



**Planning department
Canterbury City Council
Military Road
CT1 1YW**

12th May 2024

COPY ALSO SUBMITTED ONLINE

Dear Sirs

**Canterbury City Council (CCC) Local Plan to 2040
Proposed development R7 300 Homes on The Hill &
R8 for 50 Homes off of Court Hill – both in Littlebourne**

This letter is to register formally, and in the strongest terms, the objections of my wife and I to the above proposed plan for two developments. This letter contains the detailed grounds of our objection. The next paragraph details our interest and right to object.

My wife and I have been co-owners of [REDACTED] since 2019. We have been Littlebourne residents, paying Council Tax to CCC since 25th April 2002. We previously lived at [REDACTED]

We are both keen supporters of English village life and wildlife enthusiasts. Whilst we recognise the need for homes we do not believe that this should be at any cost and should be subject to the rights of existing residents. However, I write on our joint behalf to protest vehemently against these two proposed developments. To us it is crystal clear that the benefits that they generate are completely eclipsed by the problems that they would create.

1. Excessive urbanisation

The biggest impact would be on the fundamental nature of the whole area of Littlebourne. It could turn Littlebourne into “BIGBOURNE”. The village population is currently shown as 1,529. Assuming the 350 new homes to have an average occupancy of 3 each would increase the population by almost **70%**. It is obvious that a change of that magnitude cannot but be detrimental to the nature of the village and affect the lives of its current residents fundamentally.

We have discussed this with village residents of many years standing – all of whom feel acutely the threat to our village ethos and the massive changes to our life style. We find it difficult to understand and accept that the normal code of preservation of property and lifestyle is overturned and the democratic rights of villagers usurped. Other detailed objections are as follows:-

2. Loss of agricultural land.

The developments would cause the permanent loss of a substantial amount of the best prime, Grade 1 agricultural land. The national food production is already stretched to feed the population and can ill afford the loss of such a valuable resource.

Continued

**Canterbury City Council (CCC) Local Plan to 2040
Proposed development R7 300 Homes on The Hill &
R8 for 50 Homes off of Court Hill – both in Littlebourne**

3. Effect on the local landscape and heritage assets

The two proposed sites would adversely affect the local landscape characteristics with significant damage to views to the south (R7) and East (R8). They will also harm the designated heritage assets of the village and its associated conservation area.

4. Traffic and road safety

Littlebourne and its environs are already beset with problems caused by the speed and volume of the current traffic levels - both local and “passing through”. Traffic Calming measures have had little effect. There have been four major developments in the area in recent years without any improvement of the roads.

The development would add materially to that congestion. The figures speak for themselves - 350 houses with an average of 2 cars per house (80% of households do according to recent research). Service and commercial vehicles would mean at least 800 vehicles inflating the current overheated traffic.

There would also be a massive upsurge in noise and pollution levels and an unconscionable increase in road traffic accidents with injuries and fatalities resulting. The local roads are width restricted and the additional traffic would constitute an increased risk to all vehicles and pedestrians.

5. Impact on local infra-structure – flooding and sewage

The development will drastically affect the drainage and ecological systems of the main tributary of the Little Stour river and its storm-water run-off facility. This is a key feature of our local infrastructure. The 350 new houses proposed would put an unacceptable strain on this and considerably upscale the already high risk of flooding and sewage pollution. Removing sewage by tanker is hardly acceptable modern housing practice.

It is inconceivable to even consider building in such an environmentally destructive manner. To do so, we believe, is a gross dereliction of the moral duty of our generation to maintain our natural assets for future generations.

It is incomprehensible as to how one can consider a development that will over-strain the system. The obvious risk to public health and the fouling of water services argues definitively against it. The effect of Global Warming is already adding to the pressures on the system – this Plan may well be the proverbial “*straw that broke the camel’s back*”.

We must opine that to consider using vehicles to dispose of sewage clearly demonstrates that the system is at breaking point. Not only is this idea a retrograde step it will also encounter problems of access as several of the roads in the relevant locations are subject to a 7.5 ton weight limit. A Google search tells me that the tankers used contain up to 3,000 gallons with a weight of up to **28 tons**. Mutatis mutandis not applied.

The National Electricity Grid is also under considerable strain in many areas (a 10 years ban on new housing for this reason in West London). Adding 300 new homes with related services will put the power supply to the site area under excessive and dangerous pressure.

Continued

Canterbury City Council (CCC) Local Plan to 2040
Proposed development R7 300 Homes on The Hill &
R8 for 50 Homes off of Court Hill – both in Littlebourne

6. Sustainable development standards

The proposal does not meet these as it fails to address the need to increase local employment levels for the proposed incoming residents . This will result in them having to travel away from the area for employment. This would also deprive the village shops of their expenditure for meals, etc during the working day.

7. Infrastructure plans

The proposal contains no details as to how it will provide the necessary infrastructure required to meet the needs of this massive influx of new residents. This will require a substantial increase in sewage facilities, educational facilities, social premises, telephone and broadband lines, GP and other medical services, additional public transport, walking and cycling routes to name but a few.

These must be planned in detail, sourced and financed before such a proposal can be considered – let alone implemented.

8. Biodiversity

The Kent Biodiversity plan seeks to maintain our ecological surroundings and prevent the loss of endangered species by restricting the encroachment of aggressive development.

This site area has already proved to be home to many protected species. This includes dormice, badgers, skylarks, birds of prey, lizards, slowworms, butterflies, moths and wildflower species. We have found natterjack toads, frogs, newts and a diverse bird population in the designated sites. No doubt groups whose objects is the protection of such flora and fauna would become involved in opposing a development that would harm them.

9. Archeology and history

Recent information from local archaeologists has described recent exciting local finds of valuable historical interest that augment our knowledge of “Littlebourne” past” and our communal history. Their objective is to extend their “digs” with the expectation of further discoveries.

The proposed development would inhibit this and destroy potential sites - blocking the acquisition of knowledge of our local past. This is not only morally reprehensible but also “flies in the face” of accepted priorities where historical interests clash with modern development.

Conclusion

We are simply asking that you acknowledge the severe downsides of this development, recognise its serious flaws, omissions and negative impacts and accept that severe downside risks are attached to it such that warrant its outright rejection.

Yours faithfully

██████████

PFJ Bruff (Mr)

██████████

Monique Bruff (Mrs)

