

Rosemary Cane

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

31 May 2024

Dear Sir/Madam

Objection to Site C12 in the draft Local Plan to 2040

Response to Vision for the district to 2040 – Chapter 1.17

Breaking news about the future of universities, which are ‘broke and shrinking’ (www.tortoisemedia.com/2024/03/25/), being threatened by government cuts and reduced support, plus emphasis on apprenticeship programmes and increased barriers to recruitment of international students, puts in doubt the imagined impact by 2040 of our universities as a basis for regeneration of our district.

The vision advocates open spaces to be protected, habitats to be restored, biodiversity increased, air quality improved, urban areas to be greener and healthier, and yet these noble ideas are completely undermined by proposals such as C12, in particular. (See comments below)

What is the definition of the right type of home in the right place? Canterbury needs social housing, affordable starter homes, development of housing in the city where shops have died, where people don’t need to rely on cars. Large housing estates recently built on local high grade agricultural land are not fully occupied. Convert empty existing student accommodation in and around the city and on the University of Kent campus into apartments for starter homes and social housing.

Kent is a water-stressed area, where hose-pipe bans are not uncommon. If a ‘resilient water supply’ means the proposed Broad Oak reservoir, which will pump water from the Stour to maintain water levels, this rare chalk stream could be

irrevocably damaged. (See Guardian environment article 2021/jun/06/ 'The battle to save England's chalk streams, one of the planet's rarest habitats').

In summary, I suggest your vision for development in the district is basically flawed.

Response to Policy C12 – development of land to the north of the University of Kent

I strongly object to this proposed development of 2,000 houses to be built on high grade agricultural land between the villages of Blean and Tyler Hill for the following reasons:

2.15 refers to a rural settlement. This is patently untrue as the rural nature of three village settings will become an urban sprawl when a new community, two and a half times the size of the existing population, with shops, offices, commercial premises, large new primary school, sewage works and 'other necessary off-site community infrastructure' is positioned with the narrowest of box-ticking green space around the perimeter to justify the term 'rural'. This proposal directly conflicts with the Local Plan's strategic objective (p.9) which promises "protecting and enhancing green gaps between settlements".

2.16 – Traffic and access problems – Policy C12 4. Despite plans for a high frequency bus service, walking/cycling routes and community hub services, the Local Plan cannot guarantee, as it is impossible to predict, how successful this will be in persuading people to switch from using their cars or from choosing to use their cars to reach destinations further away on a regular basis. With the potential of 4,000 cars arriving in one concentrated area, and no additional road capacity, this would cause a traffic nightmare putting more pressure on the already busy bus route on the main Whitstable Road and on Tyler Hill Road which is a winding country lane, and potentially on narrow roads beyond Tyler Hill which go through ancient woodland to the coast. The Rough Common community will be adversely affected as the village road becomes a major route leading to the main access points to the site. The proposed minimising of traffic flow on Tyler Hill Road is not specific enough and not reassuring in the least. This is the most likely

route to become a 'rat run' through the site and an access point for construction vehicles.

The proposed development will undoubtedly be car-dependent and, with increased traffic and carbon emissions, and increased risk of traffic incidents, as a resident of Tyler Hill, I feel this is not a safe or healthy scenario for the area and, in fact, contravenes the UN Sustainable Development Goal advocating 'Feeling safe, secure and healthy', which should inform the Council's Local Plan.

Policy C12 3(i) - Building 2,000 houses here will destroy the open space which is home to skylarks, whose numbers have fallen precipitously since the mid-1970s, (British Trust for Ornithology) and to other red-listed passerines which nest in the fields, and are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981. The area is quality agricultural land and should be protected and not destroyed, as our continuing ability to provide our own food and not rely on imported food is at stake.

Policy C12 1(iv) – I am concerned and object to the proposed provision of a sewage/waste water treatment works to the north east of the site not far from Tyler Hill housing because of the adverse effect on the value of these properties and because of potential issues of repugnant smells.

For the above reasons, I strongly object to Policy C12.

Yours faithfully

Rosemary Cane