

**RESPONSE OF ADISHAM PARISH COUNCIL TO CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL DRAFT LOCAL  
PLAN 2040**

Contents

- Executive summary incl removal of previous Cooting Farm Development
- Spatial Strategy for the District
  - Policy SS1/SS2
  - Policy SS3
  - Policy SS4
- Canterbury
  - Policy C6/C11
  - Policy C17
- Rural
  - Policy R7
  - Policy R11
  - Policy R12
  - Policy R17

## Executive Summary

Adisham Parish Council (APC) fully supports the removal of the “Cooting Farm Development and important agricultural land” (Policy R1) sited in the previous Canterbury City Council Draft Local Plan 2045. APC would like to thank Canterbury City Council for reviewing the evidence submitted by both the Parish Council, CARE and many members of the public and concluding that the site at Adisham was not suitable for the extensive development planned due to a lack of highways and public transport infrastructure and the significant impact the development would have had on a thriving rural community and the flora and fauna surrounding the area (only this week there is evidence that the Marsh Harrier has returned to the area previously destined for 3000+ homes. The land is also prime agricultural land capable of producing high yields of cereals and oilseeds. This is important for national food security.

More broadly this new plan addresses previously unsolved problems with public transportation and we look forward to modestly benefiting from this in Adisham. There also appears to be a renewed emphasis on the environment and the value that it brings to physical and mental well being whether a Canterbury resident has chosen to live in the city or more rural parts of the district. This focus on open spaces, the broader environment (net zero and sustainability strategy) and the landscape and habitat that surround the district is welcomed.

## SPATIAL STRATEGY

- **SS1 and SS2 – APC agrees with SS1 and SS2**
  - APC welcomes the focus on green spaces and the extra provision that will be made to support residents moving to a greener way of living regardless of where they live within the district.
- **SS3 – APC strongly agrees with SS3**
  - Of particular note to Adisham is SS3 (5) and the assurance that in these rural communities, there will be limited development to protect the rural character with larger rural local centres being placed in villages that are already expanding.
- **SS4 – APC agrees with SS4**
  - APC welcomes the comments regarding SS4 (4). However public transport from Adisham, has always been considered as travel between the village and Canterbury. We would like any revised public transport provision to consider travel from the village to Sandwich and Thanet which are other employment areas where local residents work. The timing of any public transport provision needs to be relevant to the needs of local residents and not service providers.

## CANTERBURY

- **Policy C6 (Land at Merton Farm) – APC agrees with C6**
  - APC agrees with C6 and welcomes the removal of plans for extensive sports facilities at Highland Court. APC agree that a new on/off slip road from the A2 would be required to support the extension of the current sporting facilities and to aid access to any new hospital provision.

- C11 lays out some detail to support the new development but recognises the delivery of C6 to support the highways proposed changes. APC would encourage CCC to ensure that both infrastructure and development are satisfactory to ensure additional traffic does not bleed into rural roads which are not designed for larger traffic numbers.
- **Policy C12 (Land North of the University of Kent) – APC neither agrees nor disagrees with C12**
  - APC consider that C12 will push additional traffic onto the A290 and the B roads around Tyler Hill, which are already congested at peak times during the day and can see no statement of remedial action to be taken to ease congestion. APC also have concern about the loss of sports facilities, which although owned by the University of Kent, do provide for use by the general public with regard to sport and recreation.
- **Policy C17 (Land at Canterbury Business Park) – APC strongly disagrees with C17**
  - APC strongly believe C17 should be reconsidered; as there is now no need for such a level of development, given that there are now surplus commercial buildings on this site and other sites in Kent such as Discovery Park. APC note the comment made with regard to the site being within the AONB and wonder why, given it's current protection this site needs to be enlarged. We would again voice our concern that the single track roads around Adisham would see an increase in vehicular traffic due to the use by employees of the site coming into the site from Sandwich and Thanet, as they provide a quicker route to the Business Park than the A2

## RURAL

- **Policy R7 (The Hill, Littlebourne) – APC disagrees with R7**
  - APC believes R7 will create an increase in vehicular traffic around the local rural roads, as well as onto the A257. Without significant investment in upgrading existing local roads there will significant congestion at road junctions during peak times as is already the case on the 'Howletts Road'. The premise that households will work locally and not require vehicular transport is unworkable without an upgraded bus service to the main employment areas of Canterbury, Dover, Thanet and Sandwich.
  - CF1 South Canterbury an already approved development of 4,000 dwellings at the New Dover Road/ Gate Inn area and proposed new road layout will yet again impact on the journey times of residents in the rural areas of Bridge, Patricbourne, Bekesbourne, Adisham, Kingston and Barham in getting into Canterbury for work, leisure or recreation and we would wish to see travel times into the City improved rather than made worse.
- **Policy R11 (Local Service Centres) – APC agrees with R11**
  - APC welcomes the protection of rural environments as laid out in R11 and the limited development that goes along with that protection. APC encourages CCC to continue to consider all aspects of any development outside of the city centre and the impact it has on those who have chosen to live in a rural location as well as the flora and fauna with whom the local residents share their environment.
- **Policy R12 (Land West of Cooting Land and South of Station Road) – APC neither agrees nor disagrees with R12**

- APC appreciates that this is a potential site for development and is not opposed to such development as a concept, however, APC has concerns over the current design and suggestion that the entrance would be on Station Road. The existing trees and hedgerow fronting Station Road should be retained as is with a suggestion that access from Cooting Lane (for such a modest development) would avoid access onto a relatively busy single carriageway and remove substantial wildlife habitat for the area. There are examples of sympathetic small development (see Patrixbourne) that allow for adequate parking (incl for visitors) and limit removal of large areas of wildlife habitat by taking a curl-de-sac approach to the development. APC wish to see a greater emphasis on social housing/starter homes than specified, a provision for elderly residents (single storey) and appropriate use made of the disused barn currently on site.
- **Policy R17 (Broad Oak Reservoir and Country Park) – APC strongly agrees with R17**
  - APC supports this proposal, given the issues around global warming both known and expected to safeguard water supply. The creation of water sports in an area currently bereft of such activities is to be applauded, Sandwich has seen huge success with it's water park.

Adisham Parish Council  
May 2024