

## Alexander Gunyon

---

**From:** Kathryn Hartley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 June 2024 16:59  
**To:** Consultations  
**Subject:** Objection to Site C12 in the draft Local Plan

**Categories:** Green category

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

### --Email From External Account--

To whom it may concern,

I appreciate that you have certain targets set by the government.

However I think it wildly inappropriate to base the number of homes being built, on population projections from 2014. The Canterbury population is falling not rising. Insistence on using these outdated figures rather indicates an acknowledgement of this fact, but refusal to respond appropriately.

My main objection is on behalf of wildlife, trees and agricultural land, none of whom can speak to represent themselves. Nature should not pay for the University of Kent's financial difficulties.

The council has a duty to represent and support All that live in and around Canterbury, not just those who are human. Choosing the way of least resistance is callous and we will all pay if this blatant disregard for Nature is allowed to go ahead. Pollution, traffic, noise, will become unbearable.

I have been reliant on the buses here for nearly 10 years and currently the service is adequate. There are some issues but it is acceptable. But I don't see where you are going to put all the extra buses you say will be provided. The current bus station appears already at capacity.

Waiting at the bus station for a bus is already unpleasant with the noise and crowding and people smoking where they shouldn't. Nobody in their right mind would switch from using their car to using the bus. I have no choice but to use the buses but it is already a palava. Expecting people to forego the convenience of their own vehicle in favor of waiting for a bus that might never come, I think is really rather unrealistic. And expecting those who are already using buses to bear the brunt of further delays and wait times caused by the influx of at least 2000 more vehicles on local roads is unfair

Site C12 contradicts policy SS1 (10):

"The council will continue to work with partners to... support the extension and improved connectivity of the Blean Woodland Complex."

The proposed new development would sever the Blean Woodland Complex, destroying wildlife corridors and making any further connections impossible.

Moreover, the existing wildlife will be hugely affected by noise and light pollution as well as by pollution into the air and water. Wildlife populations are extremely sensitive and vulnerable to changes in their environment. If you destabilise or destroy their habitat, they will either leave and never come back, or most likely die. All very well you may think, if they go somewhere else, but where could they go and how would they safely get there? What you destroy here can never be replaced and there is no way you could mitigate what would be lost. The only way you can protect it is by just that, protecting it. Do not build on this land.

As the council, you are custodians of the land and protectors of the future. It is your duty to avoid pollution and to protect all species and support and protect all health-giving things. You say you support biodiversity. Prove it. You say you stand for public health. Prove it.

I am gravely concerned about the pollution increase if this development and others nearby go ahead. My sister has serious asthma that is inexplicably getting worse. I worry for her safety every time she comes to visit and if local rural land turns into a huge pollution-generating conglomeration, I will be increasingly fearful of her coming.

I chose my house on the basis that it was within walking distance of meadows, forest, and peace and quiet. I love nature and wildlife and knowing that I can walk out in it from my house is very important to me. I walk to the church of St Damien and St Cosmus with my neighbour and we enjoy the peace and quiet of a walk together. Since neither of us drive, having the ability to enjoy the surroundings and nature on foot is very important to us. And it would be pointless completing the Crab and Winkle way if you are going to destroy part of it elsewhere.

All in all, a preposterous plan.

Yours sincerely,

Kathryn Hartley

