

Alexander Gunyon

From: Will Haynes [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 June 2024 16:58
To: Consultations
Subject: Objection to proposed 300 houses in Littlebourne

Categories: Green category

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

--Email From External Account--

I must express my strong objection to the proposed 300-house development (R7) in Littlebourne. My concerns, previously raised along with those of many other residents, remain largely unaddressed. Furthermore, some of the minor modifications suggested by Gladman introduce additional issues.

This development, is much larger than the initial 115 house proposal which was rejected by the Council, and is therefor, for the same reasons, even more ill-suited to the location given the medieval road structure and layout of the village. The narrow and poorly maintained roads, coupled with a significant influx of vehicles, would exacerbate traffic congestion and increase safety hazards. The proposed entrance off The Hill, nearly opposite The Laurels, is particularly ill-conceived, while the suggested, curving link road through the estate to Bekesbourne Lane is likely to be dangerous for residents given the way that vehicles already park in other new estates.

The projected increase in village housing stock and population by nearly 40% is thoroughly disproportionate, doing nothing to enhance the character of the village.. Current services, including the school, pre-school, and medical practice, are already struggling to meet the needs of the existing population. Expansion will necessitate residents travelling outside the village for these services. This issue is compounded by limited bus service and the increased congestion in St Martin's Hill will further increase traffic problems.

Littlebourne's sewerage needs are currently managed by a company facing issues with excessive discharges, under-investment, and fines, posing significant risks to both the local environment and residents. The proposed installation of a new, sewage works on the boundary of the estate, adjacent to existing properties, is inconsiderate and would exacerbate pollution of the chalk streams in this sensitive area that would also receive toxic surface water from the estate's roads. I understand that there are plans to extract water from the Stour to fill the proposed Broad Oak Reservoir, so this would potentially create a toxic feedback loop. Such a feedback loop would still operate if the alternative tardily-inserted suggestion of passing foul water into the current sewage system were to operate as planned, but this requires upgrades that may well not be ready for years.

Furthermore, the inadequate surface drainage in Littlebourne is easily overwhelmed, leading to flooding and sewage ingress within the village and downstream. The proposed development, with its limited-capacity attenuation ponds, will only worsen this situation. The development also encroaches on fertile arable land, which is crucial for home-grown food production to keep prices down and minimize the carbon footprint of imports. The current landowner's frequent underutilization of this land does not justify its conversion to residential use. It would be more beneficial to use part of the site for a Littlebourne bypass and donate the rest to a farmer who would use it productively, potentially restoring traditional orchards common in the area.

Promises of affordable homes and additional facilities by previous developers often lack effective mechanisms for ensuring commitments are kept. Therefore, I urge the Council to remove Proposals R7 and R8 from the Plan as they are even more detrimental than previous ones. Utilizing the land for a bypass and

productive agricultural use would be far more beneficial for the community and environment.

I strongly object to the proposed 300 house Gladman development in Littlebourne.

Most of the concerns raised in my own previous objection, and those of many other residents still apply, while some of the minor modifications suggested by Gladman add further issues.

The development is even larger than the first, excessive proposal and in an unfavourable location given the medieval road structure and layout of the village. The narrow and poorly maintained roads, combined with a large influx of vehicles, would cause additional traffic congestion and danger. The proposed entrance location off The Hill, being almost opposite that to The Laurels is ill-conceived.

It is projected to increase the village's housing stock and population by nearly 40%, leading to unprecedented density. Existing services like the school, pre-school, and medical practice are already hard-pressed to meet the needs of the current population, so expansion will require patients/ children to travel outside the village, yet there have been recent reductions in the bus services so the diminished public transport options will thereby increase traffic problems still further.

Littlebourne's sewerage needs are currently managed by a company facing issues with excessive sewerage discharges, under-investment and fines, posing risks to the local environment and to residents. Simply allowing an out-of-area utility to instal a new unmanned sewage works on a boundary of the estate adjacent to existing properties is not only inconsiderate, but will contribute further to the pollution of chalk streams in a highly sensitive area, where there are already plans to extract drinking water that will them be fed back into the supplies, forming a toxic, positive feedback loop.

Inadequate surface drainage already exists in Littlebourne, and is easily overwhelmed leading to flooding within the village and downstream. The development, with limited-capacity attenuation ponds will only exacerbate the situation.

The proposed development encroaches on fertile arable land if the current owners could be bothered to use it effectively. At the moment the UK needs to produce all the home-grown food that it can, both to keep prices down and to minimise the carbon footprint of imports!

As with so many previous developers' promises of "affordable homes" and additional facilities there seems little effective mechanism to ensure that commitments will be kept, especially as this is only "outline permission", and as such nothing more than the thin end of a wedge.

I therefore submit that the Council should reject the applicant's proposal, it is worse than the earlier ones. If the current land owners do not choose to use the site effectively for food production, it would be far better for part to be used for a Littlebourne bypass, with the rest donated to a farmer who would use it productively, preferably enhancing it with the traditional orchards that were once common in the area.

William Haynes

[Redacted signature]