

Alexander Gunyon

From: Lester Clark [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 June 2024 16:10
To: Consultations
Subject: Chapter 2 (Canterbury), Policy C12 is the reference for the University of Kent development."Rural Settlement" of 2000 houses. Land owned by University of Kent

Categories: Green category

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

--Email From External Account--

Mr Lester Clark

[REDACTED]

29th May 2024

Dear Sirs.

Re; Chapter 2 (Canterbury), Policy C12 is the reference for the University of Kent development.

"Rural Settlement" of 2000 houses. Land owned by University of Kent.

I am sure you will be overwhelmed by the amount of comments that you have regarding this proposal so I will keep my contribution to "bullet points"

- Mass house building throughout the UK must be curtailed as it is overwhelming our public services, Sewage, NHS, Schools, Transport and most other services are being seriously affected by the huge increase. Plus of course the loss of food producing farmland.
- You will have noticed that every large development is met by fierce local opposition. You must realise that you are not working in the best interests of your local constituents by allowing these plans to proceed.
- Every council (KCC & CCC) and indeed the UKC have Environmental, Farming & Wildlife protection policies in place. These plans for huge developments do not comply with current policies.
- Your plan shows that this should be considered on a "local needs" basis, and there is no "local need".
- This is not a solution for a "housing crisis" but a " crisis caused by housing"
- This plan is "Urbanisation of a rural area". Which is a valid reason for refusal.
- When this land was sold in 2006 I bought a small area at the rear of my property as an extension to my garden. I put a shed in the corner. I have been told to remove the shed as it's considered by Canterbury City Council as "Urbanisation of a rural area", (appeal has been lodged). So what will 2000 houses on the same land be if it's not "Urbanisation of a rural area" ?
- Please be assured that I am in no way against controlled immigration but this so-called "housing crisis" is solely due to - Quote - " The UK has experienced unprecedented levels of immigration, The latest official estimates show a net in the year to June 2023 was 672,000" ! (Very sadly Nigel Farage was right, "the UK is going to sink under the weight of immigration" ! No surprise that a massive swing to the Reform Party is in the polls)
- Sewage spills are always in the news due to water companies being overwhelmed by mass housing developments. Any additional houses will exacerbate this.
- Every acre of land soaks up an acre of rainwater. But not when it's been built over so the excess rain groundwater ends up flooding or in the drains.

- The NHS is always in the news due to being overwhelmed by demand. Any additional houses will exacerbate this.
- "Support British Farmers" is also in the news. So much of their land has now been taken for housing. We will soon be mostly reliant on imported food.
- Kent has been the "Garden of England" since Henry VIII in the 1500's. Sadly it's not anymore.
- The UKC has a good record on preservation of the local natural habitats. That good record of preservation will be destroyed.
- The UKC attracts students due to the idyllic rural surroundings, Unlike other universities being inner city or near to houses or industry. This proposal will destroy this idyll.
- The UKC has a copious amount of unused land on which to build within its campus boundaries, all of which already has excellent footpaths, cycle tracks, road and bus services.
- I am sure you will have lots of valid comments on the wildlife situation, so whilst I agree with their opinion, I need not take up your time by adding to them.
- I am sure you will have lots of valid comments on the extra traffic situation, so whilst I agree with their opinions, I need not take up your time by adding to them.
- I am sure you will have lots of valid comments on the gap filling, joining up of the Villages, thereby destroying their individuality, so whilst I agree with their opinions, I need not take up your time by adding to them.
- Have you considered the cost of compulsory purchase of 2000 homes to reinstate the countryside when the errors of this plan are realised ?
- I was born in Blean and have lived here for over 69 years. So I am fully conversant with every aspect of the proposed sites, I played there as a child and still walk the area every day (with my dog).
- Local residents live here because of what Blean, Tyler Hill & Rough Common villages are. Lifestyles will be destroyed by this plan, Please go to Golden Hill (off Millstroude, north of the old Thanet Way) in Whitstable to see an example of how the developments there have destroyed what they had and caused untold stress and upset of lifestyles.
- Do not lose sight of the fact that anxiety, mental health & wellbeing is now also regularly in the news. These plans will be the root cause of stress & anxiety locally.

Let's hope that common sense and decency will prevail over profit, greed and short sighted government targets.

Yours faithfully

Lester Clark