

Alexander Gunyon

From: Alan Armstrong [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 May 2024 12:51
To: Consultations
Subject: Response to the 2040 Canterbury Local Plan consultation

Categories: Blue category

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

--Email From External Account--

Name: Walter Alan Armstrong

Status Resident in the Canterbury District

Address [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Vision for the district - Comments on the vision

1. I am very pleased that CCC has listened to those living in the southern part of Canterbury district (including residents, parish councils, voluntary groups and local and national government agencies, along with Dover District and DDC parish councils such as Aylesham, Wingham and Littlebourne concerning the need to remove Cooting Farm Community Garden Scheme/Adisham New Town, i.e, the old R1, from the previous Canterbury Local Plan.
2. I observe that nothing has changed: there is still no good reason to encourage volume house-building between Adisham and Aylesham. Indeed, no more large estates should be contemplated in the south of Canterbury district until the 4000 house Mountfield New Town is built and the knock-on effects are appraised and absorbed. Note that the Dover Plan, in its final stages includes a further 1000 or more new houses at Aylesham. Instead of large estates I believe that the public interest (if not that of developers) would be much better served by encouraging small scale, piecemeal increments to the existing housing stock in most villages, especially where brownfield sites are available.
3. The site of the old R1 mainly consists of highly productive farmland which, it is clear, needs to be protected
4. As CCC's own work makes clear, the countryside here is beautiful and has excellent, well walked, cycled and ridden public access.
5. The existing infrastructure is patently and increasingly inadequate, including the dangerous roads, B2046 and A260.
6. Finally, The old R1 would have obliterated Adisham as a separate rural community with its own distinctive historical and archaeological features.

Strategic objectives for the district -my comments are as follows;-

I agree whole-heartedly with the aspiration to foster a 'thriving environment' and believe that a protected and well managed countryside will help to ensure that Canterbury's economy is indeed sustainable and resilient. However perhaps the plan should say more about encouraging farming activities and food production.

CCC's new emphasis on public transport infrastructure is welcome and in general I agree with the plan's strategic objectives and would strongly support the scrapping of the new road envisaged which would have caused environmental deterioration through much of the south of the district.

Policy SS1 Environmental strategy for the district- my comments follow.

To reiterate and to supplement some of the points I have already made under the **Vision** section above, I am sure that the scrapping of the Cooting Community Farm Garden Scheme (the old R1) was wise because it would have entailed the loss of Adisham's identity; the loss of productive farmland and attractive countryside amenities; destruction of important wildlife habitat; the creation of fresh and additional road traffic hazards; increasing levels of particulate, noise, and light pollution; the bringing of threats to water supply from the underlying chalk aquifer-a vital resource; and might meet possible, even probable complications arising from underground coal mining operations (which I understand used to be monitored by the then Coal Board and which run underground from Aylesham through and well into Adisham parish

However in general I agree with the environmental strategy in the 2040 Canterbury Local Plan though it might say more about how CCC will protect and enhance the North Downs within the district, bearing in mind the Kent Downs National Landscape (deemed equivalent in quality to England's national parks) and as well, the North Downs AHLV/LLD.

Policy SS3 Development Strategy for the district-my comments

I agree with the plan's emphasis on city and town regeneration and on using brownfield sites first.

I also agree with the CCC's new housing strategy, reducing the target numbers by bringing the plan end date forward to 2040 (from 2045) and avoiding the parascaling of new settlements into open countryside a long way from the city and from most sources of employment.

But CCC should re-examine the district housing target calculations bearing in mind that the residency of students is both somewhat unpredictable and usually temporary. Account should also be taken of decreasing levels of household formation.

Nevertheless, a range of new houses in the district will be needed, ideally one dispersed among individual settlements as I have suggested under my **Vision** comments above. As well as some social housing, there is a need for relatively cheap two bedroom homes to enable young people to get a start on the ladder.

I do very much welcome the scrapping of the idea of a major new road (the 'Eastern Bypass Scheme' marching through from Sturry via Littlebourne to Bridge), but note the new emphasis on public transport which is very welcome and in general terms I support the development strategy for the district..

Policy SS4: Movement and Transport Strategy for the district-comments.

As just mentioned the scrapping of the major new 'Eastern Corridor' is excellent news. While the existing road is congested and already hazardous, to seek to 'improve' it in this way would be very costly indeed, and promote increased road traffic as well as causing major environmental damage across a wide swathe of countryside.

Policy SS5 Infrastructure Strategy for the district comments

In principle I am very much of the view that adequate preparation and provision should take place and be accomplished prior to any development, however modest. At Adisham, limitations to the existing waste water drainage capacity have been a subject of concern for a number of years now.

Finally I should like to register my response to two site specific plan policies, as follows:

Chapter 2-policy C17: I find this to be totally unacceptable and oppose it in principle on the grounds that it would bring great damage to the Kent Downs National Landscape; entail loss of much productive farmland; and would surely increase congestion in the adjacent country lanes and in The Street at Adisham, as well as being quite out of keeping with local, national, and even international policies.

Chapter 5 (Policy R12(question12) Plan policy title at Land west of Cooting Lane and south of Station Road, which refers

to a single line of houses opposite to Station Road and, on the other side, to existing houses- my comments are these made in the light of my advocacy of the desirability of dispersed housing additions across the villages(see **Vision** above);-

In order to be consistent, I cannot deny the logic behind this type of proposal. However,I feel that in this specific case I should like to see its merits, and otherwise, assessed in detail by CCC before expressing a definite view,