

Alexander Gunyon

From: Bob Fearnside [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 June 2024 13:19
To: Consultations
Subject: POLICY C12 - OBJECTION

Importance: High

Categories: Green category

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

--Email From External Account--

I strongly object to the proposal to build 1400 new houses around the Blean. Stating that 'new homes will meet the needs of the district', ignores the fact that there is a desperate need for social housing. Any new built homes must be equipped with solar panels by default. The 'rural settlement' is nothing of the kind as it will be 'infill' between Blean & Tyler Hill and the northern fringes of Canterbury. Much of the housing need could be met by developing derelict properties within the City itself rather than sacrificing valuable farmland.

The strong and cohesive communities at Rough Common and Blean would be severely disrupted, the character of the villages degraded and the delightful little school at Blean closed and relocated. Children there would be badly affected and their schooling seriously interrupted for a number of years, an unacceptable cost to their lives.

Infrastructure in the area is inadequate to support the current community and would be even worse with more houses added. The amount of sewage being deposited into our waters would worsen to reach dangerous levels impacting the health of all citizens. More roads, more traffic would increase pollution and further damage the environment. Much of the scenic beauty of the area would be ruined. NHS services, in the area, are severely stretched already without adding further to our local population. In the Sustainability Assessment a 'car-dependent development' is stated, which is contrary to 'inclusiveness', prejudicial to those who don't or can't drive and ridiculous when the use of public transport needs to be encouraged and supported.

Our environment can only be compromised by having more concrete dumped upon it and our precious woodlands will suffer. The roads will experience even greater volumes of traffic, leading to increased pollution and damage to air quality.

I have seen absolutely nothing that will improve life in the Canterbury area in your proposals and beg you to rethink. Focus on converting existing unused properties within

Canterbury itself and brownfield sites; this could improve the city without sacrificing our countryside.

Yours faithfully

Robert H Fearnside



Virus-free. www.avg.com