

1. Excessive urbanisation outside of the Littlebourne settlement boundary which has been artificially and illogically redrawn to fit the proposals.
2. Both Plan R7 and Plan R8 would lead to a permanent loss of the best Grade 1 agricultural land.
3. Adverse effect on Landscape characteristics with damage to views particularly towards the south (R7) and to the east (R8).
4. Harm to designated heritage assets on A257 and the associated conservation area.
5. Lack of traffic assessment in the draft plan of potentially adverse effects on Littlebourne traffic density, pollution, and risk to pedestrians on the already width constrained The Hill, Bekesbourne Lane and the narrow Jubilee Road related to both R7 and R8 which would be further compounded by the other major proposed developments along the A257.

The access to R8 is on an unmarked road near the local primary school (which has no capacity)

6. Poor capacity of existing wastewater (aka sewage) and inadequate investment in infrastructure (both network & sewage treatment plant) in our catchment. In Littlebourne and other local villages, this already results in regular, persistent and disruptive emergency measures, including pumping of sewage into the Little Stour and tankering of sewage to Canterbury's Wastewater Treatment Works. Court Hill also suffers from large amounts of farm run off which will make the road impassable if another field is not used as farmland and concreted over.
7. Tanker deployment has a significant adverse nutrient effect at the Stodmarsh internationally designated sites and therefore fails to meet the legal requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
8. Increasing surface water run-off from urbanisation could impact on surface water flooding in the village and on the water quality in the Little Stour - a rare example of a chalk stream.
9. 50% increase in village population - water-related issues will become far more significant, along with the effects of climate change. Meaning greater flows of both surface water and wastewater.
10. The proposals do not meet sustainable development standards as there is no proposal for consequential increased local employment and most work would require travel away from the area.
11. Insufficient detail in infrastructure plans. That consequential necessary infrastructure requirements such as sewers, school, GP surgery, public transport, walking / cycling routes would likely either lag way behind any development or fail to be implemented at all.

12. There is a flaw in the original site assessment for Court Hill R8 in the 'strategic land assessment document'. As the distance for services is not correct the nearest station is over six minutes' drive as is stated under 5. Could other more technical parts have been incorrectly documented. This document also lists a vet and dentist neither of which we have within the village or a 5-minute drive?

13. related to the above document for site suitability the site R8 is listed as within 5 minutes of the centre of the city as a strategic site which is clearly incorrect.

14. R8 is currently a successful coffee shop/Cafe. This was also incorrectly listed as a farm shop. The location of the coffee shop is on the south portion of the site yet in the same document it lists that there is housing to the south east and west but that would only apply to the current south section currently around half the site is surrounded by open farmland and this would mean an unnecessary extension of the landscape into open country side.

15. As mentioned above access is poor and currently a large area of hedge row not forming part of the site would need to be removed to allow for current highways visibility splays for R8.

16. R8 - loss of amenity and light to surrounding homes, the residents of Cherry Orchard, Bourne Drive and Court Hill with the volume of homes included would be adversely affected the strategic site assessment document mentions the site could be designed 'in a way to not impact on the amenity of nearby residential occupiers. I believe this should be laid down as not could but 'Should' not impact nearby residents.

17. R8 - in the consultation it mentioned a green border and the row of hedge line already on the east of the site. But this treeline is not evergreen but deciduous and as such will mean any new buildings can be seen from miles away in the neighbouring village of Wickhambreaux. (Although the current site to the west can be seen this site was built as an enabling development to facility a new doctor's surgery for locate residents not just standalone housing units.)

18. R8 - Car usage – every resident will likely be unable not to use a car as although the village has a bus service the local school primary and secondary are both at capacity as such there is not services to the nearest alternative locations.

19. I'm aware a local plan is needed as such overall I am pleased with large parts of the plan but to extend a small rural location by nearly 400 homes with all the negative issues listed above seems poorly thought out given the amount of other strategic sites which would work better.

20. I would like to show my support for the removal of the Adisham New town at Cooting Farm and also the 'generally' sensible nature of the local plan to the rural area of Little Stour and Adisham.

21. I would like to echo but not repeat all the documents submitted by CARE in Adisham and the parish councils of Littlebourne, Adisham, Wickhambreaux, Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne and Ickham and Well and all the residents within. These form the 5 villages in this council ward and many residents and experts with knowledge far superior to my own have shared detailed and concise responses which I wish to congratulate them on and also offer my support having read the many pages submitted.