

Local Plan Consultation  
Canterbury City Council  
Military Road  
Canterbury  
CT1 1YW

28<sup>th</sup> May 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

### Canterbury District Draft Local Plan 2040

I am responding specifically to **Policy C12** Land North of the University of Kent Campus.

#### Access

The concept masterplan does not explain how the problem of vehicle access will be solved. No vehicle access is indicated at the northern end of the site, and only two access points are visible in the plan at the southern and south western points of the site. It is unfeasible for the likely volume of cars to be able to safely and conveniently enter and exit the site from just these two points.

#### Traffic

It is inevitable that an additional two thousand homes will lead to a very significant increase in the volume of traffic. The traffic will be forced on to the Whitstable Road which will substantially increase the number of cars flowing into the City. This will have a very serious impact on traffic congestion and the secondary problem of air pollution caused by stationary cars running engines whilst at a standstill. A significant increase in cars going in the other direction towards Whitstable will cause severe problems at the first roundabout which already struggles to cope with peak time levels of traffic going into the town or turning on to the Thanet Way.

I would also draw attention to the impact on other roads in the vicinity. Tyler Hill Road is a narrow winding lane that is unsuitable for a high volume of traffic. Currently, it is used by motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians, often as a convenient cut-through east towards St Stephen's or Broad Oak, or west towards the Blean. My biggest fear is that any further increase in traffic volume will render the road a death trap, massively increasing the risk of car and cycle accidents, which in turn heightens the risk of serious injury and fatalities. The plan does not adequately address these risks or propose any reasonable forms of mitigation.

The roads in this area are totally unsuitable to the volumes of traffic that will arise following the development of 2,000 new homes in this area. The road infrastructure was not designed to cope with these volumes, and nor is there any evidence that the Kent County Council will be able to upgrade, let alone maintain the road network that would be required to support this increase.

### **Rural landscape/ Wildlife and diversity**

The scale of this development will permanently alter the rural landscape of Blean, Rough Common, and Tyler Hill. These are small settlements that have their own village identity. I am particularly concerned about the hedgerows and thickets in and around the proposed development. These features are a haven for wildlife which include important habitats for rare and endangered birds including the skylark, nightingale, hobby, and nightjar. The development will destroy these features and will further reduce the wildlife habitats that are essential for the native bird and mammal population.

### **Heritage**

The Church of St Cosmus and St Damian is one of the finest small village churches in Kent. It is situated within a peaceful rural location amongst farmland and next to the Crab and Winkle cycle route. This is an important heritage asset and its character would be badly damaged by the construction of 2,000 new houses. There is a very strong Anglican community here and I am concerned that many of the churchgoers would be deterred from attending the services, or from using the church for ceremonial purposes.

### **Food and farming**

The area that is earmarked for development is currently used for farming and is high grade agricultural land. The Council has a responsibility to protect this area and should support our local farming industry at a time when there is increasing pressure on food production.

### **Waste water**

The planned development includes the "provision of a high quality waste water treatment works at an appropriate location within the site" which "should be delivered at the earliest stage in the development". Such a development will be completely at odds with the existing character of this rural area and will permanently blight the homes nearby. I am greatly concerned at the disruption that this would cause as well as the devastating impact to the local wildlife and ecology.

### **Local impacts**

Local services will be greatly impacted by the addition of 2,000 new homes in the area. There is already a massive strain on school places, hospitals, healthcare, and GP services and there is no indication in the Plan as to how these services will be expanded to cope with the increase the number of people that will demand these services. The re-siting of Blean primary school will create a huge amount of disruption and will negatively impact all of the children attending the school. There is no indication in the Plan as to the whereabouts of the new primary school, nor is there an estimate of the time it will take to deliver.

I have reviewed and considered the sustainability objectives as stated in the NTS.1 SA Framework and my view is that the following objectives won't be achieved as a consequence of the proposed development:

**SA1 – To reduce air pollution and encourage improvements in air quality.** 2,000 new homes will lead to a very significant increase in the number of cars on the roads and will increase the likelihood and severity of traffic jams and gridlock. This will lead to a deterioration of the air quality.

**SA3 – To conserve, connect and enhance biodiversity across the District.** The conservation area will be badly damaged and biodiversity will be diminished.

**SA5 – To conserve and enhance the landscapes of the District for people and wildlife.** The landscape will be permanently damaged by the development.

**SA6 - To protect water resources and to ensure a high quality of inland and coastal waters.** The housing development will cause a considerable strain on existing water resources. The Plan mentions nothing about how the water needs of the expanded population will be met.

**SA8 – To promote sustainable waste management.** The development will lead to a significant increase in waste and will further strain the requirement for sustainable waste management.

**SA9 – To preserve, enhance, promote and capitalise on the significant qualities, fabric, setting and accessibility of the District’s historic environment.** The area’s heritage assets will be impaired.

**SA11 - To promote the sustainable use of land and conserve soil quality.** A large area of high quality farmland will be destroyed.

**SA13 - To promote and encourage sustainable transport.** Traffic congestion will increase and road safety will be impaired.

**SA14 - To promote safe, healthy, inclusive and sustainable communities.** The village communities of Blean, Rough Common, and Tyler Hill will be adversely impacted and there is a high risk that social cohesion will be badly affected as a consequence of the very significant increase in the local population.

I have been a resident of [REDACTED] and have always enjoyed the rural landscape and village atmosphere. My concern is that the plan will radically alter the look and feel of the village and that it will do irreparable damage to the conservation area in and around the Blean. Whilst I am not against new housing development per se, I am strongly opposed to Policy C12 in the Local Plan 2040, for the reasons stipulated above. In summary, I believe that this plan is disproportionate to the local housing needs and will have a very detrimental effect on social cohesion within the community, as well as causing irreparable damage to the local landscape and to the environment.

I trust that you will give due consideration to my concerns.

Yours faithfully

Mr Nicholas James Fogg

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]