

David Gammon

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]


28/05/2024

Dear Sirs

Re: University of Kent Development  
Ch.2 Policy C12 of local plan

I am writing to object to the development on a number of grounds.

1. Sewage. The City Council fought against the Gladman plan for 80+ houses in Blean, partly on sewage grounds. Gladman are now trying to get a waiver on the requirement for a huge cesspit/sewage disposal on site. I understand the UKC site is also suggesting a similar system for over 20 times the number of properties. The village has suffered drainage problems for years. The main sewer in this and neighbouring roads is 4" diameter!! Inadequate! If the New Dover Road development can't proceed because of pollution at Stodmarsh Nature Reserve and like Debenhams and Nasons sites, what makes the council planners think UKC plans will be better? Both Canterbury and Swalecliffe sewages sites are inadequate now.
2. Traffic. The development will triple the size of Blean. Traffic on the A290 is very heavy at present and a probable 3000 extra cars will exacerbate the problem with possibly 6-7000 extra movements per day. How many will use Tyler Hill Road which is narrow and winding? Access via the current Blean School site would be dangerous on the brow of Tile Kiln Hill. The other proposed access near Rough Common would not be legal as this is a bridleway – use for pedestrians, cyclists and horses only. This is part of National Cycle Route No 1 which I walk often. To widen Rough Common Road would be dangerous.
3. Health. Kent has one of the lowest ratios of doctors to patients in England, more housebuilding in the district will only exacerbate the problem. What about hospital places. There are large housing developments in Ashford and Thanet. K&C Hospital will require a new A&E Department. Fresh water supplies may be inadequate and the proposed Broad Oak reservoir, if it is built may not be filled because the R Stour has so much water removed upstream. The Sarre Penn brook has much less water now than when I was a child (1950s).
4. Food sustainability. The Prime Minister has declared that this country must produce more of its own food. The UKC development is on productive farmland and so it against government policy. The houses will combine 3 villages into a town. This will cause a loss of community. Bird life in particular will suffer. I have seen buzzards nesting in the University grounds and the development will cover their nearest feeding grounds.

- 
5. Facilities. It is proposed that there will be a business centre on site, including shops. How will this affect the existing village shops. If too many of the existing residents shop elsewhere, will the existing Blean and Rough Common shops survive. If not, some elderly people without cars may suffer.
  6. Occupancy. How many of the new houses will be bought by local people? How many will be “affordable”? Will we just see a further unwelcome influx of Londoners?
  7. Ecology. Both the University and CCC have ecological aims/policies. This development, and others in the district are completely at odds with the stated objectives. If it takes more protest marches to make the authorities aware of their responsibilities so be it!

If UKC is so badly managed financially as we've all heard about recently, perhaps it should close down. The number of houses and flats that would be freed for local people would solve the housing issue in the area for a long time.