

David Phipps

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

22nd May 2024

Ref Chapter 2 Policy C12 University of Kent development.

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing as I am totally opposed to the above development in the Canterbury City Council local plan 2040 due to the following reasons.

#### Impact on local area

You state in your plan that the houses being built throughout our area will support our communities. Through my job I have carried out work in various properties on some of the new developments in our region and discovered that in every case the occupiers had moved from London so how can you say that C12 or any other local development supports our communities. I know you have no control over people moving from other areas but you should not try to justify these developments by saying that they are being built for our communities, implying that they are local homes for local people when clearly they are not.

#### Impact on the city

The addition of 2000 homes so close to the city is bound to have a massive impact on traffic and congestion in the city which is already bad enough. The council's idea of a bus and cycle dominant transport system is idealistic. When you drive around the area and see the convenience of parents driving their children to school and people driving into the city I can't see them giving their cars up willingly to switch to a bicycle or getting on a bus. Considering the end date for consultation is June 3<sup>rd</sup> I was shocked at the two meetings in Canterbury on 29<sup>th</sup> April and 21<sup>st</sup> May for the council to admit that they haven't had the relevant meetings required with the bus companies involved to see if they are even prepared to provide the services the council are proposing to achieve their 'vision' of a car free environment. These bus companies are independent companies and as has been shown on local television recently if a route is not viable or profitable to run then they won't run it and they don't care who it inconveniences. Also having parked in the car park adjacent to M&S recently in the city this was pretty full despite the council considerably increasing the parking charges (presumably in an attempt to persuade people to switch to the new park & ride service) and by coincidence on the same day a local newspaper visited the park & ride in Sturry to photograph 3 buses over a number of hours with approximately 7 people in total on the 3 of them!

I think this shows the council have a battle to persuade people to give up their cars.

#### Traffic

At the meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> May when a lady in the audience suggested that there could be 1000 more cars travelling daily into the city due to the C12 development the council panel

spokesman admitted that there would be more traffic as a result of the development hence the proposal to carry out major alterations at the A2/Rough Common Road junction to upgrade Rough Common Road into a form of by-pass to carry this additional traffic into the city. When the previous administration proposed the 'zoning' system to take traffic out of the city via a number of Zones, one of the proposed zones was via Rough Common Road. Residents in this area strongly campaigned against this at the time and the new administration duly scrapped it.

It now seems that to accommodate additional traffic from the C12 development the residents of Rough Common Road are again being asked to bear the brunt of this. If they weren't happy with accepting the previous zoning plan what makes the council feel that they should now accept this equally imposing plan on their doorstep. As a resident of Ryler Hill (adjacent to the Tyler Hill Road/Link Road/Hackington Road junction) I am very concerned that we too will suffer greatly from the additional traffic created by the proposed C12 development.

When looking at the plan for C12, although it is stated that access to the development would be via 2 access points on Blean Road there is a large section of the development shown that appears to be to the north of the main development (there are no compass points on the plan) that is separated from the main development by Tyler Hill Road. This area appears to be approximately one third of the size of the main development.

Without yet seeing a proposed layout plan of the 2000 houses we must assume that there could be approximately 600 houses in this area, this area basically being separated from the main development by Tyler Hill Road. Practically if a resident living on this section of the development wanted to drive into the city or to Tankerton, rather than driving west along Tyler Hill Road to Blean Road they would drive south along THR and onto Hackington Road via either Link Road or Calais Hill. This series of roads is very narrow (especially THR) from the proposed development to Calais Hill and becomes congested now with cars & vans, this currently being a through road for Blean & Whitstable. Hackington Road is already at a standstill during morning & evening rush hour periods so a possibly additional (say 300 cars for 600 houses) per day passing through these roads would be disastrous for Tyler Hill. It is said that traffic flow on Tyler Hill Road will be 'minimised' but how does the council propose to do this on what would be a main artery road to the development. Also how would builders vehicles gain access to the site? I assume this would be from Blean Rd (even more noise and air pollution for the people of Blean & Rough Common) because they certainly couldn't gain access from the Calais Hill/Link Road end of Tyler Hill Road but then how would they gain entry onto the separate part of the site I have detailed above without travelling along Tyler Hill Road which becomes congested with cars & vans now without builders lorries.

#### Access to proposed C12 development

It is proposed to provide one access point to the development by demolishing Blean Primary school & building a new school on the C12 development to replace this. I assume this would be built very early on in the planning schedule of the development so the original school can then be demolished to provide the necessary access to the site. This means there could be children who will spend their entire primary school life on a building site. When the main focus today is on the well being and mental health of children I can't imagine what effect living in that environment would have on them.

The second access point is proposed via a Conservation area that includes the Crab & Winkly cycle route & Grade 2 Listed buildings.

I thought the idea of a Conservation Area was to 'conserve' it not build a major road on it with hundreds of vehicles per day using it.

#### Impact on rural landscape & heritage

The council on its own Landscape Charter Assessment speaks of the landscape in the C12 development area as having a 'strong rural character' with its mix of woodlands, orchards & farmlands and in its own Environmental Strategy it speaks of the many 'heritage assets' including the Church of St Cosmus and St Damian, the remains of a Roman Villa, The Mediaeval Tile Kilns, multiple Listed Buildings and multiple Conservation Areas and says that the 'districts heritage assets are highly sensitive to change and the council is committed to protecting and where possible enhancing the historic environment for the future'.

Taking all this into account, how can the council now allow the countryside in the C12 development area to be totally decimated by these proposals and its above listed 'heritage assets' to be surrounded by houses or a commercial hub when they are 'committed to protected the historic environment for the future'.

#### Impact on wildlife & biodiversity

The wildlife in the C12 development area consists of some rare and special species:

These include skylarks, yellowhammers, nightingales, bats, great crested newts, badgers and stoats.

We have very few Areas of Outstanding Beauty in this area, unlike the north of the country (Yorkshire dales, Lake district, Peak district etc.) and I would say that the C12 area goes some way towards providing our AOOB. When you walk around the 'Blean' and hear the skylarks & nightingales it gives you a sense of wellbeing that would be lost forever and this at a time when the state of all our well being & mental health are at the fore. Do the council have no regard for this.

#### Food & farming

The proposed C12 development includes large areas of Grade 2 & 3 agricultural land.

The councils Local Plan includes a policy to 'protect the best quality agricultural land'.

Surely by including this development in the local plan this goes against the councils own principals on agricultural land.

Also, we obtain a lot of our fruit & vegetable from Spain.

Recently Spain has suffered unusual heavy rainfall (global warming) & their crops have suffered severely & since Brexit we are no longer a priority customer for their produce (priorities for themselves & other EU member countries) Surely, therefore, we should be prioritising the protection of our good agricultural land, not building on it.

#### Waste water

Regarding the proposal to build a waste water treatment works to accommodate waste water on the C12 development & run this into the Sarre Penn which is no more than a stream in the summer.

I recently read of a similar situation on a development at Chilmington Green in Ashford Kent where planning permission was refused for a similar treatment works which again was to

run into a river which was mainly dry in the summer months. Permission was refused due to 'significant environmental impact, noise pollution & impact on the visual landscape'. Surely this would give precedence for the council to refuse permission for this treatment works on similar grounds as the surrounding area & circumstances sounds identical to that of C12.

In conclusion, I wish to make the following points:

I totally object to the C12 proposal as this 'settlement' would be wedged in between 3 independent villages & partly served traffic wise by what is primarily a country land (Tyler Hill Road), it would impact severely on the lives & well being of the residents of all 3 villages due to the additional traffic & pollution caused & try as I might I can say nothing in favour of it.

There are a number of very knowledgeable people on the 'save the Blean' team who have suggested a number of ways in which the land could be used in a sustainable way to raise funds for the university instead of having the C12 development but from what I understand neither the council nor the university appear willing to discuss these with them. Why is this?

I cannot understand why the council, by including the C12 application in their local plan in the first place, seem willing to go against a number of their own principles regarding wildlife, biodiversity & heritage, all highlighted in the local plan, to show favour for the C12 development.

Yours faithfully

David Phipps