

Alexander Gunyon

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 May 2024 17:02
To: Consultations
Subject: Chapter 2 Policy C12 Consultation Response.

Categories: Blue category

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

--Email From External Account--

Ref. Chapter 2 Policy C12 Consultation Response.

18th May 2024

Mr. Andrew Bond

The proposed development for two thousand houses would be completely inappropriate for the Tyler Hill, Blean, Rough Common area, and will blight all three villages and the surrounding area in the following ways.

1. The additional houses and subsequent population increase will have a wider adverse effect on the local resources of education, healthcare (which is already oversubscribed), and transport.
2. The increased volume of traffic would be disaster for the two routes into Canterbury from Chestfield, and Whitstable. These routes are currently heavily used during morning and afternoon peak, with traffic tailbacks formed as a result. This situation is of course getting worse year on year anyway, without creating additional numbers. Road widening has been mooted, but realistically where is this extra room to come from? The road infrastructure is totally unsuitable to support the development!
3. Creating new access to this development apparently involves demolishing Blean School. So will a new school be built prior to the construction of homes to enable the seamless transfer of staff and pupils? Will this new school have increased student capacity? Blean School has been rated as 'Outstanding' for many years now. What guarantees are there to ensure that this massive and unwanted disruption will not harm the schools performance and current rating?
4. Those of us that live in the three villages live in a peaceful rural setting. If this large development goes ahead all three separate villages will become part of an urban sprawl, and all character, and way of life for current residents will be lost forever.
5. The proposed development area currently contains listed buildings, scheduled monuments, and an early medieval Church, to say nothing of several Conservation areas. This housing development surely contradicts other City Council policies put in place with the foresight to protect our history and heritage? Is this Council putting the financial gain of the University of Kent, and new housing quotas, before the wishes and well being of those who elected you?
6. On a similar note, your own policies stress the importance of maintaining wildlife (some of which is threatened by this development). Turning a vast swathe of quality farmland and ancient forest into a concrete matrix of houses will decimate the area's wildlife, and again, once this is all gone, it's gone for

good. You create policies which say the right things, then act against them in this instance. Please put our views first. After all we are not responsible for the Financial situation at the University.

7. Some consideration has been given to the increase in waste water, but with the effect of blighting some peoples properties at Tyler Hill. What about ground water run off? The soil in this area takes longer to drain due to the London Clay bed that lies under the few inches of top soil. The area does not favour development due to poor drainage, and it's quite likely that flooding will regularly occur in the future if this goes ahead.