

Alexander Gunyon

From: Mstthew Allom [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 May 2024 19:31
To: Consultations
Subject: Objection to planning consultation 2040

Categories: Blue category

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

--Email From External Account--

To whom it may concern,

Consultation for Canterbury District Local Plan to 2040

I object to Policy W3 and W4 of the draft local plan to 2040

From: Matthew Allom, [REDACTED]

I would like to make my objection noted to policies W3 and W4 of the draft Local Plan to 2040 for the following reasons:

1. Landscape loss. CCC's Landscape Character Assessment 2020 recommended that CCC should reinforce the open rural setting south of Whitstable and resist development in the A299 New Thanet Way corridor.
2. The local water treatment works cannot cope with the increasing demand, and regularly releases untreated sewage into the sea, causing instances of illness for people on local beaches. The new outfall under construction will not solve this problem.
3. Sustainability. From a large development such as this, hundreds more people would be commuting to Canterbury and London, almost all of them by car because there isn't a train station within walking distance of the proposed site. It will contribute to traffic congestion in north and central Canterbury, which is very busy and often has lengthy traffic queues.

4. Lack of health facilities. Securing a GP appointment is extremely difficult already... without an additional surgery, how does CCC expect people to be able to see a doctor in a reasonable time? Also Margate's hospital has a serious lack of beds as it is.

5. Increased pollution from extra traffic.

6. Negative impact on biodiversity. Numerous fauna and flora thrive on this site currently in the hedgrows and they would be lost.

7. Loss of "best and most versatile" agricultural land. We should be encouraging the growth of more British grown produce rather than using greenbelt land for building projects.

8. The proposals would be unsustainable and would contravene paragraphs 135c, 168, 173, 180b, 180d and 191b of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework.

Sent from my iPhone