

Alexander Gunyon

From: Ann Chadwick [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 May 2024 14:31
To: Consultations
Subject: Response to Site C12 in draft Local Plan

Categories: Blue category

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

--Email From External Account--

Dear Council Members,

Response to Site C12 in Draft Local Plan

I write as a concerned resident of Rough Common.

Although it is inevitable that some development of Canterbury and District is necessary because of Government requirements for house building, the scale proposed in this plan is too large. Already over 4000 houses are planned south of Canterbury and there are many smaller in-fill development plans, such as the 85 houses behind the Royal Oak in Blean and more on Salvatori land off Rough Common Road. The proposed 2000 houses north of the University of Kent will join Canterbury to the villages of Rough Common, Blean and Tyler Hill, thus destroying the rural nature of the Blean area. The population of this currently rural area will nearly triple, causing severe pressure on services such as roads, schools, GPs, hospitals, sewage disposal and fresh water supplies – we already often suffer from water shortage in East Kent. It is surely relevant that the recent Strategic Land Availability Assessment noted significant negative effects of this proposed development on biodiversity, geology, landscape, water and the historic environment. It is pertinent that the area contains listed buildings, sites of historic and archaeological interest and conservation areas which are likely to suffer harm.

Although the Government has set targets for areas to meet in its NPFF, the Council can request mitigation of the number because of pressure on roads, schools water supplies, etc. and I urge C.C.C. to do this.

Implementation of Policy C12 will result in a large-scale car-dependent development. Being a resident of Rough Common, I am very aware of the already very busy (at certain times of the day) Rough Common Road making it difficult to cross the road due to the volume of traffic. The proposed plan will exacerbate this and effectively destroy the village by cutting it in two. It may even result in the compulsory purchase of certain houses to “improve” the road. The effect on air quality along this road and down into Canterbury vis St. Thomas’ Hill will be considerable, potentially damaging residents’ health.

I note that the CPRE, the Kent Wildlife Trust and Natural England are concerned about the detrimental effect this development will have on the natural environment in this area and I urge C.C.C. to reject the destruction of the Blean which would be caused by building on this land north of the University.

Ann Chadwick

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]