

Alexander Gunyon

From: S C [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 June 2024 11:54
To: Consultations
Subject: 2024 Local Plan and Littlebourne - R7 and R8

Categories: Blue category

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

--Email From External Account--

Hello,

My name is Silviu Chifulescu, I co-own the property at number [REDACTED]. I am writing this email to voice my concern and object to the council's draft local plan in the email subject.

Although the Local Plan aims to sound inspirational in terms of meeting the area's needs for housing and employment, whilst improving the environment and transport problems, the plan as it stands appears to be inappropriate for the unique nature of the City.

The delivery of the Broad Oak reservoir will be an essential prerequisite if building of the scale envisaged is to take place, but the sequence must be that such infrastructure is installed and demonstrably functional FIRST, before any extensive building is approved.

Removal of the ludicrous traffic zoning concept is also welcome, but the new plan retains many of the assumptions and approaches used in the previous one regarding enormous and poorly justified expansion of the city into areas of recreational countryside and productive farmland. There are frequent references to 'meeting local need', however the solutions proposed do little to meet actual need, instead assuming that allowing developers to building a large number of houses in large estates will magically enable local people to be able to afford them, and that creating "green corridors" from once open farmland will actually, somehow improve the rural environment. The fallacy of this is evidenced by the recent Barracks estate, where a ridiculously wide road, not only encourages poor parking, but the patches of grassed areas simply contribute to an overview that a multitude of very similar-looking, bland building blocks have been artificially scattered at awkward angles!

The inclusion of a disproportionately large estate in Littlebourne (Policy R7) and further creep into farmland (R8) are indicative of the one-approach-fits-all attitudes of the 2024 Plan. The village has already suffered the effects of an incongruous-looking insertion of The Laurels estate into an area that was frequently used for recreational purposes. Not only has the organic visual nature of the village been impacted, but congestion on The Hill has increased.

The addition of new estates, over three times the size will do nothing to enhance the village, and such plans have been resoundingly rejected previously by residents, environmental agencies and the council itself. Please, look again at the multiple reasons given for these rejections and remember that the views of local communities, rather than developers' profits, are supposed to be at the forefront of decision-making.

There is no way that the addition of a further 300 extra houses, that will have increased the village size by 50% since 2018 will be needed to meet actual local need. Indeed, the Laurels estate was extensively advertised as appropriate for people moving to the area from London – this is NOT local need, it actually drives up prices making the village even less affordable for genuine locals, and also contributes to the

City's car journeys and parking problems as the new residents travel into Canterbury to the train stations, supermarkets and schools.

Apart from the loss of village character and established habitats through building on productive farmland, runoff from the proposed new estates will also worsen the already problematic flooding, and need for sewage to be pumped out of Nargate Street and taken by tanker along Jubilee Road multiple times per day. Given the narrowness of the road, this is both dangerous and adds to the congestion and pollution. Furthermore, the increased volume of sewage has to be treated, and, given the current dire state of the water utilities such as Southern Water, it seems highly unlikely that the already overloaded sewage works will be up to standard by 2030.

The developer's suggestion that the large volumes of runoff from the new site (that recent research has shown is likely to contain highly toxic heavy metals and hydrocarbons) can be handled by attenuation ponds and created wetlands is contentious, as the long-term successful operation of such facilities have been called into question by ecologists and engineers in recent reports.

Thus, on these grounds alone given the proximity to sensitive sites such as Stodmarsh, such a large estate should not even be considered for inclusion in the Local Plan until the necessary infrastructure is in place and has been demonstrated to work successfully.

For the reasons given above, Policies R8 and R7 should therefore be removed.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,

Silviu