



Response to Policy C12 - Land north of the University of Kent

1. The proposal for 2000s houses, within a corridor between Blean & Tyler Hill will create a new village that swaps Blean and Tyler Hill in terms of scale and density. Whilst green corridors are indicated these are too narrow to provide any real separation.
2. The proposal will effectively link Blean and Tyler Hill, creating one block of residential housing using the A290 & Hackington Road which already suffers from a large volume of traffic from Whitstable, Herne Bay and Chestfield into Canterbury and vice versa.
3. The location of the community hub is at odds with the community buildings within Blean and Tyler Hill, adding another between will result in reduced use and funding to these existing communities being reduced as more attractive facilities compete.
4. The proposal of a Commercial, Business and Office space is pointless, the Council should be drawing businesses into Canterbury City centre to keep the high streets, offices and business viable for continued investment. Offering Commercial, Business and Office space within this proposed development will further add to highway demands.
5. The provision of a 3FE school located on / off the Tyler Hill Road, will result in increased numbers of children using the school, whilst I do not object to the school, the volume of traffic and pedestrians down an already narrow road without footpaths is not safe. Widening this road is not possible considering its length with various owners and the nature reserves.
6. The argument that this proposal will improve open space in line with Policy DS24 is incorrect. Policy DS24's aim is to protect the existing supply of open space, enhance and promote security for future generations. Currently, once you reach the top of St Thomas Hill and just beyond Kent University, the land starts falling away and particularly on the Crab & Winkle way you immediately feel within rural open space. Removal of this green field land would be against DS24.
7. The proposed development surrounds the St Cosmus & St Damian Church, Blean, whilst a section of land not owned by Kent University is not included, this only appears to be due to it not being promoted. The main vista and view of the church on the top of the hill when on the Crab and Winkle is one of the most attractive on the entire route. This building is Listed and in my opinion the setting of this listed building and therefore its curtilage will be significantly affected by this proposed development.

8. The suggestion that the Crab and Winkle / cycle routes would be improved by a development surrounding it is fascicle. Any such development would have to pass this route many times with roads and paths etc. It would have a negative impact to the safety of cyclists and their enjoyment of rural Canterbury.
9. There is a suggestion that there will be a 20% Biodiversity Net Gain, there is no guarantee this will be delivered on this site and can be transferred to well beyond any land that benefits the local community or the Canterbury Residents.
10. There is no enhancement to the disused Crab and Winkle railway route, this is outside of the ownership of Kent University the suggestion that this can be argued as a benefit or counter measure for the harm of this development is incorrect.
11. The proposal which will link Blean and Tyler Hill, is not organic or a natural expansion of the development boundary of Canterbury. Its location and position has purely been based upon the land proposed by Kent University. Its mass will have a significant negative value to the landscape and existing rural and agricultural land uses.
12. Currently there is a view from Blean to Tyler Hill via rural land enjoyed by those that live, visit locally and use the Crab and Winkle, the open countryside contributes to the character and provides visual separation between these two settlements. Any development between these villages will have a negative impact.
13. Another less known public foot path is that that circles around Canterbury, at this location it connects the St Cosmus & St Damian Church to Tyler Hill, this path continues around Canterbury and provides the most rural walk around Canterbury with views of the Cathedral. Development over this path even when maintained will have a detrimental affect for anyone's use.
14. Whilst there are practical transport considerations and school place improvements, there is no allowance for improved public services to accommodate the additional families within Canterbury past primary school.
15. The suggestion that people will use bikes, footpaths and buses for access into Canterbury and beyond is not realistic regardless of what calculations and be used to justify otherwise. We are realistically looking at 4000 more vehicles using the roads at peak times. This is not sustainable in anyway. The peak time trains from Canterbury are already overloaded with passengers, it is not correct that simply getting people to trains then solves the demand or volumes of people.
16. This development will further reduce agricultural land which is the buffer to the areas outlined as the Blean Woodland Complex, simply continuing with growth on greenfield land will have a negative impact on wildlife and biodiversity. Within Tyler Hill we have many Owls within the woods that actively hunt over these fields, this pattern of wildlife would be irreversibly destroyed.
17. The proposal will further reduce Grade 2 & 3 agricultural land. This is against the NNPF which is geared to protect best quality land outside urban settlement boundaries.

It appears the Council has supported this proposed land as an option to further increase housing numbers as other previously validated sites have not been progressed. This appears to be very short sighted with other Brown Field sites and City Center buildings remaining undeveloped partly due to the issues with nitrates within our rivers etc.

It appears this is attractive to meet housing targets as the scale ensures purpose made water treatment plants can be built, which on other sites is not practical.

There needs to be a focus on making Brown Field sites attractive with the support of the Council if they are not being developed due to commercial arguments.

The more pessimistic part of me, suggests this land is being proposed by Kent University as they are in financial difficulties and this proposal being accepted within the Local Plan will enable the University to hold off creditors. Perhaps the Council are worried about losing such a large organisation and as such is proposing this development. In the unlikely event the University did fail which would be disappointing, their campus could easily accommodate these new units on brown field sites.

Myself and my two children strongly object to this development.

Yours Sincerely,



Peter Munns