This policy is both wrong in principle and not deliverable.

In terms of the principle, expanding the population of a small settlement that has existed for hundreds of years by over 50% on one swoop is not sustainable development as required by the NPPF. It is an unsustainable increase in population that will enormously impact the character of the settlement. Also, the A257 going through the village and Bekesbourne Lane going towards the A2 are already far too busy for the environment. KCC may say that they have capacity, but that is different from whether as a matter of principle it is desirable to further increase an already intolerable amount of traffic on roads that go through the middle of a village. To note, part 4(ii) of the proposed policy is meaningless, as the physical constraints of the roads through the village, and in particular the Nargate Street / A257 / Bekesbourne Lane junction, make it impossible to improve pedestrian and cycle accessibility and safety. There can be no doubt that placing this many more cars on the roads in Littlebourne will increase the chances of serious injury or death due to the road being used above its physical constraints already.

The only way in which this proposal could conceivably be acceptable is if a bypass for the A257 were provided to mitigate the enormous detrimental impact that this level of development would have on the character of the village. There is only a small piece of land from the edge of this proposed site on Bekesbourne Lane back to the A257 to the east of the village required to complete a bypass, yet it appears that there has been no consideration of requiring a bypass to be built (if necessary using powers of compulsory purchase over that piece of land outside of this proposal site). Respectfully, the Council should insist on this as the starting point for any consideration of inclusion of this site in the local plan.

Land south of the A257 south of Canterbury (SLAA122) is considered suitable, available and achievable in the assessment of sites put forward for development. Adding 300 houses there rather than in the site on The Hill would be far more sustainable, as it would be a proportionately small increase in population to a large settlement, rather than a proportionately massive increase in population to a small settlement. From a planning perspective, it is respectfully submitted that this, and many other locations considered suitable, available and achievable in the assessment of sites put forward for development, are far, far better suited to this level of development than the site on The Hill, which is simply completely unsuited for the level of development proposed.

You will see the level of objection to this proposed development from the scale of objections to both the two applications submitted for this site (the latter of which is almost identical to the local plan proposal) and the first draft local plan (see e.g. <https://www.kentonline.co.uk/canterbury/news/developers-manipulating-process-to-build-300-homes-in-vill-296145/>). Respectfully, the Council is obliged to consider these responses to near-identical proposals so that the developer cannot say that objections are less than they are through the inevitable attrition of responses through now four consultations.

Secondly, this proposal is not deliverable as defined in the NPPF, so would be found not sound by the Inspector. The proposal in the draft local plan is for an onsite wastewater treatment plant, as was the proposal in the current outline application mirroring the proposed local plan allocation. However, from the documents on that outline application it is clear that this has been abandoned, I understand because a) the pipe it was proposed to convey “treated” water through the village is unsuitable for this (see KCC flood response to outline application) and b) the Environment Agency would not permit the “treated” water to be discharged into any watercourse.

There is therefore at present no proposal for dealing with wastewater from the site. From the Southern Water response to the current outline application and on the basis that the original application proposed an onsite treatment plant rather than discharge into the public sewer, it is clear that the sewerage infrastructure is not capable of dealing with the volume of wastewater this proposal would generate. It is understood that the Newnham Valley treatment plant where the public sewer on The Hill goes has insufficient capacity to deal with even the existing level of wastewater it is supposed to treat (there have been a vast number of collections of wastewater by tankers in Littlebourne throughout the winter due to this). It is clear from the response by Southern Water to the current outline application that there is no proposal to expand capacity at Newnham Valley. Accordingly, there is simply nowhere for this wastewater to be treated.

This means that the scheme is not deliverable.

Both on the basis of the principle of the proposal and its undeliverability, this scheme should be removed from the draft local plan. It is acknowledged that the developer has, by submitting applications for the site, pursued an approach designed so far as possible to compel the inclusion of this site in the local plan. The local population respectfully asks that the Council be robust in its response considering the manifest unsuitability of this site for the level of development proposed, particularly when there are other sites deemed suitable, available and achievable which could sustainably accommodate the level of development proposed.