**Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045**

# **Chapter 5: Rural areas**

| **Policy** | **Number of written comments** |
| --- | --- |
| R1: Land at Cooting Farm | 690 |
| R2: Rural service centres | 147 |
| R3: Blean | 43 |
| R4: Land at Mill Field | 48 |
| R5: Bridge | 46 |
| R6: Great Pett Farmyard | 38 |
| R7: Chartham | 69 |
| R8: Land to the west of Rattington Street | 122 |
| R9: Land at Ashford Road | 38 |
| R10: Milton Manor Concrete Batching Plant | 34 |
| R11: Hersden | 47 |
| R12: Bread and Cheese Field | 39 |
| R13: Land at Hersden | 36 |
| R14: Littlebourne | 103 |
| R15: The Hill, Littlebourne | 129 |
| R16: Land north of Court Hill | 90 |
| R17: Sturry | 48 |
| R18: Land north of Popes Lane | 53 |
| R19: Land at The Paddocks, Shalloak Road | 35 |
| R20: Aylesham south | 142 |
| R21: Local service centres | 117 |
| R22: Land west of Cooting Lane and south of Station Road | 314 |
| R23: Land adjacent to Valley Road | 35 |
| R24: Land at Goose Farm, Shalloak Road | 32 |
| R25: Land fronting Mayton Lane | 30 |
| R26: Broad Oak Reservoir and Country Park | 83 |
| R27: Land at Church Farm | 58 |
| R28: Countryside | 125 |
| Other comments | 47 |

## Policy R1: Land at Cooting Farm

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Concerns Over Impact on Ancient Woodland and Natural Environment/Wildlife | 328 |
| Development Will destroy traditional wide-open landscape and much needed productive agricultural land | 316 |
| Proposes Threat to Existing Communities | 305 |
| Not Conducive To Rural Living | 302 |
| Traffic Concerns-Poor Condition and Over usage of existing Roads | 299 |
| Existing Infrastructure and Services Inadequate To Support Any Further Development | 298 |
| Protection and Enhancement of Heritage Assets Vital | 180 |
| Pollution Concerns (Air Noise, Light) | 164 |
| Sewage Concerns | 162 |
| Water Supply Concerns | 150 |
| Concerned about impact of development on AONB | 121 |
| No Firm Evidence of The Need To Expand In This Location On This Scale | 120 |
| Flooding Concerns | 108 |
| Unacceptable and Unwanted coalescence between Addisham and Aylesham | 99 |
| Community Generated Planning And Development Should Be Prioritised | 52 |
| Concerns Over Healthcare Provisions With Such Rapid Growth | 49 |
| Land Owner Has Not Put This Site Forward | 49 |
| These Communities Have Already Been Exhausted By Recent Development | 39 |
| Development Too Dependant On Car Travel | 36 |
| Greater Public Transport Links Needed Across The Area | 32 |
| CCC Need To Illustrate Housing Need For This Area | 27 |
| No Mention Of the Importance Of Farmland And How Much Food This Land Produces | 25 |
| Existing School Provision Will Be Swamped With New Applicants | 24 |
| Providing New School Or Doctors Surgery Would be Futile Due To Staff Shortages. | 24 |
| Plan To Build Here Is Flawed And Ill Conceived | 24 |
| PLan Contradicts Council's Commitment To Environment and Emissions Reduction | 23 |
| Houses Just Being Built To Relocate People From Elsewhere-Will Make Tensions Rise. | 23 |
| Meet Genuine Housing Need Rather Than Just Feeding Market Demand | 19 |
| Development Will Exacerbate existing Physical/Mental Health Conditions | 18 |
| Build On Brownfield Land Instead | 17 |
| Cooting Farm Development will cause high levels of harm to the significance of designated heritage | 16 |
| No Mention Of Housing Being Reserved For Those With Local Connection | 15 |
| Limited Employment Opportunities In Area So Car Use Will Be At A Maximum For Commuting | 15 |
| Concerned About An Increase In Criminal Activity | 14 |
| No Consultation With Local Stakeholders | 14 |
| Based on Inadequate/inaccurate proposals | 13 |
| Fails To Recognise Developments In The Dover Area | 12 |
| Development Will Cause Major Disruption For A Long Time | 10 |
| Local Tourism Will Be Destroyed-Adisham Is Starting Point For Many Who Want to Visit North Downs Way Trail | 10 |
| Sewage Pipes Are Running At Above Capacity Due To Recent Aylesham Expansion | 10 |
| Housing for Local People Could Be Adequately Provided by Building On Small Parcels of Existing Land | 10 |
| CCC Failed Its Statutory Obligation To Cooperate With Neighbouring Local Authority | 9 |
| House Building Should be Spread Evenly Across The District | 8 |
| Horse Riders Overlooked In Proposals | 8 |
| Questioning Whether Land Is Actually Available For Development | 8 |
| No Mitigation For Increase In Traffic Pressures At Wingham | 7 |
| 30% Affordable Housing Seems Unlikely | 6 |
| Reservations Of Deliverability In Terms Of Both Scope and Size | 6 |
| Proposed housing density does not adhere to the new NPPF guidelines | 5 |
| Development will exacerbate existing A257 issues | 5 |
| Additional Police and Fire Service Provision Has Not Been Recognised | 4 |
| Agree with improvements to Pedestrian and Cyclist links between Adisham And Aylesham | 4 |
| Support the reference to new Secondary School | 4 |
| 500 Homes in 'North Of Aylesham' Were Removed As They Were Deemed 'Detrimental' due to Road Network | 3 |
| Failure To Stipulate How Homes Will Be Carbon Neutral | 3 |
| Consult with Environment Agency for License for Open Loop Water Source Heat Pump at Development | 3 |
| Inadequacies at the Dambridge Waste Water Treatment Works increase risk of downstream river pollution From Development | 3 |
| Current Consultation Process Inaccessible | 2 |
| Not A Garden City Just Development On Greenbelt Land | 2 |
| Infrastructure Upgrades Should Be Put In At The Start Of Developments To Alleviate Pressures | 2 |
| Traffic Assessments Required | 2 |
| Too Small To Be An Autonomous Settlement | 2 |
| CCC Needs To Clearly Demonstrate Sustainable Transport Strategy | 2 |
| Infrastructure Improvements Needed Prior To Development | 2 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| No Demand for 320 Elderly persons Accommodation | 1 |
| Garden City Principles suggest equal split between developed area and green space however, of the 173ha due to be allocated, 91.17ha (52.69%) of this is proposed to be developed, therefore not complying with the Garden City Principles. | 1 |
| Strongly Oppose Solar Farm Development | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Plan Contains No Nursery Provision In an Area Known To Have Childcare Deficit | 1 |
| New and improved walking and cycling connections to school locations Need To Be In Place Prior To Transfer (KCC) | 1 |
| Off Site Community Infrastructure Bill Needs Refining Further (KCC) | 1 |
| KCC Require Recognition Of Traffic Impacts Beyond The District Boundary | 1 |
| Disappointing lack of engagement on two large proposed allocations adjoining DDC boundary in advance of Consultation. | 1 |
| Canterbury Has A Large Number Of Empty Student Let Properties Which Could Be Used To House Those In Need Instead | 1 |
| Recommend 320 Older Persons Accommodation Units For This Scheme | 1 |
| Bold and Logical Extension to Aylesham | 1 |
| Build Upwards In The CIty Instead | 1 |
| Include Footpath From Aylesham to Barham Crossroads | 1 |
| Older People and Those Who Have Disabilities Need to Be Considered in This Plan | 1 |
| Economic Failure-Every House Will Remain Empty For Some Time To Come Due To Not Accumulating Enough Tennants/Mortgage Applications | 1 |
| DCC/CCC Boundary Location Of This Site Will Lead To Disputes About Service/Infrastructure Management | 1 |
| Plan Is Just a Premise To Source Revenue From Developers To Build New Ring Road | 1 |
| Cycling Routes to Bridge, Bekesbourne Littlebourne and Canterbury Should Be Included | 1 |
| Any People Relocated From London Boroughs Will Be Particularly Isolated From Opportunities | 1 |
| Build A New Community From Scratch Elsewhere Rather Than Overwhelm Existing Ones | 1 |
| Development Should Be Reduced To 2000 Units But Not Be Built On Agricultural Land | 1 |
| Habitats Regulation Assessment Required | 1 |
| Develop Elsewhere And Provide New Sheltered Accommodation For the Elderly | 1 |
| New houses built on greenfield land should be at least 3 floors With Underground Parking | 1 |
| Council Should Own 50% Of Properties To Make Housing Affordable | 1 |
| Only Logical Proposition In Policy Was Using Old Mining Tunnels For Ground Source Heating | 1 |
| Policy Is Just Knee Jerk Reaction To Meet Targets | 1 |
| Build North of University Of Kent Instead | 1 |
| S106 Contributions For This Site Should Not Fund New Canterbury Bypass | 1 |
| Consider Using Disused Colliery For District Heating System | 1 |
| Should Aim For This Site To Be a 'Garden City' With Many More Dwellings Than Originally Proposed | 1 |
| 50m Buffer Should Be Provided Between Development and Ancient Woodland | 1 |
| Support Requirement To Provide a Comprehensive and Integrated Sustainable Urban Drainage Network | 1 |
| Layout development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing. | 1 |
| Duplication of Policy Wording | 1 |
| Widespread Contamination Likely On Site-Costly To Remediate | 1 |
| New Secondary Too Expensive | 1 |
| Development will add to significant pressures on A2 mainline and the A2/A260 junction | 1 |
| Upgrade to Railway Station Should Consist Of Sustainable Measures Proportional To Scale Of New Development | 1 |
| Garden Community could make an important contribution to meeting housing needs | 1 |
| Strongly Support Upgrade to Adisham Train Station and Hope These Works Can Be Complete Before 25% Of The Development Has Taken Place | 1 |
| Policy R1 contradicts the protection afforded to SSSIs through Policy DS18 | 1 |
| Delivering So Many Homes (3,200) Is Too Risky Compared to Delivering Smaller Sites or Urban Extensions | 1 |
| No reference to the grade I listed Church of the Holy Innocents. | 1 |
| None of sites identified are within or close to a Special Protection Zone (Water Sources) | 1 |
| No impact on existing mains for any of the sites within our supply area | 1 |
| Only two allocated sites fall within our supply area:• R20 – 420 dwellings• R23 – 9 dwellings | 1 |
| Map Modification of Cooting Farm Area To Officially Designate Equestrian Bridleway Underway | 1 |
| Produce Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) Exercise | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The site allocation has been removed from the plan due to concerns around its sustainability, particularly concerns around local highway capacity and impact of the landscape and ecology.

Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Policy R2: Rural service centres

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Existing Amenities and Services Inadequate To Support Any Further Development | 16 |
| Development Threatens The Character Of Existing Communities | 15 |
| Development Will Destroy Much Prime Agricultural Land And Traditional Open Space | 15 |
| Concerns Over Impact on Ancient Woodland and Natural Environment/Wildlife | 13 |
| Existing Road Infrastructure Inadequate To Support Further Development | 11 |
| Significant Congestion Concerns | 11 |
| Public Transport Needs To Be Improved In Terms Of Frequency | 9 |
| Level Of Growth Disproportionate To Rural Living | 8 |
| Stop The Building | 5 |
| Existing Healthcare Provisions Are Already At Capacity | 5 |
| Local School Already Oversubscribed | 5 |
| Any New Housing Developments Need To Be Small scale Not Overpowering | 4 |
| Concerns for Existing Victorian School If Two New Ones Were To Be Created | 4 |
| Support Proposals For Minor Development And Infilling In Littlebourne. However, 350 Dwellings Greatly Exceeds These Criteria And We Strongly Disagree With The Proposal. | 3 |
| Adisham Would Not Be Able To Provide These Services And Nor Will Aylesham As It Is DCC | 3 |
| No Local Need To Develop On This Scale | 3 |
| Our Existing Community Already Has All It Needs | 3 |
| Pollution Concerns (Air,Noise,Light) | 3 |
| Plan Just Seems To Be Amalgamating All Local Rural Villages Into Canterbury -Needs Preventing | 3 |
| Unacceptable and Unwanted coalescence between Addisham and Aylesham | 3 |
| Council Need To Listen To Local People Via Consultation | 3 |
| Would Like A Clear Definition Of How Local Need Is Determined | 2 |
| Conservation Areas Must Be Protected At All Costs | 2 |
| Over Reliance On Littlebourne To Provide Housing | 2 |
| Findings Of Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Should Be Incorporated In Local Plan | 2 |
| Improve Cycle Links Before Any Further Development Takes Place | 2 |
| Development Is Threat To AONB | 2 |
| Development Will Exasperate Existing Physical and Mental Health Conditions | 2 |
| Concerns For Increase In Criminal Activity | 2 |
| Term Rural Service Centre Will No Longer Apply To This Development As It Will Become An Urban Area | 2 |
| Sewage Concerns | 2 |
| Build On Brownfield Land Instead | 2 |
| Providing New School Or Doctors Surgery Would be Futile Due To Staff Shortages | 2 |
| Significant Water Supply Concerns | 2 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1-26 | 2 |
| Stop Destroying Villages Like Littlebourne | 2 |
| KCC Support Of Minor Development That Helps To Sustain The viability Of Rural Settlements Provided They Can Be Appropriately Accessed By Walking And Cycling | 1 |
| Concern Over Clarity And Definition Of The Terminology 'Neighbourhood Plan Housing Requirement Figure' | 1 |
| Question Why Infilling On Appropriate Sites Cannot Be Major As Well As Minor Development, Depending On Characteristics Of The Site. | 1 |
| Extend Settlement Boundary In Blean | 1 |
| To Limit The Amount Of Development At A Site May Reduce Opportunities To Enhance The Vitality Of Rural Settlements | 1 |
| Any Developments Will Not Protect Valued Open Space In Blean | 1 |
| Support Delivery Of Sites Allocated For Development Through Saved Policies In Adopted Local Plan 2017. Including Land North of Hersden | 1 |
| Council Should Apply A More Flexible Approach To Settlement Boundaries And New Housing Development | 1 |
| Assessment of Sturry As A Local Hub Is Inadequate As Many Of The Services Mentioned No Longer Exist. Plan Based On False Facts Is Recipe For Failure | 1 |
| Walking And Cycling Opportunities Need To Include A Right For Equestrian Use. | 1 |
| Policy Protection Of Existing Facilities Is Welcomed | 1 |
| Policy Provides No Assurance That Facilities Will Catch Up And Keep Up With Our Needs | 1 |
| Should Be A District Wide Policy Not Hidden Away In The Site Allocations | 1 |
| These Rural Service Centres Need To Become Self Sustaining | 1 |
| Would Like Definition Of Minor Development | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Cannot Proceed Without A Detailed Rational Context Plan | 1 |
| Adisham Should Be Removed From Service Centre | 1 |
| Chartham Paper Mill Should Be Given Major Development Site Allocation | 1 |
| Seek The Inclusion Of An Omission Site Within The Rural Areas Section Of The Emerging Local Plan - Bolt's Hill Chartham | 1 |
| Policy R2 Strongly Supported Where It Continues To Support Delivery Of SitesAllocated For Development Through Saved Policies In Adopted Local Plan 2017 | 1 |
| Policy Too restrictive For Some Of Sites On Settlement Boundary Such As SLAA 086 Land Adjacent to The George Pub, Chartham. The Site Is Capable Of Accommodating 5 homes | 1 |
| We don't Need New Houses Just Improvements On Services We Already Have | 1 |
| Scale Of Facilities At Blean iS Radically Overstated | 1 |
| R12 Hersden Should Not Be Happening As It Contains Ancient Woodland And Is Just 180m From Stodmarsh SSSI | 1 |
| Development Too Dependant On Car Travel | 1 |
| Mass Development Fails To Address The Real Problem Of Shortage Of Affordable Housing | 1 |
| R2 Seeks To Carefully Frame Development In Light Of Rural context- Stark Contrast To Policy R1. It suggests Local Plan Has Been Unevenly Considered And Lacks Coherence | 1 |
| Stalling Of Promised Developments From 2017 Have Delayed Delivery Of Sturry Relief Road | 1 |
| Object To format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Consultation Process Flawed | 1 |
| Policy Gives Carte Blanche To Developers And Landowners With No Interest In Wellbeing Of Residents Developing Unsuitable Sites For Their Own Profit. | 1 |
| More Development Will Lead To Increased Litter And Fly Tipping | 1 |
| Policy Fails To Mention Adisham or Wingham | 1 |
| Plans Underestimate What Is Actually Needed | 1 |
| Proposal R2 Is Not Possible As Tyler Hill Road Is Not Wide Enough To Support Two Cars Abreast Currently And Thus Would Not Be Able To Accommodate A Foot/Cycle Path In Addition To Traffic. | 1 |
| Take Out The Beneficiaries To The Plans From The Plans | 1 |
| Where Are The Actual Plans For Delivering People, Staff, Infrastructure etc? Need More Than Just A Few Drawings And Mentions | 1 |
| Needs To Be Provision Of Affordable Homes For All Types Of People In Community | 1 |
| New Infrastructure Needs To Be In Place Prior To Development | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Blean Does Not Have A Doctor's Surgery- Residents Have To travel To Estuary View | 1 |
| Support Bridge Parish Neighbourhood Plan | 1 |
| There Are An Abundance Of Disused Spaces Within The City Centre Which Could Be Converted Into Affordable Living Units | 1 |
| You Cannot Talk About Aylesham As Service Provider Because It Is DDC | 1 |
| Herne Should Rank As Rural Service Centre | 1 |
| Each Proposed R policy Should Describe How The New Development Proposals Will Not Only Maintain Quality Of Provision For Residents (ie do no harm) But Improve Them | 1 |
| More Medical Provisions Required | 1 |
| Flooding Concerns | 1 |
| No Secondary School Provision | 1 |
| Level Of Growth Needs To be Proportionate To rural Living | 1 |
| CCC Need To Concentrate Improvements On Aylesham, Which Incidentally Falls Into Dover District | 1 |
| A Foot/Cycle Path Needed For The Entirety Of Adisham Road-Connecting Aylesham With Barham Crossroads | 1 |
| Chartham Already Overdeveloped And Does Not Have Sufficient Infrastructure To Support Further Development | 1 |
| Concentration Of Resources Into Rural Service Centres Risks Ignoring The Needs Of Those Parishioners Lower Down In The Hierarchy. | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered.

A review of the Rural Settlement Study was conducted and it was concluded that no changes were to be made to the settlement hierarchy.

## Policy R3: Blean

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| More Housing Will Only Add To Congestion In This Area | 3 |
| Flooding Concerns | 2 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 2 |
| No Mention Of How New Dwellings Will Be Environmentally Friendly | 1 |
| Seeking Clarity On The Terminology Of 'Neighbourhood Local Plan' | 1 |
| Provide Minerals Assessment in Accordance With The Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan (KCC) | 1 |
| Housing Should be Affordable And Reflect Needs Of The Local Community | 1 |
| Equestrian Provision Required | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Policy Will Be Detrimental To Environment | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Not Enough Infrastructure To Support More Housing Here | 1 |
| Why Has Littlebourne Been Targeted With More Housing Increases Than Blean? | 1 |
| Connect Blean With University Of Kent and City Centre With Viable Cycling Infrastructure | 1 |
| Unnecessary Extension To Settlement Boundary | 1 |
| Keep Developments Contained To Prevent Coalescence Between Villages | 1 |
| Policy In R2 Is Vague About What Existing Development Is Being Supported In Blean | 1 |
| Blean Could Support Additional Housing Should Land Become Available | 1 |
| Protect The 'Green Gap' At All Costs | 1 |
| Oppose Development Of Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Local Plan Needs to Focus On Infrastructure And Services Not Just House Building | 1 |
| Scale Back Housing to Less Than 10 Units | 1 |
| Some Development Here Would be Beneficial | 1 |
| Proposals Will Be Detrimental To Pupils | 1 |
| Northern Ring Road Should Be Scrapped | 1 |
| How Will Sustainable Travel Be Encouraged? | 1 |
| Affordable Housing Desperately Needed. Locals Should Be Given First Refusal | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered.

Following feedback it was decided to delete all Rural Service Centre and Local Service Centre policies from the plan to avoid unnecessary repetition.

##

## Policy R4: Land at Mill Field

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Development Will Threaten Existing Rural Community | 5 |
| Location Suffers From significant Flooding Events Which Make More Development Dangerous | 5 |
| Current Sewage System Running At Capacity | 5 |
| Significant Congestion Concerns | 5 |
| Site is Located In Conservation Area-This Designation Should Be Respected | 5 |
| Existing Roads Too Narrow To Support Development | 4 |
| Existing Infrastructure And Services Cannot Cope With More Demand | 4 |
| Construction of 36 Houses Is Not In Keeping With Character Of The Area | 3 |
| Promoter and Landowner confirm their collective commitment to the delivery of residential development | 3 |
| Policy R4 is available, achievable and deliverable for the purposes of residential development of circa 36 dwellings | 3 |
| Water Supply Concerns | 2 |
| Impact of development at the junction of Tyler Hill Road and Blean Common is likely to need review | 2 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26. | 2 |
| SLAA assessment Deemed Site Unsuitable Due To Greenfield Nature | 2 |
| Site is coincident with safeguarded land-won minerals so requires MA | 1 |
| Access to the facilities in Blean for pedestrians and cyclists from the development will be key to making this site acceptable | 1 |
| County Council requests specific reference to the PRoW network in respect of walking and cycling and the Crab and Winkle Way. | 1 |
| County Council requests ‘off-site community infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) is further defined to ensure that it includes all of KCC’s services sought | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Include Area For Flood Drainage and Biodiversity Enhancement | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| We own land west and next to Mill field. We have not and will not agree to it being used for a cycle way/access to this proposed development. | 1 |
| Development Should Be Kept To A Minimum | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Reasonable Development | 1 |
| Although Walking and Cycling Improvements are Welcomed, Reservations Regarding Site Persist | 1 |
| Housing Density Should Reflect Real Needs Of Community and Consist of Smaller Social Housing Units Rather Than Luxury Homes | 1 |
| Draft PLan Based On Inadequate/inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| South East Water Want to See Policies That Support Good Raw Water Quality, Thus Reducing Road Run Off and Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Making Use Of The Existing Topography and Natural Features of the Site Where Appropriate | 1 |
| No footway provision Included In Proposal- may need negotiation over private land | 1 |
| Heritage Assets Need To Be Preserved | 1 |
| There is an important opportunity here to create off road link for all vulnerable road users (VRU/NMU) which avoids using Tyler Hill Rd | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The site allocation has been removed from the plan due to concerns around its sustainability, particularly concerns around its lack of pedestrian/cycle access to Blean.

Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

##

## Policy R5: Bridge

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Bridge Should Remain A Village Not Become an Urbanised Part Of Canterbury | 4 |
| Concerns Development Will Cause Harm To Natural Environment/Wildlife | 3 |
| Development Will Result In Increased Congestion On Rural Lanes Due To its Location | 3 |
| Threat To Existing Communities | 3 |
| Bridge Already Suffers Significantly with Flooding. Further Development Will Exasperate This Problem | 2 |
| Additional Houses Should Not Be Built On Agricultural Land | 2 |
| Bridge Has Supporting Infrastructure Should Development Be Sought Here | 2 |
| Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Concluded 75 Dwellings Meet Local Need So These Should be Constructed on Various Vacant Plots, Not On One Large Site As Proposed. | 2 |
| Bus Links/Pedestrian/Cycle Routes Will Not Offset Emissions From Personal Vehicles | 1 |
| CCC Should Focus On sympathetic and pragmatic development of smaller scale programs-community-led housing to allow modest development and use of existing infrastructure to support whilst retaining the local culture of rural settings. | 1 |
| Seeking Clarity On The Terminology Of 'Neighbourhood Local Plan' | 1 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 1 |
| Green corridors must align with BHS proposals/aspirations | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Smaller Dwellings and Social Housing Prioritised Over Luxury Housing | 1 |
| Draft PLan Based On Inaccurate/Inadequate Proposals | 1 |
| Bus Frequency Could Be Improved by Diverting Existing Routes Through Bridge | 1 |
| Water Supply Issues Have Not Been Considered | 1 |
| Needs To Be Dedicated Cycle Route From Bridge To Canterbury | 1 |
| Sewage Issues Have Not Been Considered | 1 |
| Council Have Failed To Recognised The Community Based Planning Approach Bridge Have Provided | 1 |
| All New Housing Should Have Solar Panels | 1 |
| Littlebourne Has Been Unfairly Targeted With New Housing Density Compared To Bridge | 1 |
| Location Of 'Green Corridors' should be clarified | 1 |
| Existing road Infrastructure Is Adequate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Policy Shouldn't be So Open Ended On Housing Numbers-It Causes Stress For Local People | 1 |
| Improvements to Road Infrastructure Required To Support Development | 1 |
| Improvements to Medical Facilities Required To Support Development | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered.

Following feedback it was decided to delete all Rural Service Centre and Local Service Centre policies from the plan to avoid unnecessary repetition.

##

## Policy R6: Great Pett Farmyard

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Oppose Building On Farmland and Destroying Natural Environment/Wildlife | 3 |
| A small scale scheme So there must be sensitivity in how onerous policyprovisions are. | 1 |
| Wording Of Policy Should be Amended To Be More Reflective Of Existing Site Context | 1 |
| The Environment Act is To reduce statutory requirement Biodiversity net gain for new development into legislation, estimated To Be 10% by Nov 23 | 1 |
| County Council requests that ‘off-site community infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) is further defined to ensure that it includes all of KCC’s services sought | 1 |
| Development Is Proportionate | 1 |
| Whole Plan Is Just Pretext To Generate Revenue From Developers To Build Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Without Provision of Pedestrian Facilities And Improved Junction Layout With Station Road, There Is Potential For Accidents to Occur. | 1 |
| Strategic Allocations Place Emphasis on Mitigating Harm Rather Than On minimising and focusing on enhancements to heritage assets | 1 |
| Water Supply Concerns | 1 |
| Sewage Capacity Concerns | 1 |
| Cycle/Walking/Bus Routes Do Not Offset Emissions From Cars | 1 |
| Object To format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| The Character Of The New Buildings Should Be Informed By The Kent Downs AONB Farmstead Guidance | 1 |
| Houses Should Not Be Built Unless there is Proportionate Increase In Infrastructure and Emergency Service Provision | 1 |
| 30 % Affordable Means 70% Of Properties Will Be Unaffordable | 1 |
| Redevelop Derelict Properties near Paper Mill Rather Than Destroy Agricultural Land | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Policy should explicitly promote landscapes that replenish groundwater | 1 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1-26 | 1 |
| Site Isn't Suitable For Modern Day Farming Machinery So Better To Build Here Than On Prime Agricultural Land | 1 |
| Site Is Minor So Does Not Require Official Discussion In Local Plan | 1 |
| Policies should work to support good raw water quality-reducing road run off and pollution arising from effluent discharge. | 1 |
| Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) And Slow The Flow To Enable Water To Be Replenished | 1 |
| Housing Density Should Be Reflective Of Local Community Needs. Smaller Units and More Social Housing Over Luxury Housing | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Affordable Housing Should Be Provided On Site | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Part 2(b) of the policy text has been strengthened to require development to reflect the existing site setting. Following representations from the Kent Downs AONB Unit, a policy criteria has been included for development to be in keeping with the character of the historic farmstead to the north of the site and informed by the Kent Downs AONB Farmstead Guidance. Clarification has also been provided that the site will not need to provide new walking and cycling connections, but rather improve the existing ones.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

##

## Policy R7: Chartham

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Not Conducive To Rural Living | 18 |
| Existing Road Infrastructure cannot Sustain more Traffic | 12 |
| Chartham Is Already Overdeveloped And Does Not Have The Service Infrastructure To Support Further Development | 9 |
| Development Will Spoil Character Of Village Which Has Conservation Status and Several Listed Buildings | 6 |
| Allocation is completely out of scale with the village of Chartham | 5 |
| Environmental Concern In terms of Waste Water and Pollution into the Stour | 5 |
| Insufficient Public Transport To Sustain New Development | 5 |
| Cycle and pavement infrastructure is vastly inadequate to support Existing Population-Needs Improving | 5 |
| Development Will Have Detrimental Effect On Wildlife | 4 |
| Area Already Suffers From Considerable Flooding-Development Will Make This Worse | 4 |
| Preserve Green Gap So Chartham Does Not Become Extension Of Canterbury | 4 |
| 170 Houses Is Far Too Many | 4 |
| There Are Already Issues With Electricity, Gas And Water Supply In The Area | 4 |
| Development of Paper Mill Site would make significant contribution to the realisation of the infrastructure requirements listed in the emerging policy, the future growth of the village and housing delivery within the District | 3 |
| Imperative To Have Pockets Of Green Space | 3 |
| Whatever benefits there might be in terms of housing delivery are significantly outweighed by the harm. | 3 |
| No More Houses | 3 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1-26 | 2 |
| Agricultural land on Rattington Street is a key part of the 'green gap' between parts of the village and should not be included in the boundary. | 2 |
| Long winded and confusing text | 2 |
| APC would encourage CCC to continue with sympathetic and pragmatic development of smaller scale programs in line with community-led housing policy | 1 |
| County Council requests specific reference to the PRoW network in respect of walking and cycling | 1 |
| Boundary on the southern bank of the river near the Mill needs to be set back by AT LEAST 10m to permit river restoration in this area. | 1 |
| Policy does nothing to address existing acknowledged open space shortfalls | 1 |
| Object to Policy R7 on basis that the level of development proposed is inconsistent with the real status of the settlement | 1 |
| No provision seems to be made for overstretched medical and educational facilities | 1 |
| Enhanced community facilities may not be commercially viable | 1 |
| Access to the site is wholly unclear | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Housing Should Reflect Needs Of Local Community and Comprise Of Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Not Luxury Properties | 1 |
| Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| CCC Should consider the Call for Site Submitted by Chartham Council and the application made the Safeguarding Our Future to combine this site with the Paper Mill | 1 |
| Amount Of additional Cars Will Not Be Offset by New Cycling/Pedestrian Routes | 1 |
| Due to the number of houses that are being built elsewhere already, there is no need for any houses on this farmland. | 1 |
| Development Will Cause Too Much Pollution/Generate Too Many Emissions | 1 |
| Cycle and pedestrian links should follow beside existing roads or very close to them, rather than cutting through prime green fields | 1 |
| Chartham has a village hall which could be increased upwards for community facilities if needed | 1 |
| Object to any further new development that is on undeveloped land | 1 |
| Wedgewood Support This level of growth as is considered to reflect Chartham's status as a Rural Service Centre | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Memorial Field is a public open space and should not be included in settlement boundary | 1 |
| Ensure Local Education And Health Services Can Cope | 1 |
| Halve the number of houses so that the woodlands are still completely connected to the nearly agricultural land | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Local School Is Already oversubscribed | 1 |
| Location Of Site On Brownfield Land is Positive and Development Here Should Be A Priority | 1 |
| Make Some Improvements to Village Hall Which Is Important Part Of Community | 1 |
| Come up with a heritage plan for the paper mill and listed cottages. That would bring tourism to the area which local's actually want | 1 |
| Green Corridor between Chartham and Canterbury has already been breached By Cockering Road development | 1 |
| Need Shalmsford Street to be 20 mile an hour zone before someone is seriously hurt | 1 |
| Council Does Not Realise Chartham is not one community but three - Chartham, Shalmsford Street and Saint Augustines | 1 |
| No mention of affordable or council owned housing - This should be a priority | 1 |
| Reinstate access to Great Stour Way Cycle path at Horton Crossing to allow cyclists from Ashford Road residences access | 1 |
| Add vehicular Access point at SE end of St Augustine's Estate onto Chartham Downs Road | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered.

Following feedback it was decided to delete all Rural Service Centre and Local Service Centre policies from the plan to avoid unnecessary repetition.

##

## Policy R8: Land to the west of Rattington Street

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Significant Pollution Concerns | 24 |
| Existing Character Of Village Needs To Be Preserved | 24 |
| Roads Unsuitable For Construction Traffic | 22 |
| Not Enough Local Facilities To Sustain This Development | 21 |
| Build On The Large Brownfield Site Down The Road Before Building On Greenfield Land | 20 |
| Pressure This Development Will Place On Water And Sewage Is Unsustainable | 18 |
| Chartham Is Already Overdeveloped And Is At Risk Of Becoming An Extension Of The City Centre | 14 |
| Concern For Loss Of Agricultural Land We Should Be Protecting | 13 |
| Concerns That Traffic Implications And Site Access Points Have Not Been Properly Thought Through | 12 |
| Local Schools And GP's Are Already Oversubscribed | 12 |
| Significant Flooding Concerns | 11 |
| Narrow Lanes To And From Proposed Site Are Very Hazardous | 11 |
| 170 Dwellings Is Far Too Many And Disproportionate To The Area. Will Result In A Different Style Of Housing And Would Disrupt The Wildlife And Green Spaces | 11 |
| Chartham Has Already Seen Enough New Build Development | 5 |
| Plans Not Conducive To Rural Living | 4 |
| No Public Transport Along Bakers Lane | 4 |
| Proposed Development Site Is An Integral Feature Of Chartham's Character And Should Not Be Built On | 3 |
| Development Will Spoil Character Of The Area Which Has Conservation Status And Many Listed Buildings | 3 |
| Concern On Adverse Effect On Existing Population If There Is To Be Overlooking/Loss Of Privacy Or Noise Disturbance From New Development | 3 |
| Concern For Safety Of School Children If There Is Even More Traffic | 3 |
| There Is A Section Of Ancient Woodland In The Centre Of The Proposed Site, Which Should Be Preserved And Developed Rather Than Choked By Hemming It With Human Habitation | 3 |
| Development Will Make Area Increasingly Vulnerable To Climate Change | 3 |
| Area Is Already Surrounded By parked Cars Which Restrict Access For Emergency Vehicles And Bin Collections | 3 |
| Fresh Water And Sewage Infrastructure Needs Upgrading Prior To Further Development | 3 |
| There Are No Mentions Of New Infrastructure Or How To Deal With Traffic/Parking Issues To Support Further Development Here | 3 |
| More Social Housing Rather Than Luxury Homes | 3 |
| Most Of The Houses Around This Site Will Lose The Views They Moved To The Countryside For | 2 |
| Community Infrastructure Is Not Being Delivered In Proportion To This Development | 2 |
| Another Unnecessary Greed Project | 2 |
| CCC Has Failed To Recognise XX Larkey View, Chartham, Canterbury. In Policy Plans And Owner Is Suffering Significant Anxiety And Stress Regarding The Proposals | 2 |
| How Will CCC Ensure Minimum Of 30% Of Housing Will Be Affordable? | 2 |
| More Opportunity To Improve Cycle/Pedestrian And Public Transport Routes | 2 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect The Needs Of The Local Community | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Milton Manor Concrete Batching Plant Is Safeguarded By Policy CSM 7: Safeguarded Other Mineral Plant Infrastructure. Its Loss Should Be Justified By Exemption Criteria In Policy DM 8 Of KMWLP. However, Restoration Of Site Is Required By Condition Of Extant Planning Permission | 1 |
| KCC Requests ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure It Includes All KCC’s Services Sought-Include In Glossary | 1 |
| KCC-Plan Itself Does Not Define Whether Both Baker’s Lane And Rattington Street Would Serve As The Access To The Development | 1 |
| Planning Policies And Decisions Should Ensure That New Streets Are Tree Lined And Existing Trees Are Protected | 1 |
| Will Put Even More Pressure On The Stour With The Loss Of Natural Drainage | 1 |
| Green Buffer Zone Should Be Greatly Increased To Protect Ancient Woodland And Associated Wildlife | 1 |
| Planting Of Additional Trees, Hedges Etc Should Be Greatly Increased | 1 |
| CCC Does Not Seem To Understand That Chartham Is Actually Three Communities-Chartham, Shalmsford Street, St Augustines | 1 |
| Allocation Appears Appears To Be A Direct Consequence Of A Unjustified Assessment In The Rural Settlement Study | 1 |
| No Mention Of Inclusion Of Places Of Worship Either In The Plans | 1 |
| Number Of Additional Vehicles Brought In By The New Houses Will Not Be offset By Bus Links And Cycle/Walking Paths | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Minimising Private Vehicle Use Can Only Happen Once We Have A Bus Service That Runs Past 7pm | 1 |
| Proposed Site Is Currently An Important 'Green Gap' Between St Augustine's Development And The Village | 1 |
| Halve The Number Of Units So The Woodlands Are Still Connected To Nearby Agricultural Land | 1 |
| Needs To Include Housing Provision For The Elderly | 1 |
| Looks As Though There Could Be An Opportunity For An Additional Link Road To Facilitate Networking Between Bakers Lane and Rattington St | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| There Are No Changes Which Could Make This Policy Viable | 1 |
| Eastern Area Earmarked For R8 Development Sits On A Sharp Slope And Larkey View Experiences Increasingly More Flooding-CCC Need To Be Mindful Of Landslides And Nutrient Pollution Here | 1 |
| All Construction Vehicles Should Be Asked To Use Access Through Rattington Road And Not Through The Field | 1 |
| All New Dwellings Should Have Their Front Gardens/Parking Access Through Rattingdon Road And Not Through The Field | 1 |
| R8 Eastern Area, To Be Pushed Back Down Towards The Field's North Boundary, As Far As POssible And Away From The North Boundaries Of Larkey View pushed down towards the field's north boundary, as far as possible and away from the north boundaries of Larkey View | 1 |
| Request West Boundary Of R8 East Area, To Be Pushed Back Towards The East In Line With Our Own N/A Boundary At 10 Larkey View | 1 |
| No Mention In This Policy About Electric Car Sharing Initiatives Which Are Found In The City Centre | 1 |
| A Cohouse Model Of Shopping And Community Facilities Would Work In This Location | 1 |
| Proposal To Build 170 Homes On Greenfield Is Completely Against The Council's Pledge To Be Net Zero | 1 |
| This Development Would Make Me Move | 1 |
| No More Houses | 1 |
| No Public Consultation Has Been Held To Propose This | 1 |
| Adequate Lighting, Pavements And Cycle Paths Would Need To Be Factored Into Any Development At A Bare Minimum. | 1 |
| Chartham Just Being Used To Fund New Ring Road | 1 |
| Bungalows Are Space Inefficient-We Should Be Building Taller, Denser Housing | 1 |
| High Environmental Standards Need To Be Met | 1 |
| Significant Amount Of Attention Needs To Be Paid To Wildlife And Biodiversity Enhancements In Order To Offset Increases In Noise, Light And Air Pollution Which Will Result From Development | 1 |
| The Site Is Not Within 400m Of A Bus Stop With More Than Two Buses Per Hour | 1 |
| Number Of Allotment Plots Needs To Be Increased From 6 | 1 |
| Draft Plan Is Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| A Minimum 50 Metre Buffer Should Be Maintained Between A Development And The Ancient Woodland, Including Throughout The Construction Phase, Unless The Applicant Can Demonstrate Very Clearly How A Small Buffer Would Suffice | 1 |
| Wedgewood Strongly Support The Proposed Site Allocation, And The Recognition That The Site Is Suitable For Development. | 1 |
| Overall Site Will Need To Be Tested By A Site Masterplanning Exercise | 1 |
| Would Want To See Policies That Work To Support Good Raw Water Quality, Thus Reducing Road Run Off And Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) And Slow The Flow To Enable Water To Be Replenished. | 1 |
| RSPB Would Like To Work With CCC On How Turtle Doves Can Be Protected On This Development Site | 1 |
| With The Current Uncertainty Regarding The Future Of Chartham Paper Mill, We Would Resist The Development Of This Greenfield Site | 1 |
| Many Of Strategic Allocations Plan An Emphasis On Mitigating Harm Rather Than On Minimising Harm And Seeking Enhancements To Significance Of Heritage Assets | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The site has been removed from the plan due to sustainability concerns, particularly surrounding access and transport infrastructure constraints. Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Policy R9: Land at Ashford Road

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Pollution Concerns (Light,Air,Noise) | 3 |
| Policy Will Offset Large Development In Area | 2 |
| Site Not Strategically Important Enough To Be Introduced As Local Plan Policy | 2 |
| Site Extends To Non Allocated Business Area | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Allocation R9 Is Deliverable and Sustainable | 2 |
| More Details Of Economic Opportunity Would Be Welcomed/Supported | 1 |
| Provide Minerals Assessment in Accordance With The Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan (KCC) | 1 |
| Access to Cycle Route 1 Required | 1 |
| Logical Allocation Given Location | 1 |
| Level Of Development Proposed is Inconsistent With Rural Service Centre Designation | 1 |
| Develop On Brownfield Land Instead | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Traffic Concerns | 1 |
| Policy Refers To Greenbelt Land | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| No More Car Showrooms | 1 |
| Would Be Good Location For Housing | 1 |
| Inadequate Transport Connectivity | 1 |
| Contrary To Development Management Guidance For Both H1&F7 | 1 |
| Already Lots Of Business Services In The Parish | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| South East Water Want to See Policies That Support Good Raw Water Quality, Thus Reducing Road Run Off and Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Making Use Of The Existing Topography and Natural Features of the Site Where Appropriate | 1 |
| Plan Fits With NPPF | 1 |
| No Constraints On Site In Terms Of Heritage, Ecology Or Flooding | 1 |
| Wording Of Commercial Business Or Compatible Showroom is Welcomed Due To Its Flexibility | 1 |
| Already Existing Oversupply Of Employment Space | 1 |
| Plan Constitutes Impressive And Laudable Detailed Spatial Strategy | 1 |
| Amount Of Business Floor Space Proposed Is Suitable | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The policy requirement of a landscape buffer to the west has been removed to reflect the new allocation adjacent to the site - Land at Ashford Road (west).

##

## Policy R10: Milton Manor Concrete Batching Plant

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal Is On A Mineral Extraction site with conditions to be restored in the original state Once It Is Disused | 4 |
| Chartham Already Overdeveloped and Does Not Have Suitable Infrastructure To Support Further Development | 2 |
| Site Should Be Returned to Nature To Enhance Green Corridor Along The River | 2 |
| Site Located On Flood Plain | 2 |
| Site Located Outside Official Settlement Boundary | 2 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Heritage Assets Need To Be Preserved | 2 |
| Cement is high carbon and there could be contamination near a water source-Need To Consider Environmental Impacts | 1 |
| Policy Appears to be a direct consequence of an unjustified assessment in the Rural Settlement Study | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Good Use Of A Brownfield Site | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Concrete batching plant should be retained here and not moved to Canterbury Business Park | 1 |
| Policy Too Vague To comment On Potential Cycle Access | 1 |
| Air Pollution Assessment Should Be Provided | 1 |
| South East Water Want to See Policies That Support Good Raw Water Quality, Thus Reducing Road Run Off and Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge. | 1 |
| Provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Making Use Of The Existing Topography and Natural Features of the Site Where Appropriate | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Turtle dove (Streptopelia turtur) is a RSPB priority species due to the significant population decline both in the UK and across its breeding range-Need To Be Acknowledged in Policy | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Engagement with the site owner has confirmed that planning permission is being sought for the concrete batching plant to be delivered in a different location, therefore the site allocation policy is no longer required and has been removed from the plan. Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Policy R11: Hersden

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Hersden Has Enough New Housing | 6 |
| Concerns Regarding Foul Water Disposal Into Stodmarsh From This Development And The Level Of Housing Being Delivered In Herne Bay | 5 |
| Impact On Surrounding Farmland, woodland Etc Is Extremely Detrimental | 4 |
| Green Gap Needs To Be Preserved To Prevent Hersden Becoming Part Of Westbere | 3 |
| Will Cause Huge Traffic Issues On Poor Quality Roads | 3 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| The County Council Requests Specific Reference To The PRoW Network In Respect Of Walking And Cycling | 1 |
| APC Encourages CCC To Continue With Sympathetic And Pragmatic Development Of Smaller Scale Programs In Line With Community-Led Housing Policy That Allow Modest Development And Use Of Existing Infrastructure To Support Whilst Retaining Local Culture Of Rural Settings | 1 |
| Definition Of Terminology 'Neighbourhood Plan Housing Requirement Figure' Needed | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect Real Need Of Local Community And Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Prioritised Over Luxury Homes | 1 |
| Don't Have Enough Information | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inaccurate/Inadequate Proposals | 1 |
| CCC Need To Illustrate Local Need For These Houses | 1 |
| A Restricted Speed Limit Is Necessary On Hoath-Canterbury Road | 1 |
| There Are Limited Public Transport Links, Buses Only, And Residents Have To Drive To Access Trains | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Hersden Is A Village And Should Remain As Such | 1 |
| Consider Reopening Chislet Colliery Station | 1 |
| Hersden Has Already Changed Beyond Recognition | 1 |
| How Long Will It Be Before There Is A Never Ending Urban Sprawl Around Canterbury Running From Ashford All The Way To The Thanet Coast? | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm  | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate  | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Delete The Proposal For Houses | 1 |
| Agree Walking And Cycling Connections To Hersden Need Improving | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered.

Following feedback it was decided to delete all Rural Service Centre and Local Service Centre policies from the plan to avoid unnecessary repetition.

##

## Policy R12: Bread and Cheese Field

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Sturry Link Road/A28 Cannot Cope With The Level Of Development In This Area Of The District | 3 |
| Should Be Provisions For A “Green gap” To Retain Unique Nature Of Westbere Village | 2 |
| Already Significant Development Occurring In Hersden So Resist Further Greenfield Development | 2 |
| KCC Requests ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure It Includes All KCC’s Services Sought | 1 |
| KCC-This Site May Be Required To Contribute Towards Highway Improvements Associated With Accommodating Proposed Growth From Draft Plan | 1 |
| No Further Encroachment On Greenbelt | 1 |
| No Protection Or Consideration Given To The Countryside | 1 |
| Reject Further Aggressive Development | 1 |
| Need To Preserve Farmland To Ensure Food Security And Natural Drainage To Prevent Flooding | 1 |
| How Can CCC Destroy Beautiful Fields Which Contribute To Raising Immune Systems | 1 |
| Consider Reopening Chislet Colliery Station | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| R12 Should Not Be Happening As It Contains Ancient Woodland And Is Just 180m From Stodmarsh SSSI | 1 |
| Development Will Threaten Biodiversity And Wildlife | 1 |
| Stop Building On Farm land | 1 |
| Prevent River Pollution | 1 |
| CCC Need To Justify Local Housing Need | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Sewage Disposal Huge Area Of Concern | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers  | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm  | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate  | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Delete The Proposal For Houses | 1 |
| No One Will Want To Live Right Next To Sewage Works | 1 |
| APC Encourages CCC To Continue With Sympathetic And Pragmatic Development Of Smaller Scale Programs In Line With Community-Led Housing Policy That Allow Modest Development And Use Of Existing Infrastructure To Support Whilst Retaining Local Culture Of Rural Settings | 1 |
| Bread & Cheese site, Hersden: This is a Saxon burial ground and valuable to residents | 1 |
| Before Entering This Into The Local Plan, Please Bear In Mind That Colliery Site Has Planning Permission, Hoplands Is Still Developing, And Persimmons Were Included Last Local Plan | 1 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 1 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect Real Need Of Local Community And Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Prioritised Over Luxury Homes | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Proposed Development Would Be A Valuable And Beneficial Addition To the Areas Of Hersden And Canterbury. Design Is In Keeping With Local Area And Accords With Relevant Local And National Planning Policies AndGuidance | 1 |
| Woodland Trust Welcome General Approach In Section 3 And Note Paras 3d) and 3e) On Buffering And Reconnecting The Ancient Woodland. Complete Ancient Tree Inventory Prior To Development | 1 |
| Policies Should Work To Support Good Raw Water Quality-Reducing Road Run Off And Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) And Slow The Flow To Enable Water To Be Replenished | 1 |
| Southern Water Require Odour Assessment To Be Carried Out To Determine An Area Of Adequate Separation Between The Works And Any 'Sensitive' Development | 1 |
| RSPB Would Like To Work With Canterbury On How Further Consideration Can Be Provided For Turtle Doves | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Four policy criteria have been added, one requiring an odour assessment and to ensure no residential development is located in the odour zone, one requiring the retention of ancient woodland and one requiring the protection of Turtle Dove habitats. Following representations from KCC, the policy now also requires contributions to the Sturry Relief Road. The heritage point in the policy has also been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

A review of the Green Gaps was undertaken by the council and it was concluded that the existing Green Gap between Sturry and Westbere provides sufficient separation between the site and Westbere village.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy R13: Land at Hersden

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Many Of The Strategic Allocations Plan An Emphasis On Mitigating Harm Rather Than Minimising Harm And Seeking Enhancements To Significance Of Heritage Asset | 1 |
| KCC Requests ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure It Includes All KCC’s Services Sought | 1 |
| Unnecessary Extension Of Current Boundary | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Conserve Biodiversity And Wildlife | 1 |
| Development Will Be Visible From Hoath, Contrary To Landscape Appraisal Which States Views In H2 And H3 landscape Zones Must Be Preserved | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Remove From Plan As Area Already Overdeveloped | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers  | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm  | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate  | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Too Much Building Already | 1 |
| APC Encourages CCC To Continue With Sympathetic And Pragmatic Development Of Smaller Scale Programs In Line With Community-Led Housing Policy That Allow Modest Development And Use Of Existing Infrastructure To Support Whilst Retaining Local Culture Of Rural Settings | 1 |
| Little Thought Has Been Given To The Struggling Rural Services Or Impact On The Road Network | 1 |
| With The Completion Of Redrow - And Potentially, Persimmons – People Question If This Development Is Required | 1 |
| Policy Should Be Removed From Plan As It Is Not Strategic In Any Sense | 1 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect Real Need Of Local Community And Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Prioritised Over Luxury Homes | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Woodland Trust Welcome General Approach In Section 3 And Note Paras 3d) and 3e) On Buffering And Reconnecting The Ancient Woodland. Complete Ancient Tree Inventory Prior To Development | 1 |
| Policies Should Work To Support Good Raw Water Quality-Reducing Road Run Off And Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) And Slow The Flow To Enable Water To Be Replenished | 1 |
| Re-label Key In Concept Masterplan In Policy R13 As ‘Landscape Buffer’, Instead Of ‘Open Space/Landscape Buffer’ | 1 |
| Remove Reference To Policies In Policy R13 Which Are Repeated Elsewhere In The Local Plan | 1 |
| Increase Site Allocation Of Policy R13 To ‘Up To 24 New Dwellings’ | 1 |
| Resist Further Greenfield Development In Hersden | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The heritage point in the policy has been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy R14: Littlebourne

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Would Lead To Direct Loss Of The Best Agricultural Land And Be Detrimental To Biodiversity In Area | 30 |
| Development Will Threaten Character Of Existing Community | 29 |
| Will Overwhelm Existing Road Network | 27 |
| Will Worsen Already Inadequate Sewage System | 22 |
| Development Will Place Too Much Of A Strain On The Already Overstretched Services | 21 |
| Will Increase Flooding Risk | 20 |
| Water Supply Concerns | 16 |
| Littlebourne Already Overdeveloped | 15 |
| The Local Rural Community Do Not Want Littlebourne To Become An Urban Extension Of Canterbury | 14 |
| Local GP Surgery Is Already At Capacity And Most Residents Already Have To Travel To Bridge Or Canterbury | 14 |
| Draft Local Plan Fails To Logically Explain Why The Presence Of Certain Village Characteristics Means the Very Large And Non-Proportionate Expansion Of Littlebourne Would Be ‘Sustainable’ | 12 |
| There Is A Serious Pollution Problem In Littlebourne-This Will Exacerbate The Problem | 11 |
| Local School Is Unable To Take Anymore Children-There Are Already Waiting Lists | 11 |
| Would Like To See A Significant Reduction In Number Of New Homes Proposed - To Corresponds With Littlebourne's Position In The Settlement Hierarchy | 10 |
| Traffic On A257 Would Grind To A Halt At Times | 10 |
| Lacks Forward Plan To Address Multiple Impacts Of Increasing Surface Water Run-Off From Urbanisation On Flooding Along Nargate Street And On Water Quality In Little Stour | 8 |
| Resist Further Greenfield Development | 7 |
| The Redrawing Of The Village Boundary Is Irrational And Arbitrary | 5 |
| No Suggestion As To How The Improvements To The Cycling Connectivity To Bekesbourne Station Will Be Achieved-Roads Are Too Narrow | 5 |
| Your Proposed Policy Is Confused, Misguided And Totally Lacks Any Local Support | 4 |
| Proposals Do Not Meet Sustainable Development Standards As There Is No Proposal For Consequential Increased Local Employment And Most Work Would Require Travel Away From The Area | 4 |
| Local Bus Routes Have Already Been Cut And School Buses are Full | 4 |
| No Mention Of Increasing Facilities For The Primary School | 3 |
| Littlebourne's Willingness To Embrace Proportionate Development Has Been Evident But A Further 350 Houses Will Double Population | 2 |
| The Surrounding Roads Are Typical Narrow Country Lanes And As Such Unsuited To So Much Traffic | 2 |
| Does CCC Seek To Eradicate Village Living As Part Of The Long Term Planning Strategy, Or Promote It As A Value Of The Kent County Historic Feature? | 2 |
| Vague And Not Enough Detail To Comment On 'Potential' For Improvements To Cycle Routes Etc. | 2 |
| No Evidence Of Community Support for This Proposal Has Been Offered By CCC | 2 |
| 300 houses is beyond capability for Current Service And Amenity Infrastructure | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Why is Littlebourne The Focus Of Significantly more Development Than Other Rural Service Centres? | 1 |
| Need Definition Of The Terminology 'Neighbourhood Plan Housing Requirement Figure' | 1 |
| Don't Think The Mitigation To Assist The Village In Absorbing This Level Of Development Will Be Enough | 1 |
| We Don’t Need More Cafes Supporting The Cashless Digital ID Social Credit Agenda | 1 |
| The Attractive Village Cannot Remain Attractive If It Is Overwhelmed By New Builds | 1 |
| Concerns About Emergency Service Provision If Development Takes Place | 1 |
| Traffic Plan Is Currently Unfit For Our Village And The Full Effect Of The Laurels Development Has Yet To Be Felt | 1 |
| One Proposition To Facilitate Developments Would Be A New Road From The Top Of Evenhill, Via A Roundabout Across The Bottom Of Littlebourne Woods And Pick Up The Trackway Leading To Brick Kiln Cottage | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Redevelop Disused Buildings In Urban Areas For Additional Housing | 1 |
| The Amount Of CarsBroughtIn By Development Will Not Be Offset By Bus Links And Cycle/Walking Paths and cycle/walking paths | 1 |
| Bekesbourne Already Suffers With Too Much Congestion And Pollution | 1 |
| Strongly Support Improved Cycling Connections To Bekesbourne | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| The Village Needs And Should Have A Bypass | 1 |
| Should Be Scaled Back To A Third Of The Proposed Size | 1 |
| Proposal Will Take Out Valuable Green Space Between The Village And Howletts | 1 |
| New Sports Facility Provision Needs Detailing Further | 1 |
| Will Need Additional Retail Provision To Cater For Demand | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Littlebourne Has Just Had A Development Of 87 Homes, None Of Which Have Been Affordable | 1 |
| Compulsory Housing Targets Have Been Scrapped So No Need To Expand On This Disproportionate Scale | 1 |
| The Sites Are Merely Village Extensions Into The Countryside And Not Easily Accessible To The Village Centre | 1 |
| Questionable How Much More Development Can Take Place On This Side Of Canterbury And In Littlebourne In Particular | 1 |
| Proposed Link Road Is A Littlebourne Bypass In All But Name And Not Needed, If Sufficient Public Transport Is Provided | 1 |
| Local Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| There Appears To Have Been No Formal Traffic Assessment By CCC | 1 |
| A257 Traffic Group Request Canterbury City Council Liaises With Kent And Dover Authorities To Jointly Mitigate For The Impact Of The Sum Of All The Proposed Developments Affecting The A257 | 1 |
| A257 Traffic Group Request Capacity Of Entire Road Structure Of East Kent Needs To Be Examined To Ensure The Impact On The A257 And Feeder Roads Is Duly Considered And Mitigated Against | 1 |
| EA-Sewage Concerns Mean All Development In This Area Must Be Assessed Under Natural England’s Nutrient Neutrality Guidelines | 1 |
| There Is No Reference To The Need For Improved WasteWater Treatment Facilities | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered.

Following feedback it was decided to delete all Rural Service Centre and Local Service Centre policies from the plan to avoid unnecessary repetition.

##

## Policy R15: The Hill, Littlebourne

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Significant Sewage Concerns | 44 |
| Development Will Result In Loss Of Prime Agricultural Land | 41 |
| Development Generates Significant Flooding Concerns | 40 |
| Policy R15 Would Cause Unacceptable Harm To The Landscape Character Of The Rural Setting Of Littlebourne And Its Designated Conservation Area | 34 |
| Existing Local Road Infrastructure Is Not Suitable To Accommodate Additional Traffic Pressures | 30 |
| The School And Gp Surgery Will Not Be Able To Cope With The Additional Population Increase | 30 |
| Development Disproportionate To The Size Of Littlebourne | 25 |
| Development Will Negatively Impact On Water Supply | 25 |
| Traffic Movements Resulting From Development R15 And R16 Will Have Significant Detrimental Impact On The A257 Running From Canterbury, Through Wingham To Thanet | 22 |
| Significant Air, Noise And Light Pollution Concerns | 12 |
| Significant Traffic Concerns | 12 |
| Application For 115 Houses Ar R15 Has Already Been Refused By CCC (CA/21/01657) | 12 |
| Insufficient Detail In Infrastructure Plans | 10 |
| Local People Do Not Want This | 9 |
| Littlebourne Have Just Had Over 100 new Houses Built And None Of Which Were Affordable-No More | 9 |
| Support Proposal | 9 |
| There Are No Plans To Add Any Pedestrian Pavements On The Main Bekesbourne Road Or Any Other | 8 |
| Public Transport Connections Are Not Sufficient For The Increasing Population | 6 |
| Who Are These Houses Actually For? | 5 |
| Brownfield Land Should Be Sought For Development Instead | 5 |
| Need Evidence To Show How Stodmarsh Will Not Be Negatively Impacted By Development | 5 |
| Poor Access Arrangements | 4 |
| Would Like To See A Reduced Number Of Housing Units | 4 |
| Littlebourne Settlement Boundary Has been Artificially And Illogically Redrawn To Fit The Plan Proposals | 4 |
| Site Has Direct Connection To Little Stour. No Untreated Discharges (Including Off Road Runoff And Site Drainage) From Site To Surface Water Should Be Permitted Here | 4 |
| Keep Greenland For Future Generations To Enjoy | 3 |
| R15 Was Rejected By 96% Of Villagers in A 2019 Parish Council Poll | 3 |
| Littlebourne Does Not Have The Capacity To Take A Further 350 Houses | 3 |
| If CCC Is So Concerned With Climate Change Why Cover So Much Land In Concrete? | 2 |
| Walking/Cycling Improvements To Train Station Would Be Greatly Welcomed | 2 |
| Littlebourne Will No Longer Be A Village If This Goes Ahead | 2 |
| R15 Site Adjoins The South Western Boundary of The Littlebourne Conservation Area- The proposals Risk Harm To This Conservation Area And To The Designated Heritage Assets | 2 |
| Any improvements To Current Drainage And Waste Water Infrastructure Need To Be Undertaken Before Any Development Or At Least In Tandem With It | 2 |
| The Nearest Train Station Is Bekesbourne Which Is Not Safely Accessible By Foot | 2 |
| Recent Developments In The District Have Led To An Influx In Pupils To Local Primary Schools Which Are Already At Capacity | 2 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect The Real Needs Of The Community And A Focus On Social Housing Should Be Prioritised Over Luxury Homes | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Minerals And Waste: It Is Noted That Several Of The Development Allocations In The Plan Are Coincident With Safeguarded Land Won Minerals- MA Needs To Be Highlighted In Plans | 1 |
| KCC Requests ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure It Includes All KCC’s Services Sought  | 1 |
| Water Infrastructure Cannot Support This So All Section 106 Money Should Go On These Upgrades | 1 |
| Site Would Be Suitable For 30 Older Persons Accommodation Units | 1 |
| The Number Of Houses Needed Should Be Recalculated With The Latest Population Data Rather Than Continuing To Use Out Of Date Erroneous Information | 1 |
| Rural Economy Should Be Agriculture So More Should Be Done To Protect This | 1 |
| Proposal For Up To 300 Dwellings Would Potentially Equate To Approximately 500 Extra Vehicles At One To Two Per Household (Based On numbers From The Current Laurels Development Off The Hill) | 1 |
| Need More Accommodation For Elderly So They Can Move Out And Free Up Some Larger Homes | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Impact Of Additional Vehicles Will Not Be Offset By Cycle/Walking Paths | 1 |
| Developments Will Bring No Benefits To The Village | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| R15 Is Not A Policy Because It Does Not Have Agreement-It Is A Proposal | 1 |
| Only Way Negative Implications Of This Development Could Be Mitigated Would Be A Full Bypass For A257 | 1 |
| Howletts Will Have To Review Their Safety If Residential Properties Are Located So Close To Endangered Species | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Government Has Dropped Housing Targets So There Does Not Need to Be This Many Houses | 1 |
| Development Would Undermine The Guidance For The Littlebourne Fruit Belt Character Area In The Canterbury Landscape Character And Biodiversity Appraisals Of 2021 And 2020 | 1 |
| The Draft Plan Cannot Be Adopted Or Implemented As It Does Not Currently Meet The Requirements Of The Habitats Regulations 2017 | 1 |
| APC Would Encourage CCC To Continue With Sympathetic And Pragmatic Development Of Smaller Scale Programmes In Line With Community Led Housing Policy That Allows Modest Development | 1 |
| There is No Finalised Road Layout Submitted In The Plans, Which Could Have An Impact On Emergency Access To The Site | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Would Want To See Policies That Work To Support Good Raw Water Quality, Thus Reducing Road Run Off And Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) And Slow The Flow To Enable Water To Be Replenished | 1 |
| Layout Of The Development Must Be Planned To Ensure Future Access To Existing Sewerage Infrastructure For Maintenance And Upsizing Purposes | 1 |
| Southern Water State Proposals For Up To 300 Dwellings At This Site Will Generate A Need For Reinforcement Of The Wastewater Network Which Is Almost At Capacity | 1 |
| Has CCC Paid No Attention To The Press And The Local Fight About Proposed Development Here | 1 |
| Gladman Support The Council's Aim To Direct Growth Towards Sustainable Settlements Within The District And Particularly Welcome The Allocation Of Residential Development At The Hill Littlebourne | 1 |
| Policy Could Be More Succinct And Have Less Duplication Of Other Local Plan Policies | 1 |
| Many of Strategic Sites Plpan An Emphasis On Mitigating Harm Rather Than On Minimising Harm And Seeking Enhancements To Significance Of Heritage Assets | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Point 2g has been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy R16: Land north of Court Hill

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Development Will Result In Loss Of Prime Agricultural Land | 26 |
| Significant Sewage Concerns Associated With Development | 22 |
| Policy R15 Would Cause Unacceptable Harm To The Landscape Character Of The Rural Setting Of Littlebourne And Its Designated Conservation Area | 19 |
| Existing Local Road Infrastructure Is Not Suitable To Accommodate Additional Traffic Pressures | 18 |
| Development Generates Significant Flooding Concerns | 17 |
| Traffic Movements Resulting From Development R15 And R16 Will Have Significant Detrimental Impact On The A257 Running From Canterbury, Through Wingham To Thanet | 15 |
| Development Generates Significant Water Supply Concerns | 14 |
| The School And Gp Surgery Will Not Be Able To Cope With The Additional Population Increase | 14 |
| Basic Infrastructure Inadequate To Support Further Development | 11 |
| Support Proposal | 11 |
| Land Is Very Difficult To Access By Vehicle-Only One Vehicle Can Make It Up/Down Access Road At A Time Due To Parking | 10 |
| Development Disproportionate To The Size Of Littlebourne | 10 |
| Local People Do Not Want This | 10 |
| We Want To Maintain And Keep What Little Open Space We Have Left As A Village For Wildlife, Walking And Agriculture | 8 |
| Littlebourne Has Already Seen Enough Development Recently | 7 |
| Lacks A Forward Plan To Address Multiple Impacts Of Increasing Surface Water Run Off From Urbanisation On Flooding Along Nargate Street And On The Water Quality In The Little Stour | 6 |
| Development Will Mean Littlebourne Will Become An Urban Extension Of Canterbury | 4 |
| Development Will Result In Loss Of Prime Agricultural Land | 4 |
| Lack Of A Forward Plan To Address Likely Increased Surface Water Flood Risks In Nargate Street From Urbanisation-Accelerated Drainage | 3 |
| Lack Of Consultation On Call For Sites Would Have Solved Many Problems In Littlebourne | 3 |
| Drainage Infrastructure Improvements Need To Be Considered Before Any Development Takes Place | 3 |
| Number Of Homes Per Hectare Is Purely Speculative And Massively More Than Should Be Allowed For Non Urban Areas And Will Mean Lack Of Open Space | 2 |
| The Site Noted Here Covers Land Where There Could Well Be Important Archeology, Given That It Is On The Line Of The Roan Road Towards Stourmouth And Other Significant Roman Settlements | 2 |
| Why Do New And Improved Cycling/Pedestrian Routes Have To Be Incorporated In A Housing Plan? They Should Be Installed Anyway | 2 |
| Littlebourne Settlement Boundary Has been Artificially And Illogically Redrawn To Fit The Plan Proposals | 2 |
| No Wastewater Provision Is Made Using Treatment With On Site Plant, So This Would also Have Direct Impacts On The Nutrient Neutrality Issues In The Stour Catchment And Stodmarsh Sites | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Minerals And Waste: It Is Noted That Several Of The Development Allocations In The Plan Are Coincident With Safeguarded Land Won Minerals- MA Needs To Be Highlighted In Plans | 1 |
| KCC Requests ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure It Includes All KCC’s Services Sought  | 1 |
| Development Will Destroy Natural Drainage In Farming Land | 1 |
| No More Development-The Area Is At Saturation Point | 1 |
| Use Brownfield Sites Or Disused Buildings For New Housing Instead | 1 |
| 2021 Census Shows Increase Of 4 Percentage Points In 10 Years For The Canterbury District-This Would Mean Littlebourne Would Require 4 New Homes per Year so R16 Is Not Needed | 1 |
| Any ‘Affordable’ Housing Being Built Is Not Affordable To Most Young People Of The Village | 1 |
| Need More Accommodation For Elderly | 1 |
| Questioning The Housing Need And Who They Will Actually Be For | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Impact Of Additional Vehicles Will Not Be Offset By Cycle/Walking Paths | 1 |
| Keep Greenland For Future Generations To Enjoy | 1 |
| New Housing Should Be Innovative, Eco Friendly And Genuinely Attractive Unlike Most New Builds | 1 |
| If Littlebourne Has To Accept Housing This Is Probably One Of The Better Sites For It | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Proposal Should Be Abandoned-Increases The Village Size By "Creep" | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Need Southern Water Systems Update | 1 |
| Would Consider A Smaller Development If The Development On The Hill Was Abandoned | 1 |
| Government Has Dropped Housing Targets So There Does Not Need to Be This Many Houses | 1 |
| The Space Allocated For Business Is Too Small | 1 |
| APC Would Encourage CCC To Continue With Sympathetic And Pragmatic Development Of Smaller Scale Programmes In Line With Community Led Housing Policy That Allows Modest Development | 1 |
| There Is Little To No Traffic Assessment Studying The Impact Of These Draft Development Proposals Along With Other Developments Along The A257 Corridor From The proposed Eastern Movement Corridor City Outwards | 1 |
| Creation Of 50 Homes Is Not Infilling Or Minor Development-This Needs To Be Reduced In Scale | 1 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect The Real Needs Of The Community And A Focus On Social Housing Should Be Prioritised Over Luxury Homes | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Firmly Support Policy But Request That Wording Of Draft Policy Be Amended To provide More Clarity And Consistency Regarding The Location Of The Non Residential Development And To Reduce Requirement For Biodiversity Net Gain To Reasonable Level In Line With Scale Of Development And Requirements Of Environment Act | 1 |
| Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) And Slow The Flow To Enable Water To Be Replenished. | 1 |
| Layout Of The Development Must Be Planned To Ensure Future Access To Existing Sewerage Infrastructure For Maintenance And Upsizing Purposes | 1 |
| We Currently Have Our Entire Scout Stores Up Here For 120 Children, Are You Going To Replace This For Us? On Your Plan The Road Would Just Go Straight Over The Top Of It | 1 |
| Resist Further Greenfield Development | 1 |
| Littlebourne Does Not Have The Capacity To Take A Further 350 Houses | 1 |
| Application For 115 Houses Ar R15 Has Already Been Refused By CCC (CA/21/01657) | 1 |
| Many of Strategic Sites Plpan An Emphasis On Mitigating Harm Rather Than On Minimising Harm And Seeking Enhancements To Significance Of Heritage Assets | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Following representations from the 1st Littlebourne Scout Group, a criterion has been added to the policy for the reprovision of the existing storage facilities. The heritage point in the policy has also been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy R17: Sturry

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| A28 Is Already Saturated And Cannot Sustain More Traffic | 5 |
| Already Overdeveloped-No Further Development | 4 |
| Too Close To Greenbelt | 4 |
| Concern Over Destruction Of Agricultural Land And Wildlife | 4 |
| The Rural Community Is Slowly Being Depleted | 3 |
| There Is Not Enough Support Given To Protect The Rural Character Of These Areas | 3 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect Real Need Of Local Community And Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Prioritised Over Luxury Homes | 2 |
| Housing Targets Are No Longer Relevant To Government Guidelines So Should be Reconsidered | 2 |
| Not Enough Service And Amenity Infrastructure To Support Further Development | 2 |
| Ridiculous Idea To Have Cycling And Pedestrian Route Improved Along Railway Line | 2 |
| Misleading And Overestimating Reference To Existing Services | 2 |
| Green Gap Welcomed To Prevent Sturry From Being Swallowed Up By Encroaching Developments Nearby | 1 |
| County Council Requests Specific Reference To The PRoW Network In Respect Of Walking And Cycling | 1 |
| Site May Be Required To Contribute Towards Highway Improvements Associated With Accommodating The Proposed Growth From The Draft Plan | 1 |
| Despite Thousands Of Homes Being Built In Area, The Lack Of Investment In Local Transport Facilities Is Puzzling | 1 |
| Developers Need To Stop Looking At Sturry As Commuter Village And Start To Provide Homes To Local People Who Keep Our Local, Rural Services Going | 1 |
| Please Retain At Least The Minimum Amount Of Designated Open Space For This Overburdened Community | 1 |
| The Whole Area North Of Popes Lane Is Outside Village Boundary And Should Be Considered As A Green Gap | 1 |
| Gladman Supports Policy | 1 |
| Very Little In The Proposals Show How Local Needs Will Be Assessed, In Terms Of Community Facilities And Transport Improvements | 1 |
| Planning Is About Building Communities, Not Allowing Rows Of Economically Built, Minimum Sized Housing And Hoping That ‘Communities’ Will Follow | 1 |
| Many Of Facilities Mentioned In Plan Are Either Now Closed, About To Be Closed, Or Not Ever There! Basing Plan On False Facts Is Recipe For Failure | 1 |
| Opportunities Arising From Proposed Link South Over Railway South To Bridge Need To Be Explored/Promoted And Include All VRUs | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Plan Is Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| With Redrow Development Already And Proposed Development In Thanet At Garlinge, Westgate on Sea & Birchington This Would Create An Urban Sprawl In Both Thanet & Canterbury | 1 |
| Sturry Has No Open Space For Residents As The Existing Ones Are So Underkept And Inaccessible | 1 |
| Where Is The Sports Strategy To Underpin Sports Facilities? | 1 |
| Census Results Will Be Available In 2024 And Will Show The 4% Growth In The Area Since 2011 Has Not Increased So Much More That We Need Another 200 Houses | 1 |
| Sturry Cannot Be Used By Other Authorities To House Their Residents | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Lacks Identity As What? Village, Town Extension, Students Ville Or Overspill Dump | 1 |
| Area Cannot Cope With Extra Demand For Water | 1 |
| Inadequate Sewage System To Support Further Development | 1 |
| CCC Has Failed To Deliver Affordable Housing Time And Time Again As It Is Too Focused On Providing Student Accommodation | 1 |
| Provide Housing Through Development Of Vacant Buildings In More Urban Areas | 1 |
| Build On Brownfield Land Instead | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Delete New Housing | 1 |
| Leave The Land As It Is | 1 |
| Mulberry Estates Fully Support Policy R17 | 1 |
| Sturry Doesn't Need More Development | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered.

Following feedback it was decided to delete all Rural Service Centre and Local Service Centre policies from the plan to avoid unnecessary repetition.

## Policy R18: Land north of Popes Lane

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Inadequate Road Infrastructure To Support Further Development-Will Contribute To SIgnificant Rise In Congestion | 5 |
| Site Previously Refused Planning Permission | 5 |
| The Development Will Result In The Loss Of Best And Most Versatile Agricultural Land | 5 |
| Too Many Houses | 2 |
| Pollution Concerns | 2 |
| There Is Not Enough Support Given To Protect The Rural Character Of These Areas | 2 |
| Impact On Wildlife And Biodiversity Would Be Detrimental | 2 |
| Delete New Housing | 2 |
| Area Has Already Undergone Enough Development-No More | 2 |
| Many Of The Strategic Allocations Plan An Emphasis On Mitigating Harm Rather Than On Minimising Harm And Seeking Enhancements To Significance Of Heritage Assets | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Land Is Unsuitable For Development | 2 |
| KCC Requests ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure It Includes All KCC’s Services Sought | 1 |
| Site May Be Required To Contribute Towards Highway Improvements Associated With Accommodating The Proposed Growth From The Draft Plan | 1 |
| Site Is Suitable, Immediately Available, and Achievable So Should Be Incorporated In Local Plan | 1 |
| Sturry Relief Road Is Not Even Expected To Be Able To Deal With Additional Traffic From This Development | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| CCC Need To Update Housing Needs Assessment Based On Up To Date Evidence | 1 |
| Building More Housing To Pay For Roads And Other Infrastructure Means The Destruction Of Rural Landscapes | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Remove From Local Plan | 1 |
| Inadequate Sewage System To Support Further Development | 1 |
| Not Enough Service And Amenity Infrastructure To Support Further Development | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Specific Routes For Walking/Cycling Need To Be Given, Not Just Pope's Lane | 1 |
| Welcome The Incorporation Of Bungalows Into The Plans | 1 |
| APC Encourages CCC To Continue With Sympathetic And Pragmatic Development Of Smaller Scale Programs In Line With Community-Led Housing Policy That Allow Modest Development And Use Of Existing Infrastructure To Support Whilst Retaining Local Culture Of Rural Settings. | 1 |
| Site Could Not Be Served By Any Safe Access/Egress Points Due To The Nature Of The 20mph Popes Lane/Hawe Lane | 1 |
| A Preferred Use Of This Land Would Be Designated Open Space, Or Outside Sports Facility – Only If It Can No Longer Be Used As Agricultural | 1 |
| Parish Council Ask For This Policy To Be Reviewed And Changed In Favour Of Submission For SHLAA126. (Open Space/Community Facilities) | 1 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect Real Need Of Local Community And Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Prioritised Over Luxury Homes | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Woodland Trust Welcome General Approach In Section 3 And Note Paras 3d) and 3e) On Buffering And Reconnecting The Ancient Woodland. Complete Ancient Tree Inventory Prior To Development | 1 |
| Policies Should Work To Support Good Raw Water Quality-Reducing Road Run Off And Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) And Slow The Flow To Enable Water To Be Replenished | 1 |
| Resist Further Greenfield Development | 1 |
| CCC Should Widen Residential Allocation To Incorporate Adjacent Site Which Will Address Transport Matters, Unlock Draft Policy R18 site for Residential Development And Provide An Opportunity To Provide Additional Housing | 1 |
| It Is Considered That Requirements For Bungalows And Accessible Housing Standards May Duplicate Housing Needs-Therefore Further Clarity On Such Needs Is Required | 1 |
| Policy Should Make Provision To Support Blue And Green Infrastructure Which Supports Development Proposals | 1 |
| Gladman Support Policy R18 Of Local Plan Which Proposes To Allocate Land North Of Popes Lane, Sturry For 110 New Homes And Associated Requirements | 1 |
| Indicative Landscape Buffer To East Of Site Appears To Provide Very Narrow Buffer Zone Between Development And The Adjacent Ancient Woodland. We Would Advise Buffer Zone Aligns With Guidance Issued By Woodland Trust | 1 |
| Opportunities Arising From Proposed Link South Over Railway South To Bridge Need To Be Explored/Promoted And Include All VRUs | 1 |
| The Housing Development Is Out Of Kilter With Existing Houses To North Of Popes Lane ie The Proposed Scheme Housing Density Of 35 dph Is More Than Double That Of The Existing Houses At 17 dph | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Following representations from KCC, the policy now also requires contributions to the Sturry Relief Road. The heritage point in the policy has also been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy R19: Land at The Paddocks, Shalloak Road

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Development Would Be Detrimental To Biodiversity And Wildlife | 3 |
| Site Was Already Refused Planning Permission So Why Is It In New Local Plan? | 3 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| This Site May Be Required To Contribute Towards Highway Improvements Associated With Accommodating The Proposed Growth From The Draft Plan | 1 |
| KCC Requests ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure It Includes All KCC’s Services Sought-Include In Glossary | 1 |
| Ensure No Access To Shalloak Road | 1 |
| A Logical Extension In A Sustainable Location | 1 |
| Reconfigure Disused Buildings In Urban Areas | 1 |
| Build On Brownfield Sites | 1 |
| Will Affordable Housing Quota Apply On This Development | 1 |
| Concern About Affect On Dengrove Ancient Woodland | 1 |
| Proposed Development Will Make The Area Of Broad Oak and Sturry Coalesce At This Point Which Is Against NPPF Guidelines And Aims Within The Local Plan For Two Distinct Villages To Be Separated | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Is An Open Back Door To Give Way To Future Mass Development That Will Be Detrimental To Our Villages | 1 |
| Who Needs Farmland? | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| More Detail Needed For Where New Walking/Cycling Connections Will Go | 1 |
| Not Suitable Location For Additional Development | 1 |
| APC Encourages CCC To Continue With Sympathetic And Pragmatic Development Of Smaller Scale Programs In Line With Community-Led Housing Policy That Allow Modest Development And Use Of Existing Infrastructure To Support Whilst Retaining Local Culture Of Rural Settings | 1 |
| There Are Existing Problems With Subsidence In The Area. Addition Of Another 50 Dwellings Will Cause There To Be A Lack Of Buffer Between Villages Of Sturry And Broad Oak | 1 |
| Addition Of Another 50 Dwellings Will Cause There To Be A Lack Of Buffer Between The Villages Of Sturry And Broad Oak | 1 |
| Oppose Vehicular Access For 50 Dwellings From Shalloak Road At This Location | 1 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect Real Need Of Local Community And Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Prioritised Over Luxury Homes | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| South East Water Want to See Policies That Support Good Raw Water Quality, Thus Reducing Road Run Off and Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Making Use Of The Existing Topography and Natural Features of the Site Where Appropriate | 1 |
| Mulberry Estates Strongly Support This Allocation And The Suggested Policy Wording | 1 |
| Confident That The Site Can Accommodate 50 Dwellings, Whilst Meeting All Other Requirements Set Out In Policy S19 | 1 |
| Resist Further Greenfield Development | 1 |
| Opportunities Arising From Proposed Link South Over Railway South To Bridge Need To Be Explored/Promoted And Include All VRUs | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Three new policy criteria have been added. Following representations from KCC, Point 4d has been added to require contributions to the Sturry Relief Road. Following representations from the British Horse Society, Point 4c has been added for development to consider opportunities to improve bridleway connectivity. Thirdly, Point 4b has been added for the provision of walking and cycling connections to site 2 from the 2017 Local Plan (Policy CF1).

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

##

## Policy R20: Aylesham south

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Significant Traffic Flow And Congestion Concerns | 77 |
| Significant Air, Noise And Light Pollution | 59 |
| Significant Water Supply Concerns | 58 |
| Prime Agricultural Land Should Be Preserved So We Can Be Self Sufficient In Terms Of Food Production | 57 |
| Significant Sewage Concerns | 56 |
| Existing Service And Amenity Infrastructure Unable To Support This Development | 53 |
| Remove From Plan Entirely | 46 |
| Development Will Lead To An Unacceptable change In Character Of The Local Area-Together with R1 This Policy Would Forever Change The Historic Identity Of Villages In The Kent Downs | 29 |
| Impact On Environment And Existing Community Will Be Detrimental | 22 |
| Would Be Ecologically Devastating To A Number Of Protected Species | 22 |
| Significant Flooding Concerns | 20 |
| Community Of Aylesham Should Not Have To Endure Any Further Expansion / Development-There Is Such A Lack Of Infrastructure | 19 |
| Policy Should Be Withdrawn In It's Entirety | 15 |
| Current Road Infrastructure Is Inadequate To Support More Development In This Area | 15 |
| A257/B2046 Already At Capacity | 14 |
| Existing Medical Facilities In Aylesham Cannot Cope With Any Further Development Which Will Increase Patient Numbers | 12 |
| There Are So Few Employment Opportunities In The Area and Inadequate Public Transport So Development Will Be Dependant On Car Travel | 12 |
| DCC And CCC Should Be Co Operating On This As They Both Have Responsibility For Adjoining Areas-There Needs To Be An Overall Coherent Strategy Produced | 11 |
| Development Will Destroy The Rural And Historic Development Of The Area | 11 |
| Insufficient Public Transport Infrastructure To Support Development | 11 |
| People Choose To Live In Villages Because Of Their Tranquil And Rural Settings-This Policy Would Completely Destroy This | 10 |
| No evidence Of The Need To Develop On This Scale | 9 |
| Significant Traffic Concerns | 9 |
| R20 Threatens Historic Reains And Wildlife Habitat | 8 |
| Any Loss Of Prime Agricultural Land Is Foolish And Short Sighted | 8 |
| Residents Of Adisham And Aylesham Do Not Want Their Villages To Be Joined | 8 |
| Sewage Treatment And Disposal Plan Is Completely Inadequate | 7 |
| Policy Completely Contradicts ‘Landscape Character Assessment & Biodiversity Appraisal’, (October 2020) pages 277-282 | 7 |
| DDC Have Already Scaled Back Their Expansion of Aylesham Due To Traffic Concerns And Inadequate Road Infrastructure | 7 |
| There Is Too Much Pressure Being Placed On This Area It Is Unsustainable | 6 |
| Must Preserve Countryside For Future Generations To Enjoy | 6 |
| There Are Better Sites For Fulfilling Housing Requirements Without Sacrificing Prime Farmland And Unique Chalk Down Habitat | 6 |
| Little Point In Replicating Historic Hedge And Field Lines If It Means Destroying The Fields And Hedges In The First Place-A Disingenuous Pretence or 'Greenwashing' | 6 |
| Ancient Woodland And Rural Environment Can Just About Cope With Existing Footfall And Motorbikes Which Are Damaging Ecosystems | 6 |
| Development Will Lead To Loss Of Best And Most Versatile Land And Destroy The Traditional Landscape | 6 |
| Proposal Is Far Too Big And Should Be Reduced | 5 |
| Continuing To Destroy Rural Environments under the guise of a ‘garden community’ seems ironic | 5 |
| This Development Will Be Catastrophic For All In The Surrounding Villages On Top Of Excessive Expansion In Aylesham Already | 5 |
| No Proper Consideration For Fundamental Societal Needs:Police, Fire, Ambulance, Doctors, Infrastructure Avoiding Country Lanes, Sewage And Sanitation | 5 |
| R20 Is Just An Extension To R1 Which Will Join Adisham, Aylesham And Womenswold-This Is Not What People Want | 5 |
| The Plans For Developments At Womenswold Are Hugely Disruptive To Local Communities And Villages-They Threaten To Remove The Characteristics Which Make Them Individual | 4 |
| Strongly Disagree With This Proposal And The Additional Pressures It Will Place On The B2046 | 4 |
| R20 Needs To Be Removed-Aylesham Has Already Expanded To Capacity | 4 |
| Brownfield Sites Must Take Priority For Building Over Rural Countryside | 4 |
| Increased Traffic Will Have Detrimental Impact On Horse Riders | 4 |
| No Detailed Traffic Assessment Has Been Carried Out | 4 |
| There Is No Secondary School Provision In The Area To Support Further Development | 4 |
| Policy R20 Will Create A Segregated Community That Is Not Well Integrated With Aylesham -However Residents Of This Development Will Inevitably Utilise Resources In Aylesham Whilst Contributing Very Little To Them In Terms Of Funding Which Is Unsustainable | 4 |
| Spinney Lane (Proposed Access Road) Is Already At Capacity | 4 |
| Public Transport Insufficient And Unreliable For The Amount Of People Using It | 3 |
| No One In Adisham Or Aylesham Want This | 3 |
| Plan Is Flawed And Should Be Scrapped | 3 |
| The Communities Of Womenswold, Adisham, Cooting And Blooden Will Be Adversely Affected By A Further 420 Homes Being Added To Aylesham - This Development Will Swamp The Rural Environment And Will Blur The Boundaries Forever | 3 |
| CCC Needs A Policy Which Primarily Identifies And Demonstrates Real Housing Need | 3 |
| Plan Is Totally Inappropriate And Unsympathetic | 3 |
| If People Wanted To Live In A Town They Would Move To One | 3 |
| Do Not Believe This Is Required For Local Housing Needs | 3 |
| The Surrounding Villages Do Not Want To Be Part Of The Aylesham Sprawl | 3 |
| Local Schools Are Already At Capacity With Long Waiting Lists | 3 |
| This Is An Irreversible Plan To Destruct The Beautiful Unspoilt Area Of East kent Downland Stretching From Womenswold To Aylesham And Beyond | 3 |
| Any Increases In Service Provosop (Health/Education) Will Struggle With Recruitment And Most Of These Are Only Planned To Be In Place When A Large Percentage Of Various Developments Are Complete. In The Mean Time Existing Services Will Collapse Due To Extra Demand | 3 |
| Fail To See The Benefits Of Country Park When We Already Have Plenty Of Unspoilt Open Space To Enjoy In The Area | 3 |
| Concerns About An Increase In Crime And Antisocial Behaviour | 3 |
| Landscape Evidential Work Should Be Carried Out Prior To Allocation | 3 |
| Far Too Large Non Organic Development On Land This Country Will Desperately Need In The Future | 2 |
| How Is It That CCC Thinks This Scheme Is Sustainable When Dover DC Have Cut Their Housing Plans By 500 Due To Road Infrastructure | 2 |
| Countryside Will Be Destroyed Forever | 2 |
| Combined With R1 And DCC Construction Of Housing South Of Aylesham -A sprawling commuter settlement of over 7,000 homes and 17,000 residents (the size of a medium-sized town) with a totally inadequate infrastructure Will Be Created | 2 |
| Although Vision Of A Country Park Sounds Wonderful-Who Would Maintain This And It's Facilities within? KCC Mange County Parks Traditionally But As With All Authorities, Budgets Are Severely Stressed | 2 |
| Seems As Though Proposal Is Much A Part Of R1-Listing It Separately Is Deceptive And As Though CCC Are Trying To Water Down The Impact Of Proposals | 2 |
| Stop Destroying The Countryside | 2 |
| Aylesham Is Already Too Large-We Can See The Lights From Our Properties At Night | 2 |
| I Dread To Think What Will Happen To Our Small Country Roads Which Are Already Becoming So Called Rat Runs | 2 |
| Proposals Are Never Adhered To Once The Houses Are Erected-As We Have Seen In Aylesham | 2 |
| We Know From Experience Infrastructure Is Promised In Plans But Never Delivered | 2 |
| Aylesham Has Already Undergone Significant Changes To It's Community Make Up | 2 |
| Scheme Should Provide More Bungalows | 2 |
| The Proposed Plan For Development Of Land South Of Aylesham Should Be Withdrawn From The CCC 2045 Local Plan | 2 |
| Very Poorly Thought Out Development Plan Based On Developing Parts Of The Area That Simply Don't Need Developing | 2 |
| This Idea Should Never Have Been Proposed In The First Place-It Is Completely Out Of Context Of What A Rural Area Should Be | 2 |
| How Dare You Call This Bit Of Womenswold 'South Aylesham' It Shows How Little You Value Unique Rural Communities Despite Your Claims For The Need To Protect Them | 2 |
| This Policy Will Completely Overwhelm The Tiny Historic Hamlet Of Womenswold And Add Huge Stress To Existing Services | 2 |
| Travel Plans Based On Travel To And From Canterbury And London-Most People In This Area Travel To Coastal Areas And Many Of These Journeys Impact Traffic Levels Through Wingham | 2 |
| Would Have Same Impacts On Traffic As R1 | 2 |
| Proposal Will Irrevocably Damage A Greenfield Site When There Are Already Vacant Trust And Council Housing Stock Which Could Be Used To Meet Additional Housing Needs | 2 |
| Country Park Is Not Desirable in A Rural Area-It Is More Important To Retain Genuine Countryside | 2 |
| Development Not In Keeping With The Context Or Scale Of The Area | 2 |
| No Evidence Of Harmonisation With DDC Plan | 2 |
| Population Of Ayleshan Has Already Trebled-It Can't Take Much More | 2 |
| Government housing Targets Have Been Scrapped So No Need To Develop On This Scale | 2 |
| Land Owners Themselves Are opposed To The Scheme | 2 |
| Despite Claims That The Park Would Separate Aylesham From Womenswold, The Actual Effect Will Be The Opposite | 2 |
| Rather Than Seeking To Plan So Far Ahead As 2045 It Would Be Better To Have More Flexibility As Circumstances Arise To Plan For An Earlier And End Point | 2 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 2 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 2 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 2 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 2 |
| Rural Countryside Around Aylesham Needs To Be Preserved | 2 |
| Proposal Should Be Removed As It Is Flawed And Ill Conceived | 2 |
| Is This Just Another Example Of Extra Housing To Encourage More People From London To Move To The Already Crowded South East Of The Country? | 2 |
| CCC Should Revise Housing Targets By Focusing On Genuine Need Not Just Market Demand | 2 |
| R20 Is An Egregious Idea And Should Be Taken Out Of The Plan At The First Opportunity | 2 |
| According To CCC We Are Situated In A Dark Skies Zone So This Proposal Contradicts Guidelines On Light Pollution | 2 |
| No Mention Of Increasing Primary And Secondary School Provision Which Is So Desperately Needed In Aylesham | 2 |
| CCC Has Not Fulfilled It's Statutory Duty To Co Operate Obligations | 2 |
| The Incorporation Of A 'County Park' Is Inadequate Infrastructure Provision For A Development Of This Size | 2 |
| Remove From Plan Entirely | 2 |
| Based On A Now Defunct Housing Policy | 2 |
| A257 Traffic Group Request Capacity Of Entire Road Structure Of East Kent Needs To Be Examined To Ensure The Impact On The A257 And Feeder Roads Is Duly Considered And Mitigated Against | 2 |
| A257 Traffic Group Request Canterbury City Council Liaises With Kent And Dover Authorities To Jointly Mitigate For The Impact Of The Sum Of All The Proposed Developments Affecting The A257 | 2 |
| It Is Likely That Mitigation Will Be Necessary In The Form Of Local Highway Improvements And/ Or New Infrastructure To Make The Site Acceptable | 1 |
| The Canterbury Local Model Study Area Provides A High Level Assessment Of The Network Within The District But Does Not Consider That Beyond The Administrative Boundary | 1 |
| Highways And Transportation: The Full Impact On The Highway Network Of Large-Scale Development At This Location Needs To Be Assessed In More Detail | 1 |
| KCC Request ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure That It Includes All Of KCC’s Services Sought | 1 |
| Aylesham Is Already Too big And Further Development Should Be Avoided | 1 |
| The Social And Environmental Costs Are Likely To Outweigh Any Other Argued Benefits Given As To Why A Development Of This Nature Should Proceed | 1 |
| Reject The Plan | 1 |
| This Should Be Retained As 100% Open Countryside/Country Park To Limit The Detrimental Effect Of The Dover Development | 1 |
| No Scientific Evidence That Water Resources Can Sustain Further Development In The Area | 1 |
| Why Don't You Promote And Highlight This Area For Managed Farmland, Such As Grazed Pastures And Cut Hay Meadows, Maximising Ecological Benefits. Further Development Will Be A Huge Threat To All Wildlife And The Rural Landscape | 1 |
| I Think This Area Has Reached Capacity With Roads, Schools And The Things That Houses Need-Roads/Shops/Schools etc | 1 |
| Design And Build Quality Is Too Low. These New Buildings Are Not Green | 1 |
| The Preston Road Will Be Flooded With Traffic; It Is Already Used As Traffic Spills | 1 |
| Aylesham Has Undergone Enough Urbanisation Without Adequate Resources To Uphold The Current Population Let Alone Adding To It | 1 |
| Development Not Needed | 1 |
| How is a Mega-Estate, Rammed Hard Against Aylesham And The Dover District Boundary And Be Expected To Be Provided For By Aylesham Parish Been Incorporated In This Plan? | 1 |
| A Foot/Cycle Path The Length Of Adisham Road, Connecting Aylesham With The Barham Crossroads Must Be Included | 1 |
| The More Greenery The Better | 1 |
| Development Will Destroy The Character Of An Area Of Important Historical Interest | 1 |
| The Time It Takes For Any/All Residents To Move Around Will Massively Increase | 1 |
| This Will Force People Who Want To Enjoy Village Life As You Are Turning Their Surroundings Into A Town | 1 |
| What Plans Are There For Future Engagement With Existing Residents Of Womenswold And Aylesha As They Currently Feel Ignored | 1 |
| Transport Links Proposed For R20 Need To Link To R1 To Have Coherence | 1 |
| Aylesham Needs A Secondary School And A Supermarket-Not More New Houses | 1 |
| Idea Of A Country Park Is Over The Top | 1 |
| There Is A Precedence In The Local Area Of Developers Purchasing The Country Parks/Undesignated Nature Reserves And Then Applying For Planning Permissions To Develop The Land For Housing (e.g Betteshanger Park Near Deal) | 1 |
| No Consultation With Villages Outside Of CCC District In This Plan Have Taken Place Which Contravenes Government Planning Rules And Therefore R20 Must Be Rejected And Revisited In Conjunction With DCC | 1 |
| The Plan Is A Shambles As Its Basic Premise Is To Generate Revenue From Developers To Build A Ring Road | 1 |
| We Don't Need Another Country Park Or To Be Joined To Another Village | 1 |
| Councillors Need To Visit This Area To Appreciate Just How Unsuitable These Plans Are And How They Simply Should Not Go Ahead | 1 |
| Due To The Number Of Houses That Are Being Built Elsewhere Already There Is No Need For Any Further Housing Being Built On Farmland | 1 |
| I Go To Womenswold Church (As Part Of The Benefice Services) And Womenswold Doesn't Even Have Any Parking And The Roads Are Very Small | 1 |
| New Country Park iIn The South And East Of The Site Will Not Provide Enhanced Ecological Connections Or Maintain Separation Between Aylesham And Womenswold | 1 |
| We Do Not Need A Fake Country Park-We Already Have A Real One | 1 |
| We Need More Green Space | 1 |
| This Should Not Happen-The Historic Part Of Aylesham HAs Already Been Dwarfed By The New Builds | 1 |
| HUNDREDS More Houses With No Additional Facilities Or Transport Improvements Is Simply Not Reasonable And Would Significantly Adversely Affect The Quality Of Life For Existing Residents | 1 |
| Our Lack Of Policing (Apart From When The PCSO Was Murdered) In Our Little Village Is Obsolete So At Night Time It Is Very Unsafe | 1 |
| Our Children Desperately need A Secondary School-Our Children's Educational Standards Fall below The National Average Because They Are Not Helped To Go To School | 1 |
| A New Sewer Was Planned During Previous Aylesham Building Plans But Has Never Been Addressed And Must Be Provided First | 1 |
| Do Not Agree These Villages Should Be Merged Into One City- This Is Appaling By The Council | 1 |
| Aylesham Has Already Been Destroyed By One Outrageous Development Over Recent Years-Nobody Wants Anymore Houses | 1 |
| Should Be Assurances That Houses Will Not Be Taken By People From London Who WIll Then Rent Out The Housing And Use The Area To Commute To London Everyday Otherwise It Will Simply End Up A Commuter Town Not The Idealistic Neighbourhood Described | 1 |
| The Plan Is Very Poor And Although There Are Mitigations They Cannot Offset All The Problems It Will Cause | 1 |
| Need A Plan To Maintain Existing Footpaths/Walkways | 1 |
| The Proposed 'Country Park is A Ridiculous Idea To Ameliorate A Covering Of The Downs In Housing | 1 |
| The Argument That It Will Provide A 'Country Park' With Hides for Birdwatching Is Self-Defeating As The Development Will Have Already Destroyed The Natural Habitat | 1 |
| Development Should Not Go Ahead As It Will Enable Future Development Of This Area Because It Sets A Precedents | 1 |
| New Reservoir Has Still Not Been Created To Help With Access To Treated Water | 1 |
| Womenswold Has Already Been Negatively Impacted By The Expansion Of Aylesham o Date-Further Expansion Would Ruin This Idyllic Hamlet Forever | 1 |
| Have The Residents Of Aylesham Been Consulted On This Proposal? As The New Houses Will Be Reliant On Aylesham For Services | 1 |
| The Garden Of England Is Becoming The Housing Estate Of England-When Will It Stop? | 1 |
| Building Should Not Take Place On ANOB | 1 |
| The Sense Of Community And Local Identity In Aylesham Is Hanging By A Thread. I Fear Any Further Expansion Will Be The Final Nail In The Coffin For This Forme Mining Village | 1 |
| Will Massively Affect Womenswold, Woolage Village, & Woolage Green | 1 |
| Cannot Comprehend How These Plans Have Got This Far, To Desecrate Farmland That We Need More Than Ever. | 1 |
| Ancient Walls And Properties Of Womenswold will Be Negatively Impacted By Influx Of Additional Traffic On Roads Which Are Unsuitable To Sustain The Flow | 1 |
| Proposed Development Poses A Huge Threat To One Of Canterbury's Gems-Womenswold | 1 |
| DO Support The Idea Of A Country Park For The Local Community-But This Should Be For The Local Community Ie No Car Parks Or Toilet Blocks Etc | 1 |
| Already Shocked At The Volume Of Traffic Especially In Wingham Where The Road Narrows Down To The Village Causing Many Issues With HGV's And Tractors- How Would Infrastructure Cope With Another 3,200 Cars Minimum | 1 |
| Aylesham's Fate Has Already Been Sealed By Mass Development And Is Now A Town Without The Adequate Facilities | 1 |
| Scrap It-Aylesham Has Already More Than Doubled In Size | 1 |
| Less Houses More Green Areas So Development Is In Keeping With Womenswold | 1 |
| No Need For This To Be Built-Will Quite Simply Put People Too Far Out From Aylesham To Be Able To Access Any Facilities Without Driving | 1 |
| The Road Infrastructure Is Unable To Cope With More Pressure- There Is Already A Queue Of Traffic Outside Aylesham Cemetery Leading To The A2 During Rush Hours With Many Incidents Of Road Rage And Road Accidents | 1 |
| Planning Application Must Be Stopped ASAP | 1 |
| Planners Will Be Looked A Very Poorly By Future Generations If This Goes Ahead | 1 |
| Simply 'Dumping' Thousands Of People And Hundreds Of Homes In A Rural Area Is Not In Any Way Sustainable To The Economy, The Environment, Not Helpful To The District And City | 1 |
| Villages Are Being Developed Too Widely And Soon Village Life Will Become Extinct- These Areas Will Just Become Rat Runs | 1 |
| Extensive Amounts Of Air And Ground Wildlife Will Be Driven Away And Made Homeless | 1 |
| Within 3 Miles Of This Site, DDC Already Has 100 Hectares Of Wood And Parkland Situated At Snowdown-Although One Can See The Green Buffer That Such A Site Would Provide, It Does Seem Superfluous | 1 |
| No Retail Provision Is Provided, meaning Car Journeys Will Be Required For The provision Of Everyday Food Requirements | 1 |
| Vehicles From End Up In The Hedgerows And Litter From Traffic is Becoming An Ever Increasing Problem | 1 |
| 87,000 Houses Are Empty In London And Yet Large Parts Of The Countryside Which Are Used To Produce Food And Support Wildlife Are Being Built On | 1 |
| Delete Housing On This Site | 1 |
| How Is It That CCC Think This Scheme Is Sustainable When, On The Other Side Of The B2046. Dover DC Have Cut Their Housing Plans By 500 Dwellings Because The Authority Recognises The Weakness Of The Traffic Infrastructure? | 1 |
| The Village Of Aylesham Has Already Struggled With A Rapid Influx Of Newcomers To Its Historic Identity Made Up Of Many Local Inhabitants | 1 |
| We Would Not Propose Any Further Development Of Aylesham As It Has Already Been Developed Out Of Recognition To The Small Village That It Was | 1 |
| A Country park Is Not Necessary When We Are Surrounded By Beautiful Countryside Which Also Produces Food For The Nation As Well As Wildlife Habitat | 1 |
| Already Too Much Development In This Area | 1 |
| Residents Will In All LIkelihood Access The A2 Dover Bound Via Firs Road And Wick Lane; The Latter Being A Narrow, Winding Country Lane Where It Is Difficult For Two Cars To Pass-The Local Road Infrastructure Is Completely Inadequate To Support This Development | 1 |
| This Also Goes Against Everything Laid Out In R28 If You Read Your Own Policy You Will See That This Development Should Not Go Ahead | 1 |
| This Development Is Next To Two Other Proposed Developments Which If All 3 Went Ahead It Would Turn A Beautiful Rural Area Into A Huge Urbanised Sprawl And The Local Communities Of Womenswold, Adisham And Aylesham Would Lose Their Separate Identities | 1 |
| If The proposed House Building Targets Need To Be Met-Which I Suggest Do Not- Then You Should Review Policy C25 & C26 As An Alternative As At Least These Sites Are Closer To Canterbury | 1 |
| Nothing Like This Should Even Be Thought About Until Every Brownfield Site And Every Unused Corner Of Every Local Town Has Been Utilised-Only A Town Dweller Would Come Up With Something Like This | 1 |
| This Is Largely Cut And Pasted From Earlier Sections Of The Draft PLan And Suggests No Site Specific Investigations/Considerations Have Been Made | 1 |
| Refuse Permission To Build | 1 |
| The Plan Makes No Suggestion Of Improved Road Infrastructure On The Already Dangerous B2046-Adisham Road | 1 |
| The R20 Womenswold 'Mega Estate' Is In The Canterbury District And The Proposed Destruction Of The Beautiful Landscape Around Womenswold Is A Despicable Concept | 1 |
| The Plan Needs To Be Reviewed Immediately And A Vision For The Future Intelligently And Sensitively Divided With The Support Of The Local Community | 1 |
| Would Be Devastated If More Unnecessary Housing Went Up | 1 |
| The Plan Is Too Vague And Open Ended With Regards To The Proposed Number Of Houses-The Term 'In Excess Of' Should Be Revised To 'Not Exceeding' | 1 |
| This Is Not For Local People, It's About People Relocating From Other Parts Of The UK-This Will Cause Community Tension As New People Are Not Here To Fit In | 1 |
| The Proposed Development Would Be On Land That Is Unsuitable For Development As Previous Assessments Have Shown | 1 |
| Will Be Dangerous And Polluting | 1 |
| Given The Levels Of Development Locally This Should Be Scaled Down | 1 |
| CCC Has No Power To Dictate Planning In Aylesham | 1 |
| Aylesham Has Good Opportunities For Development | 1 |
| No Evidence This Plan Has Been Thought Through And Harmonised With DDC | 1 |
| The ‘Garden of England’ Should Remain A Garden | 1 |
| There Is A Demand For Single Persons Accommodation (Younger/Older) Multi Occupancy Homes And Low Cost Homes (Starter Homes For Couples And Families) In The Local Area-This Need Is Not Addressed In The Development Mix | 1 |
| Do Not Believe That A Small Village And Surrounding Countryside Should Be Decimated To Pave The Way For Extensive Housing Developments That Would Ruin The Local Community, Wildlife And Countryside | 1 |
| When We Moved To Adisham We Applied For An Extension To Our Property And The Construction Of Stables-We Were Told Categorically That Building On Previous Farmland Was Out Of The Question As Would Irrevocably Change The Landscape And Be Perceived As Urban Sprawl-How Can CCC Then Justify Their Plans For Mass Development? | 1 |
| Womenswold Is A Hamlet And Does Not Have Required Infrastructure To Support This Development- It Is A Particularly Beautiful Area Which Should Be Left As Is | 1 |
| Do Not Want The Village Overrun With Strangers-Will Destroy The Integrity Of Our Community | 1 |
| Don't See Why After Choosing To Purchase A Home In A Rural Community I Should Now Be Subjected To what I Consider Being Surrounded By 3,200 Homes | 1 |
| Would Have A Devastating Impact On Population Of Womenswold Which Is Only 285 People | 1 |
| Developers Are irresponsible-They Line Their Pockets Before Building The Necessary Infrastructure Around Them | 1 |
| More Commercial Space Is Needed To prevent Aylesham Becoming Even More Crowded Than It Is | 1 |
| Not Enough Community Facilities To Prevent Boredom | 1 |
| Impact On Traffic Travelling Through Wingham Has Never Been Adequately Assessed | 1 |
| Do DCC Support This Policy? | 1 |
| Very Odd Site-Would Increase The Population Of Womenswold By 200% But Would Be Completely Unconnected To The Parish | 1 |
| DDC Concerned About Impact Of R20 And The Effect It Will Have On Residents In It's District So Therefore Currently Object | 1 |
| DDC Highlights That Under Duty To Co Operate We Have Jointly Signed The Statement Of Common Ground (SoCG) So It Is Disappointing We Have Been Unable To Engage Constructively | 1 |
| This Local Plan Just Proves That Local Communities Are Not At The Heart Of Planning | 1 |
| Site Has An Opportunity To Make A Meaningful Contribution To Housing Needs In The Area | 1 |
| 42 Older Persons Accommodation Units Could Be Provided For Here (McCarthy Stone) | 1 |
| Increased And Enhanced Connections Between Existing Areas Of Woodland Should Be Provided Anyway Not Just Because Of This Proposal | 1 |
| Do Not Agree With This Density Of Building Close To Canterbury's World Heritage Site As it May MEan Canterbury Risks Having It's World Heritage Status Removed Due To Inappropriate Development | 1 |
| Womenswold And Adisham Run The Risk Of Being Submerged And Forgotten Amidst These Proposals | 1 |
| Development Should Not Even Be Considered Let Alone Permitted | 1 |
| This Development Would Make It Harder To Object To Any Future Expansions As They Would Be Minor In Comparison To This Proposal | 1 |
| Proposed New Town Would Rob The Community Of Their Historical Value And Heritage | 1 |
| Development Will Be A Strain On Development As You Will Never Get Enough Tenants Or Mortgages-Every House Will Be Empty For Some Time Due To Lack Of Income. You Will Not Make Enough Money To Compensate For What You Plan To Do | 1 |
| CCC Did Not Consult Local People On This Proposal | 1 |
| R20 Backs Onto DCC New Project So Impact Would Be Significantly Worse | 1 |
| Existing Bus Route (89) Capacity Is Too Insufficient and Unreliable To Service This New Development | 1 |
| Plan Would Result In poor Placemaking And Would Be Isolated From The Services, Facilities And Transport Connections In Aylesham | 1 |
| At Present, DDC Objects To Proposal On Grounds There Is No Indication OF How The Site Would Be Integrated With The Adjacent Allocation In Dover's Emerging Local Plan, Or Indeed The Wider Settlement | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Impact Of Additional Vehicles Will Not Be Offset By Cycle/Walking Paths | 1 |
| The New Roundabout Over The A2 Was Built By The Developer Of Current Aylesham Expansion As Traffic Along Spinney Lane Was So Bad. Already There Are Extremely Busy Periods Along This New Road With The Traffic From The New Houses Which Have Been Built-It Cannot Take The Pressures Of Another 4000 Houses | 1 |
| Policy Would Have Devastating Effect On Government Rewilding Conservation Programme | 1 |
| DDC Performed A Traffic Survey Of The B2046 And Continued Road Network And Determined It Was Inadequate For Their Proposal Of 400 Homes Adjoining The B2046 Just A Few meters From The Junction With Spinney Lane. This Survey Is Just As Relevant To R20 And For That Reason Must Be Scrapped | 1 |
| Council Representatives & Planners Have Played Pin The Tail On The Donkey When Putting This Area Forward For Development | 1 |
| If Scheme Goes Ahead A Conurbation From Snowdown Will Stretch To The Edge Of The SSSI Woods And The Character Of Which Will Inevitably Change To 'Urban Parkland' | 1 |
| Any Further Development In This Area Should Be On The Dover Side Of Aylesham As Aylesham Has Already Had Enough Expansion | 1 |
| Ancient Woodland Must Be Protected At All Costs | 1 |
| If Council's Don't Listen To Inhabitants Then I Suggest Central Government Does Take Control Of Planning | 1 |
| This Document Is Flawed As Our Towns And Villages Are not Self Serviceable Fully | 1 |
| Concerned About Rural Communities Being Turned Into Essential New Urban Towns | 1 |
| The Area Is Not Designed To Support An Overly Large Population | 1 |
| CCC Have No Scientific Evidence To Show That Local Water Resources Can Bear This Extra Burden | 1 |
| Any People Relocated From London Will Be Particularly Isolated From Opportunities Due To Lack Of Employment Options In The Area And The Insufficient Public Transport Connections | 1 |
| CCC Seems Intent On Destroying Every Village | 1 |
| The Proposed Development Site Is Only A Stones Throw Away From The Very Busy Crematorium So There Is Often A Very Slow Convoy Along The Main Access Road Behind Funeral Cars-More Development Will Make This Worse | 1 |
| These Plans Are Destroying Kent | 1 |
| Country Park Between Aylesham And Womenswold Will Separate The Two Settlements- Why Is Something Like This Not Considered To Separate Adisham And Aylesham? | 1 |
| R20 Demonstrates A Lack Of Knowledge Of The Area By Developers-Womenswold Is Part Of North Downs Way Which The Council Should Be Aware Is An SSI And Therefore Should Be Protected From Development Plans | 1 |
| Policy Just Seems Like A Knee Jerk Reaction To Meet Housing Targets | 1 |
| Villages Will Become Suburbs To Canterbury- It Will Become An Urban Sprawl Like Southampton | 1 |
| Aylesham Has Already Been Expanded To The Detriment Of Agricultural Land And The Ancient Hedgerows Bordering The B2046 | 1 |
| Adisham Parish Council Strongly Oppose Policy | 1 |
| Strongly Disagree Policies SS1-5 And C1-26 | 1 |
| Public Need To Be Given The Bigger Picture Of DCC And CCC's Plans In Regards To This Location-Work Together On A Masterplan So People Can View Expansions Wholly And Objectively | 1 |
| Adisham Garden Is Not A 'Garden Community' As It Is Not Freestanding. It Simply Creates A Greater Aylesham New Town The Size Of Faversham With Severely Limited Employment And Services | 1 |
| This Development Needs To Be Discussed With DCC | 1 |
| Would Increase Population Of Womenswold By 200% Yet Be Completely Unconnected To The Rest Of The Parish | 1 |
| Nonington Parish Council Strongly Object To Proposal | 1 |
| The Location Of Development Will not Easily Allow For Utilisation Of High Levels Of Low Level Carbon Transport So Therefore Will Contradict CCC's Own Principles In The Draft Local Plan | 1 |
| Bekesbourne With Patrixbourne Council Strongly Object To policy R20 | 1 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect Real Housing Needs Of Community And Be Of Appropriate Density With Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Prioritised Over Luxury Homes | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Ancient Tree Inventory May Be Incomplete So Needs Updating | 1 |
| Woodland Trust Welcome General Approach On Buffering And Reconnecting The Ancient Woodland (Minimum Of 50m Buffer Should Be Maintained Between Development And Woodland-Including Through Construction Phase) | 1 |
| South East Water State Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) | 1 |
| South East Water Want To See Policies That Work To Support Good Raw Water Quality-Thus Reducing Road Run Off And Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Occupation Of Development Will Be Phased To Align With The Delivery Of Water And Wastewater Infrastructure. Layout Of Development Must Be Planned To Ensure Future Access To Existing Infrastructure For Maintenance | 1 |
| Additional Healthcare Facilities Will Have To Be Funded By S106 Agreements | 1 |
| Aylesham Parish Council Want CCC To Be Aware This Policy Is Nothing To Do With The Aylesham Settlement As Aylesham Is DDC. As Such, It Is Advised The Policy Is Retitled And Linked To Womenswold | 1 |
| CCC Have Granted Planning Permissions For Hundreds of Units Where CCC Envisaged Delivery After 5 Years-Calculations Assume The Delivery Of These Will Offset The Need For R20 Fully | 1 |
| Area Needs Increased Primary And Secondary School Provision | 1 |
| CPRE Kent Has A Standing Objection With Respect To SAP24-Land To South Of Aylesham Within The Submission Version Of The Dover District Local Plan And These Would Also Apply To R20 | 1 |
| The Site Is Considered A Clear Opportunity To Make A Meaningful Contribution Towards Housing Need In The District | 1 |
| The Principle Of Policy R20 Is Supported By The Landowners Of The Site-Trustees Of The Lord Fitzwalter 1988 Settlement | 1 |
| Network Rail Request Collaborative Approach Between CCC And DCC In Regards To Rail works As The Boundaries Often Overlap In This Area | 1 |
| Impacts On The Setting Of The Kent Downs AONB-It Is Considered Thar Subject To The Development Being Confined To The Area Not Identified As A Country Park On The Concept Masterplan, The Relationship with Kent Downs AONB looks More Manageable | 1 |
| There Is An Interconnecting Point Between Southern Water And Affinity Just Outside The Boundary Of R1 | 1 |
| None Of The Sites Are Within Or Close To An Affinity Water Special Protection Zone (SPZ) | 1 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 1 |
| Many Of Strategic Allocations Plan An Emphasis On Mitigating Harm Rather Than On Minimising Harm And Seeking Enhancements To Significance Of Heritage Assets | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The site allocation has been removed from the plan due to concerns around local highway capacity. Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Policy R21: Local service centres

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Adisham Is A Village And Should Not Become A Local Service Centre As It Does Not Have The Facilities | 10 |
| Hoath Should Not Be Designated A Rural Service Centre-Although It Meets Minimum Criteria It Seems Completely Inappropriate | 6 |
| Entire Policy Should Be Withdrawn | 4 |
| Want It Removed From Draft Plan Entirely | 4 |
| Wickhambreaux Was Defined In 2011 As A Village Which Is Unsustainable Due To Lack Of Facilities. We Have Now Been Rated A Local Service Centre Despite Having No More Or Less Facilities Than In 2010 | 4 |
| Adisham Is Mentioned For Infill And Low Impact Housing Which Doesn't Correlate With 3,200 New Builds | 4 |
| Development Should Be Minor Infil And Not Impact On Existing Character | 3 |
| Suggest The Wording Of The Policy R21 Be Modified To Include Further Category Of Acceptable Housing Development Under Subparagraph (1) (D) To "Minor Development In Appropriate Locations Immediately Adjacent To The Settlement Boundaries" | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Maypole Should Be Classified As A Hamlet | 2 |
| Please Make CA/20/00271 An Official Application | 2 |
| Policy Wording Too Restrictive And Does Not Allow For Natural Growth | 2 |
| New Shopping Centre Completely Inappropriate For A Rural Village | 2 |
| Should Be A District Wide Policy Not Hidden In Site Allocations | 2 |
| No Public Transport To Either Herne Bay Or Canterbury From Hoath-This Needs To Be Addressed | 2 |
| Adisham Cannot Be Classed As A Rural Service Centre Just So CCC Can Push Through Plans For 3,200 Houses To Merge Adisham And Aylesham | 2 |
| Hoath Does Not Have A Pre School As The Council States-It Hires The Village Hall By The Hour | 2 |
| Air, Light And Noise Pollution Impacts Will Be Detrimental | 2 |
| Remove Adisham Policies From Draft Local Plan | 2 |
| This Policy Is Contradictory And Should Be Re-thought | 2 |
| Current Policy Wording Limits New Development To Infill Sites And Previously Developed Land Only- Should Be Extended To The Consideration Of Edge Of Settlement Sites | 2 |
| Agree With Principle Of The Policy | 2 |
| Stop Carving Up Kent Countryside And Build On Brownfield Land Instead | 2 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 2 |
| R21 May Be Suitable To Other Settlements But Not To Adisham | 1 |
| We Invite CCC To Review Suitability Of Land At 30 Churchwood Close For Around 12 Custom Build Plots To Include As A Housing Allocation | 1 |
| Local Service Centres Will Need Creation Or Improvement Of Active Travel Provision-This Can Be Identified Through Consideration Of The Planning Application | 1 |
| Nobody Wants To See A Free For All In The Villages With Housing Estates, even Modest Ones Just Plonked On The Outskirts Of Small Scale Settlements | 1 |
| Should Be Re Written To Say-New Housing Development Will Be Supported Where It Is:Development Commensurate to The Service Centres (Minor Development) Including Infilling On Appropriate Sites | 1 |
| Policy R21 Is Not Positively Prepared In that It Would Limit The Amount Of Development Possible On Larger Sites In Local Service Centres Which Would Otherwise Constitute Sustainable Development | 1 |
| Hoath Should Be Classified As R28 Countryside | 1 |
| Proposed Development In Hoath Is Completely Disproportionate | 1 |
| Policy Does Not Expressly Address The Spatial Context Of Reculver | 1 |
| Will This Policy Apply At The District Level? Or Just To Rural Locations? | 1 |
| Please Can We Have A Definition Of Minor Development? | 1 |
| Who Identifies Local Need? Can It Be The Parish Council? | 1 |
| Need To Improve Community Services And Public Transport In Rough Common | 1 |
| Protection Afforded To Existing Communities And Services Is Greatly Welcomed-Particularly in Terms Of Employment | 1 |
| No Protection Against Sequential And Ad Hoc Minor Development Which Overtime Amounts To Significant Development Without Appropriate Facilities And Infrastructure | 1 |
| Given Location Of Canterbury Business Park DCC Need To Understand Proposal For 51,000 sqm B8 Employment Floorspace So It Does Not Undermine Or Impact On Agreed Mitigation Solutions For Whitfield And Duke Of York Roundabouts On M2/A2 Corridor | 1 |
| The Council Should provide A Separate Policy For Villages And Hamlets | 1 |
| Developments Need To Be Considered On A Case By Case Basis-They Could Help Revitalise A Rural Settlement | 1 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect Real Need Of Local Community And Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Prioritised Over Luxury Homes. | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Disagree With Additional Housing | 1 |
| This Policy Should Not Have Just Been Drawn Up Using A Checklist - It Should Take Into Account The Reality Of Each Individual Settlement | 1 |
| This Document Is Just Very Wordy With No Explanation As To How You Will Achieve Things | 1 |
| How Is A Road Through Rough Common Sympathetic With This Proposal? | 1 |
| Hoath And Wickhambreaux Should Not Be Rural Service Centres-Upstreet Would Be A Much Better Alternative | 1 |
| Agree With Rural Service Centre Development Providing Local Infrastructure Can Cope And Existing Character Can Be Maintained | 1 |
| Too Much Development-This Will Lead To Urban Sprawl | 1 |
| None Of This Is Sustainable - Where Is The Evidence That It Is Needed? | 1 |
| No More Properties Otherwise Green Gap Will No Longer Exist | 1 |
| How Was This Policy Developed Without Input Of Key Stakeholders? | 1 |
| Natural Landscape And Biodiversity will Be Significantly Impacted-This Policy Should Not Be Allowed To Go Ahead | 1 |
| The Heritage And Environment Of Hoath Needs Preserving | 1 |
| Why Does Adisham Need A Shopping Mall? Would Be Better Placed In Aylesham Where It Can Serve More Of Their Larger Community | 1 |
| Proposed Development Is No Longer A Target Driven Necessity | 1 |
| Concerned Proposed Developments will Continue To Have An Adverse Effect On Stodmarsh, Little Stour And Preston Marshes | 1 |
| The Council Has Let Several Doctor's Surgeries Close Yet Now Want's To Build New Ones-No Logic | 1 |
| How Will Local Services Be Funded And By Whom? | 1 |
| As Adisham Is Included As A Rural Service Centre It Should Not Have R1 Directly Imposed On It | 1 |
| Existing Road Infrastructure In The District Is Inadequate To Support Further Development | 1 |
| Significant Flooding Concerns | 1 |
| Significant Sewage Concerns | 1 |
| Significant Water Supply Concerns | 1 |
| Development Will Endanger Existing Character Of Settlements | 1 |
| Point 3 Is Most Confusing-Neighbourhood PLan Number Of Homes Required For Thannington To 2045 Is Zero | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Local Service Centre Definition Unnecessary | 1 |
| Rough Common Is A Local Service Centre So Should Not Have A Ring Road Through It | 1 |
| To Upgrade Rough Common To Form The Ring Road Is A Dangerous Idea Which Will Ruin The Village | 1 |
| Despite Notes In The Plan, Nowhere In Rough Common Will Be Safe To Walk Or Cycle | 1 |
| Not Appropriate For Adisham To Be Included | 1 |
| The Council Has Failed To Allocate Land At Hardes Court Road, Lower Hardes Which Was Submitted To The Council's Call For Sites | 1 |
| Local Service Centre Designation Would Shift The Centre Of The Ancient Village Of Adisham To Adisham Railway Station | 1 |
| R21 Should Be Completely Removed From The Plan | 1 |
| Why Is Herne Not Included In This List Of Identified Service Centres? | 1 |
| Hoath Should Not Be Listed In This Category | 1 |
| We Already Have All The Services We Need | 1 |
| Remove Proposed 'Local Service Centre' At Centre Of R1 Adisham New Town | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The position of settlements in the settlement hierarchy was reviewed through a review of the Rural Settlement Study and no changes to the hierarchy are proposed. The entire draft Local Plan document was reviewed for consistency when referring to settlements and their position in the settlement hierarchy. Definitions of ‘minor development’ and ‘infilling’ have been added to the Glossary. The settlement boundary of Broad Oak has been reviewed and re-drawn to encompass the entirety of the site allocation at R24.

## Policy R22: Land west of Cooting Lane and south of Station Road

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Land Chosen For Development Is Near The Main Road And Train Station which Run Through The Village-Both Are Unsuitable To Sustain Increase In Traffic Volumes | 51 |
| Development Will Degrade Natural Wildlife Habitats | 39 |
| Significant Noise, Light And Air Pollution Concerns | 38 |
| Significant Sewage Concerns | 34 |
| This Policy Will Detrimentally Impact The Character Of The Existing Village | 33 |
| Car Park Provision Needs To Be Enhanced For Properties Along Station Road So It Becomes Less Dangerous-It Is Hard To Navigate With A Wheelchair Or Pushchair | 29 |
| Remove From Plan Completely | 29 |
| Significant Water Supply Concerns | 29 |
| Increase In Traffic, Decrease In Safety | 23 |
| Suitable Foot/Cycling Paths Need To Be Installed Along Station Road-With Adequate Lighting | 22 |
| Existing UK Farmland Should Remain Farmland So We Can Be Self Sufficient | 21 |
| This Development Will Generate Extra Surface Runoff-Which Will Likely Add To The Flooding That Already Occurs At Pond Green | 18 |
| Adisham Had Suggested A Modest Extension of The Housing Association Units along Bossington Road. This Would Fit In Better And Meet Local Housing Need | 14 |
| The First House Will Be Sited On The Corner Of Cooting Lane and Station road Which Will Block The View Of Cars Leaving Blooden And Cooting Which Is Already A Very Dangerous Junction | 13 |
| Existing Residents Chose To Move To Adisham To Enjoy The Relative Tranquillity So Will Naturally Oppose Any Development Which Threatens This | 12 |
| Will Destroy Wide Open Landscape | 11 |
| This Policy Will Destroy Adisham's Long Standing Identity As A Rural Community | 11 |
| Existing Facilities Are inadequate To Support Additional Families Moving To The Village | 11 |
| The Space Proposed For Development Is Currently Valuable Farming Land Which Should Not Be Lost | 11 |
| Policy Would Be A Disaster For The Area | 10 |
| Would Not Object To 10 New Houses As Long As Local Families Were Prioritised For Them And They Were In Keeping With Local Village | 9 |
| Railway Bridge Is Very Narrow And Can Only Facilitate One Vehicle Passing Under At A Time-It Is Very Dangerous | 9 |
| The B0246 Is Already Hard Enough To Access Due To Traffic Volumes-This Development Will Only Make Things Worse | 8 |
| Should Be Removed For The Exact Same Reasons Outlined In R1-We Do Not Want Adisham To Lose It's Identity And Merge With Aylesham | 7 |
| Public Transport Links Are Inadequate To Support This Development | 6 |
| We Have No Infrastructure to Support An Increase In population | 5 |
| This Decision Should Be Made By The Local Community | 4 |
| This Land Is Already Being Used For Horse Grazing And Has Also Been Used For Poultry Rearing. Why Can CCC Not Find Land That Is Not In Use Or Use Infill Sites Between Houses? | 4 |
| Road Is Far Too Busy There Are Other More Suitable Places | 4 |
| Not Appropriate For The Area And Should Be Scrapped | 4 |
| This Development Will Have A Huge Impact On Mental Wellbeing | 4 |
| Cars Drive Too fast Through Village And In Poor Weather Conditions It Becomes Treacherous | 4 |
| Housing Would Be Purely For Developers To Line Their Pockets-Not For Those In Need | 4 |
| Only 100% Affordable Units Should Be Built | 4 |
| Will Irreparably Damage The Countryside And Its Inhabitants | 3 |
| There Are Serious Issues With This Road-It Is Severely Pot Holed And Needs Repairing | 3 |
| The Well Established Hedge Which Exists Along The Site Boundary Is Rich With Wildlife And Should Be Protected | 3 |
| Understand The Need For More Housing But This Policy Would Be A Crime Against Nature | 3 |
| The Green Spaces We Have Left Should Be Protected For Future Generations To Enjoy | 3 |
| How Would Destruction Of Farmland Increase Net Biodiversity? | 3 |
| Farmers Do Not Want To Sell This Land For Development | 3 |
| Concerned About An Increase In Fly Tipping | 3 |
| Will Decrease Value of Existing properties | 2 |
| Sewage Already Floods Onto Farmland | 2 |
| Adisham Is Surrounded By Ancient Woodlands And Rights Of Way Which Should Be Protected | 2 |
| The Street To Blodden Is a Popular Dog Walking Spot-This Development Would Make People Feel Very Unsafe | 2 |
| Would Allow The Village To Grow Naturally And Not Overwhelm Existing Population | 2 |
| Suggested Number Of New Dwellings Could Be Easily Absorbed By Existing Population Of Adisham | 2 |
| This Small Development Would Support Adisham Primary School By Adding To The Pupil Numbers | 2 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 2 |
| If The Council Does Not Listen To Inhabitants Which This Proposed Plan Obviously Doesn’t - Then I would Suggest That Central Government Take Control Of Planning | 2 |
| Any New Developments Should Have Minimal Adverse Impact On Existing Neighbouring Properties | 2 |
| There Is Demand For Single Persons Accommodation, Multiple Occupancy Units And Affordable Housing-None Of These Seem To Be A Priority | 2 |
| Build On Brownfield Land Instead | 2 |
| Concerned Development Will Lead To Increase In Crime Rates | 2 |
| High Quality Housing' Means High Prices Which Local People Will Not Be Able To Afford | 2 |
| Question The Numbers Achievable On Land Which Is Unavailable For Development | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| KCC Requests off Site Community Infrastructure Bill Be Further Defined To Include All Sought After Services | 1 |
| Missed Opportunity Not To Allocate The Entire Site Submitted For The 60 Dwellings Sought Nearby | 1 |
| Farmland Needs Protection | 1 |
| A Well Lit Cycle/Footpath must Be Extended The Length Of The Road Linking Adisham And Barham | 1 |
| Skeffington Report Made Requirements For Planners To Consult With Local People-Over The Decades This Has Consistently Proved To Be Too Little Too Late | 1 |
| Development Is Too Big For This Specific Field | 1 |
| Development Could Mirror The Opposite Side Of The Road Where There Are Existing Houses-Thus Not Drastically Changing The Scale Or The Friendly Village Feel | 1 |
| Would Prefer CCC To Build On Brownfield But If They Have To Build Here Please Ensure The Construction Of Progressive, Sustainable Houses That People Are Proud To Live In And Add Character To The Local Area | 1 |
| Would Impact On Existing Housing Without Creating Any Tangible Gains | 1 |
| Creates A Precedent Making It Harder To Reject Future Proposals | 1 |
| Size Of Proposed Development Disproportionate To Village | 1 |
| CCC Will Not Be Able To Accumulate Enough Mortgages Or Tenants To Match The Amount Of Resources And Funds You Will Spend | 1 |
| Consideration Of A New Underground Electricity Network Is Imperative | 1 |
| Building Opposite Existing Properties In Station Road Will Negatively Impact The Amount Of Sun They Receive | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| I'm Sure If A Developer Lived Here They Wouldn't Want These Houses On Their Doorstep | 1 |
| According To CCC We Are In A Dark Skies Zone So This Policy Completely Contradicts Your Own Policies | 1 |
| I Do Not Want Adisham To Become A Big Town-Please Leave As Is | 1 |
| Policy Has Clearly Been Rushed Through To Achieve The Required Housing Numbers Set Out By Government | 1 |
| Would Cause To Much Disruption During The Building Process | 1 |
| The Houses Are An Eyesore And Do Not Match Existing Properties | 1 |
| We Need To Preserve Our Food Security Due To Impacts Of Global Warming | 1 |
| This Space Would Be More Beneficial For Local People As A Nature Reserve | 1 |
| Support Some Additional Affordable Housing In Adisham But Not In This Location | 1 |
| The Village Is Not A Local Hub For Jobs So Is There Really A Need For More Residents? | 1 |
| Adisham Should Not Be Swallowed Up By Further Expansion Of Aylesham | 1 |
| We Don't Want Noise, Car Parks Or Buildings Towering Over Us | 1 |
| Very Sceptical About BNG Claims For Providing A Rough, Unimproved Piece Of Grassland That Will Naturally Provide Habitat For Owls, Bats And Other Small Creatures u | 1 |
| Internet Connectivity Is Already A Huge Problem Which Will Only Get Worse With This Development | 1 |
| Development Would Be Better Situated Behind Existing Hedgerow | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers  | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm  | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate  | 1 |
| Hedgerows Need To Be Preserved | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Village Currently Relies On Two Retained Fire Stations-How Will They Cope With Both An Increase In Housing And Traffic? | 1 |
| This Is Not The Right Site For New Housing Due To Issues With Drainage And Overhead Cables | 1 |
| The Council Imposed Covenants On Other Planning Applications Because They Were Not Deemed To Be Necessary | 1 |
| There Has Been No Collaboration With DCC Who Have Already Cut Development PLans Due To Unsuitable Road Network That Cannot Take More Pressures | 1 |
| We Have No Interest In Selling Our Land To Facilitate This Development | 1 |
| Our Villages Are Being Lost For London Overspill | 1 |
| Refuse Disposal Would Be A Nightmare | 1 |
| No Mention Of The Current Primary School In The Plan | 1 |
| Proposed Housing Does Not Relate To Any Specific Housing Need Identified By The Council | 1 |
| Policy Not Required And Will Be Significantly Damaging | 1 |
| Adisham Parish Council Request Settlement Boundary Be Redrawn To Include Blodden, Settlements At The Railway Station And Those Beyond Love Lane- As They Are Well Established Areas Of Adisham Parish | 1 |
| Adisham Neither Agrees Nor Disagrees With Proposal For R22 | 1 |
| Strongly Disagree with Development In This Area | 1 |
| Housing Mix Should Reflect Real Need Of Local Community And Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Prioritised Over Luxury Homes | 1 |
| Draft PLan Based On inadequate/inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Would Want To See Policies That Work To Support Good Raw Water Quality, Thus Reducing Road Run Off And Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) And Slow The Flow To Enable Water To Be Replenished | 1 |
| Why Did CCC Not Support Adisham's Solution Of An Extension, As Far As Pond Green Of The existing Housing Association Properties On Bossington Road? | 1 |
| Conserve Adisham's Rural Environment (CARE) Claim R22 Would Increase Road Risk At An Already Dangerous Point Through Downs Road (B2046 And Bekesbourne) And Traffic Calming Measures Are Desperately Needed | 1 |
| Many Of Strategic Allocations Plan An Emphasis On Mitigating Harm Rather Than On Minimising Harm And Seeking Enhancements To Significance Of Heritage Assets | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. A policy criterion has been added to protect and enhance the existing trees on the frontage to Station Road.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy R23: Land adjacent to Valley Road

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Road Infrastructure Inadequate To Support Further Development | 2 |
| Essential For CCC To Retain The Existing Mature Trees Along Western Boundary Of Proposed Site-This Would Help Integrate The Proposed Development Into The Site And Retain Part Of Historic Field Boundary | 2 |
| Strengthened Requirements Should Be Included In Policy To Ensure Development Takes Place In Way That Conserves And Enhances AONB. Therefore Request Inclusion Of A Criterion That Includes Design, Form, Material, Colour Palette And Heights Of Buildings Sensitive To Site Location And Kent Downs AONB | 2 |
| Concerns At The Extent Of The Site Area Identified In The Plan And Consider It Would Be Preferable To The Site Boundary To Be Drawn More Tightly | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| KCC Requests ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure It Includes All KCC’s Services Sought  | 1 |
| Ensure Recent Flooding Is Not Increased | 1 |
| Lower Section Of Land Should Be Designated As Parking To Reduce The Challenges Of School Traffic And As Overflow Parking Of Village Hall And Shop | 1 |
| Proposal R23 Would Be Best Served With Traffic Access Only Via The Valley Road Connection To The Grove Accessible Only Via Footpath Thus Not Increasing Traffic Through The Grove | 1 |
| Development Will Not Benefit Local Community As There Is No Affordable Element Incorporated | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Inadequate Service And Amenity Services To Support Further Development | 1 |
| No More Housing Required | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| The Proposed Number Of Housing Units And Their Style Is Not In Keeping With Rural Living | 1 |
| Specified Improvements For Cyclists Should Be Shown | 1 |
| Preferable To Infill Smaller Spaces Rather Than Expand Into Surrounding Fields | 1 |
| The Village Is In Desperate Need Of A Safe Off Road Parking Area For Drop Off / Collection At The School. Could This Be Incorporated? | 1 |
| Why Has No Number Been Given To The Number Of Houses? | 1 |
| Housing Should Reflect Needs Of Local Community and Comprise Of Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Not Luxury Properties | 1 |
| Would Want To See Policies That Work To Support Good Raw Water Quality, Thus Reducing Road Run Off And Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) And Slow The Flow To Enable Water To Be Replenished | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Would Direct The Council To Expand The Developable Area To The North Of The Track At The Same Width As The Area Already Identified For The Housing-This Would Yield A Greater Number Of Units (potentially Up To 20 Houses) | 1 |
| Site Is Unacceptably Close To River And Needs To Be Set Back Due To Flooding | 1 |
| Affinity Water- No Phasing Information Has Been Provided During This Consultation And Therefore We Cannot Provide Detailed Comments Regarding Future Requirements | 1 |
| Many Of Strategic Allocations Plan An Emphasis On Mitigating Harm Rather Than On Minimising Harm And Seeking Enhancements To Significance Of Heritage Assets | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered.

The yield for the site has been revised following further assessment to reflect the latest available evidence. Further information on these changes is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

The policy has been amended to reflect the updated site yield following advice from KCC Highways to include provision of a pedestrian crossing and an upgraded bridge over the Nailbourne for an access point. Following representations from the Environment Agency, a policy criterion has also been added specifying no residential development in the Flood Zone.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy R24: Land at Goose Farm, Shalloak Road

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Extra Houses And Businesses Will Contribute To More Traffic Pressures | 3 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| County Council Requests Specific Reference To PRoW CB48/46 | 1 |
| KCC Requests ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure It Includes All KCC’s Services Sought  | 1 |
| Opportunity To Expand This Site And Deliver More Homes And Employment Should Be Taken | 1 |
| Can’t Include Birdwatching And Housing Development In Same Sentence-Birds Don't Live In Horrible Grey Towns They Live In Carbon Based Areas | 1 |
| Should Not Build On Agricultural Land As We Need It To Soak Up Rainwater To Prevent Flooding | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| No More Building On Greenfield Land-Protect Biodiversity And Wildlife | 1 |
| Not Accessible To Walk Or Cycle To Broad Oak From Sturry | 1 |
| Village Has No Schools, No Nursery Or Adequate Public Transport | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Reservoir Should Be Built At Broad Oak Before Any Further Development Takes Place | 1 |
| No Confidence In This Out Thought Plan | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Plans On Providing Safe Walking And Cycling Are Too Vague And Need Expanding | 1 |
| Agree With Reservoir And Associated Activities This Could Expand Water Sports Etc But There Should Not Be Any Additional Dwellings | 1 |
| Object To Concept Masterplans As These Predispose The Provision Of 'Back Of Garden Fence' Open Space And Slavishly Follow The Fashion For Insisting On Landscape Buffer Zones | 1 |
| Example Of Minor Development Which Cumulatively Adds To The Local Needs For Facilities But Contributes Nothing To Them | 1 |
| Housing Should Reflect Needs Of Local Community and Comprise Of Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Not Luxury Properties | 1 |
| Draft PLan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Would Want To See Policies That Work To Support Good Raw Water Quality, Thus Reducing Road Run Off And Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) And Slow The Flow To Enable Water To Be Replenished | 1 |
| Land At Goose Farm Is Deliverable And Sustainable Site And Should Remain Allocated In The Emerging Local Plan For Mixed Use Development | 1 |
| QE Considers Vision For District Presented In Draft Local Plan Is Laudable And The Council Should Be Commended For Producing An Ambitious Plan Which Seeks To Deliver Substantial Growth And Investment In The District | 1 |
| An Additional Access From Shalloak Road Has Recently Been Constructed In Connection With Planning Ap CA//18/01906) Which Allows For More Scope With This Development | 1 |
| Imperative There Is A Circular Route For ALL VRUs (Including Equestrians) Around The Reservoir And Equestrian Links In And Out To Other Routes | 1 |
| Many Of Strategic Allocations Plan An Emphasis On Mitigating Harm Rather Than On Minimising Harm And Seeking Enhancements To Significance Of Heritage Assets | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The heritage point in the policy has been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy R25: Land fronting Mayton Lane

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Mayton Lane Has Been Refused Planning Previously Due To Excessive Number Of Houses And Implications On Highways | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| KCC Requests ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure It Includes All KCC’s Services Sought  | 1 |
| As The Development Is Below The 10 Dwellings Or More Criteria To Deliver Any Affordable Housing It Has No Benefit To The Local Community | 1 |
| The Number Of Vehicle Movements From R25, Virtually Opposite Entrance To Golden Lion Public House On A Bend Would Be A Very Dangerous Exit For Vehicles | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| No More Building On Greenfield Land-Protect Biodiversity And Wildlife | 1 |
| Although On Paper It's Only A Few Houses- Cumulatively It Is Large Without Any Extra Facilities In The Village | 1 |
| Stop Building In Our Rural Villages | 1 |
| Please Defer This Plan Until NPPF Is Agreed | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| More Detail Not Just Fine Sounding Words Promising Improvements To Active Travel Access | 1 |
| Mayton Lane Was For New Water Storage And Leisure Facility. Get This Done Before Any Development As It Has Been On Back Burner For More Than 50 Years | 1 |
| Totally Unsuitable For Development | 1 |
| Site Should Be Removed From Plan As It Is Not Strategic In Any Sense | 1 |
| Object To Concept Masterplans As These Predispose The Provision Of 'Back Of Garden Fence' Open Space And Slavishly Follow The Fashion For Insisting On Landscape Buffer Zones | 1 |
| Example Of Minor Development Which Cumulatively Adds To The Local Needs For Facilities But Contributes Nothing To Them | 1 |
| Housing Should Reflect Needs Of Local Community and Comprise Of Smaller Dwellings And Social Housing Not Luxury Properties | 1 |
| Would Want To See Policies That Work To Support Good Raw Water Quality, Thus Reducing Road Run Off And Pollution Arising From Effluent Discharge | 1 |
| Policy Should Explicitly Promote Landscapes That Replenish Groundwater (Through Effective Rainfall) And Slow The Flow To Enable Water To Be Replenished | 1 |
| Site Has Been Positively Assessed By The SLAA (ref SLAA045) | 1 |
| Land fronting Mayton Lane Is located In A Highly Sustainable Area, Within Walking Distance Of Bus Services On Herne Bay Road | 1 |
| Imperative There Is A Circular Route For ALL VRU's (Including Equestrians) Around The Reservoir And Equestrian Links In And Out To Other Routes | 1 |
| Many Of Strategic Allocations Plan An Emphasis On Mitigating Harm Rather Than On Minimising Harm And Seeking Enhancements To Significance Of Heritage Assets | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The heritage point in the policy has been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy R26: Broad Oak Reservoir and Country Park

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Needs To Be Delivered Before Other Housing Developments Are Constructed To Ensure Supply Is Maintained | 7 |
| Absolute Necessity Which Has Been Taken Off The Table Too Many Times | 5 |
| Possibility That The Stour Reservoir Would Be Filled By Pumping Water From The Stour Has Raised Serious Concerns | 4 |
| Adding A Water Treatment Plant And Other Buildings Will Negatively Affect Biodiversity And Increase Emissions | 3 |
| Will Result In A Large Loss Of Agricultural Land | 3 |
| Planning For Fresh Water Supply Is Essential | 3 |
| Fully Support The Watersports/Recreation Provision | 3 |
| This Is A Highly Sensitive Location And The Policy Wording To Protect Irreplaceable And Priority Habitats Should Be As Strong As Possible | 3 |
| CCC Could Find Itself Left With The Worst Of All Options:High Housing Targets BAsed On The Assurance Of Water Supply From A Reservoir That May Never Fully Function, Lacking Available Water To Fill it And Failing To Deliver The Recreational And Biodiversity Gains Which Were Promised | 3 |
| Sarre Penn Is Not Much More Than A Stream And Has An Erratic Flow. Last Summer It Ran Totally Dry And Had No Water For Several Months. This WIll Only Worsen With Global Warming | 2 |
| Five Families Whose Homes Will Have To Be Demolished Or Repurposed Have Lived In And Loved Broad Oak Valley For Between 23/35 Years As Tenants Of South East Water -What Will Happen To Them? | 2 |
| During Construction Of A Reservoir The Habitats Of Existing Resident And Rare Migratory Birds Will Be Destroyed-Turtle Doves And Nightingales | 2 |
| Is The Reservoir Really Needed? And If It Is Needed Won't It Be At Least Partly Empty And Muddy Around The Edges During Summer When Leisure Activities Are At Their Height? | 2 |
| Strongly Supported As Long As Access Is Unrestricted | 2 |
| Sarre Penn Should Be Realigned | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| The County Council Requests Specific Reference To PRoW Connectivity And Access Routes To The New Country Park | 1 |
| Reservoir Is Supported Through South East Water’s Emerging Water Resources Management Plan; And Will Play A Crucial Role In Helping To Relieve Issues Related To Water Supply/Scarcity Within The East Of Kent | 1 |
| The Listed Buildings Should Be Taken Down And Rebuilt Possibly Incorporated As Part Of The Visitor Centre/Cafe | 1 |
| We Need More Cars, Not Less. Carbon Is The Essential Gas Of Life | 1 |
| Existing PROW Network Should Be Maintained But Only improved To Meet Minimum Standards To Minimise Intrusion And The Area Monitored For Disturbance | 1 |
| In The Case Of Broad Oak It Is Vital That It Is Not Promoted As A "Family Day Out" With Vehicle Parking Which Would Exacerbate The Intrusion Into A Natural Area Of Woodlands And Open Area | 1 |
| The Herne Bay To Canterbury Cycle Route Is Extremely Appealing-More Detail Should Be Provided | 1 |
| Construction Of Broad Oak Reservoir Has Been Put On Hold On The Grounds There Is No guarantee It Could Function properly | 1 |
| Plan Just Seems To Assume The Reservoir At Broad Oak Is A Given | 1 |
| In Early 1990s CCC Commissioned A New Study From The Renowned Water Engineers Knight Piesold (Ashford) A Copy Of This Should Be In Archives And Prove A New Reservoir Here Is Unsustainable | 1 |
| DDC Supports Proposals For A New Reservoir At Broad Oak | 1 |
| Mention Of New Infrastructure Such As Cafe/Restaurant-How Will These Give Back To Local Community? | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Where Will The Water Be Sourced From Without Compromising Other Areas? Consider Impact Of Changing Climate Patterns On Such Sourcing And The Possibility That Facilities Here Could Be Impacted By Excess Rainfall/Drought | 1 |
| Promise Of Water Sports Is A Pipe Dream. The Area Cannot Deal With The Extra Traffic And Times When The Reservoir Is Empty Because Of Water Shortages | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Would Like Evidence As To How Housing Will Be Filled | 1 |
| There Would Be Less Need For A Reservoir If CCC Stopped Building Houses And If Southern Water Fixed Their Many Water Leaks | 1 |
| Parking Should Be Sufficient And Free As To Not Cause Parking Issues In Surrounding Communities | 1 |
| Would Like Assurances This Policy Would Not Impact Existing Public Rights Of Way And Accesses To The Neighbouring Woods | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Important That Any Provision For Watersports And Leisure Uses Should Be In Keeping With The Quiet Rural Character Of The Area | 1 |
| Visitor Centres(Particularly The Eastern Visitor Centre) Must Be Secured Appropriately Outside Of Opening Hours To Prevent Vandalism And Antisocial Behaviour | 1 |
| Protect The Area Around The Site From Being Built On | 1 |
| APC Note That The Reservoir Scheme Is Now Being Marketed To The Public As A Wonderful Leisure Resource-A Tactic Which Suggests Much About The Reservoirs Actual Feasibility | 1 |
| While The Addition Of The Reservoir Is Generally Supported, What Certainty Can Residents Have That This Proposal Will Resolve The Local Problems Of Burst Water Mains Which Are A Frequent Occurrence? | 1 |
| New Reservoir won't Be Delivered Until 2040 And Additional Treatment Capacity Estimated To Be In Place Before 2035- Leaves Questions On If The Proposals Can Be Serviced And How? | 1 |
| Would Like To See Extension Of Marshland To The East Of Broad Oak | 1 |
| Concern For Pollution At Tyler Hill But Overall A Positive Scheme | 1 |
| Construction Of Reservoir Will Necessitate Destruction Of Huge Amount Of Habitats Which We Would Like To See Compensated For With New Habitat Development Elsewhere | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Minimum 50m Buffer Should Be Maintained Between Development And Ancient Woodland | 1 |
| Excellent Idea But Needs Transport And Road Connections And inclusive Of Up Of Market Leisure Facilities For People To Enjoy | 1 |
| Draft Local Plan Presents The Opportunity To Ebed Flexibility For Innovative Approaches Like Enhancing Heritage Assets In Order To Preserve A Feature Of Heritage Interest For Future Generations To Access And Appreciate More Readily | 1 |
| Natural England Welcome This Policy Provision | 1 |
| Request For Further Information About The Diversion Of The Sarre Penn Alluded To In Relation To Development Mix’(R26 point 1a)Plus An Innovative Idea For Accessing A Source Of Water To Fill The Reservoir At Times Of Water Supply Scarcity | 1 |
| Imperative There Is A Circular Route For ALL VRU's (Including Equestrians) Around The Reservoir And Equestrian Links In And Out To Other Routes | 1 |
| Many Of Strategic Allocations Plan An Emphasis On Mitigating Harm Rather Than On Minimising Harm And Seeking Enhancements To Significance Of Heritage Assets | 1 |
| Demolition And Reconstruction Of A Grade II Listed Building, Vale Farm (ID1336586) Raises Serious Concerns For Historic England As It Involves The Total Demolition Of A Listed Building, Which Even If Reconstructed Would Still Likely Be Very Harmed By Its Demolition And Reconstruction Because Of Evidence Of Craftsmanship | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered and the council has had further discussion with South East Water. No significant changes have been made. The heritage point in the policy has been strengthened following representations from Historic England. There has also been a criterion added relating to the functionally linked land for golden plover, following representations from Natural England.

## Policy R27: Land at Church Farm

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| We Should Not Be Building On Prime Agricultural Land | 17 |
| Hoath Not Served By Any Public Transport | 12 |
| Development Too Dependant On Car travel | 10 |
| The Village Is Not A Sustainable Place For Development | 10 |
| 17 New Houses Is Very Large Compared To The Size Of The Village | 7 |
| Development Will Threaten Existing Character Of Community | 7 |
| Not Conducive To Rural Living | 7 |
| Lanes That Give Access To The Site Are Already Inadequate For The Volume Of Traffic And Are In A Very Poor State Of Repair | 6 |
| No Details Of Community Facilities Proposed-Unlikely A Shop Would Be Viable | 6 |
| There Are No Safe Walking/Cycling Routes In And Out Of The Village | 5 |
| Concern About Impact On Local Wildlife | 4 |
| Cumulative Impacts On Roads And Other Infrastructure Is Of Great Concern | 4 |
| Development Will Lead To Excessive Light Pollution | 3 |
| Build On Brownfield Land | 3 |
| Keep Greenland For Future Generations | 2 |
| The Overall Plan Is Heavily Biassed Towards Increasing Housing Development At The Expense Of Local Communities | 2 |
| Sewage System Is Outdated And Needs Upgrading | 2 |
| KCC Requests ‘Off-Site Community Infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) Is Further Defined To Ensure It Includes All KCC’s Services Sought  | 1 |
| Approximately 17’ New Dwellings Should Be Changed To 'Up To 20 Dwellings' To Give More Certainty | 1 |
| Inclusion Of A Requirement For Affordable Housing Is Supported With A Preference That Local Residents Are Priority | 1 |
| Landowner Would Be Willing To Look At Removal Of The 4 Silo's To The North Of The Site And The Removal Of The Associated Concrete Hardstanding Adjacent To Provide Open Space/Community Woodland/School Nature Area | 1 |
| The Policy Wording Is Somewhat Repetitive, Repeating Requirements Of Other Policies Within The Plan | 1 |
| Hoath Should Be Designated In R28 As Countryside | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| No More Homes | 1 |
| The Map Provided Is Actually Incorrect, It Labels The Village Car Park. This Needs Changing | 1 |
| Nearest Rural Service Centre Would Be Sturry Which Is a 48 Minute Walk-Not Viable | 1 |
| Adding Further Traffic Is Unthinkable To Equestrian Community Which May Very Well Cause Them To Relocate -Damaging Local Economy | 1 |
| Climate Change And Surface Water Are Already Putting Our Houses Under Risk Of Flooding | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Traffic Calming Will Be Essential To Avoid Serious Accidents | 1 |
| Introducing Approx Up To 34 New Cars, 2 Per Home Would Be In Conflict With DM17 As This Will Add To Noise Pollution | 1 |
| New Reservoir Should Be Built Before Any Further Housing | 1 |
| Before Building Anymore Houses In this Area, The Investment Needs To Be Made To The Transport System And Road Network | 1 |
| Residents Who Have Grown Up In Village Cannot Afford To remain As Property Prices Are Too High | 1 |
| A Pedestrian Crossing Point In School Lane Is Not Required | 1 |
| No More Houses | 1 |
| No New Ring Road Required | 1 |
| APC Would Encourage CCC To Continue With Sympathetic And Pragmatic Development Of Smaller Scale Programmes In Line With Community Led Housing Policy That Allow Modest Development And USe Of Existing Infrastructure To Support Whilst Retaining Local Culture Of Rural Setting | 1 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 1 |
| R27 Does Not Refer To The Draft Nutrient Mitigation Strategy (21160-NUT-RP-02/C01) And Discussion Of The Stour Valley River Catchment And Potential Adverse Impacts On The Stodmarsh Complex | 1 |
| HPC Objects To The Development As Presented. Proposal Has Not Been Subjected To Full Scrutiny By Residents | 1 |
| Would Like To See More Land Being Provided As Part Of This Development For Landscape And Biodiversity Enhancements | 1 |
| This Will Affect Area Immensely, Especially When Coupled With Big Developments Further Along A291 At Broad Oak And Sturry | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Following representations from Hoath Parish Council and confirmation from KCC Education, the policy criteria for the provision of parking for Hoath Primary School has been removed. The heritage point in the policy has also been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy R28: Countryside

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Policy R1 Completely Contradicts The Protection And Enhancement Elements Of The Local PLan Which Are Outlined In R28 | 14 |
| Threatens The Existing Character Of The Village | 11 |
| Policy Should Be Applied To Proposed Development At Adisham And Womenswold | 9 |
| Adisham And Aylesham Should Be Removed From Plan Expansions Completely | 8 |
| Land Should Be Kept For Agricultural Use For Growing Food | 8 |
| Adisham Should Be Included And Counted As Countryside | 5 |
| Rural Areas Need Protecting-Build On Brownfield Land Like Wincheap Instead | 5 |
| Protect Hamlets | 4 |
| Adisham Does Not Have Basic Amenities To Be Classed As A Rural Service Centre | 3 |
| Need To Protect Rural Areas From Noise, Light and Air Pollution | 3 |
| More In Depth Conversation Needed With People Who Live In These Rural Communities | 3 |
| The Plan Shrinks The Countryside, Farming Sustainability And Rural Areas For Escape | 3 |
| All Plans For Destroying The Countryside Around Adisham And Womenswold Should Be Dropped | 3 |
| Once This Peaceful Countryside Is Built On We Can Never Get It Back | 3 |
| Proposed Locations Have No/Very Few Services To Support Housing Development | 3 |
| How Will The Gaps Between Villages And Bigger Towns Be Protected? | 3 |
| If This Plan Goes Ahead There Will Be Very Little Countryside Left To Protect | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree With Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Areas Should Be Protected From infill Building To Prevent Intensification Of Area | 2 |
| Our Protected Woodland Need Much Bigger Buffers But The Council/Developers Won't Allow As They Take Up Too Much Room | 2 |
| Cooting Lane Is A Hamlet And Adisham A Village | 2 |
| Existing Rural Heritage Can Be Protected Without Any Building Work Taking Place | 2 |
| Which Part Of The Plan Should We Believe If Any? | 2 |
| Sustainable Infill In Rural Villages And Supporting Rural Businesses Without Destroying Unique Character Of Villages Should Be Supported | 2 |
| Policy Makes Sense | 2 |
| Sections 1,2 And 3 Of R28 Are Failed By R1 | 1 |
| There Needs to Be Flexibility In Spatial Strategies In Emerging Local Plan To Accommodate Modest Growth In Rural Areas | 1 |
| The County Council Requests Specific Reference To Protection And Enhancement Of PRoW Connectivity | 1 |
| “Interests Of Acknowledged Importance” Test Should Suffice To Ensure That Small Scale Developments Could Happen, Contributing To The Social And Economic Life Of Settlements Without Undermining Their Characters Or Countryside Interests | 1 |
| Policy Should Cross Reference DS11/DS12 | 1 |
| Reconsideration Of Precise Wording Of R28 Must Also Take Place To Ensure The Plan As A Whole Can Be Read With Consistency Throughout | 1 |
| Please Provide Definition Of "Infill" | 1 |
| Access To The Countryside Is A Key Aspect To Equestrianism And Its Significant Contribution To Health And Wellbeing | 1 |
| Propose Part 6 Of Policy DS8 Is Amended. There Are Range Of Employment-Generating Uses That Might Sit Outside The Use Classes Stated And Which Might Nevertheless Provide Employment Opportunities | 1 |
| CCC Is Turning A Blind Eye To New Unauthorised Development That Is A Danger To The Character And Appearance Of The Countryside | 1 |
| 17 Houses Does Not Protect The Rural Character Of The Area, Rather, Urbanises It Without Supporting Public Transportation And Infrastructure | 1 |
| Encouraging To See Reference At Paragraph 5.46 ToThe Protection (And Sensitive Enhancement) Of Businesses To Support The District's Rural Economy | 1 |
| Chislet Parish Council Support Policy Broadly But Would Like To See Maintenance To Existing Road Network And Neglected Facilities | 1 |
| HPC Support Policy Where It Protects Rural Character And Appearance Of Countryside | 1 |
| Rural Lanes Need To Be Protected | 1 |
| Chartham Parish Council Welcome Reference To Redeveloping Brownfield Land | 1 |
| Need Firm Commitment To Improving Public Transport In Rural Areas So That Vulnerable People Can Access Facilities | 1 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inaccurate/Inadequate Proposals | 1 |
| Under CCC Guidelines Hoath Is Unsustainable For Development | 1 |
| Anything Can Be Defined As "For Agricultural Or Forestry Purposes" Developers Will Take Advantage Of This | 1 |
| Whole Plan Is Utterly Ridiculous | 1 |
| Land Land Adjacent To The George, Shalmsford Street, Chartham Should Be Included In Development Plans | 1 |
| How Can You Say You Will Protect Countryside When You Plan To Fill It With Thousands Of Houses And Pollution | 1 |
| Maypole Is Hamlet Not A Village | 1 |
| Boyden Gate Is Hamlet Not A Village | 1 |
| Boyden Gate Is Mentioned Twice | 1 |
| Upstreet Needs Traffic Calming/Mitigation Measures Implemented | 1 |
| R28 Needs To Be Strengthened And SLAA280 Needs To Be Removed | 1 |
| Without Limited Growth In Rural Areas There Is The Potential That Existing Businesses And Services Will Decline As A Result Of An Ageing Population | 1 |
| Any Existing Tourist Destinations, Businesses And Communities In Rural Areas Need To Be Carefully Considered | 1 |
| Object To Format Of Questionnaire | 1 |
| Appeal To Have Adisham And It's Surrounding Areas To Be Classed As A Village | 1 |
| No Policy For Villages And Hamlets | 1 |
| Gives Carte Blanche To Developers And Landowners With No Interest In The Wellbeing Of Residents | 1 |
| Build In Areas That Can Cope With Additional Traffic Demands | 1 |
| Will Be Detrimental At Womenswold For Local Equestrian Businesses Who Rely On The Tranquillity Of Existing Landscape For Trade | 1 |
| Adisham And Womenswold Lie At Heart Of Natural England Plans To Preserve Them | 1 |
| Redundant Rural Sites Can Be Transformed To Provide Employment Opportunities | 1 |
| Need To Balance The Level Of Rural Development With Brownfield Regeneration In Urban Areas | 1 |
| Can Support This Policy If Paragraph 3 Is Deleted As It Is Not Deliverable | 1 |
| Confused By Reference To Lower Hardes And Fordwich Parish Neighbourhood Plan Housing Numbers | 1 |
| South East Water States The Policy Should Ensure That Opportunities To Incorporate SuDS Are Maximised Within New Development At All Scales In The Countryside In Order To Address Surface Run Off Of Rainfall And Increased Infiltration | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| Directing A Bypass Through Blean Common Completely Contradicts Premise Of Local Plan Protection Of Rural Areas | 1 |
| Housing Number For Chartham Hatch Should Also Be 0 | 1 |
| Should Be 0 Houses | 1 |
| Remove Adisham From R21 | 1 |
| Hoath Has No Bus Service | 1 |
| More Attention Needs To Be Paid To Examining The Need For Social Housing And Sensitive Development Of Affordable Housing For Younger People | 1 |
| Apply Your Countryside Policy To Adisham | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The most common representation made against this policy raised concern that policy R1 did not adhere to ‘The protection and enhancement elements’ outlined within this policy. The site allocation policy R1 ‘Cooting Farm’, has been removed from the policy and is no longer included as a site allocation within the draft Local Plan. Policy DS11 ‘Tourism development’ has been amended to ensure that these two policies comply with one another.

## Other comments

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| New Developments Should Be Focused More Near The Centre Of Canterbury Where There Are Amenities To Support Them | 3 |
| Development In Rural Areas Should Only Be Allowed In The Most Exceptional Circumstances (Almost Never) | 3 |
| Strongly Recommend The Removal Of R1 From The Plans | 3 |
| Plan Just a Pretext to Generate Income From Developers For New Ring Road | 2 |
| Design Of Document IS More Concerned With Trying To Put People Off From Commenting | 2 |
| Land Designated For R1 Is Not For Sale | 2 |
| Impact On Crime Rates, Pollution, Traffic And Over Stretched Services Cannot Be Ignored | 2 |
| Once Farmland Is Built On It Is Lost Forever | 2 |
| CCC Need Policy Which Primarily Identifies And Demonstrates Real Housing Need-There Is No Evidence To Support The Development As Outlined In This Plan | 2 |
| Because Rural Areas Don't Directly Bring In Any Income They Are Seen As Areas To rip Up And Build On | 2 |
| Gladman Support Consultation Document And Council's Aspirations But Document Could Benefit From More Succinct Policy Wording And Less Duplication Of Policies In Line With Paragraph 16 Of NPPF (2011) | 1 |
| Government Have Removed National Housing Targets So There Is No Need To Develop On This Scale | 1 |
| Geographic Sectioning Also Increases Risk Of Contradictions Between Site Specific Policies And The Strategic Or District Wide Policies | 1 |
| In Geographical Sections Relating To The Four Main Areas Of The District-The Plan Fails to Distinguish Between Strategic Sites And Much Smaller Single Plots-Providing Every Location With It's Own Set Of Criteria And Policy Specifics -This Has Led To A Significant Amount Of Repetition Throughout | 1 |
| CPC Is Greatly Concerned About The Plan Which Makes Only Casual And Generic Passing Comments About Rural Communities-They Are Hard To Disagree With But Largely Contradicted By Our Experience On The Ground | 1 |
| Ring Road Will Cause People to Make Longer Journeys On The Roads | 1 |
| Council Should Focus On Subsidised Electric Powered Public Transport Rather Than Ring Road | 1 |
| Development Of Rural Areas Is Wholly Out Of Proportion And The Scale Will Threaten The Existing Character Of Individual Communities | 1 |
| Seek Inclusion Of SLAA111, Land at Butlers Court Farm In Chapter 5 | 1 |
| Remove From Plan Entirely | 1 |
| Protect Rural Hamlets And Villages Which Are Quintessential To The Canterbury District Area | 1 |
| Ancient Tree Inventory for The Area May Be Incomplete So Needs To Be Revised | 1 |
| Areas Of Outstanding Natural Beauty Have A Value Beyond Money-They Provide Habitats For Ecosystems Which Help Fight Climate Change | 1 |
| Rural Areas Are Being Seen As The Easy Option For Developers As There Is Less Cost Involved In The Building And Development So They make More Profit | 1 |
| There Have Been Major Changes To The Way Rural Areas Are Perceived And Use Since The Pandemic-Due To Speed This Has Happened There Is Little Research Or Data To Assist In Policy Development And Strategic Planning But The Impact On Rural Areas Is Much Bigger Than For Urban Ones | 1 |
| Protection Against Infill Developments In Conservation Areas Should Be Adhered To | 1 |
| Allocations Of Hoath And Maypole Are Incorrect And Should Be Reclassified | 1 |
| Format Of Questionnaire Is Completely Inaccessible For Many-Not A User Friendly Experience | 1 |
| Building In Rural Areas On Mass Scale Will Likely Devalue Existing Properties | 1 |
| We Chose to Live In Villages We Do Not Want Them To Become Towns- Each Have Their Own Identity Which Should Not Be Threatened | 1 |
| Large Scale Developments At Littlebourne, Bekesbourne, Adisham, Hersden And Broad Oak Are not Needed By Locals | 1 |
| Build On Brownfield Land Instead | 1 |
| As Areas Which Surround A World Heritage Site It Is Important There Is Not An Overpowering Development Or Use Of Agricultural Land | 1 |
| Map Of Maypole Is Completely Incorrect | 1 |
| Proposals Will Cause Light Pollution In "Dark Skies" Areas Where Development Should Not Be Permitted | 1 |
| Maypole Has Been Designated As A Village-This Is An Incorrect Assessment Of The Hamlet | 1 |
| East Kent Is Becoming A Pressure Cooker-Far Too Many Residential Developments Are Being Built On Top Of Each Other With Houses Being Squeezed In And Not Enough Emphasis Being Placed On Open Space | 1 |
| Consultation Process Bias Towards Property Developers | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Consultation Process Inaccessible | 1 |
| What Part Of Rural Settlement Says Policy R1 Is Being Put In A Suitable Location? | 1 |
| These New Homes Will Not Be For Local People Who Will Be Outpriced | 1 |
| Whole Area Around Adisham Is Designated As Being Of Outstanding Natural Beauty With Sites Of Specific Scientific Interest | 1 |
| There Is A Significant Lack Of Affordable Housing So Young People Are Having To Move Away From Their Families-This Is Not Fair | 1 |
| Policies Would See Farmers Taken Out Of Work And Make Them Jobless | 1 |
| Our Children And Grandchildren Deserve The Opportunities We Had To Live In Rural Areas | 1 |
| Rural Areas Should Be Protected Against Irrevocable Damage And Destruction To Farming Land | 1 |
| In Times Where WeAre Supposed To Be Being More Environmentally Friendly And Saving Our Planet, This Development Will Have Major Negative Repercussions | 1 |
| Destroying Rural Areas Damages The Quality Of Life Of The Residents Who Chose To Live There | 1 |
| Protect The Character Of Rural Areas Do Not Destroy Them By Merging Them Through Overdevelopment | 1 |
| Please Reject The Idea Of Building Such An Enormous Amount Of Homes On Prime Agricultural Land WHich Works To Produce Food For The British Public | 1 |
| Thannington Without Should Be Classed As A Rural Area And Not Subject To infill Shown In Policy C7 | 1 |
| Local Hubs Are Only USed By Those Unable To Travel Or In Emergencies Due To The Higher Costs Of Goods | 1 |
| So Much Emphasis On Walking Or Cycling But There Are Only A Minority Of Residents Who Actually Have Access To A Bike | 1 |
| Plenty Of Empty Properties Which Could Be Occupied Prior To Building New Homes | 1 |
| Building Proposals In Rural Areas Is In Response To National Housing Targets Rather The Needs Of The People That CCC Are Supposed To Represent | 1 |
| Rural Areas Are What Makes Kent So Special And Popular-These Need To Be Protected At All Costs | 1 |
| Rural Areas Comprise Open Country And Settlements With Fewer Than 2,500 Residents-If You Build 3,200 Houses In Adisham It Will No Longer Be A Rural Area | 1 |
| Bekesbourne With Patrixbourne Council Think The Housing Numbers Have Been Overestimated | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Based on feedback, the number of new homes planned for has been reduced and a number of housing allocations removed from the draft Local Plan. Sites with outstanding technical concerns were removed from the plan, in this chapter the removed sites include: R1 - Land at Cooting Farm, R8 - Land to the West of Rattington Street, R4 - Land at Mill Field and R20 - Aylesham South. Further information on the removal of these policies is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).