

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to place on record my objection to **Policy R1**, of Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045, proposed development of, "**Land at Cooting Farm**".

My name is: **Paul Lukehurst**

My address: [REDACTED]

Tel Number: [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

The reasons for my objection are as follows.

1. The loss of around 173 hectares of valuable farming land:

With our ever-increasing population, this country will need every square metre of farm land to feed everyone. Building on farm land should therefore be avoided. Only after all other brown field or less productive parcels of land have been built on, should farm land ever be considered. The Draft Canterbury District Local Plan - 2045, details many such parcels of land. They should form the main priority instead of using productive agricultural land as an easy route to achieving housing targets. This farm land could be helping to feed people for centuries to come, but not if it's built on!

2. The disruption to local flora/fauna (wildlife):

Policy R1 proposes building "around 3200 new dwellings" along with, "a minimum 320 units for older person accommodation", plus "two community hubs" containing shops, business space, early years facilities, two primary schools, possibly a secondary school if the need arises, along with associated roadways and infrastructure. If policy R1 were to proceed, it would have negative irreversible effects on the local native flora/fauna (wildlife). These negative effects would include:

a. Increased light pollution at night: Currently, apart from the unnecessary distant night time glare from the floodlit Aylesham industrial estate in Cooting Road, there is minimal light pollution in this area, meaning minimal disturbance to our local native flora/fauna (wildlife). Being open farm land that is as it should be. If Policy R1 were to go ahead, then the whole 173 hectares, as well as the surrounding environs (including the "large new areas of public accessible open spaces", and the important "SSSIs" mentioned in 5.6), would suffer from vastly increased light pollution. Inevitable sources, such as street lighting, outside lighting on both dwellings and business premises, lighting from within buildings and dwellings via windows etc, seasonal festive lighting, vehicle lights etc would all add up to flood the area with unwanted light pollution. Native species, present on this farm land and in surrounding woodland, such as the Nightingale, will almost certainly "up sticks and leave"!

b. Increased air pollution: With the huge scale of this proposed Policy R1 development, it follows that the level of air pollution will only go one way. I accept that any planned new development should be constructed to afford the latest standards in environmental protection. However, when you build on green field sites, air pollution levels for that site can only go up. Pollution produced from such a development during both construction and from the finished occupied "Garden Community", would be

considerable. Again, such air pollution is bound to have considerable negative effects upon our local native flora/fauna (wildlife).

c. Increased noise pollution: During the construction phase of any such project, there would be a very large increase in noise pollution. If Policy R1 is ever built and occupied, then at a ratio of 3 persons per household, the numbers of new dwellings quoted will also likely generate around 10,000 extra residents, including children. Two primary schools are proposed, along with shops and industrial provision! Also, many residents will likely have cats and dogs. They alone will disrupt and attempt to destroy much of the local wild life, but some dogs often create an extra 24-hour noise nuisance as well. Obviously, ten thousand new residents will create considerable extra noise, but when you also consider the added noise that thousands of extra daily vehicle movements, parties, seasonal fireworks, builders, refuse collections, white van deliveries etc will have, the local wild life will almost certainly withdraw after having been severely affected to their detriment.

3. The reduction in the quality of life: The increased light, air and noise pollution, mentioned in point 2 above, would also have a significant detrimental effect on the quality of life for those human residents already living in and around Adisham. I cannot speak for the other residents of Adisham, but I moved my family out to the country over thirty-eight years ago, in order to afford them a better quality of life. Adisham is a small standalone village surrounded by a rural landscape. On a cloudless night, the sky can be seen in very nearly, its full unspoiled glory, almost free from major localised light pollution. Also, there is little noise pollution. At most times of the day and night it is very quiet. At night it is usually silent outside save for perhaps the wind and the odd owl. If Policy R1 were to go ahead then these "quality of life enhancing" factors would come to an abrupt end! As for the increased air pollution created by such a project, please see my comments in point 5 below.

4. The detrimental effects of a local population explosion on local services: As mentioned above, if Policy R1 were to go ahead then the proposed 3200 dwellings (@ a possible average of 2 adults and one child per household), plus 320 single older person homes, could easily translate into around 10,000 extra local residents. However, Policy R1 cannot and should not be considered in isolation. To consider the impact on local services properly, policy R1 must be examined alongside the proposed housing developments at nearby Womenswold and Aylesham. Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045 - Policy R20, proposes 420 new dwellings at nearby Womenswold, whilst neighbouring Dover District Council's Draft Local Plan - Policy SAP 24, Site reference: AYL003b, proposes building 640 new homes in South Aylesham, next to Spinney Lane, on land abutting the above mentioned proposed Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045 - Policy R20.

Using the same possible average dwelling occupancy of an average of 2 adults and one child per household then the numbers of extra residents in this small local area could rise by the following:

- DCDLP - Policy R1 - "Land at Cooting Farm" - 3200 new dwellings and 320 single older person homes could mean around **9,920** new residents.

- DCDLP - Policy R20 - " Aylesham South" - 420 new dwellings could mean around **1,260** new residents.
- DDDL - Policy SAP 24, Site reference: AYL003b, 640 new homes in South Aylesham could mean around **1,920** new residents.
- Also they have just built or are still building another 700 new homes in Aylesham, so roughly another **2,100** new residents.

So, if all of these Draft Plan proposals go ahead then the estimated increase in local population could be as many as **15,200** new residents.

However, if the numbers of dwellings built, turns out to be more than so far proposed or the numbers of residents per household turns out to average out at more than three, then this estimated population increase could be higher still.

DCDLP - Policy R1 alone, represents a truly colossal and alarming increase in Adisham's small rural population that will bound to have serious effects on local services. However, when examined in conjunction with the other, above mentioned, house building proposals and current ongoing building projects, throughout the larger local area, it becomes plain to see that without a massive injection of funding and resources, how could local services possibly hope to keep pace with such an increase in demand?

As a comparison, currently it is virtually impossible to see a doctor face to face at the Aylesham Medical Centre. Getting an appointment involves telephoning the health centre, even though you are standing in front of the receptionist! Even then, you will likely be offered a telephone appointment in one- or two-weeks' time! So, a potential 10,000 new residents from DCDLP - Policy R1 alone, will I suspect, provide major new issues. Looking at the above-mentioned proposals for the whole area and it's plain to see the scale of the problems that this increase in population will generate. Unless serious investment is made in providing better services and facilities, such a development will only serve to severely reduce the quality of life for all local residents, both new and existing. Furthermore, if significant investment in services and resources is not made then the "Garden Community" concept of everyone being able to access services within the community, would be a nonstarter.

Unfortunately, it seems that the common denominator with many new housing developments, up and down the country, often seems to be, that existing residents are promised the much-needed infrastructure, facilities and services to support the new development, but they very often don't materialise.

5. The pressure on local water supplies: In this part of Kent our water is drawn from underground aquifers. It is not unusual to have hose pipe bans during the summer months, due presumably, to falling water levels and dwindling supplies. Which makes me question if Policy R1 and other large current and proposed housing development's across East Kent, will be placing too much demand on our local water supply? Even the Government now appears to be waking up to the fact that we may have serious water shortages in the UK in the not-too-distant future. They recently launched an advertising campaign to persuade the general public to save water. Could this be just one reason for

the recent you-turn on house building targets? Yes, there is a planned new reservoir in the Canterbury area but that has been planned for the last four decades! Given their recent history, I have no confidence in our local water supplier coming through on that project.

According Water UK, the average person in the UK uses 142 litres of water per day. Therefore, Policy R1, with around 10,000 potential new residents @ 142 litres per day would need roughly 1,420,000 litres of water per day. That's 518,300,000 litres per year or 207.32 Olympic swimming pools worth! Apparently, an Olympic swimming pool measures 50 x 25 x 2m. And that would be just to supply the potential new residents of DCDLP - Policy R1.

I haven't mentioned my concerns regarding sewage treatment as that has been the subject of so much media coverage of late. I would only hope that the Water Company concerned puts it's "house in order" before any of these proposals and in particular DCDLP - Policy R1 is considered any further. It would appear that they cannot effectively deal with the waste water they currently have!

6. Risk of Flooding: Adisham is located in a shallow valley with the land mentioned in DCDLP - Policy R1, sloping down towards the village. This land also slopes gradually down from the southern, Barham end of the site near the cemetery, towards the railway line that borders the Northern end. The result is that any heavy rain runs off the land and onto the tracks, forming a river of water that flows down from higher ground ending up in The Street, Adisham. This is a frequent occurrence during rainy periods, often blocking drains with mud and silt, sometimes creating localised flooding. My concern is that if Policy R1 were to be implemented, then vast areas of the land would be either built on or tarmacked over. Drainage would clearly be a feature of such a project, Policy R1 states: "provide a comprehensive and integrated sustainable urban drainage network which makes use of existing topography and natural features of the site where appropriate". However, would it adequately deal with the run off or merely serve to exacerbate this issue by creating more problems downstream?

7. The large increase in vehicle movements: At present, Adisham is a small village community that is surrounded by rolling open agricultural countryside and ancient woodland. DCDLP - Policy R1, mentions the term "Garden Community" in relation to this development's design. The thrust of which, seems to be to encourage residents to access everything they need from within their "Garden Community", thereby cutting down on their need to go elsewhere, subsequent vehicle movements and associated pollution. The emphasis seems to be on encouraging walking and cycling, which is as it should be. I also get the impression that the aim is also to cut down on vehicle dependency/ownership. However, despite the best intentions of this proposal, this would still basically be a country-based community. It would bear little relationship to a similar set up in an urban environment. The reality would be that, for most of these proposed new homes, residents would need two incomes to support both their family unit and their mortgage or rent payments. Since Policy R1 proposes to build a vast "Garden Community" on open farm land, employment prospects within the immediate area will always be fairly limited. Therefore, the vast majority of working residents

would have to travel for work. Again, the reality is that living in the country actually means that a car or van becomes a necessity and not a luxury.

Yes, Adisham does have a railway station, however, I doubt if using the train will suit all of these proposed working residents. Unlike railways within urban areas, Adisham only has one line that only goes in two directions. Ideal for London, Dover or intermediate stops perhaps, but getting anywhere else for work would not be quite so easy. As for bus services, there is currently only an oversubscribed school bus service that operates twice a day. The bus companies would have to seriously up their levels of service to and from Adisham, for bus use to become a realistic option. Since they currently appear to be cutting services, I'm not confident that bus services would ever be good enough to persuade people to give up their cars.

Unless DCDLP -Policy R1 provides excellent transport links to everywhere in East Kent, which in my view, is most unlikely, then many of these proposed 3200 households plus 320 single older person homes, would naturally turn to using the car to get about. With many homes needing two incomes, many would need to drive to work. So, despite the "Garden Community" aims of reducing vehicle traffic and encouraging residents to stay in the community, that aim will almost certainly not work from the start. If each household were to have 1.5 vehicles, that could mean around 5000 extra vehicles from Policy R1 alone. So, how many extra daily vehicle movements will this development - Policy R1 - create? And how much air pollution?

These extra vehicle movements will substantially add to the daily local congestion on our already busy local roads. Current congestion spots are: Wingham and Barham junction with the A2. Again DCDLP - Policy R1, cannot and should not be looked at in isolation. Leaving aside the 320 single older person homes proposed under policy R1, the combined above mentioned proposed and nearly completed housing projects, (see point 4), could add around 4900 extra dwellings to the area. At a ratio of 1.5 cars per household, that would mean an extra 7350 vehicles in the area. How many vehicle movements would they create each day? How much congestion would it cause? And how much air pollution would be created? And remember, 1.5 cars per household may be an under estimation!

Finally, vehicle movements would not just be confined to private cars. Every day there would be post, recycling collections, utility services, builders, white van and super market deliveries, repair vans, visitors and the list goes on, each causing pollution of the kinds mentioned earlier. None of these estimated figures include movements to or from the other industrial and commercial developments proposed by both CCC and DDC in their draft Plans.

8. "a) iv) Works to Adisham Downs Road to promote the route for cycling and reduce vehicular use". Encouraging cycling is fine but reducing vehicular use on Downs Road will only create more problems elsewhere! If the combined proposed house building proposals in the area creates an estimated extra 7350 additional vehicles, as mentioned in point 7 above, how will the extra vehicle movements created by all of these new residents be managed? Restricting one of the main arterial routes to vehicular traffic will not help!

9. Increase in crime and anti-social behaviour: With a greatly increased population there will be increased crime and anti-social behaviour. This will not improve anyone's quality of life.

10. The long-term merger of several local village communities: Whether by design or by accident, when the DCDLP - Policy R1, proposed development of, "Land at Cooting Farm", is looked at in conjunction with DCDLP - Policy R20 "Aylesham South" and neighbouring Dover District Council's Draft Local Plan for 2045 - Policy SAP 24, Site reference: AYL003b, the effect will be to merge and engulf several separate, close knit communities into one vast unwanted, urban sprawl. In doing so, those communities will lose both their identity and their geographic independence. In the case of Adisham and Womenswold, they are both ancient villages with history going back centuries. Adisham was even mentioned in the Dooms Day book. Aylesham is barely a hundred years old and has both a separate character and origin.

The proposed DCDLP - Policy R1 "Land at Cooting Farm" - "Garden Community" development will effectively merge ancient Adisham with nearby modern Aylesham and Womenswold, thereby turning the area into one huge sprawling and unsightly housing estate. No one that I have spoken to in each of these communities wants this to happen. Each community is separate and wishes to stay that way. In short, the sheer scale of proposed development in this area and in particular DCDLP - Policy R1, proposed development of, "**Land at Cooting Farm**", is preposterous, misplaced and completely unwanted. Ancient Adisham would end up being engulfed by something seventeen times its current size and against the will of its current residents!!!

As for "quality of life", there must be some benefits from such a development but I can't imagine anything in this DCDLP - Policy R1, that would in any way enhance that which is currently enjoyed by residents of Adisham.

11. Lack of proper consultation: The first I knew of DCDLP - Policy R1, was at the beginning of October 2022! I have since asked many other residents of Adisham when they first discovered that their village was "earmarked" to be swallowed up by this huge "Garden Community" project? Surely something so big and life changing must have been general knowledge and that I have just been either blinkered or missed out by accident? But no, nearly everyone I spoke to said the same thing. They too, only discovered Policy R1's proposals at the beginning of October! Yet this has clearly been in the pipeline for some considerable time. Why have CCC not notified the residents of Adisham about this proposal before now? **Has the proper consultation process been followed?**

To summarise, DCDLP - Policy R1 will create mass housing but at a very high price. The very many serious and irreversible long-term effects created by Policy R1, will cause irreparable damage to the ancient village of Adisham and its rural surroundings. The ripples will spread outwards effecting neighbouring Aylesham and other surrounding villages and communities as well. I can only speak for myself, but it saddens me that there is far too much proposed development, way more, it seems than anywhere else,

and all concentrated in this immediate area. It will cause untold harm to our glorious rural environment and ruin current residents' quality of life. I do understand that new homes are needed but do we really need to swamp one location, more than any other in East Kent, with so many so quickly?

Yours sincerely

Paul Lukehurst