

David Wadmore

January 15 2023

Objections to CCC proposed local plan

I wish to oppose the adoption of this plan for the following reasons.

1: Many of the items from the adopted previous local plan have yet to be completed and indeed, started in many instances. Thus the premise on which the new plan is based is flawed.

The following have been retained, but are by no means certain to be built.

**Policy SB3** Site 2 Land at Sturry (630 homes) and Broad Oak Farm (456) homes

Site 8 Land north of Hersden(800 homes)

**Policy T6** Sturry Park and Ride safeguarding land for the expansion of the Park and Ride.

**Policy T13** Herne Relief Road safeguarding of land required and funding from SP3

**Policy T14** Sturry Relief Road safeguarding of land required and funding from SP3Policy

How will the Sturry Link road go ahead if the developers' contributions are fixed and there has been a large increase in road building cost? Has the money been paid into an escrow account. Will the government funding (£6m?) be available indefinitely?

House building locally has slowed and the developers do not appear to be keeping o the schedules in their planning applications. Given the likely slump in house prices and higher building cost will the Sturry and Hersden developments go ahead?

If the Link Road isn't built what are the provisions to deal with the additional traffic from the Broad Oak Farm Development, Hersden and the increase of traffic coming through Herne?

2: Calculations of required housing. It is widely accepted that the calculation method of housing needs is being reviewed under the NPFF by the current government. Even using the existing methods, the space allocated by the plan to housing is in excess of the basic requirement, and is patently being used by the council to fund infrastructure and other needs. It is a self-defeating circle, as the more housing that is built, the greater the demand for infrastructure. Infrastructure that comes at the cost of local green space. The government assessment is that the area needs 9,000 new homes, not the 14-17,000 proposed.

3: Inclusion of Popes Lane, Broad Oak. This is an unacceptable addition to the plan. Already once refused planning, this site has been proposed for even greater number of houses than the first application. It makes a 'hard boundary' to the village edge and will introduce more traffic to an already congested and dangerous junction. The current works for the housing at

Broad Oak development has not been completed, so we are unable to access the actual effect this will have on traffic flows and pollution.

4: Assessment of Sturry as a local hub: many of the facilities mentioned in the plan are either now closed, about to be closed, or not ever there! Basing a plan on false facts is a recipe for failure. Nowhere is there mentioned the need to revitalize our few shopping areas in Sturry and Broad Oak, and as a result more people will be forced to take on journeys of over a mile or so to reach basic facilities. Allowing developers to 'buy off' community provision for things such as doctors surgeries, child care facilities is not a solution for residents. Planning is about building communities, not allowing rows of economically built, minimum sized housing and hoping that 'communities' will follow. The new plan offers no more than a 'dormitory' approach to community development.

Given that the area of Sturry has been designated a Rural Hub, there is nothing in the proposals that will help preserve the rural character of the area, instead it will turn the corridor from the city centre to Hersden into one long conurbation.

Very little in the proposals show how local needs will be assessed, in terms of community facilities and transport improvements.

5: The new plan also relies heavily on the construction (by the housing developers money) of by pass roads. This are unlikely to happen unless the developers pay for the infrastructure first and build (profitable) housing second. The approach is flawed, and the council puts itself in a position as a hostage to the developers.

6: Traffic zoning. Unspeakably bad idea, and probably a red herring to divert attention from all the other, over many, housing schemes. However, a great idea for unifying opposition to the council's plans.

7: Open space assessment: By including land that is over 2km away from Sturry and Broad Oak, the assessment that Sturry has adequate open space is wildly inaccurate. New developments count small areas of unbuilt land into 'open space'. This is largely unusable and unsuitable for community use. WE need designated playing fields and a better provision for sports. Relying on school land use is impractical, especially given security and insurance complications. The policy of allowing 'open space' to be off set in other areas is not acceptable and works against developing healthy, integrated communities.

8: The plan appears to assume that the Broad Oak reservoir is a given. There is a lot of discussion yet to be had on this subject, especially on the subject of traffic, land use and sustainability of local water resources.

There are also areas where the plan fails to protect, or endangers SSSI sites, especially in regards to the Old Park site and its threat from the proposed Eastern bypass. The large area of acid grassland is of national importance.

Whereas the plan supports the need to protect and enhance any habitats that offer

breeding or feeding sites of local importance to protected species such as Old Park and Chequers Wood (which provide important breeding habitats for the endangered nightingale and turtle dove), there should be a wider analysis of our local species (eg. Otters, Owls, dormouse)

The clause in the plan emphasising the need to avoid the fragmentation of habitats, and recognising the need to create and extend ecological networks and green corridors is of great importance, and is especially relevant to the East of Canterbury and the impacts from the Sturry Link Road and flyover.

Finally, there should be greater emphasis on the dark skies policy and retaining the natural tranquility of the areas around Canterbury. There are not enough green gaps in the proposals. Our communities need space to breathe...