

This policy R1 should be removed in its entirety from the Canterbury Local Plan. The reasons for this are as follows:

1) Irreversible destruction of precious landscape and environment and productive farm land.

- a) the irreparable destruction of ancient South East England landscape and with it threatening nature and integrity of the existing local communities as well as removing from production prime farmland and also threatening unique and precious species of flora and fauna.
- b) Would mean irreversible destruction of Kentish ancient upland landscape. It would irreversibly change the character of this rural environment with its characteristic chalk land landscape and views. With its old field and hedgerow networks, pathways, ancient rural settlements, hamlets (the importance of which is ironically highlighted in R28 of this plan)
- c) Prime farmland currently available and significantly active in food production for example: wheat, barley, oats, beans, peas and grazing animals. To consider removing this irreplaceable resource from productivity at a time in our nation's history where significance of producing food is of prime importance is irresponsible.
- d) Any development on this scale with many-fold increase in people living in and using the area would inevitably put under extreme pressure the existing rural and natural environment. For example specific plant species in the Ileden and Oxenden SSSI designated woods such as nationally-rare Lady Orchid and unique to the North Downs chalk landscape the Narrow-lipped Helleborine whose numbers are already fragile will inevitably be threatened. These plants existing as with many other nationally and locally 'rare species' in these our ancient woodlands and Kentish chalk-land are integral to the existing ANOB status of this precious landscape.
- e) A development of this size and nature threatens habitats of local species of for example little owl, short-eared owls which currently breed and thrive in our open farmland and woods.
- f) A development of this size threatens access to dark sky (Night Blight 2016). Adisham is currently still on CPRE's Dark Skies map of areas with access to night sky relatively free from light pollution. IDA Dark skies consideration is a crucial aspect of any development proposal.
- g) The R1 proposal claims a bio diversity net gain of 20% largely through e.g. developing man made 'natural and semi-natural open spaces'; green corridors and links; enhancements to potential habitat and pollinator connectivity..'. On the contrary and alarmingly the proposed development would destroy much of the existing rich, biodiverse and often ancient natural environment.

- h) Public access already exists has enabled public (and pollinator!) access for hundreds of years ( Adisham village celebrates 1400 years of recorded existence this year -2023) via network on footpaths, byways and bridleways (including according to local archaeologists ancient paths and routes evidenced to mediaeval times such as 'Adisham's own 'Street' itself).

2) Destruction of a close and friendly self-sustaining community that is Adisham village (and hamlets) and which has been in existence as a settlement for more than 1400 years.

- a) Destruction of essence and integrity of a close and friendly self sustaining and thriving community that is Adisham village and the hamlets of e.g. Lower and Upper Cooting which has existed as such for centuries. With community projects over the decades marking historical events with gatherings records and reports and maps, photographs, booklets etc for local natural environment and habitat records, ancient woodland reports, footpath and campaign groups. Also celebrating royal events, local anniversaries, celebrating local inhabitants lives and deaths and village community successes. A thriving primary school, active church and village hall venues, a range of current village activities such as monthly Big Breakfast, Community choir, Keep fit/ Dance classes, weekly games evenings, monthly supper club, preservation of Woods campaign group, Dog activity training and exercise area etc each attracting people from Canterbury and surrounding areas. This village community would be changed irrevocably by the construction of 2,300 houses within its boundaries.
- b) This is a completely inappropriate development proposal and clearly contradicts Canterbury City Council's own policy proposals elsewhere in the plan (eg R28) which sets out the importance of ensuing local settlements in the Countryside maintain rural integrity of community and existing nature and open space.

3) Inadequate and already treacherous existing road infrastructure. Chaotic and unsafe road networks and traffic volume problems would ensue from increase in cars and general traffic on unsuitable roads and road networks.

- a) there are already serious traffic and road safety problems on the main road between A2 and Wingham (B2046) and these exacerbated in recent months by the current housing development and increase in volume of traffic in and from Aylesham.
- b) Many incidents of injury due to lack of traffic safety and indeed fatalities have been recorded along the B2046 in the last 40 years and an increase in traffic due to the proposed town building (3,200 houses) at R1 and the City Councils proposed 420 houses at Womenswold ( R20 Aylesham south) would only

increase this pressure and further compromise safety, risk lives and add to grid lock.

- c) Indeed Dover district Council have recently removed the proposal to build more houses at North Aylesham from their recent District draft Plan 2022 based on the grid lock and safety issues along the B2046 .

#### 4) unsustainable demand on regions water resources and waste infrastructure-already under extreme pressure

- a) A development proposal on this scale and in this area fails to address need for or provision of adequate water and sewage infrastructure for 3200 houses. And this in a region where inadequate existing water and waste services are impacting daily on an already stressed region.
- b) For example where aquifers within the R1 proposed area which are crucial to a large area including Thanet, are already vulnerable to extraction and adverse activity. In the neighbouring village of Littlebourne sewage has to be physically removed on a weekly basis because the existing infrastructure is inadequate. Building more houses on the upland area at Cooting Farm will further increase these already serious problems in lower lying settlements.

#### 5) Inappropriate and unsupported/proven need for this type and scale of development (contradicts CCC's own policy elsewhere in the plan e.g. R28 Countryside).

- a) Unproven need for the housing and community development; Lack of any clear rationale or evidence for a housing proposal on this scale and of this type and particularly in the light of the recent National Government proposal ( Gove, 5th Dec 2022) that existing National housing targets be removed and reviewed identification need, nature and scale of housing returned to the locus of local communities.
- b) Some local authorities in UK ( e.g. Horsham and Teinbridge) have already taken the steps to withdraw their housing targets/ development plans as a result.
- c) A more satisfactory and appropriate approach will be that local and parish planning can identify local housing and services development needs and opportunities from within the locality. In his letter Gove (5<sup>th</sup> Dec 2022) identifies the need for people in their own communities to have more say and representation as to what is needed and what is to be developed in their community.

#### 6). Sections of proposed development land identified as 'unsuitable for development' in the city councils own recent 'Call for Sites'. Already unpopular with the neighbouring parishes and Dover district council despite reference in R1 proposal to 'coordination with ...key stakeholders and local community'.

- a) planning process appears poorly/ inappropriately applied. Undeliverable plan since various permissions and purchase required not achieved and already a lack of coordination with neighbouring councils.
- b) R1 proposal is insensitive to the integrity of the existing area, rural environment and community and obscurely appears in direct opposition what is proposed in the same planning document at R28 !