

Main Issues with Local Plan sections R15 and R16

- Lack of local amenities
 - The current school buses are full in the morning
 - The Doctors surgeries locally are understaffed and always busy
 - Secondary school provision in 2022 the new secondary received 3 times application to spaces
 - All other local schools are oversubscribed.
 - The local Littlebourne Primary is over subscribed with current home numbers
- 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 spaces.
- Loss of grade A1 agricultural land which cannot be replaced
- Loss of wildlife habitats that cannot be replaced.
- Other village developments in the area of R16 were due to an enabling development delivering required infrastructure (a new doctor's surgery) this will not be the case with this site.
- Vehicle access is beyond poor, and visibility is limited (due to hedges not part of the site)
- Lack of consultation on the call for sites would have solved many of the problems in Littlebourne but also surrounding sites due to lack to the case of R16 landowner not willing to sell the site and thus it is undeliverable
- These are not infill sites.
- The sites massively increase population with no improve in amenities the 2021 census showed an increase of 4 percentage points in ten years for the Canterbury district this would mean a need for homes for 672 people per year at around 335 homes across the whole district based on current size Littlebourne would require 4 new homes per year the current site on the hill would deliver 74 years of housing thus R16 would not be needed.
- These sites break the 15-minute rule as the local infrastructure does not have capacity thus people will have to use their cars for everything.
- The current sewage system cannot cope yet more homes will be added without and upgrade, or onsite sewage works with impacts on residents quality of life and air quality.
- For Site R16 it borders other existing homes and there aspect means loss of privacy and loss of light will be encountered unless a massive buffer of around forty metres was provided due to the shadows cast from the sun from the homes.
- R16 is on a site with an established business which would have to relocate or close for a period how can this be sensible.
- The lack of local job opportunities Littlebourne has very few and ever will employment opportunities.
- **Excessive urbanisation** outside of the Littlebourne settlement boundary which has been artificially and illogically redrawn to fit the proposals.
- Both R15 and R16 would lead to a **permanent loss of the best Grade 1 agricultural land**.
- **Adverse effect on Landscape** characteristics with damage to views particularly towards the south (R15) and to the east (R16).
- **Harm to designated heritage assets** on A257 and the associated conservation area.
- **Lack of traffic assessment** in the draft plan of potentially adverse effects on Littlebourne traffic density, pollution, and risk to pedestrians on the already width constrained The Hill (A257), Bekesbourne Lane and the narrow Jubilee Road related to both R15 and R16 which would be further compounded by the other major proposed developments along the A257.
- Lack of a forward plan to address **likely increased surface water flood risks** in Nargate Street from urbanisation-accelerated drainage.
- **No spare wastewater management capacity** to cope. The old and inadequate wastewater disposal infrastructure of the village, which already requires unacceptable, prolonged winter tankering of sewage out of the village into Canterbury (500 tankers in 2021/22 winter), will be considerably worsened by a near 50% increase in village population.
- **Lack of assessment of the effects on the Little Stour rare chalk stream.**

- The 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.
- **Lack of local support** for the developments. Even a previous smaller development proposal on the south side of the Hill of 115 houses (less than half that currently proposed in R15) was rejected by 96% of villagers in a 2019 parish council poll.
- **Insufficient detail in infrastructure plans.** That consequential necessary infrastructure requirements such as sewers, school, GP surgery, public transport, walking / cycling routes would likely either lag way behind any development or fail to be implemented at all.
-

This list is no exhaustive but proves more suitable locations must be investigated