

## Tom Hawkes

---

**From:** [REDACTED] k  
**Sent:** 21 October 2025 12:10  
**To:** Consultations  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Draft Canterbury District Local Plan : Focussed Consultation 2025 : Land adjacent to 30 Church Wood Close Ref : SLAA230

### --Email From External Account--

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write to request that the council reconsiders its decision not to include land adjacent to 30 Church Wood Close, Rough Common (ref SLAA 230). I ask for it to be included as an allocation for self-build housing in the forthcoming Regulation 19 draft Local Plan.

The site was considered “*unsuitable for the development proposed due to concerns regarding landscape and ecology impact*” in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment Summary of Site Submissions (August 2025).

I ask you to reconsider the substantial documentation submitted in the 2022 and 2024 consultations. This includes a Landscape and Visual Overview prepared by Aspect Landscape Planning and a letter from Quinn Estates 14<sup>th</sup> May 2024 which amongst other things drew attention to planning permission CA/22/00555 for 23 houses on land rear of 51 Rough Common Road. It also referred to the council’s decision to upgrade Rough Common in the settlement hierarchy to local service centre, recognising the close proximity of Rough Common to the city with excellent road, footpath and public transport connectivity to and from the city centre.

I wish to challenge the council’s assessment that the site is out of character with the built form of Rough Common.

Rough Common Road was first established as a link between Harbledown and the Whitstable Road. Built development initially followed that Road. In the inter-war period a small amount of housing was built as branches extending from it along Lovell Road and Ravenscroft Road.

There has been inevitable infill along Rough Common Road. Subsequently, in the post-war period, a number of small housing estates in the form of cul-de-sacs have been built on either side of Rough Common Road. There is nothing to distinguish them from other housing estates and cul-de-sacs which have been built throughout the country. There is no particular architectural or spatial quality which distinguishes them or which creates an identifiable character.

The previously submitted Landscape and Visual Overview provided by Aspect Landscape Planning provides a detailed analysis of the landscape context and the impact of the proposals upon it. The conclusions are clear. The site has remarkable visual self-containment as a result of the established woodland to the east and the built development to the west. I ask the council to reconsider this detailed assessment and share the conclusion that residential development on this site would not give rise to harmful landscape or visual effects with the detailed mitigation measures suggested in that report.

The landscape report also refers to the potential to enhance the woodland edge of the site, retaining that woodland and creating diverse ecology zones. These matters would be covered in a detailed planning application.

I invite the council to reconsider the substantial and compelling material which has previously been submitted in support of this site its previous assessment and share our conclusion that, in view of Rough Common’s scale, absence of any heritage designation and generally unremarkable or special character, this is

a village which has considerable potential to absorb additional development. And please share our conclusion that development of this site would have extremely limited visual impact and give an opportunity to enhance biodiversity.

Yours faithfully,

Mike Goddard BA DipTP DMS MRTPI  
Goddard Planning  
Canterbury  
Kent  
CT4 5BL

