

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

--Email From External Account--

Planning Department
Canterbury City Council

Friday 17 October 2025
Subject: **Policy C6 - Land at Merton Park**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to submit a formal objection to the proposed development at Merton Park, which is an example of urban sprawl entirely inappropriate for this location.

This site is an integral part of the city, consisting of playing fields, orchards, agriculture and connection via minor roads to the countryside. These valuable green spaces are exactly the areas that need preserving to act as a buffer to the noise and pollution of the nearby A2.

The proposal is contrary to Section 198 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires that planning policies and decisions ensure new development is appropriate for its location, considering the likely effects—including cumulative effects—of pollution on health, living conditions, and the natural environment.

The area remains largely free from Artificial Light At Night (ALAN) and consequently supports a thriving variety of wildlife. It therefore constitutes a key component of Canterbury's Green Infrastructure (GI) network, serving as a wildlife corridor that links urban and rural spaces. The plans for high-density housing and floodlit playing fields would introduce significant levels of ALAN, resulting in light pollution that would harm local amenity, dark landscapes, and biodiversity—again contravening Section 198 of the NPPF, which requires the impact of artificial light to be limited.

Section 20 of the NPPF requires that policies conserve and enhance the natural, built, and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure. The proposed development would destroy valuable GI at this site and should therefore be abandoned. In addition, the proposed loss of accessible natural and semi-natural open space is contrary to Section 8 of the NPPF, which seeks to support strong, vibrant, and healthy communities by ensuring the provision of open spaces that promote health, social, and cultural well-being.

Furthermore, Section 88(d) of the NPPF specifies that planning policies and decisions should enable the retention of accessible open space. The loss of this well-used and much-valued area would deprive thousands of residents of a vital local amenity.

It is noted that the failure to take the very serious problems of transport in this area into consideration has failed the requirements of Section 109 of the NPPF which states "Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stage of plan making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well designed and popular places". It is abundantly clear to anyone that lives in this area, no such analysis has been considered.

For these reasons, this proposal constitutes an unsound policy that conflicts with multiple key provisions of the NPPF and undermines both environmental and community well-being.

I therefore respectfully urge Canterbury City Council to reject the proposed development at Merton Park and protect this important part of the city's green infrastructure and natural heritage.

Yours faithfully,

Jonathan Deacon

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]