

From: Sean Mohan [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2025 18:02
To: Consultations
Subject: Focused consultation 2025 - Policy C12

--Email From External Account--

Dear CCC

I am responding to the following question in the draft local plan focussed consultation 2025:

Do you have any comments on the proposed deletion of Land north of the University of Kent (Policy C12)

As a Canterbury citizen for over 30 years and resident of Blean since 2006, I wholeheartedly support and applaud the proposed deletion of Policy C12 from the draft Local Plan. This development would have irreparably damaged the ancient woodland, overwhelmed the character of Blean and surrounding villages, and placed intolerable strain on our roads, infrastructure, and community.

The site was never suitable and the C12 policy contradicted the City Council's own 2021 Landscape Character Assessment. As widely recognised, it lacked viable access, threatened protected landscapes and species, and relied on vague promises about transport and wastewater provision. The idea of relocating Blean Primary School was not only costly but also deeply disruptive. The absence of proper assessments - heritage, traffic, environmental – was unacceptable.

However, beyond the many technical failings, this proposal struck at the heart of our community's identity. The land between Tyler Hill and Blean is not just green space—it's part of our shared story. The emotional toll of this plan was and has been real and profound and I know from firsthand experience as a local resident that many people felt disregarded and deeply distressed by the C12 plan. This has also been backed up by an important piece of research published in July on the CPRE website - <https://www.cprekent.org.uk/news/how-is-the-onslaught-of-development-proposals-affecting-local-people/>

To reiterate, I strongly welcome and fully agree with the Council's new proposal to remove Policy C12 and, additionally, would urge continued vigilance in light of recent media reports on the University of Kent's plans to press ahead with their plans for a 2,000-home estate regardless. Any future attempt to revive this development—under a different name or process—must be met with the same scrutiny and resolve. Needless to say, the various objections would also apply to any possible proposal for large-scale development in the area in the future. This landscape deserves protection and stewardship to safeguard it for generations - human and natural - to come.

Best wishes

Sean Mohan

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]