

## Tom Hawkes

---

**From:** David Conder [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 October 2025 15:23  
**To:** Consultations  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** David Conder response to the latest draft (regulation 18) of the 20240 Canterbury Local Plan.

**--Email From External Account--**

### My response to this latest regulation 18 consultation on the 2040 Canterbury Local Plan

- I am a resident of the district and have been so for 45 years.
- I support CCC's overall housing strategy.
- I support the plan as a whole, as proposed in this draft.
- While I appreciate the housing targets are forced on CCC by central government, I am most concerned by the continued and huge allocation of greenfield sites including highly productive farmland and beautiful countryside.
- The new emphasis on an eastern and southerly extension of Canterbury, south of the Sandwich Road, is alarming especially in the light of the approved but unbuilt Mountfield New Town. Together these new schemes, will create a large, transformational conurbation.
- The adequacy of supporting infrastructure, as it appears in the plan, seems unlikely.
- '*Affordable housing*' now being a thoroughly discredited concept, I suggest that CCC use the planning system to ensure many private **starter housing units** (2-bedroom houses/1-2-bedroom flats & maisonettes) are built for the market to enable those who want both to avoid entering social housing and to get onto the housing market ladder.
- After the 2040 plan is approved and for the rest of its life, CCC should ensure that no further large scale developments are considered in the south of what is currently the Canterbury District until both the infrastructural and the environmental impacts of - (i) what has been already approved but not yet built from the old, expired plans (ii) non-plan schemes which have been approved but have not yet been built and (iii) what is now proposed in the new 2040 plan - have all been measured, understood and absorbed (i.e. after all these plan and non-plan schemes have been built).
- CCC does further research into genuine local housing need, ideally cooperating with Kent's other district councils.

- I strongly support plan policy **R12** (Station Road, Adisham). Adisham needs a few more houses, especially 2-bedroom starter houses, and R12 is the best location for them.
- **C17** should be deleted from the plan. With the withdrawal of Chapel Down, this bit of the Kent Downs National Landscape can be protected together with the farmland that would have been destroyed. It was good news to learn that central government has decided not to water down protection for designated landscapes like the national landscapes and national parks.
- CCC gives top priority to the protection and conservation of the Kent Downs as a whole (not just the designated National Landscape) and the '*setting*' of the designated area) when considering development proposals.
- Kent Downs National Park: CCC should use its position on the KDNL JAC to support moves to include the Kent Downs in the next tranche of lowland national parks in England. As the Surrey Hills NL has recently completed, the next step should be a boundary review covering two things: (i) land inside the national landscape and (ii) the top quality Kent downland that was missed when the KD AONB was launched in 1968 and remains worthy of inclusion of national designation, be it NL or NP.
  - Reduce Light Pollution: Generally CCC should insist on best practice/ state of the art lighting. A good example would be at plan policy **N34 - 'Barham Lorry Park'**: There should be the most stringent control on light pollution attached to this plan policy. Adisham sits in a zone of low light pollution on the dark skies map, a zone that should be protected at the very least. On a clear night, you can see the Milky Way from Adisham's The Street.
  - The protection and conservation of '*Irreplaceable Habitats*', as defined by the UK government, should be integral to the plan. '*Ancient Woodland*' is at the top of the government's list of *Irreplaceable Habitats*. This should be given priority in the 2040 Canterbury Local Plan. Developers should be stopped from using permitted development procedures in '*irreplaceable habitats*', stopping buildings and roadways being thrown up in ancient woods and the dumping of motorway/construction waste & shipping containers. Where such damage has been done, CCC should be swift in enforcing remedy.

David Conder, [REDACTED]