

Tom Hawkes

From: Miranda Haynes [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 October 2025 23:17
To: Consultations
Subject: Draft Canterbury District Local Plan: Focused consultation 2025

[REDACTED]

--Email From External Account--

Dear Sir or Madam

In response to your request for comments on the updated Canterbury District Local Plan, I believe the following points should be taken into consideration.

Despite a great deal of building completed and still to take place, it appears that Canterbury city and its immediate surrounds are to be slated to accept thousands more houses. This is completely out of keeping with the important historical character of the city and its surrounding villages. There is no way that such an increase in size can be necessary to meet local need for local families. Indeed, a large proportion of the houses that have been built are now occupied by families from outside the area, many moving from London and thus inflating prices above what is affordable for truly local home-seekers, while the limited more 'affordable' housing has been taken by Redbridge council for its own tenants (followed by a rise in local crime figures).

The result is that yet more houses are proposed to meet the still unsatisfied local need. Large estates are therefore due to blight the rolling countryside that so far has resisted ribbon development of the type around Blean, Thanington and Sturry. Not only does the area to the east and south contain important chalk streams, it is also one of the few areas remaining that shows evidence of the history in which the whole region was once steeped.

Proposals along the A257 have already been resoundingly rejected by residents and councillors on the grounds of safety, poor transport and the lack of utility service infrastructure making schemes non-viable. The building of sites N4–N6 are also supposedly dependent on the prior construction of a sewage treatment facility, so phased development is likely to last for years, therefore still not meeting local need but causing massive disruption throughout.

Similarly, water supply issues will persist until a new reservoir at Broad Oak is built and filled. Even then, the water to fill and top this up is supposedly to come from Sarre Penn and from the Stour at Plucks Gutter, in other words from the combined wastewater and surface runoff from Shelford Quarry landfill, from Ashford and Canterbury, from the Lampen, Nailbourne and Wingham Rivers, forming a feedback loop into the supply that will progressively concentrate any untreated contaminants. When thousands of new homes are proposed in the catchment, this issue is highly unlikely to be resolved as proposed by replacing a limited number of leaky septic tanks and buying nutrient credits.

The whole Local Plan and its update is flawed, being driven by unworkable government policy. When it fails, Canterbury City Council and the developers will be long gone, leaving residents mired in the consequences. The government is already being called out; it is time for Canterbury to add its voice to the rising tide of dissent and insist on a workable resolution to what is actually essential locally.

Many thanks for your consideration in this matter.

Kind regards,

Miranda Haynes

Littlebourne