

Adisham Parish Council Response to Canterbury City Council Local Plan

Adisham Parish Council supports the plan as a whole generally but would like CCC to consider the following comments. Adisham Parish Council have worked with CARE and this document is based on their submission.

- The continued allocation of greenfield sites including highly productive farmland and beautiful countryside is concerning. 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 completely unbuilt Mountfield New Town (4,000 housing units plus retail and business units) which will adjoin these new schemes. We also question whether the suggested necessary supporting infrastructure is adequate.
- '*Affordable housing*' now being a thoroughly discredited concept, we urge CCC to use planning to ensure many private **starter housing units** (2-bedroom houses and 1–2-bedroom flats & maisonettes) are built for the market to enable those who want both to avoid social housing and to get onto the housing market ladder.
- Adisham residents urge 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 its neighbours.
- 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 and we ask CCC to support moves to include the Kent Downs in the next tranche of lowland national parks in England. The next step should be a boundary review covering two things: (i) land inside the national landscape and (ii) top quality Kent downland that was missed when the KD AONB was launched in 1968 and is still worthy of inclusion of national designation, be it NL or NP.
- R12 Understandably Adisham Parish Council has concerns about this development. They wholly support a development of 10 dwellings which reflect the type of housing needed in the village, large properties are not needed. A mixture of properties that are affordable is acceptable and needed. The infrastructure to support this must be in place. The main concern is the developer applying for planning permission for 50 dwellings in the future, this amount would be totally disproportionate to the size of the village and would not be supported by the Parish Council and the majority of residents.
- C17 (building a large factory & warehouse on productive farmland in a prominent place in the KDNL) should be excised from the plan. This plan policy was built around a particular scheme where the developer made certain assurances to CCC which turned out to have no substance. Although, ludicrously, the developer blames the planning system, even though it got permission, it is now clear both that the scheme was 'a bridge too far' for their business to sustain and that CCC were effectively misled.

- N34 - 'Barham Lorry Park': this plan scheme actually seems to be in Womenswold Parish, (i.e. on Adisham's side of the A2), not Barham. CARE's prime concern here is light pollution. 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. If this plan policy goes ahead, CCC must require state-of-the-art security lights that minimise light pollution. We can all clearly see what can go badly wrong when we look in the direction of Highland Court at night, an example of bad practice in terms of light pollution.
- The protection and conservation of '*Irreplaceable Habitats*', as defined by the UK government, should be integral to the plan. Quite properly, '*Ancient Woodland*' is at the top of the government's list of *Irreplaceable Habitats*.