
Personal response of a local resident (David Conder, [REDACTED], 2040 Canterbury Local Plan, reg 19 consultation)

From David Conder [REDACTED]

Date Fri 5/15/2026 11:49 AM

To Consultations <Consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Cc [REDACTED]

--Email From External Account--

1. I **support** this draft of the 2040 Canterbury Local Plan.
2. I **support** the plan's housing strategy for two main reasons:
 - (a) use brown field sites where possible;
 - (b) build out from the existing built/urban area where infrastructure exists that can be developed and extended, avoiding parachuting new towns into open countryside where no such infrastructure exists to any degree); but
 - (c) CCC and its successor should take the lead, working with its neighbours, to research genuine local & county housing need and then publicly compare these locally-researched and statistically sound figures with the national housing targets (which are based on no research) forced on it by Westminster/Whitehall;
 - (d) force developers to produce genuinely affordable housing (with plenty of 2-bedroom terraced houses and 1-bedroom flats/ maisonettes for the private market), that is much cheaper than the same houses on the same estate sold at the so-called 'full' market rate (to avoid the current situation where there is often little difference between affordable and 'full' rates by the time that developer discounts/special offers have been taken up by the latter category of buyers); and
 - (e) East Kent Council should avoid further major development in what is currently the south of the Canterbury district until all housing units as yet unbuilt but approved from the previous plan, from this plan and from approved non-plan planning applications (I estimate that this is approximately 9,000 dwellings south of and along the A28 as it runs through the district) have been built. The infrastructural and environmental impacts of creating this large bulge of housing on the south of the city and southern villages needs to be measured and absorbed before more volume-housebuilding is allowed in this area.
3. I **strongly support** policy R14 (a line of 10 houses along Adisham's Station Road).
4. I **support** policy R13 (neighbourhood plan requirement for a further 19 houses (so 10 + 19) in Adisham by 2042/43).
5. I **strongly OPPOSE** policy R21 (industrial sprawl on a prominent greenfield site on the edge of Adisham Parish for these five reasons:
 - (a) Highly destructive of the landscape (including the Kent Downs National Landscape/KDNL and the 'legal setting' of the KDNL);
 - (b) This is productive farmland which should be preserved as such food-producing land;
 - (c) This site would be almost entirely dependant on private car use, which is contrary to national policies;
 - (d) Road traffic, both lorries and cars, will cause serious problems along Woodlands Road, other country roads and in Adisham's The Street in both the construction and operational stages; and

(e) Loss of important habitat that contains two 'Red List' species, White Helleborine and Lady Orchid (the latter a '*Kent Priority Species*').

NB. The title of policy R21 is misleading in the context of this public consultation, no doubt unintentionally, because it is miles away from the conurbation and city.

6. I **oppose** policy R22 unless light pollution is taken very seriously with the best anti-light pollution design and practice as a condition of approval. CCC must avoid the situation that the south of the district is subjected to with Highland Court Business Park where the light pollution is outstandingly bad and, apparently, CCC have found it hard to negotiate measures that would reduce the very obvious problem.

7. Kent Downs National Park: CCC should start to promote the candidacy of a national park covering the Kent Downs. As well as the massive conservation and recreation reasons, a KDNP would have a transformative economic impact

David Conder

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Outlook](#)