

From: Guy Steward [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 May 2026 13:10
To: Consultations
Subject: Regulation 19 consultation 2040 Local Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

--Email From External Account--

Response of a local resident to the Regulation 19 Consultation on the 2040 Local Plan:

Name: Guy Steward
[REDACTED]

GENERAL REMARKS:

There should be NO additional large scale housing developments in or close to Canterbury permitted until basic infrastructure is in place such as:

A) There is a complete ring road around Canterbury. Traffic is gridlocked at certain times now in 2026. There are 4000 houses already destined to be built in the vicinity of the Old and New Dover Roads and other approved permissions which will inevitably add to traffic congestion. Through traffic that has no need or desire to be in the city must be kept out. (This could be enforced by anpr monitoring of number plates perhaps with a charge for non-locals, a number of "free" trips per week to allow free access by people from local villages to go shopping etc. Politically unpalatable, but an idea!)

B) Adequate provision must be made BEFORE ANY CONSTRUCTION for sewage and waste water to satisfy the environmental demands of places like Stodmarsh. Allowing housing developments where developers promise to install bespoke sewage treatment plants, or say they are going to tanker sewage away is crazy and a recipe for disaster in the future.

C) Adequate provision for water supply must be made to cater for extra houses BEFEORE, or at the same time as they are built. Whilst the water companies are obliged to provide water for whatever the Local Plan might dictate, they can't perform miracles. Their failure to invest in infrastructure over recent times will obviously curtail their ability to supply extra houses at the same time as trying to upgrade their current network to cater for existing customers.

Also:

It should be mandatory that all new houses built in the area should be fitted with solar panels (and battery?) on roofs that slope in the appropriate direction.

Additional housing developments should be considered only where there is shown to be a local NEED. We are told that nationally Developers are sitting on permissions to build 1.5 million houses that have not been started. We are also told that with a falling birth rate demand will reduce in the medium term. There is also talk of many new build properties in East Kent that are not selling at the moment for whatever reason.

Obviously BROWN FIELD sites, existing run down areas and "in fill" locations should be prioritised for new houses ahead of green field agricultural land.

Housing developers must provide a MIX of dwellings to include "affordable" starter homes and provision for older, retired people. There should also be efforts made by Local Authorities to increase their social housing stock to compensate for some of the "Council" houses sold under the "Right to buy" scheme.

POLICY R13

I SUPPORT policy R13 in general. In Adisham I support the proposal for 10 houses adjacent to Station Road. I support the proposal for an additional 19 houses in or around the village during the period covered by the Plan.

POLICY R14

I SUPPORT policy R14, provided that A) there is adequate provision for sewage leaving the village, and B) access on to the public highway does NOT result in the destruction of the boundary hedge on Station Road.

POLICY R21

I OPPOSE Policy R21 for a number of reasons:

The title "Canterbury Business Park" is completely misleading and a con! The site is a rural site on the outskirts of Bridge and nowhere near Canterbury. The long standing main businesses on the site serve the rural community; a packhouse and fruit delivery hub, a distributor of agri chemicals, a workshop that repairs agricultural machinery etc.

Development here would destroy landscape and the setting of the Kent Downs National Landscape.

Development would destroy productive agricultural land.

Development would destroy habitat.

Development here would be against national policies on car use; it would be dependant upon car use.

Development would potentially cause extra traffic on rural roads with satnavs taking people down Woodlands Road through Adisham which is not set up for through traffic of any sort.

POLICY R22

I SUPPORT (albeit reluctantly) the proposed lorry facility because the truckers badly need it. Facilities of this nature should have been designed into the road system years ago. I would ask that the light pollution could be kept as discrete as possible to try to keep the skys dark.

I hope that these remarks are helpful.

GUY STEWARD 17 May 2026



Virus-free. www.avg.com