

From: Hannah Huxley [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 May 2026 16:05
To: Consultations
Subject: Formal Objection to Development Proposal: Policy SS3 and Policy C10 (Merton Park)

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

--Email From External Account--

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a local resident, writing to formally object to the Local Plan, specifically Policy SS3 and Policy C10 (Merton Park), on the grounds that it is both unsound and legally non-compliant.

My details are:

Hannah Huxley

57 Black Griffin Lane, Canterbury, CT12DG

My concerns are as follows:

1. Severe Traffic Impacts Ignored – Failure of Duty to Cooperate and Effectiveness

The plan replaces previously proposed relief roads with a “bus-led” approach. However the Council’s own evidence, specifically the Draft Transport Strategy (Table 5.1), openly acknowledges that severe congestion will persist at key junctions, including the A2/A28 Wincheap interchange and M2 Junction 7. Crucially, there is no signed Statement of Common Ground with National Highways confirming acceptance of these impacts. Without this agreement, the plan fails the Duty to Cooperate and cannot be considered effective, rendering it legally non-compliant.

2. Unjustified Loss of Greenfield Land – Failure to Prioritise Brownfield

National planning policy requires that brownfield land is prioritised before allocating greenfield sites. In this case, the Council is proposing development at Merton Park that would harm the historic setting of Canterbury, while overlooking significant opportunities for regeneration. The Council is sacrificing the historic green setting of Canterbury to build low-density sprawl at Merton Park, while completely ignoring the chance to regenerate the Wincheap Retail Estate, city-centre car parks, and vacant student housing into high-density, eco-friendly homes.

3. Ecological Concerns – Legal Non-Compliance

The Stodmarsh Nature Reserve is already under pressure due to water pollution. The Council’s March 2026 Habitats Regulations Assessment (paragraph 5.5.22) explicitly states that there is uncertainty

about whether the mitigation measures for approximately 1,950 homes can be successfully delivered. Under established planning law principles, it is not lawful to approve a plan where there is uncertainty about its environmental impacts. This means the plan fails both legal compliance and national policy requirements.

Beyond strategic planning concerns, the plan will result in the loss of green spaces that are widely used and valued by the local community. These areas provide vital recreational space, support physical and mental wellbeing, and contribute to the character and identity of Canterbury. The removal of accessible green space in favour of low-density development represents a clear decline in quality of life for existing residents. It also conflicts with the stated aims of creating healthy, sustainable communities.

For these reasons, I strongly believe the Local Plan is unsound and should not proceed in its current form.

Please confirm receipt of this objection.

Regards,

Hannah