

From: Sue Martin [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 May 2026 16:53
To: Consultations
Subject: Canterbury District Local Plan (Regulation19) Consultation-Objection

--Email From External Account--

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to object to the Regulation 19 Canterbury District Local Plan. My reasons are detailed below:

1. Unjustified Scale of Housing Growth (Not Justified)

The scale of growth (23,000 homes) is disproportionate to identified local needs (3,000 on the housing register)

The plan should meet local affordability needs.

2. Risk of Unlocking Further Unsustainable Development (Not Positively Prepared)

The plan enables future infrastructure that would open large areas of greenfield land for further development beyond what is currently assessed.

3. Inadequate Transport and Safety Evidence (Not Effective)

The plan is not supported by adequate or credible transport modelling, particularly in known high-risk and constrained areas such as : Chestfield roundabouts, Borstal Hill roundabout and M2 Junction 7 (Brenley Corner)

4.Failure to Demonstrate Deliverable Water and Wastewater Infrastructure. (Not effective or justified)

The system is already under strain (a hosepipe ban until February 2026 and sewage overflows due to heavy rainfall.) The plan is not effective or justified as South East Water has publicly stated that it may struggle to supply water to an additional 23,000 homes proposed in this plan.

5. Increased Sewage Discharge and Coastal impact (Not Justified)

The plan would significantly increase sewage discharges at Swalecliffe creating risks for bathing water quality, marine ecosystems and local fisheries.

6. Unresolved Public Health Risks - Water Quality (Not Consistent with National Policy),

No detailed, evidence-based assessment has been provided to demonstrate compliance with public health or environmental protection requirements.

For the reasons outlined, the local plan is not justified by evidence, not consistent with national policy, not effective in ensuring infrastructure delivery and is therefore unsound.

I respectfully urge the Planning Officer to reject the Plan in its current form and require significant revision so that development is properly evidenced, infrastructure led and environmentally safe.

Yours faithfully,
Sue Martin.

Sent from my iPad