

## Fwd: LOCAL PLAN OBJECTION

CCC Planning <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>

9 August 2021 at 08:09

To: Michael Bailey [REDACTED]

Regards,

Planning Team  
Canterbury City Council  
01227 862178



Please reply to [planning@canterbury.gov.uk](mailto:planning@canterbury.gov.uk) for your email to be acknowledged.

Please give us your views through our [customer satisfaction survey](#).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Mary Cook** [REDACTED]  
Date: Fri, 6 Aug 2021 at 23:31  
Subject: LOCAL PLAN OBJECTION  
To: <[planning@canterbury.gov.uk](mailto:planning@canterbury.gov.uk)>  
Cc: [REDACTED]

Sirs,

I write to object most strongly and emphatically to the proposal to build another 17,000 houses especially as I understand you are only required to find 9,000. I particularly object to the 'called for' site that seeks to join Womenswold with Aylesham and create a huge urban sprawl on green fields and by an AONB.

Just in case you want some reasons I have expanded my thoughts below.

I am horrified at Canterbury City Council's proposal of the 'called for site' on the boundary with Dover District Council that would seek to join the Canterbury rural village of Womenswold with yet another proposed expansion of Aylesham in Dover district.

This seems to have been sneaked into your local plan in collusion with DDC who now appear to want to expand Aylesham even further to link it with Snowdown and Womenswold which would create a huge urban sprawl joining the 2 districts. Many and most, residents in both districts would not be aware of the other district's proposal and the true extent of the development of Green Belt farmland immediately adjacent to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The fields that would be swallowed up in each district no doubt have the same landowner.

Why has the adjacent Snowdon colliery brownfield site, empty and derelict for many years, not been put forward for housing instead of a solar farm? I realise it is not in CCC area but surely you were aware of it as a site to be considered? DDC appear to have granted planning for the solar farm with little, or very quiet, public consultation. No doubt, so that it cannot be used as a reason for not allowing building on the nearby countryside.

I realise you want your new 17,000 houses so that you can use the Section 106 funding for new roads around Canterbury instead of the local communities who should benefit. If you did not want to build another 17,000 houses, alongside all the others in recent years, we would not need ring roads.

If rural redevelopments and the expansion of small towns like Aylesham had increased infrastructure and public transport alongside the new houses there would not be the need to travel by car to Canterbury so fewer cars would be on the roads.

The proposed additional expansion of Aylesham is unwanted and unnecessary. There is little public transport, no cycle paths, few local jobs, no schools with vacancies, few shops, no restaurants or leisure facilities - especially for children and teenagers. The expanded doctor's surgery is already over subscribed, there is no dentist. The small unlit, country roads are overcrowded and dangerous. A ring road will not solve this. You would be creating urban sprawl and destroying ancient woodlands and linking communities and villages with no historical or logical connection. The proposal would erode the historic identity of Womenswold by

trying to join it to Aylesham. The new development would destroy a large rural area that is currently one mile of large green fields

As the area is right on the edge of Canterbury City Council, and in a very rural, farm environment you may not get many objections as there are not many residents to object. However, apart from CCC, the landowner and builders I cannot imagine anybody being in favour of such a slash and burn proposal even those who would not be directly impacted.

Across England rural communities are saying 'NO MORE'.

Mary Cook

Sent from my iPad