

## Fwd: Objections to the Local Plan 2040

1 message

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: **Evelyn Andrews** [REDACTED]  
Date: Sat, 7 Aug 2021 at 10:55  
Subject: Objections to the Local Plan 2040  
To: <[planning@canterbury.gov.uk](mailto:planning@canterbury.gov.uk)>

Dear Sir/Madam

I would like to register my objections to the proposed Local Plan 2040, in advance of the deadline of 9am on Monday, 9th August, 2021.

In the first instance, I am strongly opposed to the preferred option of 14,000 to 17,000 homes to be built centred around Canterbury. The Government has stated that only 9,000 are necessary. The South East, where house prices are already beyond the reach of many local people, is disproportionately bearing the brunt of the Government's targets for house building, drawing a work force from other parts of the country rather than developing job opportunities where there is a ready-made work force desperate to work, thus boosting the economy in areas deemed 'left behind'. This makes a mockery of their 'Levelling Up' mantra. This is a serious case of 'Levelling Down'. The Government target of 9,000 new homes in our area is infinitely preferable, in the form of social housing and genuinely affordable homes, to meet the needs of local people.

The stated purpose of these extra homes is to finance the building of a ring road around Canterbury. I strongly oppose the building of more roads. More roads only lead to more traffic and, consequently, more pollution. In the light of Climate Change and the urgent need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and dependence on fossil fuel, the objective should be to improve public transport links between Canterbury and surrounding towns and villages through the development of rail and bus services and to provide cycling and walking routes in and around the city, reducing the need to rely on private cars. Where I live, in Woolage Village, there is just one bus a day to Canterbury, which is entirely impractical. It leaves the village at 10.15 am and returns around 2 pm, taking up a whole day when one might only wish to nip to a couple of shops and then return home. A more frequent, reliable hopper bus service would be more practical and, therefore, better used.

Housing developments in and around the villages should be small, so they do not over-whelm the existing local community, and targeted at local needs, so that young people growing up in the villages have homes available to them which they can afford, thus sustaining stable local communities as used to happen in the past, rather than young people being forced to move away from family, friends and social support groups. And these new homes should be well-constructed and low-carbon, to meet and even exceed Government's emissions targets.

I am specifically opposed to the proposed site for housing development in the fields south of Aylesham, in the Parish of Womenswold, for a number of reasons.

In the first instance, Aylesham has already been expanded to double its original size through a phased housing development on the Dover District Council side of the boundary. This development is not yet complete, with two more phases not even yet begun. This development has already had a serious effect on the local community through increased traffic on the Adisham Road between

Aylesham and the A2, increased pressure on local primary schools, increased pressure on the local GP surgery and even pressure on the local Co-op, which frequently runs out of staple foods and cannot restock quickly enough to cope with increased demand. Local infrastructure is already stretched to breaking point. The alienation of the established community from the 'incomers' occurs when new developments are so large they overwhelm the original community. This is already happening here.

A large development on the fields between Aylesham, Snowdown, Womenswold and Woolage Village would destroy ancient woodland and obliterate the historic footpaths that criss-cross these fields and link the four villages named above. The impact of this proposed development on the local communities will be catastrophic, effectively amalgamating these four separate and distinct communities into one enormous urban sprawl, the size of a small town, with anonymous streets lined with featureless houses. It will destroy the unique, individual character of these small villages, where a street can be called The Street and roads are named after local families whose descendants still live here - a number of my neighbours have never lived anywhere else; villages which, at present, enjoy a strong community spirit, where everyone knows their neighbours and we all look out for one another.

Although the site of the fields south of Aylesham is only a proposed site and nothing has been decided yet, the news that it might even be considered has come at a very difficult time for the local community, which is still reeling from the shock of the murder of PCSO Julia James in April. To many people who have lived here all their lives, this was a clear case of a local woman being murdered by an 'incomer' and many feel that, had those houses not been built, that young man would not have come to the village and Julia James would still be with us. At the time when the young man in question was arrested and subsequently charged, members of this community were angered by him being referred to by the media as 'a local man' because, in their eyes, he was not 'an Aylesham man' as he had only lived here for a very short time.

Against this backdrop, the news landed on our doorsteps that even more new houses might be on the cards in the area and this, perhaps, explains the strength of feeling amongst local residents against any possibility of further expansion into Womenswold Parish, as well as the already approved expansion within Dover District Council jurisdiction. Everyone I have spoken to in the community feels the same way about these proposals. We feel we are being unfairly targeted because of our proximity to the A2 and London transport links. We fear we are about to be transformed into an anonymous dormitory town for London commuters.

The proposed development would also abut an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, on the North Downs, causing light pollution and destroying wildlife habitats. This is a rural area, a farming district, making a significant contribution to food production locally. It is also a haven for wildlife, with buzzards, red kite, ravens, sparrow hawks, skylarks and kestrels being regular and frequent feature of the skies. Hedgehogs and hares, foxes and badgers, butterflies and bats make their homes in these woodlands and green fields. In the Spring, wood anemones, bluebells and wild garlic cover the woodland floors - all indicators of ancient woodlands. This delicate ecosystem is already at risk from the climate emergency and concomitant extreme weather events we are seeing, more and more frequently. This surely goes against the City Council's claim to 'enhance and preserve our historic and natural environment'. There should be no development of greenfield sites and ancient woodland should be protected at all costs. Only Brownfield sites should be utilised for urban development, reusing land that has been developed previously, not destroying green spaces and putting more land under concrete.

For these many reasons, I oppose the preferred option.

Yours faithfully

Evelyn A Andrews

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.