

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Planning; Otterpool Applications; Programme Officer](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Opposition to Otterpool Town planning application Y19/0257/FH  
**Date:** 08 June 2020 23:29:23

---

Sir Madam.

I wish to oppose the planning application Y19/0257/FH (Otterpool Town) on the following grounds:

1: Similar to the concerns the Post Consultation Planning Report outlined on the 11<sup>th</sup> of June 2019, it is clear the design of the proposed town is not fit for purpose.

The A20 main road is the primary route for all International traffic from Dover port and the Channel Tunnel, when the M20 is blocked due to any Motorway incident or problems with the ferries or Channel Tunnel trains, causing HGV stacking on the motorway.

This proposed plan, has the town being built on either side of the A20, in such a way that it is divided along the entire length by the A20. No one in their right mind would build a town which would be cut in half by such a key international important HGV secondary main route. Due to much of the traffic being HGV lorries which are left hand drive, safety concerns at crossing from one part of the town to the next are obvious. We have already had several road traffic accidents causing serious injury and deaths along this stretch of the A20, where this proposed town is to be built. You are even planning a school next to the A20, when Public Health England clearly has evidenced the dangers to children due to vehicle traffic air pollutants and the dangers to public health.

2: The phases of the proposed construction show how poor due diligence and foresight has been put into this plan. It is clear that this is not one town but several housing estates built miles apart from each other, then gradually getting bigger and joining up. The A20 is just being treated as the main access route to these separate housing estates. The proposed (town centre) location has only been placed there due to the current railway station, though the majority of houses are being clearly built miles away and more importantly on the opposite side of the A20.

Any good town, should be designed where the town centre is at the heart of the town, where pedestrians, cyclists can access easily without having to cross an "A" road, which will have to also be extended to be a dual carriageway to accommodate the extra traffic.

3: The proposed development location of 8000 to 10000 homes, are not in an area where job growth is planned or intended to be planned, to justify such a development.

Speculation of how many people will be able to work from home or what the job market will look like, locally and regionally is very uncertain, especially now due to Covid-19 and the impending global financial fallout. Add to this Brexit and the impacts of the UK leaving Europe at the end of this year, then it is likely this proposed town could become a considerably expensive white elephant.

The Governments are pushing for a Northern powerhouse, thus we may be building houses where they will not be needed, as jobs in the area will not justify the housing needs or affordability for its residents. Evidence shows that 40% of houses bought in Folkestone and Hythe during 2018-2019 were from people from London. This may not continue due to the future UK economy and redistribution from a London and South powerhouse to a Northern one.

4: Global warming shows that the last 16 hottest years have been between the year 2000 and 2020. Rain fall in this area of South East England is becoming significantly less and future rain fall and consumption is not one anyone can control. Prediction on reducing consumption in houses either current one or future ones are not an exact science. Our current aquaphos and other water storage areas struggle to deal with current housing needs. With the proposed expansion of housing in Ashford and other developments in the South East, this proposed plan cannot and must not be looked at in isolation.

5: The proposed road infrastructure and housing layout in these plans do NOT encourage traffic to fully use junction 11 of the M20 as the main access and egress to this proposed development. 100% of all the housing are being built south East of Junction 11 and householders from most of these home who wish to travel to Ashford or London, will use the A20 driving through the village community of Sellindge to access junction 10A of the M20 instead.

No one from Otterpool Lane or the Hillside development, will drive 3 miles West to junction 11, only to drive a further 3 miles East on the M20, just to see their house as they drive passed it on the M20, on the way to Ashford or London.

Human nature and common sense will under the current plans, cause most traffic from this development who wish to access Ashford or London to use Sellindge as the gateway.

The housing and road layout must be changed to ensure that households who use their vehicles have no option to access the M20 via junction 11. The current plan has no safeguards for the village of Sellindge. The current plan will have a significant detrimental health and wellbeing impact on the residents of Barrow Hill and Sellindge Village as a whole.

The only true safeguard that could and should be put in placed, as requested by many Sellindge residents and their Parish Council, is for the road infrastructure being proposed from the A20 Otterpool Lane, in to the Hillside development, to be used as a bypass around Sellindge village.

If not implemented from the outset, then for it to be futureproofed and planned for from the outset.

The A20 Barrow Hill is controls by single one way traffic light system at Grove bridge. Traffic currently stacks up along Barrow Hill, stop start due to the traffic lights, causing significant pollution and noise. This will extend and increase if this development is allowed to go ahead. Protection measures must be put in place to reduce any impact of air pollution and noise to the residents of Barrow Hill and Sellindge. Our right to life, from Article 1 of the human rights act, imposes a duty on the state and local authorities to ensure they protect the publics health and do NOT agree or instigate anything which is likely to harm the life of individuals or members of the public. The plans clearly show a significant increase of traffic in Barrow Hill and Sellindge, which will bring the air quality and particulate matter to levels significantly higher than now. Currently the UK is not testing air quality to EU standers and have breached EU air quality targets in most cities. This development will have a similar effect on our existing community.

The development plans say much about electric vehicles, but current production of electricity and future expectation do not match the ability to produce electricity in the UK, as many power stations are coming to their end of life and new ones are not even began to be built. Renewable energy is not catching up fast enough. The UK has the least amount of infrastructure in place or planned in Europe and most motorist will not start buying electric vehicles until the power and infrastructure is in place first. Even if this development had the infrastructure, if the rest of the UK is not the same, it would be of no use. Due to this, any plans or proposals must accept that petrol and Diesel vehicles and imitions are here to stay for the next 25 years. This development must be planned and safeguards put into place regarding traffic movements, air quality and noise, so to protect the current communities from the negative traffic impacts of this proposed

new one.

I respectfully request that these point be considered during the planning and council meetings to safeguard our children's lives. If possible, I would like to attend and speak at the full council, the planning officers and the programme officer to take this into account.

Yours Faithfully.

[Redacted signature]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10