

# OTTERPOOL PARK – Y19/0257/FH

## CONSULTATION SUMMARY TABLE

NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES RECEIVED BETWEEN 18<sup>TH</sup> MARCH AND JULY 11<sup>TH</sup> 2019

Table 1				
Consultation Responses (neighbour responses)				
Ref.	Name	Date received	Comments	LPA Reference
1.	Graham Hodkinson	21/03/2019	As a resident of Folkestone I'm Horrified at the proposals. There are far too many people, houses and cars in East Kent already with an infrastructure that is creaking and can't cope.	LPA115
2.	Margaret Ludlow	21/03/2019 29/04/2019 06/06/2019 07/08/2019	<p>(1) 21/03/2019 "In the local paper it is mentioned that after taking into account people's views the plans have been passed. This is an untruth, nobody wanted Otterpool. The council have taken no notice at all of peoples view. They have all been ignored, and all the plans have been discussed behind closed doors. This development will be a disaster for all concerned, no schools, no surgery, not enough water and too much traffic on the roads. The area is supposed to be an area of natural beauty and to let the greedy offshore owners to build horrid little hutches on the land is wicked. The other developments on file are going to make the core strategy link all the area to Sellindge and beyond which was never in the starting plan. The new houses going up in Sellindge are like a maze with no space and I can see when cars are parked up there will be no space at all. It is a horrid development. Sellindge as a lovely friendly village with enough shops has been spoilt forever."</p> <p>(2) 29/04/2019 This application makes a lovely country village into a sprawling town. Already the "small" development by Taylor Wimpy has made a difference to the level of traffic, and all the extensive road works which we have had to put up with has made no difference at all, these huge TIR's still come thundering through the village. The people that the council are in cahoots with have off shore bank accounts so nothing will go into the coffers but into the pockets of a few unscrupulous people. We do not want this ugly enormous building application to go ahead. Things like the roman remains of a large development have been covered up so the residents of the villages could not see them. This area is steeped in history and also good growing soil to feed people. I understand that Mr Monk thinks mud is just dirt. He has no idea; he is a complete towney. The area designated for all this building is an area of outstanding beauty at the base of the North downs and there are many scientific species of flora and fauna which over some time I have sent photos to the FDC. This horrid plan has been thrown out once when the scale of the houses looked like rabbit hutches. Throw it out again.</p> <p>(3) 06/06/2019 This development will ruin the lives of a lot of people and animals and if the Ruben Brothers and David Monk looked at any nature programmes on TV they would hear that open land and to able to see and smell fresh air it benefits us all. No Otterpool.</p> <p>(4) 07/08/2019 Reading in the parish council news that only 165 comments have been received about this planning application I am amazed, as over the months there have been marches and many more that 165 people attended, so is it that it is so difficult to use the internet?. Reading the results of the Princes Parade vote and also Otterpool I think that is doesn't</p>	LPA40

			<p>matter how many letters the council received the result will be the same because of dodgy dealings. We in the villages do not want Otterpool or to have the Princes Parade ruined. How come that the environment agency changed its mind,? I find that shocking when it is supposed to protect special places where wild and wonderful species live. Years ago I contacted the FDC about 7 dead bats that I found along the canal path, what had happened to those little bodies?. I hope that there are still some living today, this area needs to be protected. Back to plans for Princes Parade, the plans should be to build the swimming pool on Martello lakes as that would reduce the number of cars coming through Hythe, and be nearer for the people that live on the marsh. When the new Aldi store opens in a few days time the junction at the Light railway will be horrendous. It is already very bad. Not a lot of thought has gone into that planning. Go back to the drawing board and sort things out for the residents of Hythe and surrounding villages. Yours sincerely, Margaret Ludlow.</p>	
3.	Carole Abbott (x 5 separate comments)	<p>26/03/2019 26/03/2019 3/4/2019 10/04/2019 6/06/2019</p>	<p>(1) 26/03/2019 "I must oppose the above application. 8,500 houses instead of the present numbers in villages around Sellindge and Lymyne is just not viable. This would make the villages more like towns. In any case who will buy the houses? Initially this idea was announced prior to the residents knowing. SHDC should have consulted the residents to confirm their agreement or otherwise. This they did not do. Does the Council realise that when buying a house one decides whether it be in the town or country? I think all villagers in this area chose to live in the country. The building of the proposed houses, some of which are near to an AOB, would destroy all the green spaces, farmland. In actual fact almost all green land will be tarmacked over, completely spoiling all countryside, animal life. What about inhalation of fumes also? I see that health centres are to be built within The New Town. Are SDHC unaware of the acute shortage of Doctors presently? When things come down to water shortage, that is a critical disaster. Don't the Councils know that we live in an area of acute water shortage. I have read that in 25 years' time things will really be serious, so building now seems to be asking for disaster. We are often having hosepipe bans now. Just another reason why I would ask the Council to abandon this New Town project. 8,500 new houses is probably going to mean at least two cars per house. Surely the Council must understand the roads are extremely busy now, often queues etc. The roads are presently unsuitable for yet more traffic."</p> <p>(2) 26/03/2019 "It was originally advertised as only proceeding if it obtained support from residents of the area. Public consultations have been held when the overwhelming response has been against this proposal. Councillors Monk and Hollingsbee have refused to meet residents to discuss it so avoiding feedback. Where is the democracy in this? There has been no in-depth assessment of the provision of water supplies to this number of new houses when this area is already acknowledged as being in an area of water shortage. There is not the medical infrastructure to meet this number of new residents when local surgeries are already finding it difficult to recruit Doctors. The building is scheduled to be on green field sites which the area can ill afford to lose. The Councils own projections of future housing need do not support the need for this number of new houses. The Council have blatantly lied to residents when, in the background and behind closed doors, secretly proceeding against the public wishes. i.e. the farmland on which Otterpool is based was explained as being a purchase to provide an income stream. Within days it became the basis for a new Garden Town. Blatant lies."</p> <p>(3) 3/4/19 I must object to the whole of the Otterpool scheme. When the scheme was announced not one of the villagers had any idea of what was planned. Surely it would have been courtesy to tell the villagers first? I wonder why? I object on the following grounds –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Firstly we will lose all our green fields and space. I know you will contradict me here, but presently we do have 100%. You tell us there will be 50%, obviously this would be including what green space there will be once the houses are built...</li> <li>II. Once "The Lees" is finished there will be hazards which will be dangerous. In particular by Swan Lane and the Coop, a noted area accidents. In view of pedestrians, not every pedestrian will use the crossing, making it more dangerous. I have heard the Co-op is to become a takeaway store, so there will/should be pedestrians.</li> <li>III. Please tell me how you are going to provide health care in a healthcare centre?</li> </ol>	LPA46

			<p>IV. Does the Council not know what state the NHS is in plus the chronic shortage of Doctors? I think it takes 7-8 years to qualify as a Doctor.</p> <p>V. We want all green fields, farmers crops, particularly as Brexit is almost upon us.</p> <p>VI. We want our wildlife, birds, habitats left alone please. This will disappear if Otterpool becomes reality.</p> <p>VII. So what about the chronic water shortage? Quite obviously the Council is proposing to ignore this problem? A very big problem it will be in twenty five years time when we discover dreadful problems.</p> <p>VIII. We have attended all your tick a box consultations, so know full well approximately 99% of people are against the idea of Otterpool.</p> <p>IX. There is so much history in this area. Roman remains have been found. The airfield, the AONB.</p> <p>X. The airfield is of great significance which has a history of both wars. Amy Johnson flew from the Airfield. The airfield was military and later a civil airfield which operated from 1916-1984. Presently walkers enjoy the view of the ANOB, which is a wonderful sight.</p> <p>XI. The racecourse in Sellindge is 100 years old. It was Kent's only racecourse and people visited from afar. It presently has a Planning Permission on it for 8000 houses. Prior to this it had another Planning Permission on it for 800 houses. This was rejected because it was over intensive. So we wonder if the Council will approve the application for 8000?</p> <p>XII. I have had to send via email as I cannot get to the site without Server Error appearing.</p> <p>(4) 10/04/2019 Would the Council please inform me who has made this application? Who will be deciding whether or not to give permission? Has the application sought support from the residents of the affected villages? What level of support for the application is there in the Folkestone and Hythe District. What evidence is there that 8500 houses are needed? What evidence is there that the ability to provide health services exists when the NHS is currently under enormous pressure to meet existing levels of demand? How satisfied is the applicant that water supplies can be maintained to meet such a new level of demand? What level of Council Tax will be necessary to fund this proposal? What research has been done to ascertain whether the local roads can accommodate the influx of traffic generated by the additional vehicles from 8500. new houses? Has any research been done regarding the levels of air pollution caused by this level of new traffic.? Given that Town Centres are less used as time elapses why is it considered desirable to build a New Town when present towns are dying? Where will the employment opportunities come from in a New Town? Will the public have any right of appeal should this application be granted?</p> <p>(5) 6/06/2019 Most strong objections to this application. There is a glaring number of Health Centres closing due to lack of G Ps. This is already apparent in the Folkestone and Hythe area so,with 8500 new houses to cater for the situation would be chaotic . This is probably the main reason not to proceed with Otterpool but there are many more.i.e.loss of green agricultural land,water supply. road chaos,wildlife disturbed and lost plus the general disturbance of years of building work. Protect our countryside for future generations and cancel Otterpool .It was never wanted in the first place.</p>	
4.	Julie	23/03/2019	<p>"I do not think that this project should continue. This so named Garden of England will soon turn into a concrete jungle if these projects continue to blight the landscape. The pressures on the William Harvey Hospital due to the rise in housing in Ashford can only increase should this go ahead. How are all of these people to be treated? Keep this part of Kent beautiful - not crowded!"</p>	LPA169

5.	Lisa Cutler	26/03/2019	<p>1. "We already have housing developments going up in Sellindge village (Planning for 250 homes (first 50 already constructed as first stage)), 192 homes on the A20 opposite Tescos and contentious plans for houses to go on Princes Parade in Hythe, together with the existing development at Martello Lakes/Nickolls Quarry in Hythe. This shows that there are already plenty of houses that have either been built, are being built or are due to be built for the area. If there were planning applications for 100 homes here, and 100 homes there, I would not object - however 8,500 homes is a ruinous amount of houses in an area already struggling with road, utility and health facilities.</p> <p>2. I live in a village, linked to other villages. The Otterpool development would destroy any semblance of living in a village, an AONB, and would destroy existing communities.</p> <p>3. My main concern is doctors' surgeries and hospitals in the area which are already woefully overstretched. There aren't enough general practitioners to cope with existing numbers, the William Harvey Hospital is also struggling to cope with the size of the community it serves and, with rumours that A&amp;E may go to Canterbury (a dangerous idea as it will be almost impossible for ambulances to get from areas such as Hythe to Canterbury via Stone Street if there are any problems on Stone Street, as opposed to the William Harvey which is well served by the M20) the thought of adding another 8,500 homes - which would conservatively bring 20,000 more people (judging from your application that there will be more primary, secondary schools and nurseries) - this would be impossible for existing health centres to absorb. My understanding from the application is that there won't be a new hospital built to accommodate the huge surge in population, nor is there even evidence that there has been any intent to create any new GP surgeries or discussions of how to persuade more GPs to the area - again, looking at the William Harvey, Oaklands Health Centre and Sun Lane Surgery on national surveys, all are struggling to reach even mediocre levels and to add so much more for them would no doubt lead to resignations and huge gaps in care.</p> <p>4. People in the area are already suffering enormous inconvenience from the current housing developments (see 1 above) and, to an even greater degree, the chaos being caused by the new Junction 10A on the M20 plus the delays and closures due to preparations for Brexit - the whole area has been flattened and turned into a mud pit. The M20 is down to 2 lanes, there are frequent closures of the M20 due to roadworks or accidents which cause chaos and works on JIOA are set to continue through to summer next year. Once a beautiful area, this part of Kent is being made into an ugly, enormous housing estate / lorry park.</p> <p>5. There is already an issue with lack of water in the area. I have yet to see a reasonable argument as to how the area is supposed to accommodate such a huge increase in demand for water facilities.</p> <p>6. Our roads are already in a horrendous state with pot holes caused, in part, by the volume of lorries that are constantly thundering through the area which would of course massively increase with this proposed housing development. Driving from Lympne to Ashford, or Hythe, or Jll, or onto the M20, or Canterbury, it is pot luck if you manage to get there without voluminous temporary lights, road closures, accidents closing lanes, pot holes ruining your tyres or ages spent at junctions waiting for it to be safe to turn into already heavy traffic. Adding so many more vehicles because of Otterpool would be an almost impossible situation where it is already so busy.</p> <p>7. There is already a big problem with fly tipping and rubbish being thrown from cars and lorries leaving the area looking like a dump. No doubt this will be made worse by all the lorries coming in to assist with the project and adding to the population to this degree will again make things worse.</p> <p>Frankly, I could list many more concerns I have about this proposal. I am not unreasonable and would support small developments - i.e. several, much smaller (100-200 homes) developments in different areas of Kent to lessen the impact on this one specific plot. More than a vast housing project, the area desperately needs more doctors and surgeries, better roads, improved road junctions with roundabouts or traffic lights to lessen the time people spend queuing, a vastly improved and financially supported hospital, tighter controls on lorries using the area, more consideration for the impact these plans have on residents, a concentrated effort to prosecute fly tippers, fines for people treating grasslands as a rubbish bin, a will to protect the beauty and personality of the area, and affordable housing plans for a REASONABLE volume of homes where utility companies won't be struggling to accommodate. It is frustrating to see the council buying up great swathes of land rather than putting that money to good use supporting the infrastructure of the area with the needs it has as mentioned above. The impact of JIOA and changes to the M20 have already caused devastating upheaval and the thought of starting on this proposal, which I understand could take decades to finish, will cause lasting chaos on our roads and ruin an area already reeling from all the changes we have</p>	LPA170
----	-------------	------------	---	--------

			been forced to endure. Please reconsider your proposal as you will be destroying a beautiful area which you should be protecting.”	
6.	Mr and Mrs P A Spencer	Unknown	<p>“Thank you for the recent correspondence regarding the above outline planning application for mixed use development of 8,500 homes, the demolition of existing buildings et al. We are aware there have been several meetings to engage the community in regard to these plans. We have attended and attempted to give our opinions, however like many others have left feeling whatever we have said has not been listened to nor will be. However, as our property backs onto the site and is directly affected by these plans we therefore feel it is necessary to try again to influence the outcome of these plans.”</p> <p>Westenhanger is a small Hamlet of around 43 houses, encompassing farmland and a small railway station (unmanned) along with 'Holiday Extras' call centre building. The Properties are of varying age and style. I would suggest most residents would be in the over 50's age range. We moved here 5 years ago for the purpose of a quiet retirement away from Town, traffic and tourism. We also felt lucky in finding a Bungalow to meet my disability needs which gave us a distant view and space around us.</p> <p>The Proposed outline development for Otterpool Town is HUGE! Westenhanger would no longer exist if such a development goes ahead. Hythe Town is less than 3 miles away, is a quaint High street with many independent shops and restaurants, these are struggling with the tide of internet shopping, yet the proposals talk of a High street in Otterpool Town. The whole concept is m thought out and does not suit the areas that will be swamped by it. The Plans identify infrastructure such as Primary &amp; Secondary schools, Health centres, Care Villages, leisure and of course Multi story car parks (Lovely everyone wants them don't they). However, as someone who has need of GP's and Hospitals, I would like to know how staff will be recruited to such an outlying Town when we cannot get enough staff now for the Ashford Hospital or the GP surgery's in Hythe or Sellindge. Talking of the Hospital, which cannot currently cope with the increasing population either at Ashford or Canterbury there is no infrastructure of a new additional Hospital. With regard the number of residential properties proposed I am astounded as the number of developments in Sellindge, Ashford, and Hythe itself more than make up for the required growth of the local district. I am also concerned regarding the natural resources and history of the area covered by this outline plan. There is comment on sustainable urban drainage systems, given we are in a water deprived area and that the Folkestone racecourse is criss-crossed with drainage ditches which have not been maintained in year, some of these run directly into our and neighbouring gardens and have caused flooding in recent years. I would like to know more about these 'sustainable systems'. The area has historic value and sits adjacent to areas of Natural Beauty there is little comment on how these will be protected visually and accessibly. We currently have a view of Westenhanger Castle and presume worst case scenario we will instead see a multi-story car a park. Obviously, we are against the proposed application and also oppose the manner in which such a huge development has been 'bulldozed' onto the Local Communities. We are aware of the Racecourse Owners earlier proposals for housing development on the Folkestone racecourse one of 500 homes being refused by the council and the secretary of state, stating it was 'too large a development'. I wonder what or who has changed? Given Reuben Brothers and Cozumel estates are now 'Partners' in Otterpool Town with many Offshore company's they can also bring into the fold I guess the 'Little People' who reside in the areas affected and who pay their Council taxes will continue to be ignored. It is convenient the Hythe &amp; District Council can propose their own Planning Applications as well as take the silent majority as being in favour of whatever they propose whilst those affected and bothering to attend Consultations, Council Meetings etc are completely ignored. I believe you can tell, I object very strongly to these outline proposals.”</p>	LPA171
7.	C E Lyons	08/03/2019	<p>1. If planning permission is granted how would this effect the status of our land re future use or development? 2. What are the plans for the land opposite. For example is it likely to be houses or would the businesses at the station extend this far up?</p>	LPA172

			We would also appreciate any additional information available. As none of us at present live locally I am including the addresses of my co- owners as it would be helpful if all future communications were sent to all of us.	
8.	John Champneys	13/03/2019	<p>"I am totally opposed to the proposed building of this vast town at Otterpool on several counts. We live in an area of outstanding beauty which is also a historic part of Kent. The history includes Otterpool Camp in WW1, where relatives from Canadian soldiers often come to visit the camp site. Lympne Airfield in both WW1 &amp; WW2 as well as where Sliver City, Skyways and Dan Air were part of our heritage. Folkestone Race Course. We already have expansion of nearly 1000 houses in Sellindge which will be a strain on local infrastructure (due to its restrictive design) and the already congested roads will be unable to cope with a further 8500 houses. This development will totally destroy the area, its beauty and history.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are enough houses being built in Kent with 5700s houses in Ashford and Kingsnorth, 450 at Gibraltar Farm, 15000 at Ebbsfleet, 6000 at Dover, 4000 at Canterbury, 5000 at Chattenden, 3000 at Sevenoaks, 17500 at Maidstone which are some of the development in Kent at the moment, which is 60,000 houses or more. Why is there any need for more in this area? They are certainly not for local people. Kent is supposed to be the garden of England NOT a concrete Jungle, so there is totally no need for Otterpool Park. It is absolutely unnecessary. F&amp;H DC are abandoning Folkestone &amp; Hythe high streets to dereliction only to build a new one at Otterpool Park. IL Regenerate Folkestone &amp; Hythe, bring the life back to the high street, there is enough space in these towns to accommodate these 8500 living spaces.</li> <li>2. Part of this proposed development was purchased by F&amp;H DC as agricultural land which should and must remain agricultural as it is grade 1 and grade 2 and very productive which is essential in the wake of things at the moment with- Brexit. We need to be more self-sufficient in producing our own food, as with all the surrounding farm land. Otterpool Farm is host to numerous species of small birds which breed, live and migrate to these fields, there are several pairs of Skylark per ha some places 6 pairs, flocks of Blue Tits, Great Tits, Chaffinches, Yellow Hammers, Flycatchers, Snipe, Woodcocks, Robins, Blackbirds, Thrushes, Black &amp; Green Woodpeckers, Owls, Fieldfares, Starlings and Night Jar to name a few, as well as the carrion birds. These birds, for generations, all live, breed and migrate to this land because they have been encouraged for over 40 years through good farming practices and bird habitats, which have been adopted on this land, this is their home not for houses for people to live. The building of a town on this land will wipe out years of work and encouragement and the loss of these bird's habitat. You can say that you will put in green areas but these will have human interference, not forgetting (which developers always do) if you build 8500 houses in this area you are going to introduce in the region of 4500+ cats which will wipe out all the wildlife in this and surrounding areas.</li> <li>3. There is enough crime in our area at the moment, a lot of which never gets any convictions due to the lack of police. Introducing an extra 30,000 people, will cause a dramatic increase in crime, theft, gangs of youths, drug related problems, knife crime, abuse and people trespassing on our and local resident's property and businesses. After a few years of this development being built it will degenerate into a rundown area of Sellindge making it not a nice area to live for the local existing residents and devaluing both their and my properties even more than it will do initially.</li> <li>4. This is a rural area and should remain rural for local people, not a town full of people who have no understanding of rural living. When I was growing up, Folkestone &amp; Hythe were affluent seaside towns, full of summer tourists, something to be proud of but now they are empty and run down and a disgrace. Spend the money to regenerate them and fill them with pride and attractions to get tourism back. Building houses all over the area of outstanding beauty isn't going to bring back tourism. You rejected the Centre Park in the West Woods, you made sure the Race Course, which has been there for over 100 years, didn't get planning so it could regenerate itself. The council is the reason there's no tourism in the area because they are so short sighted, these proposals would have brought in revenue to the local economy.</li> <li>5. The road structure that is proposed for all this development will not be adequate enough for the amount of traffic generated by this and other developments in the area.</li> <li>6. With Otterpool Park and Sellindge development there will be an increase of 18,000 to 20,000 of private cars (presuming every house has two cars) to the area plus delivery vans lorries ect. These roads are crammed now,</li> </ol>	LPA48

			<p>a simple Journey to Hythe now can take 20+ mins instead of 7 mins, all this extra development will gridlock the area.</p> <p>7. Where are all these people going to work? There are not going to be that many jobs created by this development, so most will work out of the area causing major traffic chaos and excessive pollution.</p> <p>8. All this development will cause excessive light pollution in a rural dark area.</p> <p>9. This new town is 8 times larger than Sellindge and Lympne put together, making it a too big a development for this rural area. The proposed house designs are more suited to town development than a rural area and will be an eyesore and a carbuncle on the landscape. This scheme is utter madness and only backed by Cozumel and a corrupt and underhanded council only out for destroying this area and bulldozing their way over people's property for their own gain, totally disregarding local resident's views, respect and quality of life.</p> <p>10. Water supply in this area is stretched with what's already built, and in the process, the supply won't be able to cope with another 8500 houses and water shortage will be inevitable.</p> <p>11. For years F&amp;H DC have rejected all of the expansion for housing in this area; ie Lympne Ind Estate and the Race Course which would have fitted into the local areas structure, but all of a sudden F&amp;H DC purchase agricultural land, Lympne Industrial Estate is sold to a developer and the Race Course is bought by Cozumel Estates. Now F&amp;H DC are brown nosing Cozumel and overnight you get planning on it (which any local farmer trying to do the same thing would have been turned down and rightly so) and want to plaster houses over Lympne, Stanford, Sellindge and surrounding area. No this stinks of bribery, corruption, under handedness and back handers.</p> <p>12. What you propose in your application will be the death knell for Sellindge, Lympne, Stanford and the surrounding area.</p> <p>13. If you are as passionate about Nature, Biology, Ecology, Ornithology, the history and the heritage of this area as you claim to be, you will need to think very long and hard before you make your decision, because you are about to open a Pandora's Box."</p>	
9.	Mr Andrew Belson	01/04/2019	<p>My main concern relates to the long-term sustainability of the project and others like this. By building out-of-town such as Otterpool it only produces 'dormitory towns' which are only possible by over reliance on private cars. Having lived in Hawkinge the majority of my life, I have seen first-hand the growth and spread of the village into the current town. The two developments are comparable and likely to produce similar outcomes. There is a lack of industry and commerce and an economy unable to support the numbers of people who reside there, resulting in high levels of commuting.</p> <p>Congestion caused by private car use is prevalent, something that Otterpool would be less affected by as the majority of vehicles would immediately join the M20. Otterpool's location mid-distance from Folkestone and Ashford would unlikely benefit economy of Folkestone, as the lack of choice and variety of shopping would primarily draw people to Ashford. The harbour arm and costal facilities are likely to generate additional income - but this is not a long-term and sustainable economy for the town to be based on.</p> <p>Folkestone needs to invest within the current town limits, more people living and working within the town reduces traffic and drive reliance on the amenities within the immediate vicinity. Money must be spent within town to benefit all, by building out-of-town this pushes people away from the town centre.</p> <p>For the size of the investment on a green field site - a better return for individuals and the wider community would be to invest it existing housing stock with the town limits or to build new housing on the abundant brownfield locations within the town.</p> <p>Building out-of-town is unsustainable and should not be policy.</p>	LPA99
10.	Mr Richard Box	01/04/2019	<p>Whereas I support the need and provision of affordable low cost housing in general, I cannot support and do firmly object to the scale of the development that this application is for, on all of the above three criteria.</p> <p>To propose to develop this huge area of rural land is both practically wrong, based on the likely adverse effects on the existing area and morally wrong.</p> <p>More than enough pressure is already being felt by the area in respect of commercial vehicle traffic and the plans for mitigation eg lorry park etc.</p> <p>Enough is enough - please stop before it is too late !!</p>	LPA55

11.	Mr Craig Drury	01/04/2019	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development plans at Otterpool for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This development is not needed or wanted by local people. There is already an array of local developments in and around the villages surrounding Sellindge, Lympne etc. - some already completed and others still being built - more than catering for the direct need for housing in these local villages. Further, there are an array of bigger developments in our local towns of Hythe, Folkestone and Ashford, which more than cater for housing needs in the local area. It is quite clear that this proposal is not for local people, it is for overspill from London and other big urban areas and is being proposed and facilitated by Shepway Council and overseas developers in the interest of making money rather than for local residents. Our area and Kent in general has done more than its share for decades to accommodate London overspill; it is time for this to stop and our countryside and rural villages be left alone.</li> <li>- This development will cause unquantifiable damage on our countryside, areas of natural beauty and rural village communities - a new town of over 8,000 house (20,000 people) plonked in the middle of a number of small villages will change the fabric of the community and countryside in this area forever. There will also be a huge strain on local services, including schools, doctors/hospitals and transport system. I know the proposal is for some new developments in this area, but these are insufficient, especially the already overly used and strained A20 and hospital at Ashford (there are no proposals for a new hospital).</li> <li>- My understanding is that a full consultation is required and local people's views need to be considered. The consultation has been an exercise of tokenism. As you'll see on every forum you look at: most or all local people are against this development - a fact not recognised by the proposers and not responded to in their proposal or consultation response.</li> </ul>	LPA100
12.	Mr Graham Funnell	02/04/2019	<p>I cannot get my head around why FHDC is looking at going into partnership to develop land - a significantly large part of which was inappropriately purchased by them with OUR money to do something that many of those that contributed to DO NOT WANT.</p> <p>It is difficult to support such a massive out of town development when it is impossible to see where the advantages to the local area will come from.</p> <p>Most "new inhabitants will be from out of town, not locals looking to buy their first homes. Most will go to those moving out of London to make money on their current properties and then commute back to London to work.</p> <p>Where will all of these thousands of jobs come from. In essence, they won't, so lets be prepared for unemployment and higher levels of crime.</p> <p>The promise of schools and GP practices - where will teachers, doctors (GP's) and Practice nurses come from - they cannot be found now!!</p> <p>The road network cannot cope with cars, vans and lorries now and even with some slight improvements they will never cope with 16,000+ new vehicles if you accept that most households these days have 2 cars.</p> <p>New shopping facilities will bring about the death of Hythe town centre and most probably Folkestone's.</p> <p>Don't forget the current residents - most of us came here to live in a village, not a bloody great big town. I for one moved to specifically enjoy village life and will end up in the dead centre of the town GREAT!!!!</p> <p>Now look at water - how will the demands cope with that. You say limiting houses to a certain number of litres a day - am sure that will work!!</p> <p>Don't forget about the fantastic archaeological findings that you have managed to keep hidden from the local population. I for one saw a mass of Roman remains over the fields, but no-one will report back openly and honestly to us.</p> <p>Do I want this development - NO. I want to continue to see the agricultural land that I live around remaining. It is not a brownfield site. This is an AONB and not a town that is not wanted by us.</p>	LPA47
13.	Colin Abbott (x 2)	03/04/19 06/06/2019	<p>I wish to most strongly object to this application. The land was purchased by the council as an income stream from agriculture but, within weeks, became the subject of an expression of interest to build a Garden Town. Nowhere was this put to the electorate but was rather the brainchild of a few individuals at FHDC. It was intended that to proceed it needed public support but this never happened. There have been several token presentations outlining the supposed</p>	LPA45



			<p>benefits of a Garden Town but at each presentation the overwhelming response from public attendees was total rejection. Have these response figures ever been made public? No Never!., In fact the Council leader described the attendees as a Rent a Mob. How is that for democracy. In fact, he Council leader and deputy leader have refused to attend meetings re Otterpool because of the level of opposition! This indicates the level of public support for Otterpool. This application to build on greenfield sites should be rejected for these reasons alone. But there are many other reasons. A previous application to build on the former Racecourse when 800 houses was the target was rejected as over intensive. How then can an application for 8500 be submitted?? Then there are water supply concerns, roads unable to cope with substantially increased traffic, present health services struggling to cope etc. etc. A new Garden Town would spell, the death of Hythe where the shopping centre already has many empty shops. Develop the existing Town centres of Folkestone and Hythe and not spoil our surrounding villages where residents prefer to live in the peace and quiet which brought them to this green and pleasant land in the first place. Otterpool would be for commuters and London overspill. Kent should remain the garden of England and not be covered in concrete! NO OTIERPOOL.</p> <p>Y19/0257/FH Now that the farcical consultation period is over and the overwhelming objection to Otterpool is apparent, what is next? Does the planning application come before the Councils own Planning Committee or before an independent tribunal? Can we expect a fair decision or will it be just another box ticking exercise?</p>	
14.	Daniel Scharf MRTPI	29/03/19	<p>I just wanted some assurance that the development (8000 dwellings and 9000 jobs) at Otterpool Park will be net zero carbon? and that this will be calculated in accordance with the RICS Whole Life Carbon Assessment for the Built Environment (or similar) that concludes that 50% of carbon attributable to housing is embodied at 'practical completion' i.e. before occupation, and emitted in the near future; a decade to 2030 when emissions have to reach net zero. Building to net zero carbon standards of construction might be a challenge and, during the Climate Emergency, the Council might consider grant funding the sub-division of existing under-occupied property. This could be managed to enable down-sizing in place, energy refitting and using the creative spirit of some of the households languishing on the self-build registers (ie custom-splitting).</p>	LPA173
15.	Tony Coultrip	08/04/19	<p>This is an over development of the area, the local infrastructure does not facilitate a high density of this nature, the Hospital, general medical services, local services including social services are stretched to there limit and are currently unable to cope with the resources currently available, the local employment does not have the resources to expand to cover such a high volume of residential properties, the local road infrastructure fails to provide the potential to incorporate such a volume of traffic at peak periods, the potential of non-local individuals deciding this application increases the potential of misjudgement on the local environment, I also believe that the implied close links between Folkestone District Council and the developer undermine the impartiality of the Planning Authority and therefore could be seen as a conflict of interests on this occasion, should this application go forward it should be judged by an independent panel with no Influence from either party involved in the potential development.</p>	LPA116
16.	Mrs Sharon Abbott	10/04/19	<p>Sellindge and Lypne are both ANOB. Why destroy this? They are both full of historical interests. There are Roman remains in Sellindge (and probably elsewhere in the villages). In addition, there is Lypne Castle in Lypne. It is near the airfield which has great significance. It has a history of both wars. Amy Johnson flew from the Airfield. The airfield was military and later civil 1916 - 1984. We have Westenhanger Castle in Sellindge. There is an awful lot of history there. King Canute owned. Then there is a dreadful traffic problem. Many houses are being built at The Lees in Sellindge plus Martello Lakes in West Hythe. Both lots of houses will probably have two cars. What we have here is going to cause gridlock. Water will be a dreadful problem. Our present water suppliers tell us there's only enough water for 1,000 extra houses. In twenty-five years', time there will be serious issues about the water.</p>	LPA103

Consultation responses table  
Otterpool Y19/0257/FH

			Who are going to buy the houses? Not our children but with our present line being improved and made faster, quite obviously London overspill will. There will be crime rates rising. Well the above are my thoughts and I will be pleased if the Planning Inspector can read. NO OTIERPOOL.	
17.	Kieran Abbott	10/04/19	Firstly it would make the roads unsafe and at gridlock. There are many houses being built at Martello Lakes, West Hythe and also many at Sellindge. As most houses have two cars it's just unacceptable. Has the Council taken note of the water shortage I think not probably. I see the station is to be updated, what a good way of encouraging Londoners to buy here. This would just create houses for the London Overspill, not our children as has been suggested. London overspill would probably mean more crime. I close by saying I do hope the Planning Inspector will read this and realise the people in these villages do not want this.	LPA49
18.	Nathan Abbott	12/04/19	I wish to object to the above application. Too many houses are being built here. The roads will be at gridlock. Many houses own at least two cars so that makes the situation worse. Doctors and nurses are hard to find, so how is the Council going to provide a service ? The surgeries and hospital here are working under great pressure, so there is just no space for yet more patients. Water just another objection. Please may the Planning Inspector read the above brief objection.	LPA57
19.	Joanne Howes	13/04/19	I must write to say how furious I am to think the local council are proposing to build a new town, Otterpool. There are many reasons why they should abandon this scheme. Water Traffic problems Doctors? ANOB Great historical findings at Otterpool Racecourse now proposed to build 8,000 houses when a scheme for 800 houses failed recently. Can you put this before the Planning Inspector,	LPA50
20.	David Laws	16/04/19	I am totally opposed to this project, here are my comments 1 The population density in South East England is the worse in the UK 2 There is a water shortage in East Kent 3 The country side is disappearing under the pressure of new housing 4 On the 25-3-19 the CPRE issued a statement that a million houses could be built on Brown field sites 5 There are thousands of people on the councils waiting list for council housing, yet no council houses are planned for this development	LPA159
21.	Martin Kemp	16/04/19	dear all can you insist fibre optic is made available to all long standing address in and around this big build project ,as open reach have so far made no or wont to give this service to us residence .(we are not all privileged to a big disposable income to pay a privet concern to supply broadband )please give this your full support.	LPA160
22.	Miss J A	21/04/19	I object to this proposal and will be contacting the Council to state my reasons.	LPA174
23.	Mr Bryan Rylands	28/04/19	At the present time it is NOT possible to support the Otterpool Park plan as there is no Viability Assessment available to the public. As there is NO viability assessment the public cannot assess the viability of the project. It is NOT possible for the developers to say the development is proportionate and justifiable. This document MUST be released as it is necessary. Failing to release it demonstrates a lack of transparency and accountability. Improving transparency of data	LPA113

			<p>associated with the viability assessment would provide more accountability but alas this the developer and the Council as the LPA have failed to implement.</p> <p>1 As there is NO Viability assessment we cannot know if it compromises sustainable development, nor can we know if the policies are realistic, and that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan.</p> <p>2 Viability assessment should be presented and published to ensure accountability. Viability assessment should be prepared on the basis that it will be made publicly available other than in exceptional circumstances. (Planning Practice Guidance) Even in those circumstances an executive summary should be made publicly available. This has NOT been done.</p> <p>3 Plans should set out circumstances where review mechanisms may be appropriate, as well as clear process and terms of engagement regarding how and when viability will be reassessed over the lifetime of the development to ensure policy compliance and optimal public benefits through economic cycles. This has NOT be done.</p> <p>4 The developer cannot show their level of return as is required in a Viability Assessment, as such the people of the district cannot know if it will make a profit. So it MUST be published.</p> <p>The deadline to comment will pass very soon and yet we are not able to see any viability assessment for the site. Therefore on these grounds I presently object to the development going ahead.</p>	
24.	Mr P Myers	29/04/2019	<p>The development is not needed. There is NO demand for 8500 houses in the Folkestone area. Also where is the democracy in this....</p> <p>A. The council buys the land without asking anybody. B. Goes into partnership with company and produces its own set of plans for the development. C. And then places the plans before itself for approval!</p> <p>Where is the democracy in that!</p>	LPA39
25.	Mrs Ann Goodwin	01/05/2019	<p>I am not against housing being built at Otterpool, but before housing is built infrastructure should be sorted out. At present the water pressure in Lympe is not good so will be even worse with more housing being built, I believe Southern Water have indicated this. The local roads will not be able to cope with the increased traffic as the roads are already congested with traffic from the Nicholls quarry housing and that presently being built in Sellindge, not to mention the mayhem caused when Operation Stack is in operation. Also, we have the added problems of the barriers put in on the M20 ready for Brexit.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the so called facilities being included in the plans will not actually materialise, as has been the case in the past with developers asking for conditions to be removed after consent has been given.</p> <p>Finally, I think that Councillors are not representing what local residents feel and surely that is the reason we voted for them in the first place!!</p>	LPA56
26.	Mrs Jean Rossiter	01/05/2019	<p>I vehemently object to this planning application for so many reasons, but mainly because it is an absolute decimation of the countryside and it is not right for this area or indeed needed.</p> <p>Why on earth do we need all these houses, combining all these lovely villages into yet another sprawling town- the answer is we just don't! Are these houses for local people, more than likely not.</p> <p>Veolia water have said in the past that there is only enough water for 1000 new homes and that was to include the new development at Sellindge, so how on earth can the proposed 8,500 new homes, schools, doctor surgeries be supported.</p> <p>If Westenhanger is developed most of people purchasing these houses would be Londoners, not local people as implied, yet another reason for objecting to this planning proposal.</p> <p>Where are all these people going to work? Not in the alleged up and coming Ashford or Folkestone where they're closing many large businesses, including Marks and Spencer's and Debenhams.</p>	LPA104

			<p>Each house will normally have 2 cars bringing an extra 17000 cars on the roads which is absolutely unacceptable and the impact on the roads and the pollution that accompanies them will be devastating, Shepway council don't seem to comprehend or appreciate.</p> <p>The impact this development will have on the wildlife will be catastrophic if their natural habitat is buried under tons of concrete and tarmac, also something that doesn't seem to matter.</p> <p>We moved here as we wanted to live in a village, as have many others and paid a premium to do so as we feel it's a privilege to be able to live in peace and quiet and look onto the green countryside. If we wanted to live in a huge town we would have stayed in Ashford.</p> <p>The planning application states that this is a joint venture between the developer and Folkestone and Hythe council. If that is the case then surely the planning consideration is compromised and biased,</p> <p>Once the countryside's gone you can't get it back!</p> <p>Say NO to Otterpool!</p>	
27.	Mr Ian Andrews	05/05/2019	<p>I am totally opposed to the proposed building of this vast town at Otterpool on several counts.</p> <p>We live in an area of outstanding beauty which is also a historic part of Kent. We already have expansion of nearly 1000 houses in Sellindge which will be a strain on local infrastructure (due to its restrictive design) and the already congested roads especially in the summer when the A20 and Hythe road is very heavily congested. Stone street and Lympne hill is already a rat run for cars from the marsh. we will be unable to cope with a further 8500 houses. This development will totally destroy the area, it's beauty and history.</p> <p>1 There are enough houses being built in Kent with 5700 houses in Ashford and Kingsnorth, 450 at Gibraltar Farm, 15000 at Ebbsfleet, 6000 at Dover, 4000 at Canterbury, 5000 at Chattenden, 3000 at Sevenoaks, 17500 at Maidstone which are some of the development in Kent at the moment, which is 60,000 houses or more. Why is there any need for more in this area? They are certainly not for local people!! This will be a commuter town alike Ebbsfleet and it will blight the whole area. I have no concern for the provision of local real affordable housing for local young people. but this is certainly not the case.</p> <p>Kent is supposed to be the garden of England NOT a concrete jungle, so there is totally no need for Otterpool Park it is absolutely unnecessary. F&amp;H DC are abandoning Folkestone &amp; Hythe high streets to dereliction only to build a new one at Otterpool Park.!! Regenerate Folkestone &amp; Hythe, bring the life back to the high street, there is enough space in these towns to accommodate these 8500 living spaces.</p> <p>I woud like FHDC to stop playing property developers and get on with looking after the area and the people.</p>	LPA106
28.	Sue Miller	08/05/2019	<p>I totally object to the Otterpool garden town. It isn't needed in the area, it will ruin our lovely countryside which is AONB ,so shouldn't be built on anyway, the water companies will not be able to provide water for this amount of extra houses, it only just provides for the houses it has, then it has extra houses in Sellindge now, the doctors surgeries in the area are all closing because there are no doctors and the doctors that are left are struggling to give patients appointments, the hospitals are at full capacity, so the area couldn't cope with this amount of extra people. The shops on the High street we already have are closing, so how will building another high street help....more empty shops to be vandalised and costing the taxpayer money. The amount of extra cars on the road would triple, we struggle now to get in and out of Hythe so with this amount of extra cars it would be gridlock, especially when the motorway is shut due to an accident or roadworks, not to mention the pollution. We chose to live in a rural area, so should not have a concrete jungle forced on us, we will lose our precious wildlife, Port Lympne reserve are promoting conservation yet in the same village they are destroying the very land that our wildlife rely on, how can that be right? The village and the area has so much history it will be lost amongst a housing estate, that will probably have mostly London overspill living there that commute to work, we wouldn't go to London and knock all their houses down and put grass on it, why do they think they can come to our lovely green area and concrete it over!! The airfield should be preserved as a memorial to all of our soldiers who fought in the war, we are gradually losing all of our airfields and it shouldn't be allowed to happen, All green space is precious and cannot be taken back when its full of houses, I want my children to be able to breathe clean air and see the wildlife that is on our doorstep, that is the reason we moved here!!</p>	LPA89

			<p>I totally object to the council buying all this land, with our money and kicking people out of their homes to compulsory purchase ( again with our money ), to build a monstrosity called Otterpool Park, just to line their own pockets why is it submitted to the council, it should have an independent council looking at it, FHDC aren't going to turn down their own planning application are they ? Its our money that has been used to underhandedly buy this land, so we should decide what happens to it. As you know everybody in Lympne and beyond objects to what you are trying to push on us. Our money could be used for better things, such as tidying up existing derelict houses and high streets, so people want to come to the area and spend money, not wasting it on lining their pockets !!</p>	
29.	Brian Greenfield	09/05/2019	<p>Outline planning permission for Otterpool Park should not be granted at this stage for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is evidence of inconsistencies, errors and omissions in the planning documents regarding health, as indicated below.</li> <li>- There is evidence that advice given by key decision makers and stakeholders regarding health has either been changed or omitted from the planning documents, as indicated below.</li> <li>- There is evidence in the Environmental Impact Assessment and the supporting documents that some of the most important issues regarding health have not been considered and/or addressed, as indicated below.</li> </ul> <p>1 Inconsistencies Land for health</p> <p>1.1 Para. 9.247 of the Planning and Delivery Statement refers to 12,980 sqm of healthcare floorspace, including one large healthcare practice in addition to three other smaller sites allocated for potential health needs, but the Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 3 - Accommodation schedule, refers to two sites of equal size 5,500 sqm (Zone 1a and Zone 2c) and two other smaller sites, 1,320 sqm (Zone 4) and 660 sqm (Zone 7). Action: This matter requires clarification and the documents should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Health facilities</p> <p>1.2 Para. 9.247 of the Planning and Delivery Statement refers to one large healthcare practice in addition to three other smaller sites allocated for potential health needs, but para 3.4 of the Design and Access Statement, refers to two GP health centres and one treatment centre. Action: This matter requires clarification and the documents should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>2. Errors</p> <p>2.1 There are errors in the Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 3 - Accommodation schedule. The areas of health development space do not correspond with the respective '% of the site' figures and the total development space '% of the site' figure is incorrect. The total number of employed is also incorrect. Action: These errors must be corrected and the document amended accordingly.</p> <p>3. Omissions Mental Health and Community health</p> <p>3.1 Mental Health and Community health (health visiting, school nursing, midwifery, district nursing) services, which will be impacted by demand from the proposed development are not mentioned in the planning application documents. Action: This omission must be addressed and the documents amended accordingly.</p> <p>4 Proposals in the planning documents Phasing</p> <p>4.1 Para. 5.3 of the Governance Strategy states that a healthcare presence on-site may be desired from an early stage.</p> <p>4.2 It is not clear why the advice given by the NHS South Kent Coast Clinical Commissioning Group and documented in the Folkestone &amp; Hythe District Council - Infrastructure Delivery Plan, January 2019 has been changed in the planning documents for Otterpool Park.</p> <p>4.3 Para. 6.39 and 6.40 of the Folkestone &amp; Hythe District Council - Infrastructure Delivery Plan, January makes it clear that the first premises for health must be provided by the first occupation, in order to bridge the gap between the first residents taking up occupation and the final health facility being open. Action: The planning documents should clearly state that the first premises for health must be provided by first occupation. This is very important, because there is no surplus capacity for new residents in existing GP surgeries in the local area and the patient to GP ratio within existing</p>	LPA90

		<p>practices are currently higher than average, para. 14.3.40 and 14.5.43 of the Environmental Statement Volume 2, Para. 4.5 of the Community Facilities Delivery Strategy and 5.3.15 of the Health Impact Assessment refers.</p> <p>Health facilities</p> <p>4.4 Para. 4.8 of the Community Facilities Delivery Strategy states that the East Kent Hospitals University NHS Foundation Trust, together with NHS organisations in Kent, KCC and Medway Council, are currently examining ways of reorganising hospital care in East Kent.</p> <p>4.5 Para. 4.9 of the Community Facilities Delivery Strategy refers to an option to close the A&amp;E at the William Harvey Hospital (WHH), Ashford and replace it with a 24/7 GP-led Urgent Treatment Centre on the same site. If this option is pursued, there would be no justification for a Treatment Centre at Otterpool Park, as the WHH facility would be less than 10km from the proposed development. Action: The need for a Treatment Centre at Otterpool Park should only be considered when the outcome of the reorganisation of hospital care in East Kent is known.</p> <p>Expansion of Sellindge Surgery</p> <p>4.6 Appendix 6 of the Planning and Delivery Statement - Policy CSD9 Sellindge Strategy, requires expansion of Sellindge Surgery for the first phase of new housing development (land located in the centre of Sellindge); and expansion of the surgery must be under construction with a programmed completion date before construction starts on the second phase of the new housing development (Site A land to the west of phase 1 and Site B land to the east of phase 1).</p> <p>4.7 The first phase of development in Sellindge has commenced and the second phase of development (Site B land to the east of phase 1) has been granted outline planning permission. No proposals have been made for the expansion of Sellindge Surgery which is required for the new housing development in Sellindge.</p> <p>4.8 Para. 4.16 of the Community Facilities Delivery Strategy states that options for Sellindge Surgery to operate in part or in full from the new Otterpool Park site will be considered. However expansion of the Sellindge Surgery will be required before planning permission for Otterpool Park is granted. Action: A robust plan to address the expansion of Sellindge Surgery is required for the proposed new housing-led development in Sellindge, this must be put in place before outline planning permission at Otterpool Park is granted.</p> <p>5.7 The Sellindge Surgery, falls under the responsibility of the NHS Ashford Clinical Commissioning Group not the NHS South Kent Coast Clinical Commissioning Group that the Applicants duty to co-operate has been extended to. The Sellindge Surgery serves Sellindge and ten other villages: five in the Folkestone &amp; Hythe District Council jurisdiction (Stanford, Westenhanger, Newingreen, Monks Horton, and Stowting), and five in the Ashford Borough Council jurisdiction (Brabourne, Smeeth, Aldington, Mersham and Hinxhill - these villages all have their own housing developments coming on stream. There are clearly cross-boundary issues that will need to be addressed. Action: A summary of cross-boundary planning issues must be compiled and a robust plan must be put in place to manage these issues.</p> <p>The Otterpool Park Health and Wellbeing Steering Group</p> <p>4.9 Para. 4.46 of the Community Facilities Delivery Strategy identifies representatives for the proposed the Health and Wellbeing Steering Group, this does not include any lay members. Community involvement should be at the very centre of all matters relating to Otterpool Park. Action: The Health and Wellbeing Steering Group should include a lay member from the community.</p> <p>Shortage of GPs</p> <p>5.2 Para. 1.4, 4.33, 4.34, 4.35 and 4.36 of the Community Facilities Delivery Strategy highlights the issue of the shortage of GPs and other primary care workers.</p> <p>5.3 It is not clear why the advice given by the NHS South Kent Clinical Commissioning Group and documented in the Folkestone &amp; Hythe District Council (FHDC) Core Strategy Review Duty to Co-operate Statement, January 2019 has not been included in the planning application for Otterpool Park.</p> <p>5.4 Para 4.34 of the FHDC Core Strategy Review Duty to Co-operate Statement states that the increase in population, along with the increased life expectancy has not been in line with an increase in health care provision. GP numbers have decreased over recent years, with recruitment of healthcare professionals, in particular GPs, remaining a major issue in the South East. Recent practice closures have resulted in GPs operating formally closed patient lists, limiting patient choice and access to primary care services.</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>5.5 Para. 4.35 of the FHDC Core Strategy Review Duty to Co-operate Statement states that "the NHS South Kent Coast Clinical Commissioning Group recognises that these challenges can be partly addressed with the development of appropriate health care facilities, however, workforce issues will remain. The CSR allows for 12,845 new homes in the period to 2037 - this could equate to an additional 30,000+ residents in the District - it is imperative that solutions are proposed to mitigate the impact of this increase on health services." Action: There should be a clear statement in the planning documents about the solutions that are proposed to address the residual workforce issues.</p> <p>Impact on existing services</p> <p>5.6 Para. 11.4.1 of the Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 2 states that the early occupation phase of the development is considered to have a potentially moderate negative effect on access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure; and that the early provision of services and facilities and use of the Sellindge Surgery are anticipated to mitigate against further negative impacts.</p> <p>5.8 Sellindge Surgery, like other surgeries in the neighbouring communities, is struggling to cope with shortage in the workforce, difficulties in recruiting staff (in particular GPs) and reliance on locums, this contributes to increased workload and problems of access for patients.</p> <p>5.9 The shortage of GPs and the increased workload has now reached crisis point and it seems likely that surgeries will have to direct patients to other clinicians or alternative providers to access overspill appointments in order to maintain a 'safe' service - a recommendation made by the British Medical Association in December 2018 (Workload Control in General Practice Ensuring Patient Safety Through Demand Management). This problem is exacerbated by GPs taking early retirement, due to the pressure of work and graduates not wanting to become GPs.</p> <p>5.10 Given that the workforce issues are now acute and systemic, the situation has changed since the planning application documents were compiled. Action: The potentially negative effect on access to existing healthcare services in the early occupation phase should be reassessed and changed from 'moderate negative' to 'Large / Moderate negative' - the change is 'significant' and warrants further consideration. This request is both reasonable and necessary.</p>	
30.	Mr Paul Diprose	10/05/19	I object to this application on the grounds that it is too much in one area, the road infrastructure cannot cope nor can the local doctors and hospital. A few houses spread over a larger area, were there would not be such a big impact on local people and services.	LPA95
31.	Miss Elizabeth Halstead	14/05/2019	<p>This application is not accurate in its depiction of people only using bicycles or public transport to travel around the district. None of these inhabitants will be prepared to trudge to a bus stop, and wait for a rural service on a timetable not of their choosing, in all weathers. Especially when buying their family food shopping. To be lumbered carrying loads of bags and waiting for a bus. They will all be using their own cars, and adding more vehicles to the already overstretched roads. The country lanes can not accommodate more vehicles, especially not packed into such a small area. From where are you going to be obtaining all the medical staff to run the Doctors' Surgeries. Where are all the teachers and support staff for these proposed five primary schools and one secondary school? Including a proposal to increase the Harvey Grammar Boys School in Cheriton: does that mean that their class sizes will increase? How will those boys travel to Cheriton? More cars on the roads. Boys already drive to that school now. They park on the small patch of adjacent land. They also ride bicycles on the pavements to that school. Thank you so much for impacting even more onto my walking on the pavements. I am now subject to the horrors of manic cyclists racing towards me on the pavements. A situation that will increase in its frequency. Your plan having the High Speed 1 Train stopping at Westernhanger (you are not changing that name to Otterpool!). You are not taking the HS1 off the two Folkestone stations. There are many commuters whom use both stations (obviously both still economically viable for Southeastern). It stopping at "Garden Town", makes it a slower train. Instead, get them on the ordinary train into Ashford, a five minute journey, whereby they will have the choice of two HS1 trains. The HS1 train from Canterbury is earlier than the Folkestone HS1 train. Don't take away from all the rest of Shepway for this "legacy" to overcrowd all of us.</p>	LPA96
32.	Mrs Bev Saunders	16/05/2019	Not needed. Not wanted.	LPA07

33.	Mr Peter Geering	17/05/2019	<p>It is my belief that this application has been started in haste and will leave the local residents to regret at their leisure. The application envisages a community being built in one of the most water starved areas in Kent. The local roads are congested and blighted by heavy goods vehicles already, a situation that will be exacerbated by the consequential increase in residents' vehicles from this expansion. Local doctors' surgeries are already suffering from a lack of GP's, the increase in patients from this vast housing estate may well prove to be the last straw. It is not needed; sufficient houses are already in plan to cater for the needs of local residents. It is not wanted; local residents have never been asked to vote on this issue. Indeed, when local residents have voiced their opinions at public meetings their comments have been decried as nimbyism. The stock answer for all questions regarding the shortfalls of this application is that they will be dealt with. I can understand that Cozumel are pushing for this as, as their recent position in the Rich List shows they are adept at making money, but for F.H.D.C. to be not only involved but to be one of the chief instigators of this application is an abrogation of their duty to the local residents. I urge you to consider, we have no water, we have few doctors, we live in a traffic corridor that is getting more and more congested, we neither need nor want this building estate to be built, and we do not want a dormer town built on our doorstep.</p>	LPA08
34.	Mr John Jarvest	18/05/2019	<p>The need for so much residential development has not been. Other developments are on hand to meet demand. The infrastructure in terms of roads and utilities are incapable of supporting such a massive development. This is all clear through evidence and local experience. To destroy vast areas of farmland and natural land is ecologically disastrous. Most people in Lympne object to the development, including myself, because of the environmental impact of people, building work, traffic and interruption of our rural community and life. I moved to Lympne to be part of a small village community, not to live in, or next to, a huge new town. The development will not benefit local people in any way. The people who move there will be short of jobs, be forced to commute for work, and have a negative and destructive impact on the environment.</p>	LPA59
35.	Mrs Jenny Harris	18/05/2019	<p>I object to this application as follows: Substantial failing in the traffic planning :</p> <p>All the traffic modelling and assessments which has been put forward in this application, DO NOT take into account that this section of the A20 between junctions 11 and 10 of the M20, is the primary relief road for the M20 motorway during traffic incidents, which is the UK's gateway to and from Europe.</p> <p>The applicant's traffic lead has confirmed this during the open public meeting, stating that their parameters were set out round current and future predictions of only local traffic movements and that they DID NOT have to model for any motorway incidents which would require the A20 to become the primary relief road at the proposed Otterpool Park development area.</p> <p>In the last twelve months, the M20 has been closed almost twenty times and the A20 at this proposed application site, having to become the primary gateway to and from the EU. None of these incidents were due to Op Stack/Op Brock, they were due to traffic incidents and motorway repairs. This caused the A20 from Sellindge to junction 11 to be at gridlock, which is the entire proposed Otterpool Park development area.</p> <p>The pinch point of Sellindge village and the A20 being reduced to one-way single traffic at Grove bridge, Barrow Hill, Sellindge, contributes to the traffic congestion becomes gridlocked all the way back to junction 11 of the M20. This is the whole length of where the proposed Otterpool Park development is to be built. If this is the congestion now, what would it be like once ten thousand houses are built and all the extra traffic this will bring?</p> <p>Last month, the Folkestone and Hythe council new development strategy explained that Sellindge is in a Rural Centre Hub for primary school, GP surgery and shops and is built along a 2 mile stretch of the A20. This community is currently having significant development being constructed now and has planning being considered for a total of of a further 1000 homes.</p> <p>As part of these planned development, the 2 miles stretch of the A20 in Sellindge village will have a total of 24 junctions into roads, closes, lanes and housing estates. As well as this, the main pinch point for the A20 traffic is Grove Bridge, at Barrow Hill, where traffic is reduced to single one-way system, via traffic lights, under the Victorian rail bridge, is staying. These new developments and junctions will slow traffic further and cause further congestion and delays, especially the case when the M20 is closed. This will impose significant traffic congestion to the whole district and its residents and communities. The proposed Otterpool Plan application is being built in the middle of this congestion. The developers are not taking this into account and no contingencies are being put into place. This will render the proposed</p>	LPA84



			<p>development and surrounding communities as a place to avoid, instead of what it wishes to be, an inspiring aspirational community, where people wish to live.</p> <p>The solutions put forward by residents and Parish councils are positive and achievable, as this application is intending to build a "Primary relief road" West from the A20 Otterpool Lane into the "Barrow Hill" Otterpool development. This current proposed primary relief road is stopping 60 meters before reaching Harringe Lane, Sellindge. If this proposed new primary road was to be extended to Harringe Lane and this to be upgraded, a bypass could be implemented round the pinch point of Sellindge, which is the traffic pinch point.</p>	
36.	Mr David Haining (x3)	17/05/2019 28/05/2019 06/06/2019	<p>(1) 17/05/2019 My family and I have lived on the A20, Barrow Hill, Sellindge for over 18 years. I am employed as a Ports Officers, working at both the Channel Tunnel and Dover ports and have an in-depth understanding of the freight haulage industry and the traffic impact this has on the local and national road infrastructure.</p> <p>This current planning application for Otterpool Town is significantly flawed, as the traffic modelling which has been undertaken by the developers does NOT take into account the fact that this section of the A20 between junction 11 and the new 10A of the M20 is the primary relief road for the M20 during any motorway traffic incidents. The chief traffic modelling representative for the development has stated during the consultation that the parameters for their traffic modelling only takes into account local traffic movement and they are not required to incorporate into their modelling any exceptional incidents covering motorway closures.</p> <p>In the last year, without taking into consideration Operation Brock/Stack or Brexit, this stretch of the M20 has been closed due to traffic incidents in one or both directions almost twenty times. Highways England and the UK haulage industry also accept that the expected modelling for HGV traffic to and from Europe will increase by 10% a year and that this will double in the next 10 years from the current lorry and HGV movements through our ports and along the M20. This will compound and significantly increase the likelihood of further traffic incidents along the M20, resulting in an increase usage of the A20 as the primary relief road and with the increase of HGV movements, make the traffic delays and gridlock significantly worse. Why is the local council and KCC proposing building these 8000-10000 housing developments along this stretch of the A20, when so often it reverts to becoming the UK's main Gateway to all traffic from/to Europe. No one will wish to live in this new development.</p> <p>I cannot understand why the local council and KCC are proposing building these 8000-10000 housing developments along this stretch of the A20, when so often it reverts to becoming the UK's main Gateway to all traffic from/to Europe. No one will wish to live in this new town or local existing communities, if it is regularly in traffic gridlock.</p> <p>It does not have to be this way, if the A20 itself is reconfigured and proper due diligence is put in place at this inception of the planning stage, this development could still take place whilst also improving the traffic flow for the whole district and Highways England, future proofing the stability of the current and future communities in this area.</p> <p>There are two way this can be progressed, alter the A20 by building a through road bypassing and averting the main traffic pinch point of Sellindge community and the single one-way traffic light system at Barrow Hill, Grove bridge, or alternatively, de classifying the A20 between junction10A and 11 and make it a "B" road and then ensuring that during traffic incidents on the M20, that the main traffic gateway relief become diverted to the M2/A2 when the M20 is closed. This second option is highly unlikely due to the management of the process.</p> <p>The main issue with this traffic flow is Sellindge Village its self, as between junction 10A and 11 of the A20, it is the only residential community spread along almost 2 miles, reducing to single one-way traffic light system at Grove Bridge, Barrow Hill.</p>	LPA162

		<p>When the M20 London carriageway is closed, the traffic congestion can back up from Sellindge all the way to junction 11 of the M20. This is the whole length of the proposed Otterpool Town. This current proposed planning application offers no alternative solution, or any mitigation controls to attempt to avert this continuing to be the norm.</p> <p>The Otterpoll Town stage 3 consultation report dated July 2018, clearly shows that many residents as well as Sellindge Parish Council and other Parish councils, have highlighted the traffic issues and have provided clear option to mitigate this.</p> <p>The one recommended by most is to allowing for the proposed primary through road which is planned into and across the Otterpool park town (Barrow Hill Development), West of Otterpool lane, to link in with Harringe lane &amp; it's motorway and rail bridges to then link back onto the A20 South West, behind Sellindge church.</p> <p>This would not have to impact on houses built in the proposed development or Harringe Lane, Sellindge or have to cut down any trees, as it is open land. This land is currently farming lane and marked up in blue in the Core strategy as "Future Development Zone, thus is available.</p> <p>The current planning application already has a proposed "Primary Road" to be constructed from the A20 junction with Otterpool lane, going South West into the Barrow Hill Development. It stops about fifty/sixty metres before reaching Harringe Lane.</p> <p>It makes perfect sense, to link the proposed "Barrow Hill development" to Harringe Lane, not only does this allow for the current A20 to bypass the Grove Bridge one-way system, but the whole village of Sellindge and its future total 24 road junctions.</p> <p>The cost of this road extension and upgrade of Harrange lane and bridge crossings will be insignificant compared to the advantages, opportunities and benefits it will bring to the whole district but also to the whole main highways Gateway infrastructure in Kent. It will allow for the uninterrupted traffic flow along the A20 between junction 11 and 10A of the M20 and more importantly, ensure that any Otterpool town does not become gridlocked each time this section of the M20 motorway is closed.</p> <p>Request for Sellindge Bypass From A20 Otterpool lane, coming out on the A20 behind Sellindge Church:      I am appalled to read the response to the Parish Council regarding this suggestion which would benefit the whole of the existing communities and future ones. To be informed that this would not be considered due to some of the land on one side of Harringe Lane not being part of SS6 &amp; SS7 boundary and thus not being possible, is disingenuous and disrespectful to the whole communities in this district. Also stating the cost is too much is also incorrect, as they are suggesting building a primary road bypassing at Newingreen and the Hythe turning on the A20, which in its self, will not significantly alleviate congestion when the M20 is closed.</p> <p>All these points have been highlighted by the Parish Councils and local residents from the outset and inception of this proposed development over the last four years. In each of these consultations this has been pointed out, though the original outlined plans have remained unchanged in this area. This makes a mockery of these consultations and clearly due diligence is being overridden by a wish to rush through this development</p> <p>The majority of this through road is having to be built to access the proposed new homes. By not linking this proposed development West of Otterpool Lane to Harringe Lane, any parents wishing to access Ashford, braiborne, Smeeth or Mursham schools, would have to drive to Barrow Hill and through Sellindge, increasing the carbon foot print and traffic through my community. This can be averted by simply linking the intended new primary road from this development and Harringe Lane.</p> <p>There is no point building new communities at the detriment of existing ones. This is bad planning and poorly thought out. The Barrow Hill residents group have mentioned this on several occasions, not because we do not wish this development to proceed but to ensure that this development and our existing community do not fail.</p> <p>The Otterpool Town sage 3 consultation report, on page 14, clearly shows that when it come to the movement and traffic approach for the development of Otterpool Town SS6 &amp;SS7, then 67 % of those in the workshops and 79% of people from the drop in, were NOT satisfied with the road infrastructure plans. Both sides of Barrow Hill Sellindge are proposed to be built round by these developments and with out a through road, the residents along Sellindge A20 will be disproportionately negatively impacted by these developments and poor traffic movement planning. If</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>consultations are of any true value and meaning or purpose, then this evidence clearly shows that the current plans are not satisfying the communities needs or wishes.</p> <p>I submit this evidence in the hope that the planning officers ensure that this proposed development becomes fit for purpose and that due diligence is done to ensure that all traffic modelling also take into account that this part of the A20, is the primary relief road for the M20 during Motorway incidents, becoming the gateway to and from the UK and Europe &amp; all the congestion this brings. Last year, this section of the A20 was in gridlock twenty times do to M20 traffic incidents. If Otterpool park is built, then it to will be a gridlocked community/town. Any traffic modelling that does not take this into account in this area becomes irrelevant and inaccurate.</p> <p>The Council planning officers must ensure that the current and future communities are protected from traffic gridlock, by ensuring that this development has written it to it, from its inspection, the possibility of facilitating a future Sellindge A20 bypass to remove the traffic pinch point which is Sellindge.</p> <p>The placement of the houses in these Otterpool Park developments are in the wrong place.</p> <p>Traffic impact has not had due diligence.</p> <p>From the outset of this development, the community have been told that the intention was that all traffic from this development would use Junction 11 of the M20 and not have to travel through the village of Sellindge.</p> <p>Now at the application stage, we see that 50% of the housing land allocated for development are being built around Sellindge Barrow Hill and West of Otterpool lane, i.e the furthest area away from junction 11 of the Motorway.</p> <p>Any residents from these new proposed homes wishing to travel West to Ashford or London will now travel through Sellindge on the A20 to access the new junction 10A of the M20 and not use junction 11. It makes no sense to travel East, incurring a higher vehicle millage and carbon print.</p> <p>NO traffic calming or road alterations are being put into place to encourage traffic to use junction 11 of the M20.</p> <p>The lead traffic management officer during the final open consultation meeting has even stated that the primary roads being constructed between Otterpool lane linking with Newingreen, are not to be used for local and other HGV traffic. HGV traffic will still be pushed down Otterpool lane from Lympne industrial park, and discouraged from using the new primary road. HGV traffic accessing this industrial park from the West or going to London will be encouraged to use the new junction 10A once this is open, thus travel through the village of Sellindge.</p> <p>No traffic calming or road alterations are taking place to discourage any traffic from travelling through Sellindge on the A20. I was told that this was intentional, as junction 11 will need upgrading once this development is built as even junction 11 will have exceeded its current capacity.</p> <p>Due diligence has not taken place regarding traffic flows and modes of transport.</p> <p>The developers are selling this proposed development as a green carbon friendly option, though most of their views are based on hopes and wishes rather than facts.</p> <p>There is no evidence that the UK will be using electric vehicles by the time this proposed development is in place. The electric capacity and infrastructure in the UK are 15 years behind most other EU countries. The carbon footprint in the production of these electric vehicles and their batteries out way any gains from using fossil fuel engines.</p> <p>The cost of these electric vehicles are out of the reach of most normal local working population, though it the developers are aiming for occupants working in London, then they may be able to afford it.</p> <p>There is no real evidence to support the applicant's views that the majority of residents will be using the buss service to access work, school and day to day travel. This is just numbers plucked from the air to reduce their vehicle statistical usage from their proposed green project.</p> <p>Though I support cycle routs, I also suspect that the number of journeys expected by cycle will not be a true representation of fact. It they were taking cycling seriously, then how come that Barrow Hill development of Otterpool park has no cycle link to their nearest community Sellindge. Barrow Hill is the link between both these communities and, though either side of barrow hill is being built along, Barrow hill is having NO road infrastructure development, NO cycle paths, No traffic calming, No road junction alterations to stop HGV traffic coming through Sellindge from Otterpool lane. At the outset, we were told we would be getting this, now it</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>comes to the plans being submitted, clearly this is not the case and local residents have been lied to by the developers during their so called consultation process.</p> <p>(2) 28/05/2019 My family and I have lived on the A20, Barrow Hill, Sellindge for over 18 years. I am employed as a Ports Officers, working at both the Channel Tunnel and Dover ports and have an in-depth understanding of the freight haulage industry and the traffic impact this has on the local and national road infrastructure.</p> <p>This current planning application for Otterpool Town is significantly flawed, as the traffic modelling which has been undertaken by the developers does NOT take into account the fact that this section of the A20 between junction 11 and the new 10A of the M20 is the primary relief road for the M20 during any motorway traffic incidents. The chief traffic modelling representative for the development has stated during the consultation that the parameters for their traffic modelling only takes into account local traffic movement and they are not required to incorporate into their modelling any exceptional incidents covering motorway closures.</p> <p>In the last year, without taking into consideration Operation Brock/Stack or Brexit, this stretch of the M20 has been closed due to traffic incidents in one or both directions almost twenty times.</p> <p>Highways England and the UK haulage industry also accept that the expected modelling for HGV traffic to and from Europe will increase by 10% a year and that this will double in the next 10 years from the current lorry and HGV movements through our ports and along the M20. This will compound and significantly increase the likelihood of further traffic incidents along the M20, resulting in an increase usage of the A20 as the primary relief road and with the increase of HGV movements, make the traffic delays and gridlock significantly worse.</p> <p>Why is the local council and KCC proposing building these 8000-10000 housing developments along this stretch of the A20, when so often it reverts to becoming the UK's main Gateway to all traffic from/to Europe. No one will wish to live in this new development.</p> <p>I cannot understand why the local council and KCC are proposing building these 8000-10000 housing developments along this stretch of the A20, when so often it reverts to becoming the UK's main Gateway to all traffic from/to Europe. No one will wish to live in this new town or local existing communities, if it is regularly in traffic gridlock.</p> <p>It does not have to be this way, if the A20 itself is reconfigured and proper due diligence is put in place at this inception of the planning stage, this development could still take place whilst also improving the traffic flow for the whole district and Highways England, future proofing the stability of the current and future communities in this area.</p> <p>There are two way this can be progressed, alter the A20 by building a through road bypassing and averting the main traffic pinch point of Sellindge community and the single one-way traffic light system at Barrow Hill, Grove bridge, or alternatively, de classifying the A20 between junction 10A and 11 and make it a "B" road and then ensuring that during traffic incidents on the M20, that the main traffic gateway relief become diverted to the M2/A2 when the M20 is closed. This second option is highly unlikely due to the management of the process.</p> <p>The main issue with this traffic flow is Sellindge Village its self, as between junction 10A and 11 of the A20, it is the only residential community spread along almost 2 miles, reducing to single one-way traffic light system at Grove Bridge, Barrow Hill.</p> <p>When the M20 London carriageway is closed, the traffic congestion can back up from Sellindge all the way to junction 11 of the M20. This is the whole length of the proposed Otterpool Town.</p> <p>This current proposed planning application offers no alternative solution, or any mitigation controls to attempt to avert this continuing to be the norm.</p> <p>The Otterpoll Town stage 3 consultation report dated July 2018, clearly shows that many residents as well as Sellindge Parish Council and other Parish councils, have highlighted the traffic issues and have provided clear option to mitigate this.</p> <p>The one recommended by most is to allowing for the proposed primary through road which is planned into and across the Otterpool park town (Barrow Hill Development), West of Otterpool lane, to link in with Harringe lane &amp; it's motorway and rail bridges to then link back onto the A20 South West, behind Sellindge church.</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>This would not have to impact on houses built in the proposed development or Harringe Lane, Sellindge or have to cut down any trees, as it is open land. This land is currently farming lane and marked up in blue in the Core strategy as "Future Development Zone, thus is available.</p> <p>The current planning application already has a proposed "Primary Road" to be constructed from the A20 junction with Otterpool lane, going South West into the Barrow Hill Development. It stops about fifty/sixty metres before reaching Harringe Lane.</p> <p>It makes perfect sense, to link the proposed "Barrow Hill development" to Harringe Lane, not only does this allow for the current A20 to bypass the Grove Bridge one-way system, but the whole village of Sellindge and its future total 24 road junctions.</p> <p>The cost of this road extension and upgrade of Harrantage lane and bridge crossings will be insignificant compared to the advantages, opportunities and benefits it will bring to the whole district but also to the whole main highways Gateway infrastructure in Kent. It will allow for the uninterrupted traffic flow along the A20 between junction 11 and 10A of the M20 and more importantly, ensure that any Otterpool town does not become gridlocked each time this section of the M20 motorway is closed.</p> <p>Request for Sellindge Bypass From A20 Otterpool lane, coming out on the A20 behind Sellindge Church: I am appalled to read the response to the Parish Council regarding this suggestion which would benefit the whole of the existing communities and future ones. To be informed that this would not be considered due to some of the land on one side of Harringe Lane not being part of SS6 &amp; SS7 boundary and thus not being possible, is disingenuous and disrespectful to the whole communities in this district. Also stating the cost is too much is also incorrect, as they are suggesting building a primary road bypassing at Newingreen and the Hythe turning on the A20, which in its self, will not significantly alleviate congestion when the M20 is closed.</p> <p>All these points have been highlighted by the Parish Councils and local residents from the outset and inception of this proposed development over the last four years. In each of these consultations this has been pointed out, though the original outlined plans have remained unchanged in this area. This makes a mockery of these consultations and clearly due diligence is being overridden by a wish to rush through this development</p> <p>The majority of this through road is having to be built to access the proposed new homes. By not linking this proposed development West of Otterpool Lane to Harringe Lane, any parents wishing to access Ashford, braiborne, Smeeth or Mursham schools, would have to drive to Barrow Hill and through Sellindge, increasing the carbon foot print and traffic through my community. This can be averted by simply linking the intended new primary road from this development and Harringe Lane.</p> <p>There is no point building new communities at the detriment of existing ones. This is bad planning and poorly thought out. The Barrow Hill residents group have mentioned this on several occasions, not because we do not wish this development to proceed but to ensure that this development and our existing community do not fail.</p> <p>Evidence of No public or Parish confidence in the traffic management assessment and proposals in this plan: I am not alone with my concerns regarding the traffic modelling and approach this application has.</p> <p>The Otterpool Town sage 3 consultation report, on page 14, clearly shows that when it come to the movement and traffic approach for the development of Otterpool Town SS6 &amp;SS7, then 67 % of those in the workshops and 79% of people from the drop in, were NOT satisfied with the road infrastructure plans. Both sides of Barrow Hill Sellindge are proposed to be built round by these developments and with out a through road, the residents along Sellindge A20 will be disproportionately negatively impacted by these developments and poor traffic movement planning. If consultations are of any true value and meaning or purpose, then this evidence clearly shows that the current plans are not satisfying the communities needs or wishes.</p> <p>I submit this evidence in the hope that the planning officers ensure that this proposed development becomes fit for purpose and that due diligence is done to ensure that all traffic modelling also take into account that this part of the A20, is the primary relief road for the M20 during Motorway incidents, becoming the gateway to and from the UK and Europe &amp; all the congestion this brings. Last year, this section of the A20 was in gridlock twenty times do to M20 traffic incidents. If Otterpool park is built, then it to will be a gridlocked community/town. Any traffic modelling that does not take this into account in this area becomes irrelevant and inaccurate.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>The Council planning officers must ensure that the current and future communities are protected from traffic gridlock, by ensuring that this development has written it to it, from its inspection, the possibility of facilitating a future Sellindge A20 bypass to remove the traffic pinch point which is Sellindge.</p> <p>The placement of the houses in these Otterpool Park developments are in the wrong place.</p> <p>Traffic impact has not had due diligence.</p> <p>From the outset of this development, the community have been told that the intention was that all traffic from this development would use Junction 11 of the M20 and not have to travel through the village of Sellindge.</p> <p>Now at the application stage, we see that 50% of the housing land allocated for development are being built around Sellindge Barrow Hill and West of Otterpool lane, i.e the furthest area away from junction 11 of the Motorway.</p> <p>Any residents from these new proposed homes wishing to travel West to Ashford or London will now travel through Sellindge on the A20 to access the new junction 10A of the M20 and not use junction 11. It makes no sense to travel East, incurring a higher vehicle millage and carbon print.</p> <p>NO traffic calming or road alterations are being put into place to encourage traffic to use junction 11 of the M20.</p> <p>The lead traffic management officer during the final open consultation meeting has even stated that the primary roads being constructed between Otterpool lane linking with Newingreen, are not to be used for local and other HGV traffic. HGV traffic will still be pushed down Otterpool lane from Lympe industrial park, and discouraged from using the new primary road. HGV traffic accessing this industrial park from the West or going to London will be encouraged to use the new junction 10A once this is open, thus travel through the village of Sellindge.</p> <p>No traffic calming or road alterations are taking place to discourage any traffic from travelling through Sellindge on the A20. I was told that this was intentional, as junction 11 will need upgrading once this development is built as even junction 11 will have exceeded its current capacity.</p> <p>Due diligence has not taken place regarding traffic flows and modes of transport.</p> <p>The developers are selling this proposed development as a green carbon friendly option, though most of their views are based on hopes and wishes rather than facts.</p> <p>There is no evidence that the UK will be using electric vehicles by the time this proposed development is in place. The electric capacity and infrastructure in the UK are 15 years behind most other EU countries. The carbon footprint in the production of these electric vehicles and their batteries out way any gains from using fossil fuel engines.</p> <p>The cost of these electric vehicles are out of the reach of most normal local working population, though it the developers are aiming for occupants working in London, then they may be able to afford it.</p> <p>There is no real evidence to support the applicant's views that the majority of residents will be using the buss service to access work, school and day to day travel. This is just numbers plucked from the air to reduce their vehicle statistical usage from their proposed green project.</p> <p>Though I support cycle routs, I also suspect that the number of journeys expected by cycle will not be a true representation of fact. It they were taking cycling seriously, then how come that Barrow Hill development of Otterpool park has no cycle link to their nearest community Sellindge. Barrow Hill is the link between both these communities and, though either side of barrow hill is being built along, Barrow hill is having NO road infrastructure development, NO cycle paths, No traffic calming, No road junction alterations to stop HGV traffic coming through Sellindge from Otterpool lane. At the outset, we were told we would be getting this, now it comes to the plans being submitted, clearly this is not the case and local residents have been lied to by the developers during their so called consultation process.</p> <p>I object to this planning application for the following reason:</p> <p>Official figures which were reported on the 18th of June 2018 in the local news (Kent Live), show that 26.380 (Twenty-six thousand three hundred and eighty) people last year, relocated from living in London, to Kent. Most of these people, bought houses in Kent and continued working in London, increasing the carbon footprint of commuting to work.</p> <p>Out of these 1040 (one thousand and fourth) people moved from London to Folkestone and Hythe district. I understand that this is 40 percent of the houses sold in our district are people moving out from London.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>At the same time, Kent Live reports that since February 2018, unemployment in Folkestone and Hythe district has increased by 29 percent. Wages for local residents working in the district are almost half of those working in London.</p> <p>This Otterpool development, is built round the use of Westenhanger train station, not so locals can travel to work in Folkestone or Ashford, as there are no jobs but to supply the housing needs of London works who wish to move out of their flats to buy houses here in Folkestone.</p> <p>Most will be young middle to upper class couples who understandably wish to have a family and their flats in London are not big enough to accommodate children.</p> <p>This in it self will have significant strain on the local NHS and maternity wings, schools and local transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The impact on the local community is that by attracting more London workers to our district, we price out the local young people from obtaining houses, as Londoners can afford to by these homes.</p> <p>Even when both couples are working in our community, they struggle to currently buy a property. Building these 10.000 homes in this New Town, will only go to exacerbate this problem by attracting more London commuters to the district.</p> <p>The only local jobs that this development will create, are service jobs, servicing the needs and requirements of London commuters.</p> <p>object as this proposed development does not correspond to the local housing and job skill growth required by the district.</p> <p>There is no clear high skilled job growth strategy for this district and at a time that unemployment is increasing in this area The strategy of build houses and jobs will come later is a misguided one.</p> <p>The current social and economic divide between local communities in Kent and that of Londoner's is growing. There is clear divide which is fuelling resentment as people living and working in the local community, are being impacted by ever increasing areas becoming commuter belt to London and locals are being left behind.</p> <p>These new commuter towns will still socialise in London and use Kent to sleep, drink, eat out in our cafes, pubs, restaurants and supermarkets, where all our local young people can only find work. The local population will just have jobs serving the Londoners needs.</p> <p>Local authorities should be spending money and time attracting good businesses to the district and improving the skill set of the local population. The current strategy of building homes for London commuters in the hope to raze more council tax funding from building new towns and this bringing more jobs, is misguided. This is not helping local needs and communities, just increasing an ideological political belief of building homes at any cost to support the London bubble.</p> <p>This is backed up by the developers own report. They say that out of 10000 homes, which now a days will require two incomes to stand any chance to afford, thus 20.000 people, only 9000 jobs will possibly be made, most are not high skilled jobs which is what will be required to afford the mortgage. How this is achieved is not clear. What is clear is that probably the 11000 other people will be working in London and commuting every day to London.</p> <p>Yes to building homes but only where there is local jobs to support them. Expand current towns and villages and build jobs round them.</p> <p>I object as the proposed development as it does not give significant green buffer zones space between the new town and Sellindge,Barrow Hill residents.</p> <p>Barrow Hill will become annex from the village of Sellinsge and taken over by the overbearing Otterpool Park Town development, which is proposed to be built either side of Barrow Hill. This will destroy the current resident community, building resentment and loosing its identity and heritage.</p> <p>A bigger green woodland divide must be put into place ensuring that privacy to both communities is given and a natural green boundary separates these two community developments. The green space may link the communities through foot or cycle paths, to allow access to each other, but allow the heritage of Barrow Hill Sellindge to be kept.</p> <p>The current proposed buffer zone next to Barrow Hill is not sufficient and needs to be extended similar to that given to Lympne Village, which gives a clear break between the proposed communities. These zones should</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>contain the planting of trees to cause privacy, support wild life and to help in some way to mitigate the carbon footprint of this proposed town.          All the green spaces should be linked, to allow for a wild life corridor to exist and be able to travel safely across the proposed site to existing communities.          Current proposals are insufficient to protect the overbearing impact of this development to local communities and the local wild.          Any New development should be built as close to the town centre and junction 11 as possible. The homes proposed either side of Barrow Hill are not part of a town, just two enormous housing estates, as far away from the hub transport network of the railway station and M20, Junction 11 as possible.          The amount of homes are not necessary for the available jobs in the district and the location proposed for the homes are befalling. Why are they overbearing existing village communities, whilst also not close to the transport hubs?          I oppose this planning application as it has been submitted prior to the Folkestone and Hythe Core strategy development document consultation having been fully considered and signed off by this council.          This proposed planning application forms a big part of this Core strategy document along with a significant other amounts of proposed development sites in the district, which the community were consulted on and as yet has not been properly considered and signed off.          There is no point having a core strategy or any public consultation regarding it, if you are going to consider the planning before the overall needs and requirements of the district.          The core strategy consultation has only recently taken place. It is there to analyse the future needs for the district. This core strategy considers the housing needs for the district, employment and infrastructure required as part of it.          This application should not be considered until the full Core Strategy has been signed off, NOT to due so, would be disingenuous and not follow due process.          How can you approve a New Town to be constructed, if the need for it, employment required to sustain it, is not there and has not been justified or evidenced in the core strategy final report?          I am concerned that this proposed planning application for significant housing developments between Lympne, Westenhanger and Sellindge is being rushed through to avoid the core strategy and the consultation responses from the community regarding this proposed development.          This proposed development will have an overbearing impact on several villages with in our district and has the potential to damage the whole district due to pore infrastructure planning and the location of the housing being too many, whilst also located in the wrong place.          With out the whole Core Strategy being considered and signed off first, this goes against a democratic and proper due process to safeguard the needs and wishes of the community.</p> <p>(3) 06/06/2019          oppose this planning application with the following evidence outlined in The Environmental Agency report called "The state of the environment, water resources", from May 2018 and with the recent speech in March 2019 from Sir James Bevan, Chief Executive of the UK Environmental Agency.          I request that the above report from the Environmental Agency be taken into account and the speak by Sir James Bevan, which I attach to this e mail, as evidence of why this development should not be built.          The speak and report clearly outlines the dangers communities are facing due to water shortages in the South East of England and must be taken into account regarding the use of land for development in areas with in the South East where water shortages are taking place and evidence shows with climate change, will get significantly reduced rain fall. It outlines the importance of reduction of consumption in the South East, as well as, prevention of population growth and demand by building houses in these area.          I have attached the full speak to this e mail and request my comments and the speach document be added to my Otterpool park portal response. Two key sections in the 2018 Environmental Agency report that evidence the need to refuse this application are:          Population growth:</p>	
--	--	--	--



			<p>Population growth will continue to be one of the biggest pressures on water resources. The population of England is predicted to increase to 58.5 million by 2026.</p> <p>Many of the growth areas in the South East are in places where the water environment and water supplies are already stressed.</p> <p>Projections suggest that if no action is taken to reduce demand and increase supply of water, most areas will not meet demand by the 2050s under high greenhouse gas emissions and high population growth scenarios. Even low population growth and modest climate change scenarios suggest significant water supply deficits by the 2050s, particularly in the south-east. Looking ahead</p> <p>The future of water resources in England will be increasingly affected by</p> <p>The pressures of population growth and climate change.</p> <p>Decisions taken in the years ahead on how energy is generated and how land is used will also have large effects on water resources in England.</p> <p>It is not yet clear what the exact extent of some of the impacts will be. However there is strong evidence that action must continue to reduce demand, increase supply and minimise wasting of water to prevent future shortages and limit environmental damage.</p> <p>Please can these comments and speech be added to the public response planning portal.</p>	
37.	Mr Peter Bishenden	19/05/2019	<p>Fundamentally and wholeheartedly object to this planning application. The first issue is that the council seem to be submitting a planning application to themselves. That cannot be right. That's like me appraising my own performance at work and giving myself a 100% pay rise. In addition to explaining the clear democratic issue this causes, I would also like to understand the relationship FHDC has with Cozumel Estates. A few quick searches on the internet raises more questions rather than answering them. Developing the countryside for more housing should be cost neutral i.e. the council and it's "partners" should only benefit by demonstrating they are providing housing to the homeless and those in sheltered or council accommodation. That should be the sole reason a council embarks on a development venture. They should not gain financially. For this venture to proceed, the council will need to disclose it's accounts completely transparently.</p> <p>The second issue is wha compensation the council are going to provide the residents who will be affected by the development work? The road infrastructure is already at breaking point and the local residents already suffer from delays due to the HGV's using the port and Eurotunnel. If it takes residents longer to get to work, do the school run etc. then the council need to reassure it's residents that delays will not take place. Not just delays either; small issues like dirt on the roads meaning higher car cleaning costs and damage to cars from debris etc.</p> <p>Many choose to live in this area because it provides a quiet and peaceful place to live with beautiful views and surroundings. This planning application will change that. What are FHDC planning on doing to compensate it's residents for this change they are forcing on it's residents that did not choose for this development.</p> <p>Lastly, i would like to propose that FHDC provide mains gas and mains sewage for all residents in the area that currently to not have these services already.</p>	LPA51
38.	Mrs Jane Woolford	19/05/2019	<p>I have attended all exhibitions held to date to obtain as much information as possible and having also reviewed the documentation now feel able to make a relatively informed decision on the proposals put forward by Arcadis on behalf of Cozumel Estates and FHDC.</p>	LPA61
39.	Mr Keith White	19/05/2019	<p>I have lived in Hythe for nearly eighteen years and my wife for much longer. During that time we have seen the ever increasing growth in housing and already it seems that Hythe Town and local areas have been saturated with housing, with much larger housing projects not far out of town (e.g. Martello Lakes, Princess Parade). This has increased traffic issues, particularly at the Sainsbury's end of town and with further developments (e.g. Aldi, West Hythe) it can only get worse. If the Otterpool Park development goes ahead then what would already be a bad traffic situation can only become a nightmare! Traffic aside, the Folkestone Racecourse area is, in my opinion, a beautiful</p>	LPA03

			<p>open area for all the surrounding inhabitants to enjoy. Building on this site will not only ruin the landscape but will turn Hythe from a beautiful town into a sprawling area of housing with the town, in my opinion, unable to cope with the large influx of people in these new homes. Otterpool will literally be a blot on the landscape! It seems that this project is all about making money with no consideration to the landscape or local inhabitants. I would suggest that a random survey be done, by the council, in Hythe and surrounding areas to get the true view of the average person in Hythe. It is my belief that 9 out of ten, maybe 99 out of 100 would be totally against this project. Please do a survey and see!</p> <p>My main concern was the size of the development and increased traffic generated. I was assured at one of the first meetings at LVH that the A20 would be rerouted and traffic would decrease. Not so; the implementation of a new stretch of dual carriageway from the small roundabout near J11 to meet the existing dual carriageway near Oak Creative means that traffic will continue along the existing A20 and only Otterpool town traffic will turn right at new traffic lights into the new development. I understand that the additional dual carriageway is required for traffic to exit to the Hythe A249 road but it is essential that traffic on the existing A20 is reduced and for this reason I would request that the RELEVANT SECTION OF THE EXISTING A20 IS SCALED DOWN FROM BEING A 'TRUNK ROAD' TO BECOME A 'B' DESIGNATED ROAD AND/OR A SPEED LIMIT OF 20mph BE ENFORCED.</p> <p>Having reviewed the proposed accommodation schedules, my main concern now is that where existing settlements, ie Westenhanger and Lympne have been provided with a green 'bund' or have low density housing closest to them, there has been absolutely no provision of this for those remaining residences in Newingreen. You are proposing high density accommodation to a height of 18m with hardly any advance planting or green spaces to protect existing residents' quality of life whilst effectively we are 'living on a building site'.</p> <p>Speaking to Julia Wallace of FHDC last Thursday I UNDERSTAND THAT THE DENSITY OF HOUSING HAS NOT YET BEEN AGREED AND THEREFORE WOULD BE KEEN TO SEE RELOCATION OF THE PROPOSED 18M HIGH BUILDINGS LOCATED NEXT TO HOLIDAY EXTRAS.</p> <p>I agree with others' concerns on dormitory towns, derelict town centres and will make further comments.</p>	
40.	Mrs L E Rowe	20/05/2019 06/06/2019	<p>(1) 20/05/2019</p> <p>Having attended the public viewing of the proposed plans for the Otterpool development, I am writing to say that I strongly object to the current planning application. It is on far too large a scale and will turn out beautiful region into a large urban sprawl.</p> <p>I have submitted further comments by an email, with a word document attachment. I should be grateful if you would update the documents tab to show this.</p> <p>(2) 06/06/2019</p> <p>I emailed in comments about the Otterpool development at the beginning of the week, as I could not fit everything I wanted to mention in the space on the planning portal, but as yet unfortunately, they have not appeared online.</p> <p>I realise that you must be very busy and I expect it takes time to upload these things, however, as the deadline for making comments is fast running out and just in case I did something wrong (eg I didn't use the correct email address or put my address on the document) please find below full details of my objection to the development.</p> <p>Whilst I would not oppose some limited additional development in the area, I strongly object to the current planning application for the Otterpool development owing to its sheer scale and the detrimental effect it will have on the health, mental wellbeing and quality of life for existing local residents. There are already plans for around 60,000 new homes to be built in the region and there is a limit to what can actually be shoehorned into this tiny, water starved corner of the country.</p>	LPA41

			<p>I should be very grateful if the planning committee would read my reasons for objecting prior to making their decision on whether or not to allow this development to go ahead.</p> <p>Traffic and Transport</p> <p>I have concerns regarding the accuracy of the traffic modelling report undertaken by the developer. Cameras to monitor traffic flow were put up in the district for a very short period of time, in the middle of the week and at a very quiet time of year. The traffic assessment states that it only needs to monitor local traffic movements and it is not required to take anything else into account. How can this be the case? Surely the area should be looked at as a whole.</p> <p>The A20 running through the proposed development is the primary relief road for the area should there be any mishaps on the M20 or any disruption due to operations stack. There are also large numbers of seasonal holiday makers and regular visitors driving through down to the coast.</p> <p>This area is also the gateway from the Channel Ports to the rest of the country so the huge amount of traffic generated by this this must surely be taken in to account when planning any new housing developments in the area.</p> <p>I am also concerned that there has been so little consideration taken in to account regarding the impact of additional traffic flowing down London Road and through Hythe, together with the implications of this on our small historic seaside town. This proposed development is actually double the size of</p> <p>Hythe. It will destroy our semi-rural lifestyle and our local infrastructure will creak at the seams. A potential additional 20,000 cars plus the volume of new traffic from the Quarry, Shornccliffe and Seabrook Road developments (yet to be fully realised in Hythe) is likely to cause mayhem.</p> <p>Traffic is already dreadful here especially during holiday periods and at every weekend. Although they will try to direct it towards the motorway, the developers have acknowledged that there is likely to be a significant increase in local traffic, particularly around the one-way system near Sainsbury's.</p> <p>Their answer to this seems to be to do away with the free parking spaces alongside the Royal Military Canal. These are currently much used by people who work in the town, by visitors to the Light Railway and people attending the many cultural and civic events that go on here. How will the loss of such a significant number of parking spaces be mitigated in a town which is reliant on summer visitors?</p> <p>Loss of free parking will be detrimental to the local High Street economy. If the through road along Princes Parade is also stopped, this could potentially end in gridlock in Hythe. The huge increase in vehicle emissions, which will have an adverse effect on the health, wellbeing and air quality for local residents.</p> <p>If the report does not take all this additional traffic movement into account then it must be must be flawed and not fit for purpose.</p> <p>There has been no agreement yet that HSI will stop at Westenhanger. At the recent exhibition, which I attended, I was told that there are currently no plans to stop the high-speed train there until it is proved that there is sufficient demand to make this viable. Significant upgrading of the station would be needed for this to happen. This obviously means that the houses will come first before any changes to infrastructure.</p> <p>10,000 houses mean at least another 20,000 + people in the area. The developers say around 9,000 jobs would be created at Otterpool, so the remainder will have to commute elsewhere. Otterpool will become a dormitory town for London commuters who will be attracted by the thought of cheaper housing. The</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>developers will be able to charge high prices and thereby price out local people living on local wages. As a result, we lose our green space with no benefit for local people.</p> <p>Anyone wishing to commute to London from there would have to either take a 1 hour 40-minute journey to Charing Cross on the slow train or go by car or train to Folkestone West or Ashford to link up with HSI. At peak times HSI trains are currently crammed full and it is already often standing room only from Ashford to London. How will all these additional passengers from Otterpool be catered for when there is so much new building going on around Ashford too? Is there sufficient capacity for additional trains to run on the network? At present unless there are significant changes and improvements, the rail service will be inadequate to meet the demand.</p> <p><b>Destruction of Prime Agricultural Land</b></p> <p>Although some of the development will be on the site of the Folkestone Racecourse, (which was a superb attraction for visitors and if a limited development had been allowed to happen in the past, to enable the refurbishment of the Grandstand, could still be so) most of it will be on prime areas of productive farmland. In this day and age, we should be looking towards sustainable, local food production to help cut carbon emissions and thinking ahead to protect productive farmland to ensure future food security. The compulsory purchase and destruction of this farmland will not help with this.</p> <p>The area is rich in wildlife thanks, in the main, to years of good farming practices and land management by our local farmers. Human interference by developers will inevitably result in the loss of habitat of many species of plants, birds and animals. There will be a significant detrimental effect on the local environment and the rural way of life of our local villages. The developers say that 50% of the Otterpool site will be green space but in fact we will be actually losing 50% of the surrounding countryside, which currently acts as a green corridor for wildlife and a buffer between the villages and the motorway. To be frank, what is to stop the planned green spaces being infilled in future, as is now happening to virtually all small areas of open green space all over the district. It seems to be if it's green build on it!</p> <p><b>Water</b></p> <p>There is insufficient water locally to support the size of this development. There is only enough capacity for around the first 1,500 houses. The Environment Agency has stated that water resources in the area are currently over licenced or over abstracted. With water being so scarce in the South East and so much development going on all over Kent, it is highly unlikely that any neighbouring water companies will have surplus supply to help out in the long term. This is a huge problem. There has been talk of piping in water from a reservoir near Dover and some talk of a desalination plant possibly being required to be built. If that is the case, is this development actually viable? who will pay to provide all this new infrastructure and where would a desalination plant be sited? Again, it is likely that existing local residents will have to suffer further disruption to their way of life for all this to take place.</p> <p><b>Hospitals and GP Services</b></p> <p>There is a chronic shortage of GP's in our area and nationwide. A huge review is currently being undertaken of accident and emergency provision in hospitals in East Kent and the system is under great strain. How will it cope with a potential additional 20,000+ people, many of whom will be moving in from outside the area, when the system can barely cope now?</p> <p><b>Affordable Housing</b></p> <p>I recognise the fact that more housing is needed in the country. However, the number of houses in this plan vastly exceeds predicted local need, when taken in to account with other current developments in the area.</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>Only 22% of this development is designated as affordable housing which, really is what is needed in our local area to enable young people to gain a foot on the housing ladder. It is therefore obvious that the target market is not local people but London overspill.</p> <p>Planning Process</p> <p>The implied close links between the Conservative led Folkestone and Hythe District Council and the developers, makes one wonder about the impartiality of the planning authority with regard to this development and whether the process has been compromised. As the Council is acting as both developer and planning authority, giving itself planning permission for its own development, holding meetings in secret and withholding information about the viability of the project from public scrutiny makes this whole process seem somewhat less than transparent and it could be perceived that they have a conflict of interest. I was under the impression that Garden Towns schemes were to be built where local people wished them to be. The local administration here has not been given a mandate by local people to go ahead with this development, yet they seem to be ploughing on regardless. The reason so many of the previous Councillors were voted out at the recent local elections was as a direct protest vote against it. Local people feel betrayed, as if their opinions on this matter do not count.</p> <p>It will be detrimental to our local tourist industry if Otterpool is built. Visitors come to enjoy the peace, fresh air and tranquillity of the countryside, explore the small villages and the attractions offered by our small historic seaside town (Hythe is actually marketed as the seaside Town where the countryside meets the sea.) Tourists will not be attracted to a huge new town where there were once open fields, nor will they relish traffic gridlock and lack of parking. It will transform our entire area from one that is essentially rural, in to a large dormitory town that could eventually merge Ashford with Folkestone transforming it in to one vast urban sprawl. The garden town/village concept is a very laudable and I can see why the Government would want to promote such towns in places where there are fewer constraints than there are here. Please consider if it is appropriate for one to be built here, especially on such a large scale, with some buildings in the vicinity of historic, ancient monuments and an area of outstanding natural beauty reaching to over 18 metres high.</p> <p>I urge you oppose this current plan. If there has to be some development, a much smaller garden village, designed to be in keeping with the rural character of the area, rather than a town might be more acceptable to everyone and meet with less local opposition.</p>	
41.	Mrs Farmer	20/05/2019	Full details on file - Objection	LPA09
42.	Mr Andrew Cook	20/05/2019	<p>Dear sir /madam, after attending a meeting held at sellindge village hall on Tuesday 14th may, I was dismayed by the lack of consideration for the residents of Barrow hill and sellindge. As you must be aware the M20 is frequently closed due to accidents or operation stack making the A20 the main route. I saw no plans for any relief road for the new development making the A20 the only accessible route in when the motorway is closed. As you must be aware of the gridlock this brings to the area, I'm not sure how emergency services are going to access the new development. Surely consideration must be given and some sort of traffic management or bypass to relieve the A20 around sellindge. I saw on your plans a road which could be extended by 50 metre could achieve this. I strongly object to the plans as they stand at present because they do not future proof this development for further expansion making it a desirable place to live</p>	LPA14
43.	Mr & Mrs Dale	20/05/2019	My husband and I strongly object to this outline planning permission application, and offer the following comments.	LPA10

		<p><b>Housing need</b>          The scale of the proposed town is out of all proportion with local need and demand. Although there is a need for affordable housing, this proposal would create over 6,000 non-affordable properties for which there is neither need nor demand, as demonstrated by the existence of estate agents. A search of listings in this area shows that this tenure group is well catered for in the open market.</p> <p>Where are these 6,000 households living at present?</p> <p>There is a need for social and affordable housing. However cramming 2,000 households into one small area would mean people being forced to live in this isolated rural backwater away from family, work, and support networks (apart from the handful who would have a local connection to the villages affected). There are many imaginative and potentially better ways to address the need for affordable housing than tagging tiny percentages of affordable housing on to vast swathes of new build for 'full value' owner occupation. These might include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing homes in and around industrial and retail parks close to work places.</li> <li>• Putting more effort into empty home initiatives.</li> <li>• Encouraging small-scale buy to rent schemes and supporting private landlords.</li> <li>• Providing good quality sheltered accommodation of mixed tenure to give choice to older people currently under occupying family size accommodation</li> </ul> <p>Undoubtedly this type of solution would be more difficult and far less lucrative for developers and politicians than the application under consideration. This proposal feeds into the obsession - across the political spectrum - to build new homes whatever the cost to existing communities and the countryside. This in turn is based on data provided by reports such as Wendy Wilson and Cassie Barton's "tackling the under-supply of housing in England" (House of Commons library briefing paper no. 07671 ), which focus over simplistically on numbers of shortfall in the provision of housing, rather than on issues around the type of tenure for which provision is required. These reports also fails to properly address the reasons for continuing high house prices and the role of the House Builders Federation in this, which result in huge profits for a small number of house builders, and the politicians who back them. The Wilson Barton report does at least acknowledge that saturating the market with non-affordable housing will have little or no impact in reducing house prices. Very little effort has been put into establishing that this is the right place for this sort of huge urban development. A group of politicians saw an opportunity to make money for themselves and did the deal before starting to 'consult' with local people. They then proceeded to ignore the very clear message that this development is not welcome. The real winners will be the developers who will make huge profits for providing another shoddy poorly constructed shanty town as they are doing all over this beleaguered corner of the country.</p> <p><b>Employment</b>          Where are these people going to work? Shops and schools will provide jobs for a few hundred (assuming they all want this type of work). Presumably there will be plenty of commuters travelling to jobs in London - where they can no longer afford to live. There will be those who work from home if broadband speed catches up - but what about the rest?</p> <p><b>Pollution</b>          This whole thing started because local people had the temerity to object to a proposal for a waste digestion system. Concern about the environmental damage that would do to this area pales into insignificance compared to the damage 8,500 properties and associated infrastructure would do. There are huge potential problems associated with water provision and disposal for this number of properties on this delicately balanced area of chalk Downland. Despite assurances by 'experts', these are unknown, not</p>	
--	--	---	--

Consultation responses table  
Otterpool Y19/0257/FH

			<p>least because of the climate changes we are likely to face in the coming years. This is not to mention the amount of rubbish which would be generated by 8,500 households.</p> <p>Transport road and rail</p> <p>How will our already regularly gridlocked road system cope with another 15,000 vehicles? The roads around the proposed town are country lanes, so these will either turn into clogged rat runs, or will be developed and expanded resulting in even more land grabbing.</p> <p>Presumably also passenger train services - already overcrowded - will be expected to cope, as will parking facilities for those commuting to London.</p>	
44.	Mr C Hunter	20/05/2019	<p>Otterpool Proposals;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Is the land suitable if the lorry park is built.</li> <li>2) To large for a rural area, with big tourist attraction in Port Lympne.</li> <li>3) Lack of water and sewerage with poor roads.</li> <li>4) will break skyline affecting 'rural' aspect.</li> <li>5) Realigning the A20 through a residential area?? If built the following need to be considered; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Infrastructure needs to be 1st.</li> <li>b) Built with consideration for developments over a wider area.</li> <li>c) Less houses, well mixed with social, affordable and a broad mix of size so residents can move within the area as needs vary through life.</li> <li>d) Priority to locals.</li> <li>e) e) Protection for wildlife.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	LPA11
45.	Mr Barry Abbott	20/05/2019	<p>I wish to object most strongly to the above application. It has no consideration for the wildlife which exists in abundance on the old Racecourse and surrounding farm land. There are many species of animals and birds which would disappear completely from this area if they were disturbed. The world is becoming increasingly concerned about the effects over population and destruction of habitat is having on wildlife and we in this area should be concerned also. Please reject this application if for no other reason.</p>	LPA13
46.	Ms J Maxwell	20/05/2019	<p>went to the EXHIBITION on the Otterpool Planning Application at Westenhanger Castle and the only thing I came away with was the certain knowledge that if this scheme goes ahead, we only know the outline boundary of the land the subject of the Application. Everything else is "well maybe not" "we would change that" " it is not set in concrete" " we will have to rethink plans" and best of all "water situation will be fine"!</p> <p>So, all the money, pretty pictures, and endless PR stuff from the FHDC amount to nothing for us residents to feel anyway confident that the Scheme is either viable or in any way caring of us poor souls who actually live around the Racecourse.</p> <p>With the houses being built in Ashford, Canterbury, Folkestone and perhaps Deal, all we can be sure of is that East Kent as a rural area is dead. It appears to me that whatever is being claimed makes this a likely Dormitory for London.</p> <p>It would be much better to have smaller groups of houses here for local people rather than the huge conurbation envisaged with the terrible toll on the countryside, wildlife and the environment.</p>	LPA15
47.	Ms F Montford	20/05/2019	<p>UNAVAILABLE (23/05/2019)</p>	LPA16
48.	Mrs Denise Haining	20/05/2019	<p>I am fed up of some people including our local councillors stating that as this development will be years in the completion, most of us will not be around to experience it, as though we should not care. Well, that may be the case for some, but I care for my children, grandchildren and future generations living in this community.</p> <p>The overwhelming medical evidence now shows that there is NO SAFE LIMIT of vehicle engine particulates and that every organ in the body is negatively impacted by them, especially to children and the elderly. Over 80.000</p>	LPA110

			<p>premature deaths are taking place in the UK each year due to these harmful pollutants. I and the rest of this community depend and expect of you to protect us and to not do so would be a fundamental breach of our human rights.</p> <p>I notice that NO recent air quality assessment has been done at Grove bridge A20/M20 or in the village of Sellindge where the primary school are located. The locations where air quality is being assessed for ambient background tests, are NOT where both the M20 and A20 cross or where there is constant stop start traffic, where local residents are living. Due to this, the current air quality assessments do not give a real picture of the air quality at these existing community traffic pollution pinch points. These traffic pinch points will be significantly negatively impacted by this proposed development, which will bring significant extra amounts of vehicular traffic movements, pollution and noise. As a minimum, we must conduct air quality tests in this area and ensure this does not increase. We need to protect the local residents for further harmful pollutants.</p> <p>Under Article one of the Human rights Act, all government bodies, including councils and planning officers have a legal duty to put article one at the forefront of all decisions they make.</p> <p>Current air quality assessments are not a accurate representation of where current traffic pinch point are in current local communities which will be impacted by this proposed development:</p> <p>I request for up to date Environmental Air Quality Assessments studies to be carried out in key areas where current residential communities live and are impacted by traffic from the M20 motorway and the A20, particularly at the pinch point of the A20, Barrow Hill, Grove bridge and the M20 which crosses at this point with in an established residential community. This proposed new town will have significant increase traffic impact at this pinch point in a established residential community, which will be putting the health and safety of the residents at harm and likely to breach "Article One of the Human Rights Act" wright to healthy life:</p> <p>Sellindge and the A20 at Barrow Hill, Grove bridge, has an extensive housing community. Over the last 30 years they have had to deal with significant traffic increase both on the M20 motorway and the A20 which cross each other at this point next to significant amount of residential houses.</p> <p>The A20 goes down to single one-way traffic under Grove bridge, controlled by traffic lights. This has the causal effect of lots of stop &amp; start traffic, which is the worst for causing air pollutants into the environment and at peak times now backs up half way up Barrow hill next to residential houses. When I use the public foot path under this bridge, I can taste the pollution in the air and find it hard to breath. I am 84 years old and my son and grand children live in Barrow Hill and have to live among this and walk this rout every day to access the local community facilities. <b>REQUEST FOR FURTHER AIR POLLUTION IMPACT ASSESSMENT:</b></p> <p>Before approving this planning application for a new town, air quality assessment tests must take place at the A20 Grove Bridge, Barrow Hill, Sellindge, where the A20 goes down to single one way traffic controlled by traffic lights, casing stop start traffic which is the biggest cause of air pollution in vehicles. To not do so, would be clearly negligent a breach of this of the human rights of the local residents living next to this area, knowing now what the circumstances and impacts this pollution is having on our health.</p> <p>The only way to avoid this traffic pinch point and air pollutant hazardous area, is for planners to put into place what local parish councils and residents have already insisted on and I agree with, that a bypass to Sellindge is implemented from the A20 Otterpool lane, coming out on the South West side of Sellindge behind the church.</p>	
49.	Mr Ian Hodge	21/05/2019	<p>The application involves far too many houses, far beyond what is necessary to meet the needs of the current population of the District. An expansion of this size will change the character of the District but no justification has been provided by the Council. What has been provided are rosy descriptions and artist's impressions of how wonderful Otterpool Park will be. The only apparent real benefit is to increase the Council Tax take but there has been no analysis of the consequent</p>	LPA42



			<p>additional costs. The changes will dramatically alter traffic flows but no plans of how to cope with this have been provided. Hythe will be particularly affected by a larger town being built so close to it. The services described in Council publications (shops, schools, doctors etc.) will not exist in the early stages of development. Residents of Otterpool Park will look, and travel, to Hythe to meet many of their needs until a critical mass of housing has been built. Hythe already struggles to meet its own needs.</p> <p>A change of this size and character should have been discussed with and agreed by the residents of the District before large sums of money were committed. This would have been a democratic way of proceeding but instead this has been another example of the over-bearing expansionist attitude of the Council over the last few years.</p>	
50.	Miss Heidi Kingston	21/05/2019	<p>I am writing to register my very strong objection to the proposed Otterpool Park Garden Town. There are so many new towns planned for Kent, it makes me wonder what they've been putting in the water if the local population has been breeding so rapidly!</p> <p>We live on a pretty small island, if we keep building on Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land, what are we going to eat in the future? I certainly don't fancy the idea of crunching on crispy insects and vegetables grown up the walls of city buildings! During the war people were told to "Dig For Victory!" If there is ever a similar situation in the future, there won't be anything to dig if it's all been built on. There is no guarantee that the gardens of the "Garden Town" won't be covered in decking or turned into extra parking, once the houses have been sold. And with the residents likely to be caught up in traffic jams and hose pipe bans a probability, they would be unlikely to have the time or water to grow much!</p> <p>Surely the green spaces of the racecourse and the agricultural land of Otterpool must help to mop up pollution from the nearby motorway and the busy A20? So many extra homes and businesses would certainly add to light, noise and traffic pollution. Even if the residents all drove electric cars, would the electricity be generated by hamsters running around wheels?! Because chances are the electricity would be generated by less than "green" means.</p> <p>The M20 and A20 are already very busy and quite often at a stand still. Add a whole extra town into the mix and it really will be chaos. When they are closed for any reason, traffic takes to the local single track lanes and many people still drive as if they are on an A road, not considering that they may meet a flock of sheep/a horse and rider or carriage/a parent with a child in a pushchair or on a bicycle etc around the next bend. They are not built to take a lot of traffic! As far as I have seen, nothing would be done to keep vulnerable road users, like riders, safe. The traffic along the Stone Street would be bound to increase, making it very hard for riders (and probably vehicles!) to cross. Will Newmarket style horse traffic lights be put in, where the bridleway/by ways cross?</p> <p>The UK is now classified as one of the most nature depleted countries on earth and the loss of foraging habitat for bees and other pollinating insects has been enormous. Without them, we will be really stuck! Rather than building everywhere, shouldn't more be done to encourage multi-generational living and house sharing? And to discourage second homes that stand empty for much of the year. Then we might not need to cover the countryside in so much concrete. Are there REALLY no brownfield sites left? There is so much wildlife to be found in the centre of the racecourse and at Otterpool, including red list species. So much would be lost if it was built on or around.</p> <p>The local hospitals and doctors are already struggling with very lengthy waiting times. The William Harvey really will not cope with all the extra homes going up and those that are planned. Building a new health facility is all very well, but how will the doctors be found to staff it, when they can't be found to take on positions in existing surgeries? There is no mention of a new hospital and IF the A&amp;E department at The William Harvey is scrapped in favour of a new hospital in Canterbury, all hospital related traffic from the new town would travel along the Stone Street, with it's sharp bends in the Farthing Common/Roundwood Hall area, where there are often accidents. The Romans didn't plan for so much</p>	LPA43

			Surely concreting over so much land (some of it marshy) will lead to more flooding in the area, not to mention more pollution entering the local water courses?	
51.	Ms Katy Bravery	22/05/2019	<p>I object to the development on these material grounds:</p> <p>The proposed development is not in keeping with the scale of the local area. That many houses will swamp the area. The proposed development will have a negative impact on the amenity of the entire local area through noise, traffic and sheer numbers of people. The development will irreparably damage the natural environment and wipe out vital green space, habitat loss for wildlife, insect life and oxygen producing trees. This at a time when we are officially in a climate crisis and facing the collapse of the natural infrastructure in which humans depend for life.</p> <p>There is inadequate water supply in a rapidly warming world to sustain this development adequately without impacting on local supplies. Kent has built more than its fair share of housing estates - especially those on greenfield sites. The development will attract more than 10,000 extra cars, causing traffic congestion and danger to local residents. Approval would create a precedent meaning that it would be difficult to object to similar proposals. Local infrastructure - hospitals, water supply, secondary schools - is not adequate to service the proposed development. The sheer numbers and density of the proposed development is inappropriate. The proposed development will demolish or adversely affect a site of archaeological value, Westenhanger Castle.</p>	LPA91
52.	Mr Julian Saunders	22/05/2019	NOT REQUIRED NOT WANTED	LPA161
53.	Mr Michael Boor	23/05/2019	<p>With reference to the above outline planning application I wish to register the following objections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inappropriate Location</li> <li>2. The proposed site is almost entirely Greenfield, and abuts areas of AONB to the east and south, and is close to, and overseen by an area of AONB to the North. The scale and area of the application is totally inappropriate and contravenes all normal planning parameters associated with a location of this type.</li> <li>3. Inappropriate Scale and House Unit Size for the District</li> <li>4. When considered alone, and together with other mass housing proposals along the M20 corridor (Maidstone/Ashford/Otterpool) the total number of housing units proposed are greatly in excess of the numbers required by the district.</li> <li>5. The average household size in the district will decrease to around 2.02 persons by the end of 2021. The Planning and delivery statement shows a range of provision of size of homes, which suggests that 92% of all homes on the park could be in the range 3-5 bedrooms.</li> <li>6. The existing Link Park has failed to attract businesses to the area over a prolonged time period, and</li> <li>7. the number of housing units are greatly in excess of the districts employment potential, this will force householders to commute to London, but the large developments at Maidstone and Ashford are shorter commuting distances.</li> <li>8. Not a true reflection of what will be built</li> <li>9. Although only an outline application, it must be viewed as whole, and as portrayed ie a complete town with all necessary infrastructure and services. The planning and Delivery Statement, Planning Strategy, sets the tone for the whole document which is full of detail but is actually worded to avoid any legal obligation to provide what has been described in detail in the application, and hence what in reality the partially, or wholly completed project will look like and consist of.</li> <li>10. False claims about the Consultation Process</li> <li>11. The application includes large volumes of statistics and outline details, supposedly based on the consultation process. Having personally attended a number of these consultation meetings, they all assumed a</li> </ol>	LPA92

			<p>predetermined scale, and only focussed on detail and layout. No opportunity was given to discuss what size the development should actually be. The overwhelming majority of the people who attended these meetings, including myself are against this size of development.</p> <p>12. F&amp;HDC must have the power to approve or reject 'For Construction' proposals</p> <p>13. The planning application and project is a joint venture between the two major land owners Cozumel Estates and Folkestone and Hythe District Council. Cozumel Estates motives for promoting the project are quite legitimately to maximise profit on their land holding, Folkestone and Hythe District Councils motives are, or should be, purely to improve and enhance the quality of life of all the existing and future residents of the District, including as part of the core provisions a non negotiable and legally binding promise to ensure proper infra structure and community facilities are in place at the front end of the construction, together with truly affordable housing to stated policy levels. Infra structure, community facilities and affordable housing provision should be subject to approval or veto by F&amp;HDC</p> <p>14. Lack of legal commitment as to how facilities and Infra structure will be Procured</p> <p>15. The application confirms and details that there is no existing capacity in the local primary schools and GP surgeries, and that the existing potable and waste water, electricity and gas networks have very little capacity, indeed the gas network has almost none at all and would require a prohibitively high cost upgrade to service the development, putting a further load on the electricity network..</p> <p>There are no confirmed details as to how critical infra structure will be provided, phased constructed or financed.</p> <p>Rail, Bus, and road links are currently barely adequate for the existing communities in the surrounding area, the application contains plenty of ideas but no firm commitments.</p> <p>The document states a section 106 agreement will set out how the facilities will be funded and managed, but this will only be negotiated after outline planning has been approved, so outline approval does not guarantee community facilities will be properly funded.</p>	
54.	Mr Graham Adams	23/05/2019	<p>I object completely to this plan on the grounds that it will obliterate valuable farm land and the associated natural habitat.</p> <p>The HMG strategy for building massive housing developments is flawed and does not take into account any impact on the local area in terms of the UK ability to retain farmland and natural habitat, reduce pollution levels and reduce traffic levels instead of using smaller, less invasive developments.</p> <p>In addition there is no plan for supporting road infrastructure, local services are unable to cope (hospitals, doctors, schools) already and so faced with a development of this size there is nothing to support it.</p> <p>Traffic movements will, once the development is complete, most likely equate to hundreds of extra journeys every days with the associated pollution and road congestion which, on roads that already struggle to cope at times will result in the existing population and emergency services being unable to travel easily.</p> <p>The environmental report is not independent and should be completed by an organisation chosen by a third party completely independent from the District Council and the developers.</p> <p>This land contains significant natural amenity for the existing population in terms of footpaths which again, will be lost and cannot be replicated elsewhere.</p>	LPA69
55.	Mrs Vivienne Webb	23/05/2019	<p>I strongly object to the application. We do not have the infra structure to support it.</p> <p>I have lived in Lympne village for 25 years, moving here with my husband and three children, from Birmingham. This is an area of natural beauty, we moved here to get away from traffic and noisy crowded towns.</p>	LPA53

			<p>Last week, my husband and I drove up to Scotland. We did not see any new towns being built. Why are they wanting to build a new town here in the South East?</p> <p>It does not make sense, people who move here will be commuting to London to work. The roads are already a problem in the area and they will only get worse. There will not be enough schools for the families moving in. I also object to the loss of wildlife which is so important especially in the face of global warming.</p> <p>We live in a beautiful village community we do not wish to join up with other beautiful villages to form a new town. We have Folkestone and Ashford as our towns.</p>	
56.	Mrs A Hird	24/05/2019	Full details on file - Objection	LPA23
57.	Mrs Corinne Barnes	24/05/2019	<p>Having finally managed to log into your website after many failed attempts, I would like to register my objection to this development as I don't believe this area can cope with such a large number of houses.</p> <p>We have plenty of development going on around Folkestone and Hythe and especially in Ashford. Such a huge development of around 10,000 homes would mean at least 20,000 additional people all looking for jobs. There is little to no well-paid employment in Folkestone, so most would have to commute to London or Ashford. This would increase the traffic on all the local roads, which are already hopeless during rush hours. Trying to get into Folkestone or Ashford at peak times is a complete nightmare.</p> <p>I believe a smaller development would be far more appropriate, perhaps the size of Broadmead Village or even a little larger. This could also accommodate a village school, surgery and shop.</p> <p>I hope my objection will be submitted for discussion along with all the other objections on your website regarding this development.</p>	LPA17
58.	Terrance Ellames	24/05/2019	<p>This application involves large scale urban development in the form of a new town in the countryside and on agricultural land. Such a large scale urban development should not be allowed in principle given a very significant loss of countryside, which is an important feature of the district. I feel sorry for the rural and other communities in the area around Lympne, Westenhanger and Barrow Hill at Sellindge, which will see their rural environment and existing communities overwhelmed. It will also have very significant impacts on the setting and character of Hythe where I live, which could turn from being a small and fairly tranquil coastal town to one that is congested and overwhelmed by its new neighbour more than twice its size.</p> <p>Urban development and growth should be focused on the existing towns of Folkestone and Ashford and on smaller scale development elsewhere in the district and sub region. This proposal threatens the potential growth of existing urban areas and sites as it focuses development on cheaper and more easily developed Greenfield land. It also results in fragmented urban sprawl from Folkestone, through to Sandgate, Hythe and onto Ashford via this new town at Otterpool.</p> <p>The applicant states the development will be over a 30 year period, but it can be seen even in the first 5 years 450-975 houses could potentially be developed. This is when proposals for a much smaller housing development at Folkestone racecourse was refused by a planning inspector only a few years ago, and large scale sites at, for example, Folkestone seafront and Nickolls Quarry are still not built out, even though they have been in the pipeline for some 15 years. This proposal in my view is intended to largely meet the needs of a much wider area and acts as a potential new dormitory town to London being astride the M25 and on a main</p>	LPA25

			<p>rail link. This new town will involve social and cultural changes to the area, as well as significant fragmented development and environmental impacts over a period of more than 30 years.</p> <p>Hythe Road between the edge of the proposed new town at Newingreen and Hythe is not proposed to be significantly improved or altered. I welcome this as it leaves in place a road to and from Hythe on its west side that has rural character and charm when entering and leaving Hythe on this side. However this winding road is slightly dangerous and congested in places and feel the addition of a new town of the size proposed will make this intolerable for traffic going to and from Hythe (and beyond to Sandgate). I would not like to see a new road as part of the development, as is not proposed at the moment, as it would urbanise the entrance to this side of Hythe, but also feel this new town would make the existing road intolerable. The proposals will also significantly add to traffic congestion through Hythe, and will undoubtedly result in severe parking problems, the latter of which seems not to have been assessed by application. This should be properly assessed and subject to consultation with residents in Hythe and Town Council. Any measures agreed to deal with these impacts should be part of a 5106 agreement.</p> <p>If one of the perceived benefits of the proposed application is that smaller sensitive sites might not need to be developed elsewhere, then sites like the highly controversial Princes Parade site in Hythe should not be developed.</p> <p>I am not convinced the impacts on wildlife will be adequately dealt with as argued in the application. A new town in the countryside with or without greenspaces and mitigation can only have a net negative impact on existing wildlife. Noise and air pollution will increase significantly despite 'green' measures proposed. You cannot build more than 8,500 houses, business parks and related urban infrastructure in a confined area without such an impact, all you can do is try and minimise the impacts as much as possible.</p> <p>I believe this proposal is not wholly necessary and ill-conceived for the district. It is worrying that this application is a partnership between the owners of Folkestone racecourse and the Council that bought large tracks of land in the area before the proposal was first announced to the public. No local political party in the district has stood on a manifesto of proposing such a new town, and the recent municipal elections resulted in the significant loss of a conservative majority and the green party is now the main party in Hythe and surrounding area. I feel it is was an undemocratic decision to start the process of proposing to build a new town in the district before the idea was put to the local electorate, and undermines local democracy. I for one previously voted conservative, but not this time, not because of failings over Brexit but because of local issues like this.</p> <p>I hope the new council and planning committee refuse this application and take a different approach to the future growth of the district. If this is to be allowed it should be on a much smaller scale and all the impacts properly assessed.</p>	
59.	Wendy Priestley	24/05/2019	<p>I write to let you know that I share the general local opinion that the ironically named "Otterpool" project is another David Monk vanity project that has got out of hand. It has nothing whatsoever to do with councillors' constitutional duty to represent the interests of their constituents - in fact it is causing fear and distress locally: It will undoubtedly lead to eventual overload and expansion of local roads such as Stone Street and the use of local roads as rat runs. The destruction of SSSIs and the foothills of the Downs will be inevitable and the rural character of the area, so prized by local constituents, will be destroyed. Meanwhile Folkestone is in desperate need of regeneration and both Hythe and Folkestone will suffer, as our locale loses all its attraction for tourists. This project is about lining councillors' pockets, catering to their business cronies, and is widely perceived as thoroughly corrupt.</p>	LPA24

Consultation responses table  
Otterpool Y19/0257/FH

60.	Ms K Cook (x 2)	24/05/2019 06/06/2019	<p>(1) 24/05/2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sellindge is in desperate need of a bypass should this development go ahead.</li> <li>When the motorway is closed and all the traffic comes through the village, as a resident I cannot leave the house. I cannot get off my drive let alone get back to my home. With an increase in traffic at peak times this will have the same impact.</li> <li>Increase in traffic will have an impact on the air quality and already my daughter and a neighbour's child has to use their asthma pumps more when the motorway is shut. The railway bridges are a bottle neck so with more traffic waiting to get through the village the pollution and ability to actually get off my drive will be impossible.</li> <li>Speeding traffic is a problem at Barrow Hill which no one will address, the 30 mile and hour limit has had no impact and motorbikes have been seen to be doing wheelies along the A20. You say Barrow Hill won't be affected by this development and it isn't important enough to consider any work at Barrow Hill but what about all the residents that came here to enjoy this area. Infact my buyer for my home from London withdrew his offer when he attended your event to view the development. I needed to move to a bungalow for my health but am now stuck here.</li> <li>Please don't think your proposed plan doesn't impact us because it very clearly does and we need to be heard too.</li> </ul> <p>(2) 06/06/2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are way too many houses planned for the area. Kent has built more than its fair share of housing estates, it will no longer be known as the Garden of England. Sellindge and Lympne will no longer be villages but will merge together to be one huge development. Our village life, history, wildlife, green spaces, trees will all be lost. This is at a time when we are officially in a climate crisis.</li> <li>Water/electric/gas networks have no extra capacity and would require high cost upgrades to service the new development which will put a further load on the network.</li> <li>This development will attract thousands of extra cars, causing so much more traffic congestion and danger to local residents. Local roads cannot deal with much more traffic. The M20 and A20 are already very busy and quite often at a stand still. Add a whole extra new town and it will be chaos. Local services (hospitals/doctors) are already struggling with lengthy waiting times. The William Harvey hospital will not cope with thousands of extra patients.</li> </ul>	LPA27
61.	Ms Jaqueline Corner	24/05/2019		LPA29
62.	Mr Dick Roberts	24/05/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would like to register my objections to your proposed Otterpool development.</li> <li>The damage to our landscape, the environment and wildlife habitats would be catastrophic and irreversible There is not enough infrastructure (hospitals, schools etc) to make the project viable</li> <li>Such a large development will unsettle the balance of population in the Folkestone area for years to come. You do not know what problems will arise and so your proposal is reckless.</li> </ul>	LPA30
63.	Ms Debbie Burton	24/05/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The whole plan is way too large, wiping out an unbelievably huge swathe of countryside which we will be gone forever. Wildlife and their habitats will be wiped out in this vast space.</li> <li>I was shocked to see Affinity Water's own prediction on the water supply, with demand set to outstrip supply in 2045, before the development is even finished. It is lunacy to jeopardise our valuable water supply in this way and put all our existing local communities at risk.</li> <li>The William Harvey hospital is already overstretched and no plans for another to cope with the additional inevitable need. I was given no reassurance at the consultation that we will have anywhere near enough</li> </ul>	LPA31

Consultation responses table  
Otterpool Y19/0257/FH

			<p>hospital beds. There was no indication at what stage any type of healthcare facility would be completed on the proposed site either.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are far too many homes planned. If there must be any, all should true zero carbon, with a view to sustainability. If Bicester can do it, so should FHDC.</li> <li>• The resulting increase in traffic on the surrounding infrastructure is unacceptable. This will cause problems locally, but also more widely in Kent. There will be additional air, noise and light pollution.</li> <li>• I am concerned that the 'promises and assurances' made at the consultation will be forgotten when it comes to paying for them. We will then be unable to stop any kind of atrocious building and development. FHDC should be helping to protect the Garden of England, not actively destroying it, which is what this development would help to do.</li> </ul>	
64.	Mr Peter Trow	24/05/2019	Full details on file - Objection	LPA32
65.	Mr & Mrs Finch	24/05/2019	<p>I object to this proposal as we do not think that any of these houses are needed. There has been considerable number of houses built in Folkestone .Ashford has had thousands of houses built which is spilling into the countryside. We only need one major computer town and that is Ashford.</p> <p>Also there is no industry down here so where are the jobs? You will make it into another computer town for London which is not good for the community. It will ruin our countryside as it is built on such a big area also will cause major disruption over the next 30 years and bring too much traffic and pollution.</p> <p>This area is largely retired people there are no jobs.</p>	LPA26
66.	Ms Julie Channer	24/05/2019	Lodge support	LPA28
67.	J P Hannah	24/05/2019	Full details on file - Objection	
68.	Mr John Langman	24/05/2019	<p>[objector's house] 3.58m apart which is the closest gap between two houses in this part of Cliff Road. Therefore the proposed two storey extension which appears to extend 4m along our boundary in front of our property {not the 2m mentioned in the report) could make the angle of view diverge from the 45 degrees allowed. No other house in Cliff Road suffers anything like a 45 degree restriction to their view which is why Cliff Road is such an Area of Special Character.</p> <p>Both The Junipers and Heatherlea are chalet bungalows so any over development would dwarf the surrounding properties. It appears that the proposed garage will be built below existing ground level meaning that there will be quite a bit of excavation necessary to accommodate the new drive. The magnificent specimen of Black Pine in the southwest corner of the plot will inevitably have part of its root system cut which could damage and untablise the tree.</p>	LPA33
69.	Mr Ian White	24/05/2019	<p>The plan's transport assessment presents great detail and forecasts of traffic flows and junction utilisation, to future saturation in some instances. It appears to disregard the present discomfort to residents on through routes. Various actions in mitigation are referred to.</p> <p>Having considered the plans my unpleasant image is of an area as heavily trafficked and slow moving as the A20 at its western end, on the outskirts of London, with traffic using unsuitable roads to dodge delaying controls. At present the unclassified and unsuitable through roads of Lympne and West Hythe, particularly Lympne Hill, suffer considerable use as a rat run between the M20 and the A259 for settlements along the coast road. The incentive is avoidance of delays on the heavily used A261 and A259, close to Hythe, which poorly distribute their demands.</p>	LPA107

			<p>A Hythe bypass has in the past been considered, its worth acknowledged long before Otterpool Park. Please, in the very different situation of the Otterpool Park proposal, let it be considered a fundamental requirement. Deny Otterpool Park without, as a minimum, construction of an additional Hythe/A259 to M20 western link road, providing a route appropriate to, and safe for, the traffic generated by the all the permitted developments of the Hythe and Romney Marsh area in addition to Otterpool Park. Let that be accompanied by prohibitions, such as 6' 6" width and 2 tonne weight limits, for the roads of Lympe, surrounding, and similarly affected areas to prevent further deterioration of their residents' environment, safety and health. Small recompense for endurance of a neighbour as dominant as Otterpool Park.</p> <p>Ideally no Otterpool Park, but please no Otterpool Park without all necessary infrastructure throughout the area, in advance.</p>	
70.	Mr Leo Craig	24/05/2019	<p>I strongly object to the Otterpool garden Town proposal, based on the number of houses the road infrastructure could not cope, specifically the M20 and the M2 including the kent section of the M25 and Dartford crossing. There are already consistent delays during rush hour periods on all these motorways adding 12000 homes with an average of 2 cars per home (no people won't be cycling or using public transport, this a utopian dream) SE kent is already building more homes that will continue to pressure on the highways, Developments In Sturry, Canterbury, Preston, Herne Bay, Faversham, Thannington without, and Ashford all of which are significant developments, that will increase the existing pressure on Kents road network. The M2 and M20 are main thoroughfares for the Dover ports which are growing and the Channel tunnel. Otterpool will be the straw that breaks the camels back. KCC and the highways agency cannot keep up with maintaining the current road network, let alone with the impact that pending new developments will do, Otterpool is not wanted nor needed. It will destroy green space and the associated wildlife, it will living in Lympe, Sellindge and surrounding areas a transport hell. This not even looking at the impact of utilities such as the supply of fresh water in Kent, and NO a desalination plant is not the solution. Kent is a natural resource, stop building on it. Reject the application in its entirety.</p>	LPA04
71.	Mrs Margaret Cooper	24/05/2019	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1/I was hoping for a Sellindge bypass but this seems to have been ruled out?</li> <li>2. 2/No traffic calming on the A20 at Barrow Hill</li> <li>3. 3/No traffic controls to stop HGVs travelling through Sellindge</li> <li>4. 4/ primary road Newingreen-Otterpool Lane will not take HGVs</li> <li>5. 5/developers no long recommending junction 11 as it cannot cope with proposed increases in traffic</li> <li>6. 6/No cycle path or pavement improvements along A20</li> <li>7. 7/No section 106 funding even though Sellindge will be severely impacted by the development</li> <li>8. 8/Huge implication on the health of local people, no air quality testing has been done</li> <li>9. 9/huge development like this should not be allowed on agricultural land.</li> <li>10.10/ this development is not needed in this area, it only serves to "infill" between small villages which will lose their individual identities. Please stop this now and invest our money wisely in an area where this amount of housing is truly needed.</li> </ol>	LPA93
72.	Mr Marc Scott	24/05/2019	<p>I object to the planning application on the grounds that I do not believe it will be beneficial to the local community as the planners suggest. The infrastructure will not be able to cope with the extra traffic. If the M20 is blocked or congested and the traffic is re routed to the A20 it simply cannot cope as recently demonstrated during operation Brock.</p> <p>The environmental impact is huge and consumes a large amount of green space and is an obvious threat to wildlife. It will be a blot surrounding an existing area of natural beauty.</p> <p>Both the increased traffic and the loss of trees will contribute to poor air quality.</p> <p>The alleged consultation has been very vague in content. For example the proposed development map hasn't changed since the initial consultation. What does it really mean, and how will it directly impact on the local community? I have been unable to ascertain what impact it will have on my own property and outlook, never mind the social and environmental impact on the local community.</p>	LPA175



			From what I have been able to decipher it would appear that the developers key interests are primarily profit. To conclude I believe the consultation has been poor. The communication has been repetitive and vague. Consultations have been held in places like Western hanger Castle, where people without their own transport were unlikely to attend. Persons whom are elderly, disabled or without public transport were likely to be under represented. How was this a public consultation?	
73.	Mrs Anthea Craig	24/05/2019	We moved to Lympe from Canterbury due to the very fact that Canterbury City Council has allowed developers to ruin a lovely city by building houses in every possible space and field in the surrounding areas. There is never any consideration or forward planning for increasing the infrastructure such as better roads/access/schools/hospitals/GP services, the planners/developers only think about how much money they can make. The areas cannot cope currently with the capacity of people/traffic, our roads are clogged up most of the time, it takes forever to get from A to B and we have GP practices/hospitals struggling to support and care adequately for the population in the area. How do they think the area will cope with more people and traffic! it simply won't, you will not be able to get your children into a local school, you certainly won't get a GP appointment and as for the hospitals, no chance. And then there's the wildlife... there won't be any, it cannot survive in such built-up areas. Please don't ruin another area.	LPA05
74.	Mr Barry Martyn	24/05/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no local demand for 12,000 homes</li> <li>• There are no local jobs to support this increase in local population</li> <li>• The local road network can barely support the current level of traffic. Another 20,000 or so cars will cause gridlock.</li> <li>• I like most people in the area moved here to be in the countryside not part of an urban sprawl that seems to be attempting to join Folkestone and Ashford together.</li> <li>• There is no benefit to the local community whatsoever from this proposal</li> </ul>	LPA163
75.	Mrs Caroline De La Rue	24/05/2019	<p>A new town of 10,000 homes, 40,000 plus inhabitants, and around 25,000 cars will have a massively detrimental impact on the local environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased pollution from car fumes</li> <li>- More traffic on our already busy local roads and M20</li> <li>- SE Kent has a water shortage problem. With increasingly warmer and dryer seasons, a new town in this region is irresponsible - Waste disposal is already a problem for existing householders and cars have to queue to use the few facilities available.</li> </ul> <p>Social facilities for the local people in this region are already under pressure, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very limited employment opportunities</li> <li>• More people will therefore be forced to commute to the bigger towns (causing pollution, congested roads)</li> <li>• There is a severe shortage of GPs in this area who are reluctant to move here from other parts of the UK</li> <li>• Limited further education opportunities</li> </ul> <p>Such a large-scale housing development would be better located around Ashford where there is already a high-speed rail station, a hospital, better infrastructure in place and far greater employment opportunities.</p>	LPA54
76.	Mr John Burrows	25/05/2019	<p>The council agreed to buy the 357 acres of Otterpool Manor Farm and paid £5.2 million. The area would be designated as agricultural land and would be tenanted and managed to give the council an income. The change of intention regarding the site is truly reflected in the application.</p> <p>We now have a proposal for a development on this land of approximately 10,000 homes with approximately 20,000 extra people in the area. The 20,000 odd more vehicles on our roads will cause more pollution and congestion to our currently overcrowded rural roads, which are unsuitable or not able to be improved to cope with this degree of traffic.</p> <p>This proposal is not locally supported and is in fact actively opposed.</p>	LPA06

			<p>Healthcare: Doctor's surgeries are already overcrowded with Doctor's appointments becoming almost impossible to obtain. The problem is the lack of suitably qualified healthcare officials to man the current facilities.</p> <p>Potable Water: The potable water supply in excess of 1500 units will require a new water main at great expense.</p> <p>Waste Water: The current infrastructure has capacity only for an additional 325 units. Any number above that will require a treatment process upgrade.</p> <p>Electricity: The existing power network has the capacity to serve the first 650 properties. A network upgrade will therefore be necessary costing some £8.5 million. Because gas may not be available, a connection to the higher voltage system may be necessary which is currently uncoded.</p> <p>Transport: Whilst the principal of cycle paths and pedestrian walkways is applauded, rural living usually means the use of one car per additional person! Trains: Westenhanger station is the choice for upgrading. The site is not adequate for current useage and no agreement has been reached to upgrade it.</p> <p>Busses: the documentation is unclear with words like "likely", and "might consider".</p> <p>Summary: This plan for a new town is unsustainable and badly thought out. I oppose the plan for the New Otterpool Town.</p>	
77.	Ms Allison Willcocks	25/05/2019	<p>Fundamentally we need more housing in our area but it needs to be largely social housing, self build plots and housing that local people can afford. Houses that cost in excess of £200,000 are beyond the means of the majority of people in Shepway who would like to own their own property. For those who are unable to buy a property more social housing is required. The specific plans for Otterpool do not provide an answer to the local housing needs,. The environmental impacts need better assessing to avoid destroying local wildlife habitat. The traffic plan proposed makes little sense and the phasing also seems to be badly thought through.</p>	LPA108
78.	Mrs Rosemary Holroyd	25/05/2019 26/06/2019	<p>(1) 25/05/2019 I wholehearted object in full to this Otterpool Park. It is disgusting and extremely short-sighted to destroy valuable farmland. Where is our food going to come from if the whole country follows this desecration? What about our wildlife; the nesting pair of birds of prey, rare newts and other species, all known to be in the proposed area? Some may say that the people living in this area are being selfish in objecting to more housing on farmland. This is pure ignorance. We have worked extremely hard to be able to afford to live in this area. Is it wrong for us to want to continue to enjoy the clean air of the countryside? Your report has openly admitted that the building works will cause air pollution and this, and the major disruptions, will go on for years, probably the rest of a lot of our lives. And for what? The idea for new house building was to provide affordable housed for people to live in. I have heard that the 'powers that be' consider 300K affordable! How ridiculous! Some might say that if we don't like it then move. I say to that, despite having been born and brought up in Stanford, my partner in Sellindge, yes please let me out of here. Do you know what's stopping us? We can't sell our house! We had it on the market until recently and nobody wanted to buy it. We had one offer which was an insulting and upsetting 80-100K below the full market value.</p> <p>(2) 26/06/2019 It is disgusting and extremely short-sighted to destroy valuable farmland. Where is our food going to come from if the whole country follows this desecration? What about our wildlife; the nesting pair of birds of prey, rare newts and other species, all known to be in the proposed area? Some may say that the people living in this area are being selfish in objecting to more housing on farmland. This is pure ignorance. We have worked extremely hard to be able to afford to live in this area. Is it wrong for us to want to continue to enjoy the clean air of the countryside? Your report has openly admitted that the building works will cause air pollution and this, and the major disruptions, will go on for years, probably the rest of a lot of our lives.</p>	LPA73

			<p>And for what? The idea for new house building was to provide affordable housed for people to live in. I have heard that the 'powers that be' consider 300K affordable! How ridiculous!</p> <p>Some might say that if we don't like it then move. I say to that, despite having been born and brought up in Stanford, my partner in Sellindge, yes please let me out of here. Do you know what's stopping us? We can't sell our house! We had it on the market until recently and nobody wanted to buy it. We had one offer which was an insulting and upsetting 80-1 OOK below the full market value.</p>	
79.	Mrs Pamela Keeling	25/05/2019	Core strategy 2013 Policy SS3 directs development towards previously developed land. It is difficult to see how this aligns with the plans for Otterpool	LPA97
80.	Mr John Holliday	25/05/2019	<p>I strongly object to the Otterpool Park planning application for following reasons.</p> <p>First and foremost it is the scale of the development which is far too big and not required. It encroaches 5 villages making it one large urban sprawl and will bring the problems that huge housing estates bring i.e. crime and anti social behaviour.</p> <p>Roads: The developer and FHDC have made no consideration of the volume of traffic already using the A20 thru Sellinge. This is the main relief road when there are incidents causing closures of the M20. This appears to me to be a major flaw in the application. Living on Barrow Hill we have had first hand experience of the motorway being closed and traffic diverted thru the village. According to the plans no traffic calming procedures are being considered to ease the situation. of the future extra traffic. There is no way this can possibly go ahead without the option of a bypass.</p> <p>Local amenities: The developer and council have given very little thought, if any, to local doctors and hospital which already can't cope with the volume of people we have now. It is totally absurd to think an additional 10,000 homes is acceptable in an already overpopulated area of East Kent.</p> <p>With regard to the consultations, we have attended them all and at every one the goal posts are moved. FHDC have not been transparent from day 1. Cozumel Estates we know only have a n interest in profit and getting richer quicker whereas you would hope FHDC would have more interest in the wellbeing of the 5 villages this will affect. On the above basis and the comments made by local residents this application needs serious reconsideration. NO TO OTTERPOOL PARK .</p>	LPA44
81.	Mr Noel Sergeant	25/05/2019	<p>I am writing to say that I strongly object to the current planning application for Otterpool which would basically destroy the local area. In your endeavor to build 'A place in the countryside' you are quite willing to sacrifice the local countryside itself and the villages amongst it in order to so.</p> <p>I know there is a need to build more houses, but this development is just too large for such a small area. The local roads, as you well know, will not be able to cope with the massive upsurge in traffic. What do you think that is going to do to Lympne and Sellinge? Take a wild guess. 8,500 homes, plus shops, restaurants, hotels etc, etc is going to bring in well over 14,000 cars - and that's a conservative estimate. Even if just a fraction of those go up Stone St every day it will cause permanent gridlock. And worse of all is that you are not even proposing any solution to this - other than you hope most people will walk. Really?</p> <p>And where are these lucky 8,500 families coming from? Will they be local or, more likely, will they be from London? We really don't mind our lives being totally blighted so some Londoners can find a relatively cheap home in what was once was really nice countryside. You promise lots of 'green areas'. What's the betting that they get scaled back?</p>	LPA01

			<p>This has nothing to do with 'Nimbyism'. I would fully support a much smaller development of a few hundred properties - but of course this would mean much smaller profits for you and the developer. Just what are your priorities? Us locals are certainly way at the bottom of the list.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that you read all these comments to get a flavour of the anger and frustration that we, the locals, all have. Others had shown their feeling much more eloquently than I ever could and I agree with them entirely. This is an ill-conceived project that will be to our detriment for many years to come. You will blight our local area for ever and we will no longer be living in an AONB.</p>	
82.	Miss Kelly Cartmale	26/05/2019	<p>I strongly oppose the Otterpool development due to concerns about air quality testing and traffic through Sellindge. It's been made clear that the development will not recommend junction 11 but junction 10 for access, leading to a suggested increase of traffic of up to 20% through Sellindge. This is an estimate, and will mean an additional 1600 cars per hour. Therefore, even as a realistic number this will have huge impacts on the village with pollution levels rising significantly. No air quality testing has been conducted in Sellindge, and no traffic calming has been suggested. It seems clear that current residents are unlikely to benefit from the new development. Furthermore, I have concerns regarding the services the development will be able to offer. Even with new doctors surgeries and schools proposed, the area suffers from teacher and healthcare professional shortages.</p>	LPA109
83.	Mr Daniel Keeling	26/05/2019	<p>The documents are not attached to the planning application just referenced, this means that the documents are not controlled and could be modified at any stage. Approval of the planning application must mean approval of all documents which then cannot be modified. Compliance with this application also needs to be enforced , how do the council intend to ensure compliance</p> <p>Planning and Delivery Statement Clause 9.3 and 9.4 According to the data submitted there are 3850 jobs to be created in Use Class B1 and B2 , other jobs are supporting the community. The commercial jobs are more likely to be highly skilled but represents only 1 for every 2 households (3850/8500). There are planned to be 5200 homes for sale but the cost of a property is likely to be around £200,000 (<a href="http://GOV.UK">GOV.UK</a>) and the salary in Folkestone is £21,000, a ratio of almost 10 and building societies will not lend on this basis The houses will not be able to be sold to locals currently resident in Folkestone and Hythe or newly resident and working in Otterpool. There is a need to ensure salaries and house prices are balanced</p> <p>Planning and Delivery Statement Clause 1.7,4.9,4.13 and throughout The Core strategy 2013 (the latest approved) does not mention Otterpool and achieves the housing targets. The revised core strategy has not been approved and to base this submission on an unapproved document is unsound</p> <p>Economic Statement This gives the positive effects for Otterpool but fails to mention the negative effects on the surrounding area. East folkestone is a deprived area, Otterpool will be more attractive and draw the more affluent houtholds from East Folkestone Retail in Folkestone will suffer as money is drawn towards Otterpool and on to Ashford Train services will take longer from Folkestone and beyond if there are extra stops at Westenhanger</p> <p>Housing Strategy There is nothing in here comparing wages/salaries with the price of houses. The document may justify need but if they cant be paid for then they won't be built</p>	LPA98

84.	Mrs Fiona Jarvest	26/05/2019	<p>I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THESE PROPOSALS. Another town is not needed! Ashford and Folkestone are both developing with many residential properties being built in the area. 8,500 homes = around 21,000 additional cars + business vehicles. Cycle and footpaths for people to use for school and work look pretty but in reality cars will be the main transport. Local roads will not cope with the huge increase in traffic. Lympne is already becoming a "rat-run" for existing new development, and any sense of peace and tranquility will be destroyed.</p> <p>Lympne Airfield has always been part of Lympne village, and plans to build on part of it, leaving a small "buffer zone" separating the village is unrealistic. Lympne will become absorbed by the town. Lympne Airfield is a highly important part of our heritage and should be preserved, not further developed. Throughout its operational years it has played a major part in the early development of aviation, before, during, between and after both World Wars. This should be preserved and celebrated, not destroyed and built on.</p> <p>The proposed dual carriageway from Jcn 11 to Newingreen will feed into minor roads through Lympne, to Hythe and Sellindge causing major congestion, noise, associated accidents and stress. Sellindge will suffer with increased heavy traffic through a village where the road has already been narrowed by new housing dev.</p> <p>Water is a major issue and the plan to bring water from the Paddlesworth reservoir will put an increased strain on the whole district in what are expected to be increasingly dry conditions.</p> <p>One medical centre is proposed for the whole town of what will be about 22,000 people. Local hospitals are already under overwhelming stress, with reduced staffing levels, and the population is increasing with the high level of housebuilding already taking place across the area; where are all these people to be treated when needing a hospital rather than a medical centre?</p> <p>NO TO OTTERPOOL PARK!</p>	LPA59
85.	Mr John Stevens	26/05/2019 26/06/2019	<p>(1) 26/05/2019 Otterpool Development We do not need or want this town This commuter town is being forced upon the local community. The people of the district were led by our council to believe, when the land was purchased, that it was an investment in farmland. There has been obfuscation ever since and we are still being told that it is a town for local people not a commuter dormitory town. The council needs to stop regarding local people as simpletons. This flawed and grandiose project will be a burden on the people of this area and will contribute to the impending ecological disaster. This town is not needed or wanted locally. The people of this area will gain little from it. The main beneficiaries will be the land speculating partners of the district council. The rate payers of the area will be left with providing the upkeep and infrastructure long after the partners have taken their profits. We have been constantly told that this town will provide housing for people of the local area. It is perfectly obvious that the predilection here is for people with highly paid jobs in London rather than local people. So far, the choice of builders that the council have encouraged in this area can at best be described as unimaginative. It does not bode well for any decent standard of architecture or build quality on this project. I envisage a massive housing estate. There are several other things that need to be taken into consideration regarding the exploitation of this land. I dispute that it is owned by the district council and consider it owned by the people of the Folkestone and Hythe district. I am told that in order to start to extract value from the project that the first three hundred houses [300] will be supplied with gas heating as the electricity grid is not in place to serve them. I can see no reason why , if it has to go ahead, they cannot wait until an ecologically sound energy supply is in place. I understand that there are also problems supplying other services.TBC</p>	LPA60

			<p>(2) 26/06/2019</p> <p>This commuter town is being forced upon the local community.</p> <p>The people of the district were led by our council to believe, when the land was purchased, that it was an investment in farmland. There has been obfuscation ever since and we are still being told that it is a town for local people not a commuter dormitory town.</p> <p>The council needs to stop regarding local people as simpletons.</p> <p>This flawed and grandiose project will be a burden on the people of this area and will contribute to the impending ecological disaster.</p> <p>This town is not needed or wanted locally. The people of this area will gain little from it.</p> <p>The main beneficiaries will be the land speculating partners of the district council.</p> <p>The rate payers of the area will be left with providing the upkeep and infrastructure long after the partners have taken their profits.</p> <p>We have been constantly told that this town will provide housing for people of the local area. It is perfectly obvious that the predilection here is for people with highly paid jobs in London rather than local people.</p> <p>So far, the choice of builders that the council have encouraged in this area can at best be described as unimaginative.</p> <p>It does not bode well for any decent standard of architecture or build quality on this project.</p> <p>I envisage a massive housing estate.</p> <p>There are several other things that need to be taken into consideration regarding the exploitation of this land.</p> <p>I dispute that it is owned by the district council and consider it owned by the people of the Folkestone and Hythe district.</p> <p>I am told that in order to start to extract value from the project that the first three hundred houses [300] will be supplied with gas heating as the electricity grid is not in place to serve them.</p> <p>I can see no reason why, if it has to go ahead, they cannot wait until an ecologically sound energy supply is in place. I understand that there are also problems supplying other services such as water and sewage.</p> <p>The burden of providing these will fall on local rate payers as will that of providing medical facilities and schools.</p> <p>I am very much against this project.</p> <p>It has the smell of hubris about it.</p> <p>It is an artificial construct which, in the race to create added value, will present us with an architectural eyesore. It was supposed to be a community lead project.</p> <p>It appears that the FHDC has been lead into it by their land speculator partners and we the community are forced to follow.</p> <p>It is a project that com modifies our countryside and contributes to the environmental disaster that is unfolding in front of us.</p>	
86.	Mrs Bernadette Tyrrell	26/05/2019	<p>I strongly oppose this development for many reasons, the main one being our simple, quiet village of Lypne being swallowed up by this massive town! It will certainly put the price down for our property which will impact us moving completely out of the area!</p> <p>I do appreciate that there is a need for houses but couldn't this be done by existing towns such as Ashford, Maidstone? Anyway, I have a long list to state my reasons why but I'll just list some of them:-</p>	LPA62

			<p>Increase of traffic on the already busy M20 Increase of pollution levels Lack of water Stess on existing infrastructure Noise pollution</p>	
87.	Mr Richard Barnes	26/05/2019	<p>This application should not be approved for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate consideration seems to have been given to extraction of water for this development on an already stretched and likely reduction in levels of ground water and aquifers supply. Council suggestions of a desalination plant are ill considered and financially a non-starter for the council. Private developers will not countenance such an outlay.</li> <li>• Inadequate consideration given to provision drainage and sewage treatment. Recent smaller developments have shown that the system cannot come sufficiently with current demand.</li> <li>• Inadequate consideration given to healthcare, both community and hospital, and educational needs for a large influx of residents. The existing systems are already under strain and current plans will not provide sufficient additional services.</li> <li>• No consideration given to the reduction in quality of environment and safety to local habitations. Traffic in Sellindge will be expected to increase by 1600 vehicles per hour at a minimum. The village already suffers from barely tolerable levels of HGV noise and vibration day and night. No provisions are planned for traffic calming or cycle paths. No air quality testing has been carried out in Sellindge.</li> <li>• The expectation of house pricing will lead to additional residents coming into the county, not relieving the perceived shortage of housing for borough or even east Kent residents. Thus the strain on existing infrastructures will only increase.</li> </ul>	LPA63
88.	Mrs Kerry Boyland-Wood	26/05/2019	<p>Dear Mr Farrar, there are many reason why this development should not be allowed to go ahead. This area of the South East is being decimated by continuous development, all our open spaces are being eroded away, we are losing our wildlife, clean fresh air, we are being blighted by more traffic and this is in addition to the huge cost of it all to the public purse, the infrastructure costs alone run into millions/billions. Whilst it is said that there is a need for housing why can't other areas be identified, why is Kent being hit so hard? They don't make land anymore, once its gone its gone! We live in such a beautiful area, please keep it that way.</p>	LPA19
89.	Mr Martin Carden	26/05/2019	<p>I object to the proposed Otterpool development for the following points. - Loss of nature habitat and the disturbance to all that live in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The transport system cannot cope very well now so with the extra traffic whether this is directed along the M20 or A20 won't make any difference it will be gridlocked</li> <li>• The south east is an extremely dry area and there is just not enough water to meet the demands even if it piped from elsewhere and grey water for flushing toilets. The cost of duel pipes and bringing water from elsewhere has been tried in other projects but has not worked and has been found to be cost prohibitive</li> <li>• Loss of productive land which is currently used to feed people</li> <li>• The health system cannot cope now with hospital and doctors now so more population would bring more pressure</li> <li>• Air quality will suffer which would lead to health complications - General disruption for the next 30 years</li> <li>• Negative impact as the proposed development would be out of proportion to the surrounding small towns and villages.</li> <li>• The employment opportunities talked about are pie in the sky</li> <li>• Once the concrete has been laid it's too late as you can't say we made a mistake</li> </ul>	LPA101

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The former airfield has fuel contamination from the 2nd world war in the soil so would have to be decontaminated and there are probably unexploded ordinance so this would also have to deal with.</li> <li>The loss of history as once the area is concreted over. The area was an important route to Canterbury and roman remains have already been discovered locally.</li> </ul>	
90.	Miss Natalie Wyborn	26/05/2019	<p>I strongly object to this application, as I feel that it is destroying the countryside with a proposal of far too many houses. Amongst other major issues, this will have a big environmental impact. We already have too many lorries in the area, with additional construction traffic there will be a lot of pollution. As well as this the proposed road system will not be able to cope with all the extra traffic.</p> <p>I strongly disagree with Otterpool Park and think it will completely ruin such a lovely green area!</p>	LPA64
91.	Mr Paul Wyborn	26/05/2019 26/06/2019	<p>(1) 26/05/2019 I most strongly object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p><b>Environmental Impact</b> We already have too many lorries/HGVs in the area. Add to what we already have will be additional construction traffic, additional pollution from the new lorry park in Stanford (how can you have so many residential houses so close to so many lorries giving off exhaust fumes + their refrigeration units. It has been shown how people especially the young can be affected by such pollution). The proposed road system will not be able to cope with the extra envisaged traffic.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure overload.</b> Hospitals etc are already overloaded with people having to travel from places like Canterbury to William Harvey and Margate accident centres etc. Add to that an additional town (Otterpool) - I believe that the NHS will collapse in this area. Additional water supply (the water board/table) strain. I also believe that other proposed facilities are not enough for so many houses.</p> <p><b>Too Many Houses</b> The proposal is for far too many houses</p> <p><b>Nature Impact</b> We have already seen how such developments have ruined the countryside (look at Hawkinge). Why are green sites being destroyed, surely there are enough brown sites to be utilised before we start on the green sites.</p> <p><b>Employment</b> Where is the employment opportunities for so many residents in this area. I think that Holiday Extras is the only large employer in the area.</p> <p>(2) 26/06/2019 <b>Environmental Impact</b> We already have too many lorries/HGVs in the area. Add to what we already have will be additional construction traffic, additional pollution from the new lorry park in Stanford (how can you have so many residential houses so close to so many lorries giving off exhaust fumes+ their refrigeration units. It has been shown how people especially the young can be affected by such pollution). The proposed road system will not be able to cope with the extra envisaged traffic. <b>Infrastructure overload.</b></p>	LPA20



			<p>Hospitals etc are already overloaded with people having to travel from places like Canterbury to William Harvey and Margate accident centres etc. Add to that an additional town (Otterpool) - I believe that the NHS will collapse in this area.</p> <p>Additional water supply (the water board/table) strain. I also believe that other proposed facilities are not enough for so many houses.</p> <p>Too Many Houses The proposal is for far too many houses</p> <p>Nature Impact We have already seen how such developments have ruined the countryside (look at Hawkinge). Why are green sites being destroyed, surely there are enough brown sites to be utilised before we start on the green sites.</p> <p>Employment Where is the employment opportunities for so many residents in this area. I think that Holiday Extras is the only large employer in the area.</p>	
92.	Mrs Elizabeth Benson	26/05/2019	<p>I would like to object to the Otterpool New Town proposal as it will adversely effect the area in which I live. Currently traffic is at times an issue, particularly now with the ridiculous road width reductions and no bus lay-bys as it can be difficult for wide loads to pass, for vehicles to overtake the busses that stop for passengers, and problematic for cyclists in heavy 2 way traffic. The buses do not run frequently, or late, which will increase the traffic on the road as, in the new proposal, the road stops short of Harringe Lane which, if continued, could alleviate some of the congestion in Sellindge. When the M20 shuts for a variety of reasons then all the traffic is diverted along the A20 through this area which again will cause traffic problems for the New Town. Another traffic consideration is the bridge under the railway is only a single lane requiring lights which is a bottle neck at times and this will be worse with more traffic for Otterpool Park. When there are issues on the A20 I have witnessed the fact that emergency vehicle struggle to make reasonable progress due to the congestion. I believe the new development will have an adverse effect on medical provision in the area as it is currently very difficult to get a timely doctors appointment due to recruitment so adding more medical facilities will not solve this issue. We moved to Sellindge to be in a village but the new development will mean that we become a suburb of the new town and this will therefore have a detrimental effect on the character of the local area. It will also have a negative visual impact on the landscape around Barrow Hill as there will be building on what is currently green fields. I also believe that there will be a noise impact which will effect wildlife and birds visiting the area and reduce the enjoyment of being outside in our own gardens as the plans put the New Town too close to existing properties. Water will also be an issue as people use &gt;90l per day.</p>	LPA67
93.	Mr Alastair Holt	27/05/2019	<p>Existing Settlements.</p> <p>The Garden City principles make reference to the provision of generous green space, including surrounding the area of development with a belt of countryside to prevent unplanned sprawl. The strategic location for this new town is poor because it is too close to Ashford which is being developed on a large scale. This creates a number of problems for the new settlement.</p> <p>Ashford is situated very close to Otterpool and has a well developed economy which means that people will commute into Ashford to work. It will be more difficult and take longer for Otterpool to develop employment opportunities.</p> <p>There is the risk that in the future, urban development along the M20 corridor will result in Otterpool and Ashford becoming one conurbation. Of particular concern with this application is that there is no surrounding belt of countryside to distinguish the new settlement from the existing settlements of Westenhanger, Newingreen and Barrowhill, Sellindge. The clear sense of identity for the new settlement is not helped by the proposal to build part of 'phase 1' closer to Sellindge than to the new town centre. Unfortunately the sense of identity that Westenhanger and Newingreen currently enjoy will be lost. There is also a high risk that Barrowhill and ultimately Sellindge and Lympe will lose their identity.</p>	LPA157

		<p>While the buffer around Lypne is welcomed, it is unclear why coalescence with Lypne is to be avoided while coalescence with Westenhanger and Barrowhill, Sellindge is not addressed to the same extent. These other communities should have equal protection/separation from the new settlement. Westenhanger also loses out because the new town will completely block out its rural setting and views. The development should consider other forms of mitigation such as offering to purchase these properties.</p> <p>Water.</p> <p>The Environment Agency classifies the area as "seriously stressed". Therefore with such a large development it is only a question of time until there is a severe water shortage. The proposals are vague about the water-efficiency measures. Even at this stage of the planning process, because water is so fundamental, there needs to be a clear design statement detailing how the 90litre/dayl maximum amount will be achieved.</p> <p>Landscaping.</p> <p>The ground south of the A20 rises approximately 30 metres in height. This is a very important aspect of the site. When the development is viewed from the North and particularly from the AONB this landscape feature is very prominent. The current proposal are weak in dealing with this. The visualisation photograph taken from the Downs clearly shows a massive brown blob of housing on this hillside. The landscaping and minor roads ideally need to follow the contours or be aligned with a strong North-west to South-east bias.</p> <p>Biodiversity.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement states: "there will be an approximate 20% increase in biodiversity value overall." This is a misleading statement, for it implies that biodiversity will increase. Biodiversity will decrease. It is important to note that the developers have modelled a 20% unit increase in the biodiversity metric. However that does not mean that the number of species will increase. The number of species will fall. This is stated in the appendix where details of individual species that will be lost are given. Housing now accounts for the biggest decline in species in the South-east. Large greenfield developments, such as this one, being the biggest drivers for local extinctions.</p> <p>The off site mitigation will not increase biodiversity because the species are likely to be already present at the site chosen. Species like the Brown Hare, Barn Owl and Common Partridge are very difficult to successfully mitigate. However the mitigation should result in higher species population density, although this is often difficult to achieve. If the mitigation is in the form of payments then the increase in species population may only last as long as the payments are made.</p> <p>The document also states: "there is a demonstrable nett gain to biodiversity." This is erroneous statement.</p> <p>Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The proposal aspires to conform to the Kent BAP and the to the Mid Kent Greensand and Gault BOA. The UK and Kent BAP list the Brown Hare as a priority species. The proposal recognises that there will be a negative impact on the population, then states "Increased traffic during construction and operation phases is unlikely to cause a significant increase in direct mortality in the area" and concludes that the impact will be not significant. This is a gross under estimation of the effect of the development. Hares are sensitive to disturbance. If the population survives some of the initial construction phase, there will eventually be a local extinction of the population. This will be as a result of loss of habitat and disturbance. The proposal vaguely states that off site mitigation for ground nesting birds will benefit the Hare. This is far to weak and unlikely to result in significant increase in population. There needs to be a much stronger proposal to counter this local extinction.</p> <p>There is an opportunity that has been missed to provide a wildlife corridor across the site. The aim would be to link the ancient woodlands of Harringe Books Wood and Folks Wood. This could be done by running a corridor across the site</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>from Harringe Brooks to the start of the riparian corridor on the Stone Street. Then as part of the off site mitigation this could continue on to Folks Wood. There would be a number of advantages of doing this. It would provide a migration route for species. It would strengthen the Mid Kent Greensand and Gault BOA. It would provide part of the landscaping to improve the views from the AONB.</p> <p>I note that as part of the impact assessment cats were considered, however there was no assessment of dogs. The proposal recognises the negative impacts on ground nesting birds. Dogs even when walked on a lead cause disturbance. As the Brown Hare is a priority species and will be affected this should be included in the impact assessment.</p> <p>Transport.</p> <p>The scope for the transport has been set too narrowly. An important criteria has not been investigated and that is the closure of the M20. I fully understand that it would be most unusual for a "what if" scenario to be included in the scoping exercise. However given the frequency of closures (currently 20 in the last year) it would make sense to plan for such a scenario. The transport strategy relies far too heavily on the M20 junction 11. Of particular concern is a London bound closure, I have witnessed traffic backing up from the traffic lights in Barrowhill to the M20. If this were to happen, the Otterpool town would be gridlocked.</p> <p>The A20 needs to be kept as an urban clearway. Future provision should be made for a by-pass for Sellindge from the Otterpool roundabout to the North-west corner of the site. This would not impact to heavily on the current master-plan and would be a useful development option for the future. I fully understand that the current proposal is to reduce the attractiveness of the A20, however given the traffic growth this aspiration may not be achievable in the future.</p> <p>The proposal for footpaths and cycle-paths to be attached to vehicular routes in an all-mode transport corridors lacks imagination. This is a concept many 20th Century Garden Towns managed to avoid. Given the amount of green space there is planned it would be safer and more encouraging for people to use to use if they were separated from roads. There is a missed opportunity to substantially separate non-motorised trips from motor vehicles.</p> <p>Planners have everywhere sought to move vehicles out of town centres to create attractive, safe places for shopping and leisure activities. The current proposal is for a 'high street' with vehicles, it is unclear how this will function and what sort of high street is being proposed. Given that most high streets are in decline it would be sensible to design a sustainable retail strategy for the town.</p> <p>Light Pollution.</p> <p>This development will generate a significant amount of light pollution. This will have an adverse impact on the surrounding area. It will be seen from a great distance and affect a large area of the AONB.</p> <p>Conclusion.</p> <p>The proposal as submitted fails in too many areas. There is a lot more work to be done on this proposal before it can be considered.</p>	
94.	Miss Stacey Dodds	27/05/2019	<p>I note with interest that you have clearly recognised the existing surrounding roads are already running at or very near full capacity, especially at peak times. I am referring to the A20, Newingreen Junction and access to the M20 motorway. I would like to make the following points in relation to this:</p> <p>- With an increase in population as a result of the proposed housing estate the volume of traffic will continue to increase. I note that you have made some minor plans to 'improve' the road but it is clear from the proposals you do not have sufficient funds with which to undertake a proper and full redesigned future proof of the roads, as the measures are not sufficient to future proof the road infrastructure.</p>	LPA22

			<p>- Has the increased population of the neighbouring village of Sellindge and its impact on the road traffic volume and amenities been taken into consideration? From looking at the plans it is clear the proposed development will join up (separated only by the M20 and railway line) with the new housing development already being built in Sellindge, thus having a significant impact on the traffic and highways and cause difficulty for residents to get about.</p> <p>- Furthermore, according to the PHE map of deprivation Shepway is a deprived area. You forecast an increase in population and employment. This will add additional burden to the current road, rail and public transport infrastructure as people will have to travel with which to secure employment, as those who do not wish to work in menial retail roles have no choice but to travel and the most effective way to do so is by car. Is there a plan for boosting quality employment in the area?</p> <p>- Due to Operation Stack, problems with the ferries/eurotunnel and Brexit - how will you manage traffic disruption and the impact of parked lorries? I presume DfT has overall control but the impact will be in the local populants and their ability to get around - has a travel disruption mitigation plan been put in place?</p>	
95.	Mr Martin Allen (on behalf of John and Edward Champneys)	27/05/2019	<p>On behalf of clients John and Edward Champneys I write to object to the proposed Otterpool Park development. If approved this will totally change the character of an historic, agricultural, environmental and visually important part of Kent. The brothers and their family before them had been the custodians of a significant part of this land for decades helping to create and shape the landscape that so many in the area enjoy, up until it was purchased by the council. They still live within the area affected by the proposal. They have specific concerns as to how it will affect their own property, but the following are more general :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The affect on the surrounding area particularly the North Downs AONB.</li> <li>• Loss of some of the most productive land in the Kent. There are brownfield sites and poorer quality land elsewhere in the district. Have other sites been researched other than those in which the council have a vested interest?</li> <li>• More houses means more people and greater interference, unintentional and intentional, that will disturb wildlife and the surrounding countryside the developers are seeking to exploit to encourage residents.</li> <li>• The A20 acts as a relief road between Dover and Ashford if there are M20 problems. It is already a busy road and it is getting busier as a result of existing development in Sellindge and can only get worse if this scheme goes ahead. A busy road separating two parts of a development cannot be good on air quality, congestion, safety or planning grounds. Also if calmed where will the traffic go - lanes that are unsuitable.</li> <li>• Proposal is too big causing the loss of identity in surrounding villages, infrastructure problems, lack of employment opportunities causing traffic etc. Organic growth of the villages is preferable.</li> <li>• This proposal is not part of the local plan approved by the Planning Inspectorate. It should not be for the council to make the decision on a scheme they have an interest in, it should go to a higher authority</li> </ul>	LPA66
96.	Mr Michael Mark	27/05/2019	<p>I object to the proposed Otterpool Park development on the grounds that such a large development is unnecessary and unsustainable.</p> <p>There are a number of sizeable housing developments in the pipeline locally, which will result in a significant increase in the population in the Folkestone and Hythe area. A further large development at Otterpool is not needed and will place excessive strain on the local infrastructure, ie roads, medical services and schools.</p> <p>The water resources in this part of Kent are already stretched and the large number of proposed houses at Otterpool will greatly increase demand at a time when water supplies are expected to be further constrained by climate change.</p>	LPA85

			<p>I object to the large-scale loss of productive agricultural land which will be required for the Otterpool development.</p> <p>I also wish to protest at the undemocratic way in which Folkestone and Hythe Council have proceeded with this development. The Council committed to the purchase of agricultural land for this development without any prior announcement or any public discussion. The Council is now so committed to this development that it can no longer provide independent adjudication on the planning proposal and, in my view, this should now be referred to a higher authority.</p> <p>Yours faithfully M J Marks</p>	
97.	Mrs Jane Woolford	27/05/2019	<p>I object to this outline application for many reasons and have previously submitted comments concerning the disastrous impact and detrimental effects on the existing settlement of Newingreen (originally mis-labelled Westenhanger on the plan and overlooked by Arcadis in all documents). These types of project have been initiated by government incentives to housebuilders and this particular one has also been fuelled by landowners' greed. Nowhere is there mention of the council being an impartial body to consider the outline application? The consultation process has been flawed, no initial discussion on a development on this scale, no promised feedback from previous meetings, vague explanations, drawings, documents etc. Absolutely no publicity of the latest ?final meeting at Westenhanger castle. The proposed 'garden town' is too big unsustainable, see others' comments. We do not need or want so many houses that are obviously designed for high earners, not local young people who are desperately trying to get on the housing ladder. 30% of this housing should be affordable but is designated 3-5 bedroom housing. Folkestone will become isolated and even more deprived if this proposal goes ahead. Previous submissions (the latest for building 800 houses) on the racecourse have been rejected as was the strategic corridor. The government introduced measures to unlock brownfield sites, why have these not been researched? Due diligence not been done on traffic volume. The existing A20 has not been fit for purpose for many years with the increase in HGV and M20 diversions causing property vibration and nose to tail traffic jams respectively, prohibiting entrance and exit to my property. I agree with all objectors' comments on all categories. Website down for 5 hours last night excluding proportion of the population wishing to comment. Just spent hour writing up my further comments only to find that login has timed out and majority is lost. Entire exercise unfair process.</p> <p>Comment submitted date: Sun 19 May 2019 I have attended all exhibitions held to date to obtain as much information as possible and having also reviewed the documentation now feel able to make a relatively informed decision on the proposals put forward by Arcadis on behalf of Cozumel Estates and FHDC.</p> <p>My main concern was the size of the development and increased traffic generated. I was assured at one of the first meetings at LVH that the A20 would be rerouted and traffic would decrease. Not so; the implementation of a new stretch of dual carriageway from the small roundabout near J11 to meet the existing dual carriageway near Oak Creative means that traffic will continue along the existing A20 and only Otterpool town traffic will turn right at new traffic lights into the new development. I understand that the additional dual carriageway is required for traffic to exit to the Hythe A249 road but it is essential that traffic on the existing A20 is reduced and for this reason I would request that the RELEVANT SECTION OF THE EXISTING A20 IS SCALED DOWN FROM BEING A 'TRUNK ROAD' TO BECOME A 'B' DESIGNATED ROAD AND/OR A SPEED LIMIT OF 20mph BE ENFORCED.</p>	LPA61

			<p>Having reviewed the proposed accommodation schedules, my main concern now is that where existing settlements, ie Westenhanger and Lympe have been provided with a green 'bund' or have low density housing closest to them, there has been absolutely no provision of this for those remaining residences in Newingreen. You are proposing high density accommodation to a height of 18m with hardly any advance planting or green spaces to protect existing residents' quality of life whilst effectively we are 'living on a building site'.</p> <p>Speaking to Julia Wallace of FHDC last Thursday I UNDERSTAND THAT THE DENSITY OF HOUSING HAS NOT YET BEEN AGREED AND THEREFORE WOULD BE KEEN TO SEE RELOCATION OF THE PROPOSED 18M HIGH BUILDINGS LOCATED NEXT TO HOLIDAY EXTRAS.</p> <p>I agree with others' concerns on dormitory towns, derelict town centres and will make further comments.</p>	
98.	Mr Max Woolford	27/05/2019	<p>I agree with all objectors' comments made so far for the reasons already stated. We live in an AONB and the scale of the proposed development is way out of proportion with any sustainable house building in this rural area.</p> <p>The sense of identity of the existing Lympe settlement has been considered by the provision of green spaces between it and the new town but there is a lack of green spaces between the new town and Newingreen, Westenhanger and Barrow Hill shown on the plans. Why is this?</p> <p>This outline application contradicts the SDC Core Strategy Local Plan and as such should not be approved.</p> <p>Consider small phased building to extend existing villages if absolutely necessary including the required 30% affordable housing but do not go ahead with this plan in its current format as it will ruin the area for future generations.</p>	LPA112
99.	Mr Peter Irvine	27/05/2019	<p>This major increase in local population will significantly damage quality of life for the existing population. The A20 and M20 are already close to maximum capacity. The local potable water supply is stressed, evidenced by summer hosepipe limitations and the planned new supply for this development is not credible. Health care in the area is already below acceptable standard with GP surgery closures and extended waits for appointments at the remainder. The local hospital provision is accepted as inadequate with no obvious plans for the significant expansion that an increase of population of 20,000 will require announced.</p> <p>The majority of the land proposed to be built on is prime agricultural land desperately needed for food production. Proposed educational provision is seriously inadequate as new primary schools require new teachers at a time when we can not recruit sufficient for our existing schools, also there is no planning for further and higher education places to satisfy the increasing demand.</p> <p>Major omissions.</p> <p>No provision for low carbon mass transit to transport the new residents into Folkestone/Ashford. This development would be ideal for a tram system.</p> <p>There is no provision for a travellers site. this would be an ideal location to help solve the current major problem with travellers circling existing communities looking for somewhere to settle.</p> <p>The only possible justification for an additional development of this scale in this area is to meet unreasonable current central government demand for new housing units. A political demand not supported by local housing need.</p> <p>Otterpool Park can only damage the quality of life of the current population of Folkestone and Hythe District.</p>	LPA35
100.	Mr Steve Smith	27/05/2019	<p>I strongly object to the new Otterpool development. I was born and raised in Sellindge and now live in Lympe, so I have seen many changes in the area. This new development will be more than a change, it will be total desecration of the area by swathing a whole area of green fields under concrete and this being in an AONB. There seems to be little or no improvement to existing roads to handle the amount of traffic that will ensue. All of us local</p>	LPA86

Consultation responses table  
Otterpool Y19/0257/FH

			<p>residents will have to endure years of upheaval, noise, pollution and many other grievances with little or no benefit to ourselves. The associated plans look very nice with their architect designed layouts showing cute houses and cafes with throngs of happy people flying kites and enjoying themselves alongside streams and paths. I feel this will all end with a sea of standard pointy roofed overpriced houses for non local people who want a country home and a high speed commute to work in London. Otterpool will eventually look like any other new development in the area. This is, in my opinion, a total badly thought out farce by FHDC.</p>	
101.	Mrs Iris Pearce	27/05/2019	<p>I strongly object to the proposed Otterpool Garden Town Y/19/0257/FH Garden towns are classed as developments of more than 10,000 homes. So this means that that Otterpool development is building 10,000 homes purely to meet the Garden Town criteria and not the need for housing within FDHC area. It is helping the housing shortages within the UK and doesn't care what the impact it has on the local environment or the people. "Otterpool Park is pioneering the next generation of garden settlements, with the aim of truly improving quality of life for its residents. " But what about the residents of surrounding villages and Hythe Town. This oversized development will be detrimental to the neighbouring residents, destroying wildlife, causing pollution (air, light, soil, water &amp; noise), and heavy traffic, reducing the quality of life and will not meet the housing needs for the local people. The developers are inviting the proposed residents of Otterpool that everything is possible from this unique location, a short distance from Folkestone, Kent. Live and work in the Garden of England countryside, enjoy walks and bike rides from your doorstep and be inspired by the heritage and natural beauty of the area. You can be at the coast within minutes, catch the train to London in under an hour and access Europe quickly and easily" How are they going to get to the coast when the roads are unable to cope with the traffic at the moment and with ongoing other developments that will also add to the traffic. The roads are not safe to ride bikes or even walk. The developers are not being honest with their proposal. It is no good pretending that people of Otterpool are not going to use their cars. I strongly object to this proposal because it is too big and not needed or wanted.</p>	LPA87
102.	Ms Lin Cronin	27/05/2019	<p>We purchased a property for a higher cost in the countryside to get away from a town centre, the noise, traffic, and have increased green, wildlife and fresh air amongst other reasons. Now, in the councils wisdom, they have decided to build a town in the countryside. So, all of the reason we purchased our property as stated have disappeared. Is there not enough disruption and building in this area? The Sellindge construction has taken away greenery, increased traffic, reduced the dwelling options for wildlife, increased pollution and brought a town to a village. Now you are going to do the same with Otterpool. Our property value will decrease, pollution increase, green areas minimised further, wildlife reduced, traffic will increase as well as noise levels. Why are you building so much in one area? Why can't you spread out your ugly new builds? Shepway is a large area but you are going to decimate one area to make the population of a small community exponentially increase giving it a 'town' feel. That defeats the object of paying more money for a property in the countryside with tranquility, fresh air, as well as the other reasons previously mentioned. I am interested as to how sdc are conserving wildlife, protecting the environment, keeping down pollution levels and how many councillors that have approved this plan actually live in the proposed area. Why are sdc concentrating so much building in one area? We all know it is highly likely planning permission will still be approved despite residents concerns and this is just a tick box exercise but some detailed human feedback (not links to website information) would be appreciated. The residents of the area are at least owed that much.</p>	LPA117
103.	Mrs Linda Harman	27/05/2019	<p>I am the new Ashford Borough Councillor for Saxon Shore, which includes the villages of Aldington, Bonnington, Bilsington &amp; Ruckinge.  Our villages are extremely close to the proposed Otterpool Park, yet have not been included in the public consultation that many more distant Folkestone &amp; Hythe villages have benefitted from. Saxon Shore residents</p>	LPA37

			<p>have had no information. Aldington, being the closest is likely to be most impacted, yet awareness of how to engage with your consultations is extremely low.</p> <p>The Garden Communities prospectus makes it very clear that a Local Authority proposing a new Garden Town MUST engage with, and involve, the community at every stage. This applies, even when the neighbouring villages are in an adjacent Local Authority. The villages of Saxon Shore MUST have proper prior consultation before this application is considered by F&amp;HDC Planning Committee. There are many traffic concerns.</p> <p>Otterpool Park is proposed in an AONB setting that is also a known area of water fragility. The Environment Agency recently reported: " Even low population growth and modest climate change "suggest significant water supply deficits by the 2050s, particularly in the South East". A new Garden Town is unsustainable in this location. New water supply systems must be installed to benefit the whole region.</p> <p>Furthermore, AONBs are designated by the Government to ensure that the special qualities of our finest landscapes are conserved and enhanced. Building on their borders doesn't enhance; it damages.</p> <p>The Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CROW) 2000 states that the natural beauty of an area must be conserved and the setting considered. Otterpool is proposed in the valley that lies at the foot of the North Downs in a known AONB corridor along the A20/ M20, together with views from the Lympne escarpment to the Romney Marsh. It will be visible from the AONB and block the view into it from the A20. This site is not appropriate for 8000 new homes.</p>	
104.	Miss Kalpana Rai	27/05/2019	<p>The Otterpool Park Development answers to much needed housing demand. It is a refreshing masterplan with integrated major green spaces, parks, gardens and views. The masterplan appears to have been well designed, responding to surrounding context, with all the required amenities and facilities.</p> <p>I would love to see this development provide and encourage some self build houses. When they allocate land for self build houses the prices should be reasonable and affordable. Having the land prices as high as the house prices is not the right incentive and support, exactly the opposite.</p> <p>I would encourage this development to provide all kinds of housing types, detached houses, town houses, cottages, flats, high density housing, social housing, self build houses, in wide variety. Variety, inclusion, pedestrian friendly, and with some innovative housing styles with it's own character would be much welcomed.</p> <p>Thank You</p>	LPA94
105.	Mr Robert Auger	27/05/2019	<p>I object to the proposal for a residential-led mixed use development on the old Folkestone racecourse, the site of Lympne Airfield and farm land south and west of the M20 motorway.</p> <p>The 'Application document' says the employment and residential potential of the development justifies the 'overall vision' of the initial phase, which would consist of up to 8,500 new dwellings, growing to 10,000 over the next 25+ years. It claims that the needs of the community will be met by the provision of... 'a range of retail, employment and leisure uses, social infrastructure and associated infrastructure'. Does this stand up to scrutiny or is it just wishful thinking?</p> <p>The previous owners of the Lympne airfield site, tried for several years to establish hi-tech commercial development on part of this site, without significant success. They told Lympne NDP that their objective of persuading high-tech 'loft' start-ups to locate there seemed unlikely to succeed, since they found that potential tenants preferred to locate in "...a busy 24/7 environment." The premise that the construction of housing in Otterpool Park would be accompanied by '...retail, employment and leisure uses and associated infrastructure' seems far-fetched in the light of current trends to order online. "Build it and they will come" is a very risky strategy.</p> <p>And will they come? They are more likely to go, if not on the adjacent M20 then via the potential Network Rail upgrade to Westenhanger Parkway Station. With its reduction of journey times, the flow of people will be London-bound in the morning and back to the HST station at night. Otterpool Park will become a dormitory for FHDC residents who find work in London or who take the motorway to their office inside the M25 ring.</p>	LPA38



			The growth of "Amazon" style shopping makes it ever more likely that Otterpool homes will be furnished with mail order goods, not with items acquired locally. In all of this, the community in Lypne fears that their voices will not be heard.	
106.	Mrs Debbie Reynolds	27/05/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High density housing follows large sections of the East Stour river corridor. Artist impressions detail minimum and completely unsuitably narrow riverside corridor margins. The pictures demonstrate how the passage for terrestrial wildlife will be restricted. Ultimately this will negate the ability of native wildlife to expand their populations, communities and gene pools.</li> <li>• It is not necessary for humans to manage and access river corridors. The impact will be horrific for wildlife with close mown areas to create 'vista's' of the water, litter, noise and light pollution that will also negatively affect aquatic ecosystems and bat foraging.</li> <li>• Level of housing. 8500. Although affordable housing for rural workers and local families is required, this level is most definitely beyond capacity for the area. The AONB will be impacted by noise, landscape views, lighting and air quality which overrides the ambitions of the plan to be a 'garden-town'.</li> <li>• Schools. Sustainability must be at the very core of building. Especially for education where it is imperative to teach the next generation how to do a better job of supporting the natural balance of the ecosystem for the benefit of all living things. All schools and businesses on site must be fitted as carbon neutral. It is achievable, and finance must be made available to support this vital infrastructure. It will have cost savings in the long run. It is weak to say budgets are constraining design concepts. It should be the only acceptable means of developing.</li> <li>• Housing. Housing should be designed to ensure connectivity between gardens. Encouraging all home owners, through welcome packs, to plant, feed, encourage and protect native flora and fauna.</li> <li>• Council/the people should have control over design and sustainability measures opposed to developers bullying councils into budgetary constraints. Affording sustainability should surpass housing numbers and reduced accordingly.</li> </ul> <p>Water. There is not enough....</p>	LPA113
107.	Mrs Sally Crux	29/05/2019 26/06/2019	<p>(1) 29/05/2019 1 This scheme is designed to be built on a flood plain and we are only too aware of the devastating effect this has had elsewhere. Inadequate drainage is proposed as there is only a proposal for a lake on one side of the A20 ..... and it will rain on both sides of the road.</p> <p>2 The South East already has a water shortage and expecting to supply a further 8500 houses, not to mention businesses, is unimaginable. We are already subject to frequent hose pipe bans when levels are low so how will the supply be increased to manage demand?</p> <p>3 Building within Sellindge is increasing very rapidly with a traffic calming scheme that barely permits two lorries to pass simultaneously adjacent to the school. I have seen nothing in plans which would prevent the increased traffic accessing the A20 west bound and this would make J10 intolerable. Changes to the existing lay out at J10 are to improve flow to Ashford and the south, not for any changes to the East of the Ashford. The A20 at Newing Green to J11 needs to be a dual carriage way now to accommodate the existing traffic flowing from Hythe up Hythe hill to Newing Green and certainly the proposed lay out does nothing to support the extensive development that is proposed.</p> <p>4 The scheme will not provide for long term employment. It will provide short term only on those services associated with construction and development. As for a proposed GP surgery and schools this is absurd. There is a national shortage of GP's and allied health professionals and putting a building there which will remain empty but need funds for maintenance is a waste of money. Likewise schools ..... the teacher</p>	LPA36

		<p>shortage is already abundant.</p> <p>5 This scheme is just in the wrong place. Chose a venue that has no existing shortages or infrastructure if more houses are needed but in a totally rural location away from south east kent.</p> <p>(2) 26/06/2019</p> <p>1 I oppose this scheme as it is not consistent with the core strategy and the case for development has not been adequately made. I object to the traffic and highways proposals which are just inadequate and likewise the water supply which is already endangered in the South East. The scheme does not demonstrate how this will be rectified when a further 8500 dwellings have been constructed.</p> <p>2 This scheme is designed to be built on a flood plain and we are only too aware of the devastating effect this has had elsewhere. Inadequate drainage is proposed as there is only a proposal for a lake on one side of the A20 and it will rain on both sides of the road.</p> <p>3 The South East already has a water shortage and expecting to supply a further 8500 houses, not to mention businesses, is unimaginable. We are already subject to frequent hose pipe bans when levels are low so how will the supply be increased to manage the revised demand?</p> <p>4 Building within Sellindge is increasing very rapidly with a traffic calming scheme that barely permits two lorries to pass simultaneously adjacent to the school. I have seen nothing in the plans which would prevent the increased traffic accessing the A20 west bound and this would make J10 intolerable. Changes to the existing lay out at J10 are to improve flow to Ashford and the south, not for any changes to the East of the Ashford. The A20 at Newing Green to J 11 needs to be a dual carriage way now to accommodate the existing traffic flowing from Hythe up Hythe hill to Newing Green and certainly the proposed lay out does nothing to support the extensive development that is proposed. There is no mitigation for how the A20 will cope in the event of Operation Stack or when the motorway is closed between J10 and J11 which occurs more frequently than I would like. The single carriageway with traffic lights under the railway bridge causes a build-up of traffic on A20 stretching from J10 to J11 and the pollution from all the cars and lorries is ghastly what is the solution to this when a further 8500 houses are built?</p> <p>5 The scheme will not provide for long term employment as suggested. It will provide some short term work only for those services associated with construction and development. As for a proposed GP surgery and schools this is absurd. There is a national shortage of GP's and allied health professionals and putting a building there which will remain empty but need funds for maintenance is a waste of money. Likewise schools the teacher shortage is already abundant. Shops are closing a rate of several a month (Debenhams and Marks and Spencer to name two) we do not need more retail premises particularly as the expansion of McArthur Glen in Ashford is due to complete shortly.</p> <p>6 This scheme is just in the wrong place. Chose a venue that has no existing shortages or infrastructure if more houses are needed but in a totally rural location away from south east kent.</p> <p>7 I understand that local councils are required to maximise income levels to cope with their ever increasing demand. But I do not believe this is the way to do it. A much much smaller scheme of social housing would be a better investment and would always generate levels of income without such a huge outlay. I have read a great deal of words in your documentation together with</p> <p>considerable repetition but noticed an absence of numbers. I have failed to establish from all your literature what financial return the council will get on this investment over forthcoming years and how it will contribute to the balance sheet or to the ever increasing demands for social care for example.</p>	
--	--	---	--

108.	Mr D Shadbolt	29/05/2019	<p>I object on the following basis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed site is adjacent to the Kent Downs AONB. Given that this area has been afforded special status, I have grave concerns over the harm caused to the character of this landscape area, of significant national importance.</li> <li>2. Placement of 10,000 houses next to an AONB cannot be overcome by any mitigation or screening.</li> <li>3. There is inadequate mention of the AONB presence in the outline planning application and how the more than significant level of harm could be overcome, even at this early stage.</li> <li>4. There has been minimal consultation on the effect of visual amenity both from, and to, the AONB - both of which should be given significant weight.</li> <li>5. I also object on the grounds that this is just sprawl/encroachment of the existing Hythe and Folkestone urban area, which goes against the Garden Towns principles of being a standalone settlement.</li> </ol>	LPA111
109.	Mr Ben MacDonald	31/05/2019	<p>I suspect like most people we feel almost powerless to stop this and the overriding commercial interests will trump both local feeling and both the quality of the final implementation. Too frequently the plans are moderated to get it through and then quietly altered further down the road. This common and well publicised cynical approach to development is why people get so angry. I therefore split my comments into) objections to development and objections if the content of the development went ahead.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are insufficient jobs in Kent to really support this number of households and the majority of people will be commuters into London. This cannot go ahead until southeaster make a binding commitment and full analysis to support peak load into London as the trains are already overcrowded now at the key 6.30am to 8.30am times</li> <li>2. The water consumption assumptions are too low and significantly risks the ability to support the aquifer sustainably. More work required on the stress testing and recovery mechanisms</li> <li>3. We face a climate emergency and although I note that by 2025 the housing stock will be on air source heat pumps the initial phase is gas. Although compliant this is obviously a cynical cost cutting exercise. Show some ambition and make it compliant from day one. I see no excuse for this</li> <li>4. A commitment and more detail on the planting scheme that will support wildlife explicitly. This just gets cut in the end and never lives up to expectations. Make this binding</li> <li>5. No commitment to swift boxes, integral bat and nest boxes and hedgehog highways. Simple and very low cost. Any excuse not to do this is just underlines the profiteering that plague these schemes. We have one chance</li> <li>6. Provision for solar panels and solar heaters from day one. This is a climate emergency there is no excuse. Being compliant with the regs is again just cynical and cost avoiding. It must be better.</li> <li>7. Build it right or don't build it !</li> </ol>	LPA102
110.	Alison Baldwin	06/06/19	<p>I'm really concerned about the increase in traffic which is inevitable with a development of this size. I have emailed via <a href="http://otterpool.org">otterpool.org</a> and asked specifically for information relating to an increase in traffic in Aldington and Church Lane and I have not received a response from them, which is very disappointing as they were supposed to be consulting with the local community.</p> <p>Church Lane has not been specifically mentioned in the application despite it being the next road along to Harringe Lane. Church Lane is the conservation area of Aldington which is from the junction with Roman Road down to the end of the tree line at my property Church Hill Cottage. With one exception all of the properties that cluster along here are listed, the road is narrow and single carriage in most places. My property is located very close to the road and therefore any increase in traffic in the lane is heard inside and often felt due to vibrations and the age of the property and I am concerned that it may suffer from structural damage if there is a significant increase in traffic. I am particularly concerned that the lane will become a 'rat run' for vehicles heading towards Ashford. We already have a noticeable rush hour of traffic each morning and evening often travelling at great speeds as the lane is national speed limit despite being narrow and with many bends.</p>	LPA118

			<p>With the development proposed here and also the development which will take place on the other side of Aldington at Cheeseman's Green, Aldington is going to be sandwiched between the two with many vehicles accessing and leaving these sites. I don't think the impact of these sites together has been fully referenced in the planning documents, largely due to both developments being in differing council areas. I would like to see this looked at further before any decision is taken.</p> <p>I am a keen horse rider but I have already been driven off Church Lane as it is now too dangerous to ride due to the speed and volume of traffic. I'm also a keen walker and it is becoming difficult to even walk my dog along the lane now especially mornings and evenings due to the volume of traffic. If the Otterpool development goes ahead I can see if will be impossible and dangerous to walk along the lane in the future.</p>	
111.	Alison Morris	06/06/19	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This gargantuan proposal will change the face of this area FOREVER.</li> <li>2. We do not have the infrastructure in the area to support additional housing of this magnitude</li> <li>3. The local plan already catered for the local housing increase - this town is not needed to supply housing for local people</li> <li>4. The roundabout at junction 11 will not be able to cope with the additional traffic</li> <li>5. The idea that we already have excess water to supply 1,500 homes is laughable - there have been frequent hose-pipe bans over the 25 years I have lived here.</li> <li>6. Water demand will outstrip supply by 2045 before the development is even finished, and that's according to the water company themselves</li> <li>7. The William Harvey Hospital is already over-stretched and cannot cope with the inhabitants of an additional town</li> <li>8. This number of houses and residents will create a vast increase in the rise in pollution and noise in the area</li> <li>9. The area to be developed houses several species of birds and other wildlife that are on the red list and will disappear forever</li> <li>10. People will have land and homes that they have worked hard for (sometimes for generations) compulsorily purchased to make way for this project, and have no way to protect themselves</li> <li>11. There are already traffic issues in Sellindge, especially since the road has recently been narrowed, and it cannot cope with the additional traffic that this development will create.</li> <li>12. No air quality testing or modelling has been done to measure the effect on Sellindge</li> </ol>	LPA119
112.	Anthony Bosley	06/06/19	<p>I wanted to email you to express my deep concerns with the planned Otterpool Park development. The concentration of homes and other buildings in an area otherwise associated with the nearby AON B will clearly have a major detrimental impact on both the environment and lives of people living nearby. Overall I feel that the scheme is too intensive, lacks vision and ambition. It is sited on an existing historic site, that if appropriately developed could rival Ascot as it used to, making the area an unrivalled destination for both the UK and European equestrian visitors and tourists and maintaining the essence of the area, whilst providing much needed jobs and some accommodation, both permanent and for visitors. Transportation would be a major problem - esp at present given the plans still in place on the M20 ahead of Brexit. The volume of development risks blighting the lives of locals for decades and would undermine existing businesses and the very development of Folkestone, which is highlighted in the report as a major local success story. The Harbour Arm itself highlights how historic development, can breath new life into the surrounding area, if done in a measured and planned way. Despite the bulk of the jobs being created reflect local and working from Home cases, the proximity of London with HSI must be a draw for many. The resulting increase in commuters will simply create a commuter town, with limited life and business taking place during the day and outside of weekends. Places and capacity at peak times are already stretched and so an additional number of this scale, will create multiple adverse issues without material investment, including parking and associated requirements within 20 years for thousands of new electrical charge points required under new Govt legislation. The Power Grid in the region already suffers from fairly regular outages and so further development without rectifying this issue is likely to compound it.</p>	LPA120

			<p>A final concern would be based on the volume of water that 8,500 new homes would need. In an already water stressed region, continuing to build that number of homes will serve to create an issue that over the life of the planned development will simply get worse and worse.</p> <p>I absolutely think that developing the site can be done in a constructive and positive way, but as presented, it simply smacks of overdevelopment of a site for the benefit of house builders rather than the local community, both now and in the future. Folkestone Racecourse was the Crown Jewel of this area. Some housing, coupled with a major investment back into that site, incl Hotel / Conference Centre style development is much more likely to create the Economic benefits sought by the Council, rather than simply copying Ashford Council in Park Farm style mass Housing Estates.</p>	
113.	Brian Friend	06/06/19	<p>Increase in traffic leading to reduced air quality and congestion at busy times. Water supply in an area already known as having a limited supply. Health provision, especially the William Harvey Hospital at Ashford which is already stressed as anyone who has had to use A&amp;E will know and may well become more stressed as large scale housing developments are already in progress all around Ashford. There is also the issue of access to local GP's who are already in short supply. Loss of countryside and effect on views from North Downs AONB. The Local Plan, which has already been produced and accepted has ample provision for housing needs well into the future. The above development was not in the Local Plan and should not be included.</p>	LPA121
114.	Carol Taylor	06/06/19	<p>Context I am fourth generation in my family to live in Sellindge. This application is absolutely huge and contains thousands upon thousands of pages of text and drawings. My first objection is on how grossly unfair it is of you to expect the public to trawl through all of this in such a short period of time. The only statutory opportunity that I have to comment on this is now and, as a consequence of the vast size of this application, I can only find the time to review areas specifically of interest to my family or me and to object or comment thereon. The case for this Garden Town The development seems not to have followed the principles of good planning but has been driven by political expedient. For instance the village of Sellindge has been subject to a village planning process for some years now and the villagers have acquiesced to just under 1000 new homes, according to the development strategy that you have published. The process for this was fairly transparent but the process for Otterpool has not. Otterpool seems to be driven by developer need and not local needs. We are told that the local authority has entered a joint venture development agreement with the Cayman Islands registered owner of some of the prime land in this development but we are not being provided with the terms of this secretive association which has fuelled speculation concerning its motives, money flows, community benefits and even potential loss of taxes to the UK. We are told that the mix of housing will ease the property needs for the area in future but yet we are told now that only 22% of the proposed total of 10000 homes will be affordable. Even this is not thought through as the provision of such affordable homes in a rural environment will need significant public transport and travel infrastructure that is not anticipated in the drawings that have been provided. We have not, at any of the public events, been satisfied that the case for a development at Otterpool is the best solution for the area, taking account developments elsewhere; for instance, it is in the public domain that Ashford intends to increase its population from around 80000 currently to around 142000 within 10-15 years. This is a town with established Road and (importantly) a very sound Rail infrastructure. There is absolutely no narrative that ties in the development of Ashford with Otterpool despite it being no more than a handful of miles away. I want the business case published in full and I want to see the assumptions that you have used and how these have been treated. I the money flows published and, in particular, I want to see what the values of the money flows that will be subject to UK taxes. I the agreements that exist between the landowners, the developers and the Local Authority published and I want to see written assurances from all past and present Councillors, that are involved in either the</p>	LPA122

		<p>development joint ventures or the planning processes, that they are not going to personally benefit in any way from any transactions associated with this development now, in the past or in the future.</p> <p><b>Rail travel</b>        The plans exclude the area of Westenhanger Station yet the developers tell us that the expansion of this Rail Hub is critical to the transport strategy for the development. I do not believe that this has been adequately considered and, as the station has been excluded from the plan, the developer is merely expressing a wish that it might. In fact at 5.3.16 of the APPLICATION DOCUMENT 3.10 TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT VOLUME 1: MAIN REPORT AND ANNEX OF FIGURES the ambitions for this vital element of the transport strategy are at best vague and certainly no more than aspirational.</p> <p>This transport hub is so critical to the strategy of this development that the developer must provide an architectural solution, before any consent is granted, and that this must be fully costed, funded by the developer and signed off by Network Rail, Oft and the Rail Franchise Operator before it could be included in the plans. The rail infrastructure proposals are immature and they do not reflect the level of potential use when they should be at the forefront of the strategy for this scheme. This lack of planning will consequently increase road use at a time when the environmental impact of this is at best poor and at worst damaging to human health.</p> <p><b>Road usage</b>        There will be three broad journey routes to and from this development. They will be West to/from London, Mid Ken and Ashford, North to Canterbury and the North Kent area and the East to Folkestone, Dover and the east Kent coast. The current drawings show that the housing in the west of the development (the most concentrated) will, in the absence of a main route through to Junction 11, result in a massive increase in road use through Sellindge. Hidden away in Table 55 of the Transport Strategy submission is the startling fact that road usage through Sellindge will increase by between 29% and 33% by 2037 rising to 30%-44% by 2044. I object to this. The Rail Bridge over the A20 is shown outside the scope of the application and I see no reference to the widening of this in the application. To do so will be a hugely expensive alteration to the Main Line Rail infrastructure, which is not included in this application. Any consent must be conditional on this being fully costed and agreed by Network Rail. Further, the development to the west does not allow for the transport infrastructure impact of the development lands in the area from Harringe Lane to Court Lodge area to the south of the A20, which is shown in the strategic plan and, if developed, would add further traffic chaos which will not be able to be alleviated as there is not provision in this development plan for any bypass for Sellindge which will be needed in the future.</p> <p>If the developer is not prepared to plan for - and fund - the widening of the A20 Rail overbridge, it should be compelled to the creation of a bypass from Otterpool Lane over Harringe Lane to join the A20 to the west of Court Lodge near St Marys Church. This will not only smooth and facilitate easy road access to the development but also facilitate easy transport access to the possible future development in Sellindge.</p> <p>Apart from those living at the eastern extremities of the proposed development, I can see absolutely no option for road users wishing to head North from the scheme other than to travel down Barrow Hill and turn right into Swan Lane to head North. I object to this. Swan Lane is not configured to take significant increases in traffic.</p> <p><b>Junction 11 of the M20</b>        The developer tells us that HGV traffic from the only existing industrial site in the scheme will continue. It will be natural for HGV drivers to want to route through Sellindge and thence to J10A en route to the West, whereas it is established that all HGV traffic is routed via J11. I am told that there will be little additional traffic mitigation to ensure the routing of this traffic to J11 that should be the position now but is little enforced. I object strongly to this. The main road in Sellindge has only just become relatively safe and calm. The village is expanding and with it there are plans to expand the primary school and other village amenities. HGVs are currently discouraged from travelling through the village and the proposed development should actively strive to continue to minimise through traffic to avoid pollution, a degradation of the environment and potentially injury or even traffic death. Sellindge is justly proud of its road casualty history and if this were to worsen due to this development, the residents - including me - will have no hesitation at pointing out that objections were made at then planning consultation stage of this scheme. The developer must, if this scheme must go ahead, be compelled to route westbound traffic away from Sellindge. I don't care what method is used - a bypass would</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>be the least costly option to the developer - but I am clear that if this is not a condition, Councillors in the Planning Committee should be held responsible for all consequences.</p> <p>S106 monies</p> <p>I want the developer - who will make billions from this scheme - to commit now to S106 contributions to be used to create infrastructure changes out with the proposed development to mitigate the impact of the development on the established communities. This must include improvements to J11 to take the increased traffic, traffic mitigation measures in Sellindge and Lympne to remove all HGV and other traffic that would otherwise be routed through Sellindge. All of the improvements proposed by the developer on its website should be reflected in the submitted plans.</p> <p>Further objections</p> <p>I object to the proposals concerning fresh and wastewater. I do not believe that sufficient consideration has been given to the impact on water consumption from the existing aquifers in the area as well as the infrastructure needed for this as well as the disposal of waste and brown water. I have asked about the extent to which the public assurances provided by Affinity Water to able to deal with this for around 30-40000 people have been tested and validated. The only statements I have seen have been based on assumptions of water consumptions of lower than 100 litres per day. The Southern Water Website provides data that shows the average consumption in its area is 178 litres per day. Therefore, someone is being mislead or is misleading us. The developer should be instructed to recast its plans to provide for more realistic water use and should explain how this is to be secured from the limited resources available currently.</p> <p>I strongly object to the loss of a rural environment. With the exception of the land on Folkestone Racecourse, pretty well all of the land to be used is currently used as farmland. This farmland provides many of us with food, a rural environment and rural amenity and I object strongly to the loss of this.</p> <p>We are told that Otterpool will have wide green open spaces and vistas. I do not believe this. An example of where this was promised but not delivered has been the Taylor Wimpey Development in the centre of Sellindge where rural vistas and amenity have been lost forever and the Local Authority was toothless in its ability to prevent this. The current view of the site as a backdrop to the Downs AONB is a part of our heritage and must be protected and not destroyed.</p> <p>Finally, I object to having imposed upon my family and me the prospect, over the last few years, of the whole concept which has been ill, conceived and which is inconsistent with the development strategy that has already been agreed for this area.</p>	
115.	Carolyne Reeves	06/06/19	<p>8,500 homes is an inappropriate and unsustainable size for this area. Residents will commute to work via car as jobs are unlikely to be within walking or cycling distance. This sizeable increase in vehicle movement will cause additional traffic and congestion on local roads, especially the A20, this will have a detrimental impact on current residents and surrounding villages.</p> <p>The WHH and local doctors surgeries are already under immense pressure. Coupled with the large amount of development in neighbouring districts, it is difficult to see how the hospital will cope and if new GPs can actually be recruited for any new build surgery.</p> <p>I object to the loss of countryside and destruction of wildlife. This development is near an AONB and construction will ruin the landscape forever.</p>	LPA123
116.	Chris Ramsden	06/06/19	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No A20 bypass for Sellindge is being considered as part of this development.</li> <li>2. No traffic calming for the A20 Barrow Hill is included in this application.</li> <li>3. No traffic controls are included to stop HGV traffic travelling from Otterpool Lane down Barrow Hill and into Sellindge.</li> <li>4. A new proposed primary road from Newingreen to Otterpool Lane, will now NOT take any HGV traffic. This road will only to be used to serve new housing in the new development. They don't want HGV traffic driving passing their new homes.</li> <li>5. The developers are no longer recommending Junction 11 as the main access route into and out of the new development. They say that Junction 11 would not be able to cope. They will let traffic head through Sellindge at whim; they say that up to 20% of new traffic will do this. Their figures mean an extra 1600 vehicles per hour at peak times. (What if they are being too optimistic about this?)</li> </ol>	LPA124

Consultation responses table  
Otterpool Y19/0257/FH

			<p>6. No cycle path or pavement improvements along the A20 on Barrow Hill is planned, and no traffic calming proposals.</p> <p>7. No air quality testing has been done for this development in Barrow Hill or Sellindge.</p> <p>8. Sellindge Village will not receive any Section 106 improvements funding as part of this development.</p> <p>9. You the council are local government and are supposed to act on behalf of your constituents.</p> <p>10. Start earning your keep. Stand up to the builders and insist that they attend to these issues. Show us that you are above corruption and that there are no backhanders at work here.</p>	
118.	Claire Yates	06/06/19	<p>The proposal does not contribute to local communities in the way that the original 'garden town' vision laid out to do - most importantly because the views of local residents are completely opposed to it which is in contrast with working collaboratively with residents and businesses for a agreeable solution.</p> <p>The build of 8500 houses will destroy natural habitats of wildlife, place increased pressure on local infrastructure particularly social care, health and education and I have not seen proposals that set out clearly how these demands will be financially or from an HR perspective will be met.</p>	LPA125
119.	Diane Archer	06/06/19	I'd like to register my objection	LPA128
120.	Essen Larsen	06/06/19	I'd like to register my objection	LPA130
121.	Emel Larsen	06/06/19	I'd like to register my objection	LPA129
122.	Jane Barnes	06/06/19	<p>This email is to register my objections to the proposed Otterpool Town development and its impact on existing villages and services. Namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sellindge will be hard hit by the proposed development and it appears that no bypass has been considered for the village in the application.</li> <li>2. No traffic calling has been considered for the A20/Barrow Hill in the application.</li> <li>3. No traffic conditions have been given consideration to stop HGV traffic traveling retouch Sellindge and this will be compounded by the new proposed primary road from Newingreen to Otterpool not allowing HGV traffic.</li> <li>4. The developers say that Junction 11 will not be able to cope with but are quite prepared for this traffic to go through the village of Sellindge a village already swamped with HGV traffic causing noise and vibrations through the day and night.</li> <li>5. No air testing has been carried out in the village of Sellindge not is there any sign of intention of this being carried out.</li> <li>6. Sellindge village is not being allocated any funding for Section 106 improvements as part of this development.</li> <li>7. Finally, in light of the environmental impact of these proposals and the apparent disregard of the lack of available water as reported by Affinity, there seems not to have been adequate research into these matters.</li> </ol> <p>For the reasons above I object strongly to the proposals set out in the Otterpool Park planning applications and think the entire project should be reconsidered.</p>	LPA131
123.	Jenny Allsop	06/06/19	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of wildlife habitat and diversity. We enjoy a wide diversity of species and no amount of off-setting and provision of barn owl boxes will enable the maintenance of the wild populations that depend on the current habitats that the site provides. If the development goes ahead, the additional cars would pose a serious risk to species with little sense of danger such as hedgehogs and amphibians. The additional pet cats would decimate bird populations.</li> <li>2. Inadequate water supply. There is only enough water for an extra 1000 houses.</li> <li>3. Road safety. When the M20 is closed due to accidents etc., traffic is redirected onto the A20. This means that a</li> </ol>	LPA132



			<p>large volume of traffic including lorries would pass through the centre of the development past the entrance to the proposed secondary school. The narrowing of the main road in Sellindge illustrated this problem recently when I witnessed lorries forced to pass within inches of each other through the centre of the village. Some of these lorries drove over the grass patches installed where the edge of the road has previously been.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. One version of the plan shows the demolition of Lympne Industrial Park. This would result in a loss of business and jobs in the area.</li> <li>5. Another version of the plan shows the Industrial Park remaining, bordered by housing. Friends of ours moved away from Lympne due to noise from the park, so to build up to the perimeter would be foolish.</li> <li>6. Height of proposed buildings. New build properties in Westenhanger have been height restricted, whereas the proposed buildings on the other side of the hedge are much taller and will block the long vistas that we're so cherished by the Council when the applications for the individual new properties were being considered. If the new town does go ahead, the properties should be built in compliance with the same height restrictions. Over recent years this area has been plagued by various planning proposals (waste digester, wind farm, lorry park etc.) and it is clear that the Council is very keen to develop the area in one way or another. However, I fail to see the need for even more housing as there are already thousands of houses being built in this district and neighbouring authority areas.</li> <li>7. I would therefore like to propose a new purpose for the whole site as a re-wilding project, with the planting of a significant amount of mixed woodland areas using native species. The site already benefits from the lake and other natural water sources for wildlife along with a wide diversity of existing wildlife. This would go a small way towards off-setting some of the habitat loss from other developments in the south east. We are losing countryside at an alarming rate and this is an opportunity to make a small, but significant contribution to restoring the balance. This site is bordered by an area of outstanding natural beauty. Let's add to that rather than reduce it even further.</li> </ol>	
124.	Joanne Down	06/06/19	<p>1) Infrastructure: The proposed development represents a massive overdevelopment of an essentially rural area that does not have the required infrastructure to meet road access requirements (the m20 is a major route in and out of the country and is already under immense pressure when there are rta's, roadworks, port problems, tunnel problems etc), a development of this size would make gridlock for the local area a very real possibility.</p> <p>The current small development in Sellindge has caused and continues to cause major disruption for local residents, both in the Folkestone district and residents that fall in the Ashford area. The hold-ups caused by this have created delays and problems that far outweigh any problems that were caused several years ago during the operation stack period and yet this is considered a national issue. So, if you enlarge the problems caused by the current sellindge residential development to the scale of this new proposal it will cause major problems for local residents both during and after construction. The plans do not address this in any meaningful way. The local road network being close to capacity cannot take an increase in traffic of this size.</p> <p>Furthermore, the development uses the development of Westenhanger station as a supporting factor, however, the train routes into London at rush hour are already at capacity with no real opportunity to increase this to meet any significant increase in demand.</p> <p>Water shortage in the area is already a very real problem for local residents and any development places further strain on this essential ammenity. A development on this scale will mean drought is a very likely outcome for residents. The Environment Agency already classifies the area as "seriously stressed". We need the land that would be lost from this development to supply and sustain the water table and the proposal fails to address this.</p> <p>The plans fail to comply with the government guidelines on new garden towns: ' Infrastructure requirements - including access to road, rail, utility considerations (including high-speed broadband, flood, water supply, sewerage and waste), and plans for health, education, and other core social infrastructure.'</p>	LPA133

		<p>2) Air pollution, Light pollution, Noise pollution</p> <p>The area is a rural area that sits as an essential green corridor between two/three major towns (Folkestone, Hythe and Ashford). It provides a green barrier that prevents these two areas of habitation from joining up. It provides 'lungs' in an area that sits beside a major motorway and fast rail link keeping air pollution and noise pollution at bay for rural residents. Any development on this site would have a massive detrimental effect on the surrounding villages that currently enjoy relatively dark skies, minimal noise pollution and relatively clean air.</p> <p>3) Loss of land and wildlife habitat</p> <p>The proposed site sits in an area that is rich in biodiversity and any development will only serve to reduce this. The birdlife at the Otterpool site is rich and unique to the landscape, with buzzards being a recent addition.</p> <p>Bats, hares, skylarks, rare plants, slow worms and so much more rich local wildlife are all present and should be protected.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement states: "there will be an approximate 20% increase in biodiversity value overall." This is a misleading statement, as it implies that biodiversity will increase when in fact Biodiversity will decrease.</p> <p>The developers have modelled a 20% unit increase in the biodiversity metric but this does not mean that the number of species will increase but the number of species will in fact fall. This is stated in the appendix where details of individual species that will be lost are given.</p> <p>Housing now accounts for the biggest decline in species in the South-east. Large greenfield developments, such as this one, being the biggest drivers for local extinctions. The off site mitigation will not increase biodiversity because the species are already present at the site.</p> <p>Therefore the document statement: "there is a demonstrable net gain to biodiversity." is a false statement.</p> <p>The Brown Hare is present at the site and is listed as a priority species. The proposal recognises that there will be a negative impact on the population, then states "Increased traffic during construction and operation phases is unlikely to cause a significant increase in direct mortality in the area" and concludes that the impact will be not significant. This is a gross under estimation of the effect of the development. Hares are sensitive to disturbance. If the population survives some of the initial construction phase, there will eventually be a local extinction of the population. This will be as a result of loss of habitat and disturbance. The proposal vaguely states that off site mitigation for ground nesting birds will benefit the Hare. This is a weak statement and is unlikely to result in any real increase in population.</p> <p>There are many other examples that could be cited and a full, more detailed, independent environmental survey needs to take place and be made widely available to the public before any further planning applications or any development of the site is considered.</p> <p>The area is nestled close to an area of outstanding natural beauty, close to areas of special scientific interest and historic importance. The attempts to mitigate the detrimental affect of the proposed development are laughable. A new development of this size in a rural area will only be negative.</p> <p>The detrimental affect of the proposed development on the character of the local area will be gigantic. The impact it will have on the rural villages it is placed within means that they will be altered irreversibly, and in some cases swallowed up within the development and lost forever.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Any loss of agricultural land would be unacceptable. Recent reports concluded that the UK would have a shortage of agricultural land by 2020. With Brexit on the horizon this is a major consideration. The land in this region is rich and fertile and is needed if we are to meet food production requirements for future generations.</p> <p>Employment</p> <p>The scale of the proposed town far outstrips the availability of local employment and the garden town will not create enough jobs for those it houses, therefore it is relying on the proximity to London to provide employment for the majority it seeks to house. This is in direct conflict to the Governments own criteria, new garden towns MUST NOT be created as dormitory or commuter towns and yet much is being made of the proximity to Westenhanger station. However the capacity of the rush hour high speed trains to London has already been overtaken by demand with no ability for the current high speed network to increase number of trains to meet this demand.</p> <p>Impact on Local landscape</p> <p>The proximity to the mass development of Ashford means that this new proposal will destroy the unique character of the rural villages that currently provide a greenbelt between the two districts. Ashford has already created a garden village approximately 5 to 6 miles from this proposed site and a further large scale residential development at the proposed site would be overdevelopment in a small area. The rural character of the remaining area will be irrevocably altered.</p> <p>There are many other objections that could be raised. Essentially I believe the development would be catastrophic for the areas character, wildlife, landscape and functionality. Furthermore i believe it fails to meet the government guidelines for proposed garden towns in many key factors: Otterpool would be a dormitory town/ commuter town which just uses 'garden' as a convenient label.</p> <p>The development is not on a predominantly brownfield sites. ( there are other brownfield sites available for housing and yet housing developments have been refused in recent years at these sites e.g. the silver spring site in Folkestone)</p> <p>Otterpool would transform the local area and yet fails to meet some of the basic criteria required</p> <p>Community engagement and involvement has been inconsistent and biased and not been well advertised. Local people have no voice and have not had</p> <p>a real opportunity to have a meaningful say. There are still many local residents who are unaware of the scale of the proposal. I live less than three</p> <p>miles from the proposed site and have not received a single communication about the proposals and yet people in Folkestone who live 10 miles away are far better informed, even though the development will not directly affect them.</p> <p>The impact on the natural and historic environment of the local area has not been fully considered or adequately mitigated.</p> <p>The proposal fails to deliver environmental enhancement and biodiversity net gains The Infrastructure proposals will not be adequate to fulfil the increased demand</p> <p>The plans fail to meet required amount of social housing for local need for a development of this size.</p>	
--	--	---	--

			I am totally opposed to the planning application and propose that it is rejected permanently. Please acknowledge receipt of my objection.	
125.	Kate Chesterman	06/06/19	<p>Traffic</p> <p>Despite claims within the Planning Application that many living within the town will be in walking distance of their place of work or school and that enhanced public transport links will serve the needs of those who have to travel further for these purposes, concentrating circa 30,000 people within this town will inevitably give rise to significant increases in traffic within the region. This is because:</p> <p>(1) large numbers of residents will have to travel out of the town for work. With the town itself projected to supply just 8950 jobs (7195 fte), many of these in extremely low paying occupations, several thousand people will have to travel elsewhere to find employment (even assuming that all of the jobs available are taken by residents in the town, which is unlikely). It is evident that the town is intended for London overspill and the developers hope everyone will get on a train to London, but many may prefer to avoid the commute and work in the district, adding to the flow of people across the region.</p> <p>(2) residents will only use public transport if it is frequent, cost effective, can be accessed easily and takes them very close to their target destination within a reasonable amount of time. With regards to bus travel The Framework Travel Plan focuses almost exclusively on the Ashford - Hythe route, not with extending the range of destinations available by bus. Ultimately bus services are not in the control of the developers or the district council, but are dependent on the willingness and ability of travel companies to supply.</p> <p>(3) even if good public transport is in place with respect to travel to work, residents will still want to travel further afield for other purposes. Many of those places will be most easily accessed by car.</p> <p>In addition, friends and family of residents will want to travel into the town for social purposes. The leisure and sports amenities offered by the town will attract visitors. Whatever the "intentions" of the Framework Travel Plan, large numbers of these will not come by public transport. Vehicles will also need to travel in and out of the town for the purposes of business, maintenance and supply.</p> <p>Although the Framework Travel Plan puts forward proposals to mitigate the impact of freight traffic, these proposals require the co-operation of retailers and suppliers, whose primary considerations will be economic rather than social. Even if such measures were effective at meeting the essential need to reduce carbon emissions, they still don't address the issue of the congestion the traffic in and out of the town will create.</p> <p>The proposed road upgrades to deal with the increase of traffic do not seem to deal the impact to Sellindge that will inevitably arise from this development, or how the narrow bottleneck at Barrow Hill, where the A20 goes under the railway, will be managed.</p> <p>Nature conservation</p> <p>The area covered by the Planning Application is home to a wide range of species many of which require protection. Although the Planning Application proposes mitigation measures, ecologists at recent consultations have admitted that there will be negative impact to the wildlife. Bats roosts will have to be re-sited, or moved away from the area altogether, resident Barn Owls will have to be relocated. There is bound to be an impact on Skylarks, who are on the BOC red list, as they nest on the ground. Linnets, also on the BOC red list, are resident on the site and doubtless many more. Although the Planning Application states that 50% of green space will be retained, the important consideration is what sort of green space will remain. Manicured sports fields and parks will not provide the environment many of the currently resident species need.</p> <p>While the Planning Application aims at the provision of homes in the context of a housing crisis, it should also be considered in the light of the Government's recent declaration of a Climate Emergency, which recognises the immediate potential for circa 1 million species to become extinct unless we all start living in a different way. There is a need for housing (although the type of housing required is a matter of debate - see below) but there is also an urgent need to protect a varied hierarchy of species upon which human wellbeing and, ultimately, our own survival depend. Given the urgency of situation in relation to nature conservation, the development of such a large scale development in a rural setting seems nothing short of utterly irresponsible.</p> <p>Layout/density of buildings</p>	LPA134

		<p>The town is to be located within what is currently a rural area. Both the density and height of the buildings proposed, including a "town centre .... with several stories of residential use above commercial premises" and "flats of varying size" will be completely out of character with the surrounding villages and irrevocably negatively alter the character of the entire region.</p> <p>Previous planning decisions        A previous application to build on the former site of Lympne Airfield was refused - with this decision being upheld within the High Court. One of the reasons for this was the negative effect that building on that location would have on the surrounding AON B. The amount of building that was proposed in that instance was a few hundred houses - a fraction of what is proposed for Otterpool. It seems unarguable therefore that a development of the size and character of Otterpool town must have an even greater negative effect, regardless of the developers' claims that these effects can be mitigated by planting, landscaping and managing where the highest density of building will occur.</p> <p>Government Policy        One of the criteria Government outlined in its invitation to bid for Garden Towns was the involvement of the local community in the development of proposals. The proposal for Otterpool was infact presented to local residents as a fait accompli and without the support of parish councilors who were only consulted about the proposals the evening before the bid for the town was submitted to Government. Subsequent consultations with residents on the town have been largely meaningless tick box exercises.</p> <p>While Government policy encourages the creation of new homes to resolve the current housing crisis, the question is, what type of houses are needed? Firstly, the Planning Application acknowledges that there is an ongoing decrease in the average size of households (just 2.02 residents per home by 2021). Secondly, the inability of first-time buyers to find affordable homes is known to be at the crux of the housing crisis. Nevertheless, the Planning Application for Otterpool outlines a mix of housing that includes 26% 4- 5 bedroom homes (2,210 homes out of the 8,500 proposed). At the same time, "a minimum of 22% of all dwellings should be provided as affordable homes, subject to viability". This means that a higher percentage of homes that don't meet critical housing need are being supplied than those that do. That's even before taking into consideration the official definition of "affordable homes" as being homes offered below the full market price. For someone earning the average wage or below, if market values are high enough (as currently) even so called affordable housing is out of reach. Much of the employment on within the town is of a lower earning potential: 1,200 jobs will be within catering and retail, 475 in care and hotels, 80 within the sports halls. None of these professions offer high earning potential to the overwhelming majority of employees. 3,850 jobs will be in commercial or light industry within the business parks, where again the significant proportion of jobs will command modest wages. While the health centre and schools will have some higher earning professionals, teaching assistants, care takers, receptionists, community health care workers and staff within the community centre will all be on average or low wages. With only 1,870 "affordable homes" on offer within the town (subject to viability) many people working within the town will not be able to afford to live there unless they are supported by another working adult. The weasel words "subject to viability" also fill me with little confidence that even 22% "affordable housing" will be supplied, given that the Council's track record of holding developers to their responsibilities in this regard is truly lamentable. While it is understood that a mixture of housing types and tenures is required to avoid "ghettoisation", it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the main aim of this town is not so much to "fix the broken housing market" as to pander to developers' ceaseless demand for high level profits</p> <p>Capacity of physical infrastructure        As has been said many times, the area of the proposed development is critically short of water. Affinity Water can currently only guarantee supply for 1,500 houses. To meet increased need, water will need to be piped in from out of area. Given that recognized trends in climate change suggest that rainfall levels in the area will only continue to decrease, encouraging the inward migration of people who can't afford property prices in places such as London by providing housing in an already overstretched area seems profoundly irresponsible and shortsighted. There is no guarantee that the water efficiency measures proposed in the plan will actually be implemented by the developers, or that they will be able to keep pace with the increasing water shortages climate change will bring about. Radical solutions such as the creation of a desalinization plant on the coast will only cause more environmental damage.</p> <p>Deficiency of social services</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>The national shortage of GPs available to service additional demand at Otterpool is another well-rehearsed but entirely valid objection to this proposal. Primary health care provision within the district is already at breaking point. Even if sufficient health care professionals can be found to staff the proposed health centre at Otterpool, it is naive to claim that the enhanced provision of primary care will entirely mitigate the impact to secondary care arising from the population rise that creating Otterpool town will encourage. Referrals to secondary care will, in many instances, be essential, placing an unmanageable burden on hospitals for whom no additional resource is planned.</p> <p>Core Strategy The principle of developing a town at Otterpool has not yet been approved as part of the District Council's Core Strategy.</p>	
126.	Kay Chapman	06/06/19	<p><b>Traffic at Barrow Hill and through Sellindge</b> As a resident of Barrow Hill, I object particularly to the transport strategy, particularly relating to one way traffic at the railway bridge.</p> <p>The existing road narrowing and shuttle working traffic signals at Barrow Hill was installed to allow a full width footpath under the bridge to improve pedestrian safety, particularly to/from the school. The junction employs System D traffic detection with speed discrimination equipment. There is logic built in to accommodate unusually imbalanced traffic flows, in the event of Operation Stack diverting coastbound traffic onto the A20, but this has never been confirmed as functioning or of practical benefit in use.</p> <p>The existing junction modelling for 2018 appears reasonable, with the cycle time and practical reserve capacities as calculated.</p> <p>However, the technical ability of Highways England (and to a lesser extent, Kent County Council) to manage and operate its traffic signal installations has been very poor over the last decade and so the ongoing monitoring and calibration of new traffic signal installations is questionable. The traffic modelling demonstrates a snapshot only of predicted traffic flows and junction performance for horizon years. The capability of the Highway Authorities' to effectively manage these installations is of concern.</p> <p>It is stated that "Junctions using sophisticated methods of control such as MOVA or SCOOT can still operate efficiently with a DoS above 90%". This is true up to a point. MOVA and Linked MOVA in particular is more effective at junction operational efficiency and can potentially reduce the period of over saturation. However, if there is more traffic demand than link capacity, oversaturation will still occur. The model does not and would not be able to allow for this.</p> <p>Two way traffic flows on Barrow Hill are predicted to increase by 30% AM in 2037 with the development to 1,129 from 869 without and 33% PM to 1169 with the development and 876 without. The percentage increase for 2044 is 32 AM and 45% PM and for 2046 40% AM and 52% PM. In all cases. The Barrow Hill traffic signals are shown to operate over capacity. This will result in cumulative queuing of vehicles each signal cycle, which the traffic model is also unable to effectively show. The resultant congestion will have a significant effect on air quality.</p> <p>The suggested mitigation relies on increasing the overall maximum cycle time of the signals along with "potential upgrade on the current vehicle detection and method of control should be considered in conjunction with cycle time optimisation. This could increase the efficiency of the junction and allow cycle times to vary depending on queue length and demand. This would help to manage queues and maintain driver satisfaction by minimising wasted green time."</p> <p>This is a vague statement that means nothing. The junction operates in Vehicle Actuation mode, so cycle times already vary by traffic flow and demand. It is possible that a revised detection and control method (such as MOVA) could improve junction performance and efficiency in future years. In any case, there will be increased congestion, queues and pollution. The best solution would be to widen the rail bridge and reinstate two way traffic flows. The preferred option would be a bypass around Sellindge to avoid this bottleneck. All consultations to date appear to have not listened to the community regarding this matter.</p> <p><b>Layout</b> I also object on the basis that previous drawings of the layout have shown a green space North of Barrow Hill, which has now been replaced with medium density housing. How can it be that I can attend all the consultations,</p>	LPA135

			<p>hear from those developing this scheme that there will be a green space only to see on the proposed planning documents that this has now changed? Why have I discovered drawings attached to the pack that show my property as being earmarked for future development? With no consultation, communication or logic behind it? I object on the basis that this planning application is not transparent in its aims and aspirations. Why was the previous application for 800 homes refused, but it is now acceptable to put thousands in the local area? There has been no reference to this that I can find within the pack.</p> <p><b>Detail on Supporting Services</b> I object on the basis that insufficient commitments have been made to service the needs of the community for healthcare, education and infrastructure. There are no hard statements, only vague ones pertaining the phasing as required.</p> <p><b>Noise</b> I object as this is not one off construction noise, this is 20 years of constant noise throughout the area.</p> <p><b>Jobs</b> Until local and national businesses make commitments to support such an endeavour, how can the assumptions regarding employment be held as correct? This part of the South East struggles for employments opportunities. I therefore object on the basis that this detail is also flawed in its assumptions.</p> <p><b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</b> I object as the application is taking up acres of the countryside for development, when it is adjacent to an area of outstanding natural beauty. The area should be preserved, not built upon.</p>	
127.	Laurence Archer	06/06/19	<p>I write to record my complete dissatisfaction at the current plans for the horrendous scheme planned under the name of 'Otterpool Park'. We live in the village of Brabourne Lees and regularly travel and walk through this lovely countryside, and are utterly dismayed at the Council's proposals for concreting it over with yet another urban sprawl. The local road and rail network is currently under great strain, and as someone who recently attended the A &amp; E Department of the William Harvey Hospital, the Hospital is already insufficient for the local population. I am incensed that the Council saw fit to reject the planning application for 200 homes from the current owners of Folkestone Racecourse which would have seen the Racecourse remain as a local amenity, on the grounds that it is in an area of outstanding natural beauty. As you are aware, the Racecourse has now been forced to close and the Council sees fit to award itself permission to build 15,000 homes. You cannot make it up!! Rest assured, we as the local population and people who have enjoyed this area for years, will do all in our power to resist this ridiculous scheme.</p>	LPA136
128.	Lee Robinson	06/06/19	<p>1) Infrastructure: The proposed development represents a massive overdevelopment of an essentially rural area that does not have the required infrastructure to meet road access requirements (the m20 is a major route in and out of the country and is already under immense pressure when there are rta's, roadworks, port problems, tunnel problems etc), a development of this size would make gridlock for the local area a very real possibility.</p> <p>The current small development in Sellindge has caused and continues to cause major disruption for local residents, both in the Folkestone district and residents that fall in the Ashford area. The hold-ups caused by this have created delays and problems that far outweigh any problems that were caused several years ago during the operation stack period and yet this is considered a national issue. So, if you enlarge the problems caused by the current sellindge residential development to the scale of this new proposal it will cause major problems for local residents both during</p>	LPA137

		<p>and after construction. The plans do not address this in any meaningful way. The local road network being close to capacity cannot take an increase in traffic of this size.</p> <p>Furthermore, the development uses the development of Westenhanger station as a supporting factor, however, the train routes into London at rush hour are already at capacity with no real opportunity to increase this to meet any significant increase in demand.</p> <p>Water shortage in the area is already a very real problem for local residents and any development places further strain on this essential amenity. A development on this scale will mean drought is a very likely outcome for residents. The Environment Agency already classifies the area as "seriously stressed". We need the land that would be lost from this development to supply and sustain the water table and the proposal fails to address this.</p> <p>The plans fail to comply with the government guidelines on new garden towns: ' Infrastructure requirements - including access to road, rail, utility considerations (including high-speed broadband, flood, water supply, sewerage and waste), and plans for health, education, and other core social infrastructure.'</p> <p>2) Air pollution, Light pollution, Noise pollution      The area is a rural area that sits as an essential green corridor between two/three major towns (Folkestone, Hythe and Ashford). It provides a green barrier that prevents these two areas of habitation from joining up. It provides 'lungs ' in an area that sits beside a major motorway and fast rail link keeping air pollution and noise pollution at bay for rural residents. Any development on this site would have a massive detrimental effect on the surrounding villages that currently enjoy relatively dark skies, minimal noise pollution and relatively clean air.</p> <p>3) Loss of land and wildlife habitat      The proposed site sits in an area that is rich in biodiversity and any development will only serve to reduce this. The birdlife at the Otterpool site is rich and unique to the landscape, with buzzards being a recent addition. Bats, hares, skylarks, rare plants, slow worms and so much more rich local wildlife are all present and should be protected.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement states: "there will be an approximate 20% increase in biodiversity value overall." This is a misleading statement, as it implies that biodiversity will increase when in fact Biodiversity will decrease. The developers have modelled a 20% unit increase in the biodiversity metric but this does not mean that the number of species will increase but the number of species will in fact fall. This is stated in the appendix where details of individual species that will be lost are given.</p> <p>Housing now accounts for the biggest decline in species in the South-east. Large greenfield developments, such as this one, being the biggest drivers for local extinctions. The off site mitigation will not increase biodiversity because the species are already present at the site.</p> <p>Therefore the document statement: "there is a demonstrable net gain to biodiversity." is a false statement.</p> <p>The Brown Hare is present at the site and is listed as a priority species. The proposal recognises that there will be a negative impact on the population, then states "Increased traffic during construction and operation phases is unlikely to cause a significant increase in direct mortality in the area" and concludes that the impact will be not significant. This is a gross under estimation of the effect of the development. Hares are sensitive to disturbance. If the population survives some of the initial construction phase, there will eventually be a local extinction of the population. This will be as a result of loss of habitat and disturbance. The proposal vaguely states that off site mitigation for ground nesting birds will benefit the Hare. This is a weak statement and is unlikely to result in any real increase in population.</p> <p>There are many other examples that could be sited and a full, more detailed, independent environmental survey needs to take place and be made widely available to the public before any further planning applications or any development of the site is considered.</p> <p>The area is nestled close to an area of outstanding natural beauty, close to areas of special scientific interest and historic importance. The attempts to mitigate the detrimental affect of the proposed development are laughable. A new development of this size in a rural area will only be negative.</p>	
--	--	---	--



			<p>The detrimental affect of the proposed development on the character of the local area will be gigantic. The impact it will have on the rural villages it is placed within means that they will be altered irreversibly, and in some cases swallowed up within the development and lost forever.</p> <p>Any loss of agricultural land would be unacceptable. Recent reports concluded that the UK would have a shortage of agricultural land by 2020. With Brexit on the horizon this is a major consideration. The land in this region is rich and fertile and is needed if we are to meet food production requirements for future generations.</p> <p>Employment</p> <p>The scale of the proposed town far outstrips the availability of local employment and the garden town will not create enough jobs for those it houses, therefore it is relying on the proximity to London to provide employment for the majority it seeks to house. This is in direct conflict to the Governments own criteria, new garden towns MUST NOT be created as dormitory or commuter towns and yet much is being made of the proximity to Westenhangar station. However the capacity of the rush hour high speed trains to London has already been overtaken by demand with no ability for the current high speed network to increase number of trains to meet this demand.</p> <p>Impact on Local landscape</p> <p>The proximity to the mass development of Ashford means that this new proposal will destroy the unique character of the rural villages that currently provide a greenbelt between the two districts. Ashford has already created a garden village approximately 5 to 6 miles from this proposed site and a further large scale residential development at the proposed site would be overdevelopment in a small area. The rural character of the remaining area will be irrevocably altered.</p> <p>There are many other objections that could be raised. Essentially I believe the development would be catastrophic for the areas character, wildlife, landscape and functionality. Furthermore i believe it fails to meet the government guidelines for proposed garden towns in many key factors: Otterpool would be a dormitory town/ commuter town which just uses 'garden' as a convenient label.</p> <p>The development is not on a predominantly brownfield sites. ( there are other brownfield sites available for housing and yet housing developments have been refused in recent years at these sites e.g. the silver spring site in Folkestone)</p> <p>Otterpool would transform the local area and yet fails to meet some of the basic criteria required</p> <p>Community engagement and involvement has been inconsistent and biased and not been well advertised. Local people have no voice and have not had a real opportunity to have a meaningful say. There are still many local residents who are unaware of the scale of the proposal. I live less than three miles from the proposed site and have not received a single communication about the proposals and yet people in Folkestone who live 10 miles away are far better informed, even though the development will not directly affect them.</p> <p>The impact on the natural and historic environment of the local area has not been fully considered or adequately mitigated.</p> <p>The proposal fails to deliver environmental enhancement and biodiversity net gains</p> <p>The Infrastructure proposals will not be adequate to fulfil the increased demand</p> <p>The plans fail to meet required amount of social housing for local need for a development of this size.</p> <p>I am totally opposed to the planning application and propose that it is rejected permanently.</p> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of my objection.</p>	
129.	Leila Long	06/06/19	<p>I believe that the Otterpool town is too close to all the surrounding villages that Being Lypne Sellindge, Newingreen and Westernhanger and that this development being so large will link all the villages making them feel like a town. Many residents of which have paid a premium price to live in a Village location.</p> <p>The scale of the project is too large. I feel this would be better too start small and see how much demand there is for these houses. I understand that there is a need for social housing and these need to be met, I don't believe that there is such a huge demand for private buyers at present. I believe this because if you look at Fin berry of Ashford there are many empty houses, that are struggling to sell. My main concern is what effect this will have on our personal finances as locals. If there are too many empty houses, those who purchases properties will end up losing money when the new</p>	LPA138

			<p>buildings are being reduced due to a fall in demand. This has happened to people I know who have purchased a larger property on the Finberry estate. There is also the development of Chilmington green in Ashford that may affect the demand for property in the area.</p> <p>I am concerned for the wildlife in the area. On numerous walks along Barrow Hill to Newingreen I have seen the following Badgers (usually dead from traffic), Bats, Squirrels, Foxes, Hares, Rabbits, Newts, Slow worms. My family home is that of Humblebee Hall, Barrow Hill Sellindge. I have previously seen Wild Boar and 4 offspring in the field opposite, The co-ordinates 51.093507, 1.011545. What will happen to this wildlife?</p> <p>I find the planning application for this proposal too complicated I have seen that there has been a proposed footpath through my family's property, I am unable to locate this source as far too many documents to go through, and not being easy to locate but according to the KCC Public right of way map there is no known footpath through our property. So where has this come from is anyone going to ask for our permission to do this? The property lies between public footpaths HE303 and HE315.</p> <p>The plans are not thoughtful to the village residents that have all ready purchased and live in their homes. Directly opposite Humblebee hall, Barrow Hill, Sellindge, Ashford Kent TN25 6JH. There is a Secondary school to be built if 12,000 homes are given the go ahead. There is so much land within the Otter pool development, why would this even be considered, to build a secondary school in front of a property that was built in 1765, that holds a lot of history to the village, once being the main source of water. Another reason that a school shouldn't be built along the A20 is because of the sheer business of the road. My sister was hit by a car here.</p> <p>I have concerns is the impact this development will have on villagers wellbeing. There is all ready a lot of rumours going around. One of which many properties along the A20 have been sold to the council. Such as the Barrow Hill Farm. I don't know if this is to be true but find it very concerning if it is.</p> <p>Barrow Hill farm is not on many of the plan documents. Village moral is all ready down, due to a small development that happened on the A20 and the effect this had on the traffic.</p> <p>My final reason for objection is the houses themselves, they are being advertised as the countryside town. I get the impression these will be town houses being sold for village prices, this doesn't appear to be affordable living. Many of the photos in the plans used to show the countryside of Otterpool Town are actually photos of land that will be developed on.</p>	
130.	Lorraine Spencer	06/06/19	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Proposals are too large for the given area which is essentially Rural Villages</li> <li>2. The 10,000 homes proposed are not required by the Local Community</li> <li>3. It would become a Dormitory/Commuter town as there are not enough well paid jobs in this area to support the number of people moving in.</li> <li>4. There is a danger that London Councils would send their homeless to the area, that have Social and medical needs which would ease the pressure in London but not provide the Social care support within Kent. (this has happened in other areas, where Westminster Council paid housing applicants to obtain Social Housing in other areas)</li> <li>5. The Proposal would affect the environment detrimentally with air pollution, water shortages, road noise and congestion, air pollution etc., and disregard's the natural habitat.</li> <li>6. The Plans recently published show new roads across Westenhanger, which would substantially change the appearance and noise levels of this small Hamlet.</li> <li>7. On the racecourse the proposals show higher rise buildings which would be directly behind houses around the racecourse the scale of these buildings is not appropriate to the size and style of existing properties, most of which are small houses or Bungalows of low stature.</li> <li>8. The strain that 10,000 homes would put on the Health services ie William Harvey Hospital, and GP surgeries.</li> <li>9. The proposed infrastructure is 'pie in the sky' with essential services/ structures unlikely to be fully funded by either Government or Private Developers.</li> </ol>	LPA139
131.	Lucy Jenner	06/06/19	Traffic from Otterden will be going straight through the village on the Roman road where the school is sited.	LPA140

			<p>There are already such a large number of speeding cars passing the parents and children in school hours, and this will hugely increase with the development.</p> <p>As a villager and parent I want to ensure that the traffic is controlled for safety, by speed bumps outside the school .</p> <p>Aldington is a wonderful village and needs to be protected from the impact of the development.</p> <p>I understand that there is a community fund available for situations such as this to support the village.</p>	
132.	Mark Chapman	06/06/19	<p><b>Layout</b> Having attended numerous Otterpool consultations and presentations, I was disappointed to see that the framework masterplan (Issued 2017, revised 2018) now bears little resemblance to the planning application in periphery areas close to existing dwellings. Areas previously illustrated as a green space bordering residents properties now appear to be allocated as medium density housing, in particular North of Barrow Hill. I feel that prior consultations and illustrations have been particularly disingenuous with this portrayal now that the scheme has reached the planning application stage.</p> <p>The transition to medium density housing is too harsh and therefore the green buffer is therefore not substantial enough.</p> <p><b>Disingenuous Future Developments</b> To transition to medium density housing North of Barrow Hill, the Otterpool scheme has, without consultation identified a homeowner's garden as an area to place low-medium density housing (drawing OPM(P)3017J . As this area does not fall within this planning application, but the further 1500 homes I have been informed that this is subsequently a moot point at Westenhanger.</p> <p>A point I wish to stress is that the community has attempted to engage with this scheme from the outset. However, to find the rear of my garden has been allocated for housing without any prior consultation (drawing OPM(P)3017J), to have been promised communication from the 'PR company' and yet still having received none means that I object on the grounds that public engagement has been less than satisfactory in regards to this process.</p> <p>Referring to my point above in regards to layout, initial masterplan documents were too vague due to being a concept. Now the scheme has reached a detailed planning stage the stakeholder engagement in between has been woeful. I therefore believe that this process is in contradiction to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF Section 12.128), a theme that appears to be common throughout this major project.</p> <p>Looking to the wider development, I wish to also make clear that in 2012 a planning proposal was put forward for 800 houses in the area was turned down, yet we are now faced with almost 10,000 dwellings. It is therefore apparent that the scale of this proposed application goes against that of the National Planning Policy Framework, especially when bounded by areas of outstanding natural beauty.</p> <p><b>Traffic Modelling</b> I simply cannot comprehend that fact that this development is being built along the A20, a key relief road to the M20 without any mitigating bypass or through roads. Sellindge is the bottleneck of the A20 and recent calming measures have only exacerbated this. When the outline development plan is viewed as a whole, the proposed settlements at Barrow Hill settlement are essentially in isolation, with the only route in/out for the Southern development through Otterpool Lane and subsequently Barrow Hill A20 should people wish to travel West. The traffic modelling does not have sufficient maturity in its assumptions to accurately predict traffic in 2044, leading to saturation levels that are marginal in terms of acceptability (90%), at the Barrow Hill One Way. If this is the case, surely the strategy should be to positively reduce levels to well below the 90%, not just 'do something' with the traffic signals and tick the box in 2019. I find it hard to comprehend why it is not possible to put in a link road from the Barrow Hill settlement to the A20 in the West near Harringe Lane for some simple alleviation of the situation. Or better still a bypass to remove the bottleneck altogether. My principal objection is that I do not believe that the transport strategy has been reviewed adequately.</p>	LPA141

			<p>I have also been informed at the exhibition that modelling of the traffic flows do not take into account closures of the M20 for accidents/maintenance or Operation Stack/Brock as these are 'infrequent' events'. Despite repeated attempts, I am yet to find anyone involved in the project who can explain how an infrequent event becomes a frequent one. To remove this from the model on this basis without any weighting at all because the frequency does not remove the problem in reality!</p> <p>Nature Conservation Building houses on a disused racecourse is one thing, taking up vast quantities of land adjacent to an area of outstanding natural beauty is desecration of the countryside. There is insufficient detail regarding how the land that is designated 'green' is being utilised.</p> <p>Noise Although material planning objections are not bound to take into account noise during construction, a development of this scale goes well beyond ordinary planning objections. Twenty years of noise and supporting traffic with associated delays creates a major impact on the local populace.</p> <p>Supporting Amenities. No firm commitments have been made in terms of schools, healthcare facilities etc or the phasing of. I object on the basis that until adequate provisions are stipulated, that these are just obligations.</p>	
133.	Mary Reid	06/06/19	<p>I have looked at the plans and ideas for the Otterpool development and strongly object to such a large development. This area of Kent is known as The Garden of England and does not need to be over developed. There are acute lack of doctors at the local GP Surgeries in the area. The William Harvey Hospital is always exceedingly busy and waiting times for A &amp; E, general surgery etc are very long.</p> <p>Has anyone ever considered what would happen if a major incident happened at the Channel Tunnel. Where would people be taken?</p> <p>Water is a serious problem and lack of it. Why not use brown field sites. Taking away good arable land is stupid. We should be growing more of our own food rather than bringing food from overseas.</p> <p>School places are an issue. As the county has grammar schools, there will be a shortage of spaces.</p> <p>The number of car will increase significantly on local roads which are already in a very poor condition. Where on earth are all these people going to work? The trains are already very busy. Only last week my son had to stand all the way to London from Ashford. I have also experienced this.</p> <p>Have you ever considered there is a reason people live in this area. Quiet, peaceful, beautiful scenery. If we wanted to live in a built up area, then I would go and live in a busy town. Light pollution, air pollution, noise pollution. Damage to the environment.</p> <p>Please consider all the above before subjecting our future generation to a blot on the landscape. I thought this was an AONB?</p>	LPA142
134.	Mr and Mrs Alexander	06/06/19	<p>This is overdevelopment of a rural area which does not have the capacity to support the increase in traffic, utilities (water usage) and medical facilities namely hospitals.</p> <p>It will have a detrimental effect on surrounding villages removing their identity as villages for ever as the development progresses around them Destroy the natural habitat that exists within the planned development even with green areas being included. You cannot replace natural habitat that has taken years to evolve</p> <p>Increase in traffic will affect my village Sellindge enormously. The A20 splits this village with schools medical facilities and housing alongside it. Pollution and noise will increase across the village with small lanes used as rat runs.</p> <p>There is no address to this in the plan</p> <p>Water shortage is a known fact for this area. There seems to be a conflict of information between affinity water and the Otterpool proposers as to whether there is enough water to supply this development.</p> <p>William Harvey hospital is already working to capacity. What arrangements Are there for all these extra residents. Yes they have included medical centres But where are the extra hospital beds coming from?</p> <p>Yes we need extra housing but there is so much new development here already, in our village and around Ashford and surrounding areas. We are suffocating our rural areas for the sake of greedy developers. Do not sacrifice our</p>	LPA143

			unique area for a huge carbuncle .Once gone it will be for ever. Our descendants may have a box to live in, but will they ever experience a rural environment we enjoy today and will they blame us for not protecting it as we should.	
135.	Mr and Mrs Cook	06/06/19	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No A20 bypass for Sellindge is being considered as part of this development. Why not? So traffic will run through our village?</li> <li>2. No traffic calming for the A20 Barrow Hill is included in this application or swan lane as this will be used to avoid any lights, or road issues.</li> <li>3. No traffic controls are included to stop HGV traffic travelling from Otterpool Lane down Barrow Hill and into Sellindge. We are already inundated with lorries, driving, parking, human waste and rubbish.</li> <li>4. A new proposed primary road from Newingreen to Otterpool Lane, will now NOT take any HGV traffic. This road will only to be used to serve new housing in the new development. They don't want HGV traffic driving passing their new homes.</li> <li>5. The developers are no longer recommending Junction 11 as the main access route into and out of the new development. They say that Junction 11 would not be able to cope. They will let traffic head through Sellindge at whim; they say that up to 20% of new traffic will do this. Their figures mean an extra 1600 vehicles per hour at peak times. (What if they are being too optimistic about this?) If you say junction 11 can't cope then how the hell will sellindge?</li> <li>6. No cycle path or pavement improvements along the A20 on Barrow Hill is planned, and no traffic calming proposals.</li> <li>7. No air quality testing has been done for this development in Barrow Hill or Sellindge.</li> <li>8. Sellindge Village will not receive any Section 106 improvements funding as part of this development. The wildlife is established on the race course and it is a beautiful place you wish to ruin.</li> <li>9. I object to the whole idea as does my husband Mr Geoffrey Cook.</li> </ol>	LPA144
136	Mr and Mrs Owen	06/06/19		LPA145
137.	Mr and Mrs Shephard	06/06/19	<p>(1) We understand that Jct 11 will not be able to cope with the volume of traffic that this new development will bring. If this is the case then how on earth is it deemed logical that the A20 through our village of Sellindge will be able to cope!</p> <p>(2) If there is a problem on the M20 and it is closed, and traffic diverted through Sellindge, surely there will be a case of Operation Stack on the A20!</p> <p>In the light of the above and the fact that the volume of traffic, especially HGVs travelling to or from the ports is inevitably going to increase, surely a By-Pass should be a critical part of the new development. We are lead to believe that the developers of this site are not willing to finance a new By-pass which we and many others feel should be an integral part of this plan.</p> <p>If this was to be built as part of the infrastructure then possibly this would be more acceptable.</p>	LPA146
138.	Mandy Tranger	06/06/19	<p>I am writing to you with regards the above planning application, as I was unable to provide my comments on the Folkestone &amp; Hythe District Council website, due to the convoluted format adopted for such an event. Whilst I appreciate the need for more housing - indeed, exploring the possibility of making the many existing empty properties across the South-East region habitable should be a priority - I am not in favour of this particular proposal, for the following reasons. My husband and I live in Stream Cottage, which, as the name suggests, is not only close to a stream, a tributary of the River Stour runs through the garden within six metres of the kitchen and lounge walls. Although the Environmental Agency work hard to ensure the waterway runs freely and at a suitable level, there are times during and after heavy rainfall when the water level reaches an extremely high level - often touching the underside of the road/foot bridge that spans the A20 next to our property. With this in mind, I am extremely concerned about the run-off that will occur once vast areas of the farmland that currently provides drainage for a high percentage of rainfall, becomes concreted over with proposed roads, footpaths, houses, schools, business etc, etc. We are literally downstream of the proposed</p>	LPA147

			<p>Otterpool site, making our home significantly at risk of flooding. The stream already breaks the far bank on occasion, not only close to our home, but also on the farmland in question, which would surely make it a floodplain and therefore unsuitable for any kind of housing development.</p> <p>Traffic has increased three-fold along the A20 in the nine years we have lived here, which is, at times, often unbearable, especially with the HGVs. The A20 was never intended to support so many vehicles, and to build a further 8,500 homes - each occupied by drivers with at least one, possibly two cars - not only would the A20 be saturated in a very short space of time, so too would all roads leading to and from it. There is not the capacity in this particular area to sustain that number of vehicles, nor is there the ability to improve the infrastructure without further concreting over vast swathes of what little countryside will remain.</p> <p>Following on from the previous point: now, more than ever, parents and grandparents are being told their children and grandchildren are in danger of suffering from breathing and chest-related debilitating - and often life-threatening - diseases due to the build-up of traffic and its omissions.</p> <p>Building a new town among villages where these parents/grandparents chose to live in order to provide their families with a better quality of life is not acceptable. Not only for existing residents but for the quality of life of those who might move into the new homes, as their children/grandchildren will also suffer from the toxic traffic fumes. This cannot be denied, as a visit to any one of the new housing estates from Hawkinge to Sittingbourne will show a sea of cars, often double-parked in the tiny 'driveways' allocated to each house, butting right up to their front doors, frequently half on and half off the pavements, which forces people to walk in the narrow roads - not ideal for parents wanting to walk their children to the newly-built primary school, consumed by traffic fumes on all sides.</p> <p>Other traffic issues are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sellindge would need a bypass.</li> <li>2. Traffic calming along the entire stretch of Barrow Hill would need to be implemented.</li> <li>3. HGVs should NOT be permitted to use the A20 through Sellindge, at any cost. Road surfaces are constantly being repaired as it is, at an enormous cost to the local council and, ultimately, the paying public - i.e. the very residents whose lives are made a misery from the traffic.</li> <li>4. It appears Junction 11 is not seen as the recommended route out of the housing development as it would not be able to cope with the increase of traffic - if Junction 11 could not cope, the heavily congested Junction 10 certainly would not cope, and the route to it through Sellindge Village would cause immeasurable suffering for all residents.</li> <li>5. A huge increase in traffic would not only stem from the 8,500 new homes, but from the proposed business, schools, retail facilities, leisure facilities - to name a few.</li> </ol> <p>If no forethought for the much-needed arable farming land that currently exists in this area, not only to provide food but to ensure future generations can enjoy the benefits of the countryside and nature - without which humankind would not survive - Sellindge, and the surrounding villages are in danger of becoming totally engulfed with vast urban sprawls connecting them to Ashford on all sides.</p> <p>Please listen to the genuine concerns of current residents - we make up the local community whose lives will be forever altered by ill-advised short-term decisions made now to please those bringing finance to the table, in favour of the long-term benefits of ensuring open countryside - and all its benefits for people and nature - is available for generations to come.</p>	
139.	Gillian Coates	06/06/19	<p>I am totally opposed to this plan. It will be a city on the edge of Lympne. It will cause chaos and confusion for drivers and cyclists. I moved to a quiet village and I believe it is completely out of scale for the local area. Local people can't afford to buy newly built homes. There is a surplus of empty properties locally because people cannot afford them. However my biggest issue is the lack of affordable social housing plus there is a huge lack of usable public transport in the area. Please do NOT pass this application. There is widespread opposition from local residents who pay high rates of council tax. Our views should be heard, loud and clear!</p> <p>There is a great deal of suspicion about the way the scheme has been given to the builders and about the honesty of the council who have railroaded this application through. These people are supposed to serve local residents, not oppose them.</p>	LPA148

140.	Neil Walker	06/06/19	<p><b>Local Need</b></p> <p>The Council Core Strategy Review 2019 makes plain at paragraphs 2.3, 2.5 and 2.7 that population increase in Kent has been due to migration from elsewhere and not from a significant local population increase. Para 2.16 emphasises this by stating that "Over this period natural change in the population has broadly balanced out". It can therefore be seen that this project is not to benefit local people, but to attract those who wish to move into the area. Para 2.4 highlights that Kent has already "made a significant contribution to the government's housing plans." A second aim of the project is to bring in a younger working age population. The Council cannot guarantee that this will happen. They cannot prohibit the purchase of properties as holiday homes (the original aspiration for Otterpool before this project), or by London or other Boroughs seeking to relocate those requiring more care and assistance. The latter would place a considerable strain on existing services.</p> <p><b>Water Supply</b></p> <p>The 2008 British Geological Survey research report RR/08/02 - The Chalk aquifer of the North Downs stated in the Executive summary "The North Downs has a long history of water supply development which has concentrated mainly on the Chalk aquifer. It is likely that the future impact of climate change processes will only exacerbate the existing conflict between supply and demand. The future for the Chalk aquifer of the North Downs will unfold within a framework of increasing national and EC legislation aimed at environmental protection and enhancement which will demand increasingly stringent control over water abstraction, use and reuse." Since this was written, there has been, and continues to be, continued development along the Chalk aquifer of the North Downs. These developments are all drawing off the same resource. To put it simply, the well will be running dry, and the Council will not be able to provide what is not there.</p> <p>The plan contains reference to technology solutions and restrictions. It will not be possible to impose restrictions on Otterpool Park and leave the rest of the FH&amp;DC area to continue as before. The plan highlights that 5% of existing properties may be retro-fitted with water saving technology, this means that 95% of existing properties will not and are therefore facing higher water bills.</p> <p><b>Cost</b></p> <p>As co-developers of the project, the Council will undoubtedly incur costs and liabilities throughout. Unless these are to be met from Central Government funds, they will have to be met by either raising Council Tax or by removing/reducing existing Services, or a combination of both. Para 5.9 concerning affordable housing states "Should this be shown to be impractical on a specific site, then an equivalent financial contribution will be required. Effectively this means the Council, as co-developer, will be fining itself, the fine will therefore be passed to local taxpayers.</p> <p><b>Services</b></p> <p>The entire project is based on assumptions that both National and Local trends are to be reversed. Shortages of GPs, Dentists, Nurses, Carers and Teachers are well reported. The shortage of GPs locally has led to a number of surgeries within the Council area closing. The Council cannot guarantee that these shortages will be reversed, and the proposal for Otterpool Park will only exacerbate matters.</p> <p>The plan also envisages a thriving, vibrant High Street, again this goes against National trends (Ashford has been touted as an exception, but as it is to lose it's Debenhams, along with Folkestone, it will be instructive to see if this continues). Furthermore, an HSI upgrade to Westenhanger will make access to Westfield Stratford City and London quick and easy, negating the reason for investment in retail at Otterpool Park. With regards the proposed upgrade to Westenhanger to HS 1 status, this does not make sense. HS 1 services already exist at Folkestone and Ashford. It is understood that the plan for Otterpool Park does not factor in the additional space required for car parking should HS 1 services be installed. HS 1 service would seem to be desirable only to take the workforce out, or bring it in, which would seem to contradict the aspirations of local employment.</p> <p><b>Employment</b></p>	LPA149
------	-------------	----------	---	--------

			<p>The plan and supporting publicity talk of around 9,500 jobs created locally, roughly a ratio of 50/50 local to commuting. The Core Strategy Review 2019 states at para 4.56 that "Adopting a labour supply scenario indicates that 4,770 new jobs should be planned for by 2037", thus changing the ratio to 25/75 local to commuting. This discrepancy is not explained.</p> <p>The proposed creation of jobs is again aspirational and cannot be guaranteed. An area can only support an economical number of similar companies before saturation is reached and there is consolidation of the market. The plan appears to be focusing on a narrow band of areas, which will eventually become unsustainable. The focus on tourism will inevitably lead to far greater levels of vehicle traffic on roads not able to cope with such increases.</p> <p>Traffic Otterpool Park will generate considerable additional traffic, not only for the M20 and A20, but also the A261 Hythe Road, B2067 Aldington Road and B2068 Canterbury Road. These latter three will struggle to cope with the extra demand, which may well lead to an increase in pedestrian and vehicle accidents. Additionally, this demand will lead to congestion, pollution and disturbance to communities outside the immediate Otterpool catchment area.</p> <p>Pollution The Otterpool Park proposal will contribute to air, noise and light pollution. The additional number of people, their vehicles and their houses, however designed, cannot avoid this.</p>	
141.	Nick Taylor	06/06/19	<p>Context I am fourth generation in my family to live in Sellindge. This application is absolutely huge and contains thousands upon thousands of pages of text and drawings. My first objection is on how grossly unfair it is of you to expect the public to trawl through all of this in such a short period of time. The only statutory opportunity that I have to comment on this is now and, as a consequence of the vast size of this application, I can only find the time to review areas specifically of interest to my family or me and to object or comment thereon.</p> <p>The case for this Garden Town The development seems not to have followed the principles of good planning but has been driven by political expedient. For instance the village of Sellindge has been subject to a village planning process for some years now and the villagers have acquiesced to just under 1000 new homes, according to the development strategy that you have published. The process for this was fairly transparent but the process for Otterpool has not. Otterpool seems to be driven by developer need and not local needs. We are told that the local authority has entered a joint venture development agreement with the Cayman Islands registered owner of some of the prime land in this development but we are not being provided with the terms of this secretive association which has fuelled speculation concerning its motives, money flows, community benefits and even potential loss of taxes to the UK. We are told that the mix of housing will ease the property needs for the area in future but yet we are told now that only 22% of the proposed total of 10000 homes will be affordable. Even this is not thought through as the provision of such affordable homes in a rural environment will need significant public transport and travel infrastructure that is not anticipated in the drawings that have been provided. We have not, at any of the public events, been satisfied that the case for a development at Otterpool is the best solution for the area, taking account developments elsewhere; for instance, it is in the public domain that Ashford intends to increase its population from around 80000 currently to around 142000 within 10-15 years. This is a town with established Road and (importantly) a very sound Rail infrastructure. There is absolutely no narrative that ties in the development of Ashford with Otterpool despite it being no more than a handful of miles away. I want the business case published in full and I want to see the assumptions that you have used and how these have been treated. I the money flows published and, in particular, I want to see what the values of the money flows that will be subject to UK taxes. I the agreements that exist between the landowners, the developers and the Local Authority published and I want to see written assurances from all past and present Councillors, that are involved in either the development joint ventures or the planning processes, that they are not going to personally benefit in any way from any transactions associated with this development now, in the past or in the future.</p> <p>Rail travel</p>	LPA150



			<p>The plans exclude the area of Westenhanger Station yet the developers tell us that the expansion of this Rail Hub is critical to the transport strategy for the development. I do not believe that this has been adequately considered and, as the station has been excluded from the plan, the developer is merely expressing a wish that it might. In fact at 5.3.16 of the APPLICATION DOCUMENT 3.10 TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT VOLUME 1: MAIN REPORT AND ANNEX OF FIGURES the ambitions for this vital element of the transport strategy are at best vague and certainly no more than aspirational.</p> <p>This transport hub is so critical to the strategy of this development that the developer must provide an architectural solution, before any consent is granted, and that this must be fully costed, funded by the developer and signed off by Network Rail, Ofst and the Rail Franchise Operator before it could be included in the plans. The rail infrastructure proposals are immature and they do not reflect the level of potential use when they should be at the forefront of the strategy for this scheme. This lack of planning will consequently increase road use at a time when the environmental impact of this is at best poor and at worst damaging to human health.</p> <p>Road usage</p> <p>There will be three broad journey routes to and from this development. They will be West to/from London, Mid Ken and Ashford, North to Canterbury and the North Kent area and the East to Folkestone, Dover and the east Kent coast. The current drawings show that the housing in the west of the development (the most concentrated) will, in the absence of a main route through to Junction 11, result in a massive increase in road use through Sellindge. Hidden away in Table 55 of the Transport Strategy submission is the startling fact that road usage through Sellindge will increase by between 29% and 33% by 2037 rising to 30%-44% by 2044. I object to this. The Rail Bridge over the A20 is shown outside the scope of the application and I see no reference to the widening of this in the application. To do so will be a hugely expensive alteration to the Main Line Rail infrastructure, which is not included in this application. Any consent must be conditional on this being fully costed and agreed by Network Rail. Further, the development to the west does not allow for the transport infrastructure impact of the development lands in the area from Harringe Lane to Court Lodge area to the south of the A20, which is shown in the strategic plan and, if developed, would add further traffic chaos which will not be able to be alleviated as there is not provision in this development plan for any bypass for Sellindge which will be needed in the future.</p> <p>If the developer is not prepared to plan for - and fund - the widening of the A20 Rail overbridge, it should be compelled to the creation of a bypass from Otterpool Lane over Harringe Lane to join the A20 to the west of Court Lodge near St Marys Church. This will not only smooth and facilitate easy road access to the development but also facilitate easy transport access to the possible future development in Sellindge.</p> <p>Apart from those living at the eastern extremities of the proposed development, I can see absolutely no option for road users wishing to head North from the scheme other than to travel down Barrow Hill and turn right into Swan Lane to head North. I object to this. Swan Lane is not configured to take significant increases in traffic.</p> <p>Junction 11 of the M20</p> <p>The developer tells us that HGV traffic from the only existing industrial site in the scheme will continue. It will be natural for HGV drivers to want to route through Sellindge and thence to J10A en route to the West, whereas it is established that all HGV traffic is routed via J11. I am told that there will be little additional traffic mitigation to ensure the routing of this traffic to J11 that should be the position now but is little enforced. I object strongly to this. The main road in Sellindge has only just become relatively safe and calm. The village is expanding and with it there are plans to expand the primary school and other village amenities. HGVs are currently discouraged from travelling through the village and the proposed development should actively strive to continue to minimise through traffic to avoid pollution, a degradation of the environment and potentially injury or even traffic death. Sellindge is justly proud of its road casualty history and if this were to worsen due to this development, the residents - including me - will have no hesitation at pointing out that objections were made at then planning consultation stage of this scheme. The developer must, if this scheme must go ahead, be compelled to route westbound traffic away from Sellindge. I don't care what method is used - a bypass would be the least costly option to the developer - but I am clear that if this is not a condition, Councillors in the Planning Committee should be held responsible for all consequences.</p> <p>S106 monies</p> <p>I want the developer - who will make billions from this scheme - to commit now to S106 contributions to be used to create infrastructure changes out with the proposed development to mitigate the impact of the development on the</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>established communities. This must include improvements to J11 to take the increased traffic, traffic mitigation measures in Sellindge and Lypne to remove all HGV and other traffic that would otherwise be routed through Sellindge. All of the improvements proposed by the developer on its website should be reflected in the submitted plans.</p> <p>Further objections</p> <p>I object to the proposals concerning fresh and wastewater. I do not believe that sufficient consideration has been given to the impact on water consumption from the existing aquifers in the area as well as the infrastructure needed for this as well as the disposal of waste and brown water. I have asked about the extent to which the public assurances provided by Affinity Water to able to deal with this for around 30-40000 people have been tested and validated. The only statements I have seen have been based on assumptions of water consumptions of lower than 100 litres per day. The Southern Water Website provides data that shows the average consumption in its area is 178 litres per day. Therefore, someone is being mislead or is misleading us. The developer should be instructed to recast its plans to provide for more realistic water use and should explain how this is to be secured from the limited resources available currently.</p> <p>I strongly object to the loss of a rural environment. With the exception of the land on Folkestone Racecourse, pretty well all of the land to be used is currently used as farmland. This farmland provides many of us with food, a rural environment and rural amenity and I object strongly to the loss of this. We are told that Otterpool will have wide green open spaces and vistas. I do not believe this. An example of where this was promised but not delivered has been the Taylor Wimpey Development in the centre of Sellindge where rural vistas and amenity have been lost forever and the Local Authority was toothless in its ability to prevent this. The current view of the site as a backdrop to the Downs AONB is a part of our heritage and must be protected and not destroyed.</p> <p>Finally, I object to having imposed upon my family and me the prospect, over the last few years, of the whole concept which has been ill, conceived and which is inconsistent with the development strategy that has already been agreed for this area.</p>	
142.	Patricia Philip	06/06/19	<p>On the following grounds:-</p> <p>This planning application is not supported by the current Development Plan which already has provision for 14,500 new homes. So why has it even been submitted?</p> <p>Where is the water coming from for this proposed development? Affinity Water have a 'Water Scarcity Status'. We are the driest area in the country.</p> <p>The loss of wildlife, habitat and trees is not acceptable in this day and age when we are losing species faster than ever before and Extinction Rebellion are mounting increased pressure on governments all over the world to halt this destruction. The recently published UN Global Assessment of Nature has comprehensively warned of the seriousness of the environmental situation we now face and is reason enough to condemn this proposed development.</p> <p>Applications to build on Lypne Airfield have been refused five separate times, culminating in the successful High Court action supported by the Secretary of State to stop development on this site and the negative impact it would have on the surrounding AON B.</p> <p>What has changed?</p> <p>Traffic pollution from a development of this size so close to the M20 with it's 12,000 lorry movements a day (as per the Highways England consultation at the Quarterhouse, Tontine Street, Folkestone) will exacerbate the poor air quality that we already suffer from in this area and no amount of cycle tracks will deter people from driving cars. Building huge amounts of houses without the infrastructure to support them will cause even more problems for the existing over stretched infrastructure. The impact of living on a building site for the next 20 years for the surrounding towns and villages that surround the proposed site will be intolerable and will compromise the quality of their lives and wellbeing.</p> <p>To comply with the statutory precondition for development of a new town Folkestone and Hythe District Council had to provide evidence of local support. I have attended all the "consultations". The last two being held at Western hanger Castle where notice of the consultation was sorely inadequate and difficult to access if you do not drive. I have conducted exit polls at both these consultations and the results show an overwhelming lack of support for this proposed development.</p> <p>The exit poll for the last consultation on 16th May 2019 are recorded as follows:-</p> <p>In favour: 9</p> <p>Not in favour: 117</p>	LPA151

No Comment: 38			
143.	Paul Sidders	06/06/19	<p>I object to this planning application under these points;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Nature Conservation ( loss of biodivesity and degradation of the natural environment)</li> <li>2) Goverment policy</li> <li>3) Proposals in the development plan</li> <li>4) layout and density of building.</li> <li>5) Sustainability.</li> <li>6) Noise, air and light pollution.</li> <li>7) Climate</li> <li>8) Human rights</li> <li>9) Traffic</li> </ol> <p>My comments cover these points Some of these points are not on the list for material considerations, but I think they are relevant. Can you please reply in relation to my concerns once you have read my comments. Thank you. I have read the EIA for this application. Spoken at length with a consultant ecologist for the project. The omittance on the EIA that wildlife will be adversely affected due to habitat loss, disturbance and direct mortality is very concerning. I can see ecological surveys have been carried out, acknowledgement of existing habitat corridors/ features been made. But the truth remains the same. Existing Species numbers and habitat will be degraded. Many of which are protected. Reliance on this site for their existance is entirely evident. There is a strong probabilty the immensity of this development will result in the collapse of ecosystems within the site, and cause the absence of some species entirely. Restricting and bordering recognised bio rich areas with urbanisation will result in direct losses for less mobile/ adaptable species, and cause degradation and decline of the natural environment. Directly affecting human health and wellbeing. Species at high risk from losses and possible local extinction include; Barn owl. Not a numerous species for this area, protected and a vital top predator, nesting in buildings and feeding in long established small mammal rich grassland within this site. The resident pair/ pairs do not necessarily need to negotiate major transport links to access key locations within in their territories. At present they have a very suitable and favorable habitat. However this will change drastically if this plan goes ahead. Direct losses due to traffic collision, disurbance, loss of suitable nesting sites, feeding areas is inevitable. Skylark, Reed bunting, Linett and other birds on the list of conservation concern. This area is extremely rich ornithologically. Many species are listed as threatened, including Skylark which have declined nationally by 75% in the last 25 years. A ground nesting bird, it is particularly at risk from disturbance and predation. Nesting in abundance in both improved agricultural areas and older grassland on the site. Even if existing bio rich areas are retained, breeding Skylark will be much reduced or absent if this development goes ahead, due to disturbance from noise, people, dogs, predation from cats and loss of habitat. I acknowledge some bird species will take advantage of new planting on the site. However the most threaten species are at greatest risk from further decline and being made absent. Species listed for conservation concern, Linett, Reed Bunting and others need a rich rural environment, with plenty of room to breed and feed. They are not suited to gardens and managed recreational areas. They need countryside to exist. 10 species of bat 10 species of bat is a tremendous return for just one ecological survey area. This represents over half the species to be found in the UK. This area has a complexity of habitats. Each species filling a unique niche, differing needs for breeding, foraging and hibernation. The overwhelming disturbance from this devolpment will in all probability reduce the number of species and bat's overall. Retention of linear features and ponds for foraging has been acknowledged. However these areas will suffer degradation and be restricted amongst an urbanised environment. The biomass of prey species will reduce and artificial light will disrupt lifecycle and habits.</p>
			LPA152

			<p>Bats themselves and their maternity/hibernation roosts are protected. I understand roosts have been located. The removal of colonies will happen. Some colonies relocated away from the area. All species are threatened. These methods are invasive and success is not garenteed. The demise of these animals risks the loss of their contribution to ecosystem.</p> <p>The list goes on. Toads which follow strict migration roots will be heavily affected by direct losses. The highly endangered Watervole will suffer further ristrictions. This development will be detrimental to biodiversity, ecology and the environment. Erase the existence of a much loved characterful landscape. It will be the unsympathetic excessive placement of housing. Twice the size of Hythe and blight nearby villages.</p> <p>I do not believe this area can sustainably support the needs of a further 22'000 people. Who will need 8'500 to 10'000 houses, water, power, infrastructure, thousands of extra vehicles. We will experience a reduction in air quality and an increase in climate changing gasses. Positive placement of housing is essential for the local community. This plan vastly exceeds that need.</p> <p>In our age the natural environment, which we depend on for health and wellbeing is under immense pressures. This development will exacerbate the problem. Turning a rural area urban is irresponsible.</p> <p>The alternative</p> <p>This land needs to largely remain as countryside. It is essential we retain the farming land for food production. Farmers can be supported to encourage wildlife. Natural areas enhanced and created. The ecosystem restored and supported. Threatened species prioritised and acknowledged for their importance. Brown field sites consiered more. A measured sympathetic approach to housing which supports the local community.</p> <p>"We need to be realistic". A consultant for the project told me "We cannot all live in tree houses". I agree, but we also should not have to live in an urbanised world, largely ignoring the environment we rely on.</p>	
144.	Pauline Kingston	06/06/19	<p>We are so lucky to live in a country with a moderate climate and good fertile soil. With more and more countries suffering extreme weather destroying crops and wildlife, instead of helping to feed the world, our "powers that be" are determined to destroy and concrete over our precious gifts.</p> <p>No wonder more people are suffering from mental health issues, even chicken were protected from life in battery houses. Families can't even go and sit by the sea to unwind, without dipping in their pockets for money for parking meters and walks through true countryside, to see wildlife will be a thing of the past. Look how many earthworms must have lost their lives under concrete and landfill and how many more we are going to see swallowed up.</p> <p>Please wake up before it is lost for good. "Money, money, money, in the rich man's world" and houses, flats and more houses, won't provide the space tp grow FOOD or provide water and fresh air quality.</p>	LPA153
145.	Penny Knight	06/06/19	<p>I wish to register my STRONG objection to Y19/0257/FH-OTTERPOOL PARK . My starting point is the fact that this Government supported</p> <p>My starting point is the fact that this Government supported Garden Town notion is meant to be community led. We have never been asked if we wanted it, in fact, 27 Parish Councillors told FHDC that they didn't want it almost 3 years ago and still</p> <p>the Council pushed on against democracy.</p> <p>Why weren't we asked if we wanted a massive housing estate linking our villages. Why have you pushed ahead with it with less than 3% support??? We already have 14,560 homes for local people in the pipeline.</p> <p>We do not need any more increases in demand.</p> <p>I include a link to Affinity Waters article dated May 2019 which clearly states that within the next 25 years and beyond, there may not be enough water due to climate change, population growth and increases in demand unless the Government takes action.</p> <p>If Affinity Water is concerned about the supply of water, why isn't Folkestone &amp; Hythe Council? Why do you insist on ploughing on with these ideas that are not welcome and are unsustainable?</p> <p>The road system in this area clearly already struggles with the traffic without adding to the situation. Who is going to pay for any required changes in infrastructure when the Council insists on buying every field in sight rather than investing money into services that already exist but are in need of investment such as social care? Will the council need to raise our Council Tax, already the highest in Kent, to pay for services to meet the needs of an unwanted town?</p>	LPA154

			Please register this objection, which we all know will be ignored as the Council plough ahead on a project that is not wanted, that it can't afford and that the existing area cannot absorb into current facilities and services.	
146.	Peter Rowe	06/06/19	<p>I emailed in comments about the Otterpool development at the beginning of the week, as I could not fit everything I wanted to mention in the space on the planning portal, but as yet unfortunately, they have not appeared online. I realise that you must be very busy and I expect it takes time to upload these things, however, as the deadline for making comments is fast running out and just in case I did something wrong (eg I didn't use the correct email address or put my address on the document) please find below full details of my objection to the development.</p> <p>Whilst I would not oppose some limited additional development in the area, I strongly object to the current planning application for the Otterpool development owing to its sheer scale and the detrimental effect it will have on the health, mental wellbeing and quality of life for existing local residents. There are already plans for around 60,000 new homes to be built in the region and there is a limit to what can actually be shoehorned into this tiny, water starved corner of the country.</p> <p>I should be very grateful if the planning committee would read my reasons for objecting prior to making their decision on whether or not to allow this development to go ahead.</p> <p><b>Traffic and Transport</b></p> <p>I have concerns regarding the accuracy of the traffic modelling report undertaken by the developer. Cameras to monitor traffic flow were put up in the district for a very short period of time, in the middle of the week and at a very quiet time of year. The traffic assessment states that it only needs to monitor local traffic movements and it is not required to take anything else into account. How can this be the case? Surely the area should be looked at as a whole.</p> <p>The A20 running through the proposed development is the primary relief road for the area should there be any mishaps on the M20 or any disruption due to operations stack. There are also large numbers of seasonal holiday makers and regular visitors driving through down to the coast.</p> <p>This area is also the gateway from the Channel Ports to the rest of the country so the huge amount of traffic generated by this this must surely be taken in to account when planning any new housing developments in the area. I am also concerned that there has been so little consideration taken in to account regarding the impact of additional traffic flowing down London Road and through Hythe, together with the implications of this on our small historic seaside town. This proposed development is actually double the size of Hythe. It will destroy our semi-rural lifestyle and our local infrastructure will creak at the seams. A potential additional 20,000 cars plus the volume of new traffic from the Quarry, Shorncliffe and Seabrook Road developments (yet to be fully realised in Hythe) is likely to cause mayhem.</p> <p>Traffic is already dreadful here especially during holiday periods and at every weekend. Although they will try to direct it towards the motorway, the developers have acknowledged that there is likely to be a significant increase in local traffic, particularly around the one-way system near Sainsbury's. Their answer to this seems to be to do away with the free parking spaces alongside the Royal Military Canal. These are currently much used by people who work in the town, by visitors to the Light Railway and people attending the many cultural and civic events that go on here. How will the loss of such a significant number of parking spaces be mitigated in a town which is reliant on summer visitors?</p> <p>Loss of free parking will be detrimental to the local High Street economy. If the through road along Princes Parade is also stopped, this could potentially end in gridlock in Hythe. The huge increase in vehicle emissions, which will have an adverse effect on the health, wellbeing and air quality for local residents.</p> <p>If the report does not take all this additional traffic movement into account then it must be must be flawed and not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Why weren't we asked if we wanted a massive housing estate linking our villages. Why have you pushed ahead with it with less than 3% support??? We already have 14,560 homes for local people in the pipeline.</p> <p>We do not need any more increases in demand.</p>	LPA155

		<p>I include a link to Affinity Waters article dated May 2019 which clearly states that within the next 25 years and beyond, there may not be enough water due to climate change, population growth and increases in demand unless the Government takes action.</p> <p>If Affinity Water is concerned about the supply of water, why isn't Folkestone &amp; Hythe Council? Why do you insist on ploughing on with these ideas that are not welcome and are unsustainable?</p> <p>The road system in this area clearly already struggles with the traffic without adding to the situation. Who is going to pay for any required changes in infrastructure when the Council insists on buying every field in sight rather than investing money into services that already exist but are in need of investment such as social care? Will the council need to raise our Council Tax, already the highest in Kent, to pay for services to meet the needs of an unwanted town?</p> <p>Please register this objection, which we all know will be ignored as the Council plough ahead on a project that is not wanted, that it can't afford and that the existing area cannot absorb into current facilities and services.</p> <p>I emailed in comments about the Otterpool development at the beginning of the week, as I could not fit everything I wanted to mention in the space on the planning portal, but as yet unfortunately, they have not appeared online.</p> <p>I realise that you must be very busy and I expect it takes time to upload these things, however, as the deadline for making comments is fast running out and just in case I did something wrong (eg I didn't use the correct email address or put my address on the document) please find below full details of my objection to the development.</p> <p>Whilst I would not oppose some limited additional development in the area, I strongly object to the current planning application for the Otterpool development owing to its sheer scale and the detrimental effect it will have on the health, mental wellbeing and quality of life for existing local residents. There are already plans for around 60,000 new homes to be built in the region and there is a limit to what can actually be shoehorned into this tiny, water starved corner of the country.</p> <p>I should be very grateful if the planning committee would read my reasons for objecting prior to making their decision on whether or not to allow this development to go ahead.</p> <p><b>Traffic and Transport</b></p> <p>I have concerns regarding the accuracy of the traffic modelling report undertaken by the developer. Cameras to monitor traffic flow were put up in the district for a very short period of time, in the middle of the week and at a very quiet time of year. The traffic assessment states that it only needs to monitor local traffic movements and it is not required to take anything else into account. How can this be the case? Surely the area should be looked at as a whole.</p> <p>The A20 running through the proposed development is the primary relief road for the area should there be any mishaps on the M20 or any disruption due to operations stack. There are also large numbers of seasonal holiday makers and regular visitors driving through down to the coast.</p> <p>This area is also the gateway from the Channel Ports to the rest of the country so the huge amount of traffic generated by this this must surely be taken in to account when planning any new housing developments in the area.</p> <p>I am also concerned that there has been so little consideration taken in to account regarding the impact of additional traffic flowing down London Road and through Hythe, together with the implications of this on our small historic seaside town. This proposed development is actually double the size of Hythe. It will destroy our semi-rural lifestyle and our local infrastructure will creak at the seams. A potential additional 20,000 cars plus the volume of new traffic from the Quarry, Shorncliffe and Seabrook Road developments (yet to be fully realised in Hythe) is likely to cause mayhem.</p> <p>Traffic is already dreadful here especially during holiday periods and at every weekend. Although they will try to direct it towards the motorway, the developers have acknowledged that there is likely to be a significant increase in local traffic, particularly around the one-way system near Sainsbury's. Their answer to this seems to be to do away with the free parking spaces alongside the Royal Military Canal. These are currently much used by people who work in the town, by visitors to the Light Railway and people attending the many cultural and civic events that go on here.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>How will the loss of such a significant number of parking spaces be mitigated in a town which is reliant on summer visitors?</p> <p>Loss of free parking will be detrimental to the local High Street economy. If the through road along Princes Parade is also stopped, this could potentially end in gridlock in Hythe. The huge increase in vehicle emissions, which will have an adverse effect on the health, wellbeing and air quality for local residents.</p> <p>If the report does not take all this additional traffic movement into account then it must be must be flawed and not fit for purpose.</p> <p>There has been no agreement yet that HSI will stop at Westenhanger. At the recent exhibition, which I attended, I was told that there are currently no plans to stop the high-speed train there until it is proved that there is sufficient demand to make this viable. Significant upgrading of the station would be needed for this to happen. This obviously means that the houses will come first before any changes to infrastructure.</p> <p>10,000 houses mean at least another 20,000 + people in the area. The developers say around 9,000 jobs would be created at Otterpool, so the remainder will have to commute elsewhere. Otterpool will become a dormitory town for London commuters who will be attracted by the thought of cheaper housing. The developers will be able to charge high prices and thereby price out local people living on local wages. As a result, we lose our green space with no benefit for local people.</p> <p>Anyone wishing to commute to London from there would have to either a take a 1 hour 40-minute journey to Charing Cross on the slow train or go by car or train to Folkestone West or Ashford to link up with HSI. At peak times HSI trains are currently crammed full and it is already often standing room only from Ashford to London. How will all these additional passengers from Otterpool be catered for when there is so much new building going on around Ashford too? Is there sufficient capacity for additional trains to run on the network? At present unless there are significant changes and improvements, the rail service will be inadequate to meet the demand.</p> <p><b>Destruction of Prime Agricultural Land</b></p> <p>Although some of the development will be on the on the site of the Folkestone Racecourse, (which was a superb attraction for visitors and if a limited development had been allowed to happen in the past, to enable the refurbishment of the Grandstand, could still be so) most of it will be on prime areas of productive farmland. In this day and age, we should be looking towards sustainable, local food production to help cut carbon emissions and thinking ahead to protect productive farmland to ensure future food security. The compulsory purchase and destruction of this farmland will not help with this.</p> <p>The area is rich in wildlife thanks, in the main, to years of good farming practices and land management by our local farmers. Human interference by developers will inevitably result in the loss of habitat of many species of plants, birds and animals. There will be a significant detrimental effect on the local environment and the rural way of life of our local villages. The developers say that 50% of the Otterpool site will be green space but in fact we will be actually losing 50% of the surrounding countryside, which currently acts as a green corridor for wildlife and a buffer between the villages and the motorway. To be frank, what is to stop the planned green spaces being infilled in future, as is now happening to virtually all small areas of open green space all over the district. It seems to be if it's green build on it!</p> <p><b>Water</b></p> <p>There is insufficient water locally to support the size of this development. There is only enough capacity for around the first 1,500 houses. The Environment Agency has stated that water resources in the area are currently over licenced or over abstracted. With water being so scarce in the South East and so much development going on all over Kent, it is highly unlikely that any neighbouring water companies will have surplus supply to help out in the long term. This is a huge problem. There has been talk of piping in water from a reservoir near Dover and some talk of a desalination plant possibly being required to be built. If that is the case, is this development actually viable? who will pay to provide all this new infrastructure and where would a desalination plant be sited? Again, it is likely that existing local residents will have to suffer further disruption to their way of life for all this to take place.</p> <p><b>Hospitals and GP Services</b></p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>There is a chronic shortage of GP's in our area and nationwide. A huge review is currently being undertaken of accident and emergency provision in hospitals in East Kent and the system is under great strain. How will it cope with a potential additional 20,000+ people, many of whom will be moving in from outside the area, when the system can barely cope now?</p> <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>I recognise the fact that more housing is needed in the country. However, the number of houses in this plan vastly exceeds predicted local need, when taken in to account with other current developments in the area. Only 22% of this development is designated as affordable housing which, really is what is needed in our local area to enable young people to gain a foot on the housing ladder. It is therefore obvious that the target market is not local people but London overspill.</p> <p>Planning Process</p> <p>The implied close links between the Conservative led Folkestone and Hythe District Council and the developers, makes one wonder about the impartiality of the planning authority with regard to this development and whether the process has been compromised. As the Council is acting as both developer and planning authority, giving itself planning permission for its own development, holding meetings in secret and withholding information about the viability of the project from public scrutiny makes this whole process seem somewhat less than transparent and it could be perceived that they have a conflict of interest. I was under the impression that Garden Towns schemes were to be built where local people wished them to be. The local administration here has not been given a mandate by local people to go ahead with this development, yet they seem to be ploughing on regardless. The reason so many of the previous Councillors were voted out at the recent local elections was as a direct protest vote against it. Local people feel betrayed, as if their opinions on this matter do not count.</p> <p>It will be detrimental to our local tourist industry if Otterpool is built. Visitors come to enjoy the peace, fresh air and tranquillity of the countryside, explore the small villages and the attractions offered by our small historic seaside town (Hythe is actually marketed as the seaside Town where the countryside meets the sea.) Tourists will not be attracted to a huge new town where there were once open fields, nor will they relish traffic gridlock and lack of parking. It will transform our entire area from one that is essentially rural, in to a large dormitory town that could eventually merge Ashford with Folkestone transforming it in to one vast urban sprawl.</p> <p>The garden town/village concept is a very laudable and I can see why the Government would want to promote such towns in places where there are fewer constraints than there are here. Please consider if it is appropriate for one to be built here, especially on such a large scale, with some buildings in the vicinity of historic, ancient monuments and an area of outstanding natural beauty reaching to over 18 metres high.</p> <p>I urge you oppose this current plan. If there has to be some development, a much smaller garden village, designed to be in keeping with the rural character of the area, rather than a town might be more acceptable to everyone and meet with less local opposition.</p>	
147.	Mr Thompson/ Phil Thornton	06/06/19	<p>Please note our objections to the above development. The developers are predicting a 30 - 40% increase in traffic on the A20 (which is not designated as a major 'A' road) through Barrow Hill and Sellindge. The environmental damage and pollution will massively impact the residents who live along this stretch of the A20 for the next 30 years plus and will cause stress and untold damage as I understand that there are no plans for traffic calming or controls planned or air quality testing. We believe that the developers are no longer recommending junction 11 of the M20 as the main access route into and out of the new development and will allow all traffic including a massive increase in HGV s to head onto the A20 instead. It will almost certainly render the homes of the residents living on the A20 unsellable. This development has no benefit for local residents and will be an environmental catastrophe.</p>	LPA156
148.	Philip Holt	06/06/19	<p>I moved to Sellindge over ten years ago attracted by the location of a reasonable quiet rural life. I now live in a village with currently up to 250 houses being constructed in its midst with little provision for the additional infrastructure required.</p>	LPA157



			<p>For example you now have to wait more than two weeks for a Dr. appointment and it takes eight days to fulfil a medical prescription.</p> <p>Looking at the application above, it seems that we are faced with changing from a village within a village to a village with a large town on its borders. The strain on amenities would be intolerable: looking at Dr. availability again, the current surgery is short of doctors for the current population so what hope would there be for the thousands of new residents. Promises of new surgeries do not necessarily produce new doctors. There is almost universal objection in the area to the proposed development with virtually every survey, vote and comment showing a clear majority of residents expressing objections. Such a project is required to have community support yet there is no sign of this despite the Council claims to the contrary.</p> <p>Finally, I have to admit I cannot understand how a planning application with the Council one of the partners can be judged by the planning committee of the same Council.</p> <p>I will leave it to others to equate the ecological damage to the area and to assess sustainability and whether there is a requirement for so much housing in an area not renowned for its economic resurgence.</p> <p>For the reasons above I object to the application.</p>	
149.	Robert Morris	26/06/19	<p>(1) The development is of disproportionate size to the character of the local community and will change the character of the area in which I live from rural to urban. Increased traffic, noise, air pollution, light pollution and a catastrophic impact upon local natural environment will substantially reduce desirability of residing in the area.</p> <p>(2) The development is not justified by the predicted housing need for the area. In fact it amounts to a substantial over-provision on its own even without taking account of the contribution towards the predicted housing need of other developments already planned or in progress.</p> <p>(3) The proposed development is not in any event aimed at meeting local housing needs but at providing high value homes for occupation by people who wish to move out of the London area. So-called @affordable@ housing within the plan will not in reality be affordable in a real sense to local residents who continue to wish to live and work in this area rather than commute to London. Failure to actually make provision for housing of local people at prices commensurate with the local economy will drive local residents out of the area to the huge detriment of the rest of the district.</p> <p>(4) The current infrastructure of road, rail and other utility is insufficient to service the proposed development and developers have failed so far to address any realistically. For example it is suggested that Westenhanger Station will be developed to provide much enhanced services to London but there is no evidence of the service provider having any intention or desire to develop the station, nor is any indication made on plans as to how this would be encompassed within the development.</p> <p>(5) Water supply to the proposed development will be inadequate and development plans for meeting the demand are again unrealistic and ill-considered. There is insufficient water within the current system to sustain continued supply to the existing housing and businesses to the end of the period of the new development and the addition of further strain on the system will exhaust supply at an exponential rate aborting not only the new development but also accelerating the exhaustion of supply to current residents.</p> <p>(6) Road links from M20 to the development are inadequate to service a new town bigger than Hythe (which will also be serviced from the same junction(s) of the M20. The A20 through Sellindge is incapable of meeting the burden of traffic diverted from M20 when there are issues and is quite incapable of servicing further routine traffic flow of the measure required by this development. Junction 11 of the M20 will also struggle to cope with increased traffic without major redevelopment. Much traffic can be expected to use the B2068 to access Canterbury from the new town (there is no direct rail route) and the B2068 is wholly inadequate to accept increased traffic flow.</p> <p>(7) Speculation by developers that provision of schools, medical facilities, employment, etc can be achieved is based on no real investigation beyond the assumption "if we build it they will come". In reality Doctors, Nurses, teachers and other professionals are in desperately short supply in this area and cannot be attracted to it. In fact the new development will contribute further to the draw of London as a place of employment for those living in the area. That we house in this area people working in London does not</p> <p>(8) not mean we can attract people to work in the local area where rates of pay are less but price of housing, such as</p>	LPA70

			<p>this new development, being increasingly boosted higher than they can afford by working locally.</p> <p>(9) This development, if it is ever to work at all, needs to be fully planned to ensure business expected to be drawn to the area will commit to provide employment here and open the shops to create the community promised. If this is not fully committed from the start the development will fail after an initial period of building which will have destroyed the rural communtiy which existed and will leave an unsupported estate serviced only by a 24 hour supermarket, bettign shop and take-away.</p>	
150.	Robin Pearce	26/06/19	<p>I would like to ask why there wasn't an exhibition on the proposed Otterpool Garden Town in Hythe. Considering that Hythe Town and the people living in Hythe will be greatly impacted by this proposal.</p> <p>I visited the Folkestone Exhibition and felt very disappointed with the display and lack of information from Acardis staff that were in attendance. If they were not able to answer my questions they passed me onto to the so called expert in that field i.e. Traffic, water, environment etc. but they still couldn't answer my questions.</p> <p>I felt that the displays were misleading when referring to homes for the local people I asked the Chief of Strategic Development Projects at FHDC about this and he said that of course it would be an open market to everybody and not just local people.</p> <p>There were no feedback forms, so how can they say they are consulting with the public and taking on board what they say. I didn't see any one taking notes.</p> <p>I feel that my objections/comments are a waste of time and that the Otterpool development is a "Done Deal" .In that case why should I bother, but I will. I know lots of people feel exactly the same and feel that it is a waste of time, as it will not make any difference.</p> <p>Already this council has spent millions of pounds on this proposal (and whose money), so it is in their interest to make sure it goes through although it will be detrimental to the surrounding villages and Hythe Town.</p> <p>Otterpool proposed development of 10,000 houses will have a population of 15,000 to 20,000 plus compared to Hythe's 14,500 population (approx.).Hythe will not be able to cope with this amount of people, traffic, demand on water, energy, GP's etc.</p> <p>FHDC should be honest and admit that they are going ahead with the development not to meet the needs of local people, but the needs of government's national housing shortage.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed Otterpool Garden Town V /19/0257 /FH for the reasons listed below. Traffic will be unmanageable and put even more strains on the roads to the surrounding area of the proposed development and Hythe Town. The roads are already gridlocked now without this development. Housing FHDC have already met the government target. The houses proposed for Otterpool is the wrong type and will only encourage second and third home owners'. Local people will not be able to afford to buy or even rent them.</p> <p>Pollution: Take away this open green space/countryside to build this proposed development of 10,000 houses and bring in approx. 10,000 to 20,000 cars that will pollute the environment and have a destructive impact on the wildlife.</p> <p>GP's and hospital. Already GP's and hospitals are unable to cope with the current population within FHDC. Adding another 20,000 plus people from Otterpool, 1000 houses Martello Lakes, Smiths Medical site for a new development and the list goes on.</p>	LPA71
151.	Roger Granthier	26/06/19	<p>A continuous supply of potable water is Earth's most vital and precious resource. Here in Kent, the great majority of our supply is from groundwater extraction. Boreholes are drilled deep into the underlying rock strata and as water moves into the borehole it is pumped to the surface for treatment and supply for human use. Groundwater is generally of high quality and should be used with care. The only way that the water extracted can be replenished is by rainfall. The eastern side of the British Isles is well-known as the driest part of this United Kingdom. The average rainfall in Kent, according to Met. Office data, is around 600 mm per year. The Environment Agency calculates that only about 11% of this is available for domestic and other uses in the county. Housing development on any scale will mean that water use will have to be permanently restricted. Local councils throughout Kent have ambitious plans, under pressure from HMG, to increase residential development. If realised, these developments will place enormous stress on Kent's water resources. Neither local authorities nor the Government can make more rain fall on Kent than does now. Anyone who watched the televised daily weather forecasts during last winter cannot have failed to notice how, time and again, rain-bearing air from the Atlantic Ocean was deflected northwards over Ireland and Scotland,</p>	LPA72

			<p>while eastern England remained dry. The Met. Office figures also reveal that winter rainfall in Kent is only 25% more than falls in summer. Thus groundwater replenishment during a period of lower demand is seriously limited. Just 100 miles further west, winter rainfall is up to 50% greater than in summer. Rainfall totals in these areas have always been significantly greater than in Kent.</p> <p>I therefore urge the Council to seriously reconsider the scale of its Otterpool proposals and either drastically reduce it or, preferably, abandon it altogether. What is more, I believe this Council should take the lead in persuading all local authorities in Kent, including the County Council, to tell the Government, in no uncertain terms, that large scale new development in Kent is simply unfeasible. I repeat, we cannot change the weather. In fact, if 'climate change' experts are anywhere near accurate in their predictions, the prospect of further diminishment in rainfall over Kent is more than likely, greatly exacerbating an already stressed situation.</p>	
152.	Sally Edwards	26/06/19	<p>Plans for building on the racecourse have been dismissed three times already. Firstly for a few houses to sustain the racecourse. Secondly a proposal by Shepway council for 800 houses and thirdly for the area to become a strategic corridor. These were considered by the inspector to produce an urban sprawl which would not enhance the area which is surrounded by AONB.</p> <p>A new town, however well designed, will be visible from all over the north downs.</p> <p>It was obviously recognised at that time, that this is a very constrained area, bordered by the M20, the railway line and existing settlements. It was for these reasons that a garden village was not proposed, but it has always been an unsatisfactory site for a town.</p> <p>Roads</p> <p>There is a proposal for improvements to junction 11 of the M 20.</p> <p>The Newingreen junction, which already has too high a volume of traffic is to be bypassed with a new spur from the M20, taking the lorries, many of which go to the Lympne Industrial estate, straight through the centre of the new town and past a primary school.</p> <p>No figures are included to show the likely air pollution.</p> <p>The A20 is the relief road for the M20. When this is blocked/shut the traffic backs up the length of the A20.</p> <p>It cannot be a sustainable plan to take the A20 through the middle of a new 'green' garden town.</p> <p>Otterpool Park is always shown in isolation and not in relation to the neighbouring villages and towns, particularly Sellindge, Aldington, Hythe and Ashford, which will continue to grow.</p> <p>There is no mention of the surrounding small country B roads, which are not designed for ever larger volumes of traffic.</p> <p>It is said that the population of this new town will cycle and walk.</p> <p>They may do so to a small extent but they will, understandably, get in their cars to visit other parts of the county. Also with the change in demographics, it is unlikely that many 70 year-olds will leap on their bicycles ! Their cars are safer. Buses work well in cities, not in rural areas. They are too infrequent, and in order to pick up the maximum numbers they take a long route and a long time.</p> <p>Water</p> <p>The south east is a water stressed area. Water for Folkestone and Hythe comes from the Paddlesworth reservoir which is supplied from aquifers. There is enough water for 1500 houses, more than that will require a new large bore pipeline to run from the reservoir to Otterpool.</p> <p>The proposals for a reduction in water use and using grey water for non-potable areas are excellent.</p> <p>However, so far this has never been achieved.</p> <p>This project is unsustainable.</p> <p>Too many houses, too many people, too little water and requiring very expensive infrastructure, with a high carbon footprint. It must be viewed alongside the other houses being built in this area in excess of 36,000, excluding Maidstone.</p> <p>The plan is for 40% green space but it should also be remembered, that if it goes ahead, hundreds of acres of agricultural land, used for growing our food, will be lost.</p> <p>Many people would accept a small number of houses built mainly for local people and not as a dormitory town for people from London. These should be carbon neutral and built to the highest environmental standards for future generations.</p>	LPA58

153.	Sandra Meadows	26/06/19	<p>We wish to register my <b>STRONG</b> objection to Y19/0257/FH - OTTERPOOL PARK.</p> <p>Our starting point is the fact that this Government supported Garden Town notion is meant to be community led. We have never been asked if we wanted it, in fact, 27 Parish Councillors told FHDC that they didn't want it almost 3 years ago and still the Council pushed on against democracy. Why weren't we asked if we wanted a massive housing estate linking our villages. Why have you pushed ahead with it with less than 3% support??? We already have 14,560 homes for local people in the pipeline. We do not need any more increases in demand.</p> <p>If Affinity Water is concerned about the supply of water, why isn't Folkestone &amp; Hythe Council? Why do you insist on ploughing on with these ideas that are not welcome and are unsustainable?</p> <p>The road system in this area clearly already struggles with the traffic without adding to the situation. Who is going to pay for any required changes in infrastructure when the Council insists on buying every field in sight rather than investing money into services that already exist but are in need of investment such as social care?</p> <p>Will the council need to raise our Council Tax, already the highest in Kent, to pay for services to meet the needs of an unwanted town?</p> <p>Please register this objection, which we all know will be ignored as the Council plough ahead on a project that is not wanted, that it can't afford and that the existing area cannot absorb into current facilities and services.</p>	LPA75
154.	Scott Parkes	26/06/19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A general detrimental effect on the amenity and enjoyment of the daily lives of those living in the adjacent areas.</li> <li>• I consider the scale of the proposed development to be vast and that its scale is such that it would overshadow and overrun the neighbouring villages.</li> <li>• It would ruin the iconic views along the Downs.</li> <li>• The light pollution would eliminate the current National Dark Sky status of Aldington and the surrounding villages.</li> <li>• The traffic congestion caused by such an influx of motor cars and delivery vehicles etc would severely affect the daily and working lives of those living in the surrounding villages.</li> <li>• The schools, Dr's surgeries and hospitals are not coping with the current population, so the extra residents, from 8,000 additional homes cannot be accommodated, either safely or sensibly.</li> <li>• The proposed development is out of scale and overbearing, compared with the surrounding, rural areas.</li> <li>• The bulking is out of character, compared with the surrounding areas.</li> <li>• The construction traffic would cause widespread congestion and increase the risk of accidents on the surrounding roads, in addition to the physical damage that is likely to be caused to the roads.</li> </ul>	LPA76
155.	Andrew Larsen	26/06/19	<p>This is my objection to the proposed plans otter pool town my reason is we moved here in 2000 to have rural surroundings and purchased our dream house for the views and tranquility and spend the time and effort doing it up to the original features. Our house was built in 1765 we brought all our children up in this house and lovely village. From your plans it looks like there is going to be a huge amount of proposed building opposite us and surrounding us. The poor wildlife is going to be taken away the wild boars,bats,badgers ext there is so many places in the town centres and other villages where there has been building near including Shadoxhurst and these buildings are not all been lived in, there are many empty and hard to rent and sell properties as it is all on large scale build,I can see these future buildings going to be the same way which will then lead to a massive impact on our village properties and our prices, properties will drop dramatically and the council still expect us to pay Top band council Tax even if they go ahead and build the proposed otterpool we will be Expected to pay top band The traffic we have to endure now is absolutely diabolical my house rumbles when these artic lorries thunder past,1 am pretty sure all the other houses encounter this problem to also not to mention the high volume of traffic Especially when the M20 is closed for the lorry stack and any accidents that happen on M20 We moved from London to a superb village of Sellindge for its glory not from London Town to Kent Town</p> <p>I feel very concerned of the future of our village and Poor Wildlife</p>	LPA77

156.	Sheila Garrard	26/06/19	<p>The application is fundamentally flawed in that the applicants have failed to consult fully or to take properly into account the potential impact on residents in neighbouring Ashford Borough, which represents the whole Western side of the site. The voluminous documentation associated with the application considers only impacts on the Folkestone &amp; Hythe District Council side of the administrative border, even though a number of Ashford Borough villages will be immediate, or very near, neighbours to the proposed Otterpool Park and will obviously and necessarily be affected by such a large development, its traffic movements and demands upon services available in Ashford Borough. This fundamental shortcoming of the investigative, planning and consultation works is particularly salient in respect of: the complete lack of direct engagement and consultation with residents of Ashford Borough in formulating the plans; the lack of direct notification of residents of Ashford Borough about the previous consultations on the F&amp;HDC Local Plan, which included proposals for Otterpool Park; the total lack of consideration of the affected Ashford Borough villages in terms of S106 benefits, despite their desperate need for infrastructural improvements (internet; mobile reception; gas supplies; water shortages; poor bus 'service'; transport issues, in that it seems planners disingenuously envisage all residents of Otterpool Park travelling only east along the A20 and to M20 J11, rather than west, towards Ashford and Js 10A and 10; health issues, where no consideration is given to the impact of Otterpool Park on the already overstretched William Harvey Hospital and its A&amp;E dept.; environmental issues, where surveys have been done all around the proposed Otterpool Park, but not within the Ashford Borough bordering areas; and the knock-on effect of water supply and waste issues, despite the area being designated, by F&amp;HDC's own written admission as an 'area of extreme water stress'.</p> <p>2. The site is immediately adjacent to a significant Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is impossible for a development of the scale of the proposed Otterpool Park not to detract from the 'setting' of the AONB, given that it will itself form the setting.</p>	LPA78
157.	Simon Champneys	26/06/2019	<p>I wish to strongly object to the application for Otterpool Park, which can at best be described as a vanity project by the Council.</p> <p>Although there is demand for additional houses in Folkestone and Hythe, the Council's core plan ("long-term plan bringing together the aims and actions of the government, local councils, residents, businesses and voluntary groups, by managing land-use and developments. The Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan was adopted as part of the statutory development plan for the district on 18 September 2013"), demonstrates that this need can be met through a number of ongoing developments such as Shorncliffe (1200 houses), Nickolls Quarry (1050 houses), Sellindge (250 houses), Folkestone Seafront, as well as pockets of development spread throughout the District. This is before the huge amount of development taking place in Dover and Ashford, such as the controversial Chilmington Green project. These developments and the housing increases in Ashford and Dover should be considered before permission is granted for Otterpool, otherwise East Kent will face an issue of an over-supply of houses.</p> <p>There is absolutely no reference to any new town or large-scale development within the 2013 Local Plan. This suggests that the need for such a huge number of houses is not a true reflection on housing demand within the area. The fact that the first reference to this scheme came after the Council had purchased valuable farmland - and it was farmland which was purchased, not land earmarked for building - should raise serious questions about the ethics of Council members.</p> <p>Aside from the underlying fact that there is not the local need for such a large-scale development, the reasons for my objection are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road infrastructure surrounding the proposed area will not be able to cope. Stone Street from Newingreen to Lympne, the A261 to Hythe and the newly narrowed A20 through Sellindge often struggle with the current number of vehicles. Through more cars into the equation and there will be traffic chaos as well as far greater chances of traffic accidents (note that there have been a number of road traffic accidents resulting in death along the A20 over recent years). Highway safety will surely be compromised and all local people will be greatly inconvenienced.</li> <li>• Issues of water supply. The increased houses plus the likely continued reduction in water availability over the coming decades from global warming will result in water scarcity for the area.</li> </ul>	LPA79

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loss of high yielding farmland. It is just wrong that the Council is seeking to concrete over valuable farmland. This land has been farmed for centuries and with food imports potentially increasing in cost, domestic farming should be a protected industry. It is saddening that the Council is prepared to concrete over hundreds of years of farming heritage for a scheme which was not even considered in its local plan!</li> <li>• Visual impact. Aside from the fact that open fields will be replaced with soulless new-build homes, a great number of properties in Lympne, Newingreen, Westenhanger and Sellindge will have the views they enjoy from their homes obliterated. For those of us who choose to move to a quiet village environment, this scheme is materially changing our quality of life. As well as the visual impact, many will be affected by loss of privacy, overlooking and general disturbance both in terms of noise, dust during construction and increased artificial light.</li> <li>• Lack of available employment opportunities. It is blindingly obvious that there are insufficient local employment opportunities for the tens of thousands of working people the Council is proposing to accommodate in these homes. Inevitably they will be purchased by buyers from London and</li> <li>• West Kent who will take advantage of lower house prices and commute to their places of work. This will, in turn, exacerbate the horrendous congestion on the M20.</li> <li>• The proposed development is over-bearing, out-of-scale and wholly out of character with the local villages it is going to destroy.</li> <li>• Insufficient health services. Local hospitals and doctor's surgeries cannot cope with the current local population. Increasing the population by such a large extent will surely push it past breaking point.</li> </ul>	
158.	Stephen Reeves	26/06/2019	<p>The development will urbanize an area of outstanding natural beauty in the heart of the "garden of England" The proposed number of houses is both inappropriate and unsustainable for this region. New residents will need to commute to their places of work by car or bus, placing considerable extra strain on the already congested local roads - particularly the A20.</p> <p>Although the development incorporates a new GP surgery, it should be noted that the existing surgery in Sellindge is unable to attract new Doctors to fill existing vacancies. Local residents currently have to wait a fortnight for an appointment. Unless the proposed surgery comes fully staffed, this will lead to a huge influx of additional patients to a practice already stretched to its limit.</p> <p>In the current political and ecological climate, we should be preserving our agricultural land. The proposal, as well as building on a green site, will also require the (potentially) compulsory purchase of existing farmland.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the transparency of the planning process. I have tried several times to lodge an objection on the planning portal, to be met with a server error on each occasion. Coupled with the timing and location of consultation meetings, I feel the council is doing its best to manage the situation so that it appears that few locals are against the development.</p>	LPA80
159.	Sue Champion	26/06/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water shortage in the area is already a very real problem for local residents and any development places further strain on this essential amenity. A development on this scale will mean drought is a very likely outcome for residents. The Environment Agency already classifies the area as</li> <li>• "seriously stressed". We need the land that would be lost from this development to supply and sustain the water table.</li> <li>• The development is a massive overdevelopment in a rural area. The required infrastructure is not in place. Road access is not if a standard that can cope with the additional traffic that this will create either during construction or after completion. The m20 is a major route in and out of the country and is already under immense pressure when there are accidents, roadworks, port and tunnel problems etc. The proposed development will only exacerbate the problems.</li> <li>• The current small development in Sellindge has caused and continues to cause major disruption for local residents, both in the Folkestone district and residents that fall in the Ashford area. The hold-ups caused by this have created delays and problems that far outweigh any problems that were caused several years ago during the operation stack period and yet this is considered a national issue. So, if you enlarge the problems</li> </ul>	LPA81

			<p>caused by the current sellindge residential development to the scale of this new proposal it will cause major problems for local residents both during and after construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plans do not address this in any meaningful way. The local road network being close to capacity cannot take an increase in traffic of this size.</li> <li>• The development uses the development of Westenhanger station as a supporting factor, however, the train routes into London at rush hour are already at capacity with no real opportunity to increase this to meet any significant increase in demand.</li> <li>• The plans fail to comply with the government guidelines on new garden towns infrastructure requirements.</li> <li>• Air quality and pollution</li> <li>• The area is a rural area that sits as an essential green corridor between two/three major towns (Folkestone/Hythe and Ashford). It provides a green barrier that prevents these two areas of habitation from joining up. It provides 'lungs' in an area that sits beside a major motorway and fast rail link keeping air pollution and noise pollution at bay for rural residents. Any development on this site would have a massive detrimental effect on the surrounding villages that currently enjoy relatively dark skies, minimal noise pollution and relatively clean air.</li> <li>• Loss of land and wildlife habitat</li> <li>• The proposed site sits in an area that is rich in biodiversity and any development will only serve to reduce this. The birdlife at the Otterpool site is rich and unique to the landscape, with buzzards being a recent addition.</li> <li>• The rich variety of wildlife present at the site should be protected</li> <li>• In the Environmental Statement it states: "there will be an approximate 20% increase in biodiversity value overall." This implies that biodiversity will increase when in fact Biodiversity will decrease.</li> <li>• The number of species will in fact fall. This is stated in the appendix where details of individual species that will be lost are given.</li> <li>• Housing now accounts for the biggest decline in species in the South-east. Large greenfield developments, such as this one, being the biggest drivers for local extinctions. The off-site mitigation will not increase biodiversity because the species are already present at the site.</li> <li>• Therefore the document statement: "there is a demonstrable net gain to biodiversity." is a false statement.</li> <li>• The Brown Hare is present at the site and is listed as a priority species. The proposal recognises that there will be a negative impact on the population.</li> <li>• Hares are sensitive to disturbance. If the population survives some of the initial construction phase, there will eventually be a local extinction of the population. This will be as a result of loss of habitat and disturbance. The proposal vaguely states that off site mitigation for ground nesting birds will benefit the Hare. This is a weak statement and is unlikely to result in any real increase in population.</li> <li>• There are many other examples that could be cited and a full, more detailed, independent environmental survey needs to take place and be made widely available to the public before any further planning applications or any development of the site is considered.</li> <li>• The area is close to an area of outstanding natural beauty and sites of historic importance. The attempts to mitigate the detrimental affect of the proposed development do not address the issues in any meaningful way. This new proposed development can only have a negative impact on the surrounding environment</li> <li>• The detrimental affect of the proposed development on the character of the local area will be gigantic. The impact it will have on the rural villages it is placed within means that they will be altered irreversibly, and in some cases swallowed up within the development and lost forever.</li> <li>• Any loss of agricultural land would be unacceptable. Recent reports concluded that the UK would have a shortage of agricultural land by 2020. With</li> <li>• Brexit on the horizon this is a major consideration. The land in this region is rich and fertile and is needed if we are to meet food production requirements for future generations.</li> <li>• The scale of the proposed town far outstrips the availability of local employment and the garden town will not create enough jobs for those it houses, therefore it is relying on the proximity to London to provide</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>employment for the majority it seeks to house. This is in direct conflict to the Governments own criteria, new garden towns MUST NOT be created as dormitory or commuter towns and yet much is being made of the proximity to Westenhanger station. However the capacity of the rush hour high speed trains to London has already been overtaken by demand with no ability for the current high speed network to increase number of trains to meet this demand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proximity to the mass development of Ashford means that this new proposal will destroy the unique character of the rural villages that currently provide a greenbelt between the two districts. Ashford has already created a garden village approximately 5 to 6 miles from this proposed site and a further large scale residential development at the proposed site would be overdevelopment in a very small area. The rural character of the remaining area will be irrevocably altered and the two regions come close to joining up.</li> <li>• I believe the development would be catastrophic for the areas character, wildlife, landscape and functionality.</li> <li>• Furthermore I believe it fails to meet the government guidelines for proposed garden towns in the following key factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Otterpool would be a dormitory town/ commuter town which just uses 'garden' as a convenient label.</li> <li>• The development is not on a predominantly brownfield site eventjough other brownfield sites are available</li> <li>• ( there are other brownfield sites available for housing and yet housing developments have been refused in recent years at these sites e.g. the silver spring site in Folkestone)</li> <li>• Otterpool would transform the local area and yet fails to meet some of the basic criteria required</li> <li>• The impact on the natural and historic environment of the local area has not been fully considered or adequately mitigated.</li> <li>• The proposal fails to deliver environmental enhancement and biodiversity net gains</li> <li>• The Infrastructure proposals will not be adequate to fulfil the increased demand</li> <li>• The plans fail to meet required amount of social housing for local need for a development of this size.</li> <li>• Community engagement and involvement has been inconsistent and biased and not been well advertised. Local people have no voice and have not had a real opportunity to have a meaningful say. There are still many local residents who are unaware of the scale of the proposal. I live less than three miles from the proposed site and have not received a single communication about the proposals and yet people in Folkestone who live 10 miles away are far better informed, even though the development will not directly affect them.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
160.	Suzy Clark	LPA82	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would like to see all buildings fitted with solar panels.</li> <li>• I would like to see all buildings fitted with solar panels.</li> <li>• Energy saving principles adhered to throughout the entire area.</li> <li>• Green space/walk/cycle/planting timeline to run concurrently with building works.</li> <li>• The protection and relocation of wildlife and the protection of the buzzards who nest in the wood behind Barrow Hill.</li> <li>• Wide/ deep green buffer zones around existing homes on Barrow Hill.</li> <li>• Urgent traffic calming for Barrow Hill.</li> <li>• Implementation of measures to deter foreign juggernaut drivers cutting through Barrow Hill, Sellindge and Otterpool park, using the area as a toilet while they do so.</li> <li>• Apply urgent traffic calming from Otterpool traffic lights down through Barrow Hill comprising of 30 mile speed limit and add zebra crossings areas. We have 122 family homes along this area which require protection as a matter of urgency. I would ask that this be part of the planning conditions and be implemented before the start of this project.</li> </ul>	LPA82
161.	Tim Bishopp	26/06/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although this development has the words Park and Garden in its title these are simply words which I believe are there to disguise the true facts. If this development goes ahead an area up to two miles in length which is at present an area of outstanding natural beauty and historic importance will be covered in concrete and inappropriate buildings. There is no way that this could be called a park or a garden, Otterpool Town will not</li> </ul>	LPA83



			<p>add to the landscape but instead will be visible for miles around destroying not only the beauty of the landscape but also the natural habitat of many species of wildlife and plant life. It will also cause unacceptable levels of light pollution and damage the general wellbeing of all who live in the area. Another reason for concern which is rarely talked about is that Defra have classified the South of England an 'Area of Serious Water Stress'. Below is an extract from the Southern Water web site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The truth is that the South of England is one of the driest areas in the UK. It has been classed as an @Area of Serious Water Stress@ by Defra, the Government Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. Climate change Climate change is likely to see temperatures rise between 2°C and 3.5°C by 2080 with rainfall in the South East of England dropping by up to half.</li> <li>• Droughts like we saw in 2004 - 6 are likely to be more common.</li> <li>• And as the population of the South East continues to rise, the amount of water we need to supply will increase even further, placing more pressure on local rivers and the already stressed natural environment.</li> <li>• Since this document was published further warnings have been published that we will running out of water within 25 years.</li> <li>• These facts must not be ignored however it seems that that the council are determined to do just that. Building on this scale in this area is simply creating a crisis waiting to happen when it could be avoided.</li> <li>• I have been told by a planner that this was a problem they were aware of at least ten years ago and yet nothing has been done to avoid the inevitable.</li> <li>• I am also concerned about the legality of the project as the council bought the land saying it was for council farms but later admitting by doing this they were able to purchase it for a building site at a better price. What concerns me is that not only were we not consulted on the proposed development in the Ashford borough villages but also it seems unlikely that the council planners will be unbiased when looking at any proposal by the council for their own proposed development of land which they own.</li> <li>• I hope someone will listen to the concerns of the people who live in the area of the proposed Otterpool Town because if this goes ahead it will destroy life as we know it and cause untold stress and misery for all who live here.</li> </ul>	
162.	Samuel Kingston	25/05/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We were led to believe when the council first purchased the land that they had brought it help those wishing to get into agriculture by giving them a first step into an industry that is hard to get into even more so in the area now with the loss of both Wye College and Hadlow but it turned out to be a lie. When the truth of the matter came out I could not believe the shortsightedness shown by the council whom have seemed to ignored the fact that we have some of the most congested roads in the country and which are only set to get worse as channel traffic increases and we live in the part of the country that most regularly suffer from droughts.</li> <li>• We are constantly told that this is a local town for local people yet on the council's own website in their marketing they heavily emphasis its links to London via the M20 and train line with a potential high speed service which seems at odds with being a local town and more a commuter town which will see locals priced out. With a high speed service it will leave Folkestone losing their service due to the limitations of the HS 1 line and the priority to tunnel traffic which will either leave them high and dry or having to commute to Sandling Station most likely by car adding further to the congestion. It has been stated about plans for dualling the A20 from Newingreen to Junction 11 yet there is no mention of enlarging the roundabout at Junction 11 to cope with the extra traffic nor of dualling the Stone Street to cope with the added vehicle. It is stated that a catchment road will funnel traffic from half of the development down a new route away from the existing Stone Street/A20/A261 yet as is seen repeatedly in other towns as soon as that route becomes congested drivers will seek other route or perceived shortcuts which will see them traveling the Lympne and down the the Stone Street making it hard for those coming from Romney Marsh and West Hythe and then making the existing junction even more dangerous with the rest of the the new town being pointed in the direction of Ashford through Sellindge which has a choke point at the bridges and the school during morning</li> </ul>	LPA177

			<p>rush hour and chaos when a bus or lorry has to complete a five point turn in to Swan Lane due to the road narrowing there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With only one secondary school to serve the whole town it is going to cause more chaos as children are ferried to exiting schools like Brockhill and those in Folkestone, it also appears that they have shown a complete did regard to the residents health with no hospital borough only a health center with the nearest being Ashford unless the plans go through to close that and rely on a new hospital in Canterbury. Given their inability to attract doctors and GPs to the area leading to most surgeries to either close or try to cope with locums to the point of pleading to those their patients that if they know of any GP to direct them their way which are not the actions of a surgery that has faith or the support of their council to provide the much needed doctors, surely it would be more prudent for them to show that they can attract GPs to the area by filling the existing vacancies and reopening surgeries first before even contemplating building more homes or health centres, rather than cold disregard shown by councillors who state that doctors won't be needed because it will be such a fairy land that no one will ever get sick and need one which is also the reason I presume for no fire station or police station.</li> <li>• It has been stated that there will be no new water sources with water instead being imported from neighbouring suppliers whom are already stretched and are facing large building projects in their own areas with dangerous amounts of water being abstracted from the River Medway to stop Bewl Water drying up in the summer. Much fanfare has been made about this being a green town and yet given their propensity to ignore or overturn their own protections to allow themselves to build on land that was supposed to be protected from development and by their own comments of it being the only place to build they will start on the next phase of infilling the green areas with more houses. With the area surrounded by the North Downs AONB it will detrimentally impact on a nationally protected area as well as on the views from the North Downs Way which is popular with tourists whom will not be wishing to visit or stay in the area to gaze out at industrial park and housing estates as if that is what they like they will be visiting London not East Kent. With Cambridge University study stating that at the current rate will see a shortage of farmland in the country it is rather disheartening to such blatant disregard to a vanishing commodity as has been shown by this council who feel the need to conduct a survey of birds in the winter months so that they can state there there are little there and that few on the area. Given their allowance for nets to be placed over trees and hedges dug up during the nesting season and there wanton distruction of high quality farmland that they wish to see the industrial farming of America with the large thousand acre open fields of their great plains here along with the use of GM Os along with irrigation and greater targeted spray applications to greatly boost yields.</li> <li>• The town is not wanted nor is it needed.</li> </ul>	
163.	Mr and Mrs Lazku-Kyte	28/05/2019	Full Details on File - Objection	LPA178
164.	Mrs R M Brenhan	28/05/2019	Full Details on File – Objection	LPA179
165.	Mr P and M Bebbington	27/05/2019	Full Details on File - Objection	LPA180
166.	Mr and Mrs Harris	23/05/2019	We have been to many meetings, consultations and written many letters/emails. We have expressed that we think this development is far too large for this area of green land. However, not one of the planners or counsellors have listened. It will require compulsory purchase of local farmland and houses, cause a huge strain on our local roads, hospitals and doctors etc. It is hard to believe that 8,500 plus houses are required are needed for our local people. At least, we hope, the planners will adhere to the so called master plan and keep to the promised buffers around our village of Lympne, to stop it being completely eroded away with the town sprawl. We know Our local Lympne Council have worked very hard to achieve this with the planners.	LPA84
167.	Mr and Mrs Richardson	04/07/2019	Full Details on File - Objection	LPA164

Consultation responses table  
Otterpool Y19/0257/FH

168.	Mrs L Wilkinson	28/05/2019	Full Details on File - Objection	LPA181
169.	Scott Parks		Full Details on File - Objection	LPA76
170.	Alison Allighan		Full Details on File - Objection	LPA88
171.	Crispin Davies		Full Details on File - Objection	LPA126
172.	D Goldsmith		Full Details on File - Objection	LPA127
173.	Mr G Bryant		Full Details on File - Objection	LPA12