

OTTERPOOL PARK – Y19/0257/FH CONSULTATION SUMMARY TABLE

NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES RECEIVED SINCE 11 JULY 2019 AND CONSULATION PERIOD 29 APRIL 2022 TO 24 JUNE 2022

(Representations Received as at 16.08.2022)

Table 1				
Consultation Responses (Neighbour responses)				
Ref	Name	Date Received	Comments	LPA Reference
1	David Haining	19.06.2022 x 3 09.06.2020 Previous comments – (17.05.2019 20.05.2019 06.06.2019)	<p>(1) 19/06/2022 I strongly oppose these updated development plans for this proposed town development.</p> <p>I have been fully engaged through out these public consultations. I have lived for 21 years in our home at Barrow Hill Sellindge, with my wife and two young children. I am member of the Barrow Hill residents' group and throughout this time we have engaged and outlined our concerns to the village. None of our concerns have been implemented in these updated plans. The plans today for Barrow Hill Sellindge, are no different than original ones put forward at the start of this process. It appears the engagement process was just a legal obligation to take place, with little intention to listen or take onboard existing residents' concerns and views.</p> <p>I am concerned that these updated and revised plans, contain a significant number of documents and the time scale given for responses is insufficient for proper due diligence, consideration for any responses in the time frame allowed. As a Sellindge Resident, I have only been able in this time frame to consider some of the many documents that affect this community, and I can only respond with that which I have looked at so far. I outline my points as follows:</p> <p>1: The traffic surveys conducted as part of this application were conducted in 2018, before Junction 10A of the M20 was operational. Now that it is, as result of this, there is now a significant increase of all traffic movement along the A20, through Sellindge & to this proposed Otterpool development. This current traffic increase is not being taken into account as part of this updated proposed planning application. Due to this, the traffic statistics quoted as a current base line are inaccurate and thus, all the future traffic movements are also likely to be inaccurate.</p> <p>This will also impact the environmental calculations regarding air pollution and noise. Add to this the impact of Op Broke/ or when the M20 is closed between Ashford and Folkestone, and then the A20 becomes gridlocked through Sellindge and all the way along the A20 where this proposed Town is to be built.</p> <p>It is inconceivable, that in the future these incidents will not increase in frequency as the Government has no plans in implementing any changes at our key National ports of Dover and the Channel Tunnel. What is accepted is that HGV traffic will increase by 10% a year through Kent ports and roads.</p>	LPA162

		<p>To propose to build a New Town, where the main access and egress roads to and from it will be also the fallback for all international and local traffic when there is an incident on the M20 motorway. I understand that as part of this proposed development, OP Brock and M20 Road closures are not part of the consideration factors for planning this development. Failing to plan and ignoring this, is just planning to fail the current and future residents in this district.</p> <p>My concern is that Folkstone and Hythe Council have spent so much council tax money on this project and taken out so many millions in loans, that obvious pitfalls and residents' concerns and wishes are being ignored.</p> <p>(2) 19/06/2022</p> <p>I have been fully engaged through out these public consultations. I have lived for 21 years in our home at Barrow Hill Sellindge, with my wife and two young children. I am also a member of the Barrow Hill residents' group who have engaged with this process throughout. We are disappointed that the traffic mitigation measures put forward do not seem to have been incorporated in the Updated plans for this Town development application.</p> <p>There are no provisions in the plan to mitigate traffic from this proposed new Town who wish to travel to Ashford or London, driving through Sellindge and to use junction 11 of the M20 instead. We were told from the outset that this would be the case.</p> <p>We have asked that Otterpool Lane be restricted to cars, cycles, and pedestrians only and that the HGV traffic which go to Lympe Industrial Estate are made to use the new main proposed through road linking Otterpool Lane and the A20 at Newingreen.</p> <p>By doing this, HGV traffic would reduce through Sellindge and be incentivized to use junction 11 of the M20, being so much closer to this junction.</p> <p>These recommendations would cost very little to implement, though would have a significant effect in reducing the 456% increase in HGV detrimental impacts of traffic and pollution to the existing residents of Sellindge along the A20.</p> <p>Under OP5, Strategic Design Principles, 5.3 Strategic Streets (A20) it states: "Transforming the Character of the existing A20/ Ashford Road is key part of creating a high-quality new town. It will change from a road for cars, to a street that brings communities together and have specific character areas along its length"</p> <p>On the red line boundary of this proposed site, this only applies along the A20 from the end of Sellindge Barrow Hill, to Newingreen. It does NOT take in the A20 Barrow Hill from Grove Bridge to Otterpool Lane.</p> <p>The current Core Strategy states: MM06 Settlement Development Requirements Phasing of Otterpool development.</p> <p>Other phases of development may come forward in tandem if they are well-connected to an existing rural centre or primary village with capacity to provide for the day-to-day needs of new residents.</p> <p>Sellindge is the Core Strategy is shown as being a COMMUNITY HUB, intended to support other existing communities as well as</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>this proposed future development during the early phases, intending these proposed new residents to use our village and community facilities.</p> <p>The Core Strategy goes on to state: This should link in with MM07 Policy SS7: New Garden Settlement – Place-Shaping Principles Policy SS7 New Garden Settlement – Place Shaping Principles.</p> <p>Point H: The nearby communities of Lymgne, Barrow Hill, Sellindge, Westenhanger, Saltwood, Stanford and Postling should have appropriate access to and benefit from the infrastructure provided.</p> <p>The only way for any residents from Sellindge or this proposed new development to access any of the Sellindge community infrastructure, is via the A20 Barrow hill, through Grove Bridge.</p> <p>Section 5.3 of the Strategic Design Principles (A Connected Place), states that the 9 mobile principles of this proposed development is to support connectivity to support residents & visitors from and to other communities. Walking, cycling and active travel MUST remain the best option for short urban journeys. The design is to be well integrated.</p> <p>Sellindge not only is the nearest community to this intended Barrow Hill Hill Top development, West of Otterpool Lane, but Sellindge is also to provide community hub infrastructure supporting this proposed development during the early phasing of the development.</p> <p>Without providing this same amount of connectivity/ traffic calming and improvement to pedestrian and cycle infrastructure along the whole of the A20 Barrow Hill, from Grove Bridge, to access the facilities in Sellindge, then it would make a mockery of Section 5.3 (Connected Places and the 9 mobile principles).</p> <p>In the document OP 5-Appendix 4.3, page 38 (4.6 HILL TOP), it clearly shows as part of this proposed development, area H.T.4, which is only about 20 meters West of current Barrow Hill residential homes.</p> <p>It appears that the proposed new development labelled H.T.4, is to be accesses by currently a farm track which is accessed halfway down Barrow Hill on the A20. The current farm tract West of Barrow Hill is apparently to become a road to access this proposed new development.</p> <p>Clearly, if the proposed H.T.4 intended development access too and from it, is to be from the A20 Barrow Hill, Sellindge, then, as part of all the above A20 intended traffic calming, pedestrian/cycle improvements must also be incorporated into the whole of Barrow Hill.</p> <p>To ensure this can be future proofed and financially linked into the phasing of the 1.0.9 agreements, then, the road and pavement area along the whole of Barrow Hill, including Grove Bridge area, must have the update plans clearly stating this and not just mention "CONSIDERATION" to undertake a review in the future.</p> <p>This part of the A20 Barrow Hill and Grove Bridge is instrumental to the connectivity via road, pedestrian, and cycle routes to this proposed new Town development. The Strategic Design Principles document must be updated to recognize this. The A20 Barrow Hill Road and footpaths must either be incorporate the red outline boundary of this proposed development or the document must agree that as part of this proposed development, the A20 Barrow Hill will be incorporated into the A20 strategic streets policy and improvements to the pedestrian and cycle facilities along the A20 Barrow Hill will extended from the Proposed development to Grove Brindge, Barrow Hill, A20.</p> <p>(3) 09.06.2022</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>The updated development OP5- Appendix 2.8- Application Contents document, shows that West of Barrow Hill there is a new development reference H.T.4, though this goes against previous assurances as this is supposed to be part of a green buffer area between Sellindge, Barrow Hill residents and the new proposed development.</p> <p>This also conflicts with the whole of the updated OP5 Appendix 4.3 document, Strategic Design Principles, which throughout, shows this area as NOT for development and is to be used as a green buffer between existing Barrow Hill residents and the New Proposed development.</p> <p>Point 4.6 Hill Top development, pages 38 & 39 of the Strategic Design Principles document, do NOT show this updated proposed development H.T.4, which is proposed to be built only about 20 meters West of the rear gardens of Barrow Hill residential homes.</p> <p>This area is marked as a buffer zone in previous documents and in pages 38 & 39 of this updated application.</p> <p>On page 38, this area is shown as being point (5) "Opportunity to incorporate small woodland area nearby the Barrow Hill Sellindge residential area." On page 39, this area is shown as point (3) "Create new tree belts incorporating SuDS, some following the landform's existing contours, through the neighbourhood development area, and bolster its field boundaries and edges."</p> <p>The Barrow Hill residents have always been informed that this area will be a green buffer between Barrow Hill Sellindge and the new Proposed Town development.</p> <p>In the whole OP5. Appendix 4.3 Strategic Design Principles document, this area is NOT for development, clearly marked for green infrastructure and boundary buffer.</p> <p>We request that the OP5-Appendix 2.8- Application Contents Document, have removed the H.T.4 development from this area West of Barrow Hill, and for it to become in line with other documents as stated above.</p> <p>(4) 09.06.2020</p> <p>Sir Madam. I wish to oppose the planning application Y19/0257/FH (Otterpool Town) on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Similar to the concerns of the Post Consultation Planning Report outlined on the 11th of June 2019, it is clear the design of the proposed town is not fit for purpose. The A20 main road is the primary route for all international traffic from Dover port and the Channel Tunnel, when the M20 is blocked due to any Motorway incident or problems with the ferries on Channel Tunnel trains, causing HGV stacking on the motorway. This proposed plan, has the town being built on either side of the motorway, in such a way that it is divided along the entire length of the A20. No one in their right mind would build a town which would be cut in half by such a key international important HGV secondary main route. Due to much of the traffic being HGV lorries which are left hand drive, safety concerns at crossing from one part of the town to the next are obvious. We have already had several road traffic crashed causing serious injury and deaths along this stretch of the A20, where this proposed town is to be built. You are even planning school next to the A20 when Public Health England clearly has evidenced the dangers to children due to vehicle traffic air partials and the dangers to public health. 2. The phases of the proposed construction show how poor due diligence and foresight has been put into this plan. It is clear that this is not one town, but several housing estates been built miles apart from each other, then gradually getting bigger and joining up. The A20 is just being treated as the main access route to these separate housing estates. The proposed (town centre) location has only been placed there due to the current railway station, though the majority of houses are clearly built miles away and more importantly on the opposite side of the A20. Any good town should be designed where the town centre is at the heart of the town, where pedestrians, cyclists can access easily without having to cross an "A" road, which will have to also be extended to be a dual carriageway to accommodate the extra traffic. 	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>3. Add to this Brexit and the impacts of the UK leaving Europe at the end of this year, then it is likely this proposed town could become a considerably expensive white elephant. The Governments are pushing for a Northern powerhouse, thus we may be building houses where they are not needed, as jobs in the area will not justify the housing needs or affordability or its residents. Evidence shows that 40% of houses being bought in Folkestone and Hythe during 2018-2019 were from people from London. This may not continue due to the future economy and redistribution from and London and South powerhouse to a Northern one.</p> <p>4. Global warming shows that the last 16 hottest years have been between the year 2000 and 2020. Rainfall in this area of Southeast England is becoming significantly less and future rain fall and consumption is not one anyone can control. Prediction on reducing consumption in houses either current one or future ones are not an exact science. Our current aquaphos and other water storage areas struggle to deal with current housing needs. With the proposed expansion of housing in Ashford and other developments in the Southeast, this proposed plan cannot and must not be looked at in isolation.</p> <p>5. The proposed road infrastructure and housing layout in these plans do NOT encourage traffic to fully use junction 11 of the M20 as the main access and egress to this proposed development. 100% of all the housing are being built southeast of the Junction 11 and householders from most of these homes who wish to travel to Ashford or London will use the A20 driving through the village community of Sellindge to access junction 10A of the M20 instead. No one from Otterpool Lane are or the Hillside development will drive 3 miles west to junction 11, only to drive a further 3 miles east on the M20, on the way to Ashford or London.</p> <p>Human nature and common sense will under the current plans cause most traffic from this development who wish to access Ashford or London to use Sellindge as the gateway. The housing and road layout must be changed to ensure that households who use their vehicles have no option to access the M20 via junction 11. The current plan has no safeguards for the village of Sellindge. The current plan will have a significant detrimental health and wellbeing impact on the residents of Barrow Hill and Sellindge Village as a whole. The only true safeguard that could and should be put in place as requested by many Sellindge residents and their Parish Council, is the road infrastructure being proposed from the A20 Otterpool Lane, into the Hillside development, to be used as a bypass around Sellindge village.</p> <p>If not implemented from the outset, then for it to be futureproofed and planned for from the outset. The A20 Barrow Hill is controls by single one-way traffic light system at Grove bridge. Traffic currently stacks up along Barrow Hill, stop start due to the traffic lights, causing significant pollution and noise. This will extend and increase if this development is allowed to go ahead. Protection measures must be put in place to reduce any impact of air pollution and noise to the residents of Barrow Hill and Sellindge. Our right to life, from Article 1 of the human rights act, imposes a duty on the state and local authorities to ensure they protect the public's health and do NOT agree or instigate anything which is likely to harm the life of individuals or members of the public. The plans clearly show a significant increase of traffic in Barrow Hill and Sellindge, which will bring the air quality and particulate matter to levels significantly higher than now. Currently the UK is not testing air quality to EU standers and have breached EU air quality targets in most cities. This development will have a similar effect on our existing community. The development plans say much about electric vehicles, but current production of electricity and future expectation do not match the ability to produce electricity in the UK, as many power stations are coming to their end of life and new ones are not even began to be built.</p> <p>Renewable energy is not catching up fast enough. The UK has the least amount of infrastructure in place or planned in Europe and most motorist will not start buying electric vehicles until the power and infrastructure is in place first. Even if this development had the infrastructure, if the rest of the UK is not the same, it would be of no use.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			Due to this, any plans or proposals must accept that petrol and Diesel vehicles and emissions are here to stay for the next 25 years. This development must be planned, and safeguards put into place regarding traffic movements, air quality and noise, so to protect the current communities from the negative traffic impacts of this proposed new one. I respectfully request that these points be considered during the planning and council meetings to safeguard our children's lives	
2	Robert Bryer	23.06.2022 12.02.2021	(1) 23.06.2022 I think the council need to listen! Just look at the objections listed. Just look at the objections listed. I need not add any more. The development is clearly unsustainable, and we should be focussing on more small developments. Stop turning down individual house builders and allow each village and town to grow at a natural pace. (2) 12.02.2021 Quite simply the plan is not sustainable. It is a plan based on the past and not the future. We need a more sustainable plan that does not take valuable or potentially valuable farming land. We have all seen the risks we face with being cut off from Europe. There is a better alternative if the Planning Officers could see common sense. 10,000 houses over 30 years are approx. 333 houses per year. How many plans are turned down each year due to minor issues of sustainability? How many people do not apply because they are worried about the process? I propose a new policy that invites villages and towns in the district to apply for eco, sustainable properties that would be minor freckles on the map. Slow incremental growth spread out to not cause a dramatic impact all in one hit. This also allows for a measure of need as the population grows or shrinks as is the case now. It would create local jobs and local income. Local, individual landowners would profit, and that money would stay within the district rather than going to large corporations. I am so passionate about this I am creating a project and campaign to support this. If you are interested in taking part, you can find me on Facebook or Linked in.	LPA 308
3	Ms Lorraine Spencer	19.04.2022	I along with many others have raised objections to this plan. There is nothing in the recent letter received by residents within the Otterpool area which gives specific information on the 'amended planning application.' How are residents supposed to respond within the 21day period if we are not given sufficient information with regard the proposed amendments? Therefore, my earlier objections regarding this planning application still stand. The development is not required to meet local housing demand, it is too large for the surrounding areas and villages. There is insufficient infrastructure planning on both educational provision and health, particularly our hospital provision. The green credentials are insignificant and poorly thought out. The 30-year plan does not consider likely Societal changes and needs it also blights the residents' current lives as we have no real idea of what the nature of this huge 'garden town' will eventually be. The resulting uncertainty prevents current residents plans for their properties. I am very much against this planning application and continue to feel this entire project is against the wishes of local communities. It is indeed viewed as a vanity project by our head of Council.	LPA 139
4	Julie Channer	24.06.2022 02.05.2022	(1) 24.06.2022 I don't think anyone in their right minds would say they really want this development on their doorstep but, the fact is, there is a housing crisis in this country and houses have to be built somewhere, so I think there needs to be a degree of pragmatism/realism. The look of the town on the plans is quite pleasant and, if building Otterpool means we can protect our villages from the kind of over development that has been happening recently then I'm in support of it. There are issues with services, water supply, infrastructure etc but, if these are addressed, then there are also positives of employment, housing for our children, and a boost for local businesses and the local economy. (1) 02.05.2022 Having looked at the plans I think that, if it is built as the plans show, it will be quite an exciting development in the area and will provide jobs and incomes for many years to come. I hope the open spaces are kept as shown in the plans and that the 'garden'	LPA 028

		Previous comments (24.05.2019)	feel is also kept. My only gripe would be that there should be more social housing, a minimum of 30% I think is usually required for a development like this and the current plans are about 8% short of this target.	
5	Luke Bailey	24.06.2022	Aside from the obvious destruction of a huge area of countryside assuming the population of the proposed plan would cause havoc for residents especially with current housing developments within the area. And although the new proposed plan has reduced the number of homes this will only increase over the years therefore I am very much against this proposal.	LPA 272
6	Angela Pumfleet	23.06.2022	<p>This development is far too large for the roads to cope with, even at the moment if there is a problem with the M20 the whole area comes to a halt. Too many houses packed into a small area causes kayos as proved with the over development of Ashford, it can take over an hour to get from one side to the other.</p> <p>I know the hypocritical council have gone too far to back down with this development now (hypocritical as they turned down an application on the race course for houses to be built around the race course keeping it open only to then purchase the site when it was not viable to keep it open without these houses and want to build well over 10 times the amount originally asked for) So if these houses and other business have to be built every property should be self-sustaining with solar panels geo thermal heating and rain water collection etc, this is the least you can do to lessen the impact on the local resources.</p> <p>On a more personal topic, looking at the map of the new town Barrow Hill seems to be engulfed by it, with development on both sides, looking like we will no longer be part of Sellindge. We have been told that the new development will not affect us but how living on a building site for the rest of my life will not affect me I am not sure. The impact of 250 houses being built in Sellindge has been bad enough over the last few years let alone the thousands to be built in the new town.</p> <p>The last thing I have to say is regarding the strip of land at the back of Barrow Hill that was proposed as a buffer, it seems to change with every plan I see, at first it was most of the existing field, at lease up to the wood which was to remain farm land but the latest was a very small strip tailing off to only a few feet which would be allotments. Please revert to the original plan and at least give us some peace of mind that we are not going to be completely hemmed in.</p>	LPA 209
7	Denise Jorgensen	24.06.2022	<p>24.06.2022 (1) This is an area of outstanding natural beauty. Sellindge, Folkestone and surrounding areas has already had a considerable amount of housing development with more planned. There is a severe water shortage in the area, the traffic has increased drastically, 16,000 extra cars not helping. No plans to accommodate these extra cars with access to Hythe. Unaffordable houses for young people living in area. This will not create jobs - only jobs for building development and associated work. Decimation of wildlife habitat. Noise and ground pollution. 98% residents voted against it including all Local Parish Councils. Shame on Government and council.</p> <p>24.06.2022 (2) This is the second comment submitted, but not published as far as I can see, the first in more detail so briefly I oppose the planning consent because it is in an AONB, Water problems, Traffic congestion, Devastation of countryside and wildlife, pollution. There has been a vast amount of development in the area. It will only create jobs for the developers, builders, and associated works. People from outside the area will only be able to afford these homes not young families who already live in the area.</p>	LPA 226
8	Mark Chapman	24.06.2022	24.06.2022 (1)	LPA 141

		Previous comments: (06.06.2019)	<p>I object on the basis that: - Major concerns by local residents on all previous consultations have been (As usual) completely ignored. - Numerous evolutions of the scheme have changed and the green space from their original locations, with minimal impact on surroundings to those of a more centrist nature, but lesser density housing on the periphery. - Transport modelling and evaluation is still woeful and contains an inconsistent approach to the input data. Put simply, the assumptions on the modelling should be challenged. How can 8500 homes not create a bottleneck through the railway bridge at Barrow Hill? The modelling does not take into account the whole community or yet again the occasional closure of the M20, which is anything but. Traffic is essentially trapped East of the bridge. - Lower density housing exists around existing settlements for most of the development, other than Northwest of Barrow Hill.</p> <p>Again, leading back the to the first point of planning houses by stealth. It has now jumped to medium density housing. How has this occurred? - I dispute the fact that the local community has been engaged. Local open days are not widely communicated and despite being a local resident I feel wholly in the dark. Questions are only answered if they are palatable. Still waiting on numerous requests. - Facilities staging should be so that they are in place before the next stage continues, not after. As per previous FHDC developments, we all know what happens there. i.e., nothing. - Wildlife. There is a huge amount of wildlife in this surrounding area, and it is an AONB. Why are we destroying the local habitat in such a way for what is essentially a FHDC vanity project?</p>	
9	Suzanne Dodman	24.06.2022	<p>We object to this planning on the basis that: Lympe will lose its village ethos and will see a significant increase in road traffic along the Aldington Road! Presently, we can walk in the fields in the evenings and feel safe and be one with nature. Presently, our children can play out in the local park and feel safe. When they start to build Otterpool Park, around the village of Lympe it will become a major thorough fair for road traffic passing through from other towns and villages. It will lose its identity and it is evident that this is already happening due to other building developments in our local area.</p> <p>The Martello Lakes site (which still has a considerable number of houses yet to be built, in addition to those being built on the Romney Marsh). We should also not forget the years of traffic delays that lay ahead of us if this development goes ahead, which will bring a further increase in traffic through the village & increased traffic noise & pollution as a result!</p> <p>Lympe hill can't cope now, and the traffic management review needs to be challenged. The hill is extremely steep and narrow at the bottom- two cars can just pass each other. Did anyone actually assess this road or just reviewed accident stats?</p> <p>We live on the Ridgeway, and we can't even sit in garden now due to the road noise from the Aldington Road. Why are we paying a high level of council tax, when we can't even sit in our own garden?</p> <p>Surely a bypass road is required around the village of Lympe before the development goes ahead! If this is not possible, then we feel the road noise and pollution needs to be mitigated. I feel the developer and council need to install an acoustic fence to reduce the road noise along the Aldington Road - reduce the road noise in the gardens in the Ridgeway estate.</p>	LPA 328
10	Kevin Weston	24.06.2022	I object to the above this whole part of Kent is being built up too much, roads can't cope with the traffic now. Our naturally beautiful countryside will slowly disappear and over populate	LPA 265
11	M Holden	24.06.2022 (x 2)	<p>24.06.2022 (1) This development does not support the local area or communities. Please listen to what people are saying!!!! What is the point of asking for opinions when you don't listen?</p> <p>The plans are unsustainable and do not meet the needs of surrounding communities. The devastation to local wildlife will be</p>	LPA 274

			<p>unprecedented. The local hospitals are already under immense pressure and cannot cope! It will have a massive negative impact which will be felt for a long time by all local residents</p> <p>24.06.2022 (2) This development does not support the local area or communities. The plans are unsustainable and do not meet the needs of surrounding communities. The devastation to local wildlife will be unprecedented. Please listen to what the residents are saying!!!</p> <p>The local hospitals are already under immense pressure and cannot cope! It will have a massive negative impact which will be felt for a long time by all local residents.</p>	
12	Mr Cooper	24.06.2022	I strongly object to the Otterpool Development. When the government asked for applications/bids for garden villages it did say that these would only go ahead if they had the support of the local community. Clearly this development doesn't have the support of the local community. So why is this folly still being pursued.	LPA 288
13	Fred Jackson	25.06.2022	<p>My family are long term residents of the village of Lympe. Lympe has a real community feel and I have a feeling that's about to change. I have now had the opportunity to study the plans for the whole Otterpool project and am horrified by the sheer scale. I believe the community feel of Lympe will disappear along with the spirit and identity of Sellindge and Westenhanger. These villages will form a blob filling the gap between Ashford and Folkestone. All identity will be lost. Of course, I am aware of the need to build more homes, but the scale of this development is completely obscene and will destroy this beautiful corner of Kent.</p> <p>Why does the development have to be so big? Surely a more discreet number of homes will be more appropriate. This corner of Kent has already seen a massive depletion of wilier with the loss of trees and habitat. This development would box in one the area by the railway, the M20 the A20 and Stone Street. It would be a wildlife catastrophe. I cannot believe that a development of this size has been allowed to go ahead. Clearly there is an awful lot of money involved. Also, I am already sceptical about the level of infrastructure of this size. My experience tells me that nothing like the level of infrastructure needed will be provided. Promises of schools, shops and additional transport links will fall by the wayside as the costs become clearer. This monstrosity will see the end of this quiet lovely part of Kent.</p>	LPA 231
14	Elaine Rose	25.06.2022	<p>The area surrounding the proposed development will be totally destroyed and will become a huge town which will join with Ashford. I object in the strongest terms. South East Kent will cease to be anywhere a tourist wants to visit or a have any rural interest.</p> <p>Tragic.</p>	LPA 228
15	Ian Rose	25.06.2022	The views of local people and villages has been totally overlooked and ignored problems. The development will cause terrible traffic congestion, Devastation of countryside and wildlife, pollution. There has been a vast amount of development in the area. It will wreck what little countryside we have left. Why not build a nature reserve and leisure area without any homes to attract tourism and protect the environment? Ashford is already a huge town. Please do not do this. Hythe will be ruined. The whole area taken away.	LPA 244
16	Marion Hazel Lang	26.06.2022	The development is too large and will have catastrophic impact on already hugely inadequate transport links of the M20 and interconnecting A and B roads In addition there has been no common sense highway strategy or understanding of the links to other areas in the vicinity which WILL create more severe problems, accidents and gridlock to existing road systems to Dymchurch, Hythe, and the Romney marsh where of course the residents will automatically want to travel en mass in the summer season to beaches.	LPA 277

		<p>Current traffic issues to maintain traffic flow are already causing gridlock through these areas so adding huge further levels of residential traffic to these levels is insane. The scale of the development also destroys the character of the Garden of England in immediate proximity to an SSSI and within a distance which due to the size of the development will have a detrimental impact to those ecosystems and debilitate wildlife which is already under threat. Are the regulations to protect these fragile but important areas to be completely ignored to satisfy those interested in profit. What is the value of the complete sale of property against the cost of buying and building? Water provision is already restricted in hot weather preventing use if hides in the summer due to our water largely being provided via underground aquifers which also have limited capacity and the draw on these to such levels will impact the existing systems to a detrimental and serious way.</p> <p>The peaceful environment is to be protected but the scale of this project is too extensive swallowing completely the rural aspect that people enjoy and paid good prices for their property to live here and invested time money and Labour to create their perfect homes and outdoor spaces. The rural aspect will be completely destroyed by such a huge development not only for local residents but anyone moving into the homes. The transport links are already appalling, I have spent 10 years trying to get to work constantly being thwarted by operation stack and operation brock. I have had to give up jobs that I worked hard to gain because of the M20 and the ridiculous farcical efforts of highways to use it as a continuous building site, with huge stretches of the motorway cordoned off but with no workers or traffic or need but with huge impact and frustration caused to road users. The car, van, and lorry driving actual users from the UK and abroad in an effort to meet the demands of commercial large, small, and global business are not in any way a priority.</p> <p>How are the number of new properties with their two to three vehicles each going to impact an existing crippled M20? People who live here and have to manage that every day know increasing capacity will only make this system break completely. There is no consideration to costs in construction which are high for steel bricks, windows and doors and timber with many have issues with the provision of resources and because of components being stuck due to crisis around the world where those are made. The development on this scale doesn't improve family lives, it results in more accidents, more crime, more congestion People who want to live here now want to because of the countryside and the peace. So, reduce the size to give other people that opportunity but in proportion to the existing valued settlement. Don't create more problems for those that live here and those that would move here. What about the change in the noise levels and the effect on people's mental health? Noise from the excavation and building will result in high level of noise becoming a part of local community day and night for the next 10 years. Will there be compensation to those residents. Well-being comes from being in calm green environments not in gridlocked high density paved and concreted mass development which changes the whole land and how it functions. How do we support all these extra people in food, power, and water? Where are your capacity models, where are your sustainable credentials and your protection of the green environment? You are proposing to do the opposite of what the government says it thinks is important. This is a contradiction. Community is about people in spaces which are not so large that no one knows or cares about each other anymore. Is the housing built for all which meets the Carbon neutral criteria we are supposed to be aiming for? How many gas boilers are you fitting? how many communal heat systems? How many ground source heat pumps are being installed? What level of the BREEAM credentials are you going to meet?</p> <p>The fact that this site is called Otter POOL Lane what is the effect on the water systems of this amount of imposed and dead loads on this site? I don't feel that England requires all these properties built in out of proportion developments. What it creates is a soulless and disconnected group of houses, garages which are not secure. An imagination of people not using cars but using the limited existing travel links in a nice orderly queue. These building developments are not separate planets. They need to function as an interlinked connected and responsive machine.</p> <p>I do not see how this can work in reality, I strongly object I strongly believe the attitudes of the resident's businesses and environmental organisations are dismissed and that therefore this is not democratic if the current plan is progressed.</p>	
--	--	---	--

17	Jo Wills	28.06.2022	I object in the strongest terms. This is a travesty. The further destruction of our dwindling countryside when we need to be reliant on food production in the UK due to the forthcoming food security crisis. We see the continual erection of vast areas of shoddy housing in areas that offer no employment. The tiny road systems in and around the area will be overwhelmed and are totally unsuitable for the huge increase in traffic. All the subsequent, noise, fumes, light pollution. I believe that any and every brownfield site should be considered before ruining our countryside/food source. In this day and age when we should supposedly be aware of the fragility of the natural world and this monstrosity of a development is something we're having to battle. Kent has had enough development; it's done its fair share and we need now to refocus our vision for this county and value the land we rely on.	LPA 253
18	Ilinca Cantacuzino	28.06.2022	This development is in excess of anything reasonable. Not only is the infrastructure unable to sustain it but at a time when we should be concentrating on sustainable development, protecting the biodiversity in the few rural places left, this development is retrograde and not wanted by the communities surrounding it. The increase in traffic alone is enough to make this development untenable. The roads in the area cannot manage now. With the increase in lorries, being in the midst of the ingress from Europe, and the destruction of the M20, this area of Kent is being destroyed. Indeed, it looks like the Garden of England is being paved over. When will it ever stop? Hythe, a nearby lovely seaside town will become impossible to access - there are no roads or possibility of developing roads to take the increase in cars from this proposal, and this development will destroy it. With the cynical way the Princes Parade Development in Sandgate has gone ahead despite fervent opposition from residents, it seems the craze for more development continues. The water systems (aquifers) will not be able to cope. The concreting over the areas of green is against the 25 year plan the government established for nature recovery. I strongly object to this development.	LPA 245
19	Jonathan Armstrong	29.06.2022	This is yet another unwanted development in East Kent- massive in scale it will have huge knock on effects, including clogging up the local roads even further, clogging up commuter trains to London (already at over capacity). Since moving back to Kent 7 years ago (having been born & bred in Kent), I have been dismayed by the sheer volume of housing development waved through by the local councils and which is ruining the local countryside. It is par for the course that the vast majority of housing developments are poor quality "monopoly" houses built for the purpose of maximising profit for developers all of whom are recording record profits fuelled by tax payer subsidies. I strongly object.	LPA 259
20	Sue Bartholomew	29.06.2022	It is inappropriate to have such a large development in Kent or Surrey. Kent is a through route to the continent which already brings problems mainly for transport. Those living and working in the eastern part of Kent are often beset with traffic chaos and restrictions on the motorways and side roads, which are not adequate for the amount of traffic. Similarly, the rail services both within Kent and towards the continent are problematic. Different types of train fuelled in different ways- so often train services are cancelled. Supplies to services and business are hampered constantly. The county cannot absorb a new town until all the info structure is working well and it has been proven that this area in Kent is the best and most needy place in England to set up a new town, or such a settlement as Otterpool. Please direct the developers to another part of the country and preserve the current status quo until there is a need for such a development. Kent provides excellent soil and climate for growing food for the current residents - more residents and less land for agriculture does not make sense. Parts of England are less fertile and have more space suitable for residential use, can we not encourage development a little further North?	LPA 327
21	Brett Mckinney	01.07.2022	I am in support of this project Simply put, house price growth in the area has spiralled out of control. I would like for my kids to live nearby when they leave home, and the way things are going this will be practically impossible The Otterpool development will help to slow (but likely not reverse) the current excessive house price increases and provide much needed additional housing in the district.	LPA 212

22	Alan Pattison	29.05.2022	When all said and done, somebody please tell me where all these people will go to the doctor and/or hospital. Getting a doctor's appointment for the people already living near this eyesore is nigh on impossible.	LPA 200
23	Alexander McConnell	21.06.2022	I strongly object to this development in its entirety. Essentially too many houses, with too many cars, generating unacceptable noise and air pollution levels currently under huge scrutiny with recent environmental research and reports. The impact to the area will be devastating in its consequences, roads, public services, environmental and biodiversity will all be drastically affected. Kent is not a state in America, it simply can't cope at all levels with this massive, expected influx, it can't cope now, so how it's supposed to in the future is beyond imagination. Hythe and other outlying areas will be severely impacted if not brought to a standstill, there are no connections other than existing roads, it appears to be what Transport for New Homes calls a cowpat development standing monolithically on its own with only roads and cars to service it, completely car centric. The existing Westenhanger station looks woefully inadequate and will probably escalate in size and costs as reality kicks in. Already critical services such as water and health are in short supply in the area so pressure on those existing ones will drastically increase and with increased heat / reduced rainfall on one hand and terminal resource / facilities on another it can only further decline. Community / renewable energy is non-existent and at this point in time with large focus on energy supply and pricing seems a glaring omission and drastic error. Is Otterpool in reality being built to offer the displaced people of the area when seas finally rise to their expected levels somewhere else to live, otherwise it's just a massive ego trip on behalf of certain local individuals and needs stopped.	LPA 201
24	Ali Plumb	23.05.2022	As I drove down to the "Otterpool Exhibition" from the top of Otterpool Lane looking at all the fields, hedgerows, and trees, I realised that in a few years' time my view would be high rise blocks of flats, huge housing estates, thousands of cars, vans, and lorries. I object to a new town and all that goes with it. 1. Why is Otterpool Town centre going to be successful when every other town locally and nationally is full of boarded up shops and To Let signs? Why not put the money into existing town centres? 2. High rise buildings that can be seen for miles in an AONB area is totally unacceptable and does not make a "Garden" town. 3. The village of Lympne seems to be swallowed up to become a suburb of Otterpool with large amounts of housing and a few trees, a bridle way as a buffer zone between Otterpool and Lympne. I think it's called Lympne Green just to make things worse. 4. The creation of all these jobs and industrial units when there are huge amounts of units/offices and shops vacant and sitting empty in and around all the local towns in Folkestone, Ashford, Hythe, and Canterbury. 5. The country lanes and the A20 will be at gridlock coping with all the additional cars, vans, and lorries. The traffic increase of 17000 cars plus vans delivering internet purchases, vans and lorries delivering goods to homes, shops and businesses daily will lead to roads being at a standstill without Op Brock/STAK. 6. In the perfect world people would walk and cycle everywhere but, it doesn't happen. 7. Where does the figure of 50% green landscape come from? Have the dimensions of households' private gardens, roadside verges, sports pitches/playing fields etc been added up to get to this percentage? This scale of development and design should be rethought completely.	LPA 202
25	Alice Bosley	20.06.2022	Lympne will not cope with the increase, and it will block the routes to Hythe, other local routes on the A20 & towards Canterbury up Stone Street. I have children at schools in Canterbury & Folkestone and any building work will be highly descriptive. They go from Westenhanger station too and disruption will be obvious. On Op brick says our road is used as a cut through, as the a20 becomes blocked. Our little country land turns into a solid traffic thorough through, with cars reaching up to 70mph. This is unacceptable.	LPA 203

			<p>In addition to the car issue, Water is in short supply in the area and the developers aren't doing anything other than using an existing reservoir, putting increased pressure on an area that has shortages already. The houses are not being fitted with water saving anything, nor solar panels. Electricity has had huge issues in the area with regular power cuts. I'm not sure if the local network will cope.</p> <p>It's all very well saying more doctors' surgeries, opticians etc but there aren't enough doctors/opticians preferred to come to the area. There aren't the jobs for this many people, in the local area. In fact, rather than helping future generations, you will be hindering them, forcing them to leave the area in search of work in other areas.</p> <p>I would be more in favour of this housing, if another major A road was built through the development, no house owner was permitted to own a car, environmental factors such as water saving mechanisms were put on all houses, a new reservoir was built for the development and the housing was reduced considerably and garden space increased to help the local wildlife. We know from banning all pesticides on our 3-acre plot, over 13 yrs. that we have the most incredible wildlife. Our wildflower meadow attracts animals and rare plants. You will be destroying all this by creating so many houses.</p>	
26	Alison Baldwin	21.06.2022 Previous comments (06.06.2019)	I would like more consideration to be given to the traffic management plan in particular the likely bottle necks which will be caused by the existing traffic lights under the M20/railway bridges. When traffic is congested along the A20 or when the road is closed or from Operation Brock / stack on the M20 this diverts significant traffic onto other roads such as Church Lane Aldington/ Sellindge which is not suitable to take it. With an increase in traffic to homes and businesses and construction traffic this will put huge pressure on the existing road structure. I cannot support the application until these points have been addressed and a revised plan submitted.	LPA118
27	Aly Malcolm	22.06.2022	Not enough infrastructure, currently shortages of e.g., GPs in local area. Concern re water supply to area. Proposed development huge and totally out of character will dwarf Hythe and make local roads gridlocked.	LPA 204
28	Amanda Harris	23.06.2022	The estate proposed will put a stretch on resources already over utilised. In the summer, Hythe is gridlocked as it is a popular destination and will be for the new estate planned. We do not have the high street to support a big population nor the room to expand. In addition to this, the video showing the new estate is not in keeping with the Kent countryside and has been designed like a London Borough. This is not London, and the villages nearby are very much small countryside towns. This should have been thought of in the planning. If schools aren't ready before the houses (which is unlikely) as housing companies obviously put profit first there are no spaces in our schools. We had horrendous waiting lists this year. 100% object but 100% know the corrupt planning office will approve to suit their own agendas regardless of the negative impact to countryside, the welfare of the people and the local infrastructure (yet they can't approve a roller shutter on my car barn).	LPA 339
29	Andrew Battershill	23.05.2022	Surrounding villages will be pushed by secondary development to expand in order to take advantage of the proximity of facilities and amenities planned at Otterpool, namely schools, shops, day care for young and old etc. This will lead to increased traffic from larger populations in the surrounding wards. There needs to be a comprehensive study of the likely traffic by foot, car, public transport and bike by a specialist urban planning consultancy and an integrated transport network that meets or exceeds environmental best practice should be specified and implemented by the client and developer. Measures to be considered to include, separated cycle lanes alongside the A20, widening and rerouting the A20, derisking the A20 junctions with sideroads by modifying layouts, cycle and footbridges over the M20, electric scooter provision, an electric guided tram within the town, a suitable number of public car charging points, a robust network of data-linked bus stops with increased bus timetables -electric buses- to provide the public wherewithal to transport elderly, unemployed and those with young children from surrounding villages to the urban centre, and the amenities available there. In addition, the local population should be consulted on the public and	LPA 205

			<p>other amenities they require within their own community. For example, increased care and activities for elderly, increased play areas in local nearby villages for children, youth club and activities for older children, playing fields for local sports teams, and so forth.</p> <p>I also have concerns about pollution entering the River Stour, which passes alongside the proposed development area. What measures are proposed to prevent flood run off into the river, which may pollute this chalk-fed stream here?</p> <p>I have another concern about the status of the local WW2 ammunition store alongside the M20. How is it proposed to preserve this and stop it becoming vandalised in the future when there is a large urban population nearby, which would be inevitable. This important relic needs a study to be undertaken on how best to preserve it, with the possibility of moving it to a museum, or a better- controlled environment.</p> <p>How is it proposed that the important archaeology surrounding Westenhanger Castle, and barn are preserved, or fully investigated during excavation phases of construction? For instance, during the HS1 construction in this area, desktop studies were carried out, followed by targeted excavation by archaeologists, and concluded with watching briefs on all other earthmoving. There are a number of recorded buildings in the immediate vicinity of the castle that should be investigated fully.</p> <p>Has there been a review of the housing requirement and local/ national plans in light of reduced immigration post-Brexit? It is difficult to see that Shepway needs 8500 homes with South Ashford building another 9000 right now.</p> <p>Concluding, it doesn't take a genius to see that the scale of this development is inappropriate for the location and surrounding area.</p>	
30	Andrew Cook	22.06.2022	I wish to object to this l'll thought plan because the lack of Road infrastructure relying on junction 11 and the a20 through Sellindge. When the motorway grinds to a halt on numerous occasions through accident, Dover Docks, Brock, Tap or Stack the A20 comes to a standstill being single file through Sellindge.	LPA 014
31	Andrew Soane	22.06.2022	This development isn't going to benefit the local community at all, more houses that are well out of most locals' price ranges, more traffic on our already crowded and pothole ridden roads and another loss for our environment with more green spaces being destroyed to make a way for more concrete.	LPA 207
32	Andrew Vizzard	20.06.2022	<p>We are continually being told by government that the reason for so much recent development is because there is a shortage of affordable housing. Given the size of this development how can it be acceptable that such a small percentage of the proposed homes are to be affordable. Considering Shepway is supposedly a deprived area it is unlikely that any of the homes being considered will be affordable for the majority of existing residents.</p> <p>The location will have a massive impact on the journey times of the existing residents of the district being on a major route. Even the smallest of developments in the area have already had a massive impact on journey times due to major roads being continually blighted by roadworks.</p>	LPA 208
33	Ann Nash	22.06.2022	I strongly object to the development. The size of this development will have a detrimental effect on the lives of people in the surrounding area. The infrastructure will be unable to cope.	LPA 210
34	Anthony Bosley	08.06.2022	This development will totally destroy the very nature of the rural / countryside lifestyle that it portrays to potential new residents. 8500 new homes sited within direct context of the existing AONB will have a detrimental impact upon it forever. The volume of traffic through the villages in Stowting, Brabourne etc will be significant, as will the volume of traffic towards the coast down Hythe and Lympne Hill - the only obvious routes to get to the marsh. Given Op Brock restrictions on the M20 are now lasting until December, the reality of this extra traffic on local roads is very real. This is not a problem that will go away and so we could end	LPA120

		Previous comments (06.06.2019)	up with a combined impact of Op Brock and c16k new vehicles which will be chaos. Building this number of homes on an already stressed nationally important access route is not a great idea. Recent power issues have also highlighted the undeveloped nature of local power infrastructure that will be stressed further by this development. No new water sources are available to support these homes and as such further pressure and environmental impact will be made by the additional water demands of such a large new development.	
35	B Garrard	23.06.2022	No planned road and access infrastructure will cause massive disruption to the whole area. This project needs more thought to the road network and local communities including not using prime farmland for building. There many brownfield sites available. This will prove to be a disaster for the whole od the area.	LPA 211
36	Barry Abbott	23.06.2022 Previous Comments (20.05.2019)	In the interests of democracy this project must be scrapped. There is no support for it from the residents of the surrounding areas. Times have vastly changed since this scheme was originally mooted. The effects of Covid have changed things in so many ways not least in the way we shop meaning less need for new towns. The area is subject to recurring water shortages, and we cannot afford to lose valuable farmland to housing. Please do not allow this blight on our countryside to proceed.	LPA 013
37	Barry Martyn	23.06.2022 Previous comments (24.05.2019)	Too many houses, the infrastructure is simply unable to cope with such a development. No respect for the countryside and open spaces, this sort of development (being too large) is simply storing up future problems with respect to transport, road networks, drainage and day-to-day services including water provision. I am not against further housing developments, but they have to be in keeping with the localised area, this current development is an outrageous ill-thought-out plan to destroy the current natural beauty of the surrounding area.	LPA 163
38	Brian Walton	01.05.2022	Regarding the above application (Otterpool), I would just like to say that most residents in the area affected seemed happy with a previous application to keep new development/building work etc contained in the Westenhanger area only but this sudden proposed additional development to subsume our beautiful villages, green countryside, and agricultural land (vital for future food production) into a large urban area/scheme is destroying our way of life, was not asked for at all by the local people and it is also a very upsetting proposal. for us. MY OBJECTIONS TO LAND USE PROPOSALS AS FOLLOWS: - 1) Can this Otterpool application proposals comprehensively demonstrate they do not pollute water systems by allowing nutrients that feed dangerous algae to run into such water systems? I THINK NOT due to the many rivers/streams, tributaries (some underground) located in the proposed area. 2) Hugely increased air pollution along the A20 Road from vastly increased vehicular traffic... even more traffic pollution on top of this when disturbances occur along the M20 Motorway to Folkestone/Dover and rerouting occurs to the A20 ... which proposed improvements to the A20 are unlikely to make much difference to the air pollution problem. NB The respiratory health of existing residents living near the A20 from Newingreen to Sellindge already suffers from additional air pollution every time vehicular traffic is re-routed along the A20 from the M20 motorway. Thank you for considering my above comments.	LPA 213
39	Carole Abbott	12.05.2022	It is impossible to follow the steps outlined in order to comment on this disastrous scheme. Where is the site to leave comments? Surrounded in mystery or just to confuse the enemy.	LPA 046
40	Charlotte Buss	21.06.2022	I strongly object to the development being built. Whilst I'm not against building work or new houses being built as a whole, I believe that the sheer size of this development will have a detrimental effect on the lives of many people in the surrounding area. I	LPA 214

			don't believe the infrastructure will be able to cope with such an influx of people and the effects it will have on the surrounding nature will be catastrophic.	
41	Charlotte East	24.06.2022	<p>I want to comment on Chapter 16 - Transport, as the modelling appears to contain a number of omissions and errors, that underestimate the impact that the increase in traffic will have on the local area.</p> <p>The first issue is that Lypne Hill is described as not being used by pedestrians, and so the impact on pedestrians is described as negligible (Table 16-22). However, Lypne Hill has a public footpath running along the road for a section and is regularly used by walkers and also by local pedestrians wanting to go walk to the Canal or to Unit 1.</p> <p>The area of Aldington Rd between Stone St and Lypne Hill is only evaluated in some sections of the document, but omitted in others, and not present in the summary table in 16.2.100. The impact of the increase in traffic in this area is not considered, despite this road having an exit from the Primary School onto it. This section of the road also has a public footpath, and local people routinely walk in the road to access the footpaths on Castle Drive.</p> <p>When looking at the impact of increased traffic on residents of houses along and close to all the roads considered in this chapter, I feel the negative effects that Otterpool will have are severely under-represented. This study ignores the current issues with the traffic calming section in Lypne, where the pavement is so narrow that people are regularly bumped by car wing mirrors. It also takes the position that the impact on residents living on these roads will be low, ignoring the impact of the traffic noise on people's lives.</p>	LPA 215
42	Mrs Cheryl A Ramsden	22.06.2022	<p>This plan to build so very many houses between Hythe and Sellindge is bordering on the ridiculous. Where is the water needed to service all this building work going to come from? We already have water shortages and with global warming a real and present danger can we afford to build such a huge amount of housing. This will probably not affect me or indeed many of you on the planning committee, but spare a thought for the children and young Mums and Dads who will face increasing pollution from vehicle discharge water and electricity shortages etc. I am very disillusioned by this short sighted and disruptive plan that will blight this corner of Kent for ever, and if it goes ahead then shame on all of you.</p>	LPA 219
43	Christopher Giles	23.06.2022	<p>I do not object in principle to additional housing provided that support services and transport connections are suitably addressed. This is where the problems lie. The transport links have not been adequately or correctly assessed.</p> <p>Firstly, the A261 assessment to determine the likely increases in traffic numbers and the effect on traffic into Military Road, Hythe was only covered at morning and evening peak times. Whilst these times are important, the worst traffic chaos and queues down into Hythe occur on sunny weekends. On occasions the A261 queues back up to the A20. Obviously, with the advance of Otterpool housing this will be much worse, and it will be virtually impossible to drive that route. Additionally, I was informed that the peak time queues in Military Road (that are already in existence) will be alleviated by removing parking from Military Road - thus creating two lanes of traffic. Quite a ridiculous remark as this will, of course, simply move the bottleneck half a mile down the road to the single file traffic feeding through Red Lion Square.</p> <p>Secondly, the full effect on traffic through Lypne onto Aldington Road, down Lypne Hill and on through West Hythe Road has been seriously overlooked. If there are 8000+ houses at Otterpool and a parkway station situated at Westenhanger this route will become the main direct route for traffic from Romney Marsh wishing to access the station and from Otterpool residents wishing to access the sandy beaches at Dymchurch and St Mary's Bay. Obviously, with weekend queues on the A261 this route will become even more popular.</p> <p>There is already a width restriction on Lypne Hill (ignored by many motorhomes, caravans, and lorries) and at least three places</p>	LPA 216

			<p>where even cars slow down to cross - and further on into West Hythe Road there are four very tight bends leading up to Botolph's Bridge. There will be a considerable increase of traffic for residents in both in Lympe and West Hythe that have, yet again, been incorrectly assessed at the wrong times - weekend traffic has been ignored.</p> <p>This development should not go ahead without much improved transport links into Hythe and The Romney Marsh.</p>	
44	Claire Reid	22.06.2022	<p>I strongly object to this development as there is not adequate infrastructure to even support the current population, as well as the environmental costs. The William Harvey Hospital is already overwhelmed with no plans to expand it nor be able to cope with the extra demands placed on it by a further 8000+ households.</p> <p>It is my understanding that the population of Hythe in 2011 was less than the Otterpool development will be, so it's more like an enormous town being built. They are not building more major roads, nor providing extra reservoirs for water, or extra power stations for this, just the houses. Therefore, in an area of water shortages and power cuts, how will that affect the current towns and villages?</p> <p>Traffic on all roads will increase and be immeasurably difficult during Operation Brock. We have already suffered, I had to add 40 minutes to my commute just to contend with the closure of the M20 and having to reroute through the countryside and inadequate roads. I have also been stuck on the A20 with an ambulance blaring its sirens, not being able to move because of traffic blocking north and south bound single carriageway lanes and roadworks. The effect of increase in fuel costs for the local population and extra traffic placed on Hythe and surrounding villages will be chaotic as they will not cope with this. It will be devastating. It will affect anyone between Ashford, Folkestone & Canterbury, and very much Hythe which is already crowded. The town will also increase flooding as more areas will be paved over.</p> <p>The current GP practices are already overwhelmed as well. Although there is a proposal for a GP practice, where are they going to find the GPs to populate it from?</p> <p>The local senior schools are already oversubscribed. Where do they plan on putting the children who will be residents of the development? The current schools need to keep open playing fields for exercise and health and cannot keep adding buildings to their sites.</p> <p>I strongly object to this development as there is not adequate infrastructure to even support the current population, as well as the environmental costs.</p>	LPA 217
45	Clare Martyn	23.06.2022	<p>I strongly object to this application. There is no need to have a development of this size & the disruption on the surrounding villages, by having so many houses in one area, will be considerable. Our small country lanes will not be able to cope with all the traffic, our hospitals will be even more overcrowded, the level of destruction that will be caused to biodiversity of the local wildlife will suffer greatly & our water supplies will not be able to cope. Please reconsider the size of this huge development it is not necessary!</p>	LPA 218
46	Colin Abbott	04.07.2022 (1) 24.06.2022 (2)	<p>Who will determine whether this project goes ahead? Is the application to be determined by members of FHDC themselves? If the Council are applying to themselves for permission surely this is undemocratic. When there is such overwhelming opposition to the project will this be taken into account?</p> <p>24.06.2022 (2) This development would be a disaster for this beautiful part of Kent and must be rejected. There are many grounds for this but primarily the loss of valuable farmland. I The very beginning of this saga Monk, announced that the Council were buying the farmland to provide an income stream for the future.</p>	LPA 045

		<p>24.06.2022 (3)</p> <p>11.05.2022 (4)</p> <p>11.05.2022 (5) Previous Comments (03.04.2019, 06.06.2019)</p>	<p>This was quickly shown to be a lie as we are now fully aware. This Council do not represent the people of the district and do not listen to their views. Wit ness the overall, objections to this scheme. Likewise, how the Council railroaded the Princes Parade scheme through against overwhelming opposition!!</p> <p>Let democracy prevail and retain our countryside for future generations by consigning the Otterpool Town scheme to the waste bin where it deserves to be. FHDC LISTEN TO YOUR RESIDENTS .NO OTTERPOOL.</p> <p>24.06.2022 (3) If this application were to be passed it would be the greatest travesty of justice imaginable. With the sheer overwhelming opposition to this complete destruction of our countryside there can be no other decision than REJECTION.</p> <p>11.05.2022 (4) I wish to object to the planning application for Otterpool on many grounds. The proposal to build. Such a new town was the subject of lies from the start when Monk announced that the Council were buying the agricultural land as an investment for future farming. This was soon proved to be a lie and followed by mass protests from local residents. An earlier application to build houses on the former Racecourse was overturned owing to the density of houses proposed so this is even more detrimental and should be rejected on the same basis. Folkestone Racecourse was Kent's only Racecourse and provided enjoyment to many people from far and wide. It was, and still is for the present, a haven for wildlife as well as rich farmland on its surrounds. The Covid epidemic has appeared since the plans for Otterpool were. first mooted and this has changed the world in so many ways not least in the need for more high street, shops Many in Folkestone and Hythe stand empty. Why build more on farmland? We currently hear how dramatically wildlife populations are declining due to their habitats disappearing so why destroy even more? The proposal to upgrade Westenhanger station to high-speed rail is designed to support Otterpool becoming a commuter town occupied by London overspill. More persons are working from home due to Covid meaning less need for the station. The Garden of England will soon become concreted over and our countryside gone forever if this proposal is allowed. Stop it now and retain our green and pleasant land before it is too late, and it is gone forever. There must be a limit to the amount of countryside which is being lost to building!!</p> <p>No Otterpool. Not necessary and not wanted. Designed for London Overspill hence the proposal to upgrade Westenhanger station to High-Speed rail.</p> <p>Save our countryside and do not foist this monstrosity on an area of A O N B!</p> <p>The residents of the District were lied to from day one of this scheme.</p>	
47	Colin Burfoot	22.06.2022	There is neither the need for a development of this size, or the infrastructure to support it. Nobody who lives locally will benefit from this, especially when there is a need for agricultural land to grow food and the vast majority of the development will be on this land. Appears to be just another money-making scheme for those involved.	LPA 220
48	Colin Green	22.06.2022	<p>My objections are the potential of water and power shortages and job shortages. After two years I still cannot access an NHS dentist and getting a GP appointment is impossible. I worry about the construction traffic and noise that will accompany the build for 25 years, and the dust and pollution.</p> <p>I am concerned about the increased traffic in surrounding area, which is already problematic. The new schools, retail area and</p>	LPA 221

			business area will add significant traffic and pressures on local infrastructure. Westenhangar and the countryside as we know it will be destroyed.	
49	Craig Drury	23.06.2022	<p>This development is not needed or not wanted. There are already numerous developments and housing projects in the local areas in and around Sellindge, Smeeth, Aldington, and various other local rural villages, comprising hundreds of houses. This is more than enough housing development to cater for LOCAL population increases. Any further developments, such as Otterpool, are purely to cater for London and urban overspill from outside of the area and to make money for F&HD Council as well big-money investors and housing developers who are backing the project in their own self-interest. This development is of no use or interest to local people.</p> <p>F&HD Council may dress up this proposal as a garden town, but in reality, hundreds if not thousands of acres of countryside, comprising a huge amount of wildlife, vegetation and flora and fauna will be cleared, concreted over, and lost forever. The fabric and beauty of our local rural villages, comprising numerous historic and listed buildings with character, will be ruined as they will be bordered by overly populated housing estates, full of ugly, crammed-in modern identikit soulless houses with no character.</p> <p>The destruction of huge areas of our countryside, which will be lost forever, is not a price worth paying to accommodate London and urban overspill and to make a huge amount of money for F&HD Council, big-money investors, and rich developers. This proposal should be pulled immediately and the continued destruction of our countryside and rural way of life should stop. It is time for someone else to accommodate London and urban overspill. Enough is enough.</p>	LPA100
		Previous comments (03.04.2019)		
50	David Essam	04.06.2022	Absolutely no consideration for the existing residents, it's already impossible to get a doctors or dentist appointment now, what will happen with the huge increase in residents. People already use Stone Street/Lympne Hill as a cut through, driving too fast and inconsiderate to other road user's and pedestrians. Surely smaller developments throughout Folkestone and Hythe would be a far better alternative.	LPA 222
51	David Turner	23.06.2022	I don't want to live in another Medway, we haven't enough facilities now.	LPA 223
52	Deborah Miller	23.06.2022	I object to the proposed development in its entirety. This area is already regularly gridlocked when there are issues on the M20 and traffic is diverted to the A20, the current road infrastructure is unable to manage the existing traffic, never mind add potentially another 10k cars on a daily basis. There is limited medical facilities in this area, including GPs and dental surgeries, and the William Harvey Hospital is already bursting at the seams as it covers such a wide residential area. Now on to the impact of the local area, which is deemed The Garden of England, sounds like you would prefer it to be The Big Car Park of England. The loss of biodiversity would be huge. The pollution would impact on every resident currently living here, potentially causing more health implications, putting more strain on health facilities. As to the new facilities planned within this Concrete Jungle, where are you hoping the employees will come from? When you consider Stop 24 and the major advantages to the area, as was claimed, how many businesses have shut down since it opened? There is most definitely a need for housing, but this is NOT the best location, size or type of housing needed for the modern age where factors such as water, transport and affordability all need to be considered.	LPA 224
53	Denice Brown	20.05.2022	<p>Like many others, I am deeply concerned about this proposed development and strongly object to it. The project is totally impractical and will overload many of the existing facilities, including:</p> <p>1) water supply and drainage;</p>	LPA 225

			<p>2) road and rail network. The A20 is severely overcrowded and compromised when the M20 is shut. Even if extra provision is made locally, there is likely to be an additional 17,000 cars using the roads to travel beyond local area, so the overcrowding will be extensive (assumes an average of 2 cars for each of the 8,500 households);</p> <p>3) broadband provision – ours still has old infrastructure that is in urgent need of replacing. The broadband width will be reduced because of the many extra households;</p> <p>4) hospital and other health services. These are already overstretched but it will have to be available for approximately another 34,000 people (assuming an average of 4 people per each of the 8,500 homes.)</p> <p>In addition, building the scheme will cause great disruption locally. There will also be considerable environmental pollution and noise. I believe the local environment will be stressed and will not tolerate additional population. What should be done is to plant many trees and provide alternative energy developments instead of permitting housing developments.</p>	
54	Donald Broad	23.06.2022 (1) 24.06.2022 (2)	<p>23.06.2022 (1) The latest plans for Otterpool Park have not addressed the major concerns expressed by local residents at previous public consultations.</p> <p>Despite the submission that Otterpool Park will be self-sustaining, many of the new residents will need to travel off-site for employment, education, healthcare, and shopping, adding to the pressures that there are already on services, facilities and infrastructure and adversely affecting existing local communities. Furthermore, water supply, wastewater and the electricity network will take years before upgrades can meet the demands of the increased population at Otterpool in addition to the other housing developments in the region. A revised road junction will not resolve the fact that the local road network is inadequate to cope with such a large increase in population; and that is without the effects of Operation Brock and the constant flow of construction vehicles on the A20 forecast for up to 19 years. Even when all building work is completed, this 'green and pleasant' garden town will have a main arterial road, a key route to the Continent, running right through the middle and cutting Otterpool Park in half.</p> <p>The effect of climate change has exacerbated the water shortage issues and the proposals to meet the extra demand seem wildly optimistic. Water cannot be supplied if it is not there, and all new and existing local residents will suffer. Similarly, the local hospital and GP surgeries are already under extreme pressure and will be unable to cope with the extra demands of more people. Even an on-site medical centre, whenever that might be built, will do little to improve the situation. Existing GP practices and clinics in the area have been and are unable to attract and recruit doctors and staff.</p> <p>Objectors to this outline planning application for Otterpool Park should not be dismissed as NIMBYs. It was Sellindge & District Residents Association that initiated 'The Lees' housing development around a village green at Sellindge. That development is the result of consultation and involvement between Folkestone and Hythe District Council planners and the local community and, though larger than originally conceived, it was at a scale that is not drastically altering the character of the village.</p> <p>Clearly, there need to be more homes built to meet demand, but this should not be achieved by destroying the rural way of life for our local communities and by building five-storey blocks of flats on valuable agricultural land. This at a time when we need to safeguard food security in an uncertain and troubled world.</p> <p>FHDC councillors, when asked to vote on this Outline Planning Application for Otterpool Garden Town, should consider the appropriateness of this overlarge and ill-conceived new town project and the effects it will have on the well-being of the existing</p>	LPA 227

			<p>residents of the area, who they were elected to represent. Monks Horton Parish Meeting asks that they refuse planning permission.</p> <p>24.06.2022 (2) The latest plans for Otterpool Park have not addressed the major concerns expressed by local residents at previous public consultations.</p> <p>Despite the submission that Otterpool Park will be self-sustaining, many of the new residents will need to travel off-site for employment, education, healthcare, and shopping, adding to the pressures that there are already on services, facilities and infrastructure and adversely affecting existing local communities. Furthermore, water supply, wastewater and the electricity network will take years before upgrades can meet the demands of the increased population at Otterpool in addition to the other housing developments in the region. A revised road junction will not resolve the fact that the local road network is inadequate to cope with such a large increase in population; and that is without the effects of Operation Brock and the constant flow of construction vehicles on the A20 forecast for up to 19 years. Even when all building work is completed, this 'green and pleasant' garden town will have a main arterial road, a key route to the Continent, running right through the middle and cutting Otterpool Park in half.</p> <p>The effect of climate change has exacerbated the water shortage issues and the proposals to meet the extra demand seem wildly optimistic. Water cannot be supplied if it is not there, and all new and existing local residents will suffer. Similarly, the local hospital and GP surgeries are already under extreme pressure and will be unable to cope with the extra demands of more people. Even an on-site medical centre, whenever that might be built, will do little to improve the situation. Existing GP practices and clinics in the area have been and are unable to attract and recruit doctors and staff.</p> <p>Objectors to this outline planning application for Otterpool Park should not be dismissed as NIMBYs. It was Sellindge & District Residents Association that initiated 'The Lees' housing development around a village green at Sellindge. That development is the result of consultation and involvement between Folkestone and Hythe District Council planners and the local community and, though larger than originally conceived, it was at a scale that is not drastically altering the character of the village. Clearly, there needs to be more homes built to meet demand, but this should not be achieved by destroying the rural way of life for our local communities and by building five-storey blocks of flats on valuable agricultural land. This at a time when we need to safeguard food security in an uncertain and troubled world.</p> <p>FHDC councillors, when asked to vote on this Outline Planning Application for Otterpool Garden Town, should consider the appropriateness of this overlarge and ill-conceived new town project and the effects it will have on the well-being of the existing residents of the area, who they were elected to represent. Monks Horton Parish Meeting asks that councillors vote to refuse planning permission.</p>	
55	Emma Jones	18.06.2022	<p>I think the plans look great, but as someone who has been on the council wait list for 4 years, will any of these properties be for the council? The vast majority of housing built around this area recently has been for the wealthy, meaning a lot of the residents aren't even from the local area, but moving down from London, would be nice for the housing to be affordable and available through the bidding list with the council.</p>	LPA 229
56	Emma Young	21.06.2022	<p>There is not sufficient infrastructure in place to justify so many houses. Our hospitals are already under huge pressure. The area will struggle with water and electricity supplies. I am not averse to change, but I am averse to ill thought through "plans" that will do nothing to enhance the life of this already resident in the area.</p>	LPA 230

57	Freya Baptiste	29.06.2022	We have a low rain fall every year climate change is happening whether you like it or not it is happening things will not get any better with our rainfall we have not got the infrastructure we have not got the services we haven't got enough GP's, dentists, social workers, schools, hospitals, and the land should be left for Agriculture.	LPA 232
58	G Coates	23.06.2022	The local area does not need a massive housing project with so many local people unable to afford the houses. The level of local traffic is already high let alone the extra traffic in this development. I'm completely against this development, it's too big and too expensive for the majority of the prior in Folkestone and Hythe. Added to the fact that many of the local councillors know this is not good for the environment. I moved to Lympne as it was a quiet village. This development has been agreed by a dodgy man, known for his lack of integrity and gets paid a fortune. Mr Monk!!!	LPA 148
59	Gareth Attwell	22.06.2022	This Does not support the local area or communities. Plans are unsustainable and do not meet the needs of surrounding communities. There is going to be so much more traffic and the current roads will not be able cope with it. Huge negative impact will be felt for a long time by all local residents.	LPA 234
60	Gary & Barbara Winham	24.06.2022	<p>We need to object to this ill-conceived proposal. There has been very limited consultation with the area adjacent the site which is not in the borough of Folkestone and Hythe but in Ashford. Whilst the paucity of detail in the voluminous proposal indicates poor planning or an attempt to disguise the true intentions of the developers.</p> <p>We would like to make following objections based on fact and investigations.</p> <p>1. In Volume 2, Chapter 5 Agriculture and Soils you state 'that a large proportion of the site will be high grade agricultural land' (5.2.32).</p> <p>Natural England in their guidance from February 2021 state in their National Policy Framework (NPPF), LPAs should use the NPPF to make decisions about the natural and local environment to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect and enhance landscapes, biodiversity, geology and soils • recognise soils as a natural capital asset that provide important ecosystem services • consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land • prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing development <p>Please explain why you deem it necessary to ignore the guidance and propose a housing development on high grade agricultural land?</p> <p>The Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (a nationally important designation, equivalent in importance to a National Park) surrounds this area on three sides.</p> <p>The location, scale, and complexity of the Otterpool Park proposed development mean there are significant environmental implications.</p> <p>Under the CROW Act, the relevant local authority, must make sure that all decisions have regard for the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB. Decisions and activities must consider the potential effect it will have within the AONB and land outside its boundary. This appears to have been completely ignored as this development will certainly not enhance the area.</p> <p>2. Building a minimum of 8,500 new homes will create more traffic in Kent. The assertion that traffic will travel on the M20 to access Ashford and other Towns to the north of the Otterpool Development is at best naïve and at worst misleading particularly as the A20 bisects the development.</p>	LPA 235

			<p>Data collected by Collision map states that Kent's roads have the second highest casualty rates in Great Britain for all road users using A Roads and Motorways. Traffic generation, road capacity, means of access, visibility, car parking and effects on pedestrians/cyclists will compromise highway safety on all the roads surrounding this site.</p> <p>The junctions on the A20 between J11 to J10a from the various villages and communities either side of this route already encounter perilous conditions when trying to join the A20, increasing the traffic on this route would lead to more casualties. Purely the journeys that will be taken to fulfil online shopping (currently at 28% of all retail sales), will result in over 1,000 additional journeys per day on the roads surrounding Otterpool, which are currently at capacity. It is more than likely that multi drop delivery drivers will use the A20 not the M20 to fulfil their quotas.</p> <p>3. There are 5 doctor's surgeries in the local vicinity all of which are at patient capacity and unable to recruit permanent General Practitioners. Even if a new surgery is proposed on this development, it is highly unlikely they will be able to recruit and retain GP's, to cope with the number of new patients on the development. In our own experience it is currently impossible to get care and support from the local general practice.</p> <p>The Hospitals in Canterbury, Folkestone & Dover do not have an Accident & Emergency Department, therefore the already over stretched facility (already having 280 visits per day) at the William Harvey Hospital will not be able to cope with all the existing new developments in Ashford let alone the proposed vast development at Otterpool.</p> <p>4. The small rural schools in this area are already inundated by parents from the towns driving to take their children to village schools leading to even more traffic and congestion at peak times. This will affect the capacity at these village schools, making it more difficult for local children to find a place in their own community. It is very misleading to state that parents from Otterpool will send their children to the school within the development.</p> <p>In conclusion we believe that this development is intended to provide a short term gain for a few interested parties at the expense of the future of East Kent, it's environment and residents.</p>	
61	George Kirby	17.06.2022 (x 3)	<p>17.06.2022 (1) I am concerned that the Stone Street (and rat-run from the Marsh via Lympne Hill) will become ever more busy as this will provide a rapid access to Westenhanger Station. It is now clear that the upgraded Westenhanger will form a hub from railway travel and must therefore attract all the traffic otherwise using Sandling - where closure is now in discussion. The Stone Street is not an acceptable major road artery, given the villages through which it passes to Westenhanger.</p> <p>17.06.2022 (2) Stone Street to the north of the Newingreen junction with the A20 is restricted to 30mph for substantially the whole length, and from discussions at Westenhanger Castle with the developer it appears this speed limit is to be retained. The Stone Street south from the Newingreen Junction is 40mph for 300m until reduced to 30mph. It would seem sensible to align the speed limit to 30mph for the entire length of Stone Street through Newingreen and Lympne</p> <p>17.06.2022 (3) The newly adjusted plans propose to make some adjustment to the A20 road junction at Newingreen. We support any improvement to this junction which is very heavily used and is a very tricky junction, with many "incidents" involving HGV as well as private cars emerging from either Hythe or from Lympne on the Stone Street.</p>	LPA 236

62	Gillian White	08.05.2022	<p>It is impossible to make a valid point due to not being able to download the Environmental Statement from the Council website. Where is it? In the notice in Folkestone & Hythe Express entitled Town and Country Planning Act 1990 I note in 2.3 paragraph that "the proposed development does not accord with the provisions of the development plan in force in the area...."</p> <p>How are the public supposed to comment by 24th June when the amended outline application has so many difficulties listed under points 2.3 to 2.6? Until I see the latest Environmental Statement, it is impossible to make any judgements.</p> <p>I simply don't have the time to read through all the documents from 2019 which I assume to be out of date anyway. In view of the Council's plans to be carbon neutral, I would have thought that building this number of houses in an AONB, more care would have been taken to inform the public as to how the environment would be protected. I also wondered if the problems at Stodmarsh will affect Otterpool Park as it is other large scale building developments in Canterbury and Ashford?</p>	LPA 237
63	Hannah Iles	21.06.2022	<p>This development will spoil a lot of the local landscape, disrupt wildlife and the biodiversity of the local environment. It will also add a lot of unnecessary pressure to the local infrastructure when there are already a lot of new build houses in the local area. It will add traffic to our village as well as the a20, worsen the consequences of operation stack and project brock which already have such a big impact on the locality.</p> <p>The area in which we live is such a beautiful place and the countryside should be preserved not built on and ruined.</p>	LPA 238
64	Hayley Babot	21.06.2022	<p>This is a massive over development of the area. Our roads and infrastructure are not suited this kind of development. But I am sure FHDC will push it through regardless to public opinion to make sure that the councillors' pockets are kept full with little regard to the damage it will cause to the local environment and community.</p>	LPA 239
65	Hayley Edmunds	22.06.2022	<p>I am extremely concerned about the development's impact on our local community infrastructure. The increase in traffic using Lympne Hill, London Road and Stone Street as rat runs will impact on the safety of the children and residents in general. The additional housing will also have an effect on grammar school places as the government will not allow grammar school expansion or new grammars to be built. In an area with a grammar school system, all children should be able to have access to a grammar school if they pass the Kent/Shepway tests. For the last few years FSG and HGS have been oversubscribed, and children who have passed the test have been turned down for places. This will only get worse if this number of houses are built in the area. The environment is also taking a huge hit. Much of the land is farming land and following Brexit and the Ukraine war, we need to be more self-sufficient in growing our own food in the UK, so giving up prime farmland for building (instead of focusing on sing brownfield sites, seems very short-sighted.</p>	LPA 240
66	Heather Deamer	24.06.2022	<p>I would like to record my absolute objection to the proposed building of a new town on the Folkestone Racecourse and other sites in the area. I have lived in the Shepway area most of my life, and in Lympne particularly for many years. I have seen the decline of Hythe from a small wonderful sleepy seaside town to a busy unwelcoming noisy mass of people and traffic. This unwanted development will be the end of this area. We will be just an extension of Ashford. The negative impact on the environment, as well as the people living here, will be colossal. No one living here wants this town. Please think again and use this area for the benefit of the residents, not to line pockets.</p> <p>Please don't take my word for it, is it possible to conduct a house-to-house survey of the people it actually affects, the population of the area, to ascertain how your poll taxpayers really feel.</p> <p>Thank you for reading this, I hope it makes you think of the consequences of your actions.</p>	LPA 241

67	Heidi Kingston	18.06.2022	<p>Surely the current situation in Ukraine has shown us how important it is to be able to grow our own food? You can't eat bricks and tarmac! When the Council originally bought the land, we were told it was still to be used as farmland.</p> <p>The roads in the area are already pretty congested, with narrow country lanes becoming dangerous rat runs when there are diversions in place. So many more cars on the local roads would make matters even worse.</p> <p>It is already impossible to see a GP and the local hospital would simply not be able to cope, yet there is no mention of building another!</p> <p>Will Folkestone and Hythe Council be able to magic more rain from the sky to help with the water situation in the South East and if sewage is currently released into the sea occasionally, what will happen when there are even more homes in the area? We protest about the destruction of rainforests in foreign countries, yet destroy so much of our own countryside, with wildlife suffering as a result. A few bird boxes and hedgehog houses are no substitute for natural habitat.</p> <p>With the M20 so busy and the A20 too, I would have thought that the fields and trees help to "mop up" pollution? A new town would just add to it. PLEASE think again!</p>	LPA 043
68	Iain Mackenzie	24.05.2022	<p>Let me get this straight. FHDC stands with Lympne against development of Airfield site as part of A.O.B., then makes a speculative gamble on housing development purchasing racecourse etc and then sets about trying to develop land including former airfield. Now FHDC supports development and its the FHDC planning department that is charged with approving or not, a planning application for that development.</p> <p>There are multiple and irrefutable reasons for refusing this application; reasons raised in planning investigations over the last 30 years, and many backed or raised by FHDC themselves, yet our council not known for any great financial genius has managed to create a conflict of interest for itself. Heavily invested in the project that it will have to sit in judgement of, a project that when it was a smaller and less invasive and it had no conflict of interest in, it rejected. One has to ask; on what grounds do they justify it now? A larger, more disruptive, and more invasive blot on the rural area of natural beauty is more acceptable or is it simply down to they are going to make some money or obtain some other benefit. Performance bonuses perhaps, justification for salary inflation or maybe a cosy wee directorship of an ALMO.</p> <p>PS. In this post Brexit, Operation Brock, Stack, M20 parking lot world, do you not think 8,500 plus vehicles trying to get on the M20 at Westenhanger might cause a bit of a snarl up.</p>	LPA 242
69	Ian Andrews	03.06.2022 Previous comments (05.05.2019)	<p>This has been a FHDC folly for years. The traffic down Stone Street from Nicholls quarry to the M20 is heavy in mornings and evenings as again people take the shortest route from the area. The scale of the application is out of touch with ANOB and with the amount of house building already being undertaken in Kent. The hopes that network rail would HS1 will stop at Westenhanger is again a hope. As are well maintained doctors and healthcare facilities, we see this in Hythe where an appt is hard enough to book anyway. I wholly object to this development.</p>	LPA106
70	Ian Oliver	24.06.2022	<p>Opposing this proposal as I can foresee issues with road infrastructures which already can't cope when there are issues on the M20 with the A20 being used as a detour. The increased traffic, noise and pollution will be huge and the disruption during the whole process too. We are constantly told of water shortages every summer and there are no plans for this with a whole new town being built. The local hospitals already can't cope and unfortunately the South East is so populated already compared with other parts of the country.</p>	LPA 243

71	Isabel Lau	22.06.2022	In this age when awareness is at last being gained of global warming, decline in insect population, habitat destruction, water shortages, atmospheric pollution, and the importance of local food production, how is it possibly justifiable to build this town? I cannot explain it to my children, who I teach to look after the environment, or understand how those leading the plan can feel they have a clear conscience. Concrete and traffic instead of greenery and wildlife and local peaceful, farmed spaces? Is it just all about money? Future generations will wonder how these planners slept at night. Do they not care, or do they not understand? It has to be one or the other. Please don't let it happen.	LPA 246
72	James Reid	23.06.2022	<p>This is a massive development which will greatly exacerbate an overcrowded busy area which is already blighted by inadequate capacity in road, healthcare, water, and many other facilities. The roads into Hythe from Newingreen and junction 11 on the M20 can already be chaotic. A substantial increase in traffic during and after this development will render the surrounding area intolerable.</p> <p>Water and healthcare facilities in the wider area are already way overstretched. Just building healthcare centres will not increase the already short supply of medical professionals in the area.</p> <p>I very strongly object to the whole scale of this development which will effectively be ribbon development from Folkestone to Ashford.</p>	LPA 247
73	Jane Blackburn	23.06.2022	I object to this development - there are far too many houses planned. It will ruin the countryside/nature/habitats of many animals. It will ruin the area for humans too. The infrastructure is already overloaded. The roads are not suitable for the area. Of course, developers in this region always promise extra health facilities and schools etc but fail to provide them focusing on housing first then conveniently running out of money for the real benefits for the community. Also, there is currently a nationwide shortage of medical staff and GP's so even if you build it there will be lack of staff to run it. It is going to cause widespread disruption to the area. In addition, whilst there may be a housing shortage at present as the birth rate declines and older generation are no longer with us there will be a surfeit of housing in 20 years' time. I do not object to some housing, but the scale planned is not required. Housing for social, bungalows etc is good and practical but we do not need 8,500 houses. This is excessive development and another example of greed overlooking after our planet. The addition of more concrete, fumes, carbon dioxide is not going to help the planet. It needs to be greatly reduced. This has been bulldozed through at great expense to tax payers.	LPA 248
74	Janet Matthews	23.06.2022	<p>I strongly object to Otterpool Town even with amendments, which the council will keep changing constantly. It is totally unsustainable. This area once called the Garden of England will be no more, building on productive arable farmland which should be growing crops and animal feed is not acceptable. What happens to all the wildlife and their habitats and the damage to the environment and eco system there? The infrastructure is not going to be there however you dress it up and make promises, the local roads will be worse than they are now, our villages will suffer even more once an accident occurs on the motorway and it shuts, and all traffic comes through Sellindge and clogs up all surrounding roads, where is the water going to come from especially when there is a drought. The light pollution will be terrible, I already see Lympne Industrial Estate lighting up the night sky every night. I choose to live in a village for that reason, it's a village, I have lived here all my life, if I wanted to live in a town I would, instead you force it on us.</p> <p>At one of your meetings, I asked can you guarantee all our surrounding villages will not be merged into this town, the answer was we would all have and keep our own identities, but however many trees, hedgerows, green spaces, buffer zones you make our villages will be swallowed up in this town. Will the schools and medical centre be built at the same time as the houses, if not how will our overcrowded doctors' surgeries, schools and more importantly our already overstretched William Harvey Hospital cope. Where will you find all these doctors and teachers from. Hythe town which already struggles will be in danger of becoming a ghost town. These houses will not be affordable to our generations of up-and-coming families, that have lived here for most of their lives but have had to move away and privately rent because they cannot afford to buy a house. You should be building more social</p>	LPA 249

			housing that our families who want to stay in the area can afford to rent. We will be living on Kents biggest building site for years. The Council do not represent a majority of the people in this district and definitely not me!	
75	Jayne Stuart	24.06.2022	I absolutely object to this huge development. Roads will be jammed and not enough jobs to support all these people.	LPA 250
76	Jessica Chidwick	21.06.2022	<p>I strongly object these proposed plans.</p> <p>Due to the area being labelled as an AONB, I believe that this should provide some sort of protection to the beautiful landscapes and open spaces, along with the nature and wildlife which currently inhabits the area. For a proposal of this size to be considered in an area which has already had a number of large housing developments built recently, doesn't make sense to me.</p> <p>The current residents in the surrounding villages already have trouble with access to NHS services along with multiple Gas, Water and Power issues. Until something has been implemented to improve the current situation and ensure that the current housing already in place has efficient and reliable access to these services, I do not believe that approving such a massively oversized development is viable.</p> <p>To add to my point above, traffic would also become a serious issue. Currently, during peak times the A20 is an extremely busy stretch of road with the junction for Stone Street, Hythe and the A20 becoming backlogged and difficult to navigate. There are already traffic calming, traffic signals and narrow stretches along this road which add to the traffic build up.</p> <p>Increasing the amount of vehicles which would use this on a daily basis would cause further traffic, stress, pollution, and noise. Not to mention the difficulties the areas faces when Operation Brock is in place.</p> <p>I believe that the extra traffic the new development and potentially upgraded Westenhanger train link would attract, could cause the stretch of Stone Street which runs through Lympne to become the go to 'shortcut'. This road already has issues with drivers speeding and having a lack of consideration to residents. This is a small village with a very popular primary school, having so many cars driving at speed through the village at peak times could become extremely dangerous for all residents, and put these children at a higher risk of injury/harm.</p> <p>I do not believe that this development will support or offer any benefits to existing residents in the area, it will simply attract London commuters and increase the population in an already overpopulated area.</p>	LPA 251
77	Jessica Hadlow	23.06.2022	<p>To quote someone else who commented "This does not support the local area or communities. Plans are unsustainable and do not meet the needs of surrounding communities. There is going to be so much more traffic and the current roads will not be able cope with it. "</p> <p>My main concerns are the wildlife, agricultural land, and traffic.</p>	LPA 252
78	Jo Willis	28.06.2022	<p>I object in the strongest terms.</p> <p>This is a travesty. The further destruction of our dwindling countryside when we need to be reliant on food production in the UK due to the forthcoming food security crisis. We see the continual erection of vast areas of shoddy housing in areas that offer no employment. The tiny road systems in and around the area will be overwhelmed and are totally unsuitable for the huge increase in traffic. All the subsequent, noise, fumes, light pollution. I believe that any and every brownfield site should be considered before ruining our countryside/food source. In this day and age when we should supposedly be aware of the fragility of the natural world</p>	LPA 253

			and this monstrosity of a development is something we're having to battle. Kent has had enough development; it's done its fair share and we need now to refocus our vision for this county and value the land we rely on.	
79	Jodi Waterfield	21.06.2022	Does not support the local area or communities. Plans are unsustainable and do not meet the needs of surrounding communities. Huge negative impact will be felt for a long time by all local residents.	LPA 254
80	John Burley	23.06.2022	The environment implications of such a large number of housing with an average of 2 cars each will be a detriment to the local roads which are not fit for purpose. Having no bypass for A20 will make roads unbearable especially when Op Stack or Op brock is implemented. The idea of an improvement on Westenhanger train station is good but this needs to be completed before the first property is sold otherwise whilst it's closed hundreds of users will be forced to use the roads once again.	LPA 255
81	John Jarvest	04.06.2022 Previous comments (18.05.2019)	This remains a rape of the rural setting. There is no need for a town. So why build one? Amenities, services, utilities, etc are already way overstretched, so why add to the overwhelming problems? Where will people work? Where will people go to school? Where are the health care centres? Dentists? Where will people park? How will people travel? Where will the waste go? Come on, this is a white elephant. It is not needed. Build on smaller plots and fit people in to the community. Don't just build a new one to overrun the existing. Disgraceful.	LPA 059
82	John Moberly	07.06.2022 (x 2)	07.06.2022 (1) We attach our reasoned objection (together with the associated plan, which is referred to in the text of the objection) to some of the details contained in the latest Otterpool Park OPA. 08.06.2022 (2) We wish to object strongly to some of the detail relating to this Outline Planning Application (OPA). We are concerned about the potential height and proximity of the development proposed in the area designated TC.7. In raising these objections, we shall be referring to a variety of plans published in the OPA, and/or presented to the public at the open exhibition held by Otterpool Park Plc at Westenhanger Castle on Thursday 19th May 2022 (the Exhibition). These plans fall into 3 categories: - a) Land use/ Green infrastructure1 b) Building Heights / Housing Density2 c) Planting & Existing Trees3 Those plans to which we are referring are detailed in the footnotes below. The Illustrative Masterplan for Land Use [OPM(P)1015_YY] was reproduced as a large floor mat and formed the centrepiece of the Exhibition. This Masterplan and all the other plans referenced under a) above include a green border (approximately 10-12 metres wide) around the South Western edge of the Stone St., Westenhanger settlement enclosed by the OPA area. This border is severely compromised in two respects. Firstly, the boundaries of the Westenhanger settlement do not correctly reflect the boundaries of the plot of land purchased by Folkestone & Hythe District Council (FHDC) from the executors of the late Mrs. Batt in December 2021 (see attached plan). This means that the boundary of the Westenhanger settlement is drawn in the incorrect place throughout the OPA, and encroaches upon land owned by us at Lyveden, Stone St., Westenhanger.	LPA 256

		<p>Not only is the border too close to our property, but to be consistent, 'the green border' needs to extend to the full 10-12 metres from the edge of the correct boundary.</p> <p>1 OPM (P)1008_YY Green Infrastructure & Open Space 12/3/22 -- Found in OP5 Appendix 4.5 – 4.6 p7/25 OPM (P)1015_YY Illustrative Masterplan (IMP) 8/3/22 - Found on floor at Exhibition, in OP4 Non-Technical Summary (NTS) p22/43 and in Appendix 4.1 p44/56 2 OPM(P)4003_rev YY Heights - Found in NTS p21/43 & OP5 Appendix 4.2 p6/6 - Undated OPM(P)5003_rev WW Heights - Found in OP5 Appendix 4.1 p42/56 and OP5 Appendix 2.8 p5/5 - Undated 3 Proposed Structural Planting Plan – Found in OP5 Chapter 4 P4-38 (p40/56) - Undated Structural Planting Plan – Found in Op4 NTS p36/43 - Undated</p> <p>Secondly, the plans for building heights detailed at b) above show substantial massing at an apparent height of 18M right up to the boundary of our property without any allowance for a green border as detailed under a) above. At the Exhibition, we spoke to an Otterpool Park Plc representative about this. When we pointed out the discrepancy between the two sets of plans a) and b) and asked him which took precedence; he told us that the building heights did so. This seems odd to say the least, given that the Masterplan itself formed the centrepiece of the Exhibition.</p> <p>The Masterplan was dated 8/3/22 and at least one of the green infrastructure documents was dated 12/3/22, whereas many of the building height documents are undated. Should these undated documents be removed from the OPA?</p> <p>In accordance with the OPA Chapter 12 paragraph 12.1.244 we are also keen to ensure that as many as possible of the significant trees outside the Westenhanger settlement are preserved. This includes the line of large trees bordering the ditch to the South. These would act as screening from high buildings in the more southerly block of buildings in TC.7 to the South of the proposed Otterpool Avenue.</p> <p>Nonetheless given the height of these trees, it would be preferable if the maximum height in this area was restricted to 12M or lower rather than the 18M shown on the plan. The significant oak tree in the North East section of TC.7 ought also to be actively preserved. While there are some individual trees shown in the various plans, it is not clear to us whether this particular tree is scheduled for retention or not.</p> <p>As well as the various plans detailed in the footnotes 1, 2 & 3 above, there are a whole range of apparently relevant plans set out in OP5 Appendices 4.5 and 4.6: -</p> <p>OPM(P)1007_YY_12-03-22 Existing trees & veg retained & removed found at p6/25 OPM(P)1012_YY_12-03-22 Illustrative Masterplan Density found at p10/25 *OPM(P)1013_YY_12-03-22 Illustrative Masterplan Heights found at p11/25 OPM(P)1015_YY_08-03-22 Illustrative Masterplan Land Use found at p12/25 OPM(P)3016_YY_12-03-22 Framework Masterplan land use found at p15/25</p> <p>4 The LVIA has also been cognisant that, as outlined, in section 3 of the OP-DS that there would be a presumption in favour of the retention of the existing structural vegetation (woodland, trees, tree belts and hedgerows) shown upon the parameter plan, including those protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). The parameter plan does not show, however, the proposed breaks in the lines and areas of this vegetation that are likely to be required to facilitate the proposed Development (e.g. for example where proposed roads, footpaths/cycleway would cross through it). These breaks will be confirmed at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 stages once detailed tree and vegetation surveys (to BS5837(2012) have been conducted and the design has been further progressed.</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>OPM(P)5009_WW_18-03-22 Illustrative Masterplan Green Infrastructure & Open Space found at p19/25 (NB title in index is incorrect) OMP(P)5012_WW_18-03-22 illustrative Masterplan Density found at p21/25 *OPM(P)5013_WW_18-03-22 Illustrative Masterplan Heights found at p22/25 OPM(P)5015_WW_18-03-22 Illustrative Masterplan Land Use found at p23/25</p> <p>As can be seen from the March 2022 dates shown above, these documents are all recent versions. In some instances, such as building heights the plans use different colour coding from plans referred to earlier apparently covering the same topics. Those marked with an * above showed building heights in a brown/orange palette, while the plans referred to in the footnotes used a blue palette.</p> <p>While it may be the case that the brown/orange palette has superseded the blue palette, it is worth noting that it was the plans in blue which were being used at the Exhibition on 19th May 2022. While the brown/orange plans do moderate the heights in the immediate vicinity of property in TC.7, the gradation of heights now shown to the West of the more northerly part of the Westenhanger settlement is much more reasonable than that still shown around the existing property neighbouring the TC.7 area. The Stanford parish council refers to building heights having been lowered / reduced since the earlier proposals. It is clearly talking about buildings further North on the racecourse rather than the latest plans for TC.7, which do still require significant amendment. In summary our position is that we are opposed to the OPA as currently presented because of the proposed building heights, and the density as well as the proximity of the new buildings in TC.7 to the existing properties within the Westenhanger settlement. However, if this can be properly addressed, we believe that we can be generally supportive of the concept.</p>	
83	John Simpson	24.06.2022	<p>We currently live in an area of beautiful countryside, which will cease to be if SDC go ahead with this mad scheme. The villages of Lympne, Sellindge, Stanford and Westenhanger will cease to be so, rather a suburban metropolis will result as Ashford and Folkestone grow ever nearer. There are too many people in this part of Kent already for the infrastructure and employment opportunities. If there is a need for more homes (and there isn't on this scale or anything like it), there is a part of the country that is under populated, welcoming to immigrants and according to its leader looking to a great economic future - Scotland - build your new town there!</p> <p>We have a great aviation heritage in the former Lympne Airfield which needs to be celebrated for future generations for education and tourism. Burying it in bricks, steel and concrete would be a crime. One of your number, Alan North, said in 2013 when Phides Estates were trying to build 250 new houses, 'Not so much as a rabbit hutch should be built on that land'. Other areas of interest; ecology, history, environment, architecture related etc, are equally important and will be lost. Overall, this whole 'Otterpool' area is an area of outstanding natural beauty and needs to remain so for our health, mental well-being, and safety.</p>	LPA 257
84	Jon Booth	05.06.2022	<p>Too many houses, the infrastructure is simply unable to cope with such a development. No respect for the countryside and open spaces, this sort of development (being too large) is simply storing up future problems with respect to transport, road networks, drainage and day-to-day services including water provision.</p> <p>I am not against further housing developments, but they have to be in keeping with the localised area, this current development is an outrageous ill-thought-out plan to destroy the current natural beauty of the surrounding area.</p>	LPA 258
85	K Holden	22.06.2022	<p>This development does not support the local area or communities. The plans are unsustainable and do not meet the needs of surrounding communities. The local hospitals are already under immense pressure and cannot cope! It will have a massive negative impact which will be felt for a long time by all local residents.</p>	LPA 260

86	Kate Laurie	22.06.2022	The overall approach I think is a good one, I accept we do need more housing in the area. I require more reassurance that the town infrastructure, and in the surrounding areas will support such urbanisation. The A20 will require development work and the power infrastructure is already struggling. I also would like to see this being a fully sustainable town, all houses should be self-sufficient in terms of power, heat source and solar on every building. Not just 'thrown up' as cheaply as possible- it is essential this becomes a 'shining light' on environmental capability.	LPA 261
87	Katy Bravery	25.06.2022 Previous comments (22.05.2019)	<p>I wish to object on many grounds, primarily on this development's effect on the natural environment, which is in contravention of the government's own 25-year plan for nature recovery.</p> <p>There is no evidence of biodiversity net gain nor confidence in the ability of the developers to achieve this in the future.</p> <p>The Environment Act demands you demonstrate how significant biodiversity net gain will be achieved through the proposed development.</p> <p>The estate will concrete over yet more green space at a time when we must conserve and protect grassland, soil and the biodiversity that lives in amongst it.</p> <p>In particular we are facing a mass extinction of insects and these huge housing developments are one of the main reason nature cannot find a home. Planting a few trees will not offset the massive loss of soil and mature pollinator, amphibian, bird, and mammal habitat.</p> <p>- I believe too that with climate change and increasing droughts there is inadequate water in the southeast to support such a vast estate - and concreting over water (and carbon) absorbing ground will add to existing problems of water runoff and flash flooding.</p> <p>- The density of housing is too much for the local infrastructure to bear, namely hospitals.</p>	LPA 091
88	Kay Rose	23.06.2022	I strongly object to this huge development, because do not believe the surrounding villages and roads can take any more traffic. Lypne Hill is a prime example which has weight/size restrictions which are ignored by everyone. It is used as a rat run to the coast and vice versa. The increased traffic makes it an extremely dangerous road for drivers, residents, cyclists, and walkers. If the development goes ahead, Lypne Hill and other similar roads will become death traps or car parks with the volume of traffic, unless something can be done to close all such roads to through traffic. I do not believe this is any benefit to local villages and communities.	LPA 262
89	Kayleigh Cheesley	21.06.2022	<p>While I understand the requirement on our council to provide x number of homes to the gov, the scale of this planned development and using farmland as well as the old racecourse is pure greed. Given the developments in the local area already underway or planned; Chilmington Green, Kingsnorth Green, Grove Park, Victoria Place. 8,500 homes is not necessary even within the next 15 years.</p> <p>What is necessary though is food and power. Families are having to choose whether to heat their homes or feed their children and we can no longer rely on reasonably priced utilities or food from our international neighbours.</p> <p>To be specific the 'Hill Top' area of your plan is currently growing Rape Seed, Barley, and Wheat, all of which we have a shortage of, and your plan will only add to this crisis. If you don't think keeping this land as farming is viable, then a solar farm or wind farm would benefit the district far more than houses.</p>	LPA 263

			If the latest plans get the go ahead, it will only prove what a dire situation this country is heading in, and how our council are only interested in lining their pockets.	
90	Kerry Railton	23.06.2022	<p>I would like to register my objections to building this monster if a project.</p> <p>This size project will massively affect our beautiful area, with traffic pollution, noise pollution and Hythe will not be able to survive such a huge development. Please reconsider.</p>	LPA 264
91	Kirsty Cook	19.05.2022 Previous comments: (06.06.2019 24.05.2019)	<p>Having looked at the plan today, we were devastated to hear that helping the residents by diverting the traffic away from the A20 comes down to cost. All the shiny maps did not show the single file road. Projected traffic movement numbers were not available nor were any studies on pollution.</p> <p>You can not believe that people will not take the shortest route out of the area which will be the A20. Don't we deserve to live with all singing and all fancying country life with health benefits instead of the polluted existence you have deemed is ok for the residence of Barrow Hill.</p>	LPA 027
92	Laurence Archer	23.06.2022 Previous comments: (06.06.2019)	I have viewed the progress of this application with absolute horror. The scale of the proposed development is totally and utterly out of proportion and against the wishes of all local people. Why on earth should the villages of Stanford, Lympe and Sellindge be joined up with this horrendous conurbation? I would ask that any right-minded local councillor who wishes to represent local people vote against this proposal.	LPA 136
93	Leslie W Barratt	23.06.2022	<p>I am totally opposed to the New Town development named as Otterpool Park for numerous reasons, but most importantly on the issue of Water Resource and Supply.</p> <p>The South East of England has always been, in relation to the rest of the UK, water stressed, heavily water stressed. Over recent years we have seen drought measures instigated by way of hose pipe bans and numerous press releases on how to save water. Affinity Water has persuaded us to use hippo bags in WC Cisterns, and even today, are promoting (FOC) water saving shower heads and similar products to save water. There was even a plan to import water through the channel tunnel fire hydrant system and tow water filled barges across the North from Scandinavia in the mid-nineties given the local drought situation.</p> <p>The scenario of severe drought has not yet fully been experienced, but with the population increasing within the local area, fuelled by immigration, the water stress situation will only become exacerbated further...</p> <p>https://www.kent.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/8149/Whats-causing-Kents-population-growth.pdf</p> <p>I refer to 2.1.2 Core strategy and Local Plan Review.</p> <p>FHDC originally based water usage for Otterpool Park at a PCC of 90 litres. This was rejected by the CSR Planning Inspector, adopting a figure of 110 litres as set out in the new building regulations. This, however, is still aspirational. It matters not how many sanitary fittings and taps are used in the dwellings to reduce water usage, people will use what they want, when they want. Moreover, if ground water levels are at dangerously low levels, there may not be enough water to serve the communities. It should be noted that the UK recognises a right to water and a right to sanitation as elements of the right to an adequate standard of living in Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.</p>	LPA 266

			<p>In a document: 'Notes of Meeting Affinity Water Offices 23rd February, 2018' it states that 'capacity exists for the first (Otterpool)1000 properties, but then infrastructure upgrades will be needed after that'. I note that most recently, this figure of 1000 has been increased to 1,500. In that same document, Alan Turner, KCC Water Resource Manager pointed out that SDC's water consumption figure of 90 litres per person per day (lpd) was aspirational, with Mike Pocock and Patrick Campbell of Affinity Water stating that the planning figure of 155 lpd will be used. This is a more realistic figure, given that the average Affinity Water area consumption is between 160-141 lpd. I also note that Affinity Water have used a consumption figure of 450 litres per day per household within Appendix 15.2. A more realistic figure set against building regulations.</p> <p>In various documents (meetings and email exchanges) obtained through FOI requests, the theme of water scarcity is continuous.</p> <p>? 'The Affinity WRZ7 (Folkestone and Dover) had the largest gap between forecast demand and planned supply'.</p> <p>? The AF SE Zone is highly dependent on groundwater and the low levels of recharges are an ongoing concern for the company...</p> <p>? We have very little water resource available in the area, so significant reinforcements are required, which will of course take time.</p> <p>? We face substantial future challenges from population and household growth, and a reduction in resource base as we seek to restore sustainable abstractions in ecologically sensitive chalk stream habitats.</p> <p>I note that from draft policy SS8 New Garden Settlement - Sustainability and Healthy New town Principles, that the reuse of water resources via grey water systems will be used across the settlement. I have my doubts whether this will be the case, especially with the first 1500 dwellings. I also note that James Kenyon, Senior Asset Scientist at Affinity Water expects that water efficient technologies are fully implemented and retained as part of this development. Once again, given the track record of FHDC, I very much doubt that this would be the case...</p> <p>I refer to Appendix 15.2 Water Cycle Study, Water Resources and Supply. 3.1 Water Demand Impacts.</p> <p>The constant reference to 90 and 110 litres per day per person is, as already stated, aspirational. The projected figures for water usage are, by that very nature, incorrect. Adopting a pragmatic approach to assessing water use at Otterpool Park is the only true way to produce accurate data. Should the application be approved, I would urge councillors, when debating the application, to insist upon using consumption figures, when built, from the first 1000-1500 dwellings to produce accurate data going forward for the remaining Otterpool development. This will enable Affinity Water to assess the true potable water demand and enable an accurate design of the water infrastructure. It should be noted that no assessment has been made for commercial or industrial units in or around Otterpool Park pertaining to water use. There is also no allowance for water consumption at Dungeness Power station going forward.</p> <p>This was a concern voiced by Patrick Campbell of Affinity Water at a meeting in February 2018.</p> <p>The current situation of importing water into the WRZ 7, Dour region is an arrangement between Affinity Water, Southern Water (SW) and South East Water. (SEW) The current licence allows Affinity Water to import 2 megalitres from SEW and .0714 megalitres from SW per day. This is only allowable if SEW and SW have a surplus of water. It stands to reason that during drought conditions, where Affinity Water are suffering a deficit, SEW and SW will also be suffering a water shortage. Water import from neighbouring water companies can not be relied upon to supplement the WRZ 7 region during drought conditions, moreover, given the high level of development in both regions (SEW and SW), any surplus water that was available at present may not be forthcoming in the future.</p> <p>The reliance upon any 'reservoir' in the Dour region is, at best, optimistic. There are no reservoirs to speak of in the area, only transfer pools. Putting this into perspective,</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Bowl Water holds 31,000 million litres of water, Paddlesworth (the proposed water supply for Otterpool) holds 13 million litres of water. This includes the recent upgrade of 3 million litres. Should the incoming supply to Paddlesworth be interrupted, the reservoir would empty in less than 2 days. (based upon 155 litres per person per day). The fact that there are no plans for further strategic storage is very concerning.</p> <p>3.2 Water Efficient Technologies</p> <p>The proposed Building Regulations Part G2 optional standard requirement as stated at 3.2 is only achievable if householders are water scarcity conscious. In any event, CSR Policy SS8 states that every residential property should include water efficient fixtures, not must. Even if water saving fitments are used, there would be nothing to stop the householder from removing them to install standard type fitments in the future.</p> <p>4.0/2,6 WC flush is achievable 1,25 l/place setting for dishwasher and 8.17 L/Kg for dishwasher is achievable. The 6 l/minute and 5 l/minute for sink and basin respectively is not achievable. The 170 l for bath and 8 l/minute for a shower is also not achievable. The 210 litre water butt for each property is laughable. The same was recommended at 'The Lees' in Sellindge. Not one water butt has been installed.</p> <p>Rainwater (RW) Harvesting is to be encouraged, either at property or communal level. Albion Water (NAV) have stated in other documentation that their Green Dual system will deliver potable water to the property together with RW for garden and car washing use. There is no mention of grey water recycling, although a Kevin Murray document states that to achieve the Promoters' sustainable water target of 90 litres per person per day, grey water recycling forms part of the water strategy for use in irrigation and WC's etc. The design of any Grey or RW harvesting system would have to be supplemented with a potable mains water supply as a failsafe feature to allow for a Grey Water system to be serviced or in case of breakdown. In the case of RW harvesting, where a period of dry weather persists or in a drought situation.</p> <p>Already, FHDC are back tracking on these integrated water management systems stating that the capital cost for the development will increase if these water saving systems are installed. As I have stated before, FHDC will do the bare minimum to build their new town. If they can get away with producing a housing estate similar to 'The Lees', Sellindge, they will, albeit on a much extended footprint.</p> <p>TO CONCLUDE.</p> <p>The recent Core Strategy Review from FHDC's standpoint was an exercise in deception. FHDC even stated that to save water, hundreds of homes within the district will be upgraded with modern low flush WC cisterns. The cost would be prohibitive and would only work if a full upgrade (cistern and pan) was carried out. Just one of the tales told to persuade a Planning Inspector to rubber stamp Otterpool Park.</p> <p>This planning application is not only a minefield of contradiction, but also peppered with ambiguity. Nothing is clear cut and lacks the technicality that one would expect from a development that is meant to be the yardstick of sustainability for future homes. At a time when energy price caps are moving steadily upward and drought situations are becoming a more regular feature across Northern Europe, including South East England, the expectation to build a 'greener' and energy efficient home must be</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>paramount. As it stands, this application states that there will be less water used, as per PCC, purporting to integrate a Green, Dual, Grey and/or RW Harvesting system? Then it states that these water saving systems would be reviewed in the future, citing that it may be too expensive to install.</p> <p>In any event, Albion Water (NAV) have never provided any evidence to suggest that their sites, where a green dual system is installed, have produced water savings lower than the average for the area. Our District Council is only interested in building homes to add to their revenue stream of Council Tax. The environment and water resource problem within the district is secondary to their short-sighted plans.</p> <p>On the issue of Water Resource alone, this application must be rejected.</p>	
94	Linda Tobin	23.06.2022	This horrendous development is not required nor wanted. The destruction of this area will bring no benefits whatsoever other than lining the pockets of greedy developers. The negative impacts on traffic, water supply and the overall area is appalling.	LPA 267
95	Linzi MacMillan	22.06.2022	<p>I whole heartily object to this proposal. The major motorway that will be needed to travel to and from this location is already under significant pressure, with frequent closure and operation brock often put in place. There will be a huge amount of additional traffic as a result of this new development, and I don't believe that the local roads can cope with current demand. The extent of the project will mean the residents will have to live with years of noise and disruption which will have an impact upon their mental health. A huge number of new build projects have already been undertaken in and around the area and I believe the extent of the project is not necessary to meet the growing population of Hythe. I further object to this project based upon the huge increase in residents that it will bring and whilst health facilities are looking to be added I do not believe this will help the local hospital waiting lists that are already unacceptable. Having a sick child and having to access these services weekly I feel a project on this scale will only add to this.</p> <p>Further I object as this will change villages into a town. I bought my home in a village and paid a premium for that because I wanted to live in a village. I believe my village changing to a town will devalue my property and undermine the quality of life that I signed up to when I bought into the village. I don't believe it's in keeping with village life and I feel the tile "garden town" is nothing more than a mask to hide the true devastation that this will cause on the wildlife in the area. I view that the zoo animals will no doubt be impacted by the noise as well as the residents in the area.</p> <p>The need for this number of houses is not there as I view a significant number of people will leave the area as the result of such a huge project. This will therefore free up a number of required homes.</p>	LPA 268
96	Lisa Cutler	04.05.2022 Previous comments (26.03.2019)	<p>I am writing to register my comments on this proposed planning application.</p> <p>In the surrounding area we have had horrendous disruption caused to the roads from building houses in Sellindge, next to Pilgrim's Hospice, as well as more disruption caused by the lorry facility near Ashford and the complete change of roads which has caused constant queues and build-up of traffic - the roads now leading into Hythe are gridlocked more often than not.</p> <p>There is more construction being proposed on Princes Parade in Hythe and many other locations nearby - there are already a huge number of new homes being built which, despite best efforts to alter roads, have brought transport to a virtual standstill and a lowering of quality of services provided (particularly GPs) due to the ever-growing population.</p> <p>The area simply isn't designed to accommodate this volume of homes, cars and people needing facilities (doctors, schools, hospitals, water, etc.)</p>	LPA 170

			<p>The question is, with the hundreds of homes already being built, when is enough enough? Or will our fields and walking routes simply disappear to this never-ending quest to build more houses? Thousands more cars, and people, all making demands on the already overstretched infrastructure will not improve the area, no matter the rose-tinted description used in the proposal.</p> <p>I used to love where I live, now, it just feels like a constant construction site and the Otterpool proposal will be a behemoth - a never-ending conveyor belt of construction lorries, road closures and misery.</p> <p>It is such a shame to treat such a beautiful part of the country so poorly by stripping it of what makes it special - the countryside.</p>	
97	Lorraine Hollands	04.05.2022	<p>I have lived in Lympe for the majority of my life, and I must express my horror at this proposed development. A 'garden town' is definitely a misnomer.</p> <p>Local people already struggle with the amount of traffic on local roads, particularly when the motorway becomes unavailable for varying reasons. Hoping for a car free area, hoping is all it can be. The road through our village is used as a 'rat run' already for traffic speeding through to access the marsh, avoiding Hythe due to the daily congestion already present.</p> <p>As an AONB the countryside should be respected, which this development does not do. Building over fine agricultural land when it is well known we need to become more self-sufficient in all crops is very poor planning. Wanton destruction of areas full of wildlife and plants, removal of hedges etc and concreting them over with overpriced houses is not acceptable.</p> <p>As others have so eloquently written, why build another town when our current towns are run down, with boarded up shops, rough pavements, and fewer people visiting. As for more doctors' surgeries and schools who will staff them? There is a national shortage of GPs, nurses, and teachers.</p> <p>I fully agree with the comments posted by Craig Drury and all the other local people who are vehemently against this development. SDC please listen to your local people, your voters, who expect you to listen to them. You have a duty of care to all of us.</p>	LPA 269
98	Lucie Beer	22.06.2022	<p>From someone who has just moved into a new build in Sellindge and can see the impact a small development can have on the surrounding wildlife I cannot see that a development of this size is positive.</p> <p>More fields are being built on and more animals are being moved off the land. The disruption on the villages and the infrastructure by having construction traffic over a long period itself will ruin the local area.</p> <p>I don't think something on this scale will benefit anyone other than the housing developers' profits.</p>	LPA 270
99	Lucy Carden	22.06.2022	<p>I do not support this development at all. As someone who grew up in Lympe and still lives within the local area, this will destroy everything about our local area. It is too many houses! I don't understand why this is still being suggested. I am also deeply concerned about the level of destruction that will be caused to biodiversity of the local area, with increased pressures so many individual species, insects, birds, plants for example, how can building this development be justified?! I have read through the ecologist reports, and can see some mitigation measures have been suggested, this is all well and good. But provision of 'new' habitat for species isn't any good when they've all been driven away during the process of building. I think the whole development needs to be re-evaluated to look at alternative options for housing in this area.</p>	LPA 271

100	Lydia Catherine Stanners	24.06.2022	This land was given by Lord Radnor for public recreation. What right has the council to steal it and sell it off for housing. It is an area of outstanding beauty on top of a nature conservation area in the Warren. Jocks Pitch is unstable and it, along with Copt Point have been gradually shrinking. Every few years there is a big fall. All this is well known. Building will accelerate this even faster.	LPA 273
101	Marc Scott	05.06.2022 Previous comments: 24.05.2019	<p>I am concerned about the environmental impact and the impact on local communities and villages. The increase in population will undoubtedly have a negative effect on the environment and communities.</p> <p>The suggested infrastructure will fall short of mitigating the increase in travel associated with building so many properties. For example, during the summer period many residents will want to make their way to the beach, however the routes into Hythe won't be able to cope and would be potentially grid locked. No alternative green, cycles routes etc have been suggested to link the coast, canal etc to dissuade people using their cars.</p> <p>The emphasis has only been suggested within the boundaries of the proposed development. We have already noticed the impact of the Martello lakes development on the traffic in Lympne village.</p> <p>West Hythe is used as a cut through to avoid the traffic congestion on the London Road, A20, Stone Street junction. My understanding was that a roundabout was proposed to mitigate the increase in traffic caused by the development. However, it never materialised because the development once granted planning permission, refused to pay for it despite it being stipulated in order for permission to be granted in the first place.</p>	LPA 175
102	Marilyn Wheeler	23.06.2022	I object on too many grounds to mention. I simply do not have the time. Developments of this size should not be built when the hospitals cannot cope as it is. Difficulties getting doctor and dentist appointments. Is all very well building surgeries but how will they be staffed? There is a water supply problem. Etc etc. FHDC should not take on the role of developers. You are going to bankrupt the District with all the borrowing.	LPA 276
103	Mark Brophy	23.06.2022	I am concerned that important considerations about this development have not and will not be properly addressed because they are not given enough priority in planning. The effect on water supply, carbon emissions (through construction), infrastructure and facilities such as healthcare and schools have not been properly investigated. These important issues must be fully addressed before planning permission is granted because all too often, once planning is passed, these issues end up falling to the bottom of the pile. The environment should be the number one consideration. Part of the development is within an area of outstanding natural beauty, this too should be of primary concern, not dismissed as only of minor importance as I have heard certain councillors saying. I object to this development because I have no faith that these concerns will be properly addressed by the majority of current cabinet members at FHDC.	LPA 278
104	Martin Carden	24.06.2022 Previous Comments; (26.05.2019)	<p>This proposed development is so wrong in so many ways.</p> <p>Transport and infrastructure are inadequate already let alone any more houses.</p> <p>Health care cannot cope now let alone with more residents.</p> <p>Loss of nature and natural areas.</p> <p>Loss of productive farmland when we should be producing more in the UK and relying less on imports.</p> <p>Lack of water in an area where it is already dry.</p> <p>Light pollution from a new town.</p> <p>Lack of local jobs meaning people will commute causing more pollution.</p> <p>The disruption of 30 years building on the local population for the profit of a few would be catastrophic.</p> <p>We cannot keep concreting and tarmacking the countryside because once it's lost it's lost.</p>	LPA 101

105	Martyn Blunt	23.06.2022	<p>I am in objection to this proposal, not only will it eat away at the greenbelt surrounding Lympne and Sellindge but the whole planning system seems to require review for this to even be put forward by the local authority.</p> <p>We are supposedly living in a democracy where the peoples voices are heard and equal to all others and where systems and processes should treat every party fairly and without bias.... however, this cannot be the case with the proposed development. The initial land purchase was closed bids and the winning bid was significantly higher than others for 357 acres of agricultural land, it transpires this was Folkestone & Hythe Council (terms Shepway Council at the time) who at the time submitted a statement to say that it was a "long term investment" and would continue to rent the land as agricultural (its current use). Shortly after the purchase the headline plans for development were announced by the council, they clearly had no intention of keeping the agricultural tie on the land and its clear their previous statement was a fabrication - a theme that continued. The local authority continued to purchase land including Westenhanger Castle and Westenhanger Racecourse from the £100m of council taxpayer funds it was gambling on this project - all property has been purchased at over market value and if no development progresses the council will have made a huge faux pas. The government have sponsored the development with support of well over £2m from the department of housing/levelling up over the past 4 years towards planning/implementation costs. In 2018 Homes England also purchased 60 hectares of land for £9m, this is the same department responsible for the £2m grants - why did they buy this land? Do they know something we don't as its currently purely speculative?</p> <p>It's also worth considering the same local authority that purchased the land (including Westenhanger Racecourse) are the same local authority that has already put forward the Racecourse in a previous local plan for a mixed-use development only to have this rejected by the planning inspectorate. It also appears that the same local authority (Folkestone and Hythe) refused the redevelopment of Lympne Industrial Estate ref 99/1147/SH for a mixed used development - I understand this was taken to appeal by the applicant and rejected by the planning inspectorate as overdevelopment.</p> <p>To summarise we appear to have speculative green belt agricultural land purchased as an "investment" by a local authority who have already refused planning on it in various guises and part has already been rejected from the local plan by the planning inspectorate. Further land purchased by Homes England on a speculative basis who in turn are owned and funded by the government - who in turn have provided £2m+ of funding towards planning.</p> <p>If I was to own this land and put in a planning application, I can categorically state it would be rejected by the local authority and if I appealed the refusal would be upheld by the planning inspectorate - absolutely no doubt and rightly so. However, the government are backing this scheme with both seed capital and land acquisition via Homes England/Levelling up fund - why should the ownership of property dictate the outcome of a planning application, is this the independent democracy we live in? It appears between the Local Authority and Government they have somewhere close to £50m invested to date, are they really going to let an impartial planning decision be made? If they use their position of bias and grant planning, then the whole system is corrupt - even worse should an appeal be lodged if planning was granted then this is decided by the Planning Inspectorate who unsurprisingly is funded by the same government department with £10m plus already invested.</p> <p>It would be a travesty if this is granted, it would rob us of the rich and diverse natural habitats and nature supported by the agricultural land. Merge 3 local villages completely losing the identity and lifestyle that bought most people to the area and of course make a complete mockery of the independence of the planning system. The local authority is banking on this from a financial standpoint and to deliver their housing quota which without this scheme falls woefully short.</p> <p>I really hope that an independent view is taken here, and the application is treated impartially but I am afraid given the sponsorship and deceit to date this will sadly not happen.</p>	LPA 279
-----	--------------	------------	--	---------

106	Mary Carden	22.06.2022	Water shortages already occurring in this area, productive farmland being taken when there is a threat of food shortages, more traffic on roads that are already very busy at certain times of the day and season, the residents of this new town will not all stay in the area, they will venture out and explore causing more traffic jams, health care will not cope with the extra pressure on them, light pollution, lack of employment , this development will be catastrophic for the area and the residents that already live here, how far will you go before you stop development of this area when there is no green fields left and nature has been destroyed.	LPA 280
107	Maurice William Cooper	22.06.2022	<p>The summary fails to address the issue of water supply. The whole of Folkestone and Hythe is subject to regular water shortages and droughts and the long-term prognosis is unclear because of climate change. Even with the proposed attempt to design for a reduced water consumption on the Otterpool Development the impact on the existing population of Folkestone and Hythe will be negative. Unless new water sources can be found the increased demand will make the point at which a drought is declared happen sooner, the per capita amount of water available to the population will be reduced and the drought will last longer. If importing water from adjacent areas is regarded as a viable option, it should not be from sources that are already used to support Folkestone and Hythe during shortages.</p> <p>The use of the A20 as a local diversion when the M20 is closed, as it regularly is, doesn't get a mention. Thanks to existing restrictions on the A20 the journey is already a nightmare at such times. Having serious volumes of traffic regularly negotiating what amounts to a housing estate isn't going to enhance the area and even at quieter times the local and non-motorway traffic will effectively divide the development in two. Add in the construction traffic and there is the potential for very serious disruption for decades to come.</p> <p>Since the Otterpool Development was proposed the international situation has changes and food security has lately become an issue. It seems foolhardy to allow large areas of agricultural land to be removed from food production just when it is needed most.</p>	LPA 281
108	Merie Harmer	23.06.2022	This development will cause so much disruption to this already overpopulated area. It is not needed, and the land should be kept for growing crops to feed us as the whole world will face a food crisis in the not too distant future. What about infrastructure anyone thought about this the extra traffic on our roads you'll have great difficulty getting in to Hythe I've no doubt. Please don't let this development go ahead.	LPA 282
109	Michael Hanson	24.06.2022	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Otterpool Park development.</p> <p>The emphasis of the development is the construction of houses. The development design seeks to address environmental and social infrastructure requirements that new residents will require (water, waste, education, and health). The proposed implementation strategy does not address these requirements in sufficient detail. Instead of a phased and costed implementation plan, the approach seems more one of 'monitor' and 'mitigate,' providing essential infrastructure only when the need arises. I fear that instead of a comprehensive development, the Council will sell off parcels of land for houses – to ease its financial liquidity – and that intolerable strains will be placed on existing transport and social amenities. Given the short-term state of the nation's finances, it is optimistic to suggest that public funds will be available in sufficient scale to meet requirements for a sustainable water/waste system, new roads, schools and health and medical facilities. Experience of smaller scale developments in Sellindge confirm that insufficient attention is being given to the broader provision of services that need to complement housing developments.</p>	LPA 283
110	Michelle Parker Slade	23.06.2022	Proposed development is too large. There is not sufficient infrastructure to support. There is already pressure on NHS locally with not enough GPs, dentists and more importantly hospital facilities. The additional traffic on the surrounding roads will be horrendous but that is nothing compared to the thought of people dying in ambulances queuing outside WH A&E because no one considered the impact of thousands of new homes and residents would have on the medical system. Could you really live with these potential unnecessary deaths on your hands?	LPA 284

111	Mike Rees	19.05.2022	<p>I fully object to the otter pool going ahead for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where is the proof that a development on this scale is needed? • I have noticed that on all otter pool literature there are phrases such as we are in talks with, we hope and we think, all to do with water pressure, electric busses, and increased traffic in local villages etc. I think before any work commences; we should have positive answers to these concerns. • What about the effect on local GP surgeries, hospitals etc, when will new GPs appear at Otterpool we already have a shortage of health care locally? • Why has there been no mention of environmentally friendly houses being built such as solar power or rainwater flushing toilets. <p>You say you want a car free town as much as possible but that won't happen for years if at all.</p> <p>I think we all know that this isn't about people's needs it is about a few greedy peoples wants.</p> <p>Let's hope that this project is shelved, and the local people won't be living around a building site for three decades.</p>	LPA 285
112	Molly Milne	23.06.2022	<p>I would like to object to this going ahead purely in the simple basis of, the roads are already too busy. Driving absolutely anywhere in and out of Hythe is a complete nightmare.</p> <p>Also, what is the long term impact on the local eco system?</p> <p>What will already local established businesses do to compete in an already very uncertain market.</p> <p>Affordable housing? Very loose term, because at the moment are any houses affordable.</p>	LPA 286
113	Mr & Mrs Bailey	23.06.2022	<p>With the world in the situation that we are reliant on other countries for our food source and oil etc. It makes no sense to build on land that should be used to plant crops and destroy our countryside. Yes, we need housing we have built enough already in surrounding areas e.g., Ashford, Sellindge etc. We have built enough of the quota that the gov has requested. This beautiful countryside is turning into a one big city with very little green growing space. I did not move to this area to live in one large city. The roads around here cannot handle at least 16,000 cars (averaging 2 cars per household) let alone schools and doctor's surgeries and no jobs for all these people. Stop enough now!</p>	LPA 287
114	Mrs Lorraine Spencer	24.06.2022 Previous comments; (06.06.2019)	<p>24.06.2022 Regarding a further notice received today with regard the amended application in regard to Otterpool proposals. I have been to the planning portal but am unable to view any amended planning application? It would seem only the outline plans from 2019 are on the site. How I wonder are residents supposed to make informed comment by June 24th, 2022, when the information is not available to them.</p> <p>There have been and continue to be numerous objections to the proposed Garden Town, both relating to the size of the development, the lack of infrastructure to support such a development in what is essentially a semi-rural area. The change of character to surrounding villages. The environmental impact, the lack of health care provision particularly inpatient care at William Harvey hospital and lack of General practitioners.</p> <p>We reside in an area where water resources are scarce, and I have seen no detailed provision for how these will be protected. This development is not needed, the additional new housing in Sellindge and Ashford along with Canterbury are more than</p>	LPA 139

			sufficient to meet local needs. These plans are purely a vision to make money, which I and many others feel in the current climate is doubtful, the housing market is going to be volatile and the areas surrounding Otterpool will be ruined with no benefit to local residents. Developers will not provide the green spaces or village like surroundings purported to be a part of this huge development. Overall, the planning application amended or otherwise does not provide sufficient detail to local residents to enable the acceptance of such proposals or even for informed decisions and Consultation.	
115	Mrs Severn	23.06.2022	I oppose this plan. Lots of areas are fighting to get seen by GP. Dentists. Places in schools. There isn't enough road infrastructure to cope with hundreds of people and families in cars. Not enough jobs, Schools or hospitals which are already finding it hard to cope as it is at the moment. As the FHDC own the course they are now trying to make more money regardless of the cost to others.	LPA 289
116	Natalie Rider	23.06.2022	Where are the new schools and doctors' surgeries going to be built to cope with that many more people living in the area? We do not have the infrastructure to cope with this.	LPA 290
117	Neil Bedford	22.06.2022	This development will ruin the area, make already busy roads unbearable especially Stone Street through Lympe which is used as a major rat run. There appears to be no consideration for extra power or water supply, all in all a disaster just waiting for a greedy town council to begin.	LPA 290
118	Neil Green	22.06.2022	This will destroy the area around Sellindge towards Hythe for good, absolute destruction of the worst order! Nobody wants this other than people who are in it for the money. I'm completely against it!	LPA 292
119	Neil Walker	16.06.2022 Previous comments; (06.06.2019)	<p>Apart from the unnecessary quantity of houses to be built, which the Council's own strategy shows are intended to bring people in from London rather than meet local needs, there are serious concerns about water management, both potable and waste. The British Geological Survey report RR/08/02 concludes in its Executive Summary the statement "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." Section 5 of the report details the challenges over meeting demand for potable water and highlights the challenges of development. Little has been done since 2008 to limit development in the area, so it is difficult to imagine that the situation has improved.</p> <p>On the aspect of waste water treatment, it is of concern that discharge from the proposed waste water treatment plant is planned to be into the East Stour River. Not only will this lead to local environmental problems but will exacerbate the Stodmarsh nutrient problem. With regards the proposed reed bed drainage, this seems to have been poorly considered. While a potential solution for an isolated domestic dwelling, it seems implausible to apply it for a town. It is not simply a process of planting reeds and letting them get on with it, the proposed bed needs to be lined, regularly maintained, and refurbished every 10 - 15 years. Various companies recommend a minimum of between 4 - 10 square metres per dwelling. It will create a biohazard that will need to be secured, and will attract mosquitoes, flies, rats, and mice. Again, companies advise siting the beds away from dwellings, and it would seem doubtful that siting it next to playing fields would be wise. As it stands, the proposed solution for Otterpool Park seems ill thought out and impractical. A final thought on water. It has been mooted that Otterpool Park residents will be strictly monitored on their usage, and should they exceed a set amount they would face additional charges. I would consider that this would be challenged in court as unfair, with the outcome being that all residents in the district would face such rationing.</p>	LPA 149
120	Nicky Hargrave	12.05.2022	I object to the size of this development. Think it is far too big in an AONB. This will lead to a huge increase in traffic on an already busy A20. It will have a negative impact on the surrounding villages. The local towns of Ashford and Hythe are already struggling with traffic at peak times specifically Ashford which is often at a standstill. This is a huge unnecessary development which will swamp the area and be a detriment to wildlife.	LPA 293

121	Nicola Barratt	23.06.200	<p>Otterpool Park is nothing but FHDC's vanity project The rolling out of a notion to build a housing estate, yes, a housing estate, will not only destroy the visual setting of the area, but also deprive our district to grow its own food at a time when food shortages are coming down the track at an alarming rate, coupled with rocketing prices.</p> <p>The criteria for going forward with the Garden Town Expression of Interest, as stated by central government, was that it should be community led. FHDC has done its very best to present to government that this is the case when local opposition to the development has been over 95% - overwhelming.</p> <p>The purchase of farmland under the guise of renting to tenant farmers for an income stream was a lie. Sending staff on New Town seminars prior to the purchase was underhand, deceitful, and only serves to illustrate how much out of kilter the moral compass is at the Civic Centre.</p> <p>The document, Otterpool Park Outline Planning Application, is unfathomable and complex to most residents whose skills lay outside of the planning process. For the elderly, not experienced in IT skills, removes them from the circle of computer savvy residents, depriving them of having their views known.</p> <p>Most of my comments will be of a general nature as referring to the document is bewildering.</p> <p>I have lived in this area for most of my life. I have seen the deterioration of communities in regard to services and facilities, now moving at a faster rate than ever. Healthcare was always a brilliant service, but nowadays I can't even get to talk to my GP, one to one. What is it going to be like when the population expands even further? Your answer will be medical centres in Otterpool, but where are the staff. The lack of GP's is a consequence of various factors including the Carr-Hill formula that prohibits funding within the district.</p> <p>Traffic is another problem that has become worse over recent years. Roadside pollution has now become a talking point, especially when the M20 is closed, not to mention the damage done to properties by heavy lorries trundling past. The problem will only get worse with increased housing. And who is the housing for? Not local people. FHDC estimated that a little over 6000 people would need housing locally. The addition of 10,000 houses in the form of a so called Garden Town is ridiculous. Where are they coming from? ONS figures state that our population is declining.</p> <p>According to FHDC's consultant's, the cost of the installation of the 11Km 560mm dedicated water main from Paddlesworth to Otterpool has not been accounted for in the 'Utilities' cost assessment. Why? Will Affinity Water customers be picking up the bill or will Otterpool customers be charged a higher rate for their water via Albion Water? This hasn't been made clear at all in the application. Will Otterpool customers be assured of a potable water supply when Affinity Water sells water to Albion Water at a wholesale rate whilst other Affinity Water customers use standpipes or bowsers? This has to be made clear.</p> <p>Having dealt with SDC/FHDC for a number of years, my experience of local and senior councillors has left me cold. Their contempt for the local population is staggering. I am of the opinion that their grand plan for a garden town will never come to fruition, and the houses that are built will not be of all singing and dancing in terms of sustainability because they will build what they can get away with. The words affordable and homes will never be realised by local people on local salaries. Perhaps our council leader and his deputy can give up one of their 15 houses to help out a poor soul on hard times. I wouldn't hold my breath on that one.</p> <p>Kick this application into touch where it belongs and start to build some decent homes in and around the district for LOCAL people using any brownfield sites that are available.</p>	LPA 294
122	Nicola Fox	21.05.2022	<p>1) There does not appear to be any consideration for the provision of secondary health care for the associated 40,000 + addition residents. East Kent Hospital services would need to be significantly expanded (William Harvey, Kent and Canterbury and QE</p>	LPA 295

			<p>Margate - since local patients are required to access services on all 3 sites) to accommodate the continuing increase in population. The delivery of primary care in the purpose-built health centre also needs to be considered- local GP surgeries have great difficulties in recruiting doctors to this area.</p> <p>2) This development does not benefit existing local people - it provides houses for London commuters at the detriment (dilution of already stretched local services in particular healthcare, increased traffic on the roads and associated pollution, no increase in long term employment opportunities provided) to the existing population.</p>	
123	Nicola Mole	22.06.2022	We object to this and the problems such as traffic and our rural area being ruined.	LPA 296
124	Nicola Sakaan	21.06.2022	This development is huge and there is huge. Will distort the area, furthermore no infrastructure has been planned to support it. I oppose strongly.	LPA 297
125	Pat Vanoli	21.05.2022	<p>Having attended the exhibit of revised proposals for Otterpool Park at Westenhanger (which seems to have been kept well under wraps as so few people seemed to have known about it) I was amazed that the, so called experts, really have no idea of the area where this proposed garden city is to be built.</p> <p>They did not know about the problems caused by Operation Brock and, even when this is lifted, just how busy the M20 and A20 gets. Nor how much building is going on in Ashford and the daily problems there.</p> <p>They foolishly seemed to believe 8500 houses will not produce thousands more vehicles on the road. Do they really think everyone will use the redirected No10 bus, (which now takes 1+ hours to get to the William Harvey Hospital? Will it ever get there when re-directed through Otterpool)? One out of touch expert even thought there was a No10A still in service.</p> <p>Can they be so short sighted to think they will be able to find teachers, for the numerous schools, doctors for the surgeries etc. When there is already a shortage in these areas</p> <p>They could not answer how much concrete/tarmac will cover the ground. 50% open space they told me yes, but this means 50% ground coverage too.</p> <p>It has been estimated that the country could run out of water in less than 10 years' time and yet we continue to build on open spaces like this surely, we should be building reservoirs.</p> <p>Will Otterpool just become a Garden City for weekend retreat Londoners. Kent is becoming a concrete jungle not the Garden of England.</p> <p>I therefore strongly oppose this planning application.</p>	LPA 299
126	Patricia Vanoli	22.05.2022	The open day of new plans at Westenhanger on 19th May was not well enough advertised - I found out, too late, that many people were unaware of it. The planners knowledgeable about the revised plans but completely unaware of the area, I would say their knowledge of the traffic problems was no-existent. 50% green space does not take into consideration this still means 50% of present green space, being covered at a time when climate change and water shortages are top of most agendas. The building going on in Ashford is spreading further and further out, just look at their traffic problems and travelling on the M20 is a nightmare at best of times.	LPA 300

			We were told Highways have it in hand (the same Highways that made such a mess of Junction 10A!) Doctors' surgeries, shops and numerous schools will be built but where are the people to occupy these vacancies coming from? Just try to see a doctor in Hythe or get seen at William Harvey or register with a dentist. Teachers are leaving the profession in droves so it is a pipe dream these vacancies will be filled. We cannot go on building in this area without sorting out its present problems first. It would be more sensible to turn the site into a reservoir. Kent the Garden of England? No, let's us just continue to destroy that image and add to global warming.	
127	Peter Cornish	24.06.2022	<p>By and large I would want to support the planning application (having myself experienced the development of Telford New Town) but wish to make the following comments.</p> <p>Sports facilities: in addition to the sports pavilion and indoor sports hall already proposed, I strongly suggest the provision of an indoor swimming pool. The proposed population of 20-25,000, plus the population of surrounding villages, certainly justifies that. It would also be in line with the proposed transport strategy as it would obviate the need for residents to travel to the far side of Hythe to use the new leisure pool.</p> <p>Health: I appreciate that a new Health Centre is proposed for the new Town Centre, but given that healthcare provision in terms of GP surgeries is already creaking badly, it is essential that that is built in the earliest stages of the town centre development. The planning application is technically correct when it says that the study area (and Lympne) is covered by three doctors' surgeries but fails to point out that the nearest is 5km away in Hythe and the other two are 6km away in Lympne and effectively inaccessible by public transport. [The surgery in Sellindge does not take patients from outside that village.] Transport Assessment: (Appendix 16.4, para 5.4.4) There is little point in improving the byway HE/343 for residents of Otterpool Park unless Aldington Road (single-track lane with no footpath) is rebuilt to double-width with a footpath. From personal experience it is not a safe route for pedestrians or cyclists as it stands.</p> <p>(Chapter 16.4.62/63) The proposal to upgrade the A261 Hythe Road to reduce adverse effects on cyclists purely through Section 106 funding is inadequate and, in my experience, gives no guarantees at all. Since cycling and walking are given such a high priority in the development of Otterpool Park, the upgrading of the A261 needs to be a core budgeted item within the overall development, because otherwise the official encouragement to cycle and walk will be much reduced in effectiveness.</p> <p>(Appendix 16.5) As soon as the new link is built between the town centre and Westenhanger station it will be important to modify the route taken by bus service 10 to link Lympne with the station.</p> <p>Rail Service Enhancement: The ambitions for enhanced rail service including the regular hourly HS provision to London must be applauded and FHDC and Otterpool Park LLP need to keep pushing on this. With regard to the development of facilities at Westenhanger Station (car parking, toilets, footbridge with accessible lifts, new station building and platform shelters, platform extensions), rather than waiting until a certain number of houses have been built, it would be far better to undertake the station improvements at the outset because that will enable the construction workforce and others to use public transport from the word go. It will also give existing local residents who may be uneasy about the development of Otterpool Park the encouragement to see that the development of the new town will bring better facilities for them too: it will help bring them on-side.</p>	LPA 301
128	Pheola Wicks	22.06.2022	Strongly oppose this development for the major detrimental impact it will have on the surrounding areas due to its sheer size. We already have too many squeezed into a small area for infrastructure, amenities, transport links, power, and water supplies that we simply could not sustain this, and it would cause more chaos.	LPA 302
129	Philip Joyce	23.06.2022	I am a Designing Out Crime Officer for British Transport Police. I would like to be consulted on the planning of this project, specifically in relation to where the development borders the railway, including the Station, and any crossings of the railway,	LPA 303

			including pedestrian level crossings, road level crossings, underpasses, and bridges. I will be looking at ways to reduce crime and vulnerability on and around the railway, and make sure that the boundary is maintained to Network Rail standards.	
130	Philippa Dale		<p>I object to the amended outline application and offer the following comments: -</p> <p>Housing need A planning system which requires 6000 plus unneeded properties to be built in order to provide less than 2000 very much needed units of accommodation is broken.</p> <p>There is a need for social and affordable housing, however putting this number of properties in 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 surrounding villages). There are many imaginative and potentially better ways to address this need than tagging often tiny percentages of affordable housing on to large swathes of new build for 'full value' owner occupation.</p> <p>These might include: - providing homes in and around industrial or retail parks close to work places; putting more effort into empty home initiatives; encouraging small-scale rent to buy schemes with support for private landlords; and providing good quality mixed tenure sheltered accommodation to give choice to older people currently under-occupying family size property.</p> <p>Waste and wastewater infrastructure The sewerage plant has been positioned at the lowest corner of the proposed site. This point adjacent to Harringe Lane, floods most years (most recently in February 2022). Assurances that advances in knowledge mean that 'no problems are expected', do not inspire confidence when situations such as the Stodmarsh moratorium continue to happen. Water provision and disposal for the number of properties being considered together with the associated infrastructure, on this delicately balanced area of chalk downland is of huge concern. The urban drainage for the development will presumably also run to the lowest point, adding to the potential for flooding. The proposed position of the sewerage plant is very close to my home, and I have serious concerns about smell and the potential impact to the water table in my immediate vicinity.</p> <p>Vehicular access and the existing highway and local road network I am very concerned about how our regularly gridlocked road system will cope with a further 8500 vehicles. In the event the proposals go ahead, Harringe Lane, which is single lane for its whole length, should be made access only from the A20 to beyond Harringe Court Farm, and become a bridleway from there to Aldington Road. Also, there should be no access to or from Harringe Lane into the proposed town.</p> <p>Other points In an increasingly uncertain world, should we be so willing to build on agricultural land, and risk losing our precious natural habitats? Assurances that solar energy or whatever sustainable alternative exists during the lifetime of the proposed development will be an intrinsic element and not an add-on, need to be followed through.</p> <p>If the scheme does go ahead, builders should be small, local, and invested in the area. There should be no option to use national developers for whatever reason down the line.</p>	LPA 304

131	R H B Ellis	06.06.2022	I have always been against this proposed new town, from the start.... when the council borrowed £5m to start it off, without any consultation with the residents of the area! Despite all the proposed ideas, it will result in excess traffic, excess load on the power/gas supplies, sewage, and water supply and, above all else, a population explosion that the local environment and facilities will not be able to cope with. This is clearly being forced through by an exploiting council, who seem more interested in getting more council tax and, therefore, more power!!!	LPA 305
132	Rachel Cornish	24.06.2022 (x2)	<p>24.06.2022 (1) The use of "stages" is inconsistent. Where facilities are promised in a staged manner this should be BEFORE the next stage, not AFTER a previous stage, or this allows for promised facilities to be delayed an unacceptable number of years. e.g.: Westenhanger Station improvement works "Phase 0 – Before construction commences of Otterpool Park" - this is fine "Phase 1 – Works to be delivered after completion of a specified number of homes (TBC with FHDC) " - this should be reworded along the lines of "before the no of new homes built reaches (an agreed value) "Phase 2 - Works to be delivered after completion of a specified number of homes (TBC with FHDC) " - same here - to be meaningful the work must be before further homes are built.</p> <p>24.06.2022 (2) Some comments on section 3.2.25 "At present there are no dedicated cycle routes in the immediate vicinity of the site" - "Other than the designated cycle routes it would be considered that there very little existing cycle infrastructure within the vicinity of Otterpool Park" This may be the case but there are significant journey by cycle in both a north -south and east-west direction, for commuting to work and leisure. In east-west direction, the A20 is regularly used (evidenced by cycling heat maps). In the north south direction, there is a link over the railway and M20 by Westenhanger station that cycles use - plans indicate this will still be allowed - this is an important link. Also, Swan lane - increased traffic here will make this dangerous.</p>	LPA 306
133	Rebecca Watkinson	22.06.2022	<p>Carefully judged, considered and sustainable development is required if the need for more housing locally is to be met. However, the planned development of 'Otterpool Park' is neither carefully judged or considered, nor sustainable. Therefore, the only possible comment to make here is an objection to this development, in strongest terms. Putting aside the emotional connection to place—having been born, raised, and now residing in Lympne—there are clear areas of concern with proposed (and amended) plans.</p> <p>1. Environment, sustainability, and inevitable pressure on natural resources: in the South East we are short of water. To add ~8,500 houses places significant strain on already stretched—and scarce—water resources and infrastructure. With no proposal to 'upgrade' existing infrastructure one can only assume we're set for failures (leakage) and drought. Recent reports from Water Resources South East (WRSE) demonstrate the extent of the issue facing this area, and the 5bn+ investment needed to address future shortages, yet here we are being told to 'welcome' plans for a development that will add further burden. How anyone in good conscious can countenance such a scheme when we are already facing an environmental catastrophe... oh yes, that's right, unless of course it is to tick a quota box as part of a frankly ill-conceived government scheme. On the flip side of this is the fact that a large development may increase the risk of local flooding—the reduction in permeable surfaces (significant increase in impermeable surfaces) raises likelihood of surface water and surface water run-off so increased flood risk is near-inevitable. How sure can we be that proposed mitigation measures will address this risk?</p> <p>2. Resultant pressure and safety risks for surrounding highways. It's a curious fact that whenever developers put forward plans these always exist in a mythical utopia in which residents' cycle everywhere, very few own cars and walking from point to point is</p>	LPA 307

		<p>de rigueur (and feasible). Put simply, 'who needs cars?' Developers would have us believe no one does. And while undoubtedly there are those who follow these paths (let's applaud those souls), the reality is that the UK is a multi-car society, with the average household having more than one car—it remains the most popular form of transport. Existing road infrastructure will simply not cope with the increased volume of traffic, and the proposed 'solutions' put forward in the plans do not address this—notable is the significant increase in traffic moving along Lympne Hill forecast by Highways England in their comment on the proposed development—an already dangerous pressure-point as a result of recent separate housing development(s), and upon which yet more burden is being placed. In terms of safety, this is not only pedestrian safety linked to the increased volume of traffic on local roads that are currently regularly subjected to speeding drivers, but also the potential increase in local pollution as a result of increased traffic movement. It's interesting to note that Highways England cite the mitigation measures (back we go to the developers 'who needs cars?' utopia) in their reasoning for there being little to no pollution impact. It would be valuable to see their assessment assuming a 'real life' scenario— i.e., the multi-car household scenario and ~10,000-20,000 more cars on local roads as a result of the development. The plan states that use of low emission vehicles will be encouraged but given that human behaviour is beyond the developer's control, and alternatives (such as electric vehicles) are still at this stage prohibitively expensive for the vast majority, this supposition seems a lofty—perhaps unrealistic—ambition.</p> <p>3. While on the topic of transport, provision of public transport is already lacking, and there seems no intention, or plan, to improve on that. However, given that most of these houses will likely be outside of the reach of anyone local and therefore dominated by buyers from elsewhere needing to commute, the already stretched commuter routes—both local and regional—will be placed under more pressure than they currently are. Anyone who has had to endure peak hour public transport either locally or regionally will attest to how close it is to breaking point. So, let's add to that with a further big population increase driven by a vast new development... quite the plan for further frustrating all those simply wanting to get from A to B with ease and without frustration. The plan states 'integration of public transport provision,' however if that provision is currently lacking with no foreseeable plan to change, then all the integration in the world won't encourage uptake—that 'developers utopia' might be at risk.</p> <p>4. Healthcare provision and policing. The obvious missing link here—local GP surgeries, dentists and hospitals are already being pushed to the nth degree, and what provision (or glaring lack of it) there will be for the many residents of Otterpool Park remains unanswered. The Office for National Statistics tells us that there are ~2.4 people in the average household, so let's assume the development will mean the local population increases by ~20,000. GPs are thin on the ground, as are nursing staff of all grades, and then paramedics, support staff etc., and we arrive at a scenario in which residents face having no safety net of healthcare provision—no GP, no ambulance arriving in the event of an emergency, and no hospital bed should it be needed. Police resources are similarly thin on the ground after round upon round of funding cuts, and this development with its accompanying population increase would stretch this further still. These are serious nationwide issues, but they're acutely felt in this area and it's hard to fathom what further stress will therefore be placed on an already very broken system, severely lacking in resources, with the sudden uplift in population.</p> <p>Granted, we need houses, but building such a large-scale and intensive development on green-belt land—productive farmland and precious countryside within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)—in a locality with natural (and other) resources, amenities, infrastructure, and healthcare provision already under significant strain is not the answer. It's simply an easy 'win' for the local, and let's face it ill-run, local council. Smaller-scale development of truly affordable homes, developed with sensitivity and awareness of environment, sustainability and local resources and infrastructure as guiding principles are what's needed. There is so much more that can—and should—be said here, but with the window of time for comments about to close let's simply hope that common sense and a more measured approach abounds.</p>	
--	--	---	--

134	Richard Chidwick	22.06.2022	The underlying infrastructure for the area is already stretched, but no one in the council appears to think this is an issue. The A20 is the ONLY alternative route for M20 yet more and more housing is being built alongside this primary route, narrow tunnels, and more and more traffic lights. Whatever happened to common sense...	LPA 309
135	Richard Stothard	23.06.2022	<p>I would like to strongly oppose this proposal. The issues that this development would create for the surrounding villages and current residents is enormous.</p> <p>I have huge transport concerns surrounding the A20 (Ashford Road), Newingreen and Lympe junction (Stone Street). These roads are not suitable for the heavy increase in traffic that is proposed.</p> <p>The junction at the A20 Ashford Road / Stone Street / Hythe Road (Newingreen Junction) for example could simply not cope with increased traffic. This junction in particular is already busy as commuters flow down the A20. Getting out of Stone Street, and onto the A20 is tricky due to the road becoming blocked by the A20 traffic coming from Ashford and heading towards Hythe. This road is used by a large variety of cars and lorries as they exit the M20 at junction 11 with lorries often parked along this stretch of the A20.</p> <p>The proposal to turn this into a signalled junction as proposed in chapter 16 would also not solve this issue and would cause further delays for commuters and village residents. Stone Street itself turns into a single lane at multiple points with multiple traffic calming areas. This road is already busy as it's used as a shortcut into Hythe. This would only become worse, with new residents in this proposed development using it to access the Southern parts of this new development avoiding traffic on the A20.</p> <p>Another concern is that on the A20 as you drive through Sellindge the road is width-restricted underneath a railway bridge. A lot of the new residents in this development would be using the A20 to travel into Ashford for work. This width-restricted traffic lit junction would become a heavy congestion zone.</p> <p>With this huge development so close to the M20, any disruption on the M20 would heavily affect traffic flows. Operation Brock often causes issues with traffic flow on the M20, especially around Junctions 10, 11 and 11A. As soon as there is disruption, this will cause stand-still traffic both for traffic approaching Junction 11 which would back up down the A20. Also, traffic that is flowing into Ashford at peak times would also become heavily congested when incidents arise. Junction 10 and 10A at Ashford become extremely busy during peak times with traffic regularly coming to a standstill on the A2070 at Sevington and the A292 approaching Ashford town centre.</p> <p>There is also concern over the health infrastructure in place. Currently, residents of Lympe, Sellindge and surrounding areas have to travel to Ashford as their local hospital. There have been no further provisions laid out to improve infrastructure, and this will put a lot of increased strain on NHS services that are already stretched.</p> <p>Furthermore, the plans to introduce new doctors' surgeries need to be prioritised. New residents will struggle to access existing surgeries in the local areas due to the lack of availability.</p> <p>Overall, the negative impact that this development would cause on all current residents in Lympe, Sellindge, Westenhanger and surrounding areas would be huge. Transport links for existing residents would become increasingly difficult. There should be concerns over the lack of health facilities. And the destruction of land in and around AONB is irreversible. There are many better ways to increase housing in smaller pockets in and around town and village hubs without putting such a large strain on facilities with such a large development.</p>	LPA 310

136	Roger Burnett	23.06.2022	I am opposed to the proposed Otterpool Park development in its entirety. Nothing good can come out of the urbanisation of a rural area. Increased traffic, noise, pollution, destruction of much needed agricultural land and wildlife habitat are all of concern to me. I love living in Lympne - I feel that once development starts, living my life amongst a building site for 20 years will be unbearable.	LPA 311
137	Roger Derek Harmer	23.06.2022	Not wanted! Not needed! Farmland should be for farming.	LPA 312
138	Roger Townshend	04.05.2022	So close to an AONB and too many new homes next to the M20 which is at best two lanes each way and then the traffic goes round the country lanes, we have a car park now not a motorway.	LPA 313
139	Rosalind South	21.06.2022	<p>I support this development in principle, but there are a number of areas that need careful consideration. I agree with the majority of comments with regards to the number of houses being built within this development. The impact this will have on the existing villages and huge strain on already precious resources is a big concern, and further reassurance needs to be given on how the development team will remedy this and support the residents already in the area.</p> <p>My main comments which I would like to be noted are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you assure us that all new build houses and office blocks within the Otterpool Park development are only passed through planning if they come with solar panels on the roofs? I see no reason to use further prime agricultural land for solar panels when all these new build homes can be built with them from the start. If batteries are also included to store the solar power, then the new homeowner benefits from low electricity bills from the start (surely a huge benefit on lower incomes which you are keen to support) and anything not used has the potential to sell back to the grid. 2. I was very pleased that you agreed with my initial comments back in 2016 with regards to closing Harringe Lane to through traffic, however, following on from a discussion with Ian Braddock of Arcadis at the most recent consultation, the location of the closure on the lane needs to be re-thought. Access to both Partridge Farm, Harringe Court Farm and 1 & 2 Harringe Court Cottages needs to be from the A20. All postal services, delivery services and bin services come from this end of the lane. The closure should be past Harringe Court Farm, please can this be revisited ASAP. I would also like to reiterate my comments made in the initial application; this closure needs to take place before phase 1 gets started. It has already been agreed that the lane is not suitable for large volumes of traffic, and while the development is being built, traffic will use cut throughs where possible to avoid the development. Harringe Lane cannot be used for this purpose, it is not safe, there are very few passing bays, and the lane is too narrow. I ask that this closure takes place at the beginning of the phase one. 3. I was also very pleased to see that the request to have a bridle path included in the plans was responded to positively. I would like to further request that these bridle paths are put into place in phase one so that the existing horse community can enjoy safe off-road riding, especially as the traffic will increase significantly as a result of this development, making riding on the roads incredibly unsafe. With the new laws in place to protect horse riders this needs to be a serious consideration. The access officer from the British Horse Society was at the consultation and is very keen to be involved in the plans to ensure the bridle paths are fit for purpose, I urge you to involve them in this process and I would also be keen to be involved in ensuring the paths are built and positioned to be widely used by the equestrian community. 4. Finally, I understand from the plans that a water treatment plant is proposed for the land after the railway bridge on Harringe Lane. Further details of this proposal needs to be made available for consideration. The details on the size, type, access, and traffic to the site is not mentioned and therefore informed consideration and comments cannot be made. My immediate concern would be the associated smell and visual appearance of a water treatment plant and these concerns need to be addressed by yourselves with further details on their impact to the residents in the immediate area. 	LPA 314

			I would finally like to add that while you have teams of professionals working on all aspects of this large project it is vital that you continue to include the opinions of local residents immediately impacted by the development. Most of your team will not live in the area effected and may not understand the impact their decisions will have. You must include subject matter experts in any decision (for example bridle path positioning) so that everything that you are proposing to build is fit for purpose. I urge you to contact such experts or residents prior to firm decisions being made.	
140	Sam Deverill	22.06.2022	I object.	LPA 315
141	Samantha Oliver	24.06.2022	I object to this proposal as there will be a massive negative impact to existing villages and residents. It will massively increase traffic on the roads which are already very busy at rush hour/school times and are already impacted by Operation Brock. We are constantly told in the summer that there is a water shortage and so 10,000 more homes will just further add to this. William Harvey hospital is already extremely busy and with long waiting times already in place, can't cope with the additional strain. Green land should be protected for future generations and should provide homes for wildlife and not destroyed.	LPA 316
142	Sara Emmerson	24.06.2022	On the basis of the size of the development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the potential volume of traffic during construction and once the estate is completed. A smaller development would be much more appropriate.	LPA 317
143	Sarah Hall	23.06.2022	I am totally against this monstrosity. It is not wanted nor needed. Leave things alone! I'm no where near against new houses but the sheer size of this is ridiculous!	LPA 318
144	Sharon Mulligan	22.06.2022	I live in a country village and want it to stay that way. the roads are already full due to Lympne Ind. Estate and when the motorway is stacked with lorries, which is often, we cannot get home as it is. we do not have a full selection of high-speed internet as it is and the water and electricity it appears in the information does not support this growth. We do not want this on our doorstep.	LPA 319
145	Simon Clarke	23.06.2022 (x 2)	<p>23.06.2022 (1) While I am sure all bases are covered in terms of planning policies here as the developer is well advised and well financed, the fundamental point is that this is development on a greenfield site in the countryside. The plan will do to Lympne, and it's surrounds what the development at Hawkinge did to that village. Incidentally, another Battle of Britain airfield site. It's simply appalling and the wrong approach to providing housing. Why ruin another village and turn Folkestone, Hythe, and Ashford into another Medway style urban blob? Lympne is highly visible from the North Downs and its many footpaths in a way that Hawkinge was not. Surely it makes more sense to expand the town of Folkestone/Hawkinge rather than ruin Hythe and Lympne and its already creaking infrastructure and road network? Just because the site was previously a racecourse does not mean it can't be returned to being greenfield that complement the AONB in which it is sited and provides the backdrop to? Plant much needed trees, rewild or use it for crop production - goodness knows we need to be more resilient and self-sufficient in terms of food supplies in light of the geopolitical situation. This development will ruin the community and sense of village that Lympne has enjoyed since Roman times and decimate the views from the North Downs. Do the right thing and favour nature and community over commerce and industry. Concentrate new housing around existing towns - don't sacrifice another rural village. The urban creep blighting the Garden of England is turning it into an urban sprawl. This green landscape should be conserved and restored to woodland/fields not smothered in housing.</p> <p>24.06.2022 (2) One further point is that villages are a scarce and ever declining way of life. New ones are not created in the way that towns such as this one is. Each one is unique and part of our heritage. Not all of those looking for a house want to live in a homogeneous town with shops etc to hand. For those that do there are towns aplenty already.</p>	LPA 320

			Others want something with a more rural feel, something in touch with nature, to become a part of its rich heritage and sense of community - the village fete, the village school, the village shop, the village hall, and well yes, that's it. They want quiet country lanes to walk their children, or a local woodland to wander off with their partner for a romantic walk, or to reminisce and walk their dog. Only villages can offer that distinctive feel and eliminating Lympe will sniff out one more candle. Retaining Lympe and all its character and history is the right thing to do. It offers choice to those, present and future, who want to live in a small tight knit community tied to history and nature. Let's retain and offer choice. Erasing Lympe simply makes village life less affordable as one more village is swallowed up by the relentless urban sprawl - people will still want to live in a village but will find it less, not more attainable if there is one less village for them to choose from. Variety is the spice of life - Otterpool can be created any time. Lympe was formed over millennia - let's cherish and conserve that. Wouldn't that be a wonderful thing to do?	
1146	Simon Hudson	22.06.2022	This development is fundamental flawed - the infrastructure isn't there and nor will it be. This includes insufficient hospitals, water supply, road structure and rail connections. There are insufficient jobs in the area to sustain a huge influx of residents and to say that Folkestone & Hythe Council will attract businesses to the area is also a joke. All local councils are trying to do this - it is arrogant of F&H to think they will be able to outperform places like Milton Keynes in doing this etc. Also, the land is predominantly arable and to build would be contrary to local electors wishes within a 40-mile radius.	LPA 321
147	Simon Price	29.05.2022	This is a travesty that will damage the Kent countryside still further. It is not in the interest of the local community and the area does not have the infrastructure to support such an influx of extra people.	LPA 322
148	Sophie Mort	23.06.2022	Building a new town is preferable to lots of small developments attached to villages. I hope there will be an off-road cycle route to connect the villages and Brockhill school and Westenhanger station. I hope there will be lots of green space and a skate park for older children. Playgrounds tend to be only for primary school age children. I hope you will plant lots of trees and hedges. I have spoken to the architect about all these things and was pleased that he cycled around the area.	LPA 323
149	Stephen Cheesley	21.06.2022	<p>I would like to take this opportunity to object to this application in the strongest terms. My objection covers various different factors relating to the proposed use of the land.</p> <p>My primary objection is in relation to the environmental impact of the overall development. The proposal to take existing farmland, as well as land that could be used for farming. At a time where we have a global food crisis caused by global warming and conflict. At a time where we see more people than ever before in food poverty, visiting food banks. It appears scandalous to me that a development of this magnitude and format could be proposed. This action will only seek to increase our reliance on external food sources.</p> <p>The next part of this objection is in relation to the soaring cost of energy. Year on year we've seen the cost of energy increase. Not only will this development see the strain on our existing energy infrastructure grow, but it will also take away land that could be used for green energy projects, such as solar and wind farms. If the land isn't to be used for farming, this would be the next best choice. On top of this, the houses and retail units being built will all be fitted with new gas boilers, only adding to the energy deficit we currently see.</p> <p>Another objection that I have is to the proposal for mixed retail and related uses. For the 8,500 units of residential property being developed in the area, there are a whopping 28,875 sqm proposed for Mixed retail and related uses. Not to mention 7,700 for Hotel and 7,425 for Leisure. If you look at the businesses that have traditionally struggled over the last decade, you would be talking about retail for sure. A lot of retail business has gone online, as evidenced by the county's closed shop fronts in many of the high streets.</p>	LPA 324

			<p>I would also like to take the opportunity to question the necessity for such a vast development, given the existence of a number of currently planned developments in the area that are already going ahead. Examples include the so-called “garden town” Chilmington Green development in Ashford. When it is complete, it is set to add an excessive 5,750 homes. This development was also built on existing farmland.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to reference the experience that Sellindge has faced of the new Taylor Wimpey development that has appeared in the village. Since its arrival, there has been no expansion of the doctor's surgery, where it is now nearly impossible to see a doctor in person, even for infant children.</p> <p>Rather than solely levy criticism, I would like to take this opportunity to point out that there are right ways to do these kinds of developments, and this isn't it. Currently, in Ashford, there is a raft of new, affordable homes being built on Victoria Road. These houses are being built on top of, now disused, industrial land. Land that has already been ruined by development. They take advantage of existing infrastructure and are developing homes that are far more affordable. Without the need for a “garden town” pretence.</p>	
150	Stephen Ivory	22.06.2022	<p>I object on several grounds, many that have already been written about, but particularly am concerned that this development will rip through prime agricultural land, not only destroying the eco structure and the biodiversity that inhabits it but also denying its use to grow crops to feed the country - it is already known that the impact of the Russian invasion of Ukraine will last for many years and will directly affect the food import supply chain. We need to preserve what land we have to increase national self-sufficiency.</p> <p>I also have concerns about the water supply and sewage management. Can the regions water catchment supply the vast amount of water needed for the proposed development and what plans are being put in place to manage sewage?</p>	LPA 325
151	Stephen Slade	23.06.2022	<p>I object to Otterpool Park development on grounds of scale. Up to 10000new homes will effectively create a new town but it seems with no provision to upgrade road, or utilities like water and electricity. It will be an act of gross incompetence if planners allow a development of this scale to progress having significant impact on surrounding area and towns of Ashford, Hythe, Folkestone, and Canterbury. Most of all the impact on NHS will be significant as already within the area WILLIAM HARVEY hospital it over stretched and it's impossible to see GPs or obtain dental treatment. Please urgently consider your responsibility towards existing residents of this area and reject the application.</p>	LPA 326
152	Sue Miller	21.06.2022 Previous comments: (08.05.2019)	<p>I totally object to the ghastly Garden Town, it is far too big to fit in with the tiny villages it will swamp, the roads will not be able to cope with the amount of extra traffic, we have hose pipe bans in this area quite frequently as there isn't the water to feed the houses that are already here, so adding another 10,000 isn't going to help the situation, the farmland and beautiful countryside that is going to be destroyed which we need now to be able to grow our own crops, we suffer with flooding in this area too, mainly because there isn't enough drainage to keep up with the rainfall we have, it rains so hard due to climate change we sometimes have a month's rain in a day, so concreting all the green areas will only make this worse, the beautiful castle should not be surrounded with housing that will ruin the character of the area, the racecourse is also part of this area's history , so is the airfield, it helped us win the war and should be kept as it is as a mark of respect to all the soldiers that lost their lives in the wars, history should not be wiped out with concrete. The local wildlife will be destroyed, which will be very upsetting for local residents as they live here because they love seeing the wildlife Most of the local residents have objected against this, why can't you listen to the people that matter, they pay your wages and trust you to represent them !!!!</p>	LPA 089
153	Suzie Armstrong	22.06.2022	<p>I find the whole idea unbelievable; they can't cope with Hythe never mind an extra town. Schools, hospital, GP's, police, water etc!</p>	LPA 329

154	Tania Holland	22.06.2022	This objection is made as a result of the density of population the new build would lead to, the terrible pressure on roads in and out of Hythe and public services in general, plus the enormous pollution and environmental impact the development will have. We have a lot of empty second homes in Hythe. We need more careful use of current resources. Not thousands of new homes. Please acknowledge that you have received this objection.	LPA 330
155	Terence Darker	10.06.2022	<p>As a general comment, virtually all of this development takes up agricultural or potentially agricultural land. Our country currently produces insufficient food despite intensive farming to feed the population. We therefore are completely reliant on importing a significant percentage of our food needs.</p> <p>We are in the midst of a potential food crisis exacerbated by the current conflict in the Ukraine, and this should be a wake-up call to all, including YOU, that loss of farming land only makes the situation worse!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the future that is predicting global heating and the effect on worldwide food production! • Consider also that we still have an expanding population, yet another pressure on lack of food production! <p>I cannot support any construction that has the potential for increasing the pressures outlined above.</p> <p>As for the specifics of this development, the comments made by the others I support entirely. As a final comment, I believe this to be a building developers' gift!</p>	LPA 321
156	Tessa Ivory	22.06.2022	<p>Kent is slowly becoming a large town. I completely oppose the building of this vanity project/money making scheme. Ten thousand houses are a town bigger than Hythe and there is no infrastructure to sustain such a building project. Kent used to be the garden of England; it is slowly becoming the housing estate of England. The impact on biodiversity and wildlife will be huge. It will impact on grazing land for farming.</p> <p>Southeast Kent inhabitants already suffer when traffic is held up either by the tunnel or port. There are too few schools both primary and secondary to cope with extra children. There are further problems providing water on an already dry county. Further to this the impact on local people will be huge. Ten thousand houses will take years to build. There will be enormous impact on residents including Lympne and Hythe. Extra road traffic, dust, noise and the A20 is already a busy major road that cannot cope with further traffic. The roads are not even mended, let alone putting more traffic on them, I hope that this project does not get permission. All the bluster about local housing for local people is a lie. These houses will be too expensive for most locals.</p>	LPA 332
157	Tim Clark	08.05.2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What action is being taken to prevent this whole area from seizing up with the additional road traffic, as has happened around Ebbsfleet and the A2? It already takes 30 mins to drive the 3 miles into Hythe on the A261 on a summer Saturday; at a conservative, estimate, Otterpool will put an additional 4-5,000 cars on the road. Will the A20 cope with the increase? What will happen when Stack, Brock or TAP are in place, as they have been every year for the past three years? 2. Secondary schools - presumably, this/these will be all ability: what is the impact assessment on Ashford and Folkestone grammar schools? 3. The plan destroys an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: it cannot be reclaimed. 4. The plans allow for business and retail units, but every other unit on Folkestone and Hythe high streets is empty; what assessment has been done to prove that there is demand for these additional businesses? If there is demand, why aren't the high streets in Folkestone and Hythe booming? 5. How has the lack of adequate water supply been resolved? 6. How has the enormous loss of natural drainage been resolved? (Flood prevention etc) 7. We were told the houses were to fulfil local demand, yet many/most will be sold to London commuters, otherwise why build next to the railway and motorway? The influx of London commuters will push up the prices of houses. Is a Conservative 	LPA 333

			<p>authority actually going to control prices for the benefit of local residents? (I speak as someone who moved here in order to commute....)</p> <p>8. Finally, rather than building more and more houses, why isn't more done to stimulate the economy (other than just in short term construction)? With investment, generated by some development, the racecourse could be or world class quality, creating jobs, not least in hospitality. Folkestone Harbour and even Lympne airport (the "garden airport") could stimulate the whole area, but all we seem intent on doing is building house.</p>	
158	Tracy Campbell	23.06.2022	I would like to object on a number of fronts such as additional traffic, lack of transport infrastructure, additional noise, light & air pollution but mostly on the grounds of health care. Our NHS services locally are stretched beyond breaking point, waiting times are high, accessing primary care services are a joke & next to impossible & our local hospital is constantly full to the brim - how on earth can we cater for the health care needs of all the extra people when we can't effectively manage those we already have?	LPA 334
159	Trevor Eke	22.06.2022	<p>I am totally opposed to this development we do not need any more house developments especially a garden town the size of Otterpool it is not sustainable and will never be the amount of problems that it will bring is massive it will ruin the countryside there are no plans concerning the roads which will create hundreds of more vehicles on the roads which will all spill out into the local villages of Lympne Sellindge Aldington and other villages it will ruin the wildlife and surrounding areas.</p> <p>There are no reservoirs being planned so where will all the extra water come from and drainage for the waste. The whole plan will be a complete eyesore and as for schools' doctors etc can you really see that being there where are the doctors and teachers coming from there's already a shortage now the council are just trying to make it look good so people will be in favour of the development the council should be ashamed of their selves probably none of them live around this area and are no doubt making a lot of money out of the development. SAY NO TO OTTERPOOL !!</p>	LPA 335
160	Triena Graham	22.06.2022	I strongly object to this proposal due to the sheer scale proposed and the lack of investment in the road network. It is not wanted and will destroy valuable wildlife habitat.	LPA 336
161	William West	22.06.2022	This proposal is completely bonkers. There is no need for a new town in this area. It will adversely impact the whole of this part of Kent, ruin people's way of life and completely destroy the wildlife habitats of tens of thousands of animals. It's meant to be a place of outstanding natural beauty here, but you are going to turn it into a suburb of hell!	LPA 337
162	Norma Pocher	04.08.2022	I personally feel that it is against the interests of the nation to build a huge new town on a greenfield site. There are brownfield sites that can be used, instead of greedily gobbling up the little bit of Kent countryside left. 8.500 homes creates the need for new roads, schools, dentists, GPs, hospital beds etc. We already have a shortage of most of these facilities, and it will only make the situation much worse. We should be prepared to leave the site green, and find another solution. We have a crisis of space in England, which should not mean that we have the right to use greenfield land which was created to protect what little we have left. This planning application should be rejected outright for these reasons.	LPA 298
163	Cllr Lesley Whybrow	22.07.2022	<p>I would like to make the following comment on the application:</p> <p>In February 2021 FHDC's Cabinet adopted the Kent and Medway ELES following a motion passed by full council which recommended that they did so.</p> <p>The Kent and Medway ELES says that by 2023 stretching net zero target should be set for any new development over 100 houses.</p> <p>https://www.kent.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0009/112401/Kent-and-Medway-Energy-and-Low-Emissions-Strategy.pdf</p>	LPA 338

			<p>In my view this should be a material consideration and I hope that officers will take it into account when drafting their report for the planning committee.</p> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of this email and include it with the documents for Y19/0257/FH on the planning website.</p>	
164	Ms Claire Gibbs	16.08.2022	<p>We are all aware that houses are needed but a development of this scale is not the solution. Whenever a large scale 'new town' is built there are always social problems. A large scale new build in Ashford is still under development and yet there have been so many anti-social behaviour problems that the police have to regularly visit and even bus services were reduced in the evenings due to drivers' safety. Smaller developments are a much better solutions where a community can be created. Using brownfield sites would reduce the impact on the environment and nature while tidying areas that have been left to become derelict eyesores. We hear continuously about the impact on wildlife in other countries, particularly areas such as the rainforest and we all think it's despicable that habitats of wild animals are being destroyed yet by using agricultural land we are doing exactly the same, ok it may not seem as significant as what we see on the orangutan's plights but there is plenty of wildlife that will lose its habitat when this development goes ahead, I find a bit hypocritical. Some of the comments state that Ashford and Folkestone will join together, with the huge solar farm proposed for the whole corridor through Aldington, when both of these developments go ahead, which no doubt they will despite objection, we will actually have no purely agricultural fields left between Ashford and Folkestone, so this is not something that is going to happen in the future, it is happening now. Otterpool is an overly oppressive development for the area that will completely change the area and will be detrimental in every aspect.</p>	LPA 339
165	Ms Samantha Cox	16.08.2022	<p>Not sustainable due to the following:</p> <p>Water scarcity area. It states "potential" water waste facility ... this means it isn't definite... this is needed due to the Stodmarsh issue & would put greater pressure on all water supply and waste resources. Due to the M20/latest and previous port/tunnel blockages the A20 is the only coastal route, this development will put substantial pressure on this route, plus increase traffic for all surrounding settlements such as Hythe & the routes of A259 in the peak summer seasons. We are affected now without an extra 20,000 cars (working out a max of 10,000 houses and a minimum of 2 cars per household.) Access routes will be comprised to the Hamlet of Stanford south due to Otterpool cutting the settlements of Westenhanger and Stanford south in half on Stone Street with access routes planned toward junction 11 of the M20. Loss of green space vista that has been enjoyed for a hundred years or more. Vital farming land lost to this development. Due to the nature of the site around Westenhanger castle, this is a natural flood plane if the tributary of the Stour overflows, which it does every winter. Plus the current racecourse land is a super soakaway which will be lost that could increase flooding issues for the surrounding area and the proposed development.</p>	LPA 340
166	Mr Michael Cooper	16.08.2022	<p>I think it is so very sad to locate a large development right in the middle of a "green corridor" for nature which is contiguous from the Eastern side of Kent, all the way across the Marshes and into Sussex. On one side hemmed in by the sprawling development of Ashford, and on the other by Folkestone and Hythe. It is a terrible crime. And then of course there is the matter of water supply. In this very dry corner of Kent where we are so reliant on borehole supply, it would put even more pressure on this precious resource. Purely on environmental and ecological ground this development should not happen.</p>	LPA 341