

# OTTERPOOL PARK – Y19/0257/FH CONSULTATION SUMMARY TABLE

NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES RECEIVED SINCE 31 AUGUST AND 6 SEPTEMBER 2022 AND  
CONSULTATION PERIOD 07 SEPTEMBER 2022 TO 10 OCTOBER 2022

(Representations Received as at 08.12.2022)

Table 1				
Consultation Responses (Neighbour responses)				
Ref	Name	Date Received	Comments	LPA Reference
1	Bryan Rylands	31.08.2022 Previous Comments (12.02.2021)	According to Environmental Impact Assessment document, the figures represent the emissions arising only from the individual project under consideration and does not take into account the cumulative emissions from those other existing and/or approved developments with emissions from the scheme itself. The scheme is not being proposed in isolation. There are other projects granted planning permission, such as the Y16/1122/SH, Y14/0873/SH, and others in and around the vicinity of the proposed site. It is only reasonable for the applicant to provide relevant information on the cumulative impacts of the project, taking into consideration the other existing and/or approved projects on climate change. It simply cannot be the case that that requirement is discharged by presenting for assessment purposes an estimate of emissions arising only from the individual project under consideration. As such the development does not take into account the interaction between the direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed development and other projects granted permission, or to be granted permission	LPA105
2	Ms Lorraine Spencer	03.09.2022 Previous Comments (19.04.2022)	Civic Centre. Castle Hill Avenue. Folkestone CT20 2QY 3rd September 2022 Re: letters received from Quod Ltd regarding Otterpool Park planning proposal Dear Sirs/Madam Following receipt of two letters, one addressed to a previous owner of 9 years ago! I do wonder how much money is being wasted, I have previously written and opposed these proposals as have many others and know by now that we are being completely ignored, however, as the letters state I have 21 days to respond again to these letters. The amended application in principle is no different substantially to the prior application. The application for a development of this size is wrong in both its location and in the number of housing units it proposes. It goes beyond the local housing need and even looking at future need given the extensive developments nearer to towns like Ashford and Canterbury is totally unnecessary and unviable financially. The viability assessments to date are already out of date given the extensive changes in economic activity, particularly in Europe. The proposal is I believe for all the housing units to run on electric, this too seems impractical in current situation. The housing market is reliably expected to fall dramatically given rises in interest rates and inflation. Will new viability studies be commenced given the new situation, if not then I can see these proposals being shelved for many years as developers will not be interested in a rural site with so many infrastructure demands. To leave such a large area to fall fallow will be a disgrace to this Council and Community. I oppose the planning application on grounds of size, unviability, and environmental damage to a rural area with many varied wildlife species and open aspects to AONB and sites of historical interest. Wider issues include water services and	LPA 139

			<p>sewage which are poor in the area as are services such as broadband. I would also like to comment on the 'Consultation' that is said to have taken place with regard these proposals, I have attended several, but none have been Consultations, purely pictures of what is proposed no questions are answered or asked of attendees and no recording of comments made. How the Consultations managed to convince Inspectors it was sound beats me.</p> <p>Finally on infrastructure, there is currently insufficient NHS services in Folkestone and Hythe, whilst some health provision is outlined in the planning hospital services are not expanding, how are over 8,000 households expected to be able to access these services? If Canterbury becomes a Super Hospital, which is far from clear and has an A @ E then William Harvey Will close their emergency service.</p> <p>Canterbury is expanding greatly and the existing road access there is very rural and slow from Westenhanger, I fear this will be a further unmanageable burden on the health service. I don't feel that there is anything anyone residing in the immediate area can say that will be heard by this Council. I will vehemently oppose this planning application as long as I live.</p>	
3	Anthony Bosley	13.09.2022 Previous comments (08.06.2022) (06.06.2019)	<p>The amendments set out in the updated documents still do not address the key issue regarding the scale of this development. Mitigation is simply not possible in this instance. Water scarcity this summer and the ongoing pressure on existing water use is totally ignored in the various 'green' labelled documents. Using existing water resources for this new development will not work, without additional large scale water capture and storage facilities. Climate change which is addressed to some degree in the documents will make this situation even more acute in this area, even without this additional development. Yet again the transport situation is not properly addressed. Use of the A20 and the B2067 to circumvent the M20 when operational issues arise as they did again this year and will do so again next year is not a solution. adding additional vehicles to this existing national problem, is going to make a bad situation worse, with negative impacts to local residents and the national economy as the area becomes at times impassable. An additional junction on the M20 doesn't mitigate this in the slightest.</p>	LPA120
4	Brian Walton	09.09.2022 Previous Comments (01.05.2022)	<p>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.</p> <p>MY OBJECTIONS TO LAND USE PROPOSALS AS FOLLOWS: -</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. 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.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my above comments.</p>	LPA 213
5	Colin Abbott	03.10.2022 Previous Comments (04.07.2022 (1))	<p>We were lied to from the start of this proposal when it was stated this land surrounding the Racecourse would be purchased by FHDC to provide an income stream from agricultural letting. Since then no notice has been taken to objections and the scheme has been railroaded through in spite of overwhelming objections. These being primarily against the loss of green agricultural land, the bespoiling of an area of AONB, the overuse of water in notable area of water shortage, the environment impact on</p>	LPA 045

		24.06.2022 (2) 24.06.2022 (3) 11.05.2022 (4) 11.05.2022 (5)) (03.04.2019, 06.06.2019)	surrounding villages and the fact that development of this size would leave to overcrowded road networks in the locality. Even at present out town centres are notably underused with many empty shops. We certainly do not require another shopping centre at Otterpool. Houses will be unaffordable now that we are in a time of rising interest rates making the cost of building ever increasing. Our countryside and wildlife it supports is more important than covering it in concrete please reject this application! !!	
6	John Moberly	30.09.2022 Previous Comments 07.06.2022 (x 2)	<p>We are very concerned to discover that despite our detailed comments on the earlier OPA dated March 2022, nothing relevant or significant appears to have been changed in the revised submission dated August 2022. We attach a copy of our original "Reasoned Objection," which we submitted at the time.</p> <p>There is now a new version of drawing no OPM1015_ZZ dated 30-6-2022, which is long after we pointed out the boundary discrepancy to Otterpool. Nonetheless, the new drawing still shows the boundary of the Otterpool development area encroaching 10 or 11 metres into what is now our garden. Furthermore, while there does not seem to be a new version of drawing no OPM (P) 5003_revWW (undated), the version of this drawing now used in the August OPA shows the applicant as wishing to build higher than 15 metres high right up to the old boundary of our property. (Previously this was up to 18 metres, but the latest version does not have ANY Height Limit!) This appears to suggest that we could be faced with 6 storey blocks of flats, or indeed much higher, extending up to 11 metres into our garden on both our southern and our western flanks. This contradicts and undermines the entire concept of the Otterpool Park garden village.</p> <p>We note that at page 14, of OP5_Appendix_4.3_Strategic_Design_Principles_Amended.pdf, reference is made to the need for a 'landscape led' development plan throughout Otterpool Park and the need to pay special attention to the surrounds of existing dwellings. The comments above suggest that this is patently not the case in this instance.</p> <p>Can you please see what can be done to ensure that no building of this height is allowed in such close proximity to existing dwellings and their gardens. It seems to be totally unnecessary to allow anything other than houses to be built in area TC7 (or at least the northern section of TC7). If flats or other high rise buildings are to be permitted in the southern section of TC7 (i.e. South of the line of existing trees), then there would still need to be an enforceable height limit (of say 15 metres.)</p>	LPA 256
7	Kirsty Cook	12.09.2022  Previous Comments (19.05.2022) Previous comments: (06.06.2019 24.05.2019)	<p>These documents mean very little to local people due to the language used however, you have liked to mention the 'green aspect' a lot. What you haven't mentioned is an air quality study for the current residents. What you haven't mentioned is a strategy for current residents to be able to leave their properties safely in the Barrow Hill area as an increase in traffic will leave few breaks to be able to pull out. What you have said that if residents did park on the A20 for their safety is that you would paint yellow lines outside our homes.</p> <p>As a residents with a chronic illness that may well need a disabled space outside my home on the A20, this fills me with dread. You haven't mentioned anything about roads when there are issues at the docks or M20. You haven't mentioned, even on your glossy plans on open days, that the road at the railway bridge is single file. Not to mention the blocks of flats are depicted smaller than my home.</p> <p>The green buffers in the Barrow Hill area are now smaller than first shown. I understand the small stream will take some run off water but there is an ancient bridge that cannot take any more during the winter.</p> <p>Now is the time to give Sellindge residents some relief from the A20 and create a bypass and some fresh air.</p>	LPA 027

			I was told at the open day you wouldn't do this due to the cost but at previous meeting it was looking like a very small adjustment was needed. With yet more development in the village earmarked surely you cannot think a single file road is suitable to cope. I understand you hope people will use J11 when in reality you know this will not happen. How about looking after residents that have lived here many years, many are not against progress but what we are against is being railroaded into having our lives and health affected due to developers making big profits at our expense.	
8	A Childs	14.09.2022	I totally object to this development. It will completely obliterate the local countryside. The villages impacted will be lost for ever and be renamed 'Otterpool' - why would anyone want our history to be lost? What we will end up with after the developers re-adjust their plans and eventually start building (despite all the objections) will be more boxes with no spaces and high buildings that are totally out of keeping. The latest three-story buildings behind the Doctors surgery are an eyesore for the village of Sellindge and I fear we will end up with even more. The increase in traffic caused by the people taking ownership of these houses to go to work will cause further strain on the roads which already cannot cope during motorway closures. Everyone using bicycles & public transport is just not going to happen. The additional schools, retail centres and surgeries are nothing more than the developers trying to sell their development. Those evaluating this scheme should look at other developments where this was proposed but has never materialised. Nothing will convince me that this is a good idea.	LPA 342
9	Della Tansley	14.09.2022	I realise that due to my age (90) the proposed development is unlikely to affect me, however, my Niece who is my carer and who lives in the next village and all of my fellow citizens of Sellindge will suffer hugely both mentally and financially. Currently we are being advised that we must wait 4-6 weeks for a visit to a Doctor, whose surgery is currently less than 1 mile to the proposed site. According to the application there are to be Health Centres, does this mean Doctors Surgeries and if so, how many and with what capacity and if not where will the 20,000 plus individuals go to for a Doctor or medication etc. I do not drive anymore but can see how much traffic currently uses the A20 and that is without the eyesore flats being built adjacent to the current Doctors. Assuming that this monstrosity of a development will somehow be agreed despite all objections it MUST be confirmed that schools, doctors, care homes and burial grounds be built in the first phase. Our homes will reduce in value due to the gridlock that will undoubtedly occur with workers driving to Ashford International Station when they realise that Westenhanger Station commands higher fares to London etc. I realise that I am almost certainly wasting some of what time I have left dictating this to my Niece to type but I cannot go to my grave knowing that I did nothing to try to stop the destruction of green fields so close to my home. It is abundantly clear that Folkestone and Hythe District Council have seemingly deliberately picked an area of land adjacent to their border so that when letters are despatched for comment it would effectively limit the number of individuals that although live close to the affected area are not actually in the same district council.	LPA 343
10	Mike & Val Harris	25.09.2022	I'd like to take this opportunity to reiterate our previous concerns with the developments, which include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The scale of the development is far too large in this area of green land</li> <li>2. It would cause even more havoc and problems with traffic in the area as we have seen this summer to the channel ports and M20 closure problems</li> <li>3. It will add to the existing strain on our local hospitals and doctors</li> <li>4. Water is a major issue already in our area</li> </ol>	LPA 344
11	Cllr. Helen Calderbank	25.09.2022	To whom it may concern re: Otterpool: Will the William Harvey be expanded? I saw a Medical Centre but that is not a hospital. More homes = more people = people do get poorly/pregnant/have nasty accidents. Pandemics happen!! Will the William Harvey cope? Does it now....??	LPA 345

			<p>1. <b>Could there be a ban on second homes/holiday lets/AirBnb properties??</b> I feel these are a huge contributor to the housing crisis.</p> <p>From what I see, Folkestone is becoming a very popular tourist destination which is certainly no bad thing, it's a great thing however I believe it is also at the cost of the average local person. Holiday homes and Air Bnb's are on the rise. Examples: <a href="#">Cottages in Folkestone and Self Catering Accommodation from £57 - Holiday Rentals Folkestone - Holiday Lettings Airbnb®   Folkestone - Holiday Rentals &amp; Places to Stay - England - Airbnb</a> , this does not include those advertised privately or through social media.</p> <p>There is also a rise in second homes in the area. The flat below my son's in Radnor Park was on the market and sold. The couple have visited around 5 times in the last 3 years when the weather has been lovely. The rest of the time, it sits empty as their primary home is elsewhere. It is not just here. I recall a street in St Ives, Cornwall when I visited where nearly every house had "Horizons Holiday Lets;" "Cornish Cottages;" or an Air Bnb sign outside. I suspect they are empty in winter when they could be someone's home. I fear this happening in Folkestone and surrounding areas.</p> <p>2. <b>HOMES</b> is where I see and accept the need for Otterpool. In the initial planning, it stated <b>30%</b> of the homes would be affordable. For a start, everything is affordable to someone! Some people can afford a £1million house for example. I was very disappointed and angered when I learned that the number of affordable (questionable) homes had been reduced to <b>22%</b>.</p> <p>Private rents are increasing, most likely due to the town's rightful popularity but it is quite frankly extortionate and with the cost of living persistently going up, I find this a grave concern. In my life experience, prices go up but very, very seldom, if at all come down and wages do not keep in line.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 bedroom flats <a href="#">Properties To Rent in Folkestone   Rightmove</a></li> <li>2 bedroom flats <a href="#">Properties To Rent in Folkestone   Rightmove</a></li> <li>General: <a href="#">Properties To Rent in Folkestone   Rightmove</a></li> </ol> <p>The House of Lords Built Environment Committee states that more social housing would reduce the benefit bill. Housing benefit costs around £23.4 bn per annum and when you consider how private rent is increasing, this will in turn affect the overall cost. <a href="https://www.insidehousing.co.uk/news/news/spend-more-on-social-housing-to-reduce-benefit-bill-say-peers-73877">https://www.insidehousing.co.uk/news/news/spend-more-on-social-housing-to-reduce-benefit-bill-say-peers-73877</a> How much does FHDC spend on Housing Benefit?</p> <p>Research undertaken by The National Housing Federation and Crisis showed that we need to be building around 90,000 social rented homes a year, currently only around 5,000 are being built. <a href="https://www.housing.org.uk/about-housing-associations/about-social-housing/">https://www.housing.org.uk/about-housing-associations/about-social-housing/</a></p> <p>I strongly urge the Council to return to their original proposed 30% of so-called affordable housing and would prefer to see more Social Housing (nationally as well) for the reasons I have stated, especially as the cost of EVERYTHING is totally bonkers. I fear that local people will be priced out of the area they grew up in and might wish to stay in, especially those who have family, and their support networks close by.</p>	
12	D E Reynolds	16.09.2022	<p>With reference to the planning application Y19/027/FH – Otterpool Garden Town. Under the circumstances that exist at present I disagree with the proposed development.</p> <p>The constant disruptions due to the weather or breakdown of service in respect of the Channel crossings ports is a problem with no ending or any immediate way to solve. The continuous restrictions and delays, inevitably causes road chaos and utter</p>	LPA 346



			<p>confusion. The Council Planning Department must realise this is happening, perhaps they will start using common sense, instead of putting their on a bank balance. Until the parking problems created by Eurotunnel and cross channel Ferries are resolved and we stop using motorways as giant Lorry Parks and infrastructure for large building developments will only cause a total gridlock on the entire movement of transport.</p> <p>The County of Kent was known as the Garden of England and now it is becoming the dumping ground of Europe. Building new estates is great for the British and local economy, but in moderation, unless you want to concrete the entire South East of Kent. Please start being sensible and solve the existing problems before creating even more trouble. I have lived in Kent for over 40 years and have seen many changes, some good and some bad, but nobody would like to live in what Kent is becoming, a gigantic traffic jam in a concrete jungle.</p>	
13	Julie Mann	02.10.2022	<p>Instead of building more homes, schools etc and ruining the environment, generating more traffic in the local and beautiful area, why isn't more money being put into the local areas which are fast becoming ghost towns because of the amount of building that have already gone up in recent years. Ashford International was built on the premise that it would enhance the surrounding areas and all that it has done is create yet another concrete jungle. It is time to stop thinking that destroying environments is the answer and to start thinking about how to improve what we already have.</p>	LPA 347
14	Mrs Belinda Pierce	03.10.2022/ 04.10.2022	<p>I urge you to reconsider plans to build this new town. We have many developments taking place in Ashford that will generate thousands of new homes, why do we need more? All over Kent Villages are being lost, eaten up by developers, we are no longer 'the garden of England,' communities are losing their identities and just becoming part of a huge urban sprawl. The environmental impact is huge as our green spaces are being decimated, which is not only bad for the environment as wildlife habitat disappears but also has a negative impact on people's mental health. I do not understand why we need yet another town, that is going to have devastating consequences for the surrounding areas. I strenuously oppose these plans.</p>	LPA 348
15	Jonathan Tennant	10.10.2022	<p>I Object to this huge mainly residential proposal that will cause further blight to the once wonderful "countryside corridor" that runs through Kent between London and Dover. Here, despite causing terrible impact on the precious and immediately adjacent, North Downs AONB, I'm quite sure the local planning authority will ultimately give itself and other landowners planning consent. Taking this as read, and a resident of more than 30 years in the neighbouring village of Aldington PLEASE will you at least look again at the Traffic Management Plan proposals? Without any detailed explanation that I can find in the voluminous paperwork the applicant has seen fit (rightly in my view) to create two new No Through Roads. The first being the first section of Aldington Road that comes out on the A261 at Hythe Hill. The second, Harringe Lane which, as locals know runs between Court at Street and Sellindge (A20).</p> <p>It will be sad to see them go but entirely logical because of the nightmare "rat runs" they will become if Otterpool goes ahead. Why then is the stopping up of the B2067 (logically at a point just south of the entry to the Port Lympne Animal Park) not proposed (or even discussed) in the same way and for exactly the same reason? Quite apart from the tortuous and single-track elements of Roman Road that runs through the village, the very busy Primary School dropping off time will coincide with rush hours. Turning off earlier, down Church Lane offers a way round, avoiding the village yet circumventing inevitable queueing problems on the A20 in Sellindge as it struggles to cope with 8500 more homes. I'm not demanding that Church Lane should be closed necessarily but why on earth have these enormously complicated traffic surveys failed to even look at the next land that runs broadly parallel with Harringe Lane and seems to me to offer the same (or even better) "rat run" opportunities? PLEASE will the LPA/Inspector demand much more detail on this from the applicant? If for some reason my above suggestion is dismissed then can there not, at the very least, be a width restriction facility installed at the junction of the B2067 and the start of Roman Road? HGV's that need to deliver into the village can continue to do so using Station Road from the Smeeth junction on the A20. Schemes of this scale may claim to be self-supporting with all the infrastructure included in order to make things "work," but they need to take into account and properly mitigate collateral damage in the locality and that will mainly be caused by the CAR. It's all very well designing</p>	LPA 349

			everything around people using bicycles and jumping on trains, but in reality, it just doesn't happen. If the applicant had a section in its application headed "Rat Run Study" then we might be getting somewhere. We ignore this aspect at our peril.	
16	Katharina Joanna Wills	13.10.2022	Building on this site is utterly wrong on so many levels. This infrastructure is wholly inadequate and the whole project is pointless. Find "brownfield" sites before you desecrate virgin land. The war in Ukraine has highlighted the importance of food security so why on earth build on green field site is beyond stupidity. And water resources?? Nothing makes any sense, and it simply appears like the developers yet again have total power to destroy our land and community.	LPA 350
17	Jane Woolford	09.10.2022	Map of A20 around Sandling and concern over the existing A20 will become a proposed primary cycle path/footpath	LPA 351
18	Jeremy Pilmore-Bedford	02.10.2022	<p>I write to express my concerns at the plans submitted for the proposed garden town at Otterpool Park.</p> <p>I believe that there are several reasons why the proposed development should not go ahead as currently proposed.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure</b> While the transport infrastructure from the M20 and A20 provide good East-West vehicle access, this is not the case for North-South access. In particular the scale of the development will cause a large amount of vehicle traffic from the West side of the proposed development heading North to Canterbury to use Swan Lane and other minor roads to access Stone Street. Traffic along this route has already increased in the last few years with the new housing development within Sellindge. A similar problem will occur for traffic going to and from Hythe.</p> <p>Unless there is a new railway station developed at Westenhanger with the High Speed trains to London stopping at it those residents of the proposed new town looking to travel to London are likely to drive to Ashford to access that service as the current train service from Westenhanger does not connect effectively with the High Speed service. This will create a large amount of extra traffic along the A20, through the bottleneck under the railway at Sellindge and on to Ashford.</p> <p>The current plans for the supply of water to a development of this size and scale in one of the most water stressed regions of the United Kingdom are inadequate. Current customers will suffer as a result with restrictions on supply and expensive water saving requirements.</p> <p><b>Services</b> In the current proposed plans there is too long a time lag between the construction of a large number of houses and the provision of new services such as doctors surgeries, schools etc. This delay will put huge pressure on the existing services which are designed for a rural population in the villages surrounding the proposed development. There needs to be much earlier provision of these services in the plans.</p> <p><b>Ribbon Development</b> The former Kent development plan wisely focused on developing the areas around Ashford and Ebbsfleet to take advantage of the infrastructure from HS1 and the motorways. It protected the area between Ashford and Folkestone to avoid ribbon development that would link the towns and adversely affect the rural character of the region between them. The current proposal for the development of Otterpool Park completely overturns this and taken together with the new junction 10a on the M20, the inland customs facilities and the proposed solar farms will create a near contiguous urban sprawl across East Kent. The scale of the proposed Otterpool should be reduced to prevent this to the area between the A20 and the high speed railway line.</p>	LPA 352
19	Mr M A Keene	28.09.2022	I refer to your letter dated 7 September 2022. I am not connected to the internet so am not able to respond in the manner you have described, nor do I have a smart phone so no email address either.	LPA 353

			<p>It would have been more thoughtful if you could have made provision for someone like me, not all of the population are on the internet.</p> <p>You mention that “improvements to the existing highway and local road network” will be taken into consideration and I am hoping that Swan Lane comes into that category. It is my opinion that Swan Lane already takes its fair share of road traffic being a cut through linking into Blindhouse Lane the junction with the B2069 to the other outlying villages. So much so I believe Swan Lane takes more traffic than the A20 to the east towards Stone Street at the junction of Swan Lane and the A20. Any more traffic in Swan Lane and it would not be worth living here due to the road noise.</p> <p>If you really wanted a paper copy of the planning application from QUOD, 8-14 Meard Street, London, W1F 0EQ would I really have to pay £7585 for it?</p>	
20	Christine Bruchell	16.09.2022	<p>I am sadden and broken today; Folkestone Hythe Council have sent me a letter to say: Amendments on Outline Planning Application for 8,500 houses. (Application Number: Y19/0257/FH). My 1 Plot (number redacted) – I did what I was told and kept up for 21 years, every 3 years renewing it and paying a surveyor. I kept it up as I have a very severely disabled daughter 65 years, I’ve nursed her, I thought the extra for the plot would help with moving that why I’ve never sold it. This will be good enough for local press, I have your letter saying my plot was not valid on 2/7/21 after all those years am disgusted, so will a lot more folk.</p>	
Responses as 08.12. 2022				