

# OTTERPOOL PARK – Y19/0257/FH

## CONSULTATION SUMMARY TABLE

NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES RECEIVED SINCE 10 OCTOBER 2022

CONSULTATION PERIOD 1 DECEMBER 2022 2022 TO 09 JANUARY 2023

(Representations received as at 17.01.2023)

<b>Table 3</b>				
Consultation Responses (Neighbour responses)				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>LPA Reference</b>
1	Lisa Cutler	06.12.2022	<p>This application keeps being sent out but nothing of consequence changes. The roads are already packed with traffic, the hospital and doctor's surgeries are already overwhelmed with sheer volume of patients, there is already a shortage of water for existing communities.</p> <p>Looking at the building going on in Ashford at the moment, it's caused chaos on the roads and there is no sign of abatement years later. This causes agitation to those made late be the delays and bad driving through bad temper. It is a horrible thing to put people through over so many years.</p> <p>Otterpool would be so much worse – it would cause chaos to the communities just trying to get from A to B, hundreds of lorries thundering by causing further damage and potholes to existing roads,</p>	LPA 170

			<p>the road through Sellindge has been narrowed to a dangerous scale through a separate home building scheme (which has gone on for years – and not finished yet) and it isn't wide enough for lorries to pass each other.</p> <p>In conclusion, we can already see the damage caused by poor planning decisions, the damage the works cause and the awful disruption these schemes create – with Otterpool I understand this will take decades.</p> <p>This scheme should be thrown out and only applications for small schemes put forward to allow existing small communities to be able to enjoy the environment in which they live whilst also allowing for SMALL building schemes. We already have the building going on in Sellindge, and there is a new scheme by the bridge as you go out of Sellindge towards the M25, there is a big scheme close to Tesco and there is a current scheme in the process as Princes Parade.</p> <p>It would be a then ALSO allow this behemoth of another 8,500 homes to add so many thousands more to an already overstretched infrastructure. A hospital would be welcome, a new, large doctor's surgery (not a vague "health centre"), a large area for collecting water for the area, improvements to existing roadways, these things would be welcome.</p> <p>"Burial ground" – what does this mean? A church with a graveyard? Too vague. "Temporary meanwhile uses" is also extremely vague wording.</p>	
2	Colin Abbott	12.12.2022	I wish to object most strongly to this unwanted application to cover prime agricultural green field land in concrete. At least fourteen M Ps representing Kent constituencies have asked the Government to abandon plans to build further housing on countryside surrounding	LPA 045

			<p>their areas. Please take note of their concerns and abandon plans for Otterpool. Our countryside is more valuable as an area of AONB and home to wildlife not to mention being in an area of recurring water shortage.</p> <p>Listen to the people of Folkestone and Hythe and surrounding villages.</p>	
3	Steven M Ogilvie	08.12.2022	<p>I received a letter inviting comments on the revised plan for Otterpool. However, having looked briefly at the documents, several things have become clear to me:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the volume and complexity of the documents as presented makes it very difficult for me and I suspect many others to grasp what is being proposed sufficiently in order to make meaningful comments. Was this a deliberate strategy I wonder?</li> <li>2. the governance model for the development seems to leave Folkestone and Hythe council as both the developer and the planning authority. Whichever way you look at this and whatever controls you apply, this is a fundamental conflict of interests.</li> <li>3. certain aspects of the plan give me concern and these revolve around <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the morality and health impact of locating a significant settlement adjacent to a high-speed railway and a motorway which is the main freight and passenger link with Europe</li> <li>b. noise and disruption to activity in the surrounding community during construction.</li> <li>c. the impact on such a large settlement on water usage and availability given that the area derives its water</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	LPA 354

			<p>supply from boreholes linked to underground sources of finite capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. the visual intrusion of large structures such as a multi-storey car park and increased light pollution on an area of scenic beauty.</li> <li>e. disposal of waste water into the upper reaches of the East Stour River, particularly during times of heavy rainfall and flooding when planned mitigation is likely to be compromised.</li> <li>f. the inclusion of a "burial ground" in the plans - given that our current society is nominally Christian in nature and cremation is the preferred means of disposal of bodies, just who is this settlement aimed at? More transparency is needed.</li> </ul> <p>I doubt very much whether you will take any of my objections and suggestions seriously, but these are my thoughts for what they are worth.</p>	
4	Valerie Perry	01.01.2023	<p>With everything that is happening in this country and the world surely building more houses on land that could be used for producing food is total madness, you really need to reconsider what your planning. We have schools without teachers, hospitals without nurses, nursing homes without carers, Doctors surgeries without doctors and supermarkets that cannot fill the shelves, farmers giving up and want to build more houses.</p> <p>Where is the logic in this. Listen to what people are saying and reconsider your options. We should be planning to grow more and support what we already have, not be turning our backs on what is falling apart. Peoples' health is already under attack who gave you the right to impose yet more pressure and worry on the communities involved.</p>	LPA 366

5	Frances and Leslie Lake	04.01.2023	<p>As before, no mention is made of the detrimental effect that Otterpool will have on Hythe. The ONE access road ( already busy with queuing traffic at weekends and during the holiday season) cannot cope with the residents of Otterpool streaming down to the coast as well! 8,500 houses initially and it seems that extra land will be acquired for the remaining 1500.</p> <p>Where is this land? Hythe is a small coastal town which will be changed forever, and the residents do not want this vanity project.</p>	LPA 367 LPA 170
6	Jonathan Tennant	09.01.2023	<p>I have already commented on this application in my submission made on 10.10.2022.</p> <p>Having been advised that the application had been updated I hoped the applicant might have provided a summary of the changes made but instead, as far as I can see, it is necessary to wade through everything again. I note there was a comment recently from someone lamenting the fact that we are faced with another huge application with no “plain English” summary to be found.</p> <p>Nothing from the applicant and nothing from the planning authority to help us. It’s hardly surprising that the comments on the website are so few. How many hours would it take someone to read it all in detail? I suspect, as others do, this is a tried and tested technique of the applicant. Information overload. I can only imagine most people have given up.</p> <p>My focus remains on one specific area – the total lack of appreciation of the traffic implications for local lanes between the proposed development and Ashford. I won’t repeat here what I put in my</p>	LPA 350

			<p>submission on 10/10/22 which still stands and remains visible. However, I would add the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As far as I can see the applicant has taken no account of any comments submitted by members of the public despite, in its covering letter, indicating that it has done so. It seems only interested in the responses from statutory consultees like KCC. Perhaps there is to be a yet further instalment, where it will be considering further comments made up until the last deadline of 10/10/22. I hope so.</li> <li>2. Following hours of further reading of the application I stumbled on what seems to be referred to as <i>“Junction 27 – Barrow Hill Shuttle Signals” – page 92 of the Transport section.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Anyone living in or near Sellindge will know this bottleneck as being the traffic lights where the Muddy Duck pub once was. The applicant’s expert talks much about the difficulties this section of the A20 presents but then laughably summarises the position as follows: <i>“Given the physical constraints there is not a practical way to significantly increase capacity through this location”</i>. So that’s all right, just move on to something else!</li> <li>b. What about when the M20 has to be closed (as increasingly seems to happen) between junctions 10 and 11 and traffic streams through Sellindge on its recently narrowed A Road? Has the applicant done any research to see what happens to the village and all the narrow lanes in the locality on these occasions? Does its data not consider what happens in the year 2037 (or indeed between now and then) when the M20 is closed for a day or two? What impact will Otterpool have when its thousands of residents are relying on the motorway connection?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>3. The applicant should be required to include Roman Road and Church Lane, Aldington in an extension to the survey work already carried out. Church Lane, which provides access to the huge Converter Station, is currently subject to no less than <i>three</i> major planning applications. A solar power station, a battery storage facility, and a Grid Stability substation.</p> <p>Surely the access route to infrastructure of such national significance should be safeguarded. If I'm only half right about the lane, post Otterpool, being used as a rat run (whether the M20 is closed or not) why would it not be logical to treat it in the same way as Harringe Lane - and close it - using the same removable barriers prescribed elsewhere in the application?</p>	
7	Donald Broad	08.01.2023	<p>The latest planning application for Otterpool Park has not addressed the major concerns that have been expressed repeatedly about this development. I respectfully ask members of Folkestone and Hythe District Council to act in the best interests of the people that they were elected to serve, and to reject this planning application.</p> <p>We are now living in a very different world. Many things have changed since this new town was proposed in 2016: Brexit makes the proximity to Europe less important for business; the Government's aim is to move economic activity away from the overheated South East to the North of England; the economic crisis and price inflation; higher interest rates; changing weather patterns affecting water supply; the NHS in crisis; the war in Europe and the obvious and increasing importance of domestic food production, i.e. we should not be destroying agricultural land. Before this major development should proceed, it is important to consider the total combined effects of the</p>	LPA 227

			<p>many other developments in this area as well as those in Ashford and Canterbury.</p> <p>FHDC should concentrate on providing good quality services and protect the natural environment for local communities instead of this ill-conceived and over-large new town project that is not needed nor wanted.</p> <p>Otterpool Park new town will be of no benefit to the existing local communities. On the contrary, it will cause massive traffic congestion; water shortages; more difficulty in seeing a GP; longer hospital waiting lists; noise, air, and light pollution; and destroy the rural character of the local environment and the AONB.</p> <p>When this project was first announced there was no evidence that there was any need for such a large housing development. It was bitterly opposed by local residents. All of the subsequent protests and well-argued objections and concerns seem to have been ignored by FHDC. The only people who seem to have benefited from over £50 million plus of taxpayers' money spent on this development so far are the landowners, offshore property tycoons and the high-priced consultants employed by FHDC to work on this project</p>	
8	Mr John Moberly and Mrs C Moberly	09.01.2023	<p>While some amendments have been made to the earlier applications (dated respectively) March 2022 &amp; August 2022) these do not appear to have addressed any of the points raised in our earlier observations commenting on these at the time. For instance, the March 2022 version of drawing number OPM(P)5003_rev WW Heights within OP5 Appendix 4.1 showed the maximum height of dark blue areas (coloured on the plan) restricted to 18 metres. However, in the August 2022 version of OOM(P)5003_rev WW Heights (found at OP5 Appendix 4.1 p42/56) the dark blue colour has no height limit at all.</p>	LPA 256



			<p>This error (if it is an error rather than an attempt to deceive) has not been corrected in the November 2022 version despite the relevant volume having been amended for other reasons. The identical drawing without any height limit is now to be found at p42/57. Given that the points that we raised before have still not been corrected, we repeat our earlier comments and objections, and suggest that before Otterpool Park are permitted to submit any further amendments, they be asked to address the errors and omissions that have already been pointed out by the electors of FHDC and other interested parties.</p> <p>Making such a request could certainly save the population at large many hours of wasted time checking that the plans have been thoroughly proof-read.</p>	
9	Leslie William Barratt (Sellindge & District Residents Association)	09.01.2023	<p>I refer to my submission dated 23.06.2022, in addition to that I will make the following statement.</p> <p>The past few Winters have proved to be a godsend for Affinity Water in as much as they can breathe a sigh of relief for the replenishment of groundwaters which serve the Dour region in this part of Kent.</p> <p>Moreover, our District Council would be mirroring the same sentiment so as to secure a positive outcome from the Core Strategy Review (CSR) Inspector's report in regard to the massive housing project 'Otterpool Park'.</p> <p>Looking at the Council's presentation surrounding Water Issues, the emphasis has always been on conserving water and generally proposing a 'green' agenda to limit the usage of water for each and every household.</p>	LPA 266

			<p>By way of reducing usage a 'Green' (as described by Albion Water) water supply will be installed. This simply means a dual pipe system of potable and non-potable. The potable being used for all fitments within the property except for the WC's and garden tap, with the non-potable, served by rainwater capture. Using a scenario of drought or a lengthy period of time during Summer months, the captured rainwater may become depleted. The water company's potable water would have to be used to then serve the WC's and Garden tap.</p> <p>It is my estimation that the so-called 'Green' dual supply system will never be used across this Otterpool project to full effect. Our Council's claim that water usage will be rated at 90 litres per person per day (lpd) is aspirational and will never be achieved. The CSR Inspector's rejected that claim and rated the usage at 110 lpd, based upon current building regulations. The true experts in water usage are Affinity Water; the company that sends us our water accounts every six months. They have always stated that a figure of 155 lpd should be used.</p> <p>The claim that only the first 1500 houses will be built, using existing mains pipework, before additional water mains infrastructure is needed is a spurious one. Will a dual supply be installed alongside the existing infrastructure? At what point will the 11Km, 500mm mains supply be planned from Paddlesworth. I contacted Affinity Water recently and they have heard nothing of the proposed mains upgrade or any costings. Will the cost of this upgrade be included within the £30,000,000 for all utilities across the site? Will existing customers of Affinity Water be expected to pay for the Otterpool water infrastructure project?</p> <p>Another claim by our Council is that they will be reducing water consumption across the district by retrofitting low-capacity WCs to thousands of existing homes. I believe this to be untrue and just</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>another 'green' virtual signaling exercise to persuade Inspector's to approve the Otterpool scheme.</p> <p>There is no doubt that the Council leader and his cohorts will stop at nothing to push forward with a short sighted and unsustainable scheme of an unwanted housing project that the majority of people in the District are opposed to. The fact that this project was meant to be 'community led' has turned out to be ignored by our Council. Throw out this application and let's start a serious debate about our communities and improving life for all within the District.</p>	
10	Michael Barnes	07.01.2023	<p>As a former resident and parish councillor of Sellindge I am appalled by the standard of both the recent expansion of Sellindge and more so by the proposed adjacent Otterpool Park major project despite massive cogent opposition by the local electorate and elected agencies.</p> <p>It appears that central and local Governments are intent on urbanizing substantial areas of our rural agricultural landscape without adhering to well established planning legislation or considering existing infrastructure in order to achieve 'housing targets' which may be required over all of Britain.</p> <p>For these reasons I am strongly averse to this concept of a 'garden town' in this location due to the many design flaws and resulting environmental degradation to the area.</p>	LPA 368
11	Nicki Stuart	09.01.2023	<p>I continue to object to this development for multiple reasons. The detrimental effect on the countryside, local wildlife, and biodiversity. The stress it will place on our water supply with increasing concerns due to climate change.</p>	LPA 369

			<p>The lack of transparency about the extent the housing and retail properties will be eco-friendly, have solar panels, and a town for a carbon neutral existence.</p> <p>The risk of the narrow roads into Hythe becoming too busy and therefore very likely to become more dangerous. The risk of not being able to staff the new medical centres, schools, and nurseries with appropriately trained and experienced personnel.</p> <p>The additional pressure on our already stretched hospital services.</p> <p>The purchase of Westenhanger Castle adding an additional strain to the FHDC budget.</p>	
12	Derek Burles	10.01.2023	<p>The scale and complexity of this application creates considerable hurdles for the layman to submit objective comments on the entirety of the scheme. Clarity is in short supply throughout – there is not even a clear date by when comments are required to be submitted. Given such complexity, I will focus my objection on the significant matter of traffic management.</p> <p>At first glance the location of the scheme, alongside a mainline railway station and a 6-lane motorway, appears to be well served by transport facilities. However, closer investigation indicates a very different scenario.</p> <p>Starting with the railway, a superior service is available from Ashford. Not at least of all in the context HS1, which does not stop at Westenhanger. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the local railway station will not meet all rail traffic requirements of the schemes population and that road traffic related to London bound rail journeys will be generated.</p>	LPA 503

		<p>Let's then consider the more significant issue of road traffic can the M20 motorway. Those loving locally know only too well the characteristics of the M20 are unlike any other motorway in the country. For sure, all motorways are prone to closure as a result of road traffic accidents and incidents and the M20 received its fair share of such closures. But, more significantly, the M20 between Maidstone and Folkestone is frequently impacted by incidents and contingency actions related to actions of the French and their impact on cross-Channel traffic: by disruptive incidents taking place at the Port of Dover, and the Eurotunnel terminal; and by the sheer volume of traffic that in peak periods are heading to the cross-channel facilities.</p> <p>It is not unknown for closures to last of multi-day periods. All of which has a massive impact on the local road structure, in particular the single carriageway stretches of the A20 between Maidstone and Ashford, and between Ashford and Folkestone, plus a knock-on impact on other A class and B class roads in the surrounding area.</p> <p>All of which requires that extraordinary attention is required to address the impact of such disruption when the significant, additional traffic from the proposed development is added to the mix. It is thus with horror than an obviously significant issue such as the single 'pinch-point' on the A20 east of Sellindge, where both the railway and the M20 cross the A20, controlled by traffic lights, is identified by the developer, and then dismissed as being of little consequence. Such arrogant and inconsiderate behaviour should not be allowed to migrate from proposal to approval.</p> <p>I speak as a resident of Aldington, a village that understands only too well the meaning of 'rat-runs' related to through traffic movements,</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>that have been a common experience of village life for many years. We see first-hand what happens when the M20 closes.</p> <p>As a result of which we see the clear potential for roadways such as (single lane) Church Road, Roman Road, and Frith Road to become the route of choice for those affected by M20 closures, A20 overload and the resultant tendency to use roadways that were never intended for the kind of traffic volumes that will clearly be imposed on them.</p> <p>Thus, my objection is clearly founded on requirement to incorporate appropriate road traffic infrastructure that will adequately accommodate road traffic infrastructure that will adequately accommodate road traffic population directly generated from the Otterpool development, but also that traffic additionally generated by closures of the M20.</p>	
13	Francoise Mountford	10.01.2023	<p>Further to the outline amended application received 10 December 2022 I would like to comment as follows.</p> <p>The time this planning application was sent near Xmas when people are busy preparing for the festivities is obviously another tactic for Folkestone and Hythe District Council to hope to receive few replies. This is a tactic for a Council to hope to receive few replies. This is the tactic for a council, who in 2017 advised residents of their purchase of farmland to be kept as farmland only to publicise the truth a few weeks later without any consultation that houses were going to be built on arable fields. The Leader's comment at the time: "it is only farmland."</p> <p>Folkestone and Hythe District Council never considered the cross district effect it would have on the village of Aldington which already had its share of house building and increase of traffic etc.,</p>	LPA 502

			<p>consequence of too many houses being built without extra infrastructure being provided.</p> <p>The garden town will be built right on the boundary of Aldington in Ashford Borough Council, miles away from Folkestone which it will not affect.</p> <p>Aldington has already had its character damaged by the large number of houses built in the village and surrounding area bringing so much traffic on its narrow rural roads and air pollution. Operation Brock a regular occurrence add to this traffic bringing gridlock to the village and its access roads which includes the B2067 where I live.</p> <p>In the last six years the traffic is such that it is no longer safe for children to ride to school, walk along there also to visit neighbours. The B2067 is narrow road with blind bends, pinch points and steep hills reflected Knoll Hill with most of houses built close to the road. The increase in traffic makes our house vibrate. Knoll Hill was a dirt track up to 1984.</p> <p>A proper road was built without sound foundation. The road has a fault line in the clay not helped by the old St Johns Woods either end side of the road in part of the road. The road collapsed a few years ago outside our driveway and was closed for seven months hence the reason I would like to know how the developers will stop extra traffic beyond Court at Street as I do not want to live near motorway traffic and have my asthma worsened having moved from town to the countryside (advised by consultant) for that reason.</p> <p>I also have to go to my local shop on my mobility scooter (not being able to walk since 1982) and I want to keep independence which extra traffic will take away.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>My view is that all the houses proposed to be built on the boundary must be removed, or even that this Garden Town not to go ahead in view of the Climate Change and war in Ukraine when we need to reduce pollution (this Garden Town will bring air pollution to the countryside as it will be car reliant) and we need all the arable land for crops.</p> <p>This development will only benefit the developers and wealthy buyers, affordable houses are never affordable to our local residents as already experienced.</p> <p>As for HS1 stopping at Westenhanger I would like to confirmation on this (Park Farm never had the station they were promised!!). However if this were to happen has any thought been given of what will happen to Ashford residents travellers and even Ebbsfleet! Obviously, cross district residents to the applicant. With all the recent events this application must be stopped.</p>	
14	Nicola Barratt	10.01.2023	<p>I have already commented 23.06.2022.</p> <p>My further comment is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looking at current ONS data, I find that the birth rate of the UK is falling. This is evidenced by the birth rate of 1,6 per couple or single mother. To maintain the status quo of the population the birth should be 2.11, that is to say, to maintain an equilibrium between death and birth, they should be equal - they clearly are not. With birth rates falling, who will be residing in the homes being built in the district over the coming years?</li> <li>• The application is being presented as a one town fits all -an autonomous town where all services and facilities are on hand.</li> </ul>	LPA 504



			<p>With the recent pilot schemes being proposed for Oxford and Canterbury, would Otterpool also be built as a 15-minute town with usual restrictions on movement for its inhabitants. Would it become a SMART - (Self-Monitoring Analysis and Reporting Technology) Town with the underlying Orwellian theme of 1984.</p> <p>These are areas of concern that have never been aired or discussed. Either way, this proposed development should never see the light of day. Get rid of it, once and for all.</p>	
Updated as at 17.01.2023				