

OTTERPOOL PARK – Y19/0257/FH

CONSULTATION SUMMARY TABLE

NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES RECEIVED SINCE 11 JANUARY 2022
CONSULTATION PERIOD 15 FEBRUARY 2023 TO 16 MARCH 2023

(Representations received as at 16.03.2023)

| Table 3 | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------------|--|---------------|
| Consultation Responses (Neighbour responses) | | | | |
| Ref | Name | Date Received | Comments | LPA Reference |
| 1 | Lisa Cutler | 15.02.2023 | I made comments previously on these voluminous planning applications and I see nothing new in this one to acknowledge or amend any previous objections. 8,500 homes is too many. That is the main objection. Adding thousands more vehicles to our already congested roads would be horrendous. The hospitals are already under enormous pressure without adding so many more people. There is a vague reference to “health centres.” We need doctors and doctor’s surgeries as the current ones can barely cope with the patients they already have. Water companies are already telling us they won’t have enough water for residents by summer and so adding thousands more people will only exacerbate this problem, the devastation to the environment, the years of lorries thundering down the local roads causing damage (and more of an issue,) I believe it is | LPA 170 |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------|---|---------|
| | | | forecast to take decades to create this behemoth of an application which will cause enormous inconvenience to locals trying to go about their business, traffic bottlenecks. The list of objections goes on and on but, despite objecting to all these planning applications, the concerns are never addressed, much less fixed. My objection to the planning application remains until all the above are addressed | |
| 2 | Clifford Styles | 16.02.2023 | <p>Yes, I would like to lodge an objection, and have it noted and minuted, although it's probably futile and will be totally ignored. I object to the building of Otterpool Park.</p> <p>I base my objections on the fact I have lived in Sellindge for only 10 years, it was a lovely peaceful transient village up and including 2019. Since then we have lived a merry hell with Taylor Wimpey development of two sites, the noise, the lorries, the mud on roads, the parking of their vehicles in our cul de sac causing bottle necks, the disrespectful workers noisily shouting, it's a continuous nightmare from 08.00am to 17.00pm Monday to Friday, you can't sit in your garden now as they've built three storey buildings in complete eyesight of my garden and back rooms, complete invasion of my privacy.</p> <p>Now they're building storage units by the motorway bridge, further disruptive influences, digging up the new paths and roads. When the pair have finished we've now got to tolerate further development.</p> <p>The lorries through the village, again the workers, the noise for what! The council profiteering at the misfortune at the local residents yet again, this will be continued until long after most of the existing residents are deceased, no rest for the living or deceased. What have we gained: an extended school, which is attended by residents, and children that live away from Sellindge.</p> | LPA 507 |

| | | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------|--|---------|
| | | | <p>The NHS UK, which our surgery see very little of the money, the surgery is full to capacity, locum doctors, virtually impossible to see a doctor.</p> <p>That's basically it, we've suffered with virtually no compensation. They've put natural gas into the new builds, I believe the doctors and the school, they should have offered it to us in [REDACTED] as a small piece of compensation.</p> <p>So basically the Otterpool is just going to continue our tortuous existence in a was., small and lovely community. Hence that's what I base my objections on.</p> <p>The irony is I love horse rating and I moved here for the Folkestone races that closed.</p> | |
| 3 | Mrs Lorraine Spencer | 16.02.2023 | <p>I have previously raised objections to this plan, the recent additional of a three-stage plan does nothing to dispel the issues. It only serves to let the developers proceed in a piecemeal fashion, being able to 'be flexible' meaning they have the wriggle room to change the overall vision for Otterpool as they feel fit. My objections are that the proposal is too large, another Town is not required with Hythe only a ten-minute drive away, and Ashford continually extending outwards, there is little detail in the immense documentation on the style of housing and exactly how integration with the semi-rural surrounding villages of Westenhanger, Stanford and Sellindge will be managed. The problems with waste water, clean water etc., are only minimally addressed with mention of a possible waste water requirement. There are many factors not least health provision as the William Harvey hospital is currently unable to cope with the expansion in Ashford, I know from recent A and E treatment that both staffing and facilities are inadequate now, so how one or two health centres will be sufficient to meet the needs of such a large development is laughable. The whole concept of Otterpool garden town is misconceived at best, at worst I and many others believe it is a means to hide excessive</p> | LPA 139 |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|------------|--|---------|
| | | | <p>spending which this Council is good at, with little to show for it for local tax paying residents. Who agreed to the turning of a rural district into a suburban Town? The World is changing away from commuter towns, trains are too expensive and unreliable. Electric cars are now being found to be not as clean as first thought and too expensive, public transport is not meeting demand and not being developed. Water shortages are likely to get worse with global warming etc., etc., I see nothing in these plans that show any depth of thought on the likely future needs of a semi-rural community that wishes to preserve that lifestyle</p> | |
| 4 | Peter South | 16.02.2023 | <p>I am unable to understand how this development can claim to have medical facilities within the plan when we currently cannot maintain our existing facilities in the area. How will we attract medical personnel to enable such a development not to have a devastating effect on the rest of the area which is already under considerable strain?</p> | LPA 508 |
| 5 | Denise | 16.02.2023 | <p>We live directly on the A20/Barrow Hill at the old racecourse end of the village. We are neither for nor against a huge housing development built on our doorstep; we understand the desperate need for homes; affordable homes especially. We say this despite that our village home will be swallowed up by development on all sides. I would however plead with planners to consider what Sellindge residents, living on the A20, suffer night and day, every day of the year and the resultant physical damage to our homes and to our mental health. Nobody buys a home situated on an A road expecting peace, we know. However, since buying our property in 2008 the traffic through the village, HGV's especially, has increased way beyond any reasonable expectation. This is due to several factors - Operation Stack where all M20 traffic is diverted through the village,</p> | LPA 510 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>past our home. Signage to supposedly deter HGVs from this route is simply ignored by HGV drivers and we suffer a constant, thundering stream of heavy vehicles which shakes (literally so.. the whole house, heavy furniture, the bed you're trying to sleep in) the house every 20 seconds or so, all night, meaning it is impossible to sleep which has a huge impact on our health. Other factors in the volume of heavy vehicles are the local HGV lorry parks a few hundred yards along the road, delays/problems at Eurotunnel and the ports, closure of the M20 for works, heavy vehicles to and from a local industrial park and the ongoing new housing developments in Sellindge. There have been numerous occasions, when the M20 is closed for any of the above reasons and all traffic is diverted through the village, when it is impossible to leave one's home. Traffic is gridlocked outside, for several miles in both directions on the A20 making it impossible (especially for someone of limited mobility like me) to get to the local shop or to the GP to collect medications, and so on. Aside from the impact this has on our quality of life, the fabric of our home is being damaged due to the constant vibration/heavy shaking of the building. Since the HGV problem really began to significantly worsen between 5 and 10 years ago, cracks (which go through the plaster and into the brickwork) have appeared from the upper corners/radiating outward of windows to the front elevation of our home and a building surveyor has said that this is due to heavy vibration/shaking of the house as a result of HGV traffic (not helped by the dreadful state or the road surface). As we hope will be understood, we do not feel that Sellindge Village and surrounding areas has anywhere near sufficient capacity for yet another vast increase in road traffic as a result of a large development such as Otterpool. We desperately hope that planners will consider the already poor quality of life that many Sellindge residents ensure and that planners will do all they can to free</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|---|----------------|------------|--|---------|
| | | | Sellindge and any new, adjacent developments of all 'through' HGV traffic and where possible, keep the area free of gridlocked traffic resulting from the aforementioned causes. | |
| 6 | Nicky Hargrave | 16.02.2023 | I wish to strongly object to this development, roads in this area are often congested and many of the surrounding villages have seen a huge increase in traffic cutting through them in order to avoid overused main roads. I feel the size of this application is far too big the impact this will have on the local wildlife and yet again on villages that surrounds this development is huge. The last thing Kent needs is an oversized development in an area where we already have problems with hospitals, doctors and water supply issues come the summer. I live in Aldington and know from first hand experience the issues we already have with cars using the village as a cut through when there are problems on the M20 or A20 and I fear this will only increase. | LPA 293 |
| 7 | Ben Corrie | 17.02.2023 | I believe we do not the appropriate infrastructure in place to support more houses in the area yet. I would like to see more reservoirs and sewage management plans built before I ever support more homes. We cannot currently cope as it is. | LPA 511 |
| 8 | David Nash | 17.02.2023 | The building of these house will bring the surrounding areas to a gridlocked standstill. The roads into Hythe can not handle the extra builds already put up in the last five years. The roads are gridlocked every morning and night, water being the most valuable. We have water shortage issues already in our area, the construction will lead to dry taps and long lines of people waiting to collect bottled water. The area can not support this size of building, it will destroy it. | LPA 512 |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|------------|---|---------|
| 9 | Josh Cremin | 17.02.2023 | <p>This is a countryside village, which I consider to already have 3 towns on its doorstep, Hythe, Ashford, and Folkestone. We do not need another.</p> <p>The peace and quiet is what has attracted residents to this area over generations with the already existing convenient infrastructure in place just about suitable. Considering residents to this county already pay for some of the highest council taxes, the local infrastructure is still below par.</p> <p>Roads in the area are awful and rarely maintained, even when they are, the works are below standard creating a cycle of problems.</p> <p>Buses in the area are already minimal, telecommunications has not even caught up to current times.</p> <p>All of these problems are going to be majority impacted but not for the concern of money grabbing corporations as well as county and local council to increase their wealth and not really consider or care for local residents needs and concerns.</p> <p>Lastly the traffic flow is already extremely heavy, especially with HGV which the roads currently struggle with, let alone with the consideration of all the extra mass traffic issues regularly caused by the Port of Dover and Eurotunnel!</p> <p>Not only 1, but the majority of the residents I know and have spoken to in the area strongly object to this development!</p> | LPA 513 |
| 10 | Kerene | 18.02.2023 | <p>Roads to Hythe can't cope. Parking already a nightmare by coast in Summer when flooded with tourists. We don't have infrastructure for so many new residents.</p> | LPA 514 |
| 11 | Julie Mann | 20.02.2023 | <p>Another blot on the Garden of England landscape. Impact on wildlife and quality of life terrible.</p> <p>More pressure on surrounding areas. Ashford is unrecognisable now – will they not be happy until this part of Kent is the Concrete Garden</p> | LPA 347 |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------|------------|--|---------|
| | | | of England. This scheme is doing nothing but making money for a few. So sad for all. | |
| 12 | Marc Baker | 22.02.2023 | I'm not a local resident however I do work close to this proposed application and although it does not impact me directly even I can see that this is a ridiculous application! This will be nothing more than a blot on an already beautiful landscape. | LPA 515 |
| 13 | Mr & Mrs C Moberly | 01.03.2023 | <p>Our previous comments on the earlier amended applications dated respectively August 2022 and November 2022 drew attention to the fact that not only had our original 'Reasoned Objection' dated March 2022 had been ignored in both subsequent rounds of amendment, but drawing number OPM(P)5003_reve WW Heights had been amended. This amendment involved removing any limit at all on the building heights shown as adjoining (and indeed encroaching on our property).</p> <p>A charitable observer might be prepared to believe that this was a human error caused by accidentally omitting details which had previously been present. However, failure to make any correction (or attempted correction) at the third opportunity must surely be regarded as deliberate.</p> <p>It would appear to be a typical developer tactic to see 'what we can get through planning' by simply failing to carry out proof reading and then letting the omission of any height restriction go through the outline process uncontested. This should not be acceptable.</p> | LPA 256 |
| 14 | Annie Thurgarland | 03.03.2023 | I work in river restoration and general attempts to improve the massive decline in biodiversity and the ever increasing damage to our rivers. Our rivers are a major infrastructure – this development, is criminal – the damage that this amount of development will do to our | LPA 516 |

| | | | | |
|----|-----------------|------------|--|---------|
| | | | <p>already suffering water systems will be immeasurable – the East Stour is already struggling/badly impacted by residual properties in its floodplain – and although the proposals leave a little bit of floodplain, they do not take into account the overall impact of this many people/developments being placed so close.</p> <p>This is backwards thinking – no mitigation will remedy what is being suggested – and I cannot see a justification for such short term thinking – yes, housing is needed – but not surrounding the river like this.</p> | |
| 15 | Charles Hopkins | 10.03.2023 | <p>I object to the above proposal. It will further erode the one-time generally open country between two major settlements. It will create even more traffic and transport problems for this area of East Kent and Channel Tunnel services. It will not assist in the regeneration of Folkestone. It seems to be a fortuitous venture, just snatched out of the air for economic purposes.</p> | LPA 509 |
| 16 | Derek Burles | 13.03.2023 | <p>Your communication of 15th February 2023 indicates that the council have received 'further amendments' to the Outline Planning Application and 'further information and other information' in relation to the Environmental Statement. But provides no other pointers or indications regarding the location of these amendments and information.</p> <p>Given the relative scale and complexity of the application and the related documentation, do you not consider it appropriate to provide either a summary of the changes made or, at the very least, references to the location of the changes within the Application and Environmental Statement documents? Without such inputs, the process of consultation and response is severely damaged and questions whether the developer and the planning authority are meeting their obligations.</p> | LPA 503 |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------|------------|--|---------|
| 17 | Donald Broad | 14.03.2023 | <p>Your communication of 15th February 2023 indicates that the council have received 'further amendments' to the Outline Planning Application and 'further information and other information' in relation to the Environmental Statement. But provides no other pointers or indications regarding the location of these amendments and information.</p> <p>Given the relative scale and complexity of the application and the related documentation, do you not consider it appropriate to provide either a summary of the changes made or, at the very least, references to the location of the changes within the Application and Environmental Statement documents?</p> <p>Without such inputs, the process of consultation and response is severely damaged and questions whether the developer and the planning authority are meeting their obligations.</p> <p>Yet another opportunity to comment on yet more revised plans for Otterpool Park new town.</p> <p>Unfortunately, Folkestone and Hythe District Council appear to have ignored all of the valid comments regarding the important issues raised by local residents at previous consultations. Since the proposals for Otterpool Park were first announced in 2016 there has been almost universal opposition from people living in the area – the villages and towns.</p> <p>Local people have expressed serious concerns about the inadequate capacity of the road network in the area and the difficulties and long delays in being able to see a GP or to receive hospital treatment.</p> | LPA 227 |
|----|--------------|------------|--|---------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>There are also concerns about water shortages and other infrastructure; also the loss of important agricultural land when food security is becoming a major issue for the country. People have made their opinions known by holding marches, public meetings and attending developers' public presentations and consultations.</p> <p>As yet, FHDC has not addressed any of these major issues sufficiently. In 2016 FHDC's own Places and Policies team, with public consultation, identified small and medium sized sites throughout the district that could be used to meet all of the increasing local housing demands for years, without the need for a massive new town development.</p> <p>Yet, at the same time, FHDC pressed on with this 'garden town' scheme without consulting the public or even the Place and Policies team.</p> <p>Over the six years plus since then, there have been thousands of new homes built and planned in Sellindge, Hythe, and the adjacent districts of Ashford and Canterbury. All of this development exacerbates the problems of the inadequacies of local roads, health services and water supply.</p> <p>Local communities are totally opposed to the destruction of the tranquil rural character of where we live/</p> <p>FHDC councillors should listen to the people that they were elected to represent and refuse planning permission for this ill-conceived development. Otterpool Park – not wanted and not needed.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|----|------------------------|------------|--|---------|
| 18 | Debbie Reynolds | 15.03.2023 | <p>Large scale development on farmland and semi natural habitats should not be considered when there are large areas of empty industrial estates/units that could be renovated into sustainable low carbon residential areas in this area of Kent.</p> <p>The impact and stress on water resources is going to be huge, resulting in irrecoverable impacts on freshwater invertebrates and associated species. Nutrients enrichment, leached car pollutants, light pollution, habitat fragmentation will occur and accelerate the pattern of local biodiversity decline.</p> <p>There's no clear plan for developing low carbon, water collecting sustainable homes. Any planned developments should deliver buildings that are the epitome of energy efficient residences that merge into the landscaping with living roofs, bird/bat/bee homes. There are other options of development to consider before removing this valuable green 'break' in housing.</p> | LPA 113 |
| 19 | Leslie William Barratt | 15.03.2023 | <p>I refer to my previous comments dated 23.6.22 and 9.1.23. My stance has remained the same irrespective of the latest revision to the Otterpool Planning Application. A response would be appreciated from an Officer or any other employee at the council on how they will deal with the back peddling on green issues pertaining to water supply. Promises of low water consumption on the proposed Otterpool site is simply a lie. Based on previous developments supported by F&H District Council, it appears that sustainability has never been at the forefront of their thinking. This council has totally ignored genuine concerns expressed by local residents.</p> | LPA 266 |
| 20 | M Holden | 15.03.2023 | <p>The development is unsustainable! The roads cannot cope with the traffic as it is!</p> <p>The devastation to wildlife will be horrendous.</p> | LPA 274 |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------|------------|--|---------|
| | | | The local hospitals are already under immense pressure and cannot cope! It will have a huge negative impact which will be felt for a long time by all. | |
| 21 | K Holden | 15.03.2023 | As my previous comments. I whole heartedly object to this development. The 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???? The plans are unsustainable and do not meet the needs of surrounding communities. The devastation to local wildlife will be 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. | LPA 260 |
| 22 | Alison Baldwin | 15.03.2023 | This is again a missed opportunity for the applicant to address how they will prevent traffic using Church Lane Aldington/Sellindge (between the A20 and the Roman Road Aldington as a cut through if and when the A20 is congested through Sellindge. The single carriageway Church Lane has height and width limits, but it is unfortunately regularly used making it dangerous for residents who are walking, cycling or horse riding as well as more hazardous for general road users. It also causes a nuisance for residents when oversize vehicles try and access the A20 and get stuck. This is also the Conservation area of Aldington with a number of listed buildings, many close to the road which should be protected from an increase in traffic and road use. Measures such as closing Harringe Lane Sellindge will compound this even further. I would urge the planning team to look further than the confines of Sellindge and to consider the devastating effect this increase in traffic will have on the residents of Aldington and Church Lane. | LPA 118 |

Consultation responses table
 Otterpool Y19/0257/FH

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------|--|---------|
| 23 | Edward Evans | 16.03.2023 | I object to this application. I am deeply concerned that the applicant is attempting to include the closure of Harringe Lane at such a late stage with wholly inadequate public consultation and no proper modelling of the wider traffic impacts, particularly on Church Lane. I am concerned that the proposed closure will displace traffic onto other roads such as Church Lane that are entirely unsuited to additional traffic due to their width and height restrictions. | LPA 520 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Updated as at 16.03.2023 | | | | |