

OTTERPOOL PARK – Y19/0257/FH

CONSULTATION SUMMARY TABLE

RESPONSES RECEIVED SINCE 16 MARCH 2023

CONSULTATION PERIOD 15 FEBRUARY 2023 TO 16 MARCH 2023

Comments received from 16 March 2023 onwards following notice of Planning & Licencing Meeting on April 4, 2023

(Representations received as at 03.04.2023)

Table 3				
Consultation Responses (Neighbour responses)				
Ref	Name	Date Received	Comments	LPA Reference
1	Margaret Ludlow	23.03.2023	This project is the worst thing that the planning committee has brought in. We need green space, the roads are in a shocking state, Hythe is a nightmare from over planning and not mending what should be. The water situation is very scarce and will not be enough to cope with the amount of houses that is on the plans. Otterpool is the last piece of green space that we all benefit from. Sellindge has been ruined with over building making what once a lovely small country village with just over 1300 residents to an ugly over developed mess. There is no space for anyone now. This development needs throwing out and the land reverting to	LPA 517

			farmland and the view of the North downs which is supposed to be an area of outstanding beauty kept. The planning committee is only there for a short while, while the damage of this project is what we live with forever. Shame on you all.	
2	J Boulden	25.03.2023	I OBJECT to the application on the grounds of insufficient provision of disposal of sewage for such a vast development and not enough detail that an excess sewage overflow will not be just flushed in adjacent watercourse thus polluting said watercourse	LPA 516
3	Lorraine Spencer	29.03.2023	<p>I thank you for the invitation and information regarding planning application Y19/0257/FH. Unfortunately, due to my ill health I am unable to attend in person, however if I am able, I would like to raise my objections again.</p> <p>I understand there have been over 300 objections raised by local residents, none of which have received any feedback. The Government initiative regarding Garden Towns advised locations for such should be brown field sites and local support was necessary, I do not recall any Consultation to ask local residents if they supported this local plan to turn a semi-rural area made up of several villages and hamlets into a vast urban area.</p> <p>The Government also stated the maximum financial support would only be available to Garden Towns of 10,000 homes, hence the likely increase from current 8,500 to meet this criteria. The infrastructure to support a new Town of this size is not and will not be available for years, in the meantime houses will be built without the facilities to support the inhabitants. This has happened elsewhere in smaller garden villages and towns with existing services placed under unbearable pressure.</p> <p>Issues such as water shortages and ecological pressures are discussed within the application, but clear evidence of how these are</p>	LPA 132

			<p>going to be resolved are only possibilities at this stage, as also the extension of Westenhanger Railway Station.</p> <p>I and many other residents feel there has been no constructive exchange with Folkestone and Hythe as from the outset residents have been told it will happen whether you like it or not! Our homes in Westenhanger have been and will be blighted by this application, we residents pay our Council taxes for local services and wonder why the Council are setting up Property development company's as Commercial enterprises using our taxes and borrowed monies. This area does not require 8,000 to 10000 homes and is unlikely to in the next 30 years, with the expansion of both Canterbury and Ashford being sufficient to meet local needs.</p>	
4	Saltwood Parish Council	29.03.2023	The Parish Council would like to reiterate its objections to the application as set out in our letter of June last year.	LPA 458
5	KCC Growth and Communities	30.03.2023	<p>The County Council, as statutory consultee welcomes the constructive discussions that have taken place with the LPA to ensure that the waste arisings from the development are satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>The County Council also welcomes the opportunity to work in partnership with both the F&HDC and the applicant to ensure that a new waste transfer station that meets both the needs of the development and the District is delivered.</p> <p>The County Council considers that the proposed conditions and Heads of Terms as set out in appendix A and B respectively, will ensure that the waste impacts of the development will be satisfactorily mitigated. Subject to the imposition of these conditions and obligations the County Council is prepared to withdraw its objection.</p>	LPA 401

			<p>If the proposed obligations and conditions are not accepted by the committee, the County Council's statutory objection stands.</p> <p>The County Council would like to thank the Council and its officers for the continued collaborative approach they have taken to date to positively plan for the delivery of a new garden settlement at Otterpool Park that is supported by the timely provision of infrastructure. The County Council would welcome continued engagement with the applicant and the Local Planning Authority to ensure that key infrastructure and services continue to be planned for, funded, and delivered to a high standard at Otterpool Park.</p> <p>If you require any further information or clarification on any matter, then please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
6	East Kent College	31.03.2023	<p>I am pleased to be writing to you today to support Planning Application Y19/0257/FH. I am writing on behalf of EKC Group, which is a family of six colleges and one training unit that stretch across East Kent providing education for some 15,000 Students and employment for more than 1,500 staff members and includes Folkestone College.</p> <p>Our College Group delivers technical and vocational provision, with many of those who choose to learn with us decoding within their home communities. It is therefore crucial that opportunities are afforded to them, both in terms of progressing into employment and in their ability to build a life for themselves following their time with us. The Otterpool Park garden town will help facilitate that ambition for learners, with a significant number of new jobs being created that is in line with the skills many of our students are learning.</p> <p>We have a vibrant and flourishing construction and built environment curriculum area, and the 8,500 houses and associated developments</p>	LPA 399

			<p>will provide clear opportunities for many of the learners we currently train. In line with this, we are working closely with Otterpool Park's LLP and have recently signed a Memorandum of Understanding to articulate the partnership and embed opportunities for students in the development.</p> <p>As part of the agreement, we will be working collaboratively to develop and implement a framework that ensures education, employment, and training for local people is at the heart of the Otterpool Park development. The framework will also support developers, contractors, and housebuilders to meet their skill needs, ensuring that job creation is seamless, and that housebuilders have skilled employees they need to deliver the ambitious targets.</p> <p>As a significant development, the depth and breadth of opportunities to engage for all of our curriculum areas and the students within them, in terms of employment, skills and training, are unparalleled in the district. Consequently, we believe that this will provide significant opportunity for our many students in the future. We therefore wholeheartedly support this planning application and feel it has the potential to deliver real benefits for the communities we proudly serve.</p>	
7	J P Hannah	03.04.2023	<p>I object to the above application.</p> <p>The land proposed to be built on is precious farmland, a valuable commodity. The war in Ukraine has shown how important it is that this country is self-sufficient in producing our food. If we continue building on our farm land then we will be forced to rely on other countries for grain etc. with very little coming out of Ukraine the shortage has already impacted in our supermarkets, a disaster which will only get worse.</p>	LPA 034

			This application is for a new town. It is enormous and will overshadow and destroy the little villages within the area. I object strongly.	
8	CPRE	03.04.2023	<p>CPRE Kent congratulates you on your monumental report to the Planning and Licensing Committee. We disagree with many of its conclusions and thank you for summarising our position in your report. We would however request you bring the following to the attention of members with your responses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on page 56 you have misquoted us. 'town-centre' should read 'two-centre'. This is an objection to the early proposal to build out two disconnected areas in 'Phase 1'. While phasing is not now up for approval, we will object strongly to any proposal to build out areas which are not next to areas already under development. The cohesion of the new town is at stake as is increased visual impact and protracted disturbance to existing residents. • we struggled with the wording of the paragraph on Otterpool Quarry in the summary. Will you please make clear whether the scheme offered for approval includes for that site to be developed as approved by KCC or re-developed for other uses? • the position on sand extraction from the area east of Westenhanger is unclear. Draft condition T2(9) implies that such extraction could proceed without a separate planning application to KCC and there is no mention of the additional environmental statement and public consultation that we would expect. Could this be clarified? • draft conditions are offered which appear to be relevant only at Tier 2 and RMA stages. It is understood that Tier 2 approvals will come to Committee and we would hope that at least the 	LPA 372

			<p>more important or controversial RMAs will also not be delegated. Are members being asked to agree all the draft conditions at this stage or only those labelled T1?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the conditions are extensive and will require close attention by your department. What proposals are there for staffing to cope with this? • finally, the concern we have expressed from the very beginning of the project both to yourselves and the planning inspectors remains. Houses will be delivered only at the rate and prices that the market will bear. The slow-down we said should be considered in any risk assessment is now a reality such that the viability of the plan is in serious doubt. Has this viability been reassessed? Isn't it time for a re-think in the light of changing government attitudes to housing targets and the growing urgency of action on climate change? 	
9	Stanford Parish Council	03.04.2023	<p>Stanford Parish Council has agreed I should write to you with its comments on your comprehensive report on Otterpool Park to the Planning and Licencing Committee and we request you bring these to members' attention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at 5.6 you state '[aside from KCC] There are no other outstanding objections from statutory consultees'. This must be corrected. The report goes on to list objections, including ours, most of which are indeed outstanding despite having been restated with each new submission • at 7.814 you mention 'proposed buffer land to the west of Stone Street'. We have in fact told OPLL that we require a buffer to surround all existing residential properties but only the part in Phase 1 has so far been discussed as to the detailed design. There are many obligations of the applicant to other 	LPA 461

			<p>parties listed in the draft conditions and accordingly we would request a further obligation to conclude an agreement satisfactory to Stanford Parish Council by which land surrounding existing properties in the Parish will be safeguarded from built development and with planting and essential infrastructure (if any) to designs acceptable to Stanford Parish Council. This agreement must be in place before approval of any lower tier planning application for this 'buffer' or adjacent parcels. Stanford Parish Council will also require funding for maintenance of any areas ceded to us.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• at 3.41 you state, 'there would be no through route to the railway station or to the Newingreen Junction, ensuring Stone Street serves as a quiet access to properties'. This is indeed what we have been advised by the applicant but unless we have missed it it's not stated in the documents submitted for approval. We require an undertaking that Westenhanger residents will not have to share Stone Street with construction traffic at any time and that Stanford South residents will at no time be required to access their properties through a building site. The applicant has indeed confirmed to us this will be the case, but we would like to see, in one of the many reports required by the draft conditions on traffic and/or construction proposals, the method by which these agreed traffic restrictions will be implemented and policed. Suitable provision for emergency vehicles will also be needed at all times.• we are concerned at the prospect of Hillhurst Farm being a potential source of bulk sand for the project. This could have a substantial impact on our residents and potentially much sooner than that area was originally programmed to be developed. Please confirm that any sand extraction operations	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>there would be the subject of an appropriate planning application addressing the full environmental impacts including details of the methods to transport the sand to where it will be used</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at 7.824 you imply that options for stewardship have been discussed with Local Parishes. There have been no such discussions with Stanford Parish Council, but we are ready to discuss as the programme firms up. • we think it essential (and have requested this) that the applicant establish an office to deal with enquiries and complaints from residents specifically to do with construction, and not just general matters of community engagement. This office should have powers to instruct any of the many contractors and subcontractors on the site. Please can this be included in the conditions. 	
10	Mrs Lorraine Spencer	03.04.2023	<p>I thank you for the invitation and information regarding planning application Y19/0257/FH. Unfortunately due to my ill health I am unable to attend in person, however if I am able I would like to raise my objections again.</p> <p>I understand there have been over 300 objections raised by local residents, none of which have received any feedback. The Government initiative regarding Garden Towns advised locations for such should be brown field sites and local support was necessary, I do not recall any Consultation to ask local residents if they supported this local plan to turn a semi-rural area made up of several villages and hamlets into a vast urban area.</p>	LPA 139

			<p>The Government also stated the maximum financial support would only be available to Garden Towns of 10,000 homes, hence the likely increase from current 8,500 to meet this criteria. The infrastructure to support a new Town of this size is not and will not be available for years, in the meantime houses will be built without the facilities to support the inhabitants. This has happened elsewhere in smaller garden villages and towns with existing services placed under unbearable pressure.</p> <p>Issues such as water shortages and ecological pressures are discussed within the application, but clear evidence of how these are going to be resolved are only possibilities at this stage, as also the extension of Westenhanger Railway Station. I and many other residents feel there has been no constructive exchange with Folkestone and Hythe as from the outset residents have been told it will happen whether you like it or not! Our homes in Westenhanger have been and will be blighted by this application, we residents pay our Council taxes for local services and wonder why the Council are setting up Property development companies as Commercial enterprises using our taxes and borrowed monies.</p> <p>This area does not require 8,000 to 10000 homes and is unlikely to in the next 30 years, with the expansion of both Canterbury and Ashford being sufficient to meet local needs.</p>	
11	Philippa Dale	03.04.2023	<p>I am hoping to attend the Planning Committee meeting tomorrow evening. I realise that I have missed the opportunity to participate, but am providing herewith information which I wish the committee to consider, and I hope that officers will kindly summarise it for the committee.</p>	LPA 304

			<p>I am a resident of Harringe Lane and strongly support the proposal to close Harringe Lane from beyond Harringe Court Farm to its junction with the B2067 at Court-at-Street, and to replace this section of the lane with a bridleway.</p> <p>I also seek reassurance that access to the sewage treatment plant proposed for Harringe Lane by heavy vehicles both during development and once complete, is kept to a reasonable level. Also that concerns about smell and noise from the plant are addressed within the proposals.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to refer the committee to the first paragraph of an email I received from Damian Collins on 26/5/16 (see below). Mr Collins supports the proposal but says "...by creating a masterplan for where development in this area could and also shouldn't take place, we can protect ourselves from future plans being brought by speculative developers". I wonder if this message has been lost in Sellindge which seems to be full of speculative development.</p>	
Updated as at 03.04.2023				