



**Derek Green**

· 14 July at 08:10

Canterbury City Council have now ratified their local plan. Within that plan they have made provision for a Green Gap, which is meant to create a green corridor between the large Mountfield housing estate & Bridge Village. Even before the ink is dry on CCCs local plan, it would seem that the Green Gap is under threat from Bridges Neighbourhood Plan.

Some of the housing sites being evaluated for inclusion within the Neighbourhood Plan, would require roads to be built across and proposed Housing built on the green gap.

I am not apposed to housing development pre se, and there is some merit in stopping developers from cherry picking sites by designating a site within the Bridge NP.

But I feel that any site that the parish council put forward for selection by the villagers, should not include sites that involves tarmacng over or erecting housing on the gap.

What do you think ?

[See more](#)



Top of Form

[Like](#)[Comment](#)[Share](#)

Marie Lockley, Anne Dickenson, David Anderson and 3 others like this.

[Comments](#)



Heather Greenstreet Agree

Like · 14 July at 08:45

[Remove](#)



Tara Pidcock I agree Derek!

Like · 14 July at 08:58

[Remove](#)



Alan Atkinson Derek

Any NP has to evaluate a number of possible sites: so that is what is being done.

However, plans come from developers, parish councils and their committees merely get to respond.

And I will remind you that you have been talking to the developers, and yet did not disclose what you talked about, even when I asked you directly.

So please, get off BPC's case, and their Neighbourhood Plan committee volunteers: the people who serve on either of those groups have served this village well.

If you want a target, try the developers, and the District's Planning Officers: they get to actually decide upon the potential applications that you seem to be complaining about so much. The BPC volunteers do not.

And remember, the Village as a whole gets to decide upon the whole NP.

And if you would very kindly share with us all exactly what you and Cantley's agents said to each other...

Like · 1 · 14 July at 10:54

[Remove](#)



Pat Hume Not exactly a reply I would expect from the Chairman of the Parish Council!

Like · 14 July at 11:32

[Remove](#)



Anne Tapley Agree

Like · 14 July at 11:37

[Remove](#)



Derek Green Alan, It was you that wrote to Canterbury City Council asking them to modify the green gap to the benefit of the developers. When the letter came to light, You had to apologise and retract that request. I arranged a site visit with Cantley's agents to put forward alternatives to building on the Green Gap, Something that you could have done. We will see if Stuart Garnet & Charlie Gooch can persuade Cantley Ltd to take on board my Ideas. If they do then you Can evaluate the new drawings in due course. The one thing I did tell you at the Neighbourhood plan Sub Committee, was that the Green Gap was a line in the sand for me. The Village want to maintain the green gap as outlined within Canterbury City Councils

Local Plan. Given your track record with regard to the green gap, I won't be letting this drop. Now that we know that you that you are following this thread. Can you guarantee the members on this site, that you and your wife will vote against the inclusion of any housing development site appearing in the Neighbourhood plan. That entails building roads across or houses on the Green Gap.?

Like · 14 July at 12:07

[Remove](#)



Alan Atkinson First: the village residents expressed support for the site you mentioned. As you already have been told, it cannot just be dumped because some others did not like the idea. So, following the advice of the Canterbury Planners, I asked the Inspector specifically to consider that site, because I had already been told, I already knew, that he would be most unlikely to support any change. BPC would then have a reason, in planning terms, to drop the site, rather than just that some in the Village did not want Bridge to become contiguous with the City. (Plenty of places are, it is not a sufficient planning reason, and that is the key point.) Any Developer could show the previous support expressed for the site when they put in their development application. And that is what you just do not seem to understand. Now you have been told this so many times it is now becoming rather dull. So as for my record re. the Green Gap, it seems to me that you have entirely misrepresented what I did. Well I will forgive you that, but please get it right in the future. You also misunderstood the proposals from Cantley for Great Pett Farm, and you suggested that there was to be 40 houses there, I believe. And you appear to misunderstand the situation regarding housing applications within the Village, and what housing applications I have and have not supported. And are you suggesting that I should promise you that another Cllr will vote as I instruct them? You misunderstand that situation quite drastically. And if you expect that Cantley will or will not sell land off for development on your say so, then I suspect that you misunderstand the situation yet again. And finally, what did you tell Cantley's agents when you had your chat with them? As dealings with Cantley potentially affects the entire village, perhaps you should tell? Of course, I wonder, had you not actually been seen, would you ever have let the general public know that you had chats with the landowner/developer?

Like · 1 · 14 July at 14:44 · Edited

[Remove](#)



Pat Hume I repeat - not exactly a reply I would expect from the Chairman of the Parish Council!

Like · 14 July at 14:02

[Remove](#)



Derek Green Alan, Following on from your statement "I asked the Inspector specifically about that site, because I had already been told that he would be most unlikely to support any change. BPC would then have a reason, in planning terms, to drop the site" Given what you have said in your reply above, that Bridge Parish Council were looking for a way of dropping the Conyngham Lane site. Can you confirm that the Conyngham Lane site will not appear in the Neighbourhood plan, as your reason to drop it has been confirmed ? Just a simple Yes or No will do, other wise your statement makes no sense.

Like · 1 · 14 July at 15:50

[Remove](#)



Mary Stars If they are called holiday homes infrastructure isn't needed.

[Like](#) · Yesterday at 01:33

[Remove](#)



Shirley Cork Oh do we hold parish council meetings on face book now...?

Surely this should be aired and sorted in the appropriate place?

[Like](#) · 2 · Yesterday at 03:11

[Remove](#)



Emily Fraser I'm a little shocked by the tone and personal nature of one or two of the comments here, especially if they're coming from the chairman of the parish council. I think everyone on the council and other committees should be thanked for all their hard work on everyone's behalf. I imagine it often feels like a thankless task - so thank you all 😊 But if there's anything being misrepresented here I'm worried its the idea that the village is in support of more buildings to join us up more with Canterbury. Why would we want that? 😞 I gather the last public meeting in the village hall showed that villagers were overwhelmingly against this. I do hope the council will sing from the same hymnbook as the villagers they represent on such an important issue.

[Like](#) · 3 · Yesterday at 03:39

[Remove](#)



Shirley Cork Shame on you all save it for the meetings or call one !

[Like](#) · Yesterday at 03:55

[Remove](#)



Steve Fawke I was immensely proud to take on my role as Parish Councillor but seriously having second thoughts about whether being a councillor is worth all the stress. I've lived in this village for nigh on 50 years, gone through the local school system with everyone else, raised a child and even got married in the local church. To use the old cliché, I simply wanted to give something back.

Parish councillors work their proverbial socks off for this village and it seems to me that some people do little else but criticise, find fault, ignore facts, create their own facts, undermine and besmirch us as individuals.

Most us are long-time residents of this village and I also include the non-councillors fighting their way through the Neighbourhood Plan process. While I don't sit on the Neighbourhood Plan I'm more than a little disappointed at the inaccuracies and tone of this thread. I'm disappointed for many reasons not least by some of the comments and I'm not referring to Alan's. Alan has my full support on this and I share his anger and frustration.

Progress and news of what is happening with the neighbourhood plan is on the agenda at every BPC meeting. The author of this thread has attended most BPC meetings and surely

knows that the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan must work alongside and in tandem with the Districts Local Plan. Being that he also regularly attends council meetings he has had ample opportunity to speak to councillors and those involved in the process. As Shirley kindly put it “shame on you”.

Every member of this community will have a chance to have their say before this long winded and very painful process is complete and “OUR” Neighbourhood Plan is adopted. With my parish councillors hat off! I’m also one of the creators of this page. John Corfield and myself created this page to provide an online sense of place, a place for residents to interact in fellowship and hopefully, with a little community spirit. We’ve tried desperately to keep this page free of politics and discord which is why some posts get removed and those that cross the line get banned. Overall, the page has been a complete success and spawned many similar community pages across Kent.

This page was not created by the parish council but as I said two residents simply wanting to bring the village together. If you have nothing better than to stir up division and discord, to attack and needle those who are simply trying to do their level best to serve the village then this page is certainly not the place for you so be warned.

[Like](#) · 1 · 22 hrs · Edited

[Remove](#)



Douglas Harding steady, Mr Fawke! 😊

[Like](#) · Yesterday at 09:29 · Edited

[Remove](#)

An admin turned off commenting for this post.