

Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2040

Chapter 1: Spatial Strategy

Policy	Number of written comments
Vision	508
Strategic objectives	377
Policy SS1: Environmental strategy for the district	381
Policy SS2: Sustainable design strategy for the district	238
Policy SS3: Development strategy for the district	421
Policy SS4: Movement and transportation strategy for the district	365
Policy SS5: Infrastructure strategy for the district	259
Any other comments	146
Total comments	2,695

Vision

- Protect nature, open space or farmland: 255 comments
- Against C12 or supporting universities: 224 comments
- More infrastructure and services needed: 186 comments
- Unfeasible or contradictory: 155 comments
- Too many houses: 76 comments
- Protect rural character: 64 comments
- Supports public transport or reduced car use: 55 comments
- Supports active travel or exercise: 55 comments
- General support: 54 comments
- Supports urban regeneration: 44 comments
- Supports affordable homes for locals: 41 comments
- Air pollution concerns: 38 comments
- Climate change or sustainability concerns: 31 comments
- Supports removal of old R1: 27 comments
- Protect heritage assets: 25 comments
- Public transport and active travel plans won't work: 18 comments
- Against Brooklands: 17 comments
- Support tourism or business: 7 comments
- Build more houses or include housing target: 7 comments
- Supports community facilities: 4 comments
- Restrict holiday lets: 4 comments
- General objection: 3 comments
- Too generic: 3 comments
- Improve quality of developments: 2 comments
- Against Mountfield: 2 comments
- Enforcement developer obligations: 1 comment
- No self-build policies: 1 comment
- Supports removal of EMC: 1 comment
- Supports Improved access to A2: 1 comment
- Build more dispersed housing: 1 comment
- Against C6 Merton: 1 comment
- Against R7: 1 comment
- Too Canterbury city focussed: 1 comment

Strategic objectives

- Protect nature: 181 comments
- Unfeasible or contradictory: 161 comments
- Against C12 or supporting universities: 155 comments
- Need more infrastructure and services: 114 comments
- Supports action on climate change or sustainability: 87 comments
- General support: 81 comments
- Protect rural character: 75 comments
- For public transport or reduced car use: 51 comments
- Protect heritage assets: 50 comments
- Too many houses: 45 comments
- More truly affordable homes for locals: 45 comments
- For active travel or exercise: 42 comments
- For urban regeneration: 37 comments
- Air or light pollution concerns: 36 comments
- Public transport or active travel won't work: 11 comments
- Improve development design: 9 comments
- For sustainable tourism: 6 comments
- Build more houses: 6 comments
- Support the rural economy: 5 comments
- Development damages health: 5 comments
- Against Brooklands: 4 comments
- For removing Eastern Movement Corridor: 4 comments
- For removing old R1: 3 comments
- Too generic: 3 comments
- Sale of homes to London councils is a problem: 3 comments
- General objection: 2 comments
- For supporting universities: 2 comments
- Restrict holiday lets: 1 comment
- Promote non-university-based businesses: 1 comment
- Create self-build policy: 1 comment
- Allow non-students to use unused student housing: 1 comment
- Build nearer settlements: 1 comment
- Support rural site allocations: 1 comment
- Against Mountfield: 1 comment

Policy SS1: Environmental strategy for the district

- Protect nature or general support: 165 comments
- Damages nature, open space or connectivity: 160 comments
- Unfeasible or contradictory: 126 comments
- Against C12 or supporting universities: 126 comments
- Improve sewage or drainage infrastructure: 54 comments
- Protect heritage or cultural distinctiveness: 49 comments
- Protect rural character: 35 comments
- For sustainable development or action on climate change: 34 comments
- Damages farmland: 32 comments
- Increases congestion or road safety concerns: 29 comments
- Too many houses: 27 comments
- Protect Stodmarsh: 27 comments
- Damages physical and mental health or exercise: 22 comments
- Air pollution concerns: 20 comments
- For more trees or maintaining existing woodland: 19 comments
- Improve drinking water infrastructure: 16 comments
- Protect Chequer's Wood and Old Park: 15 comments
- Biodiversity Net Gain is too high: 12 comments
- Support community facilities: 11 comments
- Improve medical and education services: 10 comments
- For removing old R1: 10 comments
- Strengthen wording on nature protection: 9 comments
- Increases noise pollution: 9 comments
- For urban regeneration: 7 comments
- Strengthen ecosystem connectivity: 7 comments
- Increases light pollution: 6 comments
- General concern or objection: 6 comments
- Pro allotments: 5 comments
- For public transport or reduced car use: 5 comments
- For active travel or exercise: 5 comments
- Against Brooklands: 5 comments
- Solar farm concerns: 5 comments
- Protect farmland: 4 comments
- Pro Broad Oak Reservoir: 3 comments
- Increase accessibility of open space: 3 comments
- Worsens climate change: 3 comments
- Public transport or active travel won't work: 2 comments
- Against winery: 2 comments
- Weaken flooding wording: 2 comments
- Supports Westbere marshes: 2 comments
- Damages tourism: 1 comment
- More wilderness areas without human access: 1 comment
- Reference partner organisations: 1 comment

- For new towns away from large settlements: 1 comment
- Against biofuel: 1 comment
- Too prescriptive: 1 comment

Policy SS2: Sustainable design strategy for the district

- Improve infrastructure and services: 57 comments
- Protect open spaces and nature: 54 comments
- Support net zero or sustainability measures: 53 comments
- Unfeasible or contradictory: 52 comments
- Improve quality of development: 47 comments
- Against C12 or supporting universities: 42 comments
- Improve community facilities: 25 comments
- Too many houses: 24 comments
- Protect farmland: 24 comments
- Lacks detail or strengthen wording: 20 comments
- Preserve heritage or cultural distinctiveness: 19 comments
- Improve community engagement: 17 comments
- General support: 17 comments
- Improve public transport or active travel: 16 comments
- General objection: 11 comments
- Damages rural character: 11 comments
- Air, noise, light pollution concerns: 9 comments
- Supports urban regeneration: 8 comments
- Development will be less viable: 8 comments
- More truly affordable homes for locals: 7 comments
- Public transport or active travel won't work: 7 comments
- Should be for less than 300 homes: 5 comments
- Improve internet services: 4 comments
- Impedes active travel: 3 comments
- Pro allotments: 3 comments
- Against W4 Brooklands: 2 comments
- Against old R1 policy: 2 comments
- Don't restrict cars: 1 comment
- Develop rural areas more: 1 comment
- Supports net zero water: 1 comment
- Include embodied carbon emissions: 1 comment

Policy SS3: Development strategy for the district

- Too many houses: 143 comments
- Protect rural character: 129 comments
- Against C12 or supporting universities: 99 comments
- Protect nature or accessible open spaces: 79 comments
- Improve roads or congestion: 66 comments
- Build more houses or consider our site: 62 comments
- Unfeasible or contradictory: 56 comments
- Support urban regeneration: 54 comments
- Improve housing mix or more truly affordable homes for locals: 46 comments
- Protect farmland: 44 comments
- Preserve heritage or cultural distinctiveness: 42 comments
- Improve sewage or drainage infrastructure: 40 comments
- Improve general infrastructure: 37 comments
- Improve public services: 35 comments
- General support: 29 comments
- Improve active travel or public transport: 27 comments
- Against old R1 policy: 22 comments
- Air, noise or light pollution: 16 comments
- Climate change concerns: 13 comments
- Supports business development: 8 comments
- C12 damages education: 6 comments
- Supports mental and physical health: 5 comments
- Crime concerns or London councils will buy homes: 5 comments
- Against Brooklands: 5 comments
- Policy too vague: 5 comments
- Reduce commercial floorspace: 5 comments
- Develop outside of settlement boundaries: 3 comments
- Active travel or public transport won't work: 3 comments
- General objection: 2 comments
- Don't only develop urban centres: 2 comments
- Make self-build policy: 2 comments
- Support C12: 2 comments
- Improve rural community facilities: 2 comments
- Supports more traveller's sites: 1 comment
- Reference the UN Sustainable Development Goal: 1 comment
- Supports removal of Eastern Movement Corridor: 1 comment
- Against nearby gypsy and traveller sites: 1 comment

Policy SS4: Movement and transportation strategy for the district

- Improve public transport: 178 comments
- Congestion concerns or developments worsen congestion: 149 comments
- Active travel and public transport won't work: 125 comments
- Improve active travel: 112 comments
- Against C12 or C12 contradicts reduced car use: 90 comments
- Improve roads: 62 comments
- Air and noise pollution or health concerns: 58 comments
- Protect nature and open spaces: 26 comments
- Supports removing Eastern Movement Corridor: 24 comments
- Public and active travel accessibility concerns: 24 comments
- Vague or transport modelling missing: 21 comments
- Urban parking concerns: 16 comments
- C12 damages active travel: 11 comments
- Too many houses: 10 comments
- Introduce congestion or emission charges: 6 comments
- Climate change concerns: 5 comments
- School runs worsen congestion or buses for schools: 4 comments
- Build more houses or consider our site: 3 comments
- New development should have good transport links: 2 comments
- Clarify requirements for developers: 2 comments
- Supports goods transfer stations: 2 comments
- Public transport safety or crime concerns: 2 comments
- Stop pavement parking: 2 comments
- Against Brooklands: 1 comment

Policy SS5: Infrastructure strategy for the district

- Improve drainage, sewage or water infrastructure: 107 comments
- Improve healthcare and educational services: 92 comments
- Funding or deliverability concerns: 77 comments
- Improve general infrastructure and facilities: 63 comments
- Improve roads or congestion: 54 comments
- Against C12 or supporting universities: 35 comments
- Protect farmland, open spaces and nature: 34 comments
- Too many houses: 33 comments
- Improve infrastructure before building houses: 29 comments
- Improve public transport or active travel: 24 comments
- Improve community and recreational facilities: 20 comments
- Consider alternative site or more development: 14 comments
- General support: 13 comments
- Support tourism and business in urban centres: 5 comments
- Improve housing mix or more truly affordable homes for locals: 3 comments
- Improvements are not fairly distributed: 3 comments
- Supports removing old R1 policy: 3 comments
- Supports removing Eastern Movement Corridor: 2 comments
- Against Brooklands: 1 comment
- Build near settlements: 1 comment

Other comments

- Protect open spaces or nature: 44 comments
- Improve roads or congestion: 34 comments
- Improve transparency accessibility and engagement: 26 comments
- Against C12: 24 comments
- Preserve rural character: 24 comments
- Too many houses: 23 comments
- Improve drainage, sewage or water infrastructure: 19 comments
- Protect farmland: 18 comments
- Improve detail, delivery and management: 18 comments
- Improve public transport and active travel: 15 comments
- Climate change or sustainability concerns: 15 comments
- Improve healthcare or education services: 14 comments
- Preserve heritage or cultural distinctiveness: 10 comments
- Match housing mix to local need: 8 comments
- Regenerate urban areas or local businesses: 8 comments
- Reduce air noise or light pollution: 7 comments
- General support: 6 comments
- Improve community or recreational facilities: 4 comments
- General objection: 3 comments
- Against Brooklands: 3 comments
- Public transport and active travel are not accessible: 2 comments
- Consider our site or build more houses: 2 comments
- Improve infrastructure before building houses.: 1 comment
- Create self-build policies: 1 comment
- Remove brickearth mineral from maps: 1 comment
- Measures threaten development viability: 1 comment