

Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2040

Chapter 2: Canterbury

Policy	Number of written comments
Policy C1: Canterbury City Centre Strategy	154
Policy C2: 43 to 45 St George's Place	82
Policy C3: Land north of Canterbury West Station	93
Policy C4: Canterbury City Centre Regeneration Opportunity Areas	86
Policy C5: Canterbury Urban Area	112
Policy C6: Land at Merton Park	130
Policy C7: Land to the North of Hollow Lane	98
Policy C8: Nackington Police Station	55
Policy C9: Milton Manor House	69
Policy C10: Land to North of Cockerling Road	62
Policy C11: South West Canterbury Link Road	71
Policy C12: Land north of University of Kent	1,244
Policy C13: Becket House	65
Policy C14: Land at Station Road East	62
Policy C15: Land at the Former Chaucer Technology School	68
Policy C16: Land at Folly Farm	55
Policy C17: Land at Canterbury Business Park	99
Policy C18: Land on the eastern side of Shelford Landfill	49
Policy C19: Wincheap Commercial Area	90
Policy C20: Land to the south of Sturry Road	70
Policy C21: Canterbury Urban Area Regeneration Opportunity Areas	57
Any other comments	89
Total comments	2,960

Policy C1: Canterbury City Centre Strategy

- More needs to be done to enhance heritage and culture in the city: 28 comments
- More traffic restrictions required: 24 comments
- Should use empty buildings to develop more housing: 14 comments
- Improve public transport: 14 comments
- Improve shops available in city: 13 comments
- Improve infrastructure: 13 comments
- Will have negative impact on residents: 10 comments
- Need clear plans: 9 comments
- No more new houses: 8 comments
- Existing business should be supported: 7 comments
- Plan would ruin the city centre: 7 comments
- Moving the volume of traffic is not fixing the problem: 6 comments
- Parking charges should be changed to encourage more visitors: 6 comments
- Tourism needs to be managed and kept in line with local needs: 5 comments
- More policing required in the city centre: 5 comments
- Car parks should be retained: 4 comments
- Need for more housing to be delivered: 3 comments
- Addition of more cycling and walking paths is positive: 3 comments
- Revitalise the city centre: 2 comments
- Keep the market in the city: 2 comments
- Scale of plans are too large to deliver: 2 comments
- There is not enough funding to deliver the scale of development planned: 2 comments
- Removing vehicles will have negative impact on shops: 1 comment
- Better conveniences (toilets) needed in the city: 1 comment
- More attention required to accessibility in the city centre: 1 comment

Policy C2: 43 to 45 St George's Place

- Agree with policy: 22 comments
- Disagree with language of plan and proposal: 9 comments
- Plan needs to be in keeping with heritage: 8 comments
- Concern over traffic volumes and road access: 6 comments
- Consideration needed to the commercial impact of businesses: 5 comments
- Housing density planned is too high: 4 comments
- Improved cycling/walking routes are required: 3 comments
- Support for higher quality housing: 3 comments
- Develop empty commercial areas first: 3 comments
- High quality design brief needed: 2 comments
- Car parking needed: 2 comments
- Green space needs to be protected/improved: 2 comments
- Improvements to public transportation required: 2 comments
- Make homes affordable for local people: 1 comment
- Additional housing development required: 1 comment
- Concerns regarding cost/sustainability barriers to development delivery: 1 comment

Policy C3: Land north of Canterbury West Station

- Delivery of additional rail infrastructure is necessary: 29 comments
- How will these improvements be included in the plan: 9 comments
- Support for improved public transport links: 9 comments
- Cycling/Walking provision must be increased/protected: 8 comments
- Development should keep in line with heritage: 8 comments
- Concern over impact to wildlife/lack of greenspace: 7 comments
- Policy wording requires amendment/additional detail: 6 comments
- Developments to rail infrastructure unnecessary: 3 comments
- Concern over increase in traffic: 2 comments
- Concern over impact to existing infrastructure: 2 comments

Policy C4: Canterbury City Centre Regeneration Opportunity Areas

- Keep the car parks open: 18 comments
- Policy is too vague: 14 comments
- Impact to local residents should be considered: 10 comments
- Environmental consideration needs to come before development: 7 comments
- No mention what will happen to listed sites: 6 comments
- Revitalise disused buildings before developing new sites: 6 comments
- Removing car parks will put off visitors: 4 comments
- Consider impact on accessibility and accessible places: 4 comments
- Concern on impact on infrastructure: 1 comment
- Cycling infrastructure must be maintained/protected: 1 comment

Policy C5: Canterbury Urban Area

- Protect the landscape/greenspaces: 32 comments
- Concern of increase in traffic: 25 comments
- Improve infrastructure: 19 comments
- No more new houses: 16 comments
- Not enough detail in policy/object to policy wording: 14 comments
- Support development/policy: 13 comments
- Reuse empty retail/commercial space before new developments: 11 comments
- Protect wildlife: 9 comments
- Public transport cannot replace private car use: 6 comments
- Strongly object to building on southern side of city: 3 comments
- Concern over validity of the consultation process: 2 comments
- Protect historical sites: 2 comments
- Remove hospital plans: 1 comment
- Concern over crime and safety: 1 comment
- Concerns for accessibility: 1 comment

Policy C6: Land at Merton Park

- Residents will be affected by loss of green amenity and green space should be protected: 46 comments
- Additional pressure on roads to be considered, despite promotion of active travel: 46 comments
- Negative impact on biodiversity: 33 comments
- Local plan unclear in some sections/needs rewording: 32 comments
- Local infrastructure won't cope: 27 comments
- Housing numbers are not justified: 19 comments
- Support for development: 18 comments
- Agricultural land should not be built on: 15 comments
- Concerns over sewage disposal: 8 comments
- Concerns over heritage assets: 7 comments
- Concern over lack of/ loss of safe pathways/cycle paths: 6 comments
- Modelling/assessments required prior to any developments: 6 comments
- Concern policy will not be delivered due to limitations: 5 comments
- Suggested public transport improvements needs better planning: 5 comments
- There is a need to mitigate flood risks: 4 comments
- Smarter, condensed housing is needed: 4 comments
- Concerns from developers that funding and decisions may impact significant developments: 3 comments
- Traffic in Wincheap already can't cope: 3 comments
- Will make people over-reliant on vehicles/car journeys into city centre: 2 comments
- No social housing included: 1 comment
- Concern regarding proposed football location for lack of inclusivity: 1 comment
- Suggestions from developers made to reallocate land to speed up development: 1 comment

Policy C7: Land to the North of Hollow Lane

- Concern of traffic increase: 32 comments
- Protect landscape: 30 comments
- Will destroy natural habitats: 20 comments
- Local Plan detail incorrect/wording needs to be changed: 19 comments
- No more new houses: 12 comments
- Public transport links/ walking & cycling routes need to be improved first: 7 comments
- Infrastructure is not suitable for an increase in residents: 7 comments
- Improve sewage infrastructure: 6 comments
- How will fresh water supply be maintained: 5 comments
- Concerns developers will not deliver on requirements: 5 comments
- Keep the green gap: 4 comments
- Housing needs to be affordable for locals: 4 comments
- Support for improved public transport links: 3 comments
- Modelling/assessment is required before full assessment can be made: 3 comments
- Good maintenance budget needed for green areas: 1 comment
- More consideration for vehicular infrastructure needed, including resident parking: 1 comment
- Concerns from developers that plans may not be deliverable without further planning with council officers: 1 comment

Policy C8: Nackington Police Station

- Agree with policy: 14 comments
- Concern over lack of supporting infrastructure: 3 comments
- Housing development needs to be affordable for local people: 3 comments
- Too much development proposed: 2 comments
- Details in local plan incorrect: 2 comments
- Further planning needed with officers: 2 comments

Policy C9: Milton Manor House

- Protect the green gap: 14 comments
- Concern of traffic increase: 13 comments
- Reduce amount of houses: 9 comments
- Against loss of green spaces: 9 comments
- Concern over impact to existing infrastructure: 9 comments
- Support policy: 7 comments
- Details of local plan unclear: 6 comments
- Concern over lack of protected cycling and walking routes: 4 comments
- Plans for Biodiversity Net Gain are unclear: 3 comments
- Concern over conflict of interest with ex councillors: 3 comments
- Concern over lack of affordable homes: 2 comments
- Will lead to urban sprawl: 1 comment
- Smarter development required in the city before more house building: 1 comment

Policy C10: Land to North of Cockerling Road

- Concern of increase in traffic: 11 comments
- Protect landscape: 11 comments
- Improve infrastructure: 10 comments
- Local Plan details unclear/need rewording: 7 comments
- Too many houses: 6 comments
- Should provide smarter higher density housing: 3 comments
- Support for policy: 3 comments
- Protect historic location: 2 comments
- Plans for Biodiversity Net Gain are unclear: 2 comments
- Concern homes will not be affordable for local people: 1 comment
- Developer concerns they may not be able to fully deliver due to planning constraints: 1 comment

Policy C11: South West Canterbury Link Road

- Concern of increase in traffic: 25 comments
- More detail needed about policy: 20 comments
- Approve of plans: 9 comments
- Will harm the environment: 8 comments
- Concerns public transport will not be a feasible replacement: 6 comments
- Concern that policy will not be delivered: 3 comments
- Improvements should be made to walking/cycling paths: 3 comments
- Developer concern that policy may be delayed due to constraints/conflicting priority: 2 comments
- Assessment of modelling needed before impact confirmed: 2 comments
- Road is not financially viable: 1 comment
- Concerns of significant air pollution on suggested road: 1 comment

Policy C12: Land north of University of Kent

- Negative impact on countryside / greenfield / ecology/ agriculture: 1,006 comments
- Concern of traffic increase/road access: 913 comments
- Concern over impact to wildlife and endangered species: 567 comments
- Concern about impact on heritage assets: 384 comments
- Concern over impact to existing infrastructure/Infrastructure will require improvement: 334 comments
- Concerns over increase in pollution/reduction in air quality: 326 comments
- Concerns about sewage: 287 comments
- Concerns about loss of character/community of the surrounding villages: 279 comments
- Consider future healthcare provision/lack of current healthcare facilities: 245 comments
- Concern for the demolition and rebuilding of Blean primary school: 244 comments
- Local plan missing details/conflicting with existing policies/laws: 242 comments
- Concern around University relationship to CCC and the University mismanaging of finances: 214 comments
- Concern public transport will not provide the right level of service/be supported long term: 196 comments
- Flooding concerns: 188 comments
- Scale of development too large: 172 comments
- Walking and cycling routes will be unusable as unsafe or terrain is too difficult: 140 comments
- Concern about impact on water supply: 128 comments
- Lack of supporting documentation/data provided for the proposals: 90 comments
- Concern over loss of recreation spaces and for events like parkrun: 83 comments
- Redevelop brownfield sites first: 71 comments
- Housing is not affordable for local people: 51 comments
- Support for development: 34 comments
- Concern of how developers are held to account for delivering the full policy requirements: 29 comments
- Concern regarding the consultation process: 29 comments
- New GP surgery needed: 12 comments
- Recommendation to change wording of local plan to account for changes from developers/ infrastructure providers: 12 comments
- Further consultation with direct stakeholders and national organisations needed: 9 comments
- Road safety measures needed for Tyler Hill Road: 9 comments
- Concern over loss of accessible places: 8 comments
- Concern over increase in anti-social behaviour: 4 comments
- Recommendations from developers to lower policy targets to increase speed and flexibility of developments: 1 comment

Policy C13: Becket House

- Agree with policy: 19 comments
- Redevelopment of brownfield sites should be the first option: 14 comments
- Lack of infrastructure: 5 comments
- Concern over impact of traffic: 4 comments
- More high-density housing required: 3 comments
- Car free development is not realistic, provide parking for residents: 3 comments
- Make houses affordable for locals: 2 comments
- Provide outdoor space: 2 comments
- Development is too high density: 2 comments
- Public transport needs improvement before it can be considered a feasible option: 2 comments
- Develop more policies with other health providers: 1 comment
- Wording changes requested to the local plan: 1 comment
- Further cycling connections required: 1 comment

Policy C14: Land at Station Road East

- Improve local road infrastructure: 8 comments
- Support high density on brownfield sites: 7 comments
- Approve of proposal: 6 comments
- Do not get rid of the car park: 5 comments
- Lack of supporting infrastructure: 5 comments
- Cycling/pedestrian improvements required: 5 comments
- Wording requested to be changed: 3 comments
- Area is already too built up: 2 comments
- Lack of detail presented in plan: 2 comments
- Car parking should be restricted in line with car free development: 1 comment
- Area not desirable for housing: 1 comment
- Restrict commercial development: 1 comment
- Develop a hostel to support local people first: 1 comment
- Housing needs to be contemporary: 1 comment
- Concern public transport not sufficient for strategy: 1 comment

Policy C15: Land at the Former Chaucer Technology School

- Leave as green space: 13 comments
- Approve of plans: 12 comments
- More detail needed in local plan documents: 10 comments
- No more new houses: 5 comments
- Lack of supporting infrastructure: 4 comments
- Land owned by the school and should be left to them to develop: 3 comments
- Should be used just for a school: 2 comments
- Site should remain without parking allocated: 2 comments
- Development will cause increase in traffic: 2 comments
- Should consider vehicle parking: 1 comment
- Concern over lack of schools in Canterbury: 1 comment
- High density housing should be the priority: 1 comment
- Development should not be restricted and instead mixed development promoted: 1 comment

Policy C16: Land at Folly Farm

- Not a desirable site for housing / plans have previously been rejected: 8 comments
- Lack of/missing detail in local plan: 8 comments
- Concern for increase in traffic: 7 comments
- Protect farmland: 6 comments
- Should be increase in buses and cycle lanes: 2 comments
- Infrastructure requires improvements: 2 comments
- More social housing needed: 2 comments
- Homes need to be affordable for locals: 2 comments
- Further stakeholder engagement required: 2 comments
- Support plans: 1 comment
- High density housing required: 1 comment

Policy C17: Land at Canterbury Business Park

- Would harm Kent Downs AONB: 46 comments
- Concern of increase in traffic: 31 comments
- Protect the countryside/farmland: 22 comments
- Concern over increase in pollution: 16 comments
- Requirement to change local plan details/wording: 7 comments
- Brownfield land should be developed first: 6 comments
- Support the plan: 5 comments
- Concern over lack of infrastructure: 5 comments
- Will provide much needed employment in the area: 3 comments
- Further stakeholder engagement required: 3 comments
- Renewable energy needs to be built in as standard: 1 comment
- Further cycling infrastructure required: 1 comment

Policy C18: Land on the eastern side of Shelford Landfill

- Details missing in local plan: 5 comments
- Increase in traffic is a concern: 4 comments
- Agree with policy: 4 comments
- Needs to be more provision for waste handling: 3 comments
- Detailed assessments of pollution required: 3 comments
- Further stakeholder engagement required for local plan: 3 comments
- Unsuitable site for homes: 2 comments
- Infrastructure is insufficient: 2 comments
- Concern for damage to infrastructure: 2 comments
- Additional safe cycling/walking routes required: 1 comment
- Improvements needed for public transport: 1 comment

Policy C19: Wincheap Commercial Area

- Traffic congestion solution needed: 22 comments
- Support the policy: 19 comments
- Gyrotory system is not fit for purpose: 14 comments
- Greenspaces needed to be protected: 10 comments
- Concern local plan is missing details/require amendment: 9 comments
- Improve cycling and walking access: 9 comments
- Needs to include sewage infrastructure improvement: 7 comments
- Do not adversely affect flood areas and waterways: 6 comments
- Concern for increase in pollution: 6 comments
- Build on brownfield sites before using greenfield sites: 6 comments
- Deliver more housing units: 5 comments
- Have a mix of business and residential properties: 4 comments
- Reduction needed in housing already planned: 4 comments
- Local plan missing details/details incorrect: 3 comments
- Public services will not operate as intended: 2 comments
- Heritage assets need assessing and protection: 2 comments
- Increase in healthcare infrastructure required: 2 comments
- Would impact the character of rural villages: 2 comments
- Avoid residential development in flood zones: 1 comment
- Follow the Wincheap vision document: 1 comment
- Use for industrial purposes not residential: 1 comment
- Further engagement with stakeholders required: 1 comment

Policy C20: Land to the south of Sturry Road

- Support for policy: 24 comments
- Keep this land open: 6 comments
- Protect the site: 6 comments
- Concern over increase of pollution: 5 comments
- Concern for flooding of the area: 5 comments
- Concern of traffic increase/road infrastructure: 5 comments
- Improve cycling/walking routes route: 4 comments
- Lack of infrastructure: 4 comments
- Concern for data used in policy/concern for missing data in local plan: 4 comments
- Concern over how to achieve net neutrality/time taken to achieve: 3 comments
- Concern over value of strategy: 2 comments
- Objection to plan as land is claimed not available: 1 comment
- Link road should remain part of local plan: 1 comment
- Public transport should be improved first: 1 comment
- Concern over ability to hold developers to account: 1 comment

Policy C21: Canterbury Urban Area Regeneration Opportunity Areas

- Agree with policy: 11 comments
- Prioritise regeneration over new build: 9 comments
- High density housing should be the priority: 6 comments
- Very little information regarding this policy: 5 comments
- Consideration should be given to increase in traffic: 4 comments
- No more new houses: 4 comments
- Development would impact biodiversity and ecology: 4 comments
- Concern for impact on current infrastructure: 3 comments
- Ensure cycling links are retained: 1 comment
- Keep the offices in Military Road: 1 comment
- Concern to risk over heritage sites: 1 comment
- Add edible gardens around military road: 1 comment
- Improve public transport: 1 comment

Any other comments

- Protect green spaces/woodland/farmland: 23 comments
- Amount and size of developments should be reduced: 22 comments
- Lack of detail/conflicts written in local plan: 22 comments
- Transport Strategy should take private cars into consideration as volume of traffic will increase: 18 comments
- Plan will have a huge negative impact for residents and the area: 16 comments
- Concern with impact to infrastructure: 9 comments
- Approve of policy/policy changes: 8 comments
- Concern plan is to mostly assist with university debt: 6 comments
- Should retrofit and improve existing housing: 6 comments
- Concern over impact to heritage sites: 4 comments
- Flexibility in wording where developers/stakeholders request policy changes: 3 comments
- Public transport improvements should be prioritised/may not be sufficient: 2 comments
- Further engagement with stakeholders required: 2 comments
- No explanation of how you will hold developers to account: 2 comments
- Central car parks should be retained: 2 comments
- Concern regarding loss of Blean Primary School: 1 comment
- Increase in social housing is required: 1 comment
- Walking/cycling routes should be improved: 1 comment
- No information given on how this will be funded: 1 comment
- Maps are not clear enough: 1 comment
- Restrictions should be put in place for holiday homes: 1 comment
- Bypass plans should be retained: 1 comment
- Should aim to maintain people's way of life: 1 comment
- Lack of policy surrounding coastal protection and improvements: 1 comment

