

Alexander Gunyon

From: Stephanie Green [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 June 2024 21:06
To: Consultations
Cc: mensahgreen@hotmail.com
Subject: Local plan

Categories: Blue category

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

--Email From External Account--

From:
Stephanie Green
[REDACTED]

Dear Stephanie,

Please send this to consultations@canterbury.gov.uk after filling in your name and address.

I am responding as a resident of the Canterbury District.

The comment below is in response to Chapter 1 of the Council's Local Plan

I object against the suggested plan for constructing a new town comprising 2,000 residential units on rural terrain situated north of Canterbury. The existing housing within the district already exerts substantial strain on public amenities. The identified area between Blean and Tyler Hill, characterized by its rustic charm, fertile agricultural lands, ecological significance, and accessibility challenges without the development of new roadways, is an unsuitable location for the erection of 2,000 dwellings.

The proposed plan falls short due to its glaring failure to explicitly state that policy C12 aims to reclassify rural land as urban.

Below is a response to Chapter 2, Policy C12

The Plan does not provide a clear indication of how the proposed development can be anything other than a car-reliant community, necessitating road building, heightened traffic influx into Canterbury, and a decline in living standards due to noise and air quality issues. All current roads are narrow rural routes, unsuitable for accommodating the increased traffic from the thousands of planned homes. No demonstrable evidence exists to suggest that attempts to promote greater bus patronage in the Canterbury district have been fruitful, rendering it highly questionable whether this approach will succeed in alleviating traffic congestion. The C12 proposals are at odds with the "2021 Land Character Assessment", which any present or future "Local Plan" should be grounded upon. The proposed development contravenes policy SS1.10, as it is encircled by various parts of the "National Nature Reserve", which harbors numerous rare and endangered species. The SS1.10 policy outlines the Council's intention to work alongside partners to extend and improve the interconnectedness of the "Blean Woodland Complex". Yet, this development proposal would make connectivity unfeasible.

The suggested construction would be detrimental to wildlife and biodiversity, which are hugely value for me and my family.

Many thanks for reading this email and for reconsidering the plan.

Best wishes

Stephanie Green