

Alexander Gunyon

From: Gwyneth Clark [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 June 2024 15:56
To: Consultations
Subject: Re Chapter 2 (Canterbury), Policy C12.

Categories: Blue category

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

--Email From External Account--

I wish to make the following comments regarding Land North of the University of Canterbury.

2.15 I do not believe a full sustainability assessment was carried out by the university and that the council has not carried out proper due diligence. In addition the plans do not include the "UK's commitment to net zero".

1. Development Mix-

I understand the pressure local councils are being put under to build houses. But the Formula used to calculate how many is outdated and not fit for purpose. The council should conduct its own up to date study to ensure we build the correct amount of homes on the most up to date information.

The developers seem always to build semi or detached houses and no consideration is given to lowering the footprint needed by building terraced/town houses. The council should seek to develop this thus lowering the price and attracting a range of people and not just those with large pockets.

I applaud the need for "older persons housing" but unclear what this actually means? The council should be encouraged to ensure the accommodation is for everyone to access i.e. "social older persons housing". Canterbury doesn't need anymore homes for the wealthy older folk.

I attended Blean school over 40 years ago and it is probably outdated and not fit for purpose anymore. But to knock it down just to build a road is ludicrous. The council should seek to enhance Blean school with sympathetic architects who would keep the character of the building whilst making it for purpose.

It is also prudent at this stage to ask what commitment has been received from NHS England to address the additional health requirements.

And also from the Department of Education what commitment has been received from them to ensure our education system can support the level of extra children of all ages.

The commitment to build a waste water treatment works is weak as I cannot see anywhere that there has been any commitment by Southern Water to do this. The state of the waters in the UK is not for this email but no housing should be allowed to start UNTIL the treatment plant has been built.

4, Access and transportation

The council is correct to provide pedestrian and cycle connectivity with the city centre, but this will not address the number of extra cars this development will produce. The number of cars crisscrossing Canterbury in term time grinds the city to a halt. Unless free buses are offered to all children to and from their school parents will continue to drive them. The development will bring Canterbury to a halt!

The council appears to have forgotten Blean is on a hill, and no one is going to cycle up the hill with their shopping. They will be left with no option but to use their car again going across the city adding to the already busy roads.

Rough Common Road...it is busy now with the traffic backing up Palmers Cross Hill....this will only increase. In addition Palmers cross Hill is a dog leg turning, how can the road be upgraded to make this safe for residents and car users?

I am all in favour of buses but Stagecoach have not committed to providing the service you are thinking about. Indeed they cut the service through Rough Common and indeed many other places deemed not viable. This development will not work without cheap good transport links

Gwyneth Clark



Virus-free www.avg.com