

Alexander Gunyon

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 June 2024 15:32
To: Consultations
Subject: Objection to The Draft Local Plan 2024

Categories: Blue category

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

--Email From External Account--

My name is Gill Lampard and I live at [REDACTED]

I wish to object to Chapter 2 - Canterbury Policy C12 - Land North of the University of the Draft Local Plan.

I believe this site is totally inappropriate for the large scale mixed use development being proposed.

There would be a huge loss of agricultural land. I do not believe the proposed development can justify the loss of such an important agricultural area which will not be replicated anywhere.

This development will result in the villages of Blean, Rough Common and Tyler Hill being merged into one. Although green spaces are being proposed, they would not appear sufficient to separate the villages.

I do not believe access to the site is adequate. It is proposed the majority of traffic will use Rough Common Road. To suggest this extra traffic would use a road through a village is not acceptable. This road can get very busy and parts are narrow. How can improvements be made to allow all the extra traffic access. If parking on the road is restricted, what alternative parking will be made available? Currently the junction/roundabout at the Whitstable Road gets very congested in the morning rush hour.

The main access to the development site will be roughly where the Crab and Winkle Line meets the Whitstable Road. To have two main road junctions in such close proximity to each other does not seem sensible. Added to this is the congestion created by parents dropping off their children at Kent College. They bring the traffic to a standstill in the mornings.

As a keen cyclist and walker I am pleased to see there will be improvements to walking/cycling connections to the wider area. However I do not see this as a reason to assume fewer car journeys would be made. People may well walk and cycle but I see this very much for leisure purposes not for example for work or shopping. I do not believe people will start cycling to work in such a hilly area or when it is cold and wet. How many people who live in this development will actually work within a short cycle ride of their homes?

I am concerned how the walking /cycling routes will actually work alongside the new roads. Will they be completely separate and what will be left of the existing Crab and Winkle Line? Canterbury parkrun currently

enjoy using the C&W Line. It would appear that this would no longer be possible and be a huge loss to the local community.

A transport hub in the development with a new bus route sounds good but if it only connects the development with Canterbury West Railway Station and the town centre it would seem somewhat limited. Based on the poor bus service currently available, it would seem unlikely that any new service would be of a sufficient level to encourage residents out of their cars and onto a bus. People like the convenience of a car which can take them from their drive to their destination. A new bus service would need to be very frequent and have various destinations. Having had two children who relied on the bus service to get from Rough Common to Simon Langton Boys School every day, I am very aware how poor the service is. They were frequently late having allowed themselves over an hour for the short distance to school and on numerous occasions had to walk part of the way.

The site suffers from regular flooding and some of it is under water for large parts of the winter. By building over the majority of the area, the flooding will only become much worse.

The whole area will lose its wonderful character - the rural area so close to the villages and Canterbury which so many people enjoy, the heritage and the wildlife. Despite the Plan suggesting various ways in which these important features will be retained, the sheer scale of the development will no doubt destroy or adversely affect many of these features.

The Plan says proportionate land and build contributions will be made towards education and healthcare facilities. How will this work in practice when we can see that healthcare services are already over subscribed? In an area which has a Grammar School System, where will the extra Grammar places be provided when there is a restriction on new such schools being built?

I am pleased to see that the Phasing and Delivery of the development has been considered but very concerned to read that any improvements to Rough Common Road need not be made until 50% of the dwellings are occupied. This means that all the construction traffic and vehicles associated with 1,000 dwellings plus the non residential elements will be using the road with no improvements having been made. This is not acceptable.

For these reasons I do not believe this Policy should be adopted.

