

Alexander Gunyon

From: Gillian Showler [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 June 2024 16:43
To: Consultations
Subject: Draft 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--

Good afternoon,

Please see my below email, which relates to Chapter 1, Q1 and Q2 and also Chapter 2, Policy C12 of your Draft Local Plan.

I write to ask you to withdraw your development proposal which is at odds with your own and the university's policies.

The government imposed housing targets are not mandatory. A housing development of this size and the generic housing target vastly overstates Canterbury's future housing requirement based on our population projections. It would be a car dependent development, seriously adding to congestion, air pollution, carbon footprint etc. Only able-bodied individuals would be able to cycle or bus into town. Your suggestion of extra cycles and additional buses will only work for journeys that require a single activity/destination or indeed if there is not a heavy 'shop' to carry. What about a doctor's appointment, followed by a supermarket shop and a school run? The present bus service is a shambles and does not run effectively, yet you expect hundreds more people to use them. What about the elderly, infirm and disabled? I recently attempted to use a bus to come home from Boughton and on another occasion to catch a bus into town. On both occasions the timetable at the relevant bus stops was to say the least a figment of imagination and indeed at one bus stop there was a sign stating that buses were not operating on this route due to road closures. The roadworks that instigated this closure had been completed a number of days previously but nobody had considered removing the sign. This left me pondering whether I should wait for a bus, this coupled with the fact that the bus was seriously late, just led to confusion for me and other people stood waiting with their fingers crossed. I would add that on both occasions it was not rush hour, which one could possibly state was a reason for the delay.

It is unacceptable that drawings of new slip roads are unavailable until after the consultation deadline. If Rough Common Road were to become a major arterial road the quality of life for those residents would be unhealthy, dangerous, noisy and the value of their house would fall significantly. It will spoil a lovely village and at the same time effectively merge three rural areas into one conurbation. As with much of your plan there are serious contradictions and certainly your stated aspirations for environmental improvement are comprehensively contradicted by the plan to build 2000 houses on the land north of the university.

Residents of the three affected parishes have chosen to live in a rural area for a reason. The loss of the existing biodiversity, agricultural land, conservation areas, wildlife and historical sites conflict with your own policies and a cause for great concern. The land deserves special protection and if you fail to change your plan, I can only say you will inevitably be viewed with contempt and shame at in perpetuity.

I believe much of your transport plan will only dissuade people from going into town with the commercial benefits this provides and instead will go to the Ashford outlet or Bluewater. Clearly and understandably Canterbury cannot compete with these vast shopping outlets and therefore to provide more reasons not to shop in town can only have a negative impact on the city centre shops. The city is already a sad sight in certain quarters since Covid. The draw of

shopping in Canterbury is already dangerously reliant on Fenwicks, so we and most importantly you, the council, need to have positive policies that draw people into the city centre.

The proposed housing development would have negative impacts on air quality, geology, water quality (already a massive problem), waste, sewage, health and heritage. As a city we already have infrastructure problems, for example the nearest fully functioning hospitals are a minimum of 30-40 minutes away. Your plan suggests infrastructure issues will be resolved, without wishing to be rude, words come cheap, actions and positions end results aren't so easy, as we see day on day with politicians and councils throughout the country.

Yours faithfully,

Gillian Showler,



Sent from my iPad