

Comment on the Draft Canterbury District Plan 2040

For the avoidance of doubt I object most strongly to the proposals detailed, and make my observations thus:

Your “marketing led” descriptions of the various benefits to the local community is flawed in so many respects and in many cases CCC are not in a position to deliver on these vague promises.

1. You state that there is an emphasis on “green areas”, yet without any compunction whatsoever you are proposing to dig up green areas and long standing farmland and replace this with ghettos of housing.
2. You state that there will be jobs and businesses available, but where are these jobs coming from?.....CCC has no control whatsoever on whether jobs are created...or businesses decide to move into the area. There are already many retail locations empty in Canterbury City Centre alone as well as empty Commercial premises in East Kent.
3. You state that the housing planned will benefit the community....where are the 20,000 plus residents going to come from???.....East Kent?.....NO, as the developers proposals will no doubt cater for 3/4/5 bedroom homes which will be more financially beneficial to them, but out of the reach of many Kent residents!.....May I suggest that their marketing focus will be advertising these homes much further afield...London perhaps where there is financial benefit to move to East Kent.....GHETTOS!!!!
4. You state that the emphasis will be on public transport serving these various developments. Again, you have no control whatsoever over the routes that Stagecoach may or may not implement (in fact Stagecoach have removed a resident beneficial route that used to serve Rough Common!!!)
5. You state that you will cater for space for an extended Canterbury General Hospital and provide for additional health provisions. Yet again this is a pointless promise as anything associated with health is the sole responsibility and decision making by the Department of Health and not CCC!!!
6. You state that there will be “Cycle Led” emphasis for transportation.....This is so laughable!!!.....
 - a) How are parents going to get their children to school??? On bikes???
 - b) How are parents going to get their weekly shop from out of centre supermarkets???On bikes???
7. There is already a critical situation with regards to the provision of water and sewage disposal. Both of these essential utilities and the provision of a reservoir at Boad Oak would be within the mandate of South East and Southern Water and NOT CCC! There are already rumours of clandestine removal of sewage from some developments by tankers.

It would not be surprising that CCC have not insisted that developers contribute to a new sewage farm as a condition of their getting planning approvals.....That would be just too controversial and probably put the developers off!!

8. This bus and bike led concept is totally contradictory to the proposal to demolish a school (Policy C12) and in its place build an access road to the proposed development.....and what will this access road be used for??.....CARS! as no one in their right mind would travel by bike from a hill located development to anywhere in the City or beyond!

9. Policy C!2 is NOT a panacea for the provision of “beneficial housing for the benefit of the community.....**IT IS ALL ABOUT MONEY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE UNIVERSITY!!!!**
Plus the Sustainability Appraisals fall very short of the legal requirements to achieve compliance .In addition, the legal, planning and policy processes are deeply flawed.
In addition and “lobbying, evidence, and other submissions from the University of Kent have not been provided to the public for scrutiny or challenge. This approach would indicate an “under the table” method of obtaining planning permission!!!
THERE IS NO TRANSPARENCY!
10. “Improvements to ROUGH COMMON Road”???.....NO explanation as to what these may be , and yet again a “woolly and evasive “ statement.
A) Is CCC considering widening the road and removing houses to make that possible?
B) Is CCC considering increasing the existing 30MPH speed restriction so as to allow motorists zooming to work at 60plus mph from the University Development? (this would be for Highways to decide and not CCC)

ALL IN ALL A FLAWED PROPOSAL THAT DOES NOT ADDRESS ANY OF THE REAL ISSUES IN THE DISTRICT BUT SIMPLY BUILDS HOUSES FOR THE BENEFIT OF CCC SO THAT THEY CAN FINANCIALLY BENEFIT FROM THE SALE OF THE LANDS, THE DEVELOPER PLANNING COSTS AND LEVIES, AND 10,000 COMMUNITY CHARGES!!!!

IT’S ALL ABOUT MONEY AND NOTHING ELSE!!

J Clark

████████████████████

████████████████████

03/06/2024