

Alexander Gunyon

From: Aaron Gmail [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 June 2024 13:31
To: Consultations
Subject: Local Plan

Categories: Green category

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

--Email From External Account--

My following comments relate to Chapter 1, Q1 & Q2 and Chapter 2 C12 of your plan.

The house building targets are excessive and I believe based on other available information that you have over estimated the population growth in Canterbury over the period of the plan. I have great concern, as to the impact that the 2000 targeted homes on the University land and also the proposed 1500 homes at Brookland Farm will have on the area.

I would conservatively estimate, that 3500 new homes will lead to at least an additional 5500 cars, with the accompanying impact on a vast array of day-to-day elements. As with much of your plan there are huge contradictions. A central part of your plan is biodiversity and yet you believe there is justification to destroy a huge area of ancient agricultural/woodland. Similarly the University is very good at preaching biodiversity but when it suits them this is totally ignored.

In your plan, you talk about supporting the growth of our universities and colleges. We all appreciate that the university is an important part of our City but that doesn't mean it should dominate our city and we, the long term citizens should pay the price for their incompetence and mis-management. Furthermore it is my understanding that Canterbury already has one of the largest student populations per head of any city in the world.

As part of this plan the Council intends to demolish the current 'outstanding' Blean Primary school to build an access road onto Whitstable Road and similarly, to build another access road on part of the Crab & Winkle Way that goes past the The Oaks Nursery School and comes out, opposite Kent College. The Council previously shelved a plan to make Rough Common Road a bypass road, it appears this is being totally ignored, feels rather like a stealth tax. This would have been a retrograde step prior to the plan to build 3500 houses but this would now make Rough Common Road an undesirable residential area, with a considerable negative impact on the value of the houses in that road.

Blean school actually use the Crab & Winkle way as part of their learning, this is valuable heritage site, I'm not your decisions take this into regard.

Your Vision for the district, references 'Healthy communities'

- New healthy communities will be of high-quality, low carbon design and investment in infrastructure.

Once again the sceptic in me, feels this is a contradiction with much of what you are planning and much of what has happened in the past. As an example, the facilities at the K&C Hospital are totally inadequate and with an increasing population this will be even more apparent. Yes, we have had a change in the political landscape of our council but I see little in this plan that gives comfort.

I would ask the council to consider much smaller developments that do not have such a huge negative impact on the local environment. Brownfield sites are highlighted in your plan and Wincheap is referenced as a priority. There are numerous brownfield sites in the city centre, which I believe were highlighted for development but have been shelved due to sewage issues. The obvious examples being Debenhams and Nasons. If this can't be resolved, then why should we believe that the huge developments you are planning won't come with an accompanying adverse effect on water quality and sewage.

I also believe that your transport plans whilst well meaning are somewhat short sighted and pay scant regard to the historical layout of our city and the limitations this imposes. If we are not careful in terms of 'car accessibility' we run the risk of encouraging people to hop in their cars and go to more 'car friendly' shopping centres, eg Bluewater and the Ashford outlet, with a potentially large adverse cost on the sustainability of retail units in our city.

Finally, I would ask the Council to take a more robust approach in challenging the number of houses that are needed to be built in this area. I do not believe that Canterbury with its heritage history and the fact it has UNESCO status does not have very strong credentials for special treatment and it is also my understanding that the standard methodology calculation that you refer to in your plan is not a mandatory positioning but merely a starting point. Are you as a Council really pushing back hard enough?

Can you please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Yours faithfully,

Aaron Willcox, 