

Alexander Gunyon

From: Robert Benfield [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 June 2024 12:32
To: Consultations
Subject: Draft Canterbury Cycling and Walking Implementation Plan to 2045 - Comment on Proposals

Categories: Green category

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

--Email From External Account--

This is a comment on the Draft Cycling and Walking Plan of the Local Plan 2025-2045. I generally welcome this plan with its well-researched proposals. However, I want to suggest changes to proposals CS14 and CS15 in the Canterbury cycle network.

Proposal CS14 is to "Remove parking, widen footways and install table junction to provide better crossing area at the junction of Beaconsfield Road and St Michael's Road." As a resident of St Michael's Road, I wish to object to the removal of parking spaces in Beaconsfield Road. They are essential for residents. On the SE side of Beaconsfield Road there is a terrace of houses (numbers 2 – 32) without any off-street parking. Similarly on the NW side, numbers 11-17. Several of these houses are student HMOs, which by their very nature can have two or more cars each. All the on-street parking spaces here are very heavily used at all times of day and night.

If these parking spaces are removed, residents of this part of Beaconsfield Road will be forced to park in St Michael's Road. This is not an acceptable solution; numbers 5-15 and 19 St Michael's Road have no off-street parking, and neither do numbers 2 and 10. The on-street parking spaces on the SW side of St Michael's Road are heavily used, all the way up to the junction with St Michael's Place. At number 17 we have a private driveway for off-street parking, but this is frequently blocked by inconsiderately parked vehicles.

At present there is just about a workable balance between the number of on-street parking spaces in Beaconsfield Road and St Michael's Road, and the demand for them. Removal of parking spaces in Beaconsfield Road, as proposed, would destroy this balance and make it impossible for residents here to park in the locality of their own homes.

One of the aims of proposal CS14 seems to be to protect cyclists by slowing traffic at the junction of Beaconsfield Road and St Michael's Road. I do not see that this is necessary. Traffic speeds here are already limited by speed humps, a pedestrian crossing, and the tight radius and restricted visibility at the junction (especially for vehicles turning out of St Michael's Road into Beaconsfield Road, in either direction).

By all means improve signage and road markings for cyclists and motorists at this junction, as proposed recently by Kent County Council, but I believe it would be a bad mistake to remove these parking spaces in Beaconsfield Road.

Proposal CS15 is to "Investigate "Share with Care" length of path and removal of barriers" at Hackington Place, specifically the underpass at the railway line. This seems to me to be a bad idea. A significant proportion of cyclists currently ignore the "cyclists dismount" signs here, and cycle through the underpass and along the narrow pathway, creating a hazard for pedestrians. Removal of the barriers can only make this problem worse.

I would like to propose an investment in upgrading this pathway and underpass under the railway line. At present it is extremely unpleasant for all who use it, whether cyclists or pedestrians. It feels unsafe, even in daylight. The underpass is very poorly lit, by two rather faint lights which are vulnerable to vandalism. It is not visible from nearby properties. It is regularly targeted by graffiti "artists", and cleaning this graffiti comes at a high cost in council funds and/or volunteer time. If the old station car park is built on, as proposed, the path leading to the underpass from

Station Road West will become darker, and even less visible from the street.

I would like the lighting, within the underpass and also either side of it, to be significantly improved with securely mounted, high-intensity LED lighting (directed downwards so as not to cause light pollution nuisance). CCTV camera coverage is also needed here, for general security and to deter vandals. I also suggest that the walls of the underpass be painted with high-technology graffiti-resistant paint, so that any graffiti simply wipes off.

Doubtless this would be expensive, but I suggest it will be a far better use of funds than the £100,000 listed for Proposal CS14.

Dr R E Benfield

