

Chapter 1: Strategic Objectives for the District

1. **Create a thriving economy:** How will this be achieved? The council cannot create industries and Canterbury city centre is disintegrating rapidly with more and more empty buildings. This looks to be the opposite of a thriving economy. This is also not in the complete control of the council as they do not own a lot of the land in central Canterbury.
2. **Support the growth and development of our universities:** Why would the council spend time and energy on this when there are far more pressing social issues that are not being addressed such as the support of the elderly? It is for the universities to grow and develop themselves and support their local communities, not the other way around.
3. **Capitalise on our rich and distinctive heritage and culture:** By doing what? We are now overrun by bubble tea cafes and barbers. There is no heritage left to capitalise on - we will have to build up again from scratch.
4. **Create accessible vibrant town centres:** The opposite has been done by implementing exorbitant parking prices, making it inaccessible for people to come into town for a couple of hours.
5. **Reduce the causes of climate change:** Even if we were to achieve net zero the impact on carbon emissions would be negligible and we are spending too much money and energy on ineffective activities, rather than building our society and focusing on more and better quality research on how we can actually address climate change. One council will not achieve anything.
6. **Protect and enhance our rich environment:** Why do you not start with working with the water companies to stop polluting the rivers, seas and woodlands with sewage and waste - we cannot even maintain our basic standards at the moment.
7. **Create a transport network with a focus on district-wide public transport and low-carbon travel to improve air quality:** In reality this makes travelling a nightmare, pushes the pollution elsewhere and sometimes increases it and is an unrealistic and unachievable focus on net zero policies that will ultimately have limited impact on climate change. It will make our lives more difficult and more miserable
 - a. Better, long term town planning is required. The council are looking like they are simply after money rather than serving their community, which is their duty. For example, regarding SS5 (2.h) the renovations at the Canterbury Rugby Club could include some additional houses on the Stuppington Lane site (see Call For Sites). This is a close distance to the city centre, much more suited to supporting SS4 (1.49) and the new Transport Strategy.
8. **Take advantage of and improve our links to and from London and the Continent:** How will this be done and why, where is the demand? London is becoming the most dangerous city in the UK and the cost of travelling by train is extremely expensive. The focus should be on growing the region.
9. **Positively exploit the delivery of infrastructure needed to support growth to maximise the benefits for existing residents and businesses while ensuring critical infrastructure is delivered at the right time to support development.** This does not make any sense in English, it needs clearer articulation – what infrastructure is being exploited and how is it being exploited? Maximise what benefits? This is a clear case of being far too vague so that it cannot be determined if it was achieved or not – clear, understandable goals are needed.

10. **Provide affordable high-quality housing:** how will you make housing affordable when it is not in the control of a council but of the housing market and what do you mean by mixed and sustainable communities? If you are overcrowding areas and building houses that do not have the appropriate infrastructure this is not sustainable and why is mixed communities desirable?
11. **Ensure housing is of high-quality design, is low-carbon and energy and water efficient:** More research is required to be able to achieve this goal, which we currently do not have. Relentless pursuit of low carbon at the cost of other things is undesirable to grow a society. Better to find research on this.
12. **Support the sustainable growth of our rural communities:** This is a repeat of above – with a focus on housing and transport. The design is to make people dependent on monopoly companies such as Stagecoach and prisoner to their costs.

Chapter 2

C12

2.15 This does not present a highly sustainable settlement as the current infrastructure is already at its limit and it will overpopulate a rural, green area. Furthermore, Site C12 contradicts policy SS1 (10): “The council will continue to work with partners to... support the extension and improved connectivity of the Blean Woodland Complex.” This development would cut across the Blean Woodland Complex making connectivity impossible.

2.16 There is insufficient information and detail provided on the development of infrastructure and what upgrading Rough Common Road and Harbledown junction means. This sounds like bringing a lot more traffic along a residential area and bringing significant changes to the layout of the region. In addition this has no evidence on how beneficial this will be in the long term. The adopted Local Plan 2017, policy EMP7, requires that significant development proposals at the University be subject to updating of the University’s Transport Impact Assessment and a review of the University Travel Plan. Neither of these has been produced in relation to site C12.

2.17 There is insufficient information on how the boundaries between the villages will be maintained

2.18 Moving one of the best primary schools in the region is a significant action that is likely to have a detrimental impact on the children and the staff. It is in an ideal location with great green spaces around it for the children, how can that be improved? Furthermore, adding another school in the area is increasing the overpopulation of a small area. Blean is a rural village and this proposal is turning it into a small town. Policy C12 does not comply with SS4 (1.49), which says: “focusing growth at the urban areas, and at Canterbury in particular, presents the greatest opportunities to plan for a switch to sustainable transport.” Site C12 is called a “rural settlement”, is outside the urban envelope of the city, and is described as a “large-scale car-dependent development” in the SLAA.

2.19 Where is the evidence that businesses require space in Blean? Take a look at the Riverside complex, which is absolutely deserted. Much more evidence is required and market research to be able to show any value in creating spaces – it is far more likely that these spaces will destroy green areas and not be used at all. Canterbury and Blean have no industries, the majority of people in the region are employed by the NHS or universities, one of which is selling their land as they have no money.

Chapter 6

Policy DS12: Rural economy

Site C12 is an area with the best and most versatile farmland, rated Grade 2 in the North and Grade 3 in the South of the site. Therefore the proposal contravenes Policy DS12 6.35 in the Draft Local Plan to protect the best quality agricultural land outside of urban and settlement boundaries.

Policy DS14: Active and sustainable travel

Site C12 proposal would drastically increase the traffic adding many cars to an local road that cannot sustain the increase. The proposals of pushing residents to using the bus or even cycling is unworkable. The buses are not that reliable for work and sometimes do not show up and there is only the option of one bus company, making residents at the mercy of whatever prices the bus company decides. Where are the mechanisms for insuring that the quality of the proposed bus services is increased and maintained? This is not run by the council. Furthermore, cycling in Canterbury is dangerous with no consistent cycle routes from one side to the other but moreover with the big hills in between Blean and Canterbury it is completely impossible for many individuals to do.

Policy DS19: Habitats, landscapes and sites of local importance

Site C12 proposal is not compatible with the Land Character Assessment, which the Local Plan has to conform to. In addition it does not meet the requirements of policy DS19 of the Local Plan, as site C12 would create one large continues area with no separation between the three distinct villages of Tyler Hill, Blean and Rough Common. The current proposal for open space and landscape buffer areas do not provide enough detail to demonstrate that it would mitigate the impact on the villages, landscape or adjacent listed buildings, especially Blean Church and Church Cottage.

Policy DS21: Supporting biodiversity recovery

Site C12 states "Improving biodiversity across the district is a clear priority of this plan" whilst also stating that "Although the district benefits from the biodiversity hotspots including The Blean, the Kent Downs, The River Great Stour and the coast, biodiversity across these sites and neighbouring countryside and urban areas continues to decline." How can the C12 site improve biodiversity when The Blean is already identified in the Local Plan DS21 as a biodiversity hotspot? It is an identified 'Biodiversity Opportunity Area' (BoA) in the Kent Wildlife Strategy, is a priority Area of Particular Importance for Biodiversity in the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. In fact Site C12 contradicts all of these policies and will actively destroy biodiversity.