

Alexander Gunyon

From: Nadia Beckett [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 May 2024 19:01
To: Consultations
Subject: Canterbury District Local Plan 2040

Categories: Blue category

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

--Email From External Account--

To whom it may concern

I am writing in respect of Chapter 2 Policy C12, Chapter 1 Q1 and Q2.

I am concerned about the overall housing numbers proposed, and the impact on services, supply of water, traffic, pollution, and quality of life.

While I agree that we need new, affordable homes for the local community this should not be at the expense of and detriment to the character of a unique and ancient city. Canterbury is a very special city, sitting as it does so close to London, in the heart of the countryside and close to the coast. If you live in Canterbury, you have all the advantages of city life while being within walking distance of the countryside. This is one of the things that makes Canterbury so special and unique. The proposed development of 2000 houses to the north of the university is not (as described) a rural development. It is urban sprawl the size of a small town and it will destroy the special, outstanding beauty of Blean and all that it has to offer Canterbury residents who currently enjoy the tranquillity and beauty of the Blean corridor.

New homes in Canterbury can be found using empty commercial spaces and preventing residential properties from being turned into HMO for students. A large percentage of the family homes in west Canterbury (and beyond) are occupied by students taking what would otherwise be affordable local housing off the market. Students are great but the colleges in Canterbury should be required to provide their own, on campus accommodation for their students. This represents a long time failing of the council to control student lets in the city.

Canterbury is a very small, ancient city. It simply cannot accommodate this level of development which it does not have the infrastructure for and the only way of providing it is to destroy or take out of the public domain green spaces which residents have enjoyed for decades if not centuries. No number of cycle lanes, busses or bypasses will ease the congestion which prevents residents from using the roads around Canterbury between 11am and 7pm most days. This is a car dependant development which will add c4000 new cars to Canterbury roads, roads which were designed for horses and not motorised vehicles. There is a limit to what can be done to accommodate more cars on the roads in Canterbury and that limit was reached some time ago. While it is sensible and laudable to encourage the use of bikes and public transport the reality is that most people prefer to use their own transport and will continue to do so despite the pollution and congestion that this will add to the city.

The impact on Forty Acres Road and St Steven's is very concerning. Forty Acres and Beaconsfield Roads have speed humps and a 20 mile an hour limit but still have speeding traffic and backed up traffic during rush hours. The increased pollution levels and use of our roads as rat runs are inevitable. St Stevens has a large school, an ancient church, and a thriving community of families. The impact of this development will so severely impact on the area that it is bound to significantly reduce our quality of life.

The traffic noise levels on St Dunstan's Road are already deafening. If I am using my headphones to listen to music or drama while out walking, I turn them off on that stretch of road as I cannot hear anything but the roar of traffic. This leaves me very concerned about how much worse this will be with a further 4000 cars trying to access Canterbury via the Whitstable Road. As an Asthma sufferer I already struggle with the levels of traffic pollution in Canterbury (which is exacerbated by the fact that Canterbury sits in a valley). The proposed development will have a detrimental impact of the health and welfare of existing residents.

The rural landscape of Blean and Rough Common add to our quality of life and the overall beauty of Canterbury. This strong rural character is what makes Canterbury unique for a City and enhances its character. An urban sprawl of 200 homes will have the opposite effect. Once this landscape has been lost it will never be recovered.

The proposed development will destroy the setting and character of ancient monuments and listed buildings. Once gone they are gone forever. The council's own Environmental Strategy emphasises the sensitivity of the district's heritage assets which must be protected and enhanced. The development will do the opposite.

The proposed development will damage and potentially destroy a National Nature Reserve. It is inappropriate to develop ancient woodlands and destroy their amenity for future generations. There are many rare and endangered species in the area, and it is the council's duty to protect them for the future.

The proposed development will mean the loss of large areas of grade 2 and 3 agricultural land and is at odds with the Local Plan's policy to protect best quality agricultural land. Furthermore, in an age when food security is so important to our country the proposed development is inappropriate and reckless.

Finally, Canterbury is already a water stressed district and I am very concerned about the supply of water, the huge potential for water shortages and pollution to the water table. A further 2000 new homes will be a disaster for the local water situation and is therefore reckless and negligent.

Yours,

Nadia Beckett

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.A black rectangular redaction box covering contact information.