

Alexander Gunyon

From: Beatrice Shire [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 May 2024 21:56
To: Consultations
Subject: Policy C12 comments from David Shire

Categories: Blue category

--Email From External Account--

From: David Shire, [REDACTED]

Re Local Plan, Chapter 2, Policy C12

Dear Canterbury City Council, I write in consternation over the proposed development. I understand entirely the national need for new homes to be built; the real question is "Where?" The land north of Canterbury could hardly be more inappropriate.

- The northern end of the development would be served by Tyler Hill Road, a dangerous country lane that is quite unsuitable for access. Accidents have already occurred at the crossing of The Crab and Winkle where lines of sight are notoriously bad. Traffic from this road will presumably feed into Blean Village and eventually Rough Common Road. This would bring in the western by-pass by the backdoor. And what are the "improvements" to this thoroughfare? The "plan" is merely a sketch. More information is required!! Alternatively the traffic could pass along that "red line" that disgorges into the Whitstable Rd opposite Kent College. We have the University Road, Glen Iris Road, access to St.Edmund's School and opposite that the entry and exit to residential properties, Neal's Place road, Giles lane, the entry and exit points to Kent College, Hillside Avenue and the Rough Common junction all within a distance of half a mile! It is madness to incorporate another major junction. Has anybody with any authority witnessed the scenes when students at Kent College arrive or leave in family cars? Locally we refer to that "red line" as Kier's Lane; it also serves as the Crab and Winkle. It represents a quiet route for cyclists and walkers to the green open spaces that we all cherish. Now they will encounter cars, their fumes and urban sprawl. Currently parents use this route to accompany their children safely to Blean School.

Alternatively traffic could leave Tyler Hill Road at the Calais Hill end and so on into Canterbury by the dangerous St.Stephen's Hill, a nightmare for cyclists. And is the western by-pass to be blessed with a suitable cycle route? This is not a plan; I repeat it is a sketch. If planning permission is to be given to a sketch, what horrors await?

- The land on which the proposed development is intended to take place is quite unsuitable, often waterlogged and draining very poorly. Part of the area is one remaining stronghold of the skylark and this unspoilt part of The Blean represents an important green corridor linking the NNR to the west and other ancient woods to the east around Tyler Hill. You proudly announce opportunities for biodiversity; does this include the skylark? Blean Church will lose its environmental context. In the fields nearby flint axes and Roman and medieval tiles have been found. Much archaeology remains to be discovered for there is evidence of an old manor being situated here. The farmer managing this land was permitted to plough only to a certain depth to preserve this potential archaeology of the future.
- I understand that the Ministry of Housing and Planning does not mandate targets. CCC can put forward its own plans where exceptional circumstances pertain. Canterbury is a World Heritage site with an already appalling traffic problem. This development will only make matters worse

especially as the state secondary schools lie predominantly in the south of the city so that students from this development will travel from the north to the south in the morning and back again in the afternoon. So more buses, more cars, more fumes for us to breathe. The Ministry advises that plans should be for "the good of the communities they serve". Residents do not feel they are being served. The council is serving only one body with this plan and this is UKC. I have been a mature student at this institution and have also helped in a small way with a master's course. *As a whole* I believe that this university has been very poorly managed. For many years courses have been run attracting few students with teaching staff highly underused whilst other staff members have excessive workloads. The university has not adapted to being in the market place with the student as customer and it has not adapted adequately by changing its strategy post Brexit. The financial incompetence is palpable. Now it is undergoing "restructuring" and it has chosen to axe a jewel in the crown, the internationally recognised ethnobotany course. Need I say more? Universities are **businesses** and it is not the role of the council to bail out failing businesses at the expense of the health and well being of its residents

- As to the proposed sustainable housing, will these properties be fitted with solar panels, heat pumps etc? What are the arrangements for sewage? A development in the south of Canterbury was required to have its own sewage plant. Is this also the case in this development and, if so, will Southern Water dump all the waste in the Sarre Penn when it rains at all heavily? And who is going to buy these houses? Where are the jobs for the new residents? I guess that most of these will not be in Canterbury... so out comes the car. Will landlords buy these houses with a view to converting them into HMOs and will London Boroughs have precedence over young Canterbury families requiring a home?

I ask two final questions, what is the *justification* for this despoliation and will residents of Rough Common be able to sell their houses in the ensuing blight? We understand that our councillor has been required to swear that he will not venture an opinion on this scheme. Is this representative democracy at work and is "whipping" taking place in our local politics? Both thoughts concern me greatly.

Yours sincerely, David Shire