**Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045**

# **Chapter 2: Canterbury**

| **Policy** | **Number of written comments** |
| --- | --- |
| C1: Canterbury city centre strategy | 267 |
| C2: 43 to 45 St George's Place | 125 |
| C3: Canterbury city centre regeneration opportunity areas | 155 |
| C4: Canterbury urban area | 190 |
| C5: South West Canterbury | 196 |
| C6: Land at Merton Park | 237 |
| C7: Land to the north of Hollow Lane | 157 |
| C8: Milton Manor House | 99 |
| C9: Land to North of Cockering Road | 99 |
| C10: South West Canterbury Link Road | 122 |
| C11: East Canterbury | 174 |
| C12: Land south of Littlebourne Road | 132 |
| C13: Land south of Bekesbourne Lane | 121 |
| C14: Land north of Bekesbourne Lane at Hoath Farm | 96 |
| C15: Canterbury Golf Course | 156 |
| C16: Canterbury Eastern Movement Corridor | 302 |
| C17: Becket House | 65 |
| C18: Land at Station Road East | 84 |
| C19: Land at the former Chaucer Technology School | 68 |
| C20: Land at Folly Farm | 49 |
| C21: Land at Canterbury Business Park | 84 |
| C22: Land on the eastern side of Shelford Landfill | 38 |
| C23: Wincheap commercial area | 108 |
| C24: Land to the south of Sturry Road | 71 |
| C25: Canterbury urban area regeneration opportunity areas | 61 |
| C26: Land north of University of Kent | 135 |
| Other comments | 46 |

## Policy C1: Canterbury city centre strategy

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Remove circulation plan | 68 |
| Will have negative impact on residents | 23 |
| Plan would ruin the city centre | 21 |
| Improve shops available in city | 18 |
| More needs to be done to enhance world heritage sites | 16 |
| Removing vehicles will have negative impact on shops | 15 |
| Need clear plans | 14 |
| Improve infrastructure | 13 |
| Improve public transport | 13 |
| Disagree with unrestricted movement | 10 |
| No more housing | 10 |
| Revitalise the city centre | 9 |
| Circulation plan will increase traffic pollution | 9 |
| Moving the volume of traffic not fixing the problem | 8 |
| Keep the market in the city | 6 |
| Make use of shops upper levels for flats | 6 |
| Make plans to bring people into city centre | 5 |
| Disagree with road zones | 5 |
| Improve cycle routes and facilities | 5 |
| In favour of aims | 5 |
| More detail on disabled parking and access | 4 |
| Further engagement needed | 4 |
| Improve sewage | 4 |
| Sustainable travel unrealistic for everyone | 4 |
| Park and ride is too expensive | 4 |
| Make homes for local people not students | 3 |
| Night time economy needs to be better run | 3 |
| Improve health care facilities | 3 |
| More emphasis on public transport | 3 |
| Do not build on green land | 3 |
| Agree with protecting shop fronts | 3 |
| Provide incentives for more shops | 3 |
| Make public transport free | 3 |
| Parking is too expensive | 3 |
| More support for local businesses | 3 |
| Support the circulation plan | 3 |
| Canterbury feels unsafe | 2 |
| Protect wildlife | 2 |
| No ring road required | 2 |
| Local residents should be exempt | 2 |
| New housing is an eyesore | 2 |
| Strongly object houses south of canterbury | 2 |
| Canterbury is not big enough for larger roads | 2 |
| Priority to improve health care provision | 2 |
| Charge businesses to discourage them from driving | 2 |
| Reduce air pollution at rail crossings | 2 |
| Canterbury needs to be made more attractive | 2 |
| Affordable housing needed | 2 |
| Circulation zone good idea but not practical | 2 |
| More info needed on digital connectivity | 1 |
| Item 3 is too vague | 1 |
| Have a stricter pedestrian only zone | 1 |
| Should only be commercial space in town centre | 1 |
| Include tree cover | 1 |
| Residents of rough common need to be considered | 1 |
| Increased reference to using solar power | 1 |
| Include leisure centre improvement | 1 |
| More information on how city and towns can contribute employment | 1 |
| Put link road through Old Park | 1 |
| Strongly object to Sturry bypass | 1 |
| Improve city visitor attractions | 1 |
| Eastern bypass should run where existing road is | 1 |
| Ban busking and begging | 1 |
| Remove big car parks of supermarkets in city | 1 |
| Make provision for people with disabilities | 1 |
| Convert empty shops to housing | 1 |
| Preserve old buildings | 1 |
| Don't leave it until 2045 | 1 |
| Add mobility hubs | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Having considered the representations made throughout the Local Plan consultation and the overwhelming number of responses objecting to the Circulation Plan, a new alternative transport strategy is being proposed in the form of a bus-led strategy with improvements to public transport. The Circulation Plan has been removed from the plan and policy C1 subsequently.

Comments regarding impact on shops have been considered. The council is currently preparing an Inward Investment Strategy which will help improve shopping and leisure provision and outline plans to help revitalise the city centre.

Following representations from Canterbury Cathedral, the Canterbury Town Centre boundary has been amended to include the Cathedral grounds. Comments regarding the enhancement of the World Heritage Site have also been noted. The council is preparing a World Heritage Site Management Plan which will outline plans to ensure the continued conservation of the cultural heritage assets in the city.

Two additional points have been added to the policy. A requirement for bin storage to be located to the rear of buildings has been added to Point 9, and Point 11 has been amended to include the council’s ambition to manage last-mile deliveries and sustainable mobility of goods within the city centre. These points both aim to improve the city centre environment which will in turn stimulate and enhance the visitor experience within the city centre and help businesses.

## Policy C2: 43 to 45 St George's Place

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Make homes affordable for local people | 11 |
| Agree with plan | 8 |
| Housing density too high | 6 |
| Need to be in keeping of heritage | 6 |
| High quality design brief needed | 5 |
| Car parking needed | 5 |
| Ensure it is sustainable | 5 |
| Turn into social housing | 4 |
| No emphasis on sustaining conservation areas | 3 |
| Use space for underground parking | 3 |
| Cycle parking needed | 3 |
| This is a significant loss of commercial space | 2 |
| Where will the residents put their cars | 2 |
| Include solar panels | 2 |
| No more student accommodation | 2 |
| Restore facade of cinema | 2 |
| Improve infrastructure | 2 |
| Restore the whole of cinema building for the arts | 2 |
| Southern Water infrastructure crosses this site | 1 |
| This should be removed from plan | 1 |
| This should be high value housing site | 1 |
| Ensure it cannot be used as second homes | 1 |
| Landscape and green infrastructure needed | 1 |
| You will end up with a people free zone as well | 1 |
| Need to come up with new ideas | 1 |
| Need to prioritise local need | 1 |
| Two way cycle route needed | 1 |
| Plant more trees | 1 |
| Must be accessible | 1 |
| Plan is too vague | 1 |
| Consider its next to late night music venue | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Following a number of resident comments, Point 4a on “car-free” development has been removed from the policy. It was made clear that implementing the policy would be challenging. In replacement, a criterion has been added for the development to support active travel by facilitating safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle connectivity, which will encourage sustainable travel.

Point 2d has also been strengthened following representations from Historic England and a number of residents.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy C3: Canterbury city centre regeneration opportunity areas

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Keep the car parks open | 35 |
| Removing car parks will put off visitors | 20 |
| Agree with policy | 10 |
| No mention what will happen to listed sites | 9 |
| Policy is too vague | 9 |
| No consideration given to local neighbours | 5 |
| Protect green space | 4 |
| Will have negative affect on businesses | 4 |
| Agree with developing Nasons and Debenhams | 4 |
| Create more green space | 3 |
| Canterbury should not be the focus of growth | 2 |
| All need to be repurposed | 2 |
| Car parks are easily accessible for disabled, don't take them away | 2 |
| Goes against C1 policy | 2 |
| Reinvent the highstreet | 2 |
| Ensure housing is not for second homes | 1 |
| Disagree with shared pathways | 1 |
| Will create a bottleneck in Wincheap | 1 |
| Improve cycle facilities | 1 |
| Promote park and ride more | 1 |
| Reduce the cost of parking | 1 |
| Create multi story car park in Holman’s Meadow | 1 |
| Include contribution of churches | 1 |
| Develop an underground car park | 1 |
| Prioritise local people | 1 |
| Develop sites into high end property | 1 |
| Spend money on other priorities | 1 |
| Do not use for housing | 1 |
| Do not duplicate amenities | 1 |
| Improve public transport | 1 |
| Improve sewage | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The council recognises that the policy does not contain a high level of detail, however this reflects the early stages and complexities of the identified sites. A criterion has been added to the policy that the council must prepare detailed Development Briefs for all Regeneration Opportunity Areas. These development briefs will help to quantify development potential and ensure attractive and sustainable design for any proposed schemes. The council will continue to work with stakeholders to ensure any development of the car parks progresses in a sustainable way and does not negatively impact the visitor experience or other wider aspirations of the Local Plan.

## Policy C4: Canterbury urban area

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Disagree with circulation plan | 57 |
| Improve infrastructure | 18 |
| Protect the landscape | 15 |
| Less development needed | 13 |
| Strongly object to building on southern side | 12 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 11 |
| Protect wildlife | 6 |
| Remove hospital plans | 6 |
| Improve public transport | 5 |
| Spread the development rather than cram into Wincheap | 4 |
| Circulation plan will increase pollution | 4 |
| Focus on new health care provision | 4 |
| No staff to manage new hospital | 4 |
| Urban area plans are unrealistic | 3 |
| Put solar panels on roofs | 3 |
| Support facilities on canterbury football club | 3 |
| Sustainable transport is unrealistic | 3 |
| Support proposals | 3 |
| No more student accommodation | 3 |
| Follow wincheap society vision document | 3 |
| Disagree with new road building | 2 |
| Avoid urban sprawl | 2 |
| No cars is unrealistic | 2 |
| Disagree with eastern bypass | 2 |
| The need for more housing is not clear | 2 |
| Bring back A&E at K&C | 2 |
| Disagree with plans | 2 |
| Support allocation on Canterbury Business Park | 2 |
| Disagree with dividing canterbury | 1 |
| Remove hotel in UKC from the policy | 1 |
| Build more flats | 1 |
| Stop poor development sites | 1 |
| Only build university sites within their campuses | 1 |
| Do more to make canterbury safe | 1 |
| Doesn't take into account future trends | 1 |
| Agree with section 7 and 8 | 1 |
| Deliver health care in Thanington | 1 |
| Exclude gas central heating from new builds | 1 |
| Consider local innovation business grants | 1 |
| Agree with better hospitals | 1 |
| Need to carry out an impact analysis | 1 |
| Support a ring road | 1 |
| Improve sewage | 1 |
| Agree with south west link road | 1 |
| Ensure the policy is enforced | 1 |
| More reference to community gardens | 1 |
| Support green infrastructure | 1 |
| Disagree with one way system | 1 |
| Agree with development of urban area | 1 |
| Plan lacks detail | 1 |
| Need reference to PRoW network | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Having considered the representations made throughout the Local Plan consultation the Transport Strategy has been changed to be a bus-led strategy with improvements to public transport. The Circulation Plan has been removed from the plan and policy C4 subsequently.

Comments regarding the improvement of infrastructure have been considered and up-to-date infrastructure considerations have been outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2024).

Comments regarding the new hospital in Canterbury have been considered, however no changes to the policy have been made. Discussions with NHS England remain ongoing.

## 

## Policy C5: South West Canterbury

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Protect the landscape | 32 |
| Too many houses | 30 |
| Disagree with policy | 18 |
| Improve infrastructure | 18 |
| Focus on health care provision | 14 |
| Agree with creation of football club | 11 |
| Concerns of the impact of development | 8 |
| Approve of the policy | 7 |
| No evidence for this development to happen | 7 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 7 |
| Improve cycle routes | 4 |
| Disagree with circulation plan | 4 |
| Include equestrian paths and PRoW | 3 |
| Improve public transport | 3 |
| Approve of more green space | 3 |
| New slip road needed | 3 |
| Concern of overpopulation | 3 |
| Concerns of no funding for developments | 3 |
| Hospital build is unlikely | 3 |
| Plans are unrealistic | 2 |
| Concern of flooding risk | 2 |
| Make park and ride more appealing | 2 |
| Improve sewage infrastructure | 2 |
| Concern of pollution | 2 |
| Protect heritage assets | 1 |
| Disagree that the policy meets NPPF | 1 |
| More information on priority habitats | 1 |
| Provide parking | 1 |
| Sustainable travel is unrealistic | 1 |
| Limit the amount of development | 1 |
| Provide blue badge facilities | 1 |
| The four sites are not integrated | 1 |
| Thanington Without should have own identity | 1 |
| Include bungalows | 1 |
| More social housing needed | 1 |
| Allocate community hubs in existing developments | 1 |
| Protect the orchards | 1 |
| New schools are needed | 1 |
| Relief road needed | 1 |
| Houses need to be affordable for locals | 1 |
| Analysis needed for type of housing required | 1 |
| Map doesn't show where access is | 1 |
| Install a tram through the city | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The policy status has been removed to allow for more flexibility and avoid repetition from the other policies in this chapter. The text is now included as supporting commentary. A point has been added to the supporting text which sets out expectations for site developers to work collaboratively to ensure the Strategic Development Area is delivered in a coordinated manner, with the aim of helping to secure the timely delivery of infrastructure alongside new housing and other development, and ensure active travel connectivity and green spaces are well integrated within and between the sites.

## Policy C6: Land at Merton Park

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Residents will be affected by loss of green amenity | 53 |
| Green space should be protected | 51 |
| Negative impact on biodiversity | 39 |
| Housing numbers are not justified | 34 |
| Support for development | 18 |
| Traffic in Wincheap already can't cope | 18 |
| No social housing included | 15 |
| Concerns over sewage disposal | 12 |
| Local infrastructure won't cope | 12 |
| Given food insecurity, it makes no sense to lose agricultural land | 11 |
| Will make people over-reliant on vehicles/car journeys into city centre | 11 |
| No clear strategic rationale | 10 |
| Inconsistent with responsibility to reduce carbon footprint | 9 |
| Concerns over heritage assets | 8 |
| Mitigate flood risks | 8 |
| Support sports facility provisions | 7 |
| No detail of the connection form the A2 to South Canterbury Road | 7 |
| Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure | 6 |
| New sports facility will increase traffic flow | 6 |
| Green energy sources needed (solar panels etc) | 5 |
| Park and Ride facility does not seem viable | 5 |
| Site is unconnected from city centre - no community cohesion | 4 |
| Entry AND exit to A2 is required to prevent traffic congestion through Wincheap | 4 |
| Local waste water plant will be necessary | 4 |
| Will lead to increased mileage and pollution at Hollow Lane | 4 |
| Increased cycle access and bridleways are essential to the success of the plan | 4 |
| Park and Ride concerns - outsourcing would be expensive for residents and poor service | 4 |
| Landscape impact assessments are lacking | 4 |
| Support for enhanced accessibility | 3 |
| Continuous construction work will impact local residents | 3 |
| Mitigate noise pollution | 3 |
| Hospital shouldn't be considered until funding has been sourced | 3 |
| Hospital shouldn't be linked to new housing | 3 |
| Concerns over lack of enforcement/controls as planning breaches are likely | 3 |
| Consultation has been bias in favour of developers | 3 |
| Will provide base for Canterbury City FC - disabled sports facilities (support) | 3 |
| Stuppington Road is not suitable for increased traffic | 3 |
| Lime Kiln Road is not suitable for increased traffic | 3 |
| Not enough detailed drawings or plans | 3 |
| Support for Park and Ride facility | 2 |
| Support for adequate infrastructure delivery | 2 |
| Policy wording needs to be more flexible | 2 |
| Housing type/size should match demand (smaller dwellings) | 2 |
| Affordable housing should be priority | 2 |
| Consideration for older persons' accommodation is needed | 2 |
| Loss of Cathedral views | 2 |
| Mountfield Park link necessary | 2 |
| Site is uphill | 2 |
| High street shop occupancy should be encouraged | 2 |
| Concerns over how developments will impact air quality | 2 |
| Should look to improve existing resources, not build new ones as there is not the staff (NHS/teachers) to make new resources sustainable | 2 |
| Hospital should not be funded by developers | 2 |
| Loss of historical value by demolition of roman hollow way | 2 |
| Road infrastructure will not cope with population growth | 2 |
| Support provision of diverse open spaces | 1 |
| Support for enhanced community cohesion | 1 |
| Support for new hospital | 1 |
| Off road cycle access is needed | 1 |
| No mention of disabled access housing | 1 |
| Accommodation for elderly population needs to be considered | 1 |
| Equestrians should be provided at crossings | 1 |
| Footpath/bridleway should be upgraded | 1 |
| Security of proposed site should be considered (CCTV etc) | 1 |
| New housing proposals should be on hold until government review is complete (Gove) | 1 |
| Planting trees/hedges to provide habitat for wildlife | 1 |
| New housing should exclude gas central heating | 1 |
| Environmental reporting should take place by CCC before development begins | 1 |
| A 50-metre swimming pool is needed | 1 |
| Link roads are complex | 1 |
| Consultation process was not user-friendly | 1 |
| Accompanying documents are illegitimate - specifically, Climate Topic Paper | 1 |
| Solar farm will have a negative impact on community | 1 |
| More detail about sports provisions is required - further consultation needed | 1 |
| The proposed community hub should be located within the huge housing developments already being built as part of the 2017 LP | 1 |
| Increased housing will made roads dangerous for motorists | 1 |
| Plan impacts businesses that rely on cross-city travel | 1 |
| Infrastructure - especially hospital - should be built prior to houses | 1 |
| Park and Ride facility should be available when 10% of dwellings are occupied, not 50% | 1 |
| Viability of a community hub means that people will not need to use their cars to access a range of facilities is questioned for a development of this size | 1 |
| Such a development cannot be a sustainable garden city based on the scale | 1 |
| Everyday needs will not be viable within a 15 min walk radius | 1 |
| Tram system should be considered | 1 |
| Support the suggestion of creating 74 new allotments | 1 |
| Consider building new access road next to the rugby club | 1 |
| South Canterbury link road would not be sustainable with a narrow road like Hollow Lane | 1 |
| Canterbury is a provincial town - not a suburb of London | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. A number of new criteria have been added to the policy. Point 2h requires the location of older persons housing to be within the community hub, point 3c requires the site to assess potential for functionally linked land for golden plover following representations from Natural England, and point 3f requires new allotment pitches to be located adjacent to the existing Wincheap allotment. The primary school on the site has been specified to require early years provision, following representations from KCC Education (point 1bii)

Comments on transport and traffic concerns have been noted. The council is progressing with transport modelling work to better understand the mobility patterns in the area and how the development can best accommodate these. More detailed evidence will be published for the next iteration of the draft Local Plan.

The yield for the site has been revised following further assessment to reflect the latest available evidence. Further information on these changes is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## 

## Policy C7: Land to the north of Hollow Lane

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Protect landscape | 31 |
| Too much development | 20 |
| Concern of traffic increase | 11 |
| Keep the green gap | 10 |
| Will destroy natural habitats | 7 |
| Housing needs to be affordable for locals | 7 |
| Improve sewage infrastructure | 6 |
| Avoid urban sprawl | 5 |
| Concern of overpopulation | 5 |
| Protect wildlife | 4 |
| Protect ancient trees | 3 |
| Unclear how it links with other nearby sites | 3 |
| Disagree with plan | 3 |
| Support creation of green corridor | 2 |
| Include a community hub | 2 |
| SSSI site will be surrounded by new homes | 2 |
| Need more social housing | 2 |
| Abandon link roads | 2 |
| Impact assessment needed | 2 |
| Approve, this is suitable for housing | 2 |
| Area is not suitable for development | 2 |
| Connect Hollow Lane to Bridle Way | 1 |
| Unconnected outer urban housing | 1 |
| No layout for the link road connection | 1 |
| Health care facility needs further discussion with NHS | 1 |
| Limited capacity for sewage | 1 |
| Increase to 25% biodiversity | 1 |
| What happened to promise hospice? | 1 |
| Allow smaller developments nearby | 1 |
| Cycle lane to be part of above flood level route | 1 |
| Link road needs to be moved on map | 1 |
| Clarity needed on biodiversity opportunities | 1 |
| Reduce the number of homes on the site | 1 |
| Use brownfield sites | 1 |
| Area not suitable for a bypass | 1 |
| Will destroy biodiversity | 1 |
| Site was already refused planning | 1 |
| This is an AONB | 1 |
| Map needs more detail | 1 |
| New schools need to be built | 1 |
| Site is too far from town | 1 |
| Approve of new link road | 1 |
| Site is not suitable for older persons | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. A number of new criteria have been added to the policy. A number of new criteria have been added to the policy. Point 2f requires older persons housing to be within the community hub, point 3c requires the site to assess potential for functionally linked land for golden plover following representations from Natural England. The primary school on the site has been specified to require early years provision, following representations from KCC Education (point 2bii).

Comments on transport and traffic concerns have been noted. The council is progressing with transport modelling work to better understand the mobility patterns in the area and how the development can best accommodate these. More detailed evidence will be published for the next iteration of the draft Local Plan.

The yield for the site has been revised following further assessment to reflect the latest available evidence. Further information on these changes is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy C8: Milton Manor House

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Protect the green gap | 15 |
| Will lead to urban sprawl | 10 |
| Reduce amount of houses | 9 |
| Concern of traffic increase | 9 |
| Strongly disagree | 8 |
| Save the landscape | 6 |
| Improve infrastructure | 5 |
| More cycle lanes needed | 4 |
| Concern of flooding | 4 |
| Negative impact on historic location | 3 |
| Will destroy natural habitats | 3 |
| Improve sewage | 3 |
| Will triple population of Thanington | 3 |
| Negative impact on SSSI Larkey Woods | 3 |
| Disagree with out of city estates | 2 |
| Locate developments in existing settlements, not new ones | 2 |
| Outside urban boundary set in 2017 plan | 2 |
| Change it into a park for residents to enjoy | 2 |
| No easy access to city centre | 2 |
| More social housing needed | 2 |
| Will harm character of villages | 2 |
| Bridleway should be included | 1 |
| Not connected with facilities | 1 |
| Protection needed for Turtle Doves | 1 |
| Protect ancient woodland | 1 |
| Complete ATI across site | 1 |
| Shouldn't be in the local plan | 1 |
| Negative impact on chartham residents | 1 |
| Only one way in/out of the development | 1 |
| Development too close to lakes | 1 |
| Increase to 25% biodiversity | 1 |
| Plans are unrealistic | 1 |
| New properties should exclude gas heating | 1 |
| All properties to have solar panels | 1 |
| Add cycle path on A28 | 1 |
| Health care provision needed | 1 |
| More schools needed | 1 |
| No staff for new hospitals | 1 |
| Improve public transport | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Following representations from the RSPB, point 3g has been added for the protection of Turtle Dove habitats within the site. Point 2e has also been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

As explained in the Draft Natural Environment and Open Space Topic Paper (2024) a Green Gap between Canterbury and Chartham has been included under Policy DS19 - Habitats, landscapes and sites of local importance.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy C9: Land to North of Cockering Road

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Too many houses | 10 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 8 |
| Protect landscape | 7 |
| Improve infrastructure | 7 |
| Protect historic location | 5 |
| Strongly disagree | 5 |
| Avoid urban sprawl | 5 |
| Keep the farmland | 4 |
| Improve cycling/walking paths | 3 |
| Improve sewage | 3 |
| Concern of overpopulation in Thanington | 3 |
| More social housing | 3 |
| Concern of flooding risk | 3 |
| Goes against 2017 local plan boundary | 2 |
| KCC Highways already objected building | 2 |
| No justification for this many houses | 2 |
| Too close to the stour | 2 |
| Goes against objectives of NPPF | 1 |
| Site is too far from facilities | 1 |
| Housing on this site was refused by highways | 1 |
| Protect the land for leisure uses | 1 |
| Concern of poorly built houses | 1 |
| Improve public transport | 1 |
| Increase 25% biodiversity | 1 |
| Sustainable travel is unrealistic | 1 |
| Improve school and healthcare | 1 |
| Build infrastructure first | 1 |
| Protect right of way access | 1 |
| Too close to Larkey Valley Woods | 1 |
| Highly sustainable location for housing | 1 |
| Support housing here | 1 |
| Suggestion for site to be car free | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. For all site allocation policies, the policy text regarding housing mix has been simplified to avoid confusion when interpreting alongside Policies DS1 and DS2 and provide flexibility in the type of housing provided to ensure it will meet the needs of the local community.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## 

## Policy C10: South West Canterbury Link Road

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Disagree with plans | 15 |
| Road is not financial viable | 10 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 10 |
| Approve of plans | 10 |
| More detail needed | 7 |
| Will harm the environment | 6 |
| No real benefit for this road | 5 |
| The lane is of historic importance | 4 |
| Will help reduce congestion | 4 |
| Build roads first before homes | 4 |
| Impact assessment on Larkey Valley | 3 |
| Leave landscape as is | 3 |
| Include walking/cycling routes | 2 |
| Will increase pollution | 2 |
| Slip roads are needed | 2 |
| Improve public transport | 2 |
| More detail needed on slip roads | 1 |
| Crosses over foul sewers | 1 |
| Negative effect on residents in Adisham | 1 |
| Shouldn't form part of circulation plan | 1 |
| Infrastructure cannot support this | 1 |
| Must be part of the overall transport strategy | 1 |
| Stop urban sprawl | 1 |
| Bypass is needed | 1 |
| Install a tram system | 1 |
| Plans are poorly thought out | 1 |
| No evidence that development is needed | 1 |
| Outer ring road is the best option | 1 |
| Too much road building | 1 |
| Add a congestion charge | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. No changes have been made to this policy.

## Policy C11: East Canterbury

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Disagree with EMC | 43 |
| Protect green space | 27 |
| Would harm the environment | 22 |
| Too many houses | 14 |
| Object to the plans | 13 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 11 |
| No rational why development is happening | 9 |
| Protect wildlife | 9 |
| Do not cross through Fordwich | 6 |
| Support the plan | 4 |
| Protect SSSI | 4 |
| Prioritise sustainable transport | 3 |
| Support the growth in housing | 2 |
| Create cycling and walking paths | 2 |
| Not financial viable | 2 |
| Sustainable travel is unrealistic | 2 |
| Concern of increase in pollution | 2 |
| More information needed | 2 |
| Improve walking routes around Bekesbourne station | 1 |
| Need new road connection | 1 |
| Plan is unrealistic | 1 |
| Extend the road beyond the A2 | 1 |
| Build ring road around the city | 1 |
| Ensure road can manage future capacity | 1 |
| Concern of flooding | 1 |
| Ageing population not considered | 1 |
| Build infrastructure first | 1 |
| Impact analysis needed | 1 |
| Install a tram across the district | 1 |
| Need more social housing | 1 |
| Improve junction at Bridge | 1 |
| Improve public transport | 1 |
| Negative impact on local people | 1 |
| Protect PRoW network | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. This policy and all sites part of the East Canterbury SDA have been removed from the plan due to transport infrastructure constraints. Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Policy C12: Land south of Littlebourne Road

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Object to plans | 20 |
| Too much development happening | 20 |
| Protect open spaces | 18 |
| Keep the farmland | 17 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 10 |
| Disagree with EMC | 10 |
| Where is the evidence extra housing is needed | 7 |
| Concern of overpopulation | 6 |
| Improve infrastructure | 5 |
| Improve sewage | 5 |
| Protect SSSI | 3 |
| Protect wildlife | 2 |
| Support link road | 2 |
| Development is in the wrong place | 2 |
| Will ruin character of the area | 2 |
| Negative impact on biodiversity | 1 |
| Sewage infrastructure has limited capacity | 1 |
| Map is unclear | 1 |
| Affordable housing for locals needed | 1 |
| Stop urban sprawl | 1 |
| More social housing needed | 1 |
| Which garden city principles are applied? | 1 |
| Sustainable travel is unrealistic | 1 |
| Concern of flooding risk | 1 |
| Improve walking and cycling from Bekesbourne station | 1 |
| Support more housing | 1 |
| Policy is not clear | 1 |
| Correctly phase the development | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. This policy has been removed from the plan due to transport infrastructure constraints. Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Policy C13: Land south of Bekesbourne Lane

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Keep the farmland | 17 |
| Protect open spaces | 15 |
| Do not support scale of development | 12 |
| Disagree with EMC | 10 |
| Improve sewage infrastructure | 6 |
| Protect wildlife | 6 |
| Concern of overpopulation | 5 |
| Protect ancient woodland | 4 |
| No clear rationale for development | 3 |
| Implement EMC first | 3 |
| Protect character of the town | 3 |
| Too much focus on development | 3 |
| Where are the funds for EMC? | 2 |
| Disagree with plans | 2 |
| Will have a negative effect on local people | 2 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 2 |
| Protect SSSI | 2 |
| Protect fordwich conservation area | 1 |
| Promote sustainable travel | 1 |
| Improve infrastructure | 1 |
| More social housing needed | 1 |
| Who will maintain in the future | 1 |
| Which garden city principles? | 1 |
| Stop increasing littlebourne | 1 |
| Protect PRoW | 1 |
| Will increase pollution | 1 |
| Garden city principles welcomed | 1 |
| Will have destructive visual impact | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. This policy has been removed from the plan due to transport infrastructure constraints. Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Policy C14: Land north of Bekesbourne Lane at Hoath Farm

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Object to policy | 25 |
| Protect the landscape | 12 |
| Focus on farming land for food security | 9 |
| No evidence that housing is needed in this area | 7 |
| Disagree with EMC | 6 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 6 |
| More social housing needed | 3 |
| Improve cycling paths | 2 |
| Stop urban sprawl | 2 |
| Improve infrastructure first | 2 |
| Include minerals assessment | 1 |
| Keep Lampen Stream clear of pollution | 1 |
| Consider turtle doves | 1 |
| Phase development inline with sewage infrastructure | 1 |
| Sewage improvements needed | 1 |
| Improve existing housing | 1 |
| Change wording to maximum 67 | 1 |
| Have a smaller development on brownfield site | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. This policy has been removed from the plan due to transport infrastructure constraints. Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Policy C15: Canterbury Golf Course

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Protect old park and chequers wood | 49 |
| Protect wildlife | 46 |
| Add in a buffer zone to the SSSI | 26 |
| Do not build on the golf course | 21 |
| Strongly disagree with policy | 11 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 10 |
| Do not support the number of houses | 7 |
| Improve infrastructure | 7 |
| Improve sewage | 4 |
| Not a suitable site for housing | 4 |
| Would increase pollution | 3 |
| Install traffic lights or a roundabout to improve junction | 2 |
| Improve public transport | 2 |
| Assessment needed for driving range | 1 |
| Incorporate with Royal Parade development | 1 |
| Provide a safe cycle route | 1 |
| Not financially viable | 1 |
| Fails to meet CO2 emission goals | 1 |
| Route the EMC here | 1 |
| Too much development in the area | 1 |
| Site is too far from town | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The site allocation has been reviewed and it has been decided to remove the site from the plan due to ecology constraints and the loss of a sports facility. Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Policy C16: Canterbury Eastern Movement Corridor

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Significant impacts to designated wildlife sites and priority habitats and wildlife and biodiversity generally | 72 |
| The bypass will have significant impacts to SSSI | 62 |
| Significant negative ecological and environmental impacts | 60 |
| Route will impact archaeologically sensitive areas | 57 |
| Estimated costs are unrealistic/unaffordable. Very expensive option | 50 |
| Direct loss of/impact to ancient woodland | 48 |
| Would be within SSSI buffer zone | 44 |
| There will be noise, light and traffic pollution | 43 |
| The money for the Eastern Movement Corridor would be better spent on alternative schemes with greater benefits e.g. large scale public transport improvements | 42 |
| The Eastern Movement Corridor won't reduce traffic/ no evidence to support | 40 |
| The proposed route cuts Fordwich completely in half | 36 |
| Eastern Movement Corridor will pose threat community | 33 |
| Will increase traffic movements | 33 |
| Historic character and heritage which would be heavily impacted | 32 |
| Extend and protect the Old Park and Chequers SSSI | 30 |
| Consider an alternative route/ different place for the bypass | 28 |
| Will interrupt the connectivity for wildlife (e.g. between the SSSI at Old Park and Chequers Wood to the RAMSAR site at Stodmarsh) | 26 |
| Wouldn't be able to access Fordwich from Moat lane or Well Lane / Cuts across Well Lane | 25 |
| Should be removed from the plan | 23 |
| The Eastern Movement Corridor will cause harm to Fordwich Conservation area | 23 |
| Would run through Trenley Wood which is designated as ancient woodland, is an important habitat link and has significant historic value | 22 |
| Loss / ruin of agricultural land | 22 |
| Route passes through flood plains/ Will increase flooding | 21 |
| Loss of landscape and character areas/Change the character of the area | 19 |
| The road is not needed | 19 |
| Route overlaps numerous well used PROWs, Bridle paths and cycle routes, contradicts encouragement to walk and cycle | 18 |
| Would increase carbon emissions and pollution | 17 |
| Main purpose of Eastern Movement Corridor is to facilitate the zoning proposal | 17 |
| The scale and cost (financial and to the landscape) of the road doesn't outweigh the proposed benefit | 17 |
| Goes through the north east corner of the SSSI | 16 |
| Will destroy the countryside | 16 |
| Proposed residential developments will cause more traffic on the roads | 16 |
| Large housing developments only included in the plan to fund the Eastern Movement Corridor | 15 |
| The route cuts across an area of considerable Palaeolithic potential which is considered to have national and international significance | 12 |
| Eastern Movement Corridor would encourage greater car use | 12 |
| Eastern Movement Corridor won't improve city centre air quality or pollution or have any positive impacts for climate change | 12 |
| Recognise and understand the need for the Eastern Movement Corridor | 11 |
| Journey times will be longer/ increase mileage | 11 |
| Improvement to public transport would reduce reliance on cars and remove the need for the EMC | 10 |
| Request that delivery phase is prioritised to accommodate increase in vehicles caused by surrounding developments | 10 |
| Relies on development for funding | 10 |
| Reduce and control traffic growth instead | 10 |
| Longer and more expensive than initially proposed route | 10 |
| No clear benefit / not beneficial | 9 |
| Source of funding and finance is wholly unclear | 9 |
| Eastern Movement Corridor will cut across the Littlebourne Cluster which is a designated wildlife corridor | 8 |
| Would cut through Moat Rough and Sandpit Wood highlighted on KCC's heritage map | 8 |
| Eastern Movement Corridor intends to offload city centre traffic into rural areas | 8 |
| Too little information provided regarding the policy and no map | 8 |
| The footprint of the road doesn't allow for a buffer zone around designated wildlife sites (contradicts DS18 and DS19) | 7 |
| Modal shift' options presented as contingent upon the Circulation Plan and Eastern Movement Corridor. Sustainable transport should be instead of road infrastructure | 7 |
| Will have significant impacts to wildlife and habitats at Sturry Community Park | 7 |
| Local Plan HRA doesn't fully assess the potential for the proposal to impact on Stodmarsh Habitat Sites | 7 |
| Won't contribute to sustainable transport around the district | 7 |
| Eastern Movement Corridor would be likely to get very congested due to junctions | 7 |
| SSSI has not been assessed since 1985 and surrounding areas have become significant and should be protected | 7 |
| Clear that the purpose is to address existing traffic and pollution problems in the city centre and to facilitate a modal shift | 6 |
| Already a lot of existing pressure of SSSI | 6 |
| Local plan should focus on green and blue infrastructure instead | 5 |
| Would be no need for the Eastern Movement Corridor without the housing allocations | 5 |
| Should stand alone with the ring road rather than the alongside the zoning proposal | 5 |
| Ensure the EMC is of sufficient capacity to deal with future traffic increase | 5 |
| Greater consideration should be given to greener cycle routes away from traffic | 5 |
| Need for the developments has not been demonstrated | 5 |
| Support the proposal | 4 |
| A detailed Palaeolithic assessment supported by field evaluation is necessary to inform route options and design | 4 |
| How does the Eastern Movement Corridor align with the plan's strategic objectives? | 4 |
| Would have significant impacts on air and water quality due to pollution | 4 |
| Access to the site during construction is likely to be through rural roads which are unsuitable for construction vehicles | 4 |
| Monitoring of the trees lining the route will need to be undertaken | 4 |
| Will destroy important green space | 4 |
| Single lane highway will get congested quickly | 4 |
| Views across Fordwich Conservation area will be impacted including views towards the World Heritage Sites | 3 |
| Developing on green belt land goes against NPPF Chapter 13 | 3 |
| Ability to deliver bridge over railway is within the control of Network Rail or KCC, not Gladman or Wates | 3 |
| Propose an alternative delivery approach | 3 |
| Policy provides road infrastructure that is needed | 3 |
| Traffic on the A28 at Wincheap needs to be addressed | 3 |
| Reduce the cost of public transport | 3 |
| Will lead to longer journey times | 3 |
| Combining the cycle corridor with the distributor road is unnecessarily length a route | 3 |
| How will people cross the Eastern Movement corridor? Have safe crossing points been costed in? | 3 |
| The bypass would significantly impact the aesthetic value of Fordwich Conservation area | 2 |
| Goes against NPPF guidance by presenting no alternative options to reducing city centre traffic. None explored or consulted on | 2 |
| Transport evidence base will need scenarios with and without the Eastern Movement Corridor to determine where capacity enhancement to the SRN is required | 2 |
| Eastern Movement Corridor would impact Alder carr woodland | 2 |
| Proposed junction from EMC to A257 is at a 50mph section of the A257 where lots of accidents are recorded | 2 |
| Delivery of the Eastern Movement Corridor should not be reliant on funding and delivery of C12 and C13. EMC is providing much wider benefits than to just those sites | 2 |
| The Eastern Movement Corridor won't address transport from new developments into the city centre | 2 |
| Changed route is an improvement | 2 |
| Contradicts the environmental strategy SS1 | 2 |
| To maximise its use the Eastern Movement Corridor needs to be turned into a full outer ring road | 2 |
| The road should be extended towards Ashford to join the A28 near Chilham | 2 |
| No mention of the North Downs Way National Trail | 2 |
| Lack of waste water provision | 2 |
| Only allow heavy goods vehicles into city centre outside of peak traffic hours | 2 |
| Road would encourage more development around Fordwich | 2 |
| Tree lined local distributor road' is not adequate compensation for loss of ancient woodland | 2 |
| No need for cycle path, not on any other parts of the ring road | 2 |
| Re-open the park and ride to reduce traffic in the city centre | 2 |
| Topography is unsuitable | 2 |
| Noise and light pollution from the road would urbanise the rural conservation area | 1 |
| The policy doesn't reference land designated for heritage | 1 |
| Developing so close to SSSI goes against NPPF section 15 on conserving and enhancing the natural environment and conserving habitats and biodiversity | 1 |
| Mirrors Norwich's Wensum Link estimated to cost £251m and being challenged by Judicial Review | 1 |
| Chapter 2 is the opposite of what residents desired from the consultation process | 1 |
| Requirements of policy could hinder site delivery | 1 |
| Link delivery of sites to completion of off-site sections of the eastern movement corridor | 1 |
| Plan is not scientifically acceptable | 1 |
| No benefit to the countryside | 1 |
| Nitrogen deposition from vehicle pollution will negatively impact habitats e.g. acid grassland | 1 |
| Call for the protection of Sturry Road Community Park habitats | 1 |
| Proposed route appears to traverse land in MOD ownership | 1 |
| Inappropriate to consider improvements to the SSSI as a compensatory measures as is stated in the feasibility study | 1 |
| Would like evidence to support the statement that the proposed Eastern Movement Corridor avoids harms to the SSSI in line with government policies | 1 |
| Policy contains no specific requirements to avoid or mitigate for the potential impacts of the EMC on the natural environment | 1 |
| Will it be part of a ring road around Canterbury? | 1 |
| 20% biodiversity net gain will be unachievable and offsetting will contradict environmental pledges made | 1 |
| Feasibility study should be conducted | 1 |
| The landscape provides rural separation between the city centre and Fordwich and Sturry | 1 |
| The rural landscape contributes towards the valley setting of the historic city | 1 |
| The Landscape and Biodiversity Assessment states advices avoiding proposals that impinge on remote undeveloped landscape | 1 |
| Landscape and Biodiversity Assessment states that proposals for highways upgrades should 'retain rural character of the lanes' | 1 |
| Make it just for cycle and pedestrian use | 1 |
| Proposed cycling provision is positive | 1 |
| Use existing roads to prevent drastic impacts on EMC on Sturry and Fordwich | 1 |
| Route passing the rail crossing gates at Sturry means the road will be shut everytime a train passes | 1 |
| No justification for the choice of route has been provided | 1 |
| No data to prove that too many cars are going through the city centre to the A2 | 1 |
| Will not work as a solution | 1 |
| No firm proposal showing the land-take, local road accesses and diversions | 1 |
| Development on greenfield land should be avoided | 1 |
| Extend the link road north towards Whitstable | 1 |
| 20mph boulevard street at the railway should be considered | 1 |
| Will only temporarily solve traffic problems | 1 |
| Mitigation for new developments can be provided within the developments | 1 |
| No consideration for risk/reward to rural community versus central residents | 1 |
| Provide amenities for 15 minute cities before building the road | 1 |
| Reinstate Sturry Park and Ride | 1 |
| Create an ultra low emission zone for Canterbury's inner ring road | 1 |
| Mass will increase crime rates and antisocial behaviour | 1 |
| Should continue with the ANPR charging without the inclusion of the Eastern Movement Corridor | 1 |
| The Eastern Movement Corridor would reduce antisocial behaviour in the SSSI | 1 |
| Must be a southern bypass for the plan to work | 1 |
| Would not pass NPPF test of soundness | 1 |
| Plans don't show how EMC will be accommodated alongside the Mountfield development | 1 |
| New automotive technologies will make the EMC obsolete before it is even complete | 1 |
| Concerns that the Eastern Movement Corridor is unviable | 1 |
| Add a congestion charge instead | 1 |
| The Eastern Movement Corridor should be used to restrict development to the east | 1 |

Having considered the representations made throughout the Local Plan consultation the emphasis of the Transport Strategy has been changed away from road building, towards a public transport and active travel approach. The Eastern Movement Corridor and circulation plan are no longer being proposed, therefore this policy has been removed from the plan. Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Policy C17: Becket House

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Agree with policy | 7 |
| Car free is not realistic | 6 |
| Provide parking for residents | 6 |
| Conversion should be the only option | 5 |
| Make them affordable for locals | 4 |
| Provide outdoor space | 4 |
| Too high density | 3 |
| More social housing needed | 3 |
| Disagree with policy | 3 |
| Improve sewage system | 2 |
| Concern of traffic | 2 |
| Increase traffic pollution | 2 |
| Previously mentioned a lower amount of flats being built | 1 |
| Will there be adequate living space | 1 |
| Flexibility of the type of housing needed | 1 |
| Conflicts with DS6 | 1 |
| Minor site and should be removed from the plan | 1 |
| Don’t lose historic buildings | 1 |
| Make sure the building is sustainable | 1 |
| No justification for need of housing | 1 |
| Improve infrastructure first | 1 |
| Include bike racks | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Following a number of resident comments, Point 4a on “car-free” development has been removed from the policy, and replaced with a criterion for the development to support active travel by facilitating safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle connectivity. Point 2d has also been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy C18: Land at Station Road East

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Do not get rid of the car park | 21 |
| Car free is unrealistic | 6 |
| Area not desirable for housing | 5 |
| Homes must be affordable for locals | 4 |
| Approve of proposal | 3 |
| Area is already too built up | 2 |
| Support high density on brownfield sites | 2 |
| Area is unsafe at night | 2 |
| Whole area is currently an eye sore | 2 |
| Show pedestrian and cycle access on map | 2 |
| Prove there is a local need for housing | 2 |
| Renovate signal box | 2 |
| Minor building plans remove from local plan | 1 |
| Retain historic features | 1 |
| Use the land for recreation purposes | 1 |
| Make this into a green space | 1 |
| More social housing needed | 1 |
| Ensure houses are eco friendly | 1 |
| No more houses | 1 |
| Provide cycle park | 1 |
| Make the bridge more cycle friendly | 1 |
| Do not ruin historic environment of the station | 1 |
| Use the site for leisure building | 1 |
| Disagree with policy | 1 |
| Extend green corridor to wincheap roundabout | 1 |
| Improve infrastructure first | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Following representations from Network Rail, a policy criterion has been added to ensure adequate car parking arrangements for the train station remain in place (point 4a). Following a number of resident comments, the point on “car-free” development has been removed from the policy, and replaced with a criterion for the development to support active travel by facilitating safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle connectivity (point 4b).

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy C19: Land at the former Chaucer Technology School

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Leave as green space | 10 |
| Should be used just for a school | 8 |
| Car free is unrealistic | 5 |
| Parking needs to be provided | 3 |
| Approve of plans | 3 |
| Access to barton schools to be improved | 2 |
| No more houses | 2 |
| More social housing needed | 2 |
| No proof for the need of housing | 2 |
| Take into account water infrastructure | 1 |
| Clarity on east of the site | 1 |
| Facilities for buses and bikes | 1 |
| Provide affordable housing for locals | 1 |
| Confirm improvement in cycle routes | 1 |
| Access from st augustine and spring lane | 1 |
| Protect the trees | 1 |
| Improve infrastructure | 1 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Following a number of resident comments, the point on “car-free” development has been removed from the policy.

A Policy criterion has been added for development to prevent overlooking the adjacent school (point 3c).

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy C20: Land at Folly Farm

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Clearer map needed | 4 |
| Support plans | 3 |
| Plans have previously been rejected | 1 |
| Approve for use of housing | 1 |
| Frequent buses and cycle lanes | 1 |
| Protect farmland | 1 |
| Improve cycling facilities | 1 |
| Not a desirable site for housing | 1 |
| More social housing needed | 1 |
| Homes to be affordable for locals | 1 |
| Too much development | 1 |
| Protect green space | 1 |
| Sustainable travel not suitable for elderly | 1 |
| Make development smaller | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Following representations from KCC Minerals and Waste, the policy criterion for a minerals assessment has been removed. Point 2c has been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy C21: Land at Canterbury Business Park

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Would harm AONB | 14 |
| Support the plan | 13 |
| Will provide much needed employment in the area | 9 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 6 |
| Protect the countryside | 5 |
| Strongly disagree | 5 |
| Would cause harm to conservation area | 4 |
| Could harm historic buildings | 3 |
| Access points need to be changed | 3 |
| This should be in the rural section of the plan | 2 |
| Will have minimal impact on AONB | 2 |
| Do not over develop this area | 2 |
| Protect the dark skies | 2 |
| Good to see local business growth | 2 |
| Retain and enhance bridleways | 1 |
| Should be under SS3 | 1 |
| Layout of the development to be planned in existing sewage infrastructure | 1 |
| Redevelopment Wincheap industrial estate | 1 |
| No provision for long term maintenance | 1 |
| Would make people travel further into work | 1 |
| Further research on site needed | 1 |
| No impact analysis or sustainability assessment | 1 |
| Not suitable for any large scale businesses | 1 |
| Keep development in the ridgeline | 1 |
| Protect wildlife | 1 |
| Add a green buffer around the site | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Following numerous representations from residents as well as local and national organisations such as Natural England and Kent Downs AONB Unit, the policy criteria on mitigating landscape harm has been strengthened, including to enhance the existing trees (point 3d). Point 2c has been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

## Policy C22: Land on the eastern side of Shelford Landfill

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Needs to be more provision for waste handling | 3 |
| Unsuitable site for homes | 3 |
| Agree with policy | 2 |
| Install safe cycling routes | 2 |
| Information on how methane gas from the site will be emitted | 2 |
| Strongly disagree | 1 |
| Infrastructure is insufficient | 1 |
| Suggestion for outdoor leisure facilities | 1 |
| Area is a biohazard | 1 |
| Need a clearer map | 1 |
| Transport assessment to be carried out | 1 |

All representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The majority of representations were in support. No significant changes have been made to this policy.

## Policy C23: Wincheap commercial area

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Suitable site needed for Canenco depot | 93 |
| Support site used for strategic wetland | 92 |
| Policy is unclear | 90 |
| Do not adversely affect flood areas and waterways | 89 |
| Avoid residential development in flood zones | 85 |
| Needs to include sewage infrastructure improvement | 84 |
| Gyratory system is not fit for purpose | 83 |
| Traffic congestion solution needed | 68 |
| Follow the Wincheap vision document | 57 |
| Provide a Wincheap bypass | 53 |
| Have a mix of business and residential | 51 |
| Use site for flats for first time buyers | 49 |
| Deliver more housing units | 47 |
| Improve the junction at the roundabout | 46 |
| Use for industrial not residential | 39 |
| Scrap the one way system | 37 |
| Off road cycle lanes needed | 37 |
| Sustainable travel is unrealistic | 36 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 35 |
| Evidence shows this wont work | 32 |
| New junction on the A2 will help | 31 |
| Agree with policy | 30 |
| Dont expect people to walk from Wincheap | 24 |
| Site well in need of development | 22 |
| Add pathways at the end of Cow Lane | 21 |
| Provide safe crossing for cyclists onto Castle Street | 20 |
| Protect the nature reserve | 19 |
| No impact analysis given | 16 |
| No more car parks | 15 |
| Too much development in the area | 14 |
| Need commercial areas close to the city | 12 |
| Plan is not realistic for all residents | 11 |
| Do not adversely impact character of the city | 8 |
| Have green buffer zones in place | 7 |
| Parking needs to be provided for new homes | 6 |
| Too many houses, concern of overpopulation | 5 |
| Previous plans have been rejected | 2 |
| Where will the businesses be relocated to? | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Point 2e has been added to the policy for the location of older persons housing within the community hub. The policy criterion for a 300 space car park has been removed as this will no longer be needed following the deletion of the Circulation Plan.

The yield for the site has been revised following further assessment to reflect the latest available evidence. Further information on these changes is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## 

## Policy C24: Land to the south of Sturry Road

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Support policy | 19 |
| Keep this land open | 8 |
| EMC will have negative affect | 7 |
| Improve cycling route | 4 |
| Too much development in the area | 3 |
| Wetland needs to be downstream of stodmarsh NNR | 3 |
| Is this site deliverable for CCC to manage | 2 |
| Area will be isolated surrounded by development having negative impact on wildlife | 1 |
| A positive for wildlife | 1 |
| Vital area for flood defence | 1 |
| Waste water and flooding already happening | 1 |
| Traffic congestion needs sorting | 1 |
| Conflicts with other policies | 1 |
| Allocate for battery storage provision | 1 |
| Establish this above all other developments | 1 |
| Confusing policy wording | 1 |
| Plan is inadequate, 10x amount of land needed | 1 |

All representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered - the majority were in support of the policy.

This policy is directly linked to the council's Nutrient Mitigation Strategy, and as such the council has worked closely with key stakeholders such as Natural England. The land allocated in this policy is supported by other parcels of land which are safeguarded for wetlands under *Policy DS17: Habitats of international importance.*

An additional point about no adverse effects on the groundwater quality, in line with Policy DS20 and DM16, has been added to the policy.

## Policy C25: Canterbury urban area regeneration opportunity areas

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Very little information | 11 |
| Agree with policy | 4 |
| Consider social housing for this site | 4 |
| Keep the offices in military road | 2 |
| Council offices in whitefriars are not accessible | 2 |
| Do not allow student accommodation | 2 |
| Add edible gardens around military road | 1 |
| Improve public transport | 1 |
| Agree with residential development | 1 |
| Protect the trees | 1 |
| Housing in the area needs upgrading | 1 |
| Evidence this follows local need | 1 |
| The area is already residential | 1 |
| Include outdoor sports | 1 |
| Ideal for community led co-housing | 1 |
| Build affordable homes for locals | 1 |
| Do not build up to the top of the car park | 1 |
| Mix of commercial and rental | 1 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 1 |
| Specific reference to PRoW needed | 1 |

All representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered - the majority were in support. The council recognises that the policy does not contain much detail, however this reflects the early stage of the opportunity area redevelopment. No changes have been made to this policy.

## Policy C26: Land north of University of Kent

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Strongly disagree to outer ring road | 30 |
| Negative impact on countryside | 26 |
| Disagree with circulation plan | 24 |
| Protect the farmland to the north | 18 |
| Not enough information | 10 |
| Do not build on site | 5 |
| This policy should be removed | 4 |
| Concern of traffic increase | 2 |
| This was allocated in 2020 call for sites | 2 |
| Agree with new garden | 1 |
| Develop after outer ring road complete | 1 |
| Will make the university less attractive | 1 |
| Disagree with garden community | 1 |
| Farer sharing of developments across the district needed | 1 |
| Replace with small innovation hub | 1 |
| Meaningful consultation with residents needed | 1 |
| Do not build more student accommodation | 1 |
| Restrict developments within the campus grounds | 1 |
| Approve to completing the bypass ring | 1 |
| Goes against the plans overall objectives | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The policy has been wholly replaced with a draft site allocation policy for a residential-led mixed use development of around 2,000 homes and this new policy will now be subject to consultation as part of the Canterbury District Local Plan (2040).

## Other comments

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Amount and size of developments should be reduced | 9 |
| Proposed zoning system would damaging | 7 |
| Flexibility in wording where developers need to meet southern water network | 5 |
| Circulation plan should be abolished | 4 |
| No information given on how this will be funded | 3 |
| Maps are not clear enough | 3 |
| Plan will have a huge negative impact for residents and the area | 3 |
| Lack of detail | 2 |
| Impact of traffic scheme on existing residents/businesses should be considered | 1 |
| Housing numbers are not justified | 1 |
| Local infrastructure is not in place to cope with new development | 1 |
| New building should be energy efficient | 1 |
| Increased pollution from the South West Canterbury link road will be detrimental to the New House Lane residents | 1 |
| No provisions made for those with disabilities | 1 |
| Strongly oppose solar farm development | 1 |
| Protect open space | 1 |
| Protect green gaps | 1 |
| Stop building student accommodation | 1 |
| All the development could harm world heritage site | 1 |
| New slip roads on/off A2 needed | 1 |
| Restrict development to just brownfield sites | 1 |
| Do not destroy rough common with ring road | 1 |
| Allocate southern slopes as a green gap | 1 |
| Zoning would put off tourists | 1 |
| No improvements for those already living in the city | 1 |
| Concern of overpopulation | 1 |
| Complete ATI at allocated sites | 1 |
| Council are yet to deliver on the last local plan | 1 |
| Council are not taking carbon emission seriously | 1 |
| Disagree with all policies | 1 |
| Policies conflict each other | 1 |
| Lack of conservation policies | 1 |
| Agree with the policies | 1 |
| Change wording to avoid duplication in policies | 1 |
| All plans are unsustainable | 1 |

All of the representations made on this chapter have been analysed and considered. Based on feedback, the number of new homes planned for has been reduced and a number of allocations removed from the draft Local Plan, including sites C12-15.

Having considered the representations made throughout the Local Plan consultation objecting to the Canterbury Circulation Plan, a new alternative transport strategy is being proposed in the form of a bus-led strategy with improvements to public transport. The Circulation Plan has been removed from the plan.

Details about funding will be outlined in the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2024).