



CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Opposition to Draft Canterbury District Local Plan 2020-2045

1 message

Paul Cowham

10 January 2023 at 19:46

To: "consultations@canterbury.gov.uk" <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my opposition to significant elements of the Draft Canterbury District Local Plan 2020-2045.

The key elements of the plan include:

- 1.) The building of at least 10,000 new homes and the consequential increase in the local population by more than 25,000;
- 2.) The introduction of an outer ring road to support an experimental, unproven circulatory system based on new zones and rules;
- 3.) Subscription to a politically inspired, ideological, green agenda committed to the reduction of carbon emissions, even on an immaterial scale, to allegedly 'save the planet'.

The plan fails to recognise that:

1.) Canterbury is a relatively small City constrained by its historic evolution. The entire infrastructure of the City, particularly the transport infrastructure, is compromised by legacy limitations. Much of the City was not designed for modern living or for the uncontrolled expansion of multiple higher education establishments. The social and economic assets of the City are very limited, and barely support the current population. Even with modifications, the City is incapable of supporting a significant population increase. There are not enough jobs or facilities, and there is insufficient capacity in the transport infrastructure, to support this expansion, without causing an unacceptable disadvantage to the existing population;

2.) The outer ring road is flawed both practically and financially. The concept is reasonable in principle, as the inner ring road is at capacity, but the proposed solution will not work. Firstly, the proposed road is only a partial ring, with a significant section between Rough Common and Sturry having been omitted. Therefore, by definition, this is not a ring road, and it cannot deliver an efficient and functional circulatory system. Secondly, the concept of adapting the Rough Common road is ludicrous. This is a narrow suburban road with established housing along its entire length. It is neither practical nor safe to convert this into a circulatory relief road for an entire City. Thirdly, the proposed zonal system will be over complicated, inconvenient, and unpopular. It imposes an unfamiliar and unwelcome level of state control over the local population with draconian financial penalties, and restricts the freedom of movement currently enjoyed by the existing population. Furthermore, such a system will discourage economic activity in the City encouraging people to spend their money in more convenient and unrestricted locations elsewhere. Finally, it is simply unaffordable. The plan excludes an accurate budget for the construction of the new roads and junctions, but the final cost is likely to be excessive and impossible to justify;

3.) Expansion of the district is incompatible with any green agenda. An increase in population will only serve to increase the carbon footprint of the area, not to decrease it. Draconian measures to reduce the environmental impact of this expansion can only be at the expense of the existing population. The local authority does not possess the democratic mandate to do this, and, if it believes it does, it should be

redetermined, transparently and honestly, at the ballot box. The future of Canterbury District should be democratically determined by the people of Canterbury District, not by the machinations of an overreaching state in pursuit of flawed political ideals.

I believe that these views are shared by many local people, and I urge Canterbury City Council to reject this plan, and to replace it with a more realistic, more affordable, less expansionary, greener proposal, designed to be advantageous to the existing local population - people who should be served by their local authority, not dictated to.

Yours faithfully,
Paul Cowham

