



CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045

1 message

Maggie Yaxley Smith [REDACTED]

13 January 2023 at 14:18

To: consultations@canterbury.gov.uk
[REDACTED]

Dear Sir or Madam,

We enclose some comments on the plan that we hope you may take account of, we suddenly realised the date is upon us !

Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045

Comments on the different sections you have highlighted in this plan:

We would comment primarily on Canterbury since we are residents of Harbledown:

The number of houses you are intending to build seem to contradict entirely the facts that this city is already fighting unhealthy levels of pollution in the bowl of Canterbury. It seems to us this will get much worse with the traffic jams that are likely to occur with the sectioning off of this small city in the proposed traffic flow changes. The changes recently made to St. Dunstons, making wider pavements have caused heavy traffic jams. We know your intention is to limit the people driving into the city and we commend any cycle lanes and, if possible smaller buses from a well situated park and ride. BUT, building of more houses is going to increase the traffic coming in and out of the city; having 5 different sections is going to make life difficult for everyone. The one word prevalent in any discussion of these traffic plans is the word 'bonkers' and we have to agree with that. The idea of a main road running through Rough Common, which is a residential area with playgroups, playgrounds and residences for the elderly is plainly ridiculous and dangerous. This is a place of access of the of the best assets in the South East of England, Blean Forest, now one of the largest areas of RSPB Reserve and forest in England. The pollution that would be caused by this road scheme will damage this area. As for the village of Routh Common - this is a place where people live!

PLEASE TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THAT IF YOU BUILD MANY MORE UNITS OF ACCOMMODATION FOR OLDER PEOPLE, CONSIDERING THAT PEOPLE ARE LIVING LONGER, YOU WILL FREE UP HOUSING ACROSS THE PRICE RANGE FOR EVERYONE SO THAT WE DON'T NEED SO MANY HOUSES BEING BUILT - THEY ALREADY EXIST. The numbers of units of accommodation proposed for older people are ridiculously small compared with the need.

If any houses are built, surely the priority has to be the building of affordable housing. We believe this needs to be the opposite of what is proposed i.e. 70% affordable housing and 30% more expensive housing and at the very least 50% of each and ALL OF IT ECO HOUSING. For years expensive private housing has been built to the exclusion of houses that young people starting out can possibly afford to buy or run. This has caused huge hardship in young people having to move far away from the support of family and friends to find housing they can afford. We speak as people who built our own house and we and our children have been fortunate enough to have comfortable housing. The local council has a responsibility to encourage housing to be built for those most in need, others can surely take

care of themselves. PLEASE BUILD MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR YOUNG PEOPLE STARTING OUT.

55 hectares of publicly accessible open space sounds too little for the need of families and children.

2 new primary schools sounds less than will be needed by then with the large class sizes now and the number of teachers leaving teaching because of the ratio of staff and pupils.

There needs to be an urgent assessment of new healthcare facilities since it has become locally almost impossible to see a G.P; to get a hospital appointment for a consultant; to get any kind of help in the A & E less than 10 hours wait. This is urgent nationally for obvious reasons. I think the G.P.'s have bought in ways of helping, the best they can with the lack of resources and how the Local Plan can possibly bring more people to this area to live when it is an area desperately short of essential infra structure brings to attention the need to question this intended increase in population.

New Sports facilities and more schools will of course offset some of the lack of health services.

Park and Ride: Please could this be placed further out from the city with smaller buses more often, using biofuel. The ideal site, of course, is the University of Kent site, there is space, it would help with the lack of parking for University of Kent staff and students during the week and would make best use of a park and ride at the weekends, when the car parks on campus are empty. It is crazy that this has not been negotiated years ago with the university. It is the one place where there are already buses every 10 minutes, using biofuel, going from there to the centre of Canterbury and the centre of Whitstable. I cannot understand why it is not possible to make this happen!!

The two important reasons for not building more larger houses is simple the inadequate services needed to support such a rise in population i.e. pollution of the City of Canterbury bowl, which if we walk over Duke's Meadow in the morning has been obvious and unhealthy for many many years; vastly inadequate sewerage; inadequate health care facilities; too large a classes in schools at every level; vastly inadequate lack of provision of social care and care of the elderly in suitable accommodation which would free up housing for families!

I hope you can take something of value from this and I do appreciate you having a Local Plan and considering these issues. I know you have the most difficult job to provide what is needed in a changing society and a changing world. Please do bring in as many eco solutions as you possibly can, that is the only way this city, this area, this population will thrive in the future.

Good luck with all of this and thank you for asking for comments.

Maggie and Chris Smith,

