



## Comments on CCC local plan 2022-45.

1 message

**Doreen Rosman** [REDACTED]  
To: consultations@canterbury.gov.uk

14 January 2023 at 10:43

From Dr Doreen Rosman [REDACTED]

As a long-term resident of Canterbury, I welcome some marked improvements in this draft of the local plan, but remain concerned about some elements of it.

SS1. Environmental strategy.

I **strongly agree** with commitments to protect and enhance rivers, streams and ponds; to work to restore Stodmarsh Nature Reserve; to ensure that large housing developments have a minimum of 20% tree cover; and to support the development of renewable and low-carbon sources of energy. Given the priorities outlined in SS1, it would seem logical to designate the most significant open space in the St Stephens area, the university Southern Slopes, as a protected area.

SS3. Development strategy.

I **strongly disagree** with proposals to build 1252 new houses a year, considerably more than professional advisers recommended. This would inevitably lead to the loss of green spaces, and increased traffic and pollution, which would in turn have a detrimental effect on physical and mental health at a time when the health service can barely cope with existing problems. It seems that changes in government policy will allow local communities greater discretion over the amount of house building and this provides an opportunity to rethink how much and what kind of housing the area needs. I would like to see targets set - and enforced - for an increased amount of social and affordable housing since this is what is most needed. It is mere speculation to assume that large scale developments of expensive housing will either yield the revenue for new roads or attract new business.

SS4. Movement and transportation strategy.

I **strongly disagree** with the proposed zoning system, which would cause major problems for those with limited mobility, the elderly, the sick, and families with young children, who may not be able to use modes of transport other than cars to reach shops, medical practices, dentists, Age Concern, CAB, churches etc. These groups include people who are least likely to have the computer skills needed to apply for exemptions. ( The need for multiple exemptions would in any case make the system so complex as to be unworkable. ) Zoning also seems counter-productive since people would have to drive longer distances to get to supermarkets rather than using direct routes, and the carbon emitted on each journey would therefore increase.

C26. Land north of UKC.

I **strongly disagree** with the idea of constructing a 'northern movement corridor'. No viable route has been proposed and it is difficult to see how one could be devised. Rough Common Road cannot be widened and any other route would be destructive of green space and existing wildlife habitats. Building a new major road would in any case be a carbon-intensive process, incompatible with movement towards zero-carbon goals. The aim may be to reduce congestion but it seems likely that any new northern road would simply displace it, causing new delays on roads such as St Stephen's Hill which takes traffic towards the city through St Dunstan's, already one of the worst areas for air pollution.

DM3. Housing in Multiple Occupation

I **strongly agree** with the continued restriction on the number of HMOs in areas subject to article 4. I live in such an area and can recall the time when an escalating number of HMOs was leading to an imbalanced community with much disruption of life for non-student residents. The implementation of article 4 along with co-operation between the local residents' association and the university has led to a marked improvement. I am therefore **concerned about the clause which implies that in some circumstances consideration could be given to conversions, extensions or building of further HMOs. I strongly disagree with any watering down of the existing policy.**

Sent from my iPad