Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045

Consultation

Comments on TRANSPORT TOPIC PAPER (OCTOBER 2022)

1. a step change increase in the proportion of active travel in the District's urban and suburban areas – *whilst desirable and as an active cyclist, there is no evidence other than a few comments that this is something that the majority of people want, or are inclined change to.*
2. rapid electrification of road vehicles to reduce emissions – *there is no evidence that this affordable for the majority of people*
3. better connected and available public transport and opportunities for mobility as a service – *there is no credible strategy as to how this would be achieved, or funded.*
4. There is public dissatisfaction with the level of congestion which impacts daily life. (Issues consultation July 2020) – *445 comments out of a population of 157,000 is statically invalid.*
5. However, although car trips are decreasing, HGV and LGV deliveries are increasing and there is little evidence of anything other than a very modest uptake of sustainable transport. *– one concludes that a zoning strategy which limits the freedom of residents, is due to the increase in HGV & LGV deliveries.*
6. Public transport patronage which was increasing, naturally suffered significant losses of confidence during the pandemic and has not yet recovered. *– there appears to be no evidence that there will be a modal shift to public transport.*
7. 5. A neighbourhood approach where additional road capacity is provided by a new movement corridor at the outskirts of the city, road space is reallocated to active travel and neighbourhood zones are created with modal filters at key points to remove all through traffic from the neighbourhood zones.*- following comments 1.-6. it appears that the evidence for the neighbourhood approach is based solely on the additional housing being built. There is no evidence other than a few people out of 445 responses out of a population of 157,000 (2020 consultation) that there will be a shift to active travel. Neighbourhood Zones have recently had significant international media coverage with scant evidence that this is something residents in multiple cities want. The cities haven't provided evidence that it works. It is a costly strategy with minimal evidence.*
8. A cycle propensity study and technical note have also been prepared as part of the modelling work to provide an analysis of the potential modeshift to cycling due to proposed Local Plan interventions - *where is this study available to be read?*
9. The transport strategy is based on the following principles of circulation planning that have been demonstrated as successful in other european cities and in other authority areas – *the cities have been named but no summary, or detailed evidence*

given. How can a resident find this a credible strategy if no summary evidence is given? Should a resident support the Council on the basis of "have been demonstrated as successful in other european cities and in other authority areas".

10. Neighbourhood areas - This approach has been put into practice in northern european cities and has made a vast difference by significantly increasing active travel and improving both the air quality and the traffic congestion in residential neighbourhoods, and making the neighbourhood zones more pleasant streets. *Once again no evidence is provided.*

11. Cycle Network - A proposed network of cycle route infrastructure is set out in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. - *whilst desirable and as an active cyclist, there is no evidence other than a few comments that this is something that the majority of people want, or are inclined change to.*

12. Modal Filters - These are road closures that only permit certain modes of vehicles to pass and are proposed at all locations where roads link one neighbourhood zone to the next. – *these are measures which negatively affect the less affluent, those in poor health and the elderly. If I were an elderly person who lives on the Sturry Road and once a week attends a community event in Fordwich, I would have to make a journey many times the length to continue to attend. If I could barely afford to run a car now and I want to visit a friend, go to work, or attend a hospital appointment, I will have to drive further, which I can barely afford now. The two assumptions that support modal filters are that a significant number of people will walk, or cycle, or that there will be a significantly increased and more affordable public transport service. This paper does not provide that evidence.*

13. Highway infrastructure - Consequently two additional routes were assessed, one to the west of Old Park and one to the east. The western alignment still had an effect on the SSSI, and therefore the alignment to the east, skirting south of Fordwich is now proposed. Although this route option is longer and therefore more expensive, it avoids harm to the SSSI in line with government policy. –
    a. *having avoided the SSSI, the second option creates several issues in an around Fordwich, when there is a significantly less damaging and less costly solution.*
    b. *There is already an east-west raod, Stodmarsh Road, so why create a new road to the south, damaging the peaceful environment, ancient woodland sports amenities and existing housing.*
    c. *Why create maximum damage to Fordwich's environment by routing the proposed road over*
        i. *archeological sites,*
        ii. *ancient woodland*
        iii. *baring existing public rights of way*
        iv. *and cutting the Town in half,*
    d. *When, the road could be routed over Grade 3 farmland between Chequers Wood and Moat Lane*
    e. *Less costly with no disadvantages.*
    Why create maximum damage and cost, when there's a less damaging and less costly solution?

14. Mode Hierarchy
    This whole section appears to be explaining what is required to happen, without evidence that it will happen. If I approach a problem by saying I want something

better to happen, it has some virtue. However, it depends entirely on convincing residents that they want to change their behaviour. Alternatively, I will make it happen by forcing residents to change their behaviour without them agreeing to it. I cannot support either approach.