



Response to the Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045

1 message

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

15 January 2023 at 10:16

In response to the Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045

Firstly, I would like to say that this proposal is supposed to be up for local consultation, ie, the local population are supposed to be able to make constructive comments about the proposal.

The truth is that the Draft plan is totally inaccessible to the ordinary person. It has been made extremely difficult and expensive to get a hard copy, with even local residents' associations having to pay for a copy. And whilst we are told it is available to read on line, many people either don't have that facility or would find it hard to read online.

In response, we are expected to fill in a 176 page form online (again, inaccessible to many), with the form being impossible to complete without having read the plan, which as stated above, is inaccessible.

This is an absolute sham of a public consultation - it is an exercise in 'box-ticking' so the council can continue to do what they wish and claim that the population is behind them, where in truth, the majority of the local population are against many of the proposals, but are unable to make any representation.

Regarding the proposed Local Plan, I would like to record that as a resident of Canterbury City centre, I strongly disagree with the majority of the plan that relates to Canterbury.

I believe that the number of houses proposed is out of proportion with the current population of the city.

I accept that the aim is to raise money from the new houses for the building of better infrastructure, but there will obviously be more people using the infrastructure, so this will become self defeating.

I believe that the zonal partitioning of the city, and fining of people for travelling across those zones, will make ghettos where people are not able to access facilities outside those zones, or are fearful of the costs incurred.

I believe the zonal partitioning will also make short journeys much longer, as people will have to travel out of the city, around, and back in - this is incredibly energy inefficient.

I believe that if we really need to build the number of houses that has been proposed in the county of Kent, we would be better to build a properly designed New Town, which could be organised efficiently for the population, with shops, doctors and dentists surgeries, community buildings for clubs, parks for children/sports/dogs - the list can go on. This would be so much better than tacking ill designed areas onto the edges of towns and cities, which then have none of the above facilities, so the people have to rely on travelling into the town they have been tacked onto, thus increasing the traffic.

The proposed Local Plan does not appear to protect Canterbury's many heritage sites, and by aiming to remove and build on all the city centre car parks the businesses within the city centre will be destroyed. Currently there is a large income from tourism and shopping - this will be severely cut if there is no parking in the city. And as for removing the parking from the train station - if you want to encourage people to use the trains, that seems completely self defeating.

The coast bound off slip road at Wincheap seems to have disappeared. As this was a requirement for agreeing to the houses being built at Thanington, this needs to be reinstated.

Emma Marriott