

# Oliver Waldron - 2045 Local Plan

Hi,

My name is Oliver Waldron. I'm [REDACTED] and live in Central Canterbury. Please see my thoughts on the local plan below.

## **SS2**

A strong emphasis should be placed on “distinctive local character and history” this means building houses and public spaces similar to Canterbury’s quaint but mediaeval centre. Houses with large lawns and driveways void of biodiversity, culture and architectural importance should be avoided. Not doing so could risk Canterbury's UNESCO status. If we build boring single detached houses with driveways and no cultural interest why do we deserve a UNESCO status over a town such as Ashford?

## **SS4**

Very little is mentioned about railway services. This plays an extremely important role within our transportation makeup. Canterbury council is not responsible for railways but should lobby for a better rail service for example, the re-introduction of the 06:20 service towards from Ashford to Ramsgate via Canterbury West. (The first service in the morning). This was removed during Covid leading to a decrease in rail capacity for people travelling to Thanet.

Other bold options should also be explored such as taking buses under local council ownership like Manchester and introduction of a Canterbury smart pass working similar to an Oyster card in London. We should also legislate for a cap on the price of a bus fare within the region. (These are all things the city of Ghent has achieved and it seems we love to follow in their footsteps.)

## **DS1**

Social housing could be increased

## **DS3**

**Agree**

## **DS5 & DS1**

The policy regarding the site having “high quality cycle storage” in DS5 is extremely admirable and should be applied to DS1.

## **DS6**

While everything recommended in this is a good policy proposal it must be ensured that cycling and walking infrastructure is not just built as ‘islands’ to meet demands set out by council. 24mbps simply isn’t good enough. FTTP should be required in all new sites upon completion otherwise a levy should be charged to the developer.

## **DS13**

**Strongly Agree**

**DS14*****Strongly Agree***

Once again, while everything recommended in this is a good policy proposal it must be ensured that cycling and walking infrastructure is not just built as 'islands' to meet demands set out by council. We have all seen examples of cycling infrastructure just ending. It should be ensured that all new walking cycling routes link up with an already well used cycle and walking corridor such as the National Cycle route, the city or town centres. The wording around the bus stops should be changed from a 'should' to a 'must'

**DS15**

Every new parking space should be EV charging compatible.

*Point 2c & 4a:* Strongly Agree.

*Point 6b:* There is no evidence of how to shift to road based-bourne freight in the rest of the report, this should be explored more in depth.

**DS16*****Agree***

However, point 4 is in complete contradiction of policy C16 (Eastern Bypass)

**DS17**

All developments should be built to reduce the use of private car. This includes mandatory minimum bike spaces ect.

**DS18*****Strongly Agree***

However, is once again in complete contradiction of policy C16 (Eastern Bypass)

**DS21*****Agree***

*Point 2b:* A levy should be charged to developers who wish to choose the lower options in the hierarchy.

**DS22*****Strongly Agree*****DS24*****Strongly Agree***

CCC must require a long term bond from the developer to allow for upkeep of new public spaces.

**DM1*****Strongly agree*****DM2*****Agree***

**DM5**

Parking should be discouraged where possible and only used as a last resort. As stated for DS15, EV charging points should be provided at every new space.

**DM6**

*Agree*

**DM8**

***Strongly Agree***

This must be actively enforced by CCC once policy.

**DM9**

*Agree*

**DM1**

***Strongly Agree***

The point on bike storage is highly commendable.

**DM12**

*Agree*

**C2**

*Agree*

However, no mention of cycling facilities such as a bicycle rack.

**C3**

*Agree*

**C8**

***Strongly Disagree***

The cycle and walking connections are completely inadequate. Especially seeing as there would be an opportunity to link this development with Cycle Route 18 on the other side of the A28. The site should not be contributing to the A2 junction.

**C16**

***Strongly Disagree***

The eastern corridor is possibly this most environmentally disastrous and ill regarded use of funds provided to the council.

Firstly, to call the corridor anything but a bypass is a complete farce. The plan is completely car focused, merging cyclists and walkers onto the same narrow lane next to a busy roadway. This will make the cycle path near upon unusable on its completion having to share with pedestrians which can include disabled users putting them at far greater risk.

Secondly, as set out in your 2017 transport plan "I has long been recognised that building extra road capacity does little to solve existing traffic congestion and can actually increase traffic on roads" The council must look extremely carefully at new road projects as it

encourages more drivers only making issues, like pollution and congestion, laid out in this report worse. I fear by building the Eastern Bypass we should simply be shifting the high pollution sites such as the New Dover Road. Further out rather than actually eradicating the problem.

Thirdly, the cost. The highest estimated cost for the roadway is over £100 million. This is put in context when a city such as Amsterdam only spends around €70 million on cycling infrastructure.<sup>1</sup> This highlights a massive subsidy provided by housing developers through S106 to private car owners.

Finally, the destruction of the SSSI at Old Park & Chequers Wood is reprehensible. I completely agree with the Old Park & Chequers Wood position presented to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee on Wednesday 14th December 2022. The route is a keen nature spot and the bypass will lead to a decrease in biodiversity and tourist activity thus hurting the local economy.

### **C17**

#### ***Agree***

However no mention of cycling facilities such as a bicycle rack

### **C18**

#### ***Agree***

Make use of the abandoned Signal Box at Canterbury East. Turning it into a focal point of the community.

### **C22**

#### ***Agree***

Cycling and walking routes should be made clearer.

### **C23**

*Point 2c:* Disagree

*Point 4c:* Agree

### **C24**

#### ***Strongly Agree***

The land should be protected under all circumstances. No mention of improvements to the national cycle network that passes through it.

### **W1**

#### ***Agree***

### **W2**

#### ***Agree***

---

<sup>1</sup> [Why Amsterdam is Removing 10,000 Parking Spaces](#)

**W6**

No connection with Cycle Route 1 The Crab and Winkle Way is a concern.

**R1*****Agree***

Canterbury City Council should lobby Southeastern and the Rail Delivery Group for a more frequent service to Canterbury, Faversham and Dover to coincide with its opening.

**R9**

Access to cycle route 1 should be provided.

**R10*****Agree*****R17*****Strongly Disagree***

Poorly drawn diagram, how you can improve cycling and walking access along a railway line is beyond me...

**R12**

This development is extremely close to Chislet Colliery Railway Station, an abandoned station with the platforms still in situ. Reopening should be considered.

**R26*****Strongly Agree***

The Herne Bay to Canterbury cycle route is extremely appealing. More detail should be provided.

Kind Regards,  
Oliver Waldron