

Have repeatedly lost my on-line submission. Am consequently sending this as an email.

Resident of Canterbury

SS1

1 Neither agree or disagree

1a These are all very commendable ideas but the ways of implementing them seem vague, and with reference to new housing and road expansion, unrealisable. Nothing set out regarding water pollution which, with Southern Waters consistent illegality, effects strongly the Stour, Stodmarsh and, frankly, the entire region.

SS2

2 Tend to agree

2a Objectives commendable but environmentally valid aspersions clash immediately with other elements of the plan. Radical destruction of countryside and massive expansion of transport not commensurate (to say the least) with the aesthetic and non-polluting goals of the text. Most of the city's heritage currently either closed off (Cathedral grounds, Castle) or at risk from vandalism and misuse (Dane John Gardens). Need explicit programmes to protect and develop these

SS3

3 Tend to disagree

3a A fairer allocation of new housing should be made. Canterbury, a World Heritage centre, has been allocated massive housing development without a realisable plan of how to deal in real time with the traffic this will generate. The coastal towns, which have adequate road infrastructure, are to be underdeveloped (most likely because these are the regions councillors live in). Canterbury will lose its appeal to residents and visitors if it is to be buried beneath 32,000 new homes (and how many people?)

SS4

4 Neither agree nor disagree

4a Certainly support the idea of diminishing pollution in Canterbury and surroundings but am troubled by the ghettoisation involved in the CCP plan. I am a senior citizen with a fully electric car who is retired from the university but still needful of getting there. I do not feel the plan takes into account the needs of those of us with challenged mobility, and I must say that suggesting a shopping trip to Sainsbury's will involve a roundabout trip of some fifteen miles is obscene. How ill I get to the Medical Centre at the University in an emergency? Will there be egress from the centre of the city into and through other enclaved areas, or will everything need to be accessed via a single route such as, I suspect, the A28 at Wincheap?

5 Neither agree nor disagree

5a Despite the assertions of this section, massive expansion of building has already been approved by the Council without regard for the strain this is putting on existing infrastructure. Water provision, and purification, is a centrally salient question. Traffic management is another. The 'Ring Road', I gather, will not be completed (if then) until well after the enclave system is imposed on the city. How will this work without generating far more driving, extensive traffic problems, and the concomitant pollution?

No mention is made of charging points for local residents' electric cars. These are currently underprovided, and the idea that one who already pays local council tax and on street parking permit charges should have to pay to charge in Council car parks or park and ride facilities is a slap in the face for those of us who have invested heavily in green technologies to precisely improve our environment.

6 Further comments

The plan, in not taking into account basic matters such as inflation over the time covered, difficulty in getting builders to 'cough up' for promised adjunct developments, and the likely diminution or destruction of Canterbury City's appeal to residents as well as out of town shoppers and tourists because of overcrowding and transport problems, is not viable.

C1

Neither agree nor disagree

All very commendable on paper, but how will these developments be brought about (and financed)? At present Canterbury's central region is dense with Taiwanese Bubble Tea shops, Vaping outlets, mobile phone repair shops. How will you bring better businesses in? The Green Spaces are precious, but people are afraid to use most of them at night. The 'night time economy' serves young drinkers, many from out of town or the universities, and walking down the High Street from 18:00 on is a study in aggression and noise. Vandalism and graffiti is prevalent. Yes, all of this should change, but how? Finally the Council's encouragement of electric scooters (useless for shopping and only good for joy riding) has led not only to the rental scooters racing along pavements and through parks but also to the proliferation of privately owned scooters, the irresponsible use of which puts local residents - and visitors - at risk of corporeal damage.

C2

Don't know

C3

Tend to Disagree

Until some viable plan for dealing with sewage is developed the considerable development proposed here can only give rise to absurd 'solutions' such as that currently in play for the former Nason's site (i.e. tanker trucks coming in twice a day to 'magic' waste off to some site outside of town). Car parks disappearing under further housing or business developments need to be environmentally assessed; we won't need the car parks if the city plan goes as proposed, but this needs to be environmentally assessed.

C4

Tend to agree

With the proviso raised in C3 above, this generally sounds good. Not sure how the Council intends to stop students from living off campus although moves in that direction would make for more housing for locals without the need of new buildings. Connectivity of green spaces excellent, but I note that the area currently designated for car parking across from Hambrook Marshes remains as such despite the plans being withdrawn. This is an important connectivity link and, like those connecting Larkey Valley to the countryside, remains very much at risk.

C5

Tend to disagree

3000 new homes! All of this above the Stour. Where will the waste go? This is a major threat to the already at-risk quality of that important chalk river.

All of the positive aspects of this plan depend on the property developers routing profits into infrastructure. Experience has shown that this rarely happens and, in the current economic climate with inflation as well as faltering demand for new housing, it is much more likely that the district will see a series of uncomplete (though vital) projects with the costs, and problems, being passed on to those who continue to live in the area. Larkey Valley, incidentally, is already surrounded on three sides by denuded fields and bulldozed building sites. Don't know about connectivity, but do know the demand for bicycle and motorbike routes within that remaining green space will destroy a treasured local green area.

C6

Don't Know

C7

Neither Agree nor Disagree

Already in play, so why are you asking? When will the necessary roads be built?

C8

Don't know

C9

Neither Agree or Disagree

Water pollution to the Stour?

C10

Neither Agree nor Disagree

Ensure this does not encroach upon SSSI areas around the old military barracks area. Not sure about Hollow Lane being upgraded into a major connection link into what appears later to be the sealed off Wincheap area.

C11

Neither Agree nor Disagree

Protect SSSI

C18

Tend to disagree

Parking for railway users. Fine to say restricting parking for proposed residents, but those who use the trains will need to park elsewhere making neighbouring roads unusable for local residents.

C26

Disagree

Modern movement corridor is vital for the entire ring road plan, but this property is substantially outside of Canterbury meaning that any traffic routed through it from the city will be travelling ludicrous distances. This is also quite beautiful and well loved countryside with a substantial residential community which will strongly resist a major circular route being put through.

Do you have any other comments on Chapter 2: Canterbury

As I've said from the beginning, this is wonderful verbiage but much if not all of it is unrealisable. Too much depends on the "generosity" of builders – an oxymoron if ever I heard one – which is likely to dry up at precisely the moment when substantial work is needed to cope with the enlargements proposed. There are also substantial environmental issues, most saliently increased flow of waste water into the catchment area of the Stour but also simply the impact on local green areas – a real treasure – of a massively increased residential population. All of the rehabilitation proposed for Canterbury city depends on a pie in the sky appeal to desirable businesses to move into an urban area which at present is haemorrhaging good businesses at a stupendous rate, replacing them with vape shops, mobile phone repair shops and Taiwanese bubble tea outlets. Finally, Canterbury will no longer be Canterbury with 32,000 new houses plus all of the business expansion you envisage.