



CCC Consultations &lt;consultations@canterbury.gov.uk&gt;

## Canterbury and District Local Plan

1 message

Natalie Miller [REDACTED]  
To: consultations@canterbury.gov.uk

24 January 2023 at 16:07

I am a resident.

### 1. General Comments

For a Council who cannot negotiate to replace level crossings with bridges or to enough sufficient sewage treatment plants for the current level housing density, or who cannot empty the bins on time, provide adequate numbers of Constables, or whose lack of strategic thinking destroys the centre of the city and concentrates on non-council tax paying students, this consultation is a hugely hubristic document.

Regarding your disguised plans to fine people who do not obey your proposed rules of zoning within Canterbury and its environs making them use a ring road, and not cross zone lines in line with UN and the World Economic Forum's doctrines

I would like to point out the following:

On 21 July 1993, the Speaker of The House of Commons issued a reminder to the courts. Betty Boothroyd said: "There has of course been no amendment to The Bill of Rights . . . the House is entitled to expect that The Bill of Rights will be fully respected by all those appearing before the courts."

There is a provision in the Bill of Rights Act 1689 which states:

"That all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of a particular person before conviction are illegal and void."

This states that a conviction is necessary before a fine or forfeit can be imposed. As you will be aware, the Bill of Rights is a "constitutional statute" and may not be repealed impliedly. This was stated in the case *Thoburn v City of Sunderland*, the decision commonly referred to as the "*Metric Martyrs*" Judgment. This was handed down in the Divisional Court (18 February 2002) by Lord Justice Laws and Mr Justice Crane (I will paraphrase, the judgment's relevant sections 62 and 63).

62. "We should recognise a hierarchy of Acts of Parliament: as it were "ordinary" statutes and "constitutional statutes." The special status of constitutional statutes follows the special status of constitutional rights. Examples are the Magna Carta 1297 & The Bill of Rights 1689 . . ."

63. "Ordinary statutes may be impliedly repealed. Constitutional statutes may not . . ."

This was upheld by Lords Bingham, Scott and Steyn in an appeal which went to the House of Lords on Monday 15 July 2002.

I am not aware that your plans to fine motorists for crossing between zones makes express reference to repealing the Bill of Rights Act 1689 therefore there can be no fine or forfeiture except for one that is imposed by a court.

It is therefore important that the courts considers the implications of any attempt to override the provisions of the Bill of Rights and the constitutional considerations of doing so. It will then be necessary to understand the constitutional considerations of ignoring the Declaration of Rights.

Now to some specifics

**Chapter 1: Spatial Strategy for the District to 2045** The whole thing needs rewriting to form a lawful and legal document. It must consider the Ancient Laws and Customs of the English which are protected in the Constitutional Document the Bill of Rights 1689. You cannot stop the free movement of people. You cannot fine them for going about

their daily business. You have no legal nor lawful right to do so. This means no modal restrictions, no fines, no zones. Rights of Way are Rights of Way, no matter which conveyance is used.

### **Policy SS1: Environmental Strategy For the District**

The levels of carbon particulates - the current size by number and the target for the same should be stated. There is no good having a policy if you have no means of measuring success.

"Protecting biodiversity" - this is nonsense as you have set yourself the target of increasing it by 20%. Please adjust. Just protecting it is not increasing it, as it just maintains the status quo. Specify what, how, when, with what money and how you will be measured.

Does this include the carbon in human-life forms or not? If not, why not? If you are increasing the population you are increasing the amount of carbon in the district.

Do you mean carbon or carbon dioxide here? Please be specific. They are two different chemicals. CO<sub>2</sub> is required by plants to live, just as oxygen is required by humans to live. If you reduce or limit CO<sub>2</sub> you are stunting the growth of plants and reducing the amount of food they produce. Carbon particulates are harmful to breathing animals and should be minimised. Cheap Hydrogen fuel for vehicles with the by-product of water will solve this problem and the technology is already well developed. Once the Rockefeller control over the world's energy is eliminated non-carbon based fuels will expand exponentially and will do away with expensive and damaging to the environment electric vehicles and electric batteries.

### **Policy SS2: Sustainable Design Strategy For the District**

Do you mean carbon or carbon dioxide? Carbon dioxide is required by plants to photosynthesise. The higher the ppm of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere the bigger and more lush the growth of plants becomes. Carbon dioxide is only 0.00041472% of the atmospheric gases. Water vapour varies between 0 and 10%. Any climate changes the Earth experiences are due to the sun's activity. Any effect on warming temperatures have a 75 year time lag between cause and effect. Water vapour is much more significant to any heating of the atmosphere. What is needed is proper control of the water cycle in the district. This means dealing with drainage, field run-off, limiting any housing development to the barest minimum and proper management of the water supply - eliminating leaks and proper sewage treatment.

Please do not confuse sustainable design with how the sun heats the planet. Sustain means to keep going for longer. You need longer lasting design out of natural materials that doesn't waste water resources. For example insist on Japanese-style wash basins in which the grey water from the waste feeds directly into the toilet cistern in all council owned properties.

### **Policy SS3: Development Strategy For the District**

The local population is not growing. With the excess deaths of 1000 per week due to the government the injection of a bioweapon into the population (US DoD has the patents), 2 billion people world wide are affected, it is wrong to claim that the population is growing.

You need to consider the consequences of this population cull by the world's eugenists will have on the ability to maintain services, and the effect this is going to have on the surviving population.

### **Policy SS4: Movement and Transport Strategy for the District**

By carbon emissions do you mean particulate carbon or carbon dioxide. They are quite different things and you need to be specific.

How is the sustainable transport structure being delivered to each rural area, and to the elderly and the disabled without being prejudiced?

Please specify what, where how and at what cost.

The Molmutine Laws are enshrined by the Bill of Rights 1689. They allow complete freedom of movement without hindrance on the King's Highway. Modal blocks are thus illegal and unlawful. Forcing people to use different types of conveyance is also unconstitutional.

Canterbury City Council is a Corporate body, therefore the Law of Contract applies. You will need to have a wet ink signatory to each contract between each person in the district and the Council. This does not apply to living men or women of course.

#### **Policy SS5: Infrastructure Strategy For the District**

The proposed WEF/UN 15-minute city in Canterbury will deny access to day-to-day services and unlawfully prevent the free movement of people and goods. Fining people is unlawful and illegal in England. Administrative Courts can NEVER be legal in the UK (see Halsbury's Laws of England), so ALL so-called breaches of zoning rules will need to go to court to be tried by a jury of one's peers of 12 good men and true.

**DS13** The Quality and extent of pavements throughout the district are not discussed. The management of footpaths, pavements and road markings neither present nor future are discussed. Parking on pavements is not discussed. This is not compatible with the stated desire to get more people walking. What is the cost of maintaining the current and that of reaching equitable throughout the District?

The Council has closed the Sturry Park and Ride.

There are town roads with no pavements.

The council does not protect walkers crossing the bridge at Fordwich.

The council should provide a plan to maintain what it already has before producing a grand hubristic plan.

**DS14** Currently no thought has been given to the elderly, disabled or people with pushchairs

There is no provision for ubiquitous cycle lanes. If they are not along every road, they do not encourage active travel.

The Cycle routes marked do not take you to where you want to go, unless they are ubiquitous. Cycle lanes work in flat Amsterdam because they are everywhere, but will not work in the hilly parts of Canterbury district.

**DS 15** I can find no reference to DS 15 in the Consultation document. Please add the policy and rerun the consultation.

With regard to your plans to close off roads within the district I would also like to point out the following in the Bill of Rights Act 1689

#### **The Subject's Rights.**

And thereupon the said Lords Spirituall and Temporall and Commons pursuant to their respective Letters and Elections being now assembled in a full and free Representative of this Nation taking into their most serious Consideration the best meanes for attaining the Ends aforesaid Doe in the first place (as their Auncestors in like Case have usually done) for the Vindicating and Asserting their auintient Rights and Liberties, Declare

#### **Dispensing Power.**

That the pretended Power of Suspending of Laws or the Execution of Laws by Regall Authority without Consent of Parlyament is illegall.

#### **Late dispensing Power.**

That the pretended Power of Dispensing with Laws or the Execution of Laws by Regall Authoritie as it hath beene assumed and exercised of late is illegall.

That all and singular the Rights and Liberties asserted and claimed in the said Declaration are the true auintient and indubitable Rights and Liberties of the People of this Kingdome and soe shall be esteemed allowed adjudged deemed and taken to be and that all and every the particulars aforesaid shall be firmly and strictly holden and observed as they are expressed in the said Declaration And all Officers and Ministers whatsoever shall serve their Majestyes and their Successors according to the same in all times to come.

The new Coronation Oath of 1688 required the monarch to uphold Protestantism and the statues, laws and customs of the realm as well, and bound all subsequent Monarchs to do the same.

#### **Coronation Oath of 1688**

Form of Oath and Administration thereof.

The Arch-Bishop or Bishop shall say,

Will You solemnly Promise and Sweare to Gouverne the People of this Kingdome of England and the Dominions thereto belonging according to the Statutes in Parlyament Agreed on and the Laws and Customs of the same?

The King and Queene shall say,

I solemnly Promise soe to doe.

This

means that the Coronation Oath Act of 1688 (and all subsequent Coronation Oaths requires the country to follow the Ancient Laws and Customs of this land. This includes the Molmutine Laws which grant amongst other things:

"There are three civil birthrights of every Briton:

- the right to go wherever he pleases
- the right, wherever he is, to protection from his land and sovereign
- the right of equal privileges and equal restrictions."

In addition

The seven years after the defeat of Brennus who took flight to Gaul following the slaughter of his 15,000 Norsemen were devoted by Belinus to the completion of the roads begun by his father. A law was made throwing them open to all, natives and foreigners, and placing them on the same footing of religious security as the river and the sanctuary:

"There are three things free to a country and its borders, - the river, the road, and the place of worship. These are under the protection of God and His peace: whoever on or within them draws weapon against any one, is a capital criminal." In this law originated the expression - "the King's Highway"; these highways, on which it was a capital offence to stop or commit an outrage on a traveller."

"There are three civil birthrights of every Briton:

- the right to go wherever he pleases,
- the right, wherever he is to protection from his land and sovereign,
- the right of equal privileges and equal restrictions.

This means that you cannot lawfully or legally block off any roads allowing preferential access (such as emergency vehicles only, or bicycles only) to a privileged few, within the United Kingdom and you cannot fine anyone or lawfully charge anyone for using the King's Highway.

In case there is any doubt, I have a passport which on the first page says:

Her/His Britannic Majesty's Secretary of State Requests and requires in the name of Her/His Majesty all those it may concern to allow the bearer to pass freely without let or hindrance, and to afford the bearer such assistance and protection as may be necessary.

I hereby put you on notice that you need to seek the advice of a Constitutional Lawyer before you proceed any further with your plans to restrict the movement of any people within the District.

### **Policy DS17: Habitats of International Importance**

Why on earth are you sequestering carbon, when it is the source of life for plants? Do you have any understanding of biology at all?

How are you going to protect the region's water resources exactly? Why are you saying you are going to protect biodiversity when you have also charged yourselves with increasing it by 20%?

Please specify how you are going to create new open spaces.

Please explain how they will be new. What closed spaces are you going eliminate to do this? Please specify what, how, where, when. Please explain what are the green gaps. Please explain their function. Please explain their function and their point if they are isolated.

Renewable energy is often not cheaper and not available as this month's usage of all fuel sources in the UK clearly demonstrate. How is a new development NOT going to have an effect on Stodmarsh?

### **Policy DS18: Habitats and Landscapes of National Importance**

“Avoids material harm to biodiversity is just attempting to maintain the status quo.”

This is not your target which you have stated is to increase it by 20%.

“Provision of Green Infrastructure”

What are you going to provide exactly, that is not already there? Providing electric power points for electric cars that need 6 times more mines is NOT providing green infrastructure. It is enabling more destruction of the planet.

“Development will affect the character of the district’s landscape”

So why do it? There is no mandate from central government to provide more housing, so as the population of Canterbury is not increasing it is NOT necessary.

“SS1, SS2, DS18 policy and DS19 policy and the site specific development requirements will largely minimise adverse effects”.

How?

Policy DS19: Habitats, landscapes and sites of local importance

“Protect all open spaces including privately owned ones”

How are you going to do this when you don’t even enforce planning decisions at the moment?

“Support conserving, connecting & enhancing biodiversity across the district”

How are you going to increase the connection of biodiversity (whatever that means) without knocking down current structures? Are you enhancing biodiversity by 20% or are just enhancing it, or are you trying to maintain it? There is inconsistency in the policies right across this document.

### **Canterbury Eastern Movement Corridor**

I understand that the routes mapped out for the Canterbury Local plan were done without any real thought and are essentially a “back of a fag packet” designation of the route. It is therefore difficult to comment on it in detail, but comment on it I must, as a residence of Fordwich. As so little regard has been given to the nature and proposed location of the new Eastern Movement bypass I expect you will take full notice of Fordwich’s Neighbourhood Plan when it is published as it will be far more considered than the Canterbury Council has done.

It is good to see the recognition that all the traffic currently going through Fordwich is on the current Eastern movement bypass of Canterbury. This currently is more than the town can bear with the lack of separation between pedestrians and vehicles and cyclists and motorised vehicles on the Fordwich bridge. The speed bumps on the High Street are causing severe vibration-based issues to a Grade 2 listed building and need removing. A traffic light system at the top and bottom of the town would solve many of the current issues by deterring current users of the Canterbury East bypass.

The proposed routes take little into account of the ancient archeology at the top of the hill, and will decimate what could be one of the best preserved neolithic sites in Europe. The Eastern one of the three proposed routes is far too long and far too expensive. It will also cut the town in two, separating those on Stodmarsh Road, Well Lane and the top of Moat Lane off from the rest of the Town. The proposed illegal modal filters to the South will prevent any delivery lorries or emergency vehicles reaching the town as from the North the bridge over the River Stour and the right-angled bends in King Street will make access from the North impossible. As Cycle Route 1 already takes both roads up the hill to the Stodmarsh Road, this slope is perfectly suitable for cycling, so there is no need for the road itself to expensively meander about purely to provide a 4% incline. the Fordwich bypass could go straight up the hill from the roundabout on the A28 (although for some strange reason the current map does not bring the road in at this roundabout.) Account must be taken of the Stour Valley park from Ashford all the way out to the sea, as well as the SSIs, the effect on the Stodmarsh Nature reserve and the wetlands and flood plain around the town.

In addition, the historic nature of Fordwich as Canterbury’s port means that it should be included in the World Heritage site, along with the Cathedral and St Martin’s Church. Without the port at Fordwich Canterbury would not be what it is today.

**Reading the Canterbury Local Plan** it strikes me that you are not competent or knowledgeable enough about the real world (rather than the regurgitating propaganda fed to you by the BBC and other TV stations) to write such an important document.

“

"We have an opportunity to review our local Plan. That means bringing in the latest technology to tackle Climate change, to have electric vehicle chargers, to have high speed internet access available. These are some of the things I want to see put in the local plan".

Electric cars are a failed environmental technology.

Let's just look at the mining requirements, in order to meet your electric car mandates, specifically, a sixfold increase in demand over the next decade, we're going to need 384 additional graphite, lithium, nickel and cobalt mines by 2035, according to industry forecasts. Expensive recycling mandates will only reduce this number to 336 new mines that we are going to need. In fact according to the International Energy Agency, an electric car requires six times the mineral inputs of a comparable internal combustion vehicle, six times the mining to produce a comparable car. And of course, copper is a critical component in this technology, and copper mining is what environmentalists are currently trying to shut down. As it is their contention that the mining required to produce electric cars is a threat to the environment, then they are also admitting that the electric cars require it, are also a threat to the environment. Can't you see how foolish and self destructive and absurdly contradictory these policies have become? Can't you see yet the damage that you're doing not only to the environment but to people's lives?

Hydrogen technology and Tesla based sub-quantum energy are the new technologies for which the Canterbury Local Plan should be gearing up.

"I want us to find a new way of providing council services; but it has to work for everyone".

Your role is to do as the people tell you, not the other way around. You are our servants not our Masters. You as councillors and council staff are our servants not our masters. We tell you what to do, not the other way around. It is not your place to tell me, a free born English woman, how to live my life. You need to go and read all the books on the English Constitution that you can find going back the Triads and the Molmutine Laws so that you can understand the laws of this land.

The proposed Zoning scheme - well hidden from proper scrutiny within this Local Plan is an open prison for the residents of Canterbury. It will be fascistic restriction on the daily lives on local people. You write that Canterbury "could change beyond recognition this decade". We the people have not instructed you to do this. You have no mandate and it is your role to **serve** us not to reign, rule or officiate over us. You are not charged with saving the planet. You are charged with running a council, to deliver the services we pay for and require.

You can't even provide a Park and Ride on the Sturry Road. You don't keep the streets clean nor keep the drains free flowing. You don't enforce planning decisions. You run unlawful Administrative Courts. You don't empty bins on time or in full. You don't provide safe foot paths or protect old buildings. You don't provide adequate policing. You are unable to keep Park and Ride going despite bus routes passing by the entrance.

How is all this going to be financed when the Council's loan liabilities are at £183m? You have policies for attracting students that do not pay council tax. You have policies for moving the centre of town out to the Sturry Road. You charge exorbitant parking fees in the centre of the city which is dying, but charge nothing at the out of town retail parks.

Canterbury's congestion issues and hence increased carbon particulate matter in the atmosphere are due in main from the poor interaction between road vehicles and railway lines. There is nothing in this plan that addresses this major issue.

You also appear to not have any understanding of economics. Filling Canterbury with non-council tax paying students has been disastrous.

You and your predecessors have destroyed the centre of Canterbury, have no understating of the Laffer curve and how it effects income from carparks.

"1 1/2 years since "The Climate Emergency" was declared. We are looking at the Council on this because we need to start with the things we can control"

"**The Climate Emergency**" is a political statement, not a scientific one. It has no place in a Local Plan to 2045. Climate taxes, carbon taxes and carbon tax credits were all devised as a corrupt payment to Al Gore, via the IPCC, for handing the US Presidency over to George W Bush in the contested 2000 election. If you need further proof, the King was not allowed to go to COP 27, as it is political debate, not a scientific one.

Just like King Canute found that it is the moon that controls the tides, you need to understand that it is the Sun that controls the climate. Weather has been controllable by man for over a Century, but climate is not. It is hubristic beyond belief to think that you can. You can control the pollution of the atmosphere, our water, our lighting and our rubbish. So concentrate on those things you can control.

You talk of democracy and yet, like the ugly Multi-storey Car Park at Canterbury West Station you ignored 1000+ submissions against it. I repeat constitutionally you are our servants, not our Masters. And no one is above the law.

Resident

Natalie Miller

