



CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Response to Canterbury Plan

1 message

henry sugden [REDACTED]

12 February 2023 at 20:21

To: consultations@canterbury.gov.uk

Hello,

Thank you for the extra time to respond to the Plan.

As a resident of Fordwich I appreciate that the Council has made a suggestion to address the amount of traffic that use Fordwich as a 'rat run'. However there may be cheaper and more effective ways of doing this than building a bypass by for example:

- More traffic calming measures to slow traffic through Fordwich that would encourage people to take alternative routes
- Using ANPR cameras to charge non-residents to drive through Fordwich
- Additional, smaller buses for local schools, including private ones

If a bypass is to be built, I do not think that the Eastern option is the best of the three proposals outlines in the STANTEC report:

- It is the longest and therefore most expensive route, leading to the most air pollution
- It cuts Fordwich in two. It would be impossible for some emergency services, delivery vans and removal vans to access the southern part of the town (unless the 'modal access' specifically allows this)
- It crosses sites of paleo-archaeological national (and probably international) importance
- It goes straight through Ancient Woodland in and around Trenley Wood, destroying this habitat
- It goes through Sandpit Wood, where CCC have imposed Tree Preservation Orders
- Chequers Wood and Old Park Wood SSSI would become an ecological island, marooned from surrounding wildlife havens in the woods to the east of Fordwich and Stodmarsh SSSI
- It severely impacts two working farms, making fields uneconomic to farm, and will force a livery business to close
- It cuts through the Fordwich conservation area, enlarged in 1993 specifically to protect the village
- It destroys any opportunity for the City to make the most of its UNESCO World Heritage status to attract more tourists by linking up the City with outlying areas, especially Fordwich which was for so long Canterbury's port and retains medieval buildings; and linking the City to the Stour valley, encouraging residents and tourists to walk and cycle between the two

In the past few years I have lamented the decline of cuckoos along the Stour to the West and East of Fordwich. But like many others, I have enjoyed the return of turtle doves and nightingales to areas of Old Park Wood and the East of Fordwich. In order to encourage this, it would make more sense to link the areas than sever them in two.

It would therefore make far more sense for any bypass to follow more closely the western of the three routes in the STANTEC report, hugging more closely to Canterbury. This would limit the encroachment onto the Old Park Wood SSSI. It would also avoid all the negative impacts raised above. In addition, it would: provide a curb to the urban sprawl of the city; provide a buffer to the Old Park Wood SSI (preventing predation and disturbance of rare species by domestic pets); and enable a natural corridor for wildlife linking Old Park Wood to Stodmarsh SSSI/RAMSAR.

For the bypass to properly support the suggested zoning, it needs to have a northern section skirting the north of the city from the A2 to the A28.

Overall, the Plan seems to be too Canterbury City centric, with scant thought for outlying areas, save where they impact on the city.

Regards,

Henry Sugden

