

From: Edd Barrett [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 May 2026 08:40
To: Consultations
Subject: Regulation 19 consultation

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

--Email From External Account--

Good Morning,

I'm writing in response to the Regulation 19 consultation for the proposed local plan.

As a resident of South Canterbury, I am very concerned about Policy C10 at Merton Park.

Besides the pre-existing objections raised by the community regarding the Merton Park development (loss of recreational area, loss of wildlife habitat, loss of site of natural beauty, loss of views of the historic city, lack of supporting local infrastructure, ...), it is also becoming very clear that the roadways cannot support the development.

While I understand the need for new homes and facilities, the current access proposals don't look sufficient and place far too much pressure on the roads in and around our neighbourhood.

The plan appears to rely on residential streets such as Birch Road, Hollow Lane and Homersham for access to a very large development. These roads are not suitable for that purpose. Birch Road is a cul-de-sac, Hollow Lane is treacherously narrow and in places has no footway, and Homersham is already a residential road that was not designed to carry heavy through traffic. I do not believe these roads can safely or sensibly take the level of traffic this development will generate. My concerns are only exasperated by the locality of a primary school adjacent to the affected area. My daughter attends this school, so this development will have direct impact on my family and their safety.

I am also concerned that the map in the draft plan is out of date and does not properly reflect the existing layout, including more recent development in the area. That makes it difficult to have confidence in the proposal.

According to the Wincheap Society, there has been little engagement with local residents about these access arrangements. That is a serious concern, especially given the scale of the development and the likely impact on traffic, parking, safety and rat-running through surrounding streets.

In my view, Policy C10 is not sound. The access arrangements are not justified, not practical, and the development, in general, is not in the interests of existing residents.

--

Best Regards
Dr Edd Barrett

[REDACTED]