

## Local plan consultation reponse

2 messages

Doreen Rosman [REDACTED]  
To: CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

30 July 2021 at 17:25

I have tried to complete your consultation document but had problems with your website. You sent me a Word document but the word processing programme I use is liable to alters the formatting when converting to Word. I am therefore sending you my responses to the consultation by email.

### Growth options.

#### **I strongly disagree with the preferred option.**

- Canterbury simply does not have the infrastructure for 14,000 to 17,000 new houses.
- Choosing to build more housing than the government requires in the hope that this will enable developers to finance infrastructure is a very risky policy.
  - There can be no certainty that developers actually would finance the needed infrastructure. Their record (eg on building agreed numbers of affordable houses) is not promising. Far tighter control over them would be needed to ensure that commitments were met and it is difficult to see what form effective control might take.
  - Offering to exceed the required amount of housing could encourage governments to impose even higher targets on the district in future.
- Large-scale building of this sort might well prove to be counter-productive.
  - People who are thinking of moving to East Kent for a quieter more rural lifestyle are unlikely to want to live on vast edge-of-town estates.
  - Excessive building and increased traffic could have a detrimental effect on the tourist trade on which so much of our economy depends. Liverpool's recent loss of World Heritage status should serve as a salutary warning.

### Re other options focusing on particular areas

- Keeping the amount of new housing to 9,000, the level required by government is to be welcomed, as is the emphasis on public transport, walking and cycling routes, and on the protection of the environment.
  - BUT I see no benefit in focusing development EITHER on the coast OR the countryside OR Canterbury. Our region is small enough for people to be able to commute with ease to any other part of it, so the economic development of any one area does not necessitate focusing housing in that area.
- Whether a new free-standing development would be an acceptable way forward would depend on its location.
  - BUT it is likely that any such development would seriously impinge on greenfield sites, putting it at odds with the council's environmental and climate policies.

**I therefore think the council should give serious consideration to an alternative growth option: spreading 9,000 new houses ACROSS the district rather than focusing predominantly on any one area or type of area.**

- This would facilitate more small scale development and would avoid excessive infrastructure problems in any one area.
- It would maximise the use of brownfield as opposed to greenfield sites.

### Housing and new communities

**I agree with Option HNC1B** - set specific housing mix targets which each site must deliver, based on the identified needs for size, type and tenure, across different parts of the district.

- I think it is essential to prioritise the needs of the area over the wishes of developers.

While I am not at all opposed to the suggestion in Option HNC1C (set specific housing mix targets which each site must deliver and identify opportunity sites for specific types or tenures) I think it is crucial that the needs of the entire district (as in option B) are considered when approving plans for any site and would hope that this might be written into this option if included in the final plan.

Above all the council needs to focus on truly affordable and social housing, including the replacement of council housing.

- Social and affordable housing is essential to house existing inhabitants of the area properly, and to enable children from local families to continue to live and work in the region.
- Focusing on social and affordable housing is also essential if the council wants to encourage graduates from our universities and other young entrepreneurs to set up small independent businesses which would boost the economy and prove attractive to tourists.

### **Brownfield and regeneration developments**

**I strongly agree with Option HNC3B (preferred option) - maximise opportunities for delivery of suitable brownfield and regeneration developments.**

- This option provides the greatest protection to greenfield sites.
- It also has the huge benefit of providing more smaller developments which are likely to be more appealing to future residents.
- It favours smaller, often local firms, over large-scale national developers who have no particular commitment to our district.
- There are certain parts of our region which would benefit from redevelopment, notably the Wincheap industrial estate in Canterbury for which local residents have proposed exciting new plans. I hope that the proactive approach proposed in this option would involve serious consideration of such proposals. By working with local residents' groups such as the people in Wincheap, the council will avoid the opposition which often arises when a scheme designed by an outside developer is suddenly presented to residents who have had no say in what they want to happen.

### **Housing Densities**

#### **Alternative option**

- The key factor in achieving good quality housing with appropriate density for a particular site is to draw on the expertise of the (often small-scale) architectural firms which have specialised in such development. The example of cities such as Norwich shows that it is possible to build dense developments of affordable housing, which are both attractive and meet new carbon standards. But the large scale developers may well not be the people to approach about this.

### **Community infrastructure and design**

**I strongly agree with Option HNC6C - (preferred option) set clear requirements for new or improved social and community infrastructure to be delivered as part of strategic developments, and large developments must show that essential services can be accessed within 15 minutes walking or cycling time.**

### **Low Carbon and Energy Efficient Housing**

**I agree with Option HNC8C - (preferred option) all new homes delivered to net zero PROVIDING THIS MEANS THAT THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IMMEDIATELY.** I'm a bit concerned about the absence of a date.

### **Public Transport**

**I strongly agree with options MT2B - (preferred option) all major developments must show how they will maximise access to the existing local bus network and MT2D - (preferred option) all major developments must show how they will maximise access to rail services**

BUT I think it is essential that the council in conjunction with KCC and the bus and rail companies develops an integrated transport policy. It would make a huge difference if Canterbury West station became an integrated travel hub and if access was arranged to the station from the north.

### **Transition to zero-emissions vehicles**

**I strongly agree with Option MT3B - (preferred option) accelerated transition to zero emissions vehicles**

### **Heritage and the Historic Environment**

**I agree with Option NE1B - make changes to the current Local Plan policies**

- Current policies have failed adequately to protect and to publicise our historic environment. Unlike comparable cities Canterbury no longer has a museum tracing its history from the earliest times to the present – and most visitors no longer have the chance to access the Poor Priests Hospital, one of the most remarkable old buildings in the city. Unlike comparable cities Canterbury has a very small Visitor Information Centre which many tourists struggle to find.



CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

2 August 2021 at 07:46

To: Doreen Rosman



Good morning Dr Rosman,  
Thank you for your email. I will ensure your comments are reported and considered as part of the consultation process.

Best wishes  
Mike

**Mike Bailey**  
Corporate Consultation Manager  
Canterbury City Council

On Fri, 30 Jul 2021 at 17:25, Doreen Rosman  wrote:

I have tried to complete your consultation document but had problems with your website. You sent me a Word document but the word processing programme I use is liable to alters the formatting when converting to Word. I am therefore sending you my responses to the consultation by email.

#### **Growth options.**

##### **I strongly disagree with the preferred option.**

- Canterbury simply does not have the infrastructure for 14,000 to 17,000 new houses.
- Choosing to build more housing than the government requires in the hope that this will enable developers to finance infrastructure is a very risky policy.
  - There can be no certainty that developers actually would finance the needed infrastructure. Their record (eg on building agreed numbers of affordable houses) is not promising. Far tighter control over them would be needed to ensure that commitments were met and it is difficult to see what form effective control might take.
  - Offering to exceed the required amount of housing could encourage governments to impose even higher targets on the district in future.
- Large-scale building of this sort might well prove to be counter-productive.
  - People who are thinking of moving to East Kent for a quieter more rural lifestyle are unlikely to want to live on vast edge-of-town estates.
  - Excessive building and increased traffic could have a detrimental effect on the tourist trade on which so much of our economy depends. Liverpool's recent loss of World Heritage status should serve as a salutary warning.

#### **Re other options focusing on particular areas**

- Keeping the amount of new housing to 9,000, the level required by government is to be welcomed, as is the emphasis on public transport, walking and cycling routes, and on the protection of the environment.
  - BUT I see no benefit in focusing development EITHER on the coast OR the countryside OR Canterbury. Our region is small enough for people to be able to commute with ease to any other part of it, so the economic development of any one area does not necessitate focusing housing in that area.
- Whether a new free-standing development would be an acceptable way forward would depend on its location.
  - BUT it is likely that any such development would seriously impinge on greenfield sites, putting it at odds with the council's environmental and climate policies.

**I therefore think the council should give serious consideration to an alternative growth option: spreading 9,000 new houses ACROSS the district rather than focusing predominantly on any one area or type of area.**

- This would facilitate more small scale development and would avoid excessive infrastructure problems in any one area.
- It would maximise the use of brownfield as opposed to greenfield sites.

### **Housing and new communities**

**I agree with Option HNC1B** - set specific housing mix targets which each site must deliver, based on the identified needs for size, type and tenure, across different parts of the district.

- I think it is essential to prioritise the needs of the area over the wishes of developers.

While I am not at all opposed to the suggestion in Option HNC1C (set specific housing mix targets which each site must deliver and identify opportunity sites for specific types or tenures) I think it is crucial that the needs of the entire district (as in option B) are considered when approving plans for any site and would hope that this might be written into this option if included in the final plan.

Above all the council needs to focus on truly affordable and social housing, including the replacement of council housing.

- Social and affordable housing is essential to house existing inhabitants of the area properly, and to enable children from local families to continue to live and work in the region.
- Focusing on social and affordable housing is also essential if the council wants to encourage graduates from our universities and other young entrepreneurs to set up small independent businesses which would boost the economy and prove attractive to tourists.

### **Brownfield and regeneration developments**

**I strongly agree with Option HNC3B (preferred option) - maximise opportunities for delivery of suitable brownfield and regeneration developments.**

- This option provides the greatest protection to greenfield sites.
- It also has the huge benefit of providing more smaller developments which are likely to be more appealing to future residents.
- It favours smaller, often local firms, over large-scale national developers who have no particular commitment to our district.
- There are certain parts of our region which would benefit from redevelopment, notably the Wincheap industrial estate in Canterbury for which local residents have proposed exciting new plans. I hope that the proactive approach proposed in this option would involve serious consideration of such proposals. By working with local residents' groups such as the people in Wincheap, the council will avoid the opposition which often arises when a scheme designed by an outside developer is suddenly presented to residents who have had no say in what they want to happen.

### **Housing Densities**

#### **Alternative option**

- The key factor in achieving good quality housing with appropriate density for a particular site is to draw on the expertise of the (often small-scale) architectural firms which have specialised in such development. The example of cities such as Norwich shows that it is possible to build dense developments of affordable housing, which are both attractive and meet new carbon standards. But the large scale developers may well not be the people to approach about this.

### **Community infrastructure and design**

**I strongly agree with Option HNC6C - (preferred option) set clear requirements for new or improved social and community infrastructure to be delivered as part of strategic developments, and large developments must show that essential services can be accessed within 15 minutes walking or cycling time.**

### **Low Carbon and Energy Efficient Housing**

**I agree with Option HNC8C - (preferred option) all new homes delivered to net zero PROVIDING THIS MEANS THAT THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IMMEDIATELY.** I'm a bit concerned about the absence of a date.

### **Public Transport**

**I strongly agree with options MT2B - (preferred option) all major developments must show how they will maximise access to the existing local bus network and MT2D - (preferred option) all major developments must show how they will maximise access to rail services**

BUT I think it is essential that the council in conjunction with KCC and the bus and rail companies develops an integrated transport policy. It would make a huge difference if Canterbury West station became an integrated travel hub and if access was arranged to the station from the north.

### **Transition to zero-emissions vehicles**

**I strongly agree with Option MT3B - (preferred option) accelerated transition to zero emissions vehicles**

### **Heritage and the Historic Environment**

**I agree with Option NE1B - make changes to the current Local Plan policies**

- Current policies have failed adequately to protect and to publicise our historic environment. Unlike comparable cities Canterbury no longer has a museum tracing its history from the earliest times to the present – and most visitors no longer have the chance to access the Poor Priests Hospital, one of the most remarkable old buildings in the city. Unlike comparable cities Canterbury has a very small Visitor Information Centre which many tourists struggle to find.

Dr Doreen Rosman

