

## Local Plan 2040 Consultation Response

Growth Options:

“Preferred” Option (Canterbury focus B).      Strongly disagree.

This is my least favoured option. I would also question how it came to be listed as the city council’s preferred option when I have been told by several councillors that the matter has never been put to a vote of the whole council.

It is not clear how many houses are proposed to be built. Some versions say 14,000, and some say 17,000. Both figures are completely out of proportion to the existing size and character of the city and exceed the 9,000 target set by the government. The main rationale for this option appears to be that a private developer would fund the cost of a new eastern link road. This is not a good reason for the development to go ahead. Concentrating all development in Canterbury will only increase congestion, irrespective of any new link road.

A new road from A28 at Sturry to the Canterbury by-pass will do irreparable harm to ancient woodlands, open space and existing SSSIs. It will also not prevent the delays caused by the level crossing at Sturry.

I think this is the worst option and should be removed.

Option (Canterbury Focus A).      Disagree

Though slightly better than focus B, this option still places most of the potential for development in Canterbury. Surely this will increase the amount of commuting from the coast into the city?

I would also query the government target of 9,000 new houses because the government’s own statistical watchdog has stated that the ONS population projections for small cities, especially those with universities, are based on an error. I think the council should not just accept this estimate but ask for it to be recalculated.

In general, I agree with the reallocation of road space and the provision of more attractive routes for walking and cycling. Investment in public transport infrastructure would also be welcome.

Coastal Focus      Neutral

I don’t know how this proposal would affect the character of Whitstable and Herne Bay. Their residents are better placed to judge that. However, a more balanced distribution of housing and economic development seems preferable to concentrating everything in Canterbury. It would be better to build up the economies of the coastal towns so that people who live there can get to work by public transport or on foot or bicycle.

Rural Focus

Disagree

Although some new settlements should be built in the villages, I think concentrating on this option is likely to lead to urban sprawl along the main roads and will probably destroy the character of some of the villages through over-development of housing and ill-defined economic opportunities. Without the latter, there is likely to be an increase in commuter traffic.

New Free-standing Development      Strongly disagree

There is map showing where the transport hubs would be but no indication of where the new development would be built. This plan cannot really be called a plan unless possible sites for the new development are proposed. I suspect creating a completely new settlement is a non-starter.

Patricia Kane,

