

Local Plan 2040 Consultation Response

Growth Options:

Canterbury Focus A - Disagree

I disagree with the focus being mainly on Canterbury with only limited growth in the coast and villages. Adopting this plan will completely change the character of the city and increase commuting from coastal residents. 9,000 new houses concentrated in one place is disproportionate. I would also like the council to ask for the target set by the government to be negotiated downwards, bearing in mind that the population is not growing at the rate originally projected and the fact that the ONS statistics on which the projections are based have been criticised by the government's own statistics regulator.

"Preferred" Option (Canterbury focus B). Strongly disagree.

My first question is "preferred by whom"? When was this option debated in the full council. At a recent meeting attended by local councillors and residents, several councillors said that this has never been put to a vote.

Building this enormous number of houses would place a huge strain on an already creaking infrastructure (schools, sewage, water, hospital, refuse etc.) It would also completely change the character of Canterbury.

I believe that this option has been highlighted because a developer has agreed to fund a link road from Sturry to the Canterbury bypass. Such a road would not solve the problems of congestion – building new roads usually leads to more cars. It would also not address the delays at the Sturry level crossing.

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

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.

B. Martin Kane

