

Fwd: Comments on the Local Plan

1 message

CCC Planning <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>

6 August 2021 at 08:01

To: Michael Bailey [REDACTED]

Regards,

Planning Team
Canterbury City Council
01227 862178



Please reply to planning@canterbury.gov.uk for your email to be acknowledged.
Please give us your views through our [customer satisfaction survey](#).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Thu, 5 Aug 2021 at 18:26
Subject: Comments on the Local Plan
To: <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>

I have answered your questionnaire about the local plan but since hearing more details from our Parish Council I wish to add a few more comments.

I have felt while reading it, and such supporting documents as I had looked at, that, while the plan professes to consider active (or sustainable) travel, it starts by planning for motor-vehicle traffic, suggesting adding lots of unnecessary houses to get section 106 money to pay for more roads. It barely mentions cycling and walking after the initial suggestion that the best thing to do would be to encourage these means of transport. This is extraordinary since most journeys around the city are local journeys of less than 3 miles which would be easy for these means of travel.

See Jacobs notes below from Section 9.1 of their document.

"The model used in this project is highway based only and therefore cannot be used in its present form to quantify mode shift from car to sustainable modes.... The model assumes that the level of car journeys remains fixed, no matter how much easier it is to walk or cycle the volume of car journeys will not change. Also, journey time analysis is by car only whereas it is known that most trips in Canterbury made by car are short trips which could be made by walking or cycling with sustainable transport options in place."

I think that the plan does not do what it should be doing which is to consider modal shift to sustainable transport, and unless this is considered first no recommendations will make any sense.

Of the extra roads proposed I found out about the 'western bypass' from two city councillors and our Parish Council. The route is described as 'deliberately vague as it is undecided' so it is hard to make helpful comments. If as stated it is to join the A290 opposite Giles Lane, its route will cut through Kent College land, separating a boarding house and car park from the rest of the school. Has

the school be consulted? It also cuts National Cycle Route 1 where it runs parallel to the A290. This will not encourage walking and cycling to Blean school, or any other active travel on that route! And when the traffic gets to Giles Lane, where is it intended that it goes then? Giles lane is narrow and not suited to a lot of traffic.

I cannot see the purpose of this 'bypass' unless it is to enable lorries to drive legally from Harbledown to the University on as short a route as possible. I consider this desecration of countryside for no valid purpose. At the other end, on the A2050, an extra junction near Hall Place would create a serious hazard. The traffic lights at Palmars Cross Hill encourage two lanes travelling towards Canterbury to merge into one lane just where the pedestrian crossing to the hole in the Wall is. Recently the entire island in the centre of the road was wiped out by a large vehicle failing to 'merge'. It appears as a race to get to the narrow bit first which is just before where the proposed junction taking heavy traffic to Giles Lane is to be. This would make the A2050 even more dangerous than it is already.

Finally, the proposed Park and Ride in Upper Harbledown is again a vague star on a very small scale map so it is hard to see how it may be accessed. One of the many objections to any P&R sited in Harbledown was the number of junctions close to each other the A2. It is a completely unsuitable place for a large car park as it is in a hollow and can be seen from all around - e.g the North Downs Way, as well as enabling pollution to collect in the valley. Any P&R must be further from the City, beyond the morning traffic jams for example near Brenley Corner. Surely some cooperation with Swale is possible!

I do not support the plan and hope you will think again and consider sustainable transport seriously.

Yours,

Beatrice Shire 