

Fwd: Fw: Views on Local Plan

1 message

9 August 2021 at 08:40

Simone Ward [redacted]
To: Michael Bailey [redacted]

I think this is the last one in my inbox.

Simone Ward
Planning Officer (Local Plans and Infrastructure)
Canterbury City Council
Tel: 01227 862197
www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning



Please give us your views through our [customer satisfaction survey](#).

----- Forwarded message -----
From: **Rhianne Pearson** [redacted]
Date: Wed, 28 Jul 2021 at 16:18
Subject: Fwd: Fw: Views on Local Plan
To: Simone Ward [redacted]

Hi Simone,
Just wanted to check has this been uploaded please? Do you need me to do anything with it?

----- Forwarded message -----
From: **Andrew Thompson** [redacted]
Date: Mon, 19 Jul 2021 at 22:07
Subject: Fwd: Fw: Views on Local Plan
To: Rhianne Pearson [redacted], Simone Ward [redacted]

----- Forwarded message -----
From: **CCC Planning** <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>
Date: Mon, 19 Jul 2021 at 13:14
Subject: Fwd: Fw: Views on Local Plan
To: Andrew Thompson [redacted]

Regards,

Amy
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: **Andrew Ellison** [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, 19 Jul 2021 at 12:55
Subject: Fw: Views on Local Plan
To: Planning <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>

As I have received no response to my email and therefore still not sure whether my views have been registered I am summarising my thoughts:

Preferred Option

The idea of building up to an extra 8,000 homes above the government target of 9,000 is ill conceived and I do not support it for the following reasons:

Traffic - despite plans for more cycle routes and improved public transport so many additional houses will inevitably lead to a substantial increase in traffic. Not only will there be additional homeowners cars used for work travel, taking children to school, visiting limited medical facilities but also many more delivery vans and contractors vehicles. A by-pass might give some relief to Canterbury for "through" traffic but there is still going to be an increase in local journeys and what about the rural main roads and lanes. These are already narrow and congested in many places, dangerous for cycling, and a Canterbury by-pass will be of very little help.

Infrastructure - existing medical facilities are already inadequate with many GP surgeries "full" and the two main hospitals in East Kent are both outside the Canterbury district. The sewerage system seems unable at times to cope with the existing homes with discharges into the sea and tankers pumping out sewers for months in some areas during the winter.

Environment - East Kent has two major trunk routes, high speed train lines, ferry terminal and the possibility of a cargo hub at Manston. We already have high levels of pollution and rubbish strewn main roads and whilst a by-pass might give some help to Canterbury what about the rest of the district? If we are not careful there will be no really rural green places left in the area for the residents to enjoy.

Food Production - it is difficult to see how the additional homes are going to be built without using prime agricultural land. At a time when there is a general consensus that we need more local sustainable food production which inevitably means lower yields we cannot afford to lose top quality agricultural farming land.

What guarantee is there that the by-pass would actually be built? We have seen over many years that promises of road improvements often never actually happen so we could end up with the worst of all worlds - 17,000 additional homes with all the consequent problems and no new by-pass.

Regarding the various options put forward in the Local Plan Consultation my preferred (or least worst) choice is for most of the new 9,000 homes to be in a New Free Standing Settlement. This would have the advantage of being able to concentrate new educational, medical and retail facilities in one area and the ability to include purpose made cycle and walking paths. This option should mean less increase in traffic congestion, pollution and the like but the big question, of course, is the location of this new settlement. As I have already stated we cannot afford to lose more agricultural land but is there a suitable brown field site?

Please make sure that my views are taken into account.

Andrew Ellison
[REDACTED]

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

From: Andrew Ellison [REDACTED]
To: Planning <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>
Sent: Monday, 5 July 2021, 12:56:30 BST
Subject: Views on Local Plan

Good Afternoon

Along with I understand a number of other local residents I have had difficulty in completing the online form.

I have twice attempted to complete Section 1 - Draft Vision & Growth including the 5 options put forward in the plan. I have received two references: 534687 & 532661 but the information I provided does not appear to have been saved.

Can you please advise how I can complete and save one of these registrations.

Andrew Ellison

--

Andrew Thompson

Planning Manager (Local Plans and Infrastructure)

Canterbury City Council, Military Road, Canterbury, CT1 1YW

T [REDACTED] M [REDACTED] E [REDACTED]

--

Rhianne Pearson

Technical Officer – Planning Services

Canterbury City Council

Tel: 01227 862150

www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning



Please give us your views through our [customer satisfaction survey](#).