

PREAMBLE

This document is submitted to Canterbury Council in the form of a written comment on the basis that I consider that the documentation submitted by CC for public consideration is unwieldy to understand, particularly unfriendly, and is potentially designed to confuse the residents of Canterbury and surrounding areas.

It is full of vague statements ,inconclusive submissions, and insufficient evidence.

COMMENT

I strongly object to the proposals detailed as CANTERBURY FOCUS OPTIONS A and B

THUS:

The proposals to build 17000 houses in this area has no merit whatsoever, and does not take in to account the following issues:

Basic maths.....17000 houses equals potentially 34000 people and a possible 17000 cars!
Canterbury for example is already a traffic chaos without adding a further 17000 cars
Providing new roads has been proven not to improve matters either.

You state that Canterbury is a historic city that has immense benefit...so how would that be improved by the influx of so many people?

The city centre has little to offer as for example there are over 40 empty retail premises....so what is going to attract folk to the City Centre?

There are no real business in Canterbury and no indication of any major companies wishing to move into the area.....so where are all these people going to work?

The present sewage system may not cope with such an influx of additional population, but no mention has been made of reviewing and possibly upgrading this essential element of infrastructure.

There are insufficient Doctors, Hospitals, and Medical facilities at present (the current delay time to see a GP is horrendous!).....so how is that critical facility going to be addressed ?.....especially as the only mention of “medical facilities” are at proposed developments in Whitstable and Herne Bay!!.....SO YOU ARE GOING TO ADD A FURTHER 30 THOUSAND + PEOPLE TO THIS PROBLEM!!!

NO ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEYS AND STUDIES HAVE BEEN CARRIED OUT TO ACCOMPANY THE PROPOSALS

THERE IS A LEGAL REQUIREMENT TO UNDERTAKE A STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ON PLANNING PROPOSALS OF THIS NATURE ...which you have chosen to ignore!

WESTERN BYPASS

There is no need for this proposal, and there is no submitted evidence nor case studies as to its use nor purpose.

What exactly is it “BYPASSING” ???

If one travels on it from say Blean, the only sensible direction to go at the end is LEFT...which takes one into the bottleneck of the Reims Way and Canterbury.

One would hardly go up the A2 and almost back the way you came!!

If one travels from the A2050 toward Blean, the only sensible direction is to go RIGHT and again into the Canterbury bottleneck!

Again...why turn left back toward the Thanet Way?

OR.....one could go straight on at the proposed roundabout and enter the University then turn right at the end down St Stephens Hill.....REALLY???

There will be excessive pollution from vehicles travelling at up to 40 MPH (permissible speed as stated by CC)

The proposed route, or any other suggested or amended will have a devastating effect upon the current land use, and a loss of natural amenities that have immense benefit to the wellbeing of all residents.

It should not traverse farmland nor green belt land.

When roads such as this are mentioned in the Focus Options they have not been accompanied by a STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTTHIS IS A LEGAL REQUIREMENT!