



# Fwd: Canterbury District Local Plan Consultation (CDLPC) 2040

1 message

CCC Planning <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>

9 August 2021 at 08:01

To: 


Regards,

Planning Team  
Canterbury City Council  
01227 862178



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

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

From: **C Brown**   
Date: Sun, 8 Aug 2021 at 19:43  
Subject: Canterbury District Local Plan Consultation (CDLPC) 2040  
To: CCC Planning <[planning@canterbury.gov.uk](mailto:planning@canterbury.gov.uk)>

PART 1 of 2



Dear Canterbury City Council

Using your headings, I have the following comments and observations on the CDLPC 2040:

-

## **“The district vision by 2040”**

I agree with the draft vision.

## **“Our strategic objectives”**

I agree with all of the options but suggest that the final option includes the following additional wording: “Adapt to and reduce the impacts of climate change by making sure **existing properties and** new developments **are made** highly energy efficient and encourage low carbon lifestyles.”

## **“Growth options”**

## General Comments

The “Growth options” described in the CDLPC have been followed by the Wood Group in their Sustainability Appraisal, however other reports have not adopted these descriptions. For example, in many reports the “Coastal focus” option is identified as Option 2 whereas it is the fourth option in the CDLPC. In consequence it has been somewhat difficult to compare the merits of the various options with complete certainty. Notwithstanding, I have the following general observations:

1. If the provision of 9000 homes would meet government targets it would be helpful to know for assessment purposes, the pros and cons of increasing the housing provision to 14,000 or more units as proposed in “The preferred option” and the “Canterbury focus B” option?
2. In their Forecast Report of 14 May 2021, Jacobs conclude in their “Executive Summary” under “LPR Option Comparisons” that: ... there is no single stand out option that could be recommended for solving the existing local and strategic issues in the network.”
3. Later in the “Conclusions and Recommendations” section of the Jacob’s report, mention is made that “...it has been identified that often, when one issue in the network is resolved by implementing one measure, it would consequently free up some suppressed traffic that in turn causes other problems elsewhere on the network.” However where improvements to the network are made, traffic may also take up the additional capacity provided by the said improvement. In short, It is not clear whether the issue of suppressed demand has been fully considered at Canterbury and if so, its likely effects on the various “Growth options”.
4. In the Canterbury CC “Local Plan 2040: Road transport options carbon emissions” of January 2021 the “Recommendations” include the opening advice: “This evaluation of emissions from the local plan road transport options shows that without other interventions, all the options are likely to increase the total carbon emissions from the district transport system. Moreover, in order to reach carbon reduction targets towards net zero emissions, significant alternative transport system changes and interventions will be needed.” With respect to Option 5, the Recommendations conclude that “... A much more detailed and comprehensive multimodal study is required to develop and evaluate option 5.”
5. To summarise, it would seem that all of the options identified in the CDLPC need further analysis in order to fully assess their relative benefits and disadvantages. See also paragraphs 6 – 9 below.

## “Growth options”

## Specific Comments

6. Coastal focus: (aka Option 2) In this option, growth is concentrated at Herne Bay and Whitstable with only limited development at Canterbury and the villages. This could drive additional investment in the two coastal towns but could also lead to greater car use and deny support for enhanced transport provision both within and around Canterbury city. In addition there would most likely be increased pressure on the designated coastal nature sites.

7. The Coastal focus option also includes the proposal for a new Chestfield junction on the A299 together with a connecting link. As far as I can ascertain these proposals are not covered in the CDLPC but are mentioned in Jacob’s report (among others) under Figure 4-2 “Road / Infrastructure schemes” and Table 4-2 “Development Options Scheme description”. Such proposals appear contrary to existing Green Gap policies OS6 and OS7 in the Adopted Local 2017 and also consultation policies Option NE5A and Option NE5B (preferred option). The construction of a new Chestfield junction and link, if approved, would provide unparalleled access to the Herne Bay – Whitstable Green Gap potentially leading to pressure from developers for its development.

8. New freestanding settlement: A settlement of some 9000 homes would have a substantial impact on the surrounding countryside and most likely be difficult to integrate within the existing limited infrastructure and local landscape. On the positive side, it could be designed and constructed to fully meet the latest environmental and sustainable building requirements but conversely would do very little to benefit the wider community especially the adverse traffic and environmental conditions within Canterbury. It is likely,

depending on the relative remoteness of the settlement, that it would also generate additional car movements in preference to walking and cycling.

-

9. To conclude, it is suggested that the above options ie "Coastal focus" and "New freestanding settlement" are not taken forward for further analysis.

-

Regards

C S Brown

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.  
[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)