



Connected Canterbury – Unlocking the Tales of England highways proposals

Consultation responses

1. Introduction

Consultation on Canterbury City Council's (CCC) plans to make changes to the public highway took place between Monday 14 August 2023 and Monday 6 November 2023.

This consultation sought views on each of the following five proposals:

- changes near the Westgate Towers and creation of a Westgate Square
- changes near the clocktower and creation of a St George's Square
- changes along St George's Lane and to the bus station
- changes to the pedestrian and cycle routes to the Norman Castle
- changes to footways on Pound Lane between The Causeway and St Peter's Lane.

Respondents were asked to comment on the current appearance and layout of these areas before giving their views on proposed changes.

The consultation also set out individual features within each proposal and asked respondents to express their level of agreement for each of these.

A total of 139 responses were received.

2. Executive summary

The main findings from the consultation are:

- Most respondents are not satisfied with the current appearance of all of the five areas, particularly the road and footways in St George's Square.
- Across the five areas, the reasons for this are lack of safety, cleanliness, and specific reference to cars dominating public spaces.
- Overall, there was a majority of respondents that agreed with all or some of the proposals at each of the locations.
- The pedestrian and cycling routes to Norman Castle received the highest level of agreement with respondents recognising the benefits of enhancing cycle routes and lighting for cyclists and pedestrians (59% agree).
- The proposals with the lowest level of agreement are changes to footways on Pound Lane between The Causeway and St Peter's Lane (40% disagree), this was followed by proposed changes to St George's Lane and the bus station (38% disagree).
- The concerns raised for proposals were specific to each of the five schemes, as were the elements people perceived as positive.

3. Consultation methodology

Consultation took place between Monday 14 August 2023 and Monday 6 November 2023. The following methods were used to seek views:

- an online questionnaire, which received 121 responses
- a paper version of the questionnaire, of which none were returned
- written representations were also welcomed and 18 were received.

The consultation was promoted in the following ways:

- an article on the council's newsroom site
- posts on the council's social media channels
- two in-person meetings where council officers were present to answer questions and take suggestions from the public.

Additionally, the following stakeholders were emailed directly to encourage them to respond to the consultation:

- Parish councils
- CCC councillors
- Relevant KCC councillors
- Residents' associations
- Local 'Friends of' groups
- Canterbury Connected Business Improvement District (BID)
- Canterbury Archaeological Trust
- Canterbury Green Party
- Canterbury Inter Faith Association
- Canterbury Society
- Canterbury Society
- Canterbury Action for Sustainable transport
- Canterbury College
- Cathedral Court Residents Association
- C4B
- CPRE Kent
- CPRE Kent
- East Cliff Neighbourhood Panel
- English Rural Housing Association
- Ethnic Minority Independent Council (EMIC)
- Ethnic Minority Independant Council
- Herne Bay and District Chamber of Commerce
- Hi Kent
- Hilltop Community
- Home Builders Federation
- Chamber of Commerce
- Invicta Chamber of Commerce
- Local Democracy Forum
- Moat Housing
- Mono Consultants Limited
- SPOKES East Kent Cycle Campaign
- St Mildreds Area Conservation Society SMACS
- The Crab & Winkle Line Trust
- The Canterbury Academy Trust
- The Gardens Trust
- The Georgian Group
- The Ickham, Littlebourne and Wickhambreaux Society
- The Open Spaces Society
- The Society of Sturry Village
- The Talk of Tankerton
- The Twentieth Century Society
- Theatres Trust
- Whitstable Improvement Trust
- Visit Kent
- Canterbury Climate Action Partnership
- Canterbury Christchurch Student Union
- University of Kent Student Union
- UCA Student Union

- Age UK Canterbury
- Canterbury Inter-Faith Association (CANDIFA)
- Disability Advisory Panel (DAP)
- Ethnic Minority Independent Council (EMIC)
- HiKent
- Nigerian Community Association
- Polish Educational Club in Kent (PECK)
- Karibu Community Action Kent
- Kwan Ngei Chinese Association
- Canterbury and District Jewish Community
- Canterbury Muslim Cultural Centre
- Kent County Council - Highways
- Stagecoach
- Whitefriars
- Marlowe Society
- English Heritage
- World Heritage Committee
- Pride
- Visit Kent
- Canterbury Cathedral
- Canterbury Festival
- Continental Drifts
- Kent Cultural Transformation Board
- Canterbury Tales of England
- Canterbury Archaeological Trust

4. Findings

NB: Percentages have been rounded to the nearest decimal point

4.1. Questionnaire responses

A total of 121 completed questionnaires were submitted, all of which were online.

4.1.1. Respondent profile

Over 90% of respondents are residents of the Canterbury district.

Respondent type	Percentage
A resident of the Canterbury district	93% (112)
A visitor to the Canterbury district	2% (2)
A worker in the Canterbury district	3% (3)
A business, organisation or community group	3% (4)
A city, county, parish or town councillor	-
An MP	-

The majority of people responding were aged between 45 and 74.

Age	Percentage
Under 18	-
18 to 25	5% (6)
26 to 34	12% (14)
35 to 44	12% (14)
45 to 54	17% (20)
55 to 64	22% (26)
65 to 74	17% (20)
75 to 84	12% (14)
85 and above	1% (1)

NB: 6 (4.9%) respondents did not give their age

More females responded than males.

Gender	Percentage
Male	35% (42)
Female	56% (68)
Prefer to self-describe (for example, non-binary, gender fluid etc)	1% (1)

NB: 10 (11.6%) respondents did not give their gender

4.1.2. Changes near the Westgate Towers and creation of a Westgate Square

Over half of respondents are not satisfied with the current appearance of the road and footways around the Westgate Towers.

Satisfied with current appearance of the road and footways around the Westgate Towers	Percentage
Yes	36% (21)
No	59% (34)
Don't know	5% (3)

Respondents were asked to explain why they were either satisfied or dissatisfied with the appearance of the road and footways around the Westgate Towers. The following comments were received:

- Too many cars: 10 comments
- Area needs cleaning: 9 comments
- Feels unsafe to cross: 7 comments
- Busy junction with noise and air pollution: 6 comments
- Railing need to be added: 6 comments
- Lack of green space: 6 comments
- It's fine as it is: 5 comments
- Too much clutter: 4 comments
- Easier for cyclists: 4 comments
- Waste of money: 3 comments
- Doesn't look aesthetically pleasing: 2 comments
- Keep it functional and authentic: 2 comments
- It already does what's needed: 1 comment
- Approve the adding of the square: 1 comment
- Like that more trees are planted: 1 comment
- Remove beggars: 1 comment
- Disagree with changes: 1 comment
- Remove social distancing posts: 1 comment
- It looks disorganised: 1 comment
- Disagree with getting rid of bus shelter: 1 comment

68% of respondents expressed agreement with some or all of the proposals to change the layout and appearance of Westgate Square, with some third of respondents disagreeing with them completely.

Agreement with proposals to change the layout and appearance of Westgate Square	Percentage
Yes	21% (12)

No	31% (18)
Some of them	47% (27)
Not sure	2% (1)

Respondents were asked to explain why they agreed or disagreed with proposals to change the layout and appearance of Westgate Square. The following comments were received:

- Need to maintain traffic flow: 9 comments
- Disagree with closing Pound Lane: 8 comments
- Make it safer for pedestrians: 6 comments
- Waste of money: 6 comments
- Decrease street furniture: 5 comments
- Agree with closing Pound Lane: 4 comments
- Improve cycling routes and facilities: 3 comments
- Consider using accessible materials for paved areas: 3 comments
- Need more detail: 3 comments
- Keep the heritage aspects: 3 comments
- Standardise the street furniture: 2 comments
- Whole area needs improving: 2 comments
- Plenty of food outlets already in St Peters: 2 comments
- Make it easier for sight impaired travel: 2 comments
- Add more green space: 2 comments
- Stop discriminating against disabled drivers: 1 comment
- Install ULEZ zones: 1 comment
- Enforce existing rules: 1 comment
- Leave Westgate alone: 1 comment
- Concern of impact on Masonic Hall: 1 comment
- Seating is needed: 1 comment
- Disagree with larger square: 1 comment

Respondents were asked to state the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with proposed new features near the Westgate Towers and creation of a Westgate Square.

A majority of respondents either strongly agree or tend to agree with all of the proposed features with the exception of the removal of the 'left turn only' traffic order from St Peters Street and the need for a new food or beverage concession.

Proposed new features - extent of agreement/disagreement						
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Carriageway and footway materials	12	15	12	10	9	-
	21%	26%	21%	17%	16%	-
Road layout	9	16	8	7	17	1

Proposed new features - extent of agreement/disagreement						
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
	16%	28%	14%	12%	29%	2%
New traffic regulations						
a) Pound Lane closure	18	11	5	7	17	-
	31%	19%	9%	12%	29%	-
b) Remove left only from St Peter's Street	10	11	8	9	18	2
	17%	19%	14%	16%	31%	3%
c) Restricted parking zone	20	11	8	6	13	-
	35%	19%	14%	10%	22%	-
d) Replacement of taxi rank with four trees	24	16	3	4	11	-
	41%	28%	5%	7%	19%	-
Seating	25	11	8	6	8	-
	43%	19%	14%	10%	14%	-
Planting	26	16	5	3	7	1
	45%	28%	9%	5%	12%	2%
Lighting	22	22	9	-	5	-
	38%	38%	16%	-	9%	-
Decluttering the street	25	16	7	2	7	1
	43%	28%	12%	3%	12%	2%
Cycle parking hub	16	10	16	4	10	2
	28%	17%	28%	7%	17%	3%
New food and beverage concession	5	11	14	10	17	1
	9%	19.0%	24%	17%	29%	2%

4.1.3. Changes near the St George's Tower (clocktower) and creation of a St George's Square

Over two thirds of respondents (70%) are not satisfied with the current appearance of the road and footways in St George's Square.

Satisfied with current appearance of the road and footways in St George's Square	
Yes	28% (13)
No	70% (32)
Don't know	2% (1)

Respondents were asked to explain why they were either satisfied or dissatisfied with the appearance of the road and footways in St George's Square. The following comments were received:

- Needs a clean: 11 comments
- Dominated by cars: 7 comments
- Dangerous for pedestrians: 5 comments
- Keep with the heritage: 5 comments
- New paving is awful: 4 comments
- Too much street clutter: 3 comments
- Do not change traffic flow: 3 comments
- It's easier to travel: 2 comments
- Waste of money: 2 comments
- Make more green space: 2 comments
- Difficult for sight impaired users: 1 comment
- It's adequate as it is: 1 comment
- More public seating is needed: 1 comment
- Place automatic barriers for disabled drivers: 1 comment
- Clock tower feels abandoned: 1 comment

70% of respondents expressed agreement with some or all of the outlined proposals with 28% disagreeing completely.

Agreement with proposals to change the layout and appearance of St George's Square	Percentage
Yes	24% (11)
No	28% (13)
Some of them	46% (21)
Not sure	2% (1)

Respondents were asked to explain why they agreed or disagreed with proposals to change the layout and appearance of St George’s Square. The following comments were received:

- Waste of money: 7 comments
- Proposals will restrict traffic flow: 5 comments
- Stain proof paving needed: 5 comments
- Approve of plans: 4 comments
- Proposals will make the area more attractive: 4 comments
- Scheme is confusing: 3 comments
- Maintain history of the city: 2 comments
- Remove street clutter: 2 comments
- Proposals will create more places to sit: 1 comment
- Clarification needed: 1 comment
- Use permanent structures for food stalls: 1 comment
- Should be taxi access only: 1 comment
- KCC don’t maintain what’s already there: 1 comment
- Would make it less dangerous: 1 comment
- Would support a ULEZ scheme: 1 comment
- Tower looks disconnected: 1 comment
- Install more cycle hubs: 1 comment
- More planting needed: 1 comment
- Retain disabled parking: 1 comment
- New paving is not easy to navigate in a wheelchair: 1 comment
- Need to provide large vehicle access to the Marlowe Theatre: 1 comment

A majority of respondents either strongly agree or tend to agree with all of the proposed features with the exception of the road layout where some people are concerned that traffic flow would be restricted.

Proposed new features - extent of agreement/disagreement						
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don’t know
Carriageway and footway materials	6	15	7	7	11	-
	13%	33%	15%	15%	24%	-
Road layout	5	13	8	7	12	1
	11%	28%	17%	15%	26%	2%
Seating	15	17	6	2	6	-
	33%	37%	13%	4%	13%	-
Planting	16	17	5	2	5	1
	35%	37%	11%	4%	11%	2%
Lighting	12	19	7	2	6	-
	26%	41%	15%	4%	13%	-

Decluttering the street	17	17	3	2	7	-
	37%	37%	7%	4%	15%	-
Concessions	8	12	15	2	6	3
	17%	26%	33%	4%	13%	7%

4.1.4. Changes to St George's Lane and the bus station

An equal number of respondents are satisfied with the current appearance of the road, footways and bus shelters on St George's Lane as they are dissatisfied.

Satisfied with current appearance of the road, footways and bus shelters on St George's Lane	Percentage
Yes	48% (42)
No	47% (41)
Don't know	6% (5)

Respondents were asked to explain why they were either satisfied or dissatisfied with the appearance of the road, footways and bus shelters on St George's Lane. The following comments were received:

- Provides protection against the weather: 22 comments
- Old fashioned, needs updating: 11 comments
- It's fine as it is: 10 comments
- Large seating area is needed: 10 comments
- Waste of money: 8 comments
- Dislike current bus shelter: 7 comments
- It's not welcoming for pedestrians: 6 comments
- Needs queue management, too crowded: 5 comments
- Materials are non recyclable: 3 comments
- Needs a clean: 2 comments
- Signage needs improving: 2 comments
- Footways are too narrow: 2 comments
- Need more exists from the bus station: 1 comment
- Air too dirty: 1 comment
- Vehicle dominated area: 1 comment
- Noisy and confusing environment for sight impaired: 1 comment
- Better lighting needed: 1 comment
- Information point needed: 1 comment

Overall, 60% of respondents expressed agreement with some or all of the outlined proposals with 38% disagreeing completely.

Agreement with proposals to change the layout and appearance of St George's Lane and the bus station	Percentage
Yes	19% (17)
No	38% (33)

Some of them	41% (36)
Not sure	2% (2)

Respondents were asked to explain why they agreed or disagreed with proposals to change layout and appearance of St George's Lane and the bus station. The following comments were received:

- Continuous bus shelter is needed: 40 comments
- Large seating area needed: 10 comments
- Waste of money: 6 comments
- Agree with plans: 5 comments
- Agree to expand footways: 3 comments
- Need to address overcrowding and queuing: 3 comments
- Needs to reflect entrance to the city: 2 comments
- Agree with tactile zebra crossings: 2 comments
- Changes are not needed: 1 comment
- Agree to create cycle hubs: 1 comment
- Would support a ULEZ zone: 1 comment
- Surfaces are not sustainable: 1 comment
- Add more green spaces: 1 comment
- Need CCTV at cycle hubs: 1 comment
- Will be hard for busses to turn in the station: 1 comment
- Agree to replace shelters: 1 comment
- Disagree with location of cycle hire: 1 comment
- Work on traffic flow: 1 comment

Respondents were asked to state the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with proposed new features to St George's Lane and the bus station.

A majority of respondents either strongly agree or tend to agree with all of the proposed features with the exception of the new bus shelters.

Proposed new features - extent of agreement/disagreement						
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Walking between the bus station and Whitefriars and improved pedestrian routes and space						
New bus shelters	17	8	5	9	45	4
	19%	9%	6%	10%	51%	5%
Green roofs on bus shelters	30	18	19	8	10	3
	34%	21%	22%	9%	11%	3%
Improved lighting in bus shelters	52	25	5	1	3	2
	59%	28%	6%	1%	3%	2%

Real-time bus information	63	15	6	-	3	1
	72%	17%	7%	-	3%	1%
Footway widening	38	15	18	6	9	2
	43%	17%	21%	7%	10%	2%
Road surfacing	17	24	25	8	11	3
	19%	27%	28%	9%	13%	3%
Raised zebra crossing	21	23	21	7	13	3
	24%	26%	24%	8%	15%	3%
Cycle facilities	18	18	27	9	12	4
	21%	21%	31%	10%	14%	5%
Improved bus access into the bus station with kerb buildout	25	21	19	7	11	5
	28%	24%	22%	8%	13%	6%
Improved area around former ticket office building	26	28	17	3	10	4
	30%	32%	19%	3%	11%	5%

4.1.5. Changes to the pedestrian and cycling route to the Norman Castle

Over half of respondents (56%) are not satisfied with the current appearance of pedestrian and cycle routes to the Norman Castle and Dane John Gardens.

Satisfied with current pedestrian and cycle routes to the Norman Castle and Dane John Gardens	Percentage
Yes	28% (11)
No	56% (22)
Don't know	15% (6)

Respondents were asked to explain why they were either satisfied or dissatisfied with the current pedestrian and cycle routes to the Norman Castle and Dane John Gardens. The following comments were received:

- Doesn't feel safe: 5 comments
- Difficult for cyclists: 5 comments
- Badly signposted: 3 comments
- More than adequate: 3 comments
- Waste of money: 3 comments
- Needs to be cleaned: 2 comments
- Footpath is too narrow: 2 comments
- Agree with lighting improvements: 2 comments
- Not an area I visit: 2 comments
- Agree to encourage cycling: 1 comment
- Changes will not make a difference: 1 comment
- Unsafe for sight impaired residents: 1 comment
- Wall is in the way: 1 comment
- Disagree with loss of spaces: 1 comment

Over three quarters of respondents (77%) expressed agreement with some or all of the outlined proposals with 23% disagreeing completely.

Agreement with proposals to change the pedestrian and cycling routes to the Norman Castle	Percentage
Yes	59% (23)
No	23% (9)
Some of them	18% (7)
Not sure	-

Respondents were asked to explain why they agreed or disagreed with proposals to change the pedestrian and cycling routes to the Norman Castle. The following comments were received:

- Waste of money: 5 comments
- Agree with scheme: 5 comments
- Improving lighting is important: 5 comments
- Agree to remove high wall: 4 comments
- Widening path is important: 3 comments
- Important to create a cycle route: 3 comments
- It'll become full of litter: 3 comments
- Improvements don't go far enough: 2 comments
- Make the lighting a heritage design: 1 comment
- Road resurfacing needed: 1 comment
- Needs to be more accessible: 1 comment
- CCTV needed: 1 comment

Respondents were asked to state the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with proposed new features to the pedestrian and cycling route to the Norman Castle.

The majority of respondents either strongly agree or tend to agree with all of the proposed features.

Proposed new features - extent of agreement/disagreement						
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Church Lane						
Road resurfacing	16	11	6	1	4	1
	41%	28%	15%	3%	10%	3%
Improved lighting	24	7	2	1	4	1
	62%	18%	5%	3%	10%	3%
Gas Street to Dane John						
New raised crossing point on Castle Street	16	8	5	2	7	1
	41%	21%	13%	5%	18%	3%
Widened pathway with buff surfacing	19	8	3	-	8	1
	49%	21%	8%	-	21%	3%
Landscaping planter	16	9	2	2	9	1
	41%	23%	5%	5%	23%	3%
Lighting	22	8	4	-	4	1
	56%	21%	10%	-	10%	3%
Cycle facilities in car park	15	7	6	1	9	1
	39%	18%	15%	3%	23%	3%

4.1.6. Changes to footways on Pound Lane between The Causeway and St Peter's Lane

A relatively equal number of respondents are satisfied with the current footways on Pound Lane between The Causeway and St Peter's Lane as they are dissatisfied.

Satisfied with current footways on Pound Lane between The Causeway and St Peter's Lane	Percentage
Yes	47% (21)
No	42% (19)
Don't know	11% (5)

Respondents were asked to explain why they were either satisfied or dissatisfied with the current footways on Pound Lane between The Causeway and St Peter's Lane. The following comments were received:

- Pathways are too narrow: 9 comments
- Dangerous for pedestrians: 9 comments
- Works well now: 7 comments
- Waste of money: 3 comments
- Disagree with closing Pound Lane: 2 comments
- Sufficient for pedestrians: 1 comment
- Use materials historical to the area: 1 comment
- Make the underpasses safe: 1 comment

Over half of respondents (56%) expressed agreement with some or all of the outlined proposals with 40% disagreeing completely.

Agreement with proposals to change the footways between The Causeway and St Peter's Lane	Percentage
Yes	36% (16)
No	40% (18)
Some of them	20% (9)
Not sure	4% (2)

Respondents were asked to explain why they agreed or disagreed with proposals to change the footways between The Causeway and St Peter's Lane. The following comments were received:

- Safety for pedestrians: 7 comments
- Widen walkway: 6 comments
- Waste of money: 6 comments
- It's ok as it is: 4 comments

- Disagree with closing Pound Lane: 4 comments
- Prioritise pedestrians: 3 comments
- Proposal will make traffic worse: 2 comments
- It's currently dangerous: 2 comments
- Agree with plans: 1 comment
- Need to allow large vehicles into Marlowe Theatre: 1 comment
- Already too narrow: 1 comment

Respondents were asked to state the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with proposed new features to footways on Pound Lane between The Causeway and St Peter's Lane.

Both features received a relatively mixed response with respondents split in their levels of agreement.

Proposed new features - extent of agreement/disagreement						
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Widened footway at The Causeway	16	4	8	4	12	1
	36%	9%	18%	9%	27%	2%
Widened footway on Pound Lane near St Peter's Place	16	4	3	7	14	1
	36%	9%	7%	16%	31%	2%

4.2. Written representations

A total of 18 written representations were received. A summary of the main points raised in the written responses is also included within the committee reports.

WR001 was received from a resident. This representation was unclear but seemed to suggest that the scheme would cause traffic to make detours to other areas of the city, wasting fuel and increasing pollution. As there are no proposals to change the traffic flow through or around the towers, it is not considered that this is a valid concern.

WR002 was received from a resident. This representation suggested that the government funding could be better spent on other projects in the city. The projects suggested are outside of the scope of the Connected Canterbury project but could be considered as part of the Transport Strategy.

WR003 was received from a residents association. This representation asked general questions relating to the overall Connected Canterbury project relating to sustainability, affordability, aesthetics, and heritage conservation...

WR004 was received from a resident. This representation called for more cycle parking, better cycle routes and clearer signage which will be taken into account in the scheme designs and within other stands of the Connected Canterbury project. It also called for e-scooters to be banned which is outside of the project scope.

WR005 was received from a resident. This representation did not support the scheme design for the footway changes in Pound Lane between the Causeway and St Peters Lane.

WR006 was received from a residents association. This representation suggested design alterations for the Westgate Square proposals. We have considered these as part of our scheme design development.

WR007 was received from a residents association. This representation suggested design alterations for the footway changes in Pound Lane between the Causeway and St Peters Lane. We have considered these as part of our scheme design development.

WR008 was received from a resident. This representation requested that the horse trough by the westgate towers be used as a flower planter and that a pedestrian crossing be installed on Pound Lane. We have considered these as part of our scheme design development.

WR009 was received from a business. This representation raised concerns over the accessibility to vehicles of the Westgate Square, St George's Square and footway changes in Pound Lane between the Causeway and St Peters Lane. We have considered these as part of our scheme design development. It also asked for improvements for cycling on other routes which we will consider within different stands of the Connected Canterbury project.

WR010 was received from a resident. This representation called for the shelters within the bus station to maintain the same amount of cover and seating as they currently have. We have considered these as part of our scheme design development.

WR011 was received from a local group. This representation called for increased and improved cycling infrastructure within the schemes. We have considered these as part of our scheme design development.

WR012 was received from a resident. This representation provided detailed design suggestions for all of the schemes. Where these were within the scope of the Connected Canterbury project, we have considered these as part of our scheme design development.

WR013 was received from a business. This representation provided detailed design suggestions for all of the schemes. We have considered these as part of our scheme design development.

WR014 was received from a business. This representation provided detailed design suggestions for all of the schemes. We have considered these as part of our scheme design development.

WR015 was received from a business. This representation provided detailed design suggestions for all of the schemes. We have considered these as part of our scheme design development.

WR016 was received from a local group. This representation provided detailed design suggestions for all of the schemes. We have considered these as part of our scheme design development.

WR017 was received from a public authority. This representation commented on the schemes in terms of highway asset management and road safety. We will address these comments as part of our Section 278 agreement with the highway authority and by carrying out road safety audits.

WR018 was received from a resident. This representation provided detailed design suggestions for the Westgate Square proposal. We have considered these as part of our scheme design development.

4.3. Public drop-in sessions

Public drop-in sessions were held on:

- The Guildhall, St Peter's Place, Canterbury, CT1 2DB, on Thursday 14 September 2023, 10am to 4pm
- The Guildhall, St Peter's Place, Canterbury, CT1 2DB, on Saturday 23 September 2023, 10am to 4pm

These events were promoted via email to a wide array of stakeholders on the council's newsroom website as well as social media channels.

In total, both events were attended by approximately 130 people.

Council officers involved in the design and delivery of the schemes were in attendance to answer questions and provide further details and clarifications on specific elements of the schemes.

In general, people were supportive of the overall principles of the schemes but there were a number of alternative suggestions made towards the details. These were also raised in the online survey.

A number of people were concerned that vehicle access through the Westgate Square and St George's Square would be restricted, and officers were able to reassure people that these measures were not being proposed.

5. Conclusions

Overall, the survey results show that people are generally unsatisfied with how the five areas look as they are.

Where there is a lack of overall agreement for each of the proposals, respondents did state that they agree with some of the suggested changes.

While the reasons for this were mixed contingent on the scheme in question, there were common themes that ran through each of them.

Safety was deemed important with concerns for pedestrians at the heart of numerous comments. Respondents also feel that any changes should be in keeping with Canterbury's cultural heritage.

While respondents expressed that they don't like some aspects of the proposals, these figures and comments should be considered in conjunction with evidence around current appearance and layout.

It's clear that the people of Canterbury are dissatisfied with how the five areas currently look. This suggests that action is needed.

Given the response rate and overall engagement during the consultation period, residents seem engaged with proposed changes to work on the public highway.

It's hoped that the findings from this consultation provide useful insight as to how the council will proceed during the next stages of the project.