Alexander Gunyon

From:	Matthew Wale
Sent:	03 June 2024 07:37
To:	Consultations
Subject:	Objection to the Brooklands farm development
Categories:	Blue category

You don't often get email from

Learn why this is important

--Email From External Account--

I object to this development on a number of grounds:

Firstly, the development is not needed. There is more than sufficient housing in the area with many existing houses remaining empty. If the planning team were part of the community, they would know this.

Secondly, the development focusses on the wrong demographic. The emerging demographic is of single / double occupancy households. This is due to the falling birth rate, the loss or migrant workers and the aging of the population. This is a retirement area. Only a small proportion of this development is given over to this demographic. There may be a lot of smoke and mirrors in the plan but it is wholly for profit and council fund generation / preservation.

Thirdly, why do we need the schools? The planned schools do not reflect the local population. Primary schools are shutting all over the country due to falling birth rate, why are you building a new one in a retirement area? Who is paying for the schools? If the developer is paying in whole or part, then, this is a bribe. An incentive that is considered highly illegal. It is a bribe. This is also being used as a bribe to stop people objecting. Do the council believe that we are stupid enough to not see this?

Fourthly, there is a lack of infra structure to support new houses. We are currently shoving pollution out to sea on a regular basis as the structure can't cope. To make it worse, a new pipe is being installed at Swalecliffe to push the problem further out to sea. The water supply is so erratic now that the only time a shower can be had with consistent pressure is at night. No mention is made the new electricity sub-station that will also have to be installed to cope with the demand of the new houses. Even if the new builds all have solar panels, the existing system would not cope with the additional, harvested electricity. The road structure, already buckling at the seams cannot cope with additional traffic. The existing railway station would not be able to cope with the increased level of commuter traffic.

Fifthly, this is a 'green disaster'. The development may be dressed up as having green belts or corridor but the reality is that we will lose a significant amount of green space. Building and the consequences or building are the biggest destroyers of our environment. Our wild life, our air quality, carbon footprint and well being will all be severely compromised with a building project that is wholly un-necessary.

Sixthly, there are no jobs in the area to support this kind oof population growth. People moving into these homes, will have to commute for work. Our road and rail structures cannot handle this. The answer is not to build even more roads and steal even more green belt. Its to not build in the first place.

Lastly, with the massive slow down in the property market and many of the new builds on existing developments remaining unsold, why do we need this development? Or is the plan to ship more of London's social housing problems to Whitstable bringing with it the reciprocal social issues destroying our safe community?

Matthew Wale