

Alexander Gunyon

From: suzegomme [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 June 2024 15:30
To: Consultations
Subject: Consultation for Canterbury District Local Plan to 2040 - Objections

Categories: Blue category

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

--Email From External Account--

I strongly object to Policies W3 and W4 (Brooklands Farm) of the draft Local Plan to 2040, for the following reasons:

1. This is not a suitable or sustainable location for a large development - there is little/ no employment locally and many of the residents will commute into Canterbury, or via the city's road network, making a mockery of a transport plan which seeks to reduce car use. It will contribute to traffic congestion in the north of the city, particularly if any of the proposed Blean/ Tyler Hill development goes ahead.

2. Increased flood risk from the Swalecliffe Brook: where at present rainwater sits on the farmland and is slowed on its course into the Brook, more development will accelerate run-off and increase flooding. On several occasions in the last year Radfall Road has been impassable due to flooding and this will only be more likely if this area is developed.

3. Water demand - there will be no additional water supply until the proposed new reservoir is built in Sturry, in if we are lucky the early 2030's. Seems as though we can look forward to low water pressure and more hosepipe bans.

4. Sewage - the local works can not cope with the present demand and regularly discharges into the sea. The new outfall under construction will not solve this problem.

5 Traffic - the proposed new junction linking the A299 to Chestfield Road and South Street will create a huge increase in traffic, road safety issues, noise problems and pollution in residential areas. I believe the traffic modelling for the Local Plan did not include this site, the proposed school, etc - how can it be approved without this information?

In addition, the proposed vehicle access from the development to South Street, Rayham Road, etc., will be hugely disruptive to locals. By all means offer pedestrian and cycle access to/from the site at some points, but why increase the traffic disruption any development would cause?

6. Loss of an area of high landscape value - the Council's own Landscape Character Assessment 2020 recommended that CCC should reinforce the open rural setting south of Whitstable and resist development in the A299 corridor.

7. Lack of health facilities - it is increasingly hard to get an appointment with a local GP and our hospitals have to use corridors for patients due to lack of beds. Dr John Ribchester stated that they have no more capacity in the existing WMP sites.

8. Adverse effects on wildlife and biodiversity - I'm no expert on this, but I know that there are many bird species and bats, plus insect life, associated with the Brooklands fields, which will be destroyed and displaced by any development.

9. The specific local area around South Whitstable has seen a vast amount of housing development in recent years, mainly along the Old Thanet Way. It feels as though the town has already taken its share of southwards development, with what used to be a ribbon of green between Borstal Hill and Tesco now almost totally built-up and much of the resulting population and traffic increase still to come and squeeze into existing facilities and roads. Surely all of that increase should be allowed to 'settle' and its impacts be understood before we are asked to accommodate what I believe is the largest ever development in Whitstable?

I believe an issue is that development around Canterbury is constrained due to the Stour/ Stodmarsh/ nutrient neutrality issue - pushing development outwards. Surely, a pause should be called until this is resolved and other sites around the city then become available, not try to solve this problem by shoehorning such a large development into South Whitstable?

As I commented in response to the previous development proposals for this site, I'm not opposed to all development - but what is built should be 'in scale', so considerably less than a major development of 1400 houses. Plus in the case of any development, it is essential that developers are held to commitments made for community facilities, etc. and disruption to local residents bordering the site is minimised.

Thank you,

Suze Gomme, 

[Sent from the all-new AOL app for iOS](#)