

Alexander Gunyon

From: Faris [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 June 2024 15:52
To: Consultations
Subject: Fwd: CONSULTATION FOR CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN TO 2040

Categories: Green category

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

--Email From External Account--

Consultations@canterbury.gov.uk

To Whom it may Concern,

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

1. Loss of first class landscape with wonderful rural views from my property. CCC's Landscape Character Assessment 2020 recommended that CCC should reinforce the open rural setting south of Whitstable and resist development in the A299 New Thanet Way corridor.
2. This is not a sustainable place to develop another large development, from which (if similar to the other areas in south Chestfield) more people would be commuting to Canterbury than any other destination, almost all of them by car. It will also contribute to traffic congestion and pollution in the north Canterbury area.
3. Increased flood risk downstream on the Swalecliffe Brook. At present heavy rain sits on the farmland before it slowly evaporates or trickles into the Brook. Vast areas of storage would be required to accommodate rainwater run-off from any urban development, this could not be located close to the Brook due to that area already flooding when the river level rises over the riverbanks as per what occurred in February 2024 after heavy rainfall.
4. Local Health Facilities and Accessibility: Local GP and hospital appointments are currently difficult to secure. A development of 1400 houses in addition to the other developments being built in the area would cause a great strain on the local healthcare provision. Margate Hospital is already at full capacity for beds and A&E wait times. This would increase and put strain on the local hospital also.
5. Local Schools: Local schools are already oversubscribed. With one Secondary School in the area, which is currently oversubscribed every year, places will become even more few and far between. The Education system in the area particularly for Secondary education simply would NOT cope.
6. The local sewage works cannot cope with the increasing demand resulting in regular releases of untreated sewage into the sea. This has caused instances of serious illness for people on local beaches in the past and would only get worse. The new outfall under construction will not solve this problem.

7. The proposed new junction linking the A299 to Chestfield Road and South Street would have unacceptable adverse consequences for local people. Road safety would be seriously compromised, and pollution would be increased in residential areas.

8. Seriously negative impact on Biodiversity. There is a lot of insect life associated with the cattle of Brooklands Farm, and consequently there are swallows, house martins, skylarks, wagtails, numerous bats and no doubt , many more species that would be impacted.

9. Adverse effect on the Convicts Wood Local Wildlife Site. Building 1,400 houses nearby would cause it to be severely degraded and used as a children’s recreation area and dog-walking route. Residents would use the area for dumping garden waste, as already happens in comparable areas along the Swalecliffe Brook..

10. Loss of “Best and most versatile” agricultural land.

11. CCC needs to recognise that housing developments affect the coastal towns much more severely than Canterbury. Canterbury can expand to north, east, south, and west. Whitstable can only expand southwards, as it is constrained by marshland to the west, and by Herne Bay to the east. What little farmland that remains within easy walking distance of Whitstable is needed for residents’ recreation and well-being as well as to preserve the last vestiges of the natural setting of this tourist destination town. Therefore, the farmland between the Blean woodland and the existing urban edge of Whitstable should be given statutory protection.

11. For the reasons listed above, the proposals would be unsustainable and would contravene paragraphs 135c, 168, 173, 180b, 180d and 191b of the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework.

I urge you to take this objection along with many others very seriously. A new development of this size will cause considerable problems for the local area and its residents. Again, I strongly OBJECT.

Yours Faithfully,

Faris Hadi

