

Alexander Gunyon

From: Catherine Birkin [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 June 2024 13:59
To: Consultations
Subject: Objection to Brooklands Farm Development - Chapter 3 policy W4

Categories: Green category

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

--Email From External Account--

I object to the Brooklands farm development for the following reasons:

No provision has been proposed for critical water management in the wider area. More houses on a green field site not only generates more sewage and waste, but less infiltration, directing the surface water flows into already overladed sewerage systems. Whitstable has one of the worst sea water quality records in the country and this needs to be dealt with before any additional housing is developed. Statistics are readily available and the water quality of the sea water off Whitstable and Tankerton needs to be improved as a matter of urgency, certainly before any additional development is consented. This is without the dramatic number of new dwellings already proposed and consented in the area. This development will cause more pollution and more flooding.

The location of this proposed development does not tie into the council's Corporate plan objectives. This development does not address any one of the five goals.

- You are not listening to residents – residents don't want this development,
- you are not delivering for our community –the local services and infrastructure are not sufficient for the existing population, let alone more,
- you are not growing our district sustainably – you are destroying biodiversity, infiltration, character and you are creating places where people have to drive cars,
- you are not creating environments that are safe, secure and healthy – you are creating an unhealthy district where people have to drive and wellbeing of exiting residents is constantly downgraded by removal of vital green infrastructure
- and you are certainly not protecting our district for future generations – you are building short term hosing to address a fictitious need when the real issue is affordability,

Open Space – your polices almost solely refer to open space as an accessible resource. This is not a sustainable way of defining a growth strategy. Open space provides many benefits for people and nature and not all needs to be accessed and 'developed'. An open character, connection to nature (both visual and physical) and biodiversity all support wellbeing, quality of life and sustainability for future generations. Green fields need to be enhanced in a way that provides recovery of nature, improved resilience and protection of vital biodiversity. The proposal of housing on this site does none of these things. The Draft local plan states that brown field development is prioritised. It is not. Much more can be done to infill, redevelop and repurpose existing brownfield and already developed sites. This should be the focus, and your plan states this but doesn't deliver. There is no evidence that CCC has exhausted these possibilities. It is simply much easier for CCC to hand over green field sites to developers but this is dangerous, damaging and should be stopped. The green wedges mentioned in your policy will not sustain the rural character, they are insufficient and tokenistic.

There is not a housing supply problem, there is an affordability problem. CCC is content to throw up poor quality housing that doesn't actually address the need for future generations. By looking at smaller, better

positioned brown field sites, much of the housing quota can be met, This would leave the green field sites to be enhanced to provide the biodiversity, water management, Green infrastructure and nature recovery elements the district desperately needs.

The position of this development will generate more traffic. It is not positioned near enough to the town centre to provide any benefits to local businesses in the town, and will simply generate more traffic, pollution and congestion which will prevent more people from visiting the town. Developments like this will put the final nail in the coffin of our town centre. This development will also put tremendous pressure on existing resources such as GPs, dentists and education. We note that a doctor from the local surgery asked how these people were going to be accommodated, and no plan is in place except for a trite answer about talking to the local NHS provider. I see that you have Bodkin Farm designated as a new secondary school – again on a greenfield site which continues to erode the countryside and all its benefits.

CCC needs to start again on priorities. We need to protect nature, not destroy it. CCC has a terrible track record in allowing habitat to be devastated and not planning for the future. This Local Plan is an opportunity to address that and make sensible decisions for the future. CCC is taking the easy option and building over more and more countryside, destroying the character of the area, reducing local food production (again unsustainable) and destroying biodiversity. Brownfield sites need to be further investigated to provide housing, and the issue of affordability, not simply numbers of dwellings, needs to be sensibly interrogated and defined.