

**From:** Simon Reynolds [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** New Local Plan - Feedback request for consideration to a material change  
**Date:** 3 June 2024 at 16:36:08 BST  
**To:** [consultations@canterbury.gov.uk](mailto:consultations@canterbury.gov.uk)

Good afternoon,

My comments below are in relation the Whitstable Urban Area - which specifically encompasses Chestfield.

Those are not about the major land allocations, which the informed members of the public are fully aware of as being generally inevitable under Government requirements, but more so about the need to address minor amendments to the settlement boundary surrounding part of Chestfield, and in particular how that relates to the old Green Gap policy of the 2017 adopted Local Plan.

For while the Green Gap rightly sought to prevent the coalescence of settlements, as well as preserve the setting of the open countryside, however the new Local Plan 2040 Draft proposes to draw the settlements of Chestfield and Greenhill closer through Policy W6, Bodkin Farm - thereby narrowing the pinch point more than ever. In part, that proposal includes 250 new houses into the previously protected Green Gap.

Yet further south on the eastern side of Chestfield, the settlement boundary has not been revised in any way that would allow for a minor number of new houses, or self build opportunities to occur, which in themselves would add to the housing stock, whilst also relating to the character of the village itself.

This does need a simple but careful review as part of the post-consultation work, otherwise small housing opportunities will be lost until the next Local Plan review, and past boundary lines will remain dated.

There is one particular area where the settlement boundary and the Green Gap policy boundary that remains confused and previously poorly drafted as to actually how that area is, and has been, legitimately used for a number of decades. That area relates to an area of land east of The Drive.

Specifically, the property curtilage of 'Badgers End', which is completely and legitimately residential, yet the settlement boundary and Green Gap designation cuts half way through their open garden! That garden is fully utilised for residential associated uses, such that such a policy division is both invisible and non sensical - albeit the aims are understandable, but not applicable.

This therefore requires amendment, however minor that may look to officers when looking down on a large map. The curtilage of that property comprises of mature trees and shrub planting closing of virtually all of the boundary, and with extremely limited views into the open countryside. The land immediately adjacent and beyond that i facing east, is and has been fallow to any private or agricultural use. The position of the garden of Badgers End is further west on the fringe of Chestfield settlement than that of the housing developments of Kemnal Meadows and Carnoustie Close, both of which are significantly closer east, therefore

themselves have an already obvious proximity impact on the Green Gap as it stands.

Both the settlement boundary and the Green Gap boundary need to be revised and re-published. And given that the NPPF is not relevant here, any small development - be it a single dwelling or single self-build property, would therefore not be inappropriate, harm the character of the open countryside, or the setting or character of the village of Chestfield.

As a result, it is requested that both those aspects be revised accordingly. Not to do so undermines the basis of councils seeking to maximise housing numbers from minor additions, other than planned developments. If that were not the case, then such a determination would need to be justified with quite some extensive convincing evidence base to the contrary - particularly not to be challenged in the light of what Bodkin Farm alters in the years ahead.

If the Council determines such an alteration, it still has the protection of assessing any such planning application that might follow by the owner, as that would still be considered on the usual merits of character, fit, design, materials, etc.

We trust the Council will view this positively.

Kind regards

Simon Reynolds

