



CCC Consultations &lt;consultations@canterbury.gov.uk&gt;

## Response to Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045

1 message

**Marion Allison** [REDACTED]

16 January 2023 at 15:58

To: "consultations@canterbury.gov.uk" &lt;consultations@canterbury.gov.uk&gt;

General

CCC is proposing to construct far too many homes across the District, certainly more than required by national government. We should be constructing only what is required to meet local need.

Section 3: Whitstable

Seaside towns experience even more difficulty than inland towns when trying to find land for new developments, and Whitstable is no exception. It cannot expand to the east, west or north. As has been pointed out by many people, the undulating farmland south of Whitstable is of "high landscape value" according to the last Local Plan, and it gives the town an essential part of its character. Whitstable needs a green belt to preserve its setting.

This Local Plan is simply one of a series, there will be many more, each demanding more and more farmland for housing. Where is it going to end? Without a Green Belt there will no farmland left between Whitstable and the Blean!

I agree with the current e-petition that Canterbury City Council should stop all new housing development until sewage pollution on our beaches stops or significant improvements are put in place by Southern Water. This could be achieved with a Grampian condition that no new houses can be occupied until Southern Water makes the necessary changes to eliminate the public health hazard on our beaches.

Site W5: Brooklands Farm

Brooklands Farm should not be developed because it has been designated and remains an area of high landscape value. If the Council has changed its status of the land since the last Local Plan, this can only be because they want to build there. Another reason for its unsuitability for development is that it is a haven for wildlife. Surveys have shown the presence of newts, glow-worms, buzzards and red kites, among other species.

The claim that 20% biodiversity net gain can be achieved appears highly improbable because we would lose the existing native open-landscape ecosystem.

I would add that the proposals represent an example of a large intrusive estate that is alien to the character of Whitstable. CCC should be considering smaller sites that integrate better into the community.

Sites W6 and W7: Land south of Thanet Way and at Golden Hill

These sites are on the top of a ridge of high ground which is the only place close to Whitstable where residents can look out to sea in one direction and then turn around and admire a view across a valley in the other direction with the Blean woods on the horizon.

Any development here would be very visible from both the north and south, and it is unlikely that trees could be used to screen it. I don't think that a housing estate on the skyline should Whitstable's view of its southern horizon.

The claim that 20% biodiversity net gain can be achieved appears highly improbable because we would lose the existing native open-landscape ecosystem (hares etc). We have already lost the meadow on the north side of the Old Thanet Way (A2990).

Dr Marion Allison  
[REDACTED]

1/17/23, 7:11 AM

EKS Partnership Mail - Response to Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045

