

Helen O'Connor

From: Leo Whitlock
Sent: 11 October 2025 16:11
To: Consultations
Subject: Fw: Sites N21, N23 and N24

From: Jean Butcher [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 11, 2025 9:56:13 AM
To: Leo Whitlock [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: Sites N21, N23 and N24

--Email From External Account--

Sent from [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Aron Kennedy [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2025 10:41:27 AM
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Sites N21, N23 and N24

--Email From External Account--

Dear Councillors,

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed development of sites **N21**, **N23** and **N24**, as well as the proposed **Traveller sites** included in the Draft Canterbury District Local Plan.

While I support the need for inclusive and lawful planning, these specific proposals raise serious concerns around **sustainability, infrastructure capacity, public safety, and the well-being of existing communities**.

Key objections:

1. Water stress and supply risks

This region is officially classified as **seriously water-stressed**, with frequent hosepipe bans, low pressure, and interruptions. It is irresponsible to allocate high volumes of housing on N21 and N24 without full, evidence-based guarantees that the water infrastructure can cope, especially under worsening climate conditions.

2. Sewage, drainage and flood risk

New developments in the area have already caused sewage overflows and blocked drains (e.g. at Whitstable Heights). Without robust drainage systems in place beforehand, developments at N21 and N24 risk compounding these problems. The potential impact on **public health and the natural environment** is unacceptable.

3. Erosion of green space

Both sites involve loss of greenfield land, with negative effects on **local wildlife, landscape character**, and access to open space for residents. This directly contradicts the council's commitments to climate resilience and biodiversity.

4. Traffic congestion and air pollution

Local roads are already heavily congested. Adding hundreds more vehicles will worsen this, increasing **air pollution, road safety risks**, and journey times. There is also **insufficient public transport**, particularly for working families, schoolchildren and elderly residents.

5. Inadequate health, education and public services

GP surgeries, dentists, and local schools are **already over capacity**. The plan gives no detailed, costed assurances that infrastructure will be upgraded in time to meet new demand.

6. Traveller site concerns

The proposed allocation of Traveller sites near N21 and/or N24 raises serious concerns among local residents around **safety, community cohesion, and the adequacy of support services**.

While the provision of Traveller accommodation is a legal requirement, it must be done transparently, with **full local consultation**, clear management plans, and careful consideration of **site suitability, policing, and local impact**.

There are significant concerns that insufficient oversight or poorly integrated siting could lead to **anti-social behaviour, pressure on emergency services, and public safety issues** — especially in areas already struggling with resource shortages

Additional personal concerns:

I live directly opposite Whitstable Heights and was assured by the developer that we would still be able to view the sea. However, this has proven untrue. The houses are built higher and positioned differently from the plans we were originally shown, completely blocking our sea views. This affects the quality of life for existing residents and raises serious questions about transparency and accountability in the planning and development process. My drains were also blocked because of the development, and the amount of dust and noise created by them was unacceptable.

This was an email I sent in August 2024 and I haven't received a response to my email despite chasing.

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Ongoing Issues at Whitstable Heights – No Response

Dear Chartway Group,

I previously raised several concerns regarding the Whitstable Heights development, including:

- Work regularly commencing before 8:00 AM, often as early as 7:00 AM.
- Excessive dust due to a large dirt mound and a lack of regular water suppression.
- Minimal use of the mobile sprinkler system.
- Significant dust impact on my property, including vehicles, windows, outdoor furniture, and children's play equipment.
- Discrepancies between the current build (particularly property heights) and what was originally communicated.

This lack of communication suggests a clear disregard for the well-being of existing residents.

Furthermore, not all houses in the current developments, including Whitstable Heights, have been sold. This raises doubts about the actual demand and whether further large-scale developments like N21 and N24 are genuinely needed or sustainable.

Summary and request:

I request that Canterbury City Council:

- **Remove N21 and N24** from the Draft Local Plan
- **Reassess the proposed Traveller site locations**, with meaningful community consultation and full risk assessments
- Ensure that **no development proceeds** until supporting infrastructure (water, drainage, transport, healthcare, schools) is fully in place and funded
- Publish clear evidence that community safety and service capacity have been properly evaluated

Residents are not opposed to all development, but what's proposed is **disproportionate, poorly supported**, and will result in irreversible harm to community wellbeing, the environment, and public trust.

Yours faithfully,

Aron Kennedy



Leo Whitlock

Head of Policy and Communications
Strategy and Improvement



Find us online at canterbury.gov.uk

This email, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain privileged or confidential information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, immediately contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of this message.