

Helen O'Connor

From: James Grant [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 October 2025 18:46
To: Consultations
Subject: Chestfield road planning

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

--Email From External Account--

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to register my strong objection to the above planning application proposing the construction of 150 new dwellings on Greenfield land off Chestfield Road, Whitstable. While I recognise the need for new homes, this proposal represents unsustainable overdevelopment that would cause permanent harm to the landscape, infrastructure, and community of Chestfield.

1. Conflict with Policy N20 – Protection of the Countryside

The proposed development is located on undeveloped Greenfield land outside the existing settlement boundary. Under Policy N20 of the Canterbury District Local Plan, the countryside will be “protected and enhanced for its own sake.” This proposal directly conflicts with that policy by extending urban development into open countryside and eroding the clear visual and physical separation between Chestfield and Whitstable.

The loss of this landscape would significantly undermine the rural character of the area, contrary to both Policy N20 and the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which require that planning decisions recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

2. Highway Safety and Traffic Impact

Chestfield Road is already under considerable pressure from existing traffic, particularly during peak hours. The addition of approximately 150 dwellings could easily add 300–400 additional vehicle movements per day, creating dangerous congestion points at nearby junctions with the A299 and Radfall Road.

This increased traffic poses a serious risk to pedestrian and cyclist safety, particularly for children walking to local schools and for residents accessing local amenities. No amount of minor mitigation could realistically offset the fundamental inadequacy of the local road network to absorb this level of additional traffic.

3. Pressure on Local Services and Infrastructure

Local schools, GP surgeries, and community services are already operating at or near full capacity. The application provides no convincing evidence of how this development will be supported by proportionate investment in local infrastructure, leading to further strain on already stretched services. Without such provision, the proposal would fail the NPPF requirement for sustainable development that supports strong, healthy communities.

4. Environmental and Ecological Harm

The site supports a variety of wildlife and mature vegetation typical of semi-rural landscapes. Its loss to housing would mean irreversible destruction of habitat and a reduction in biodiversity. The development would also increase surface water runoff and local flood risk due to the replacement of permeable land with hardstanding, contrary to Policy CC2 (Flooding and Sustainable Drainage).

The environmental cost of building on this Greenfield site is entirely disproportionate to any claimed housing benefit.

5. Incompatibility with Local Character

Chestfield is defined by its village identity, green corridors, and open views. A dense modern housing estate of this scale would fundamentally alter the area's character, blurring the distinction between Chestfield and the surrounding urban edge of Whitstable. Such suburban sprawl is contrary to Policies DBE3 (Design of New Development) and N20, both of which seek to maintain the scale and character of existing settlements.

6. Lack of Genuine Local Benefit

There is no clear evidence that this development would deliver meaningful local benefit, such as genuinely affordable housing or improved community infrastructure. The adverse impacts — on landscape, traffic, services, and ecology — clearly outweigh any limited public gain.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, this proposal fails to comply with Policy N20 and several other key provisions of the Canterbury District Local Plan, as well as national planning guidance promoting sustainable and environmentally responsible growth.

I therefore respectfully urge the Council to refuse this application.

Yours faithfully

James Grant.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]