

OBJECTION to Proposed Site Allocations in the Draft Local Plan (Focused Consultation 2025) with strong OBJECTION to N21, N23 & N24

To: Consultations Team

From: MR CHRIS HOOLES

Address: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: 20<sup>th</sup> October 2025

Reference: Draft Local Plan, Focused Consultation (Regulation 18)

Dear Consultations Team,

I am writing to formally and strongly object to the proposed site allocations in the Draft Local Plan regarding developments in Whitstable. I find the plan to be unsound and unsustainable, failing to adequately address key material planning considerations. My primary concern is the cumulative impact of these proposals on the town's character, environment, and already strained infrastructure.

While acknowledging the district's housing needs, I believe that the current proposals are inappropriate, and are not supported by robust evidence nor justification for the need of housing to this area.

Without prejudice, before I share more detail, be advised that with support from the thousands of protestors against these proposals, I/we, will do everything in our power, within the law, to ensure that any prospective residents to the W5 and N21 sites, are fully made aware of the gypsy proposals under N21 and N24, rendering the units utterly undesirable and unsellable. If you decide to decimate our livelihoods and property prices, then we shall reciprocate the gesture entirely.

**Cumulative Impact on Whitstable:**

The Draft Plan considers these site allocations in isolation, which fails to account for the combined, unsustainable pressure on local services and infrastructure.

Infrastructure Strain: The total of at 220+ new homes from these sites will place an excessive burden on existing services, including schools, health facilities, and the local road network, which are already operating at or near capacity.

**Environmental Capacity:** The ongoing development of greenfield sites increases pressure on resources such as water supply and overlooks the need to protect sensitive landscapes and key environmental assets. More flora and fauna destruction is not necessary for housing.

**Character and Sustainability:** The proposed developments represent an excessive density that is out of character with the area and is therefore unsustainable.

### **Objections to Specific Sites:**

The following objections relate to specific material considerations for individual site allocations:

#### **Site N20: Land East of Chestfield Road (opposite Brooklands)**

**Highway Safety and Traffic Congestion:** The development of 150 dwellings will significantly increase vehicle movements on Chestfield Road, which is already congested at peak times. The local road network cannot safely absorb this additional traffic, especially in light of the proposed adjacent Brooklands development.

**Character of the Area:** The high density of the proposed housing is out of keeping with the semi-rural character of this location and the adjacent Chestfield Conservation Area.

**Green Infrastructure:** The plan fails to provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposal provides adequate and appropriate open space, a requirement of relevant policy.

**Noise Pollution:** The plan's assessment of noise mitigation measures for residents exposed to the A299 is inadequate and raises significant concerns.

#### **Site N21: Land at Golden Hill (opposite Whitstable Heights)**

**Impact on Landscape:** The acknowledged requirement for landscaping to mitigate visual impact from the A2990 confirms the development's prominent and potentially damaging visual effect on the landscape character. This site overlooks the whole of Whitstable and has been kept rural for that very reason. The suggestion of houses, caravans and worse is an absolute disgrace and insult to all of the local community.

Traveller sites are notorious for refuse, burning, fly-tipping and pestilence, and I have had personal and years of professional experience to corroborate these points.

**Sustainable Access and Highway Safety:** The use of Golden Hill as a secondary route, particularly for construction traffic, will add significant pressure to a local road network that is already under strain. The roads, as per the rest of Whitstable, are exhausted and vastly under-maintained. Pre-construction traffic will cause further damage and place severe risks on safety within the vicinity. Post-occupation traffic will not be honoured as per designer's intention. The reality will be that the occupants of said proposed premises will loiter the affluent roads of Golden Hill and adjacent roads, making it their own "playground". Dirt bikes and other small vehicles will be abused. Golden Hill will become a rat-run for anti-social behaviour, crime, and violence. With every occasion of placing gypsies/travellers so close to private residential, the impacts have been utterly detrimental. Statistics prove this!

Relating to any development of W5/N21/N24, absolutely no access to Golden Hill (vehicle nor pedestrian) should have been proposed. The site is already an utter accident blackspot due to speed and visibility. Added traffic to this area is a very grave mistake.

The site is also privy to restrictive covenant which clearly forbids desecration of the land by way of caravans/temp accommodation etc. It also if I recall correctly comments on the prevention of any aesthetically displeasing activities, burning etc, something of which WILL happen on a traveller site.

**Over-development:** The cumulative effect of 70 new houses and a Traveller site on this location represents an excessive and unsustainable density for the area. The infrastructure is utterly exhausted.

We see flash-flooding near Golden Hill, and the further removal of green land will exacerbate this. SUDS do not work akin to green land.

This year, the whole local site experience outage and vast drops in water pressure due to the disgusting negligence by Statutory Undertakers. Further footfall will cause even more horrendous issues for local existing residents.

Foul sewers are extremely old and outdated. Again, as per flash-flood experiences, the existing infrastructure cannot cope with additional connections. In particular, experience with traveller sites has presented significantly increased sewerage and drainage issues, due to inappropriate blockages of existing systems. Again, this is fact.

Existing healthcare is urgently under strain and of detriment to the existing community. There is a vast shortage of healthcare professionals, hospitals are consistently in the news with quality concerns. Your negligent development proposal will worsen this matter.

**Crime:** Whilst you will refuse to present the truth on the grounds of prejudicial discrimination, crime statistics confirm that sites relating to persons of “no permanent address” are notorious for ASB, petty theft, organised crime etc. The individuals easily evade crime prevention by way of false identity and the ability to “disappear” with ease. Individuals will “ghetto’ise” the local roads and regularly target all properties/vehicles for theft/burglaries. Golden Hill is the perfect getaway; again this is utterly poorly thought out. We, as local residents are utterly distraught at the concept of 100s of new residents using Golden Hill as a cut-through. It will do nothing but exacerbate social issues, as well as increase risk of pedestrian/vehicle accidents.

**Property Value:** The introduction of a traveller/gypsy site in the middle of an affluent existing Residential development will decimate property prices. This is a disgraceful infliction to put upon your existing community.

### **Site N23 & N24: Additional sites in Whitstable**

**Insufficient Detail:** The Focused Consultation document does not provide enough information on these sites for the public to make properly informed and detailed comments. This lack of transparency undermines the consultation process.

**Visual and Landscape Impact:** For Site N24, proposed as a Gypsy and Traveller pitch, there has been no proper assessment to ensure it does not negatively impact any functionally linked land.

The following points are repetition from N21 which I shall duplicate as objection to N24:-

**Impact on Landscape:** The acknowledged requirement for landscaping to mitigate visual impact from the A2990 confirms the development’s prominent and potentially damaging visual effect on the landscape character. This site overlooks the whole of Whitstable and has been kept rural for that very reason. The suggestion of houses, caravans and worse is an absolute disgrace and insult to all of the local community.

Traveller sites are notorious for refuse, burning, fly-tipping and pestilence, and I have had personal and years of professional experience to corroborate these points.

**Sustainable Access and Highway Safety:** The use of Golden Hill as a secondary route, particularly for construction traffic, will add significant pressure to a local road network that is already under strain. The roads, as per the rest of Whitstable, are exhausted and vastly under-maintained. Pre-construction traffic will cause further damage and place severe risks on safety within the vicinity. Post-occupation traffic will not be honoured as per designer's intention. The reality will be that the occupants of said proposed premises will loiter the affluent roads of Golden Hill and adjacent roads, making it their own "playground". Dirt bikes and other small vehicles will be abused. Golden Hill will become a rat-run for anti-social behaviour, crime, and violence. With every occasion of placing gypsies/travellers so close to private residential, the impacts have been utterly detrimental. Statistics prove this!

Relating to any development of W5/N21/N24, absolutely no access to Golden Hill (vehicle nor pedestrian) should have been proposed. The site is already an utter accident blackspot due to speed and visibility. Added traffic to this area is a very grave mistake.

The site is also privvy to restrictive covenant which clearly forbids desecration of the land by way of caravans/temp accommodation etc. It also if I recall correctly comments on the prevention of any aesthetically displeasing activities, burning etc, something of which WILL happen on a traveller site.

**Over-development:** The cumulative effect of 70 new houses and a Traveller site on this location represents an excessive and unsustainable density for the area. The infrastructure is utterly exhausted.

We see flash-flooding near Golden Hill, and the further removal of green land will exacerbate this. SUDS do not work akin to green land.

This year, the whole local site experience outage and vast drops in water pressure due to the disgusting negligence by Statutory Undertakers. Further footfall will cause even more horrendous issues for local existing residents.

Foul sewers are extremely old and outdated. Again, as per flash-flood experiences, the existing infrastructure cannot cope with additional connections. In particular, experience with traveller sites has presented significantly increased sewerage and drainage issues, due to inappropriate blockages of existing systems. Again, this is fact.

Existing healthcare is urgently under strain and of detriment to the existing community. There is a vast shortage of healthcare professionals, hospitals are consistently in the news with quality concerns. Your negligent development proposal will worsen this matter.

Crime: Whilst you will refuse to present the truth on the grounds of prejudicial discrimination, crime statistics confirm that sites relating to persons of “no permanent address” are notorious for ASB, petty theft, organised crime etc. The individuals easily evade crime prevention by way of false identity and the ability to “disappear” with ease. Individuals will “ghetto’ise” the local roads and regularly target all properties/vehicles for theft/burglaries. Golden Hill is the perfect getaway; again this it utterly poorly thought out. We, as local residents are utterly distraught at the concept of 100s of new residents using Golden Hill as a cut-through. It will do nothing but exacerbate social issues, as well as increase risk of pedestrian/vehicle accidents.

Property Value: The introduction of a traveller/gypsy site in the middle of an affluent existing Residential development will decimate property prices. This is a disgraceful infliction to put upon your existing community.

For these reasons, I formally ask the council to reconsider these allocations and find the relevant sections of the Draft Local Plan to be unsound. I request that these concerns are taken into consideration during the decision-making process.

Yours sincerely,

Mr Chris Hooles, 