

Tom Hawkes

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 October 2025 20:35
To: Consultations
Subject: Objection to additions to the canterbury Draft Local Plan
Categories: awaiting reply

--Email From External Account--

Mrs Alison Tappenden
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Consultations at Canterbury City Council

I write to formally object to Policy N20 - Land east of Chestfield Road, in the latest Canterbury City Council draft local plan.

Adding 150 houses to an infrastructure system which is already at breaking point is irresponsible and utterly inconsiderate regarding the lives of the current residents. To consider that adding these houses on top of the 1350 (possibly 1400) houses already proposed on Brooklands Farm shows blatant disregard for the welfare of existing residents and future residents alike when it only worsens the effect that such development will have on the quality of life of the entire community.

The infrastructure requires enormous investment before any building takes place:

Fresh water supplies should be safe and reliable, which at present is not the case. 4000 homes and businesses in the district were without water this year (2025) for nearly a week - this had a detrimental impact on everyone involved. There should be no further building undertaken until a supply can be guaranteed. Stating that a new reservoir at Broad Oak will resolve the problem, yet it will not be supplying water for at least a decade is an unacceptable solution. Loss of water this year has not merely been an 'inconvenience', it has caused delays in hospital treatments which require equipment to be clean, risks to the lives of livestock who need to consume water to maintain health, businesses to lose revenue and more. The water station provision had the knock on effect of causing gridlock on the local roads, so much so, that people were unable to attend medical appointments as they became stuck in traffic.

The sewage treatment works at Swalecliffe are unable to treat the current waste levels, and as all local residents know, discharge raw sewage into the estuary as soon as there is any rainfall. I am unable to comprehend that Government allows this to happen (allegedly within guidelines), yet fines companies for releasing when they shouldn't and tells us, the public, that it is unsafe and a risk to health to swim in the sea after these discharges have taken place! Swalecliffe is due an improvement scheme, but I doubt whether the situation will change if so many new residents are added to the equation.

The current road system is unable to cope with the existing traffic levels, let alone the addition of (likely) over 3000 cars if all the proposed sites are developed. 150 houses at 'land east of Chestfield Road' may generate a minimum of 150 cars, but more likely 300 or more. The existing roads are deteriorating rapidly, with a long stretch of the Thanet Way A299 having a 50mph limit due to subsidence causing an undulating surface. The Old Thanet Way A2990 has the same undulations and collapse along a stretch at Benacre - thousands more cars will only serve to cause greater damage at a faster rate. The road network on the

main roads serving Whitstable and Chestfield are not able to deal with current traffic levels travelling into and away from the town and village, and the smaller roads within each area are too small to allow safe and easy movement of cars, bicycles and pedestrians.

I would draw your attention to the letter from Kent County Council dated September 2025 regarding the outline planning application CA/25/00779 Brooklands Farm. The letter raises a holding objection due to so many concerns identified when they have looked at this application. The first section details 'Highways and Transportation' and specifies numerous issues to be addressed before planning permission should be debated. These concerns apply to the proposed development at land east of Chestfield Road, particularly when Canterbury City Council states that this will 'complement the proposed draft allocation at Brooklands Farm and form a logical extension to the south of Chestfield'.

Some of the points raised by Kent County Council pertain to road safety - there can only be greater risks to road users when so many vehicles will inevitably be added to the network.

I am sceptical about the proposed bus led transport plan - KCC have made suggestions to encourage new residents to adopt the use of public transport. I would want to see proposals and financing plans made available for public viewing as to whether a private bus company would consider the long term investment into a bus led transport system. I would also like to see the proposals to make the bus service preferable to the use of private cars. The majority of local employment in the area is either in Canterbury or in rural areas. How does CCC propose to improve the road network to provide bus lanes etc to entice the public to make use of buses? I travelled between my home in Chestfield and school in Canterbury back in the 80s - travel time was dependent on the levels of traffic - there is much more traffic now than there was in the 80s, so delays whilst using public transport will be increased accordingly.

Chestfield and Swalecliffe Halt will require huge improvements if it is expected to serve an increased population who may be commuting to London for work. The station is not fit for purpose - it has no disabled access and no parking. This is yet another example of CCC and developers making a site seem appealing to buyers, but the reality is that the rail network is another private company and will only put improvements in place if they stand to gain financially.

Whitstable cannot sustain further increase in population with regard to healthcare - more people place more demand on a provision that is at breaking point. Current residents are stating that they wait at least two weeks for medical appointments. We are lucky to have Estuary View as a minor injuries facility, but the services there are at capacity. The two accident and emergency hospitals in the area are QEQM at Margate and William Harvey at Ashford, both of which have been under scrutiny regarding their abilities to provide care. The local authority and central government should be able to ensure that future residents are not putting their lives at risk by moving to an overpopulated and under resourced part of England.

I have been shocked to discover that a planning application was submitted to CCC around 2017, asking for permission to build a single dwelling on 'land rear of 149 and 151 Chestfield Road', a site which was a large part of what is now referred to as 'land east of Chestfield road'. This application was opposed and two appeals took place, the latter of which was dismissed on the 3rd May 2019. The reasons provided by the Planning Inspectorate are, in my opinion, still relevant now, and I cannot understand how a local authority could object to one home, yet proposes to add 150 houses on the same site!

I also write to formally object to Policy N21 - Land at Golden Hill and N24 - Land lying to the West of Golden Hill.

The reasons above all apply to Policies N21 and N24.

N24 is a particularly contentious proposal - unfortunately the reputation held by travellers can cause animosity and resentment from other parts of the community which I fear could lead to enormous social problems for those who live nearby. This may lead to an increased need for a police presence in the area to prevent incidents involving different groups who are unable to live side by side harmoniously.

Regards



Virus-free. www.avg.com