

## Tom Hawkes

---

**From:** justin mitchell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 October 2025 10:42  
**To:** Consultations  
**Subject:** Objection to Proposed Site Allocations in the Draft Local Plan (Focused Consultation 2025)

### --Email From External Account--

**To:** Consultations Team  
**From:** David Mitchell  
**Address:** [REDACTED]  
**Email:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 21st Oct 2025

Dear Consultations Team,

I have previously objected to the unbelievably insensitive proposal for a 1350 house development at Brooklands Farm CA/25/00779 and now I find myself having to respond to the latest proposal of extra houses on top of the previous development.

Therefore, I am writing to formally object to the proposed site allocations in the current Draft Local Plan, specifically concerning developments in the Whitstable area, as outlined in the Focused Consultation (Regulation 18).

I find the plan unsound due to its negative impact on the local environment, existing infrastructure, and the character of the community in Whitstable. While I acknowledge the district's need for new housing, these specific proposals do not represent sustainable development and have not adequately addressed their impact on key issues.

My objections focus on the following sites and specific material considerations:

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

- **Proposed development:** Approximately 150 new dwellings.
- **Grounds for objection:**
  - **Highway safety and traffic congestion:** The development of 150 houses will significantly increase vehicle movements on Chestfield Road, which is already congested, particularly at peak times. There are significant concerns that the local road network cannot safely absorb this additional traffic.
  - **Character of the area:** The proposal fails to respect the existing character of the surrounding area, with lower-density development adjacent to the Chestfield Conservation Area. The proposed density of new housing is out of keeping with the semi-rural feel of this location as highlighted by the councils own Landscape character and biodiversity appraisal.
  - **Green infrastructure:** The plan allocates this land, but more information is needed to ensure the proposal provides sufficient and appropriate open space, as required by policy.
  - **Noise pollution:** Development on this site could expose new residents to noise from the nearby A299. The mitigation measures detailed in the plan may be inadequate.

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

- **Proposed development:** 70 houses and a Traveller site.
- **Grounds for objection:**
  - **Impact on landscape:** The search results indicate a need for landscaping to mitigate the visual impact from the A2990. This highlights that the development is visually prominent and potentially damaging to the area's landscape character.
  - **Sustainable access:** While plans mention a principal access via a different site (W6), the reliance on Golden Hill as a secondary route for construction and residents adds to local road pressure.

- **Over-development:** The cumulative effect of 70 additional dwellings and a new Traveller site on this site, following previous development proposals, represents an excessive density that is unsustainable and out of character with the area.

**Site N23**

**&**

**N24**

**: Additional sites in Whitstable**

- **Proposed development:**

Site N24 is proposed for a Gypsy and Traveller pitch.

- **Grounds for objection:**

- **Insufficient Detail:** The focused consultation document does not provide enough detail on these specific sites for the public to make a properly informed comment. The council must provide a transparent assessment of how these proposals impact the environment, infrastructure, and community.
- **Visual and landscape impact:**

Site N24, allocated for a single pitch, needs proper assessment to ensure it does not negatively impact any functionally linked land.

**Cumulative impact**

My overarching concern is that the plan considers these sites in isolation, failing to assess the cumulative effect of all these developments on Whitstable's services, character, and infrastructure.

- **Infrastructure strain:** Existing services such as schools, health facilities, and local roads already operate at or near capacity. The proposed total of at least 220 new homes (and potentially more from sites N23/N24) will place an unsustainable burden on these services.
- **Environmental capacity:** The plan mentions the need to protect sensitive landscapes and key environmental assets. However, the continued development on greenfield sites and the pressure this places on resources like water supply is a significant concern.

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

Yours sincerely

David Mitchell