

Tom Hawkes

From: mark barnes [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 October 2025 20:33
To: Consultations
Subject: N20, N21, N23, N24 and W4 Consultations

[REDACTED]

--Email From External Account--

Mark Barnes

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I am writing to formally object to the proposed site allocations N20, N21, N23, N24 and W4 in the Draft Local Plan regarding developments within the Whitstable area, particularly the areas adjoining the parish of Chestfield

My primary concern is the cumulative impact of these proposals on the town's character, environment, and already strained infrastructure, I believe the current proposals are inappropriate and not supported by robust evidence

The reasons for my objection are laid out below:

1. I worked away from Whitstable for a number of years and part of my time was involved within the local area resolving surface run off and fowl water drainage issues where the provisions in place were below what was needed for medium to high rainfall alongside fowl water, let alone one in 10 or 20 year scenarios. Models currently being used are outdated as developers and their consultants will only do what they must do to maximise profit and move on. What is happening is that with these proposed larger developments due to poor understanding of land and drainage issues, whether deliberate or misunderstood is compounding an already recognised problem within the area. Whitstable's soil and substructure is clay. Clay is notoriously difficult to manage where drainage and runoff are concerned. Removing new developments run off water from the fowl water system is tinkering at the edges as these properties are requiring further capacity from an already broken system for their fowl water which will result in more sea water pollution incidents
2. Road infrastructure both in the immediate areas and outskirts of Whitstable district are already at breaking point at peak times. Speed reductions to 50 mph on the junction of the A299 – A2990 often has queueing due to traffic lights and other inappropriate stops on the run in to Whitstable. To resolve the issue of the ill-conceived highway planning at Prospect Way, there is a proposal to have a new junction onto Chestfield Road. As I explained at the consultation to several of the developer team at Chestfield WI, there are two issues with this proposal:

- i) The drop-down feeder road will if built, be coming from an elevated position. Resulting braking and accelerating as vehicles come to the lower junction will result in noise pollution across the southern half of Chestfield due to coming down from a height above the properties to the north of the A299
 - ii) Once the cars come down on to Chestfield Road, if heading north, this is a village road not a major local trunk road and not suitable as an arterial road. People will look for rat runs to avoid queueing at the Whitstable junction. The result would be grid lock within Chestfield, noise and hydrocarbon pollution etc. The top half of the road (north end) would become a problem for the local population, initially at peak times and progressively extend to most of the working day. Radfall Hill/Radfall Road/Thornden Wood Road route would be congested through desperation due to greater population demand in finding alternative routes
3. Several developments of significant size have been built within the last 15 years around Whitstable and adjoining towns. The result of these developments is that they have brought new people into the area compounding and not resolving the issue, so marginalising the existing local population as invariably the new arrivals have come from more expensive areas and have more wealth as a group to compete for new housing. The thought that new housing would be allocated to the local population is a myth as market forces will rule. Ask any generational local family
 4. The Hyde development is a good example. Build property for the local population is what was their mantra, only to be sold on to organisations/councils and people from outside the area with some antisocial issues being brought into the town that had not previously existed especially on this development where play areas etc have been vandalised. The north Kent corridor is becoming a dumping ground for some London's councils and our current local planning process is fuelling that issue as they are offloading into cheaper housing stock areas with no risk to their balance sheets
 5. Grasmere Gardens, the development has and is being built in the wrong location with the wrong types of property. High density, no natural sunlight within many outside private spaces, classic maximise profit developer housing. The impact due to the levelling out of the site will have rainwater run off issues, though a large holding tank has been installed (who will maintain sediment levels and eventually replace the plastic crate structure when it fails as an example), this will have limited impact if when completed we have sustained wet weather. The surrounding properties on Grasmere road's western section and east section of the John Wilson Business Park are significantly below the development's finished ground levels. Irrespective of the holding tank etc, due to the high percentage of hard surfaces, it is a matter of when not if that the site's drainage will be overwhelmed and run off water run to the lowest points causing damage to the previous existing property stock
 6. Building any large developments on the NE side of Chestfield will also compound the sewage issues at Swalecliffe. Greenhill's Oxenden Park and piping the sewage across Thornden Wood Road to Maydowns Road shows the desperation to plough on regardless to get large sites built. This was opposed by the Maydowns Road residents, but overruled. This has not been a great success and we have already seen overflows at the junction with Chestfield Road. This is only going to get worse as Oxenden Park is further developed and when we get flash flood rain fall, does not bear thinking about as sanitary towels, toilet paper and feces emerge from an overwhelmed drainage system. I have seen this elsewhere and with Chestfield Road being the village's main link to Swalecliffe and the A2990, does not bear thinking about
 7. N20 is proposed to be built between Chestfield Road, A299 and Little Paddocks. Where Chestfield Road passes under the A299, Highways excavated the ground and dropped the road level to get the required underpass level for traffic under the A299. The result is when we get large rainfall and particularly during the autumn leaf fall and winter the road floods. Building on the higher adjacent

ground as this proposal proposes, no matter what perceived drainage is put in place will increase the chance of flooding and increase the amount of trapped water within the immediate area. N20 currently acts as a sponge and holds, slows down the flow of run off from the north side of Radfall Hill. Removing this land for development will result in serious issues as explained

8. W4 the same as above, plus questionable at best, or possibly outright misleading information has been provided with regard to the grade of the land proposed to be built on as explained by the agricultural professor in a previous letter where having experience of Brooklands Farm area, questioned the rating as he believed it to be of much higher grade and should be excluded from urban development
9. N21 Golden Hill, where is the demand locally for travellers sites. Not all, but most usually mean trouble and question whether one should be next door to a large population stock. I also question the perceived grading of the land to allow for urban expansion

I am not against well thought out, well designed small sites where local builders and trades have pride in the finished product where they also live, so uplifting the community and general area

What I am against is ill conceived, poorly thought out, maximise profit large sites built by national builders such as Persimmon Homes, Hyde, Redrow etc. Their current business models do not allow for lower density well-built stock, but invariably poor quality housing stock, quickly built which has issues and invariably shorter viable life expectancy than well built properties. Nationally this is a well documented issue that neither the government nor county councils have looked to address when awarding planning consents

If the district council was serious about getting houses built for local people by local companies, they should engage local people wishing to be involved in a self-build program with local craftsmen and allow small appropriate parcels of land to be assigned to do this. Graven Hill (<https://www.gravenhill.co.uk>) is an excellent example of this and would probably on a smaller scale over several areas, get the backing of the local population

To date, where medium to large developments have been granted and brought to fruition within the Canterbury, Swale and Thanet District Councils as seen being built in the last 15 years, through the planning process, gives little confidence over the decisions being made through siting of the development sites and quality of the finished product. We appreciate that housing stock, the right well-built housing stock is required, but I do not feel that the location nor type in size and density of build is appropriate for an area that has already been saturated with resources particularly within Whitstable breaking down on a regular basis

On that basis I believe that the above should be reviewed with care, local population listened to and local infrastructure as explained above be brought up to standard prior to any new major building program. The population are watching this process very carefully and will hold those that make ill-conceived decisions to account at some point in the future if a full review is not carried out

Kindest Regards

Makr R Barnes