

Tom Hawkes

From: Michelle Saunders [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 October 2025 16:22
To: Consultations
Subject: Draft Local Plan, Focused Consultation 2025

[REDACTED]

--Email From External Account--

Dear Consultations Team,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed site allocations in the current Draft Local Plan, specifically concerning The Plan's proposals for the Whitstable area.

I find the plan unacceptable 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 (making the Plan unsound). Personally I find myself unsure of how democracy works these days and in particular to this area. Although it was reassuring to see the removal of Policy C12 from the current Plan after much opposition, Policy W4 still remains and Whitstable now sees additional proposals included, thereby further increasing the total number of houses and developments to an area which is not suitable for this level of development. So in addition to the comments I made at the previous draft Local Plan consultation, I have the following comments about the new additions to the draft plan and further problems that have become apparent more recently.

I object to the proposed new site N20 Land East of Chestfield Road for the following reasons:

1. The impact of all the proposed Local Plan developments on the levels of traffic, pedestrian safety hazards and air quality on A2990 Thanet Way, A290 Clapham Hill and the Radfall Hill / Tyler Hill route to Canterbury (NB it appears CCC has not modelled these issues);
2. N20 would be another unsuitable car-dependent development about 1.5km (over a mile) walk to the supermarket, and about 2.5km (1.5 miles) from the nearest primary school.
3. There is virtually no nearby employment and many people would drive to Canterbury for work or education. If the proposed A299 / Radfall junction were to be built, the site would simply be used as dormitory housing for commuters driving to work anywhere along the A299 / M2 corridor.
4. The single access to the proposed site onto Chestfield Road is in an area where the road is prone to flooding, so that in these situations there is a risk that access to / from the site may not be possible.
5. Adverse effect on the Chestfield Conservation Area, which currently benefits from a semi-rural environment.

I object to the proposed new site N21 Land at Golden Hill for the following reasons:

1. The cumulative impact of all the proposed Local Plan developments on the levels of traffic, pedestrian safety hazards and air quality on A2990 Thanet Way and A290 Clapham Hill (NB it appears CCC has not modelled these issues).
2. The ever-growing levels of traffic and delays due to pedestrian crossings along the A2990 Thanet Way will lead to ever-increasing numbers of drivers choosing alternative routes parallel to the A2990 i.e. through unsuitable residential roads. These alternative routes include (a) through Tankerton or (b) Chestfield Road and the A299 if the Brooklands Farm plan is approved.

W4 Brooklands Farm Since the previous Local Plan consultation, further information has come to public attention, demonstrating the unsuitability of this site for any large development. Evidence in planning application **25/00779** shows this

development would require a new A299 junction at Chestfield Road to relieve severe congestion on Thanet Way. However, the new junction would cause Chestfield Road (a residential area) to be used as a "rat-run" for any driver wanting to by-pass delays on the Old Thanet Way. These delays increase with every new planning application along Old Thanet Way. Has the traffic impact been estimated with any up-to-date traffic modelling?

I further object to site W4 Brooklands Farm on grounds of the highway safety of:-

1. Chestfield Road, due to significantly raised levels of traffic and pedestrians trying to cross the road. (Note that the new A299 junction would enable drivers to use A299 and Chestfield Rd to bypass increased delays on A2990 Old Thanet Way, especially in peak periods).
2. Radfall Hill: substantially increased traffic levels (especially if the new A299 junction is built) would endanger pedestrians because this road has substandard pedestrian pavements and insufficient room to build better ones.
3. A299 Thanet Way near Yorkletts: increased risk of cars crashing into static queues extending back from A2990 junctions at Prospect Retail Park and A290;
4. A290 Clapham Hill: increased traffic levels would cause increased risk to pedestrians and cyclists trying to cross the A290 near Long Reach roundabout and nearby bus stops;
5. South Street: substantially increased traffic levels would endanger cyclists using on-road Crab & Winkle cycle route near junction with Millstrood Road.
6. Millstrood Road and South Street, due to potential conflicts between pedestrians and increased levels of traffic. For example, where pedestrians walk between Tesco's and the Thanet Way footbridge, and conflicts between pedestrians / cyclists using National Cycle Route 1 and increased flows of traffic on Millstrood Road.
7. Planned slip roads at the proposed A299 / Radfall Hill junction, due to conflicts between traffic using the slip roads at speed and pedestrians trying to cross them. The pedestrian routes here include public footpath CW28 (Chestfield to The

Blean woods) and the Radfall Hill footway which links houses in Radfall to Chestfield. There is already a similar hazard at Clapham Hill, where the A299 slip roads have no pedestrian crossings, leading to difficulty for pedestrians using the A290 pedestrian pavement and difficulty for Whitstable residents trying to walk to the Wraik Hill nature reserve and viewpoint.

To sum-up this up, there is no evidence that the consequences of the proposed new A299 junction have been evaluated, so the Local Plan is unsound in regard to the impacts it will have on Whitstable and Chestfield.

Furthermore, it is not clear how CCC could ensure that any developer at Brooklands actually constructs the proposed A299 junction. In practice, developers are usually successful in postponing, diluting or removing onerous planning conditions.

I also object to Policy W4 as the improved accessibility created by the new A299 junction would trigger opportunistic development along the A299 corridor and would be almost impossible to stop under the present planning regulations. The effects of such developments has not been assessed.

Noting what has been learnt from the recent planning application, **I object to the plan to build houses and a secondary school at Bodkin Farm (site W6)** for the following *additional* reasons:-

1. Highway Safety: the pedestrian pavement of Herne Bay Road under the railway bridge at Chestfield Station is too narrow to be used safely by large numbers of teenagers as well as other commuters and parents / children walking to and from Swalecliffe Primary School.
2. Other safety issues: the platform width at Chestfield Station is too narrow to be used by large numbers of teenagers waiting for (and alighting from) trains. This issue has already been raised by British Transport Police.
3. Green Gap. The site lies in the officially-recognised Green Gap between Chestfield and Herne Bay and therefore should not be used for urban development. The only reason it was justified in the draft Plan was that it

would provide a much-needed secondary school for the benefit of the community. However, having demonstrated above that it is unsuitable for the intended secondary school, the proposed development should be removed from the draft Local Plan. If this development goes ahead, it will serve as a precedent for other developments in the Green Gap, which will then cease to exist.

4. The planning application also shows that Bodkin Farm is home to protected wildlife species, e.g. dormice, bats, slow-worms, lizards, skylarks etc. **I therefore also object on the grounds of adverse impact on protected wildlife.**

The Plan is clearly unsound because it is based on inadequate assessment of its consequences (lack of up-to-date traffic modelling, failure to assess impacts on/from pedestrians, etc).

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 over 2,100 new homes will place an unsustainable burden on these services.
- Environmental: 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. The relevant sections of the Draft Local Plan are unsound.

I request that these concerns are taken into consideration during the decision-making process.

Yours sincerely,

Michelle Saunders

Mrs M H Saunders

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]