

Tom Hawkes

From: Tony Pat more [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 October 2025 16:35
To: Consultations
Subject: Objection to planning application reference CA/25/00779

[REDACTED]
--Email From External Account--

To: Consultations Team
From: Mr Antony Patmore
Address: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Date: 20th October 2025
Subject: **Objection to Proposed Site Allocations in the Draft Local Plan (Focused Consultation 2025)**

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).

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 and its junction with A2990 Thanet Way, which is already congested, particularly at peak times. There are significant concerns that the local road network cannot safely absorb this additional traffic. Also, in light of the proposed Brooklands development, this

extra 150 houses would see Chestfield extended almost up to the Blean woods.

- Character of the area: The proposal fails to respect the existing character of the surrounding area, with lower-density development in the Chestfield Conservation Area. The proposed density of new housing is out of keeping with the semi-rural feel of this location.
- Noise pollution: Development on this site would expose new residents to noise from the nearby A299. The mitigation measures detailed in the plan appear to 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 development is visually prominent and would be 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 impact that is unsustainable and out of character with the area.

Site N23 – Land southwest of Joseph Wilson Business Park

- Grounds for objection:
 - This site is in an Area of High Landscape Value. CCC wants to remove this status, but it has no *independent and properly evidenced* landscape assessment to support this. Policy N23 suggests providing landscaping so it cannot be seen from the surrounding countryside, however the JW Industrial Estate failed to provide any useful screening last time they extended into the countryside.

Site N24: Gypsy and Traveller pitch.

- Grounds for objection:
 - Insufficient Detail: The consultation document does not provide enough detail on these 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, because the site is on the top of a hill and can be seen from the countryside to the south.
- Traveller sites, albeit informal, already exist nearby on the A2990 and at Greenhill.

Site W4: Brooklands Farm

Significant new information has been learned about this site following the recent planning application, emphasising the unsuitability of the site for any large development.

- Grounds for objection:
 - Highway safety. The construction of houses on this site would unacceptably increase traffic on A2990 Old Thanet Way and worsen existing highway safety problems around the Long Reach roundabout and further west along the A2990 to the A299. CCC think the answer is to build a new A299 junction at Chestfield Road, but the developer would need to build-up funding from selling houses on the site before it could finance the new junction, meanwhile the congestion and safety problems would become worse. The developer may never build this junction, leaving us with worse problems and no solution.
 - Highway safety. The proposed new A299 junction would turn Chestfield Road into a short-cut for any driver wanting to avoid the ever-increasing delays on the Old Thanet Way. In the evening peak the route from the A299 at Yorkletts to Chestfield via the new junction would be almost twice as quick as driving through Long Reach roundabout. The extra traffic caused by the new junction would create highway safety problems in Chestfield and also on the Radfall Hill route to Canterbury.
 - Impact on wildlife and biodiversity: Surveys carried out for the planning application show that Brooklands Farm is home to protected species such as hazel dormice, bats and slow-worms, as well as hundreds of other other wildlife species some of which are rare. The proposed development could never provide an increase in Biodiversity.
 - Flooding. No-one has provided convincing evidence that this development could be built without causing

increased risk of flooding both on and off the site, especially under future scenarios of climate change.

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,

Antony Patmore