

Brendan McCarthy  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Canterbury City Council  
Planning Department

Date: 20 October 2025

## **Objection to CCC Local Plan Proposals N21, N23 and N24 in Whitstable**

I wish to raise my formal objection to the proposed developments on sites **N21, N23 and N24** as outlined in the Canterbury City Council Local Plan. These sites are wholly unsuitable for the proposed use and are in **direct conflict with the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS)**.

### **Conflict with Government Policy**

The proposals for these sites contradict multiple key objectives within the **PPTS**, which sets out that **Traveller Sites should be located in open countryside, away from existing settlements** (Policy H26). Furthermore, the PPTS requires local authorities to "very strictly limit" new traveller site developments, even in areas deemed appropriate. The proposed locations sit immediately adjacent to long-established settled communities, directly contravening the Government's spatial strategy.

### **Impact on the Local Community and Landscape**

The PPTS (Policy C14) advises that "when assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community." Given the elevation of these sites—which currently remain visually unobtrusive—construction of multiple pitches, caravans, and associated buildings would visibly dominate the surrounding communities and alter the character of the wider Whitstable landscape.

The visual impact would be substantial; the site sits at one of the highest points in Whitstable, visible from large parts of the town. Development here would undermine Whitstable's scenic appeal and contribute to a sense of overdevelopment and urban sprawl in what is a small coastal town.

### **Social Cohesion Concerns**

Policy B13(a) of the PPTS highlights the need to "promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community," and the introduction (4.i) stresses the importance of reducing tensions between settled and traveller communities. Locating a traveller site directly beside a settled community that has expressed strong opposition to the proposal makes such integration virtually impossible.

### **Strain on Local Infrastructure and Services**

Policy B13(f) of the PPTS requires that proposals "avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services", and (Intro 4.k) urges local planning authorities to safeguard local amenity and the environment. Whitstable already faces significant strain on key infrastructure—including sewage systems, water supply, and road networks. These proposals would only worsen an already unsustainable situation.

### **Sewage**

Whitstable continues to suffer from severe sewage issues, with frequent discharges into the sea at

Tankerton and Swalecliffe due to the local plant operating beyond capacity. Adding further residential demand would exacerbate this long-standing environmental and public health concern.

### **Traffic**

Whitstable's road network is already overburdened, particularly along the Thanet Way, which has seen multiple serious and fatal accidents in recent years—including one in October 2025. The additional vehicle movements generated by a site of this scale would dramatically increase congestion and road safety risks.

### **Water Shortages**

The town has faced repeated and prolonged water shortages, with around 3,000 households in Whitstable and Seasalter losing water in July 2025, and 500 homes still affected weeks later. Hosepipe bans remain in place even months later, showing a system already operating beyond its sustainable limit.

### **Flooding Risk**

Although the proposed field itself may not be classified as flood-prone, Whitstable as a whole is vulnerable due to ageing and failing clay water pipes, which frequently burst and cause localised flooding. The PPTS (Policy B13.g) specifically warns against placing caravans in areas prone to such risks.

### **Environmental and Green Belt Concerns**

The PPTS (Intro 4.d) and (Policy E16) clearly state that "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development" unless exceptional circumstances apply. The land identified in these proposals forms part of a vital green corridor separating Whitstable from Canterbury. Allowing development here would erode these essential green spaces.

### **Access and Refuse Collection**

The proposed site's access road, Golden Hill, is narrow, steep, and located on a sharp bend, making it unsuitable for large vehicles such as refuse trucks or caravans. Regular refuse collection and emergency vehicle access would be impractical and potentially unsafe.

### **Conclusion**

In summary, the proposals for sites N21, N23, and N24:

- Breach several key policies of the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS).
- Would visually dominate the surrounding community and harm the town's landscape.
- Risk significant strain on already overburdened infrastructure and essential services.
- Contravene Green Belt and environmental protection objectives.
- Present serious access and safety concerns.

For these reasons, the proposals are wholly inappropriate for the identified locations and should be rejected in full.

Yours faithfully,

Brendan McCarthy