



19 October 2025

Canterbury City Council  
Planning Department  
Military Road  
Canterbury  
Kent, CT1 1YW

Dear Sir or Madam

Draft District Local Plan: New Consultation September 2025

Thank you for providing the opportunity to read the additional proposals to the draft document of 2024.

I should begin by saying that all my comments regarding the 2024 proposals still stand, as I note that one of the new proposals (N20) appears to be closely linked with a previous draft proposal, namely the one for Brooklands Farm (listed as W4), which I considered, and still consider, totally unacceptable, for the reasons I gave in my response of 28 May 2024. Hugely increased road traffic problems are going to be created if some of the Council's proposals go ahead.

My views on the additional sites proposed are:

Whitstable Area

The overall government-imposed annual target for new housing is arbitrary and unacceptably high in a relatively small coastal town, limited to expansion into its greenfield hinterland. The City Council should be vigorously questioning and resisting the imposition.

Para. 3.35 – Site N20 - Land east of Chestfield Road. I object to the inclusion of this site, which will create the same severe traffic problems on Chestfield Road as those on the Brooklands Farm (W4) site, resulting from any new A299 junction, which would clearly serve both sites. As I said before, not only Chestfield Road would become a congested rat-run, but so would adjacent routes and junctions (Chestfield roundabout, the Herne Bay Road/St John's Road junction, Molehill Road-Greenhill, Radfall Road and South Street). In my view, the choice of this, and the nearby already long-approved Area of High Landscape Value at Brooklands Farm, is arbitrary, perhaps chosen for timely convenience rather than need, and appears to lack much serious preliminary assessment by the City Council.

This paragraph (3.35) suggests that site N20 would “complement” the proposed allocation of site W4. It would not – it is, on the contrary, unconnected, and separated from W4 by a busy local/residential through-road between eastern Whitstable and Canterbury.

Para. 3.36 – Site N21 - Land at Golden Hill. I object to this proposal. Local residents were assured that no further development would be imposed south of the old Thanet Way. Golden Hill overlooks the high landscape area towards Court Lees/Bogshole Lane and open farmland, previously identified as of high landscape character. Again, the draft sets much store by cycling and pedestrian routes into town, but town facilities are a mile and more away. Just who is going to jump on a bike or walk down in the depths of winter? And where is the bus service?

Para. 3.37 – Site N23 – Land south-west of Joseph Wilson business park. Further southward encroachment into the high landscape value area of Court Lees/Bogshole Lane is not acceptable, whether screened or not.

#### Herne Bay area

Site N26 – land at Beacon Road. Perhaps the City Council might think again about this one. It's a useful open space in that part of Herne Bay, with a history of providing leisure facilities. Central Park, with all its current antisocial behaviour problems, is not a convenient walk away. It will create a very dense housing estate within a tightly-grouped housing block. The forthcoming David Lloyd centre, up at Altira, is not a feasible substitute – it will be very expensive to subscribe to and is not easy to access from town, other than by car.

Site N29 – Land at Home Farm, Strode Park. This is a long way from the town centre. Again, the old theme appears: “cycle and pedestrian routes created/improved”. In the middle of winter? In the pouring rain? And how far to the nearest buses? A somewhat worse problem even than the old Strode Farm development currently being built. So, even more car traffic will be created. Not acceptable.

Site N30 – land to the west of Bullockstone Road. Even further from town, and even further from public transport than N29. Unacceptable visual impact bordering greenfield areas. Same old cycle and pedestrian provision. No mention of poor access to bus routes... More cars, I guess.

#### In short

The City Council don't appear to have gone to any great trouble to research in detail some of their more questionable proposals. “There's a gap – let's fill it” seems to be the mindset. That is not high-quality forward planning.

Yours faithfully

Michael Whitley