



Dear Consultations Team,

I write regards the local plan update for Chestfield Ward, specifically and including N21 and N24.

This objection relates to a part of the CCC Local Plan, specifically the site off Golden Hill in Whitstable (N21 and N24), from a Soundness and Legal Compliance perspective

The proposal for one site in particular in the local plan is of grave concern. The proposal of a traveller site on a field just off Golden Hill in Whitstable (sites N21 and N24) is in direct conflict with the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). The plan conflicts with the objectives laid out in this policy.

In the PPTS (Policy H 26.) it is clearly stated that Traveller Sites should be located in Open Countryside (or equivalent local designation), and are away from existing Settlements. The PPTS requires local authorities to "very strictly limit" new traveller site developments in even appropriate locations. These proposals for this location, which isn't just close, but butts up against a long established settled community, contravenes the spatial strategy of the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

The PPTS also states (Policy C 14.) 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". Being on such an elevated site that at present remains at a level that is unseen by local residences, once site pitches, with caravans placed on them, as well as houses and other buildings are built, the whole site will loom over the settled communities that are in very close proximity to the whole site, as well as the whole town of Whitstable.

The PPTS states (Policy B 13. a) that chosen sites for Traveller sites should "promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community" and (Intro 4.i) to reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan-making and planning decisions; At such close proximity to a settled community that strongly opposes these proposals, this will prove to be very difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish.

I have a number of concerns which I would like to raise:

1. The water supply is already under pressure: is there capacity to supply additional housing, especially at this number of proposed new buildings? Such is the pressure, we are annually under hose pipe bans.
2. CT5 beaches suffer from sewage already, this issue is locally important and there are protests about it. Is there sufficient provision for increased sewage?
3. Waste removal. There are issues collecting household waste already, what provision is in place for additional houses and sites? If there is a minimum of twenty sites, would the provision need to be amended if there are more than twenty (same for '2')?
4. As the highest point in Whitstable, what provision is in place for drainage. So much green and brown field is being built upon, the natural drainage is being removed. It is widely accepted that climate change will bring increased rainfall and storms. Without natural absorption of the water, significant drainage must be prepared for, what provision is in place? There is also the consideration that we are rapidly eroding the natural habitat for wildlife and biodiversity across the town and its surrounding area. The amount of wildlife dead on the roadside has markedly increased in the last couple of years. Has this all been researched?
5. Our roads are already extremely busy. The routes onto and from Thanet Way from Whitstable Heights, Millstrood Road, Golden Hill, Church Street and to Pean Hill from Bogshole Lane are all congested, making entry/ exit difficult. An additional 70 houses and (minimum of) 20 gypsy / traveller sites will increase this. These roads are hazardous. The condition of the roads (Thanet Way, Bogshole Lane and the bridge over the Thanet Way on Golden Hill) already require frequent repair, the surfaces undulate, the bridge has had a 'ramp' sign for months. Golden Hill is a two lane into one lane road. All of these

surface issues are likely exacerbated by climate change (as '4'). How are these to cope with extra traffic and what provision is in place?

6. Whitstable is a successful tourist destination. There is a likely change to the visual dynamic with the proposed developments, which will not be beneficial to the aesthetic offered to visitors. There seems to be no desire to protect the unique character of the town, as it becomes surrounded by additional housing. Has this been considered?
7. What provision is in place to supply the same level of support from our emergency services given the increase in proposed residents? This encompasses GP appointments, police fire and ambulance service.

There has been no clear evidence how Golden Hill has scored against alternative sites, whether cumulative impacts were considered or why this location is preferable to less constrained options. Without this evidence, the allocation is not justified.

There are a number of existing Traveller sites scattered around the Whitstable area. It is unclear why existing sites can't be expanded to meet the alleged need for further sites in the Whitstable area.

On the basis of the above, I am against the above proposed development and request your consideration.

Thank you for allowing residents' input to this consultation:

Unlike some of the other developments locally, this seems to be progressing quicker for some reason. I note that a previous proposal for eight properties on this land was rejected for very similar reasons. I look forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes

Andrew and Joanne Payne

