

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 May 2026 07:33
To: Consultations
Cc: Cath Wallen; CBI; FOI CCC; Ken Little; Janet Little
Subject: Local plan

--Email From External Account--

Morning:

We own the site at Golden Hill CT5 3AR, known as the W7 site in the DLP 2045 plan.

We were marked as a "sustainable" site in the Local Plan 2017.

The site having passed 2 SHLAA test and other test undertaken by this LPA, including highway access.

The LPA suggested 220 Social Houses on the W7 site, then 120 SH, then the LPA abandoned that idea under Regulation 18 in March 2024.

The site owners then put in a 8 self build application to be followed by 32 more self build homes, the LPA decided to refuse that application.

The site owners went to appeal-, a planning inspector made what can only be described as a perverse decision, and refused the site for those self build homes.

Then, the Inspector suggesting that -[the LPA on the matter of the Local Plan was still in "uncertainty" of what will materialise in the local plan] !

Then in August 2025 A LPA officer called one of the site owners stating-; " the W7 site (N21-N24) was NOW included in the new, new plan, known as the DLP 2040 plan", just like that!

The LPA authority were well aware that a Gypsy Traveller site was proposed by one of the owners of the site (W7 or N21-N24) 18 months (or more) before the site was -;

(a) Refused planning permission by a Planning officer,

(b) then removed under Regulation 18, 2024.

(c) refused planning permission by the Government inspector-, (based upon, she said-, uncertainty over the sites allocated in the 2040 plan.

EVIDENCED:

1. The LPA have had NO consultation with the W7 owners; -ever, over the (a) social housing application (proposal) (b) the Self builds, or (c) the Gypsy Traveller site.

2. We the owners, right up to August 2025 had NO idea that the site was now included in the DLP 2040 plan, as a GT Site until that call in August 2025.

3. The LPA have placed upon the W7 site, or (N24-N21) site, such "conditions" that are commercially, in effect making the site commercially ineffective as a site in the DLP plan, or any plan!

4. The “conditions” imposed on this site, are in our view unprecedented.

The LPA have not discussed, as examples below for this sites inclusion in the DLP 2040 plan -;

Cont-;

A. Who is to purchase the Gypsy Traveller site, or is it a lease arrangement ?

A (a) How long a lease?

A (b) Or no lease, only Outright purchase?

B. Who is to manage the site-, if not purchased outright, B (a) and if outright purchase by another “entity” who will manage the site?

B (c) Is there a “value” indicated as commercially acceptable by the LPA for the provision of the GT site in the 2040 DLP by the site owners?

C. Where does this GT site sit on the site plan of K737971 ?

C (a) Who decides that GT site “position” on the proposed GT site?

D. Which access route is to be used for the GT site, the roundabout on the Thanet way, D (a) OR the track between 38-42 Golden Hill?

E. Why is it that the GT site has to be “fully set up” and “occupied” before the 70 home proposal is allowed to start building ?

E (a) how is the GT site infrastructure to be funded then if not from the house builds?

E (a) by KCC ?

E. (b) by CCC ?

E (c) by Others ? Who?

F. IF no “entity” comes forward to invest in the GT site -[infrastructure] what then happens to the GT site?

F (a) or does the 70 homes proposal still stand, If the GT site is abandoned?

F (b) or does that 70 homes remain as part of the proposal-DLP 2040 plan that includes the GT site?

F (c) How does (any) above affect the DLP 2040 for the Government inspector to approve the 2040 plan, on GT site allocations?

F (d) housing numbers?

G. Is the Crab and Winkle cycle route and pathway -and highway still proposed to go through the track at 38-42 Golden Hill?

G (a) using the track access point onto the Golden Hill highway?

G (b) any improvements to Golden Hill? Speed ramps - limits?

G (c) new pathways?

G (d) wider junction into Thanet Way?

G (e) pelican / toucan crossing?

G (f) who is funding A to E ?

We understand that we can speak (or sit at the table) at and during the Government public process.

Our site is a significant part of the Gypsy Traveller site allocation for the DLP 2040 plan.

That position suggest that “we” the owners must have representation in and in the DLP given we hold nearly 50% of the GT site allocation for the area.

Please let us know CCC -LPA position on the application to sit at the public consultation process of the local plan.

Or that we cannot with the reasons why !

Regards

Mr Ken Little.

Sent from my iPhone