

From: justin mitchell [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 May 2026 14:12
To: Consultations
Subject: Regulation 19 draft Local Plan consultation (2026)

--Email From External Account--

Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing to very seriously object to the above development proposal.

The draft Local Plan raises serious concerns regarding deliverability, infrastructure provision, environmental impacts, and compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In particular, Policy W4 (Brooklands Farm) appears heavily dependent on infrastructure that may never be delivered, including a new junction on the A299 New Thanet Way, which developers could later claim is financially unviable. There are also unresolved concerns regarding water supply, with Southeast Water admitting difficulties in supplying the scale of growth proposed and uncertainty surrounding the deliverability and safety of the proposed Broad Oak Reservoir.

The Plan is also not supported by sufficiently robust or up-to-date evidence, contrary to NPPF paragraph 32. Traffic modelling around Chestfield fails to properly assess the impacts of two proposed secondary schools, particularly on already congested junctions and pedestrian crossings. Serious pedestrian safety concerns remain unresolved at locations such as Clapham Hill and Chestfield & Swalecliffe station. In addition, key environmental and public health risks — including sewage pollution, PFAS contamination, flood risk, and pressure on healthcare services — have not been adequately investigated or addressed.

Policies W4 and W7 would significantly harm valued countryside, biodiversity, ancient woodland, and the setting of the Blean landscape, conflicting with NPPF policies relating to landscape protection, biodiversity, sustainability, and environmental enhancement. The developments would urbanise an important rural landscape, increase pressure on protected habitats, worsen sewage pollution affecting beaches and marine environments, and remove accessible countryside valued for residents' wellbeing and mental health. Alternative locations, such as land near the University of Kent, appear substantially more sustainable yet were excluded without clear justification.

Overall, there is substantial doubt that the proposed developments are deliverable, sustainable, or compliant with key provisions of the NPPF.

Sincerely David Justin Mitchell