

---

## Canterbury Local plan for Chartham

---

From Diane Sutton [REDACTED] >

Date Fri 10/17/2025 9:06 AM

To [REDACTED]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

### **--Email From External Account--**

From:

Mr Paul and Mrs Diane Sutton



We are writing to comment on the Canterbury Local Plan, particularly as it relates to Chartham, where we have lived since 1992

#### Policy N31 – The Old Paper Mill

Some development of the old paper mill site is inevitable and probably desirable. However, the local plan only puts 165 houses on it, no mention of anything more imaginative like a mixed residential, retail and small workshop use, or possibly a health hub now the NHS wants to move more services locally. 165 houses will mean on average in a rural area 235 cars. There is a vague mention of widening Station Road (with no idea of how this is to be achieved) but no mention of improvements to the junction of Station Road with the A28. There is no mention of how the site will be cleared, as a long-time industrial unit there are bound to be contaminants including asbestos which will need to be dealt with safely and responsibly. The site goes over the Great Stour, there are sluices that need to be managed and there has already been contamination of the river from old oil inadvertently escaping from the site. Preservation of Kent's globally important chalk streams is important, any pollution released here could easily affect Canterbury and Stodmarsh Nature Reserve downstream. Has the council thought about any of this?

#### Policy N32 – Rattington Street

The plan here is for 170 houses to be built on an open field that provides a break between the main part of Chartham village and St Augustines. It contains a patch of ancient woodland. We fail to see how the building of 170 houses will not affect this ancient woodland and the well-established hedgerows surrounding the plot without disturbance to wildlife corridors and the trees themselves. Once lost these things are very hard to re-establish. Also, we note from your map that you have marked pedestrian and cycle access, but not vehicle access for the approximately 240 cars associated with these 170 houses. Perhaps this is because you know that the roads surrounding the site are narrow, winding and have little or no pavements. This omission of vehicle access is appalling.

In both cases will these developments include social and/or affordable housing? Who does the council anticipate will buy these homes? Are there sufficient jobs in the area to support these extra

people?

We have five general concerns, increased traffic, infrastructure, school places, GP services and buses.

Traffic:

475 more cars in the village will mean more traffic down Shalmsford Street with the concomitant pollution. Anyone leaving either of these proposed developments heading in the Ashford direction is bound to use Shalmsford Street to avoid delays at Chartham level crossing, and it is safe to assume that much of this traffic will be during morning and evening rush hours. All this traffic would have to negotiate the large number of parked cars. We have a supposed traffic calming narrows outside our house and it is horrifying how many times over the years that the bollard on it has been knocked over by speeding cars that have either not seen it on time or have had no choice but to hit it to avoid oncoming traffic. Will there be more substantial traffic calming measures in the Street and will improvements or alterations be needed at Shalmsford Street's junction with the A28 with increased traffic?

Infrastructure:

Can village infrastructure, particularly water and sewage cope with 335 extra houses? We would like to see the Council working with South-East Water and Southern Water on this before planning houses. There have been many occasions, particularly in the last few years when Shalmsford Street has been dug up to fix the water and sewage mains, presumably the mains are getting old and not coping with the extra demands on them. Every time Shalmsford Street is closed there are traffic incidents at the Station Road junction as cars queue back onto the A28 when the level crossing is closed.

School:

Is there spare capacity at Chartham Primary School? We don't know how many children 335 houses would have, but we do know that pressure is already being put on Chartham Primary by Kent County Council's delay building a new school in Thanington as was promised when all the new houses were built there

GP services:

335 houses mean approximately 800 extra people. Can the two local GP practices cope with that extra? Have they been consulted?

Buses:

In March Stagecoach East Kent changed the route of Bus 1 so it no longer comes up Shalmsford Street and through the village. It just goes straight along the A28. So effectively the bus service for the lower end of Shalmsford Street is now non-existent and reduced for the main part of the village which is now served only by Bus 24. Is the council aware of this and is there any likelihood of the service being restored if there is to be all this new housing in the village?

Finally we do appreciate that more houses are needed and Chartham's Neighbourhood plan had provision for more housing at a sensible level in the parish. However, Policies N31 and N32 seem to have been hastily conceived to meet a target with no real thought going into them and how they would affect and alter the surrounding area in Chartham, and we would like to see all the above points addressed by Canterbury City Council before the planning process continues.

Postscript:

Although we do not live in Thanington we would like to register our strong objections to the City Council's proposal to use Thanington Recreation Ground for a new Park and Ride site. There are constant concerns in the media about childhood obesity, but CCC thinks it is fine to deprive the people of Thanington the only green space in the area where both children and adults can run about,

play football etc. To do this to Thanington, a known deprived area, is quite frankly wicked and this car park must not go ahead.