

**From:** kevin king [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 October 2025 21:58  
**To:** Consultations; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Objection to N32 (rattington street)

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

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

To whom it may concern,

As a resident of Chartham [REDACTED] I would like to formally object to the Rattington street proposal of up to 170 houses on the site N32.

As I am sure many have already postulated, this is a green field site with high quality soil. Given the need to look at brown field sites first for new projects, I am surprised to hear this site is under review at this point in the process of finding much needed additional housing in the County.

I would like to raise my objections on several points:

1. This is green field and should be the last resort for housing development.
2. The Paper mill site is a far better proposal; this is unused industrial land which would have a far better impact for the community and we should aim for building on such sites first - This site already has a significant space for housing and should be long completed to see the effects of such additional housing before looking at N32.
3. Drainage can already be a problem in this area, in heavy rain, water flows down the bottom of the street towards the Artichoke pub and houses near the paper mill; I doubt the loss of N32 as green land will help this situation. I would be concerned about flooding the paper mill development and surrounding houses too.
4. The traffic management is poor in this area; most of bakers lane is only passable by one car due to the cars parked on one side of the road. This is the same for Shalsford street and Station road; rattington street is largely single track; cockering road is already adding hundreds of houses and is a huge 'rat run' to avoid connection through win cheap - being pragmatic, that is not going to allow hundreds of additional cars per day to freely move (adding pollution in these areas unnecessarily - it will put significant additional pressure on the roads and environment. It would be un realistic to suggest most of these additional homes would use public transportation - the majority of households are two cars + in this area and it is unlikely to change - changing statistics to suit our needs is poor research methodology.

5. Chartham lacks additional infrastructure to handle both of these developments - any additional projects should include community required developments such as doctors/ schools/ shops - assuming a modest 50 families with children move into these 300+ houses between both sites, this could require an additional 100 school places - the school does not have this level of infrastructure and when combined with other local proposals, this would leave many children travelling further than necessary for their schooling.

In conclusion, I believe Chartham can handle more housing; I do not believe though building on green field is the answer. I strongly oppose the lack of connected planning on display here; too many new housing sites being added simultaneously within a couple miles with no thought about how they will impact each other. Many in the village are pro the disused Paper mill site and against the N32 site - I would take that as a win and work towards removing N32 for the foreseeable future. Development of the paper mill site is a much more pragmatic view on what can be achievable with local resources and infrastructure.

Kind regards, Kevin King