

**From:** mark froome [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 October 2025 09:37  
**To:** Consultations  
**Subject:** N32 proposal objections

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

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

Good morning.

I would like to submit my upmost objections the plans N32 for building within the village of Chartham on the Greenfield site at Rattington Street.

I have reviewed the planning applications in full on the council website.

Regards N32, the objections are based on the following;

1. This site is wholly unsuitable for this number of houses. The site was rejected for planning of 110 properties in 2023 on grounds of environment and traffic. How is it suddenly suitable?

2. Traffic.

The plans do NOT show where the planned traffic access is for this estate. If it is to be on Bakers Lane this is wholly unsuitable. As there are no parking restrictions along this road, it is often already parked upon between Rentain and Sumner Piece Grove. This reduces the narrow road to a single track already. In any event, the road leads to a narrower section on Rattington Street or to a busy junction towards the school. Increase of traffic along here would NOT be sustainable or safe. The roads in the village are narrow and already in areas, decrepit.

Furthermore, Chartham is accessed via three main routes. One is via a weight restricted bridge at the bottom of Shalmsford Street. One is via a barrier-controlled railway crossing onto a busy A road. The other is via the Milton Manor Roundabout. An increase of vehicles in the village based on the properties intended to be built (conservatively 2 cars per household) is not practical. The traffic flow through the railway crossing and bridge will not work and that is already proven in the current flows of traffic and compounded further when only route is subject to works. That would place all the traffic through the Milton Manor Roundabout which at times is already over-run by traffic using

the A28 as the only real access route in and out of Canterbury on this side of the city.

Quite frankly, the village cannot cope with the increase in traffic that this building proposal will bring and it is clear that this has NOT been considered at all.

### 3. Environment.

The environmental impact of these builds is huge. Whilst there is the increased levels of pollution from the increased amount of cars and properties to be considered, there is a real increased risk of flooding as well. The fields provide natural soak away and drainage for the village centre below. Building on this site will take that away and increase flooding risk from surface water across Rattington Street and Bakers Lane which are already susceptible to flooding in periods of heavy rain.

Removal of this greenspace will obviously be hugely impactful on the local wildlife. Chartham borders on the area of outstanding natural beauty. At a time when climate change is so prevalent, how can it be acceptable for a council to remove green spaces, destroying natural wildlife habitat? What is more is that this proposal will remove the only real, natural green space between the village centre and the St Augustines Estate. Maintaining these greenspaces between large areas of residential builds is imperative to the protection of wildlife and local environment as well as preventing the area becoming one, large scale, singular housing estate.

The building of the necessary power / internet / phone / water utilities to service this estate will be disruptive and devastating to the local environment, through noise and light pollution and the obvious permanent destruction of natural habitat, within which is an area of protected, ancient woodland.

### 4. Infrastructure.

As always, there has been no consideration as to improving or even attempting to improve the local infrastructure to accommodate the increased population. The local school is already at capacity, as are the doctors surgeries in this area. Whilst the village is served by good rail links to Canterbury, the station has no designated parking. Buses no longer travel through the village via Shalmsford Street owing to the narrowness of the road. The traffic situation in Chartham is such that the council themselves have deemed it unsafe to have a 'walking bus' route through the village for primary school pupils. All secondary education is based in Canterbury. This means that at peak times, there will be an increase on traffic around the village, trying to access Canterbury via the A28; a road already over subscribed to traffic now.

This is not a case of objecting to building because I live near this site. I understand that there is and will always be a need for increased housing around Canterbury and throughout the UK. The fact is though that proposing to build 170 homes on this small, greenfield area is both preposterous and so unbelievably short sighted as to the environmental and social damage that will be caused. You cannot just dump 170 homes into a village without consideration for the impact and with zero consideration or account for improving or increasing the infrastructure. This site is unsuitable for building regardless of the number of houses, but certainly not for so many.

Whilst N31 is at least a brownfield site, and development should be embraced (provided it takes into account the environmental and social needs of the village); there are also reservations regards this proposal as well. At the very least, should it be developed, the site requires a further access road onto the A28 rather than relying on the singular access via the train track; lest the same traffic and pollution issues be raised for that development as well.

I implore the council to review and reconsider this planned development of N32.

Mark Froome [REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED]