

From: Philip Kiss [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 October 2025 10:17
To: Consultations
Subject: Proposed developments in Chartham

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

--Email From External Account--

Dear Canterbury City Council,

I have resided in Chartham for close to [REDACTED] years and I am writing to you with regard to the proposals for N31(Chartham Mill 165 dwellings) and N32 (Rattington Street 170 dwellings) to build an excess of 330 dwellings on Greenfield and Brownfield sites in Chartham. I urge you to consider the below before committing to the proposals.

Firstly, I have to ask whether there is actually a need for these extra properties in Chartham. I say this, because there has already been significant development in Chartham over recent years. I remind you of the extensive redevelopment of the site of the former St Augustine's hospital; this made sense as the site was brown field and was no longer required by the Health Authorities. More recently, there have also been extra houses built at Summer Piece Grove and Downs View Way, both off Baker's Lane.

It is also worth noting that there is a site close to Chartham, one which has consent for development but where no significant progress has been made, and that is the one between Cockering Road and Milton Manor Road. Surely one should wait for the houses on that site, and also the site between Cockering Road and the A2 southbound, to be completed and fully occupied before other further sites are considered.

However, if the sites referred to above are ultimately fully occupied and that there is still deemed to be a need for further houses in Chartham, may I make the following comments.

Paper Mill site.

Of the two sites, I agree that the mill site should be redeveloped. There has been a paper mill here over a long period, but there is a recognition that there is no longer a demand for the sort of paper that was produced here, and despite many efforts made by the recent users and previous ones to

continue production here, it would seem that the site is no longer viable for that purpose.

There was some years ago a planning application for houses on part of the site, to the east of Station Road, made by a previous operator of the mill, but that application was withdrawn when the site was taken over by the most recent operator.

The site should be favoured because it is brownfield, and because of its proximity to existing bus routes and the railway station, shops, church and nearby doctor. There have been concerns due to its immediate proximity to the river which could lead to flooding. The site may also be regarded as being contaminated due to the historic use of chemicals involved in paper production and the presence of asbestos within some of the buildings themselves. These may present a challenge to any developer, but none of them should prevent redevelopment as there are techniques readily available to deal with such matters. To not do so, would inevitably lead to further decay of the site which would be unwelcome to everybody.

The site should have houses that are modest in size so that they would be affordable to local people who wish to remain in Chartham rather than to better off people from outside the district. They should also be built to the highest possible environmental and energy standards, so that they have an EPC rating of at least A. Furthermore, we should be assured that there will be appropriate investment made to increase the capacity of all appropriate utilities, the doctors surgeries and the local school.

Rattington Street

At present, Chartham comprises three distinct areas being central Chartham, Shalmsford Street, and St Augustines. These areas are presently separated from each other by green areas that are in agricultural use. The development of the Rattington Street site would remove one of those green areas which could not be replaced or compensated for by any amount of landscaping offered by the developer. Vehicular access to the site would have to be from Bakers Lane, Rattington Street, Larkey View, or Shalmsford Street.

Bakers Lane and Rattington Street are both very narrow and neither of them presently have any point of access to the site. It would be difficult to create a safe point of access from either of these roads. Larkey View does

terminate at the edge of the site, but that is narrow, and being a cul-de-sac is used as parking for the properties in that road; to use this as the access point would subject those properties to unacceptable traffic movements and associated noise.

The last potential access would be a narrow gap between existing properties at the very top of Shalmsford Street at its junction with The Crescent. This is already a difficult junction and to introduce further traffic movements there would be regarded as very challenging and potentially dangerous.

As to the site itself, there are a number of matters that should prevent it being developed. In the middle of it, there is an area of ancient woodland; this is presently protected and that protection is enhanced by being surrounded by agricultural land. That protection would be degraded if the woodland were surrounded by houses. There is an electricity transmission cable across the site, and the electricity authorities would certainly impose their own restrictions regarding proximity of possible houses to their cables, and the need for maintenance access to them. There is also a high pressure water trunk main across the site; its route is roughly parallel to and north of Cockering Road, and it passes under Rattington Street at the top of the hill. It passes under the site parallel to its south boundary and exits the site under the narrow gap between the houses at the top of Shalmsford Street, referred to earlier as a potential vehicular access point. I believe that present water regulations would prevent any construction work within at least 3 metres of this water main.

Finally, there is a possibility that there may be Roman archaeological remains on this site.

To conclude, this proposal contradicts the Canterbury Local Plan's strategic goal to focus on sustainable and accessible growth, and at the same time has ignored the Neighbourhood Plan objectives (i.e. "...to maintain village character and protect green space") – Chartham is a village not a town. Additionally, it is at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sections on sustainable development, protecting the natural environment, managing flood risk, and promoting sustainable transport. It is for all these considerations that I ask Canterbury City Council

to consider the development of the paper mill site, but to oppose the Rattington Street proposal.

Regards,

Philip Kiss

[Redacted signature block]