

From: Madalyn Quenby [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 October 2025 09:44
To: Consultations
Subject: Proposed Development In Chartham, Kent - N31 and N32 Draft Local Plan

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

--Email From External Account--

Dear Sirs

Proposed Development in Chartham in relation to the following which have been included in the New Draft Local Plan

- 1. N31 Chartham Paper Mill (approx. 165 houses) and**
- 2. N32 Rattington Street (approx. 170 houses)**

All communities around the country are fully aware of the need to provide more housing, but it must always be considered in relation to the location and its needs. Brownfield sites being put before greenfield sites; regenerating derelict sites; the correct proportion of houses and the right type; with all the correct infrastructure.

Chartham is a rural community which should be protected. It doesn't need sprawling and/or disconnected developments which would overwhelm the current infrastructure, water supply, sewerage, roads etc; Doctors surgeries and schools.

1. N31 Chartham Paper Mill (approx. 165 houses) – I support the redevelopment of the site, however

The current proposal is poorly thought out, just ticking boxes without considering the many challenges redevelopment of the site provides.

Any future development should be a balanced mix of homes, amenities and community life. Having local retail services, small shops, café, bakery, hairdressers being able to service daily needs of the community without the need to get in our cars to drive into Canterbury. Provision of green landscaped area; safe walking and cycling connections. Improved lighting. A clear design code to ensure that the architectural character of the village is preserved. A place that the residents want to spend time in, not just commute from.

2. N32 Rattington Street (approx. 170 houses) – I oppose this development (previous planning refused)

The proposed site is unsustainable apart from the fact that it is a greenfield site comprising an area of ancient woodland the following is also pertinent

- Previously undeveloped land, contradicting national policy prioritising brownfield first.
- Situated outside of the existing settlement boundary and therefore extending the village into open countryside and fragmenting the village creating a separate community disconnected from the centre

- No local services within walking distance
- No public transport in the area and what there is, is infrequent and unreliable therefore there would be a huge increase in traffic. The traffic and parking situation in the village is already dire.
- The nearby lanes are narrow and poorly lit and would not be suitable for the increase in traffic; rat runs would increase danger to pedestrians and cyclists
- Massive impact on local infrastructure – school; GP surgeries (no provision to expand); Sewage systems; water capacity
- Flooding drainage and environmental risks – The site is near the Nailbourne and River Stour both of which are prone to seasonal flooding; increase in hard surface water run-off will only exacerbate the situation.
- Risk of soil contamination and/or subsidence to the watercourses
- Threat to local wildlife habitats – wetlands, hedgerows, mature trees and open fields – with a potential loss of biodiversity
- Increased light pollution and noise in a dark-sky area.
- Air pollution.
- The proposal contradicts the Canterbury Landscape Character Assessment which seeks to preserve village separation providing green corridors.

There really isn't a single thing to recommend this development of a precious greenfield site. It is ill considered, and unrealistic. Notwithstanding the above it

- Contradicts Canterbury Local Plan
- Ignores Neighbourhood Plan
- Inconsistent with National Policy Framework
- Doesn't deliver any community benefits
- Represents unsustainable, car dependent sprawl on greenfield land
- Increased congestion, flood risk, strain on local community services and detrimental to Chartham's rural setting and heritage character.

I could go on forever giving reasons as to why you should refuse this development and remove it from the Local Plan.

Yours faithfully

M Quenby

