

**From:** Pippa Kiss [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 October 2025 11:57  
**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 Sirs,

I have lived in Chartham for nearly 20 years and am writing regarding the proposals for N31 (Chartham Mill - 165 dwellings) and N32 (Rattington Street - 170 dwellings) to build excess of 330 dwellings on greenfield and brownfield sites in Chartham. I urge you to consider the following points before committing to the proposals.

Firstly, I would question whether there is actually a need for these extra properties. There has already been significant development in Chartham over recent years; eg, the extensive redevelopment of the former St Augustine's Hospital site and, more recently, extra houses at Summer Piece Grove and Downs View Way, both off Baker's Lane.

Additionally, there is a site close to Chartham, which has consent for development but has had no significant progress made; ie, the one between Cockering Road and Milton Manor Road. Surely these houses, along with those on the site between Cockering Road and the southbound A2, should be completed and fully occupied before other further sites are considered.

If these sites are fully occupied and it is still deemed necessary to build further houses in Chartham, then I would like to make the following comments:

Paper Mill site.

Of the two, I agree that the mill site should be redeveloped. Whilst there has been a mill in Chartham over a long period, it is recognised that there is no longer a demand for the sort of paper it produced and it would seem that the site is no longer viable for that purpose, despite efforts made by recent and previous owners to continue production here.

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application for houses on part of the site some years ago, to the east of Station Road, but that application was withdrawn when the site was taken over by the most recent mill operator.

This site should be favoured, because it is brownfield and because of its proximity to existing bus routes, the railway station, shops, church and doctors surgeries. I understand that concerns may have been raised due to its proximity to the river and possible flooding, also, that the site may be contaminated due to the historic use of

chemicals involved in paper production, along with the presence of asbestos within some of the buildings themselves. Whilst these may present a challenge to a developer, none of them should prevent redevelopment, as I believe there are techniques readily available to deal with such matters. To not develop the site, would inevitably lead to further decay, which would not be welcomed by anyone.

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

### Rattington Street

Chartham currently comprises three distinct areas; ie, central Chartham, Shalmsford Street and St Augustine's. These are separated from each other by green areas that are in agricultural use. Development of the Rattington Street site would remove one of those green areas; this 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 extremely narrow and neither currently has any point of access to the proposed site. It would difficult to create a safe point of access from either of these roads. Whilst Larkey View terminates at the edge of the site, it is a narrow cul-de-sac, used as parking for properties in that road and 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 top of Shalmsford Street and its junction with The Crescent. This is a difficult junction already and to introduce further traffic movements there would be very challenging.

Regarding the site itself, there are a number of matters that should prevent it from being developed. Firstly, in the middle of it, there is an area of ancient woodland, which is protected; that protection is further enhanced by being surrounded by agricultural land. That protection would be degraded if the woodland were surrounded by houses. Additionally, there is an electricity transmission cable across the site; the electricity authorities are likely to impose their own restrictions regarding the proximity of houses to their cables and the need for access to maintain them. I believe that there is a high pressure water trunk main across the site and that present water regulations would prevent any construction work within 3 metres of this water main. Finally, there are possibly Roman archaeological remains on this site.

In conclusion, this proposal contradicts Canterbury's Local Plan strategic goal to focus on sustainable and accessible growth and, at the same time, has ignored the Neighbourhood

Plan objectives; ie, "... to maintain village character and protect green space". Chartham is a village, not a town. It is also at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework sections on sustainable development, protecting the natural environment, managing flood risk and promoting sustainable transport.

It is for all these considerations that ask Canterbury City Council to consider the development of the paper mill site, but to oppose the Rattington Street proposal.

Yours faithfully,

Philippa Kiss (Mrs)

[Redacted signature block]