

**From:** Shawn Sykes [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 October 2025 09:35  
**To:** Consultations  
**Subject:** Re: Proposed developments N31 and N32 Rattington St. And Former Chartham paper Mill siteChartham Nr Canterbury Kent.

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

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

On Tue, 21 Oct 2025, 09:20 Wendy Sykes, [REDACTED] wrote:

On 20/10/2025 21:17 BST Wendy Sykes [REDACTED] wrote:

I am writing to object to the proposed developments of houses at Rattington St Chartham and the former Chartham Paper Mill site Chartham. N31 AND N32.

Both proposed sites for development are on and near Rattington St which is a small rural road which does not lend itself to traffic. Let alone a huge amount more traffic! There are no proper footpaths which leave pedestrians in danger and also narrow bridges where cars compromise pedestrian safety every day.

The alternative route i.e Bakers

Lane and Shalmsford St is again not viable as a main road that is already constantly congested and twice a day with parents parking for school pick ups becomes virtually impassable!

No walking. Bus scheme can be implemented as the road is deemed to dangerous.

Train and bus services are not good enough as Chartham has no car park at station. And no good bus service at this point in time.

Our GP surgeries could not withstand extra pressure of more patients or the oversubscribed primary school as well as Secondaries in Canterbury.

The proposed development would be detrimental to the Conservation Area and areas of Natural beauty we as a village are lucky to have.

Chartham Neighbourhood Plan says "developers must protect the villages rural character and surrounding greenfield sites"

The proposed developments are both close to River Stour and thus a flood risk and pose a ground water and drainage problem. Being g from. Riverside in Chartham. We are constantly under threat from Flooding at certain.

Times of the year. Also Stodmarsh Nature Reserve would be comprised as it is already under pressure from nutrient loading. Planners are or.certainly should be aware that National Planning Guidance requires developers to

demonstrate nutrient neutrality. The proposed developments definitely do not!

Development N32 has an area of ancient woodland within it and is home to many varied species of animals and birds like owls. Badgers, foxes, voles and bats (protected species) Any building work would disruption breeding and biodiversity.

The Woodland Trust and WildlifeTrust have expressed major concerns about the ecological impact of the proposed developments.

To conclude I would like to say:-

The proposed developments are:,-

Unsustainable

Unsafe

Inconsistent

Would damage biodiversity

No proper infrastructure

Damage community wellbeing

I call upon Canterbury City Council to reject developments proposals N31 and N32

Thank you

Wendy Sykes (Mrs)