

## Tom Hawkes

---

**From:** Andrew McCord [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 October 2025 16:41  
**To:** Consultations  
**Subject:** Formal Objection – Proposed Development of 170 Houses on Site N32, Rattington Street, Chartham

[REDACTED]

--Email From External Account--

Dear Canterbury City Council,

I wish to object to the proposed 170-house development on Site N32, Rattington Street, Chartham. While I support sensible use of brownfield land such as the former Chartham Paper Mill (N31), I strongly oppose building on greenfield land.

A smaller version of this plan was refused recently for valid reasons, and since then local roads, drainage, and services have only deteriorated further.



### Highways and Safety

Rattington Street is a narrow rural lane with sharp bends, single-track sections, and no pavements or cycle paths. Station Road and Shalmsford Street are also unsuitable—both are already congested and hazardous, especially near the village school.

Speed Watch data shows persistent speeding, and Kent County Council has even deemed Chartham unsafe for a Walking Bus scheme. Adding traffic from both N31 and N32 (up to 470 vehicles) would create serious safety risks.

The last traffic survey is seven years out of date and no valid access plan has been shown. The proposed pedestrian routes across private land are not acceptable.



### Community Impact

The development would increase traffic, air pollution and noise, particularly affecting children walking to school. Local GP and school capacity are already at breaking point, leaving no room for the additional demand.



### Landscape and Heritage

The site borders listed buildings and the Chartham Conservation Area, forming part of the open slopes of the Stour Valley. Development would permanently damage local views and the village's rural setting, contradicting the Chartham Neighbourhood Plan and Canterbury Landscape Character Assessment.



### Flooding and Environment

The land lies close to the Nailbourne and River Stour, both prone to flooding. Replacing natural ground with housing would increase surface runoff and flood risk.

The project also fails to address nutrient neutrality issues that affect the Stodmarsh Nature Reserve, going against national environmental policy.



#### Loss of Productive Farmland

This is high-quality agricultural land (Grade 1–3a) that has been farmed for decades. The NPPF clearly states that the best and most versatile farmland should be protected. With food security now a national concern, this loss is unjustifiable.



#### Wildlife

The field includes ancient woodland and habitats for bats, owls, badgers and birds. Development would fragment habitats and harm biodiversity, as highlighted by both the Woodland Trust and Kent Wildlife Trust.



#### Conclusion

This proposal is unsafe, unsustainable, and unnecessary. It would harm the environment, increase flooding and traffic risks, and destroy Chartham's rural character.

I therefore urge Canterbury City Council to refuse the N32 development.

Yours faithfully,  
Andrew McCord

