

21/502609/OUT | Outline application for the erection of up to 10no. residential dwellings with associated landscaping, road layout and parking. (Access being sought). | Land To The East Of Lynsted Lane Lynsted Kent ME9 9QN

I object to this proposal in the strongest terms as it is dangerous and inappropriate as to scale, location and threatens coalescence. The proposal would fracture the essential rural and historic patterns of development in Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish as defined in SPG (Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Design Statement, adopted by SBC). The proposal is also inappropriate for its cumulative impact on AQMA5.

The Site has not formed part of the current Local Plan (Bearing Fruits) and is not part of the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan. For that reason alone, the proposal should be rejected on grounds of **prematurity**. It is simply not appropriate to make significant proposals outside the formal Local Plan process.

Scale: This proposal is only one part of a wider conversation that the developers say they are having with *SBC Officials* for the development of the whole Site from New House Farmhouse at the corner of Lynsted Lane/A2 to Fir Tree Cottage (355 meters south of the A2). The quantum being discussed falls between 40-50 new homes and should be determined in that context.

Setting: Lynsted Lane at the A2 junction is physically limited by two listed buildings – The George Inn and 74 London Road. Because the lane is so narrow, the junction is a clear danger to pedestrians without any alternative means of approaching the Greenstreet services. The lack of safe pedestrian access along this stretch also means that “active travel” options for the proposal, even for the short distance of 65 meters between the development and the A2 cannot be achieved.

The proposal site also backs directly onto three listed buildings that would lose their historic setting and openness to the south of the A2 – namely 70, 72 and 74 London Road (all Grade 2). The Site will also intrude on nearby listed buildings on the south of the A2 – namely, 42, 52, 54-56 London Road.

Highways Matters: With the potential for 40-50 homes in total, it is entirely appropriate for SBC Planning Officers to apply the **KCC Highways** judgement on the planning application that for the site immediately opposite this proposal. I attach copies of the relevant KCC Highways objections. For the sake of convenience, I have reproduced below the **KCC Highways** short summary dated 19th February 2021.

“I would still recommend that the application be refused on the following highway grounds:

- 1. Lynsted Lane by reason of its restricted width, poor alignment and sub-standard junction with London Road is considered unsuitable to serve as a means of access to the proposed development.*
- 2. The existing road network in the vicinity of the site has insufficient capacity to accommodate the material increase in traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development.*
- 3. The proposed development will increase traffic on a highway lacking adequate footways with consequent additional hazards to all users of the road.”*

I entirely agree with KCC Highways judgement.

Laughably (if it wasn't so serious), the developers propose the introduction of yellow lines to ease access to the proposed site. This idea is based solely on monitoring for parked cars on Tuesday, 23rd February, and again on Sunday, 28th February. From this ridiculously biased and simplistic approach the developers suggest that only one car was a problem! Hardly a serious piece of evidence from the developers and entirely at odds with real day-to-day conditions. SBC Planners will also discount this nonsense for its timing in full Covid-19 lock-down.

I can confirm, having lived on London Road for over twenty years and regularly using Lynsted Lane that the pattern of obstructions varies throughout each day and across time. At best, this part of Lynsted Lane has appalling lines of sight, made much worse by it being effectively single-file for most of any day. The entrance to the development, set 65 metres south of the A2 will add further levels of complexity and danger to road-users and pedestrians alike. Having an entry-point so close to an already complex and congested access to the A2 is dangerous and misguided. With the lack of car parking in Teynham/Lynsted, many cars park throughout the day for visits to the Cooperative Stores, Post Office, Pharmacy, Doctor, Dentist, vet etc, for people from Lynsted and our surrounding villages. In addition to parking on the road at the bottom of Lynsted Lane, many cars also park and/or use as a turning point the car park of The George Public House. That pub is up for sale and any new owner may not tolerate this practice.

The poor attempt to characterise and 'manage' the narrow lane, made worse by the proximity of the site to the A2, is neither robust nor reliable. There is certainly no argument for the yellow lines proposed to displace current residents, workers and shopping visitors. I use Lynsted Lane frequently and the problems around the slalom between cars cannot be dismissed so casually or glibly. This becomes even more problematic and dangerous if you add agricultural, bus, cold-store, SUVs, emergency vehicles, delivery vans and lorries into the mix. The developer's simplistic argument is unbelievable and unfounded to even a casual observer.

AQMA5: the proposal is adjacent to AQMA5 and will add seriously to congestion along this narrow lane, onto the junction and against traffic along the A2 without any possibility of mitigation. Bear in mind, this is only the first stage in proposed development site.

Coalescence: Finally, this proposal, taken together with the larger site, threatens coalescence pressures between the A2, as far as Vigo and Batteries to the south and eastward towards the Conservation Area of Cellar Hill that has its own distinct identity and concentration of Listed Buildings.