

At the top of your objection include:

19/505036/OUT | Outline application for the erection of up to 86no. residential dwellings, including 50% affordable housing (Access being Sought), as amended by drawings received 28th May 2020 and further amended by drawings information and drawings received 18/11/2020 and 26/01/2021. | Land South Of London Road Teynham Kent ME9 9QJ

Begin with a simple statement of objection: "I strongly object to this proposal."

If you have previously objected – add:

"Nothing material has changed in the planning application. My previous objection(s) dated remain valid and unchanged. *[You can cut and paste the previous objection into your current one if you so wish]*

Additionally you can remind SBC:

I draw your attention to (a) the KCC Highways and Transportation letter of 30th June 2020 that has advised refusal of this application; and (b) SBC's Senior Environmental Health Officer recommended refusal in his memorandum of 25th June 2020.

Other valid planning OBJECTIONS you may want to raise include:

- (a) **Conflict with Supplementary Planning Guidance** – "The Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Design Statement" (2002) has identified the importance of a "sensitive edge" defined immediately behind the historic linear pattern of development to the south of Greenstreet (A2). This pattern protected the important agricultural crops".
- (b) **"Green Spaces"** are valued by SBC and Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish argued that this "Sensitive Edge" should also be preserved to retain ready access to open countryside from Greenstreet and Teynham Village to the north with all the benefits this offers to physical and mental wellbeing;
- (c) **"Loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land.** Across the whole Borough, this is the most fertile land available. This is important if we are to reduce the carbon footprint of food production";
- (d) **Protecting residents and workers in Air Quality Management Area No5 (Greenstreet/London Road).** "The development site is next to AQMA5 feeding into Lynsted Lane. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Guidance **obliges** SBC, when looking at development proposals, to make sure pollution inputs are **reduced**. In AQMA5, **any** housing development will inject **additional** traffic pollution into AQMA5 and increase the harm we experience every day.
- (e) **"Cumulative impact" of pollution created by all new housing estates.** All developments near Greenstreet will add "cumulative impact" of harmful pollution in other AQMAs at East Street and Ospringe. *The first duty of SBC is to protect residents in AQMAs from harmful pollution.* Our AQMA is directly linked to neighbouring AQMAs who will suffer from additional traffic pollution from existing approvals in Bapchild, Teynham and Ospringe. SBC fails to address the greater threat from Particulate Matter (PM2.5 and PM10) when considering local harm to our health. By 2037, national statistics show growth of HGVs by 18% and LGVs by 50%.
- (f) **Access to essential services and shops in Teynham is already in decline.** Car ownership in rural settings is higher than any other setting and more car trips are made by those living outside towns. We have poorer access to GP's (Swale has the largest Patient Lists and is unable to recruit GPs), one dentist, inadequate shops for weekly food shopping, distant secondary schools, train station, without car parking (this pushes residents into commuting from better served town stations). Low levels of local employment opportunities without cars. [Source: DEFRA "Statistical Digest of Rural England 2020"]
- (g) **The lack of local employment opportunities will lead to more car use to 'travel to work'.** New homes in this location can only worsen traffic congestion, more dangerous junctions and lack of lines of sight.

This is not an exclusive List. You can add as much or as little as you feel comfortable with. Your personal thoughts on how you are made to feel or behave will be important too for our Councillors as they face the consultation process.