

# LYNSTED with KINGSDOWN PARISH COUNCIL

5 December 2021

**Application No: 21/502609/OUT**

**Proposal: Outline application for the erection of up to 10no. residential dwellings with associated landscaping, road layout and parking. (Access being sought).**

**Address: Land To The East Of Lynsted Lane, Lynsted, Kent ME9 9QN**

**Commenter Name: Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Council**

**Commenter Type: Parish Council**

**Stance: Objection to the Planning Application**



Dear Sirs

We note the further amendments to this application.

Firstly, we wish to express our frustration at the endless re-submission of these plans. This is putting undue pressure on an already over-stretched parish council. It is also time-consuming and irritating for local residents to have to constantly reappraise the proposals.

We have reviewed the response from F J Williams, who we understand to be the owners of the land proposed for pedestrian access to the A2. We note the letter from the applicants' lawyers regarding the public right of way. However, our understanding of the primary purpose of public rights of way is to allow walkers to enjoy access to the open countryside over private land. They are not intended to create the main pedestrian access in and out of a new housing estate because the vehicular access is unsuitable due to lack of pavements.

We understand that the Highways Act 1980 states that a public right of way may not pass through commercial areas where privacy, safety and security are an issue. This is clearly the case here. As they have explained, they have large articulated lorries delivering at all times with forklifts in their driveway. This is a safety hazard to the public. Who would be responsible in the event of an injury or fatality? Further, they have industrial waste skips, external material stacked stores and dipping tanks which are all accessible externally. This would again be a safety issue, and also a security issue as regards potential theft. We doubt that F J Williams would be able to obtain insurance cover for these risks, certainly not on competitive terms.

We would also suggest, given this pre-existing situation, that the pedestrian access to the London Road for shopping and public transport links etc would not be satisfactory for the residents of the proposed new properties, being an unsuitable route across commercial premises.

As we have previously stated, the applicants have made clear this is only the northern section of a larger plot they are promoting, in response to Swale Borough Council's Local Plan Review, for 40-50 homes in total stretching southwards along the margin of Lynsted Lane from New House Farmhouse at the corner of Lynsted Lane/A2 to Fir Tree Cottage (355 metres South of the A2). The application must therefore be determined in this context, as its approval would set a precedent for the southern section to also be approved.

We note the further tinkering to the road layout - including new signage, road lines and narrowing of the road. This does nothing to address the fact that Lynsted Lane simply cannot cope with this level of additional traffic. If we are ultimately looking at 50 houses, based on an average of 1.76 cars/vans per household in rural areas in the South-East, this would mean an extra 88 vehicles using this narrow country lane. This is simply not feasible and will result in an exacerbation of the logjams that already regularly occur at the London Road end. There is no potential to widen or otherwise alter the junction with the A2 because of the presence of listed buildings on either side.

The amended road safety audit now suggests the installation of granite setts on the western (non-priority) side of Lynsted Lane. As you are aware, there is also a pending application to build 84 houses on land to the West of Lynsted Lane (Ref: 19/505036/OUT) with vehicular access onto Lynsted Lane. Should this gain approval, the western side would then be the priority side, being a larger development. What happens then regarding carriageway narrowing measures?

On a point of detail, the audit refers to existing granite setts further south along Lynsted Lane. Could you please confirm the exact location, as we are unsure what is being referred to.

In conclusion, we reiterate our objection to this application.

We trust this is the last time we shall have to compose correspondence on the subject.

Yours faithfully

**JULIEN SPEED**  
**Chairman**  
**Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Council**