

LAND TO THE EAST OF LYNSTED LANE: Application No: 21/502609/OUT

Text of a presentation to the Planning Committee on 10 February 2022 by Julien Speed,
Chairman of Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Council

Good evening. We strongly oppose this application and on the planning portal there are 207 detailed letters from residents, every one of which objects.

I ran a poll on local social media groups in Teynham and Lynsted. 507 residents voted against with just 7 in favour (all from one household). The committee shouldn't be approving an application that 99% of local residents reject.

The reason for recommendation is lack of housing supply but this doesn't mean houses should be built in the wrong place.

Lynsted Lane already suffers from excessive traffic and cannot absorb more. The objection letter from KCC to a proposal for 84 houses on the other side of the Lane highlights its inability to handle more traffic. The lane has restricted width, poor alignment and a sub-standard junction with the A2 that cannot be widened because of listed buildings on either side. This application should be viewed in conjunction with that 84-home proposal, because the cumulative effect of both being approved would be disastrous.

The Road Safety Audit was based on one site visit and the photographs are a serious misrepresentation of the regular bottleneck at the top of Lynsted Lane. It only takes one or two vehicles at the junction to create congestion, especially with HGVs and buses. Emergency vehicles already struggle to get through and the proposal is actually to narrow the road still further.

The priority shuttle system will leave residents with even fewer places to park. The three off-road spaces proposed for existing residents are nowhere near enough, so parking will be displaced further South. This would be further away from people's homes, so loss of amenity, and would restrict visibility around the bend in the road there.

This site is on higher ground than the existing homes which means they would be overlooked, so loss of privacy.

It fails the test of reasonableness. These ten homes cannot reasonably be considered in isolation from the stated intention by the developer [through the Reg19 and 18 processes] for up to 50 new homes across this plot. As such, it also fails the test of prematurity given the new Local Plan is still in development.

This loss of valuable BMV land will start to infill the Important Local Countryside Gap between Teynham and Lynsted identified in the Council's own report of January last year.

NPPF Guidance obliges the Council, when looking at proposals, to make sure pollution inputs are reduced. Extra housing in this AQMA5 area will add to traffic pollution.

We also believe the application should be refused for not complying with para 17 of the NPPF and policy ST3 of the adopted local plan.

Were this application to be approved, we would ask that a binding sterilisation in planning terms be imposed against future development on the wider plot - and prohibition against any future traffic through the plot from other plots.

The benefits of a development can be opposed when there are countervailing disbenefits. You will hear shortly from a local business.

In conclusion, we urge the committee to reject this application.

Thank you very much indeed for the opportunity to address the committee.