

## Response from members of the public AC Goatham- Pump Lane

25 January 2021

Name, address, contact details, date received	Comment
<p>Ken Stuart</p> <p>No address given</p> <p>19 January 2021</p> <p><a href="mailto:kenstuart79@hotmail.com">kenstuart79@hotmail.com</a></p>	<p>Objections/Observations.</p> <p>The average household has between 1.2 and 1.5 cars meaning between 1500 and 1625 more vehicles on the inadequate roads if this development is approved.</p> <p>The bus service along Lower Rainham Road is one per hour.</p> <p>Final Transport Assessment.</p> <p>3.4.10. States that access can be made to Rainham train station from Pump Lane for pedestrians, rather a long walk and I am sure this would take longer than 28 minutes unless you use the current existing footpath from Pump Lane, unsurfaced and unlit then a swift walk down Lower Bloors Lane, then another footpath unsurfaced and unlit through to Berengrave Lane and eventually to the train station.</p> <p>Statement of Case.</p> <p>7.42. How can amenities be improved for pedestrians and cyclists with so many more cars?</p> <p>7.43. No consideration has been given to the impact of increased pollution for residents whilst vehicles are waiting at the proposed traffic lights by the railway bridge in Pump Lane.</p> <p>The Doctors surgeries in the area are absolutely full now, Dental surgeries are not taking anymore patients and Medway Maritime hospital just can't cope, none of these vital facilities are going to show signs of improving either in the short or very long term.</p> <p>No mention with regards to water supply/pressure nor waste water/sewage capabilities.</p> <p>There is a large housing estate being built in Station Road Rainham which will use Lower Rainham Road, an even bigger housing estate in Berengrave Lane there just simply isn't enough facilities or infrastructure.</p>

	<p>How often, if ever, have developers, planners architects and builders paper plans, promising everyone involved the absolute dream living actually come to fruition? Please don't allow this development.</p>
<p>Mr &amp; Mrs John Samson No address given 20 January 2021 <a href="mailto:john-sansom@sky.com">john-sansom@sky.com</a></p>	<p>Dear Sir my objections to the above named project are as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1/ This site is prime farming land allowed to grow wild and with Brexit completed this country will need every bit of agriculture land it can get. One must not forget the lessons we learned from what happened during the last war when we could have starved to death and now with our population growing we would be in a worse state.</li> <li>2/ Are our main sewers that are already struggling to cope going to be upgraded to take what is the equivalent of the village of Upchurch where they have had big problems with the sewers being overwhelmed.</li> <li>3/ There will be an extra one thousand two hundred and fifty cars and vans minimum added to the already overloaded roads in this area and my experience driving in the ambulance service on similar estates does not fill me with confidence for the future of the area.</li> <li>4/ Our one and only hospital The Medway Maritime Hospital has been struggling for the last fifteen years minimum due to the closure of All Saints Hospital, St Williams Hospital, St Bartholomew's Hospital and Keycol Hospital. The majority of these having been sold for building. Another five to six thousand people as we are finding with the virus will bring it to its knees in its present form.</li> <li>5/ Schools are finding it difficult now to accommodate the children in the area and another approximately five hundred plus children will add to a system already at breaking point now.</li> <li>6/ Doctors and dentists are already under great pressure with more doctors and dentists urgently needed.</li> <li>7/ Likewise the Ambulance service is overwhelmed especially now not having the Patient Transport service. This was a group of highly trained people that were able at that time to support the Accident and Emergency crews when like now they were overwhelmed but alas sold off to the private sector.</li> </ol>

	<p>8/ Public amenities such as country walks, which are a very important form of relaxation from an already overcrowded area, cannot help but be affected by the proposed development.</p> <p>We are now 79 and 80 years of age and by the time this proposal is built may not be around but we have a responsibility to guard against such, in our view, criminal use of farm land for such projects for the benefit of those that come after us, and not for the money grabbing builders that will take their loot and run.</p> <p>MR &amp; MRS J. SANSOM</p>
<p>Lianne Falkingham</p> <p>No address given</p> <p>24 January</p> <p>liannefalkingham@blueyonder.co.uk</p>	<p>For the attention of Mr D Harris, Head of Planning</p> <p>Dear Mr Harris,</p> <p>In respect of the Planning Application MC/19/1566, and the Appeal Ref 3259868, I would like to make the following comments, in relation to the additional information only of the Appeal.</p> <p>All other comments, concerns and objections raised by me in relation to the proposal MC/19/1566 remain.</p> <p>Having read Rapley’s Statement of Case, dated 22 September 2020, I’m still convinced that the proposal should not be approved.</p> <p>The updated responses and additional documents that they have submitted in their appeal are inadequate and the development should not be allowed to proceed.</p> <p>In particular, the impact on local transport and infrastructure is still not acceptable – there remains insufficient road space for the increased traffic, despite the two ‘improved’ junctions that are proposed; especially when this is taken in light of current and proposed developments in the immediate area, and not in isolation.</p> <p>The impact on climate is also not sufficiently addressed – I covered this more fully in my original objection, so will not repeat here, other than to say it is more imperative now than ever before. We must all play our part – and I believe this development would have a major negative impact overall, both now and for the future.</p>

	<p>One extra comment that I would like to include, is regarding the BMV. With the current changing situation of leaving the EU, we are going to need all the locally grown produce we possibly can. The appeal mentions high cost of replanting old fruit stock, inclement weather, seasonal workers, transport access – and yet, circumstances are considerably altered in light of Brexit and trade deals. The news this week is full of details on high tariffs for imports/exports, for businesses and consumers alike; even that we may not be able to import bananas due to the high costs. At least in our climate, we can grow our own apples and pears, top and soft fruit – saving costs on fuel for transport, and providing employment for the local workforce – but only if we have the foresight to save the land available to grow crops. Not exactly ‘dig for victory’ but we could certainly ‘plant for common sense and future prosperity.’</p> <p>I appreciate all that Medway Council have done so far with this planning application, and all that you will continue to do with the appeal.</p> <p>Please accept this email as my continued objection to the proposed development and I fully support the decision to refuse planning permission.</p>
<p>Sandra Ward</p> <p>No address given</p> <p>25 January 2021</p> <p><a href="mailto:alansandward@blueyonder.co.uk">alansandward@blueyonder.co.uk</a></p>	<p>Dear Sirs/Madam</p> <p>Further to your letter dated 24th December 2020, regarding the proposed Development at the above site I would strongly like to object to this applications approval.</p> <p>I understand that A C Goatham &amp; Sons have appealed to Medway Councils refusal of this application.</p> <p>I do feel that the Medway towns is already over populated and whilst I understand that people need homes to live in surely there is a less densely populated part of Kent that could accommodate the proposal.</p> <p>Residents of Medway already do not have the infrastructure to support the extra 1,250 residential units and proposed facilities to accompany this development. Surely we would be better serviced by Goatham building another hospital as</p>

	<p>currently Medway Hospital is nearly full to capacity as this is not just due to the Covid 19 Virus. I work for the NHS and know the waiting times for patients to be seen in many of the services that Medway provide to its residents and it does not have the capacity to take on another 1,250 families that may need treatment. Waiting lists are already under severe strain in many services and this was before the Covid pandemic.</p> <p>I also feel strongly that the amount of increased traffic to this area would be detrimental not only to health of residents (Car fumes) but also waiting times to drive anywhere, particularly if there is an accident on the motorway and everything comes to a stand still as re-routed through the Medway towns</p> <p>In conclusion please log my objections in the strongest terms to this development.</p> <p>Your faithfully</p>
<p>Jo Elsmore</p> <p>No address given</p> <p>25 January 2021</p> <p><a href="mailto:joelsmore@phonecoop.coop">joelsmore@phonecoop.coop</a></p>	<p>I begin by stating that my comments relate to the additional information only and all other comments/objections raised by me in relation to the proposal remain.</p> <p>I have looked at the details regarding traffic volumes on Lower Rainham Road and Pump Lane and once again the developer has failed to take into account the most significant local factor. All parallel roads running East/West West/East are interlinked and an event on one has an instant impact on the others. A major accident on the M2 results in gridlock on Lower Rainham Road very quickly, roadworks on the A2 the same. It is easy to provide statistics that give no picture of real world conditions.</p> <p>The developer has repeated the assertion that the orchards have little environmental value, which is unproven and in my view false. Not only do the orchards support wildlife but they provide a valuable link between the community woodland on the other side of Lower Bloors Lane and the fields and ponds beside Bloors Wharf Road and on to Riverside. These areas support wildlife that is under threat and absent elsewhere, particularly nightingales and turtle doves.</p> <p>I feel that the views and genuine objections of local people are in danger of being steamrollered by a well resourced developer and national government. Local people and</p>



politicians know that this development will not provide homes for a single person currently on the council's waiting list. It won't even provide genuinely affordable homes for those locked out by high prices. It is an excessively large proposed development, which would create problems for the whole area and would introduce several thousand new residents marooned on an island accessible only by vehicular traffic. Finally I wish to lodge my firmest objection to the claim that this development in any way way conforms with sustainable local transport. Using terms like multi-modal transport may allow the developer to tick boxes but they conceal a basic failure to address the matter honestly. Not a single person will commute by bicycle from this site and a few minutes with a map, or on a bicycle will make this clear. I live on Lower Rainham Road near the junction with Lower Bloors Lane and have cycled all my life. I consider myself a confident and experienced cyclist and there is no safe cycle route to Rainham town centre, the railway station, or Twydall. Walking is possible and I do it regularly but it is at the limit of most peoples' range, I rarely meet anyone other than dogwalkers. The only way to seriously address this issue would be to look at Bridlepath G6A as the starting point. It is already open to be used by cyclists and fairly basic attention to surfacing would make it more practical. We would then need to open up footpath G6 to being a shared walking and cycling route, it is plenty wide enough. G6 meets footpath G5 and there is only a short section to attend to in order to gain access to Berengrave Lane. From there National Cycle Route 1, or Tufton Road provide access to the station and the town centre.

The provisions suggested for the railway bridge on Pump Lane are all well and good but a short foot and cycle path under the bridge solve nothing beyond a very localized hazard. If the intention is for real people to actually walk and cycle towards Twydall then more action is needed. The absolute minimum would be a protected walking and cycling path from the development, continuously to join up with provision on Beechings Way. The lack of a footpath the length of Pump lane is a major omission. There are already a number of school children taking their lives in their hands to get to and from schools.

	<p>National government needs to be made aware of the increasing disillusionment with the way the planning system is skewed towards the benefit of big developers. Local people and politicians are being sidelined and talk of localism is now seen empty.</p>
<p>Robert Unsworth ME8 6EY 19 January 2021 <a href="mailto:eastcourt_robert@outlook.com">eastcourt_robert@outlook.com</a></p>	<p>I appreciate many local people do not like change and that they have lived in a broadly unchanged area for a long time and that in an ideal world new building would take place 'elsewhere' however we must provide homes for people to live in. The Twydall estate when it was built in the 1950's provided vital housing and amenities to that generation and these need to be matched for the current generation. I would like my children to have the opportunity to live close to me and with so few new houses being built this is difficult. I regret the loss of 'green' space but this is private land which the community have never had access to. The local area, and Medway in general, does have a good range of public open spaces, with limited plans to extend these further. On balance I support these plans.</p>
<p>Michael Chapman ME8 7DN 23 January 2021 <a href="mailto:M50V89@gmail.com">M50V89@gmail.com</a></p>	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 24th December regarding Appeal Having looked at the detail I would like to make the following representation: In regard to the changes at the junction of Pump Lane and Beechings Way via the railway tunnel. The amendments appear to be limited and therefore in my view, insufficient to cover a 1250 house development with its associated amenities unless some considerable redevelopment occurs to widen the railway bridge over Pump Lane. Traffic flow is onto the Twydall Estate via Beechings Way which as suggested is a road through the estate and presumably designed for estate traffic only. There is a new vehicle outlet at the North end of the proposal adjacent to the existing Pump Lane / Lower Rainham Road junction. This is welcomed, but it does not appear to do anything for the increased vehicle flow going east/west along the Lower Road that does get very congested and indeed, blocked in certain circumstances. Looking at the Lower Rainham Road in more detail it will be seen that. There are already traffic lights and a pinch point near the Three Mariners Public House. There are two small developments in the same area, one is still incomplete. There is another pinch point and traffic lights at the junction of the Lower Road and Berengrave Lane. Still</p>

travelling east, there is notification of another housing development before the Station Road junction. A mini roundabout at the Lower Road Station Road junction. a school is being built and developed on Otterham Quay Lane as well as a large housing development just a short distance from the Lower Rainham Road junction. All these points fall within 1.5 miles (approx) to the east of the propose Pump Lane development. The Lower Road is currently a busy road for traffic travelling west in the direction of other parts of Medway and subsequently, London and East to Sheppey, Sittingbourne and the coast. The infrastructure is currently under pressure without the proposed 1250 house development. This development should not take place.