

Response from members of the public AC Gotham- Pump Lane

12 February 2021

Name, address, contact details, date received	Comment
<p>Paul Alexander</p> <p>185 Pump Lane ME8 7BU</p> <p>10 February 2021</p> <p>paulalexander185@hotmail.co.uk</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I wish to make a representation for the below proposed development.</p> <p>Planning Inspectorate Appeal Reference: APP/A2280/W/20/3259868</p> <p>Planning Application Reference: MC/19/1566 (Alternative Ref: PP-07846586)</p> <p>Appellant: A C Gotham & Son Site : Land off Pump Lane, Rainham, Kent , ME8 7TJ</p> <p>As the owner of 185 Pump Lane and the land between my house and the railway. I wish to strongly disapprove with revised Pump Lane Railway Bridge Improvements (20230-05-1 Rev E).</p> <p>The proposed plan of the area shows the pavement extending past 185 Pump Lane and this is the proposed location of the traffic lights. This is not the case ,the pavement ends at 185 Pump Lane and the rest is privately owned (by myself). This area is currently being used as a driveway and if there were any traffic lights put close to the bridge this would make it impossible for us to use our driveway safely. With parking in this part of Pump Lane limited (especially evening and weekends) as only a few houses have drive ways on our side of the road, the proposed traffic lights will cause stationery traffic next to parked cars and anything coming up from the proposed development will struggle to get through. To hint that in the future this could be used as a bus route is totally unacceptable. This will cause an increase in accidents and vehicles mounting the pavement. This proposal will also cause an increase in pollution and noise from the stationary</p>

	<p>traffic for the area. I also wish to reiterate my comments from my original objection, that any traffic measures put in place for the bridge would require widening of the road and this would require compulsory purchase of gardens. Which is totally unacceptable as this has constantly been raised during the planning process.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>
<p>Cllr Martin Potter</p> <p>23 Ellison Way, Rainham Kent, ME8 7PL</p> <p>10 February 2021</p> <p>martin.potter@medway.gov.uk</p>	<p>Our ref: MP/KC/YS</p> <p>Date: 9th February 2021</p> <p>Councillor Martin Potter 23 Ellison Way Rainham Kent ME8 7PL 01634 566475 martin.potter@medway.gov.uk</p> <p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Re: Pump Lane Appeal (APP/A2280/W/20/323259868) 'Your Shout' Further Transport and Access Consultation</p> <p>We are responding to this consultation as the ward councillors for Rainham North ward, where the site which is subject to the appeal is located. We have taken the opportunity to read the responses of local residents who have copied their responses to us and in every case they continue to object. Residents not only point out that the transport and access proposals continue to be inadequate, but they also refer to the array of other significant and harmful issues that remain as previously articulated by ourselves, the community and Medway Council.</p> <p>Our concerns in relation to transport and access are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Severe vehicular congestion on local roads and rural lanes, particularly Pump Lane, Lower Rainham Road (B2004), and A289. Also, from vehicles trying to cut through Twydall to

avoid congestion on the Lower Rainham Road by using Lower Twydall Lane, Grange Road, and Eastcourt Lane through to Beechings way to get to the also congested A2. The Lower Rainham Road and A2 are the only routes through the area as the geography of the area dictates an east/west flow.

2. Significant impact on the wider road network, namely the A2, A289, A278, and the M2 (J4).

3. Car dependent development with very limited pedestrian connectivity and not within walking distance of a train station. The pedestrian connectivity to the north is a single path under a railway bridge with limited safe permeability linking to the rest of the site.

4. Noting point 3, in terms of pedestrian connectivity to the south, the 'ghost' island is a noted safety feature, but future residents would bizarrely have to walk east on the single path out of the site in order to access the path on the other side of the road which leads west. There is no onward route to the east (Rainham). To the east and west of the site future residents would find themselves emerging into country lanes.

5. Since 2017 Medway Council have made significant progress in air quality improvement in Rainham but the impact of the severe vehicular congestion from this development would likely see this improvement reversed.

Furthermore, all of our previous concerns and objections associated with the significant harm there would be from this unsustainable development, which is in a valued rural landscape and would destroy the orchard, remain valid.

Yours faithfully

Martin Potter Kirstine Carr

Councillor Martin Potter Councillor Kirstine Carr
Rainham North Councillors (Medway Council)

	Cc: Medway Council Planning, Planning Inspectorate Service
<p>Andrea Perry</p> <p>None given.</p> <p>11 February 2021</p> <p>AndreaPerry@hotmail.co.uk</p>	<p>Thanks for your letter re the above.</p> <p>Not one for writing reams and this email will be short. I am opposed to your development as this will impact severely upon the local area, environment and road network. During construction and the subsequent occupation of the 1,250 residential units, the vastly increased volume of traffic along Lower Rainham Road and surrounding roads will cause chaos especially for those living in the immediate area and will filter out to the surrounding roads, we are busy enough as it is and in turn the subsequent knock on effect for our local area/environment will not be enhanced.</p>
<p>Debra Craddick</p> <p>None given</p> <p>12 February 2021</p> <p>debra.craddock@medway.gov.uk</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>With reference to the proposed application to build an extensive housing estate and school etc. these roads are already major routes of congestion in the Rainham area, which will get considerably worst should this proposal go ahead. The roads are narrow country lanes and struggle with the current amount of traffic. With the extra housing and a school (bringing its own extra traffic) the nightmare for people already living in the area will escalate beyond all recognition, with resultant noise and air pollution a constant threat to their well- being plus additional time required for all journeys to and from their homes. The potential for accidents will also increase enormously with disastrous consequences a definite outcome.</p> <p>This proposal should be rejected</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
<p>Corrinne Noot</p> <p>ME8 7LG</p> <p>10 February 2021</p> <p>cjnoot346@btinternet.com</p>	<p>100% Against</p>
<p>Mrs Deborah Summers</p> <p>41, Twydall Lane, Gillingham, Kent ME86JE</p>	<p>In response to the appeal that has been lodged regarding the Pump Lane proposed development, I feel that I have to object wholeheartedly. The area cannot sustain a development of the (approximate)size in question or any development for that</p>

12 February 2021

deb.summers64@hotmail.com

matter. Traffic congestion is the main concern as Twydall is already struggling with very heavy numbers of vehicles on mainly quite narrow roads and basically, country lanes. Pollution is a huge concern and is getting worse year on year. As local facilities and services are currently struggling to provide for the resident population, an influx of people will further pressurise these. As there is a shortage of open spaces in Medway it would be prudent to extend the Riverside Country Park into the orchard area therefore enabling local people access to an open space that they can walk to rather than having to drive further afield. It will be to the detriment of all residents, both physically and mentally if this proposal is approved in any shape or form.

T 020 3151 4511 | thorncliffe.com | yourshout.com

The Royal Doulton Factory, 312 China Works, Black Prince Road, London, SE1 7SJ