

**21/502609/OUT – Land To The East Of Lynsted Lane, Lynsted, Kent, ME9 9QN -  
TABLED UPDATE FOR ITEM 2.5**

1. Paragraph 5.3, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point (on Page 138 of the agenda) of the Committee Report provided an officer comment:

*[NB: This was a policy in the regulation 19 plan previously produced and as the Council has now decided to go back to the Regulation 18 stage, this policy is no longer relevant.]*

This can be changed to:

*“This was a policy in the regulation 19 plan previously produced, and as the Council has now decided to ~~go back to the~~ **undertaken further Regulation 18 consultation and will prepare a new Regulation 19 plan stage.** This policy is no longer relevant.”*

2. Officers require delegated authority to add a reason for Condition 7 (detailed drainage scheme)(on Page 166), and this will read as follows:

*“To ensure the development is served by satisfactory arrangements for the disposal of surface water and that they are incorporated into the proposed layouts.”*

3. Officers require delegated authority to add the following words to Condition 5 (Housing accommodation schedule)(on Page 166):

*‘...unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority’*

4. Officers require delegated authority to change the drawing number of Condition 4 (approved plans)(on Pages 165 and 166) to Site Plan 20/0922 – 01 REV J and the access plan 49905/5501/001 E (1 and 2).

5. On pages 142,143 and 155 of the Committee Report, the following condition references are incorrect (condition 18, condition 19 and condition 20: they are out by one or more number.

For completeness, on pages 142 and 143, the condition numbers referred to should be amended as follows:

Condition 18 should be Condition 19 (Archaeology)

Condition 19 should be Condition 20 (Landscape/Tree Management Plan)

Condition 20 should be Condition 22 (Travel Plan)

6. Similarly, on page 155, Condition 15 should be Condition 16 (Noise assessment).
7. An additional neighbour objection (further to those summarised on Pages 137 and 138) has been received since the publication of the Committee Report. The neighbour made the following comments:

*“This is already an congested village, yes village not town as they are trying to turn*

*Teynham, Lynsted, Bapchild, Sittingbourne and Faversham into. We don't have the infrastructure for the heavy good vehicles that now run daily on the A2 through the village and certainly not through Lynsted lane, which as it says is a lane NOT a motorway.*

*Where are the schools, Doctors, and other amenities that we need - THESE ARE NEEDED NOW, NOT MORE HOUSING."*

8. The secondary land contribution at paragraph 8.38 states £36,357, which is a typo; it should be £26,357.
9. Paragraph 8.9 (on Page 153) states that the size of the site is 0.52 hectares. During the course of the application, the red line of the site boundary was amended and the revised size of the site is 0.49 hectares
10. For clarity, the contributions listed in the Heads of Terms shown on paragraph 8.38 (on Pages 156 and 157) are a maximum and based on 10 residential units being delivered. Should the final development deliver less than the maximum 10 residential units then the contributions sought will be revised accordingly, to reflect the final number of units.
11. The off-site highway works – which have been agreed by KCC Highways and Transportation – are as shown on drawing number 49905/5501/005 D. Delegated authority is sought to impose an additional condition requiring that these works are provided in full before the occupation of the 1<sup>st</sup> dwelling. The works will also require a separate approval under s278 of the Highways Act.
12. Please be advised that the proposed highways works to Lynsted Lane and the North East Corner access to the A2 are presented to the Council as two different options. They don't both need to be delivered. The applicant, is prepared to deliver both options, if required, but the Lynsted Lane improvements aren't actually required., if the North East corner is delivered.
13. Please be advised that there should be a reference to condition (38)(Development Brief) in paragraph 8.28 Officers require delegated authority to amend this condition to ensure that it development brief is approved before the reserved matters application is submitted and that the reserved matters submission shall be informed by it.
14. The final part of paragraph 8.91 should be amended to say the percentage reductions (which could ultimately be greater than 50%) will be agreed in due course, rather than as part of this application. To this end, Officers require delegated authority to amend Condition 29 (energy efficiency).
15. Officers' **conclusions** remain as set out in the Committee report, which are as follows:

*"Although the application site is located outside the built-up area of Teynham, it has good connectivity to local schools and shops, and the wider bus, road, and rail network.*

*KCC Highways have indicated that the scheme, subject to conditions, will improve the current highway network situation.*

*Whilst this is an application in outline only, an illustrative layout has been prepared to demonstrate how the site could accommodate a sympathetically designed scheme for up to 10 dwellings that would reflect the design characteristics of the local area.*

*Significant weight also needs to be given to the lack of a five-year housing land supply. For these reasons, I consider that outline planning permission should be granted, subject to the conditions set out below and the signing of a suitably worded Section 106 agreement.”*

16. **Recommendation:** Planning permission to be granted subject to conditions as set out in the report and the amendments to (and addition of) conditions as outlined above, and subject to the completion of a S.106 agreement. With delegated authority to amend the wording of the s106 agreement and of conditions as may reasonably be required.

JRW – 9/2/2022