

## **Matter 5. Infrastructure.**

### **5.1 Transport infrastructure – is the modified Plan supported by robust infrastructure planning which demonstrates that the proposed development is deliverable?**

No. Referring to AX6 **the Councils response to Transport Issues Point 1 (SBC/CSR/5)** *‘Development in this location and at this scale is not considered to be in conflict with the NPPF paragraphs in question. There are local services at Newington and public transport appropriate to the limited levels of growth proposed. The NPPF does not take the view that additional traffic cannot be placed on key roads, with para.32 indicating that such impacts would need to be severe and not capable of mitigation before it would act as a constraint to growth. This is not the case here’.* I think the Councils argument is completely flawed; the Development is classed as a large Major development how can the Council say ‘limited levels of growth’. The public transport is not appropriate for the existing population never mind additional, so people will take to their cars as we do for that very reason. The junction will have a severe impact (see paragraph 1.3 in Matters 1) and it is not possible of mitigation given the restrictions of the Road width one of the narrowest points on the whole of the A2 (Figure1). The only mitigation I can see is that the Highways England is suggesting a Financial Contribution of 94,864 for improvements to Key Street Roundabout. I do not know how improvements to Key Street by creating a bigger problem elsewhere on the A2 at Newington makes sense.

### **5.2 Does the Plan include adequate infrastructure planning for highway improvements along the A249 corridor to accommodate growth to the west of Sittingbourne?**

No. Improvements to the A249 should be in place before any Major development allocations are included in the plan to the West of Sittingbourne. I understand that improvements to Junction 5 will not take place until 2024.

### **5.3 Has the highway impact of the proposed level of growth on Sheppey been properly addressed?**

No. For traffic going to and from the Island there is ‘bottle neck’ on the A249 at Stockbury roundabout. Improvements to the A249 should be a priority (maybe an underpass under the roundabout for traffic travelling to Maidstone and A20). This ‘bottle neck’ impacts on surrounding routes with drivers taking alternatives to avoid congestion, in particular the A2 going both ways through Newington.

### **5.4 Does the Plan include robust infrastructure planning to ensure that the highway network can accommodate the level of growth proposed in and around Faversham, with particular regard to the impact on J7 of the M2?**

Yes (Mostly). The M2 is a lot busier to the West of Junction 5 than to the East (which includes Junction 7), if money is available the M2 should be widened to 3 lanes throughout its length to bring it up to modern standards, but it is not such a priority as the A249 and A2.

Figure 1



**AX6 Newington.  
Proposal to narrow  
carriageways at this  
point on the A2 from  
3.55m to 2.8m together  
with narrowing of  
pathways to 1.5m, to  
accommodate a ghost  
lane will be impractical  
and very dangerous.  
New access Road will be  
bottom right of pictures.**

