

## Highways and Transportation

### Introduction

It is very disappointing that key aspects of the original sustainable aspirations for this site have not been taken forward in the Application (for various reasons). These include:

- Segregated lanes for the Fastrack buses, as requested by KCC and as noted within the Gravesham Core Strategy, the Draft Dartford Local Plan and the EDC Sustainable Travel Strategy;
- The walking and cycling link between the site and Northfleet Station, identified in the Dartford and Gravesham Core Strategies and the EDC Implementation Framework;
- The connection to the 'Bridge to Nowhere' from the western side. In addition:
- Widening of the A2260 to accommodate segregated cycle facilities;
- Improvements to pedestrian and cycle facilities along Southfleet Road.

Each of these are important elements which would support the sustainable transport outcomes for the site in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and in line with the ethos of development provision in Kent Thameside over previous years. In addition, the following detailed points need to be addressed:

### General Comments

The general planning documents make little reference to the importance of Fastrack, with the exception of the dedicated link across Southfleet Road. However, this is not considered to be a 'dedicated route' (as originally envisioned), but a shared two way road with a small dedicated section / bus gate. Paragraph 11.1.10 of the Transport Assessment (TA) states that the Fastrack link from Southfleet Road, and the two way working of International Way will enable more efficient running of Fastrack. However, KCC are concerned that the increased traffic coming to/from the site, plus the change from roundabout to signal junctions on the highway could lead to an increase in journey time for the buses. As this is a Fastrack only link, the impact on commercial services also need consideration. Evidence should be provided to demonstrate the proposed time saving to both Fastrack and commercial buses. E.g what is the journey time saving from the football ground to Ebbsfleet Station? In both the Transport Assessment and the Environmental Assessment the Fastrack Network Plan Ref: App A is out of date. Please contact the Fastrack team for an up to date network plan.

The Green Corridors scheme along Thames Way referred to in paragraph 2.7.18 of the TA is not yet committed. If this is not delivered, the Applicant will need to deliver the fully segregated ped and cycle route. It is unclear whether the route is proposed to be tree lined / incorporate a verge. Regardless of whether Green Corridors delivers the segregated route, the verge is required in order to create an attractive route for the significant numbers of pedestrians and cyclists generated by the proposals and also assist in natural speed reduction. The highway plans should be updated to reflect this.

The online Natural England SSSI plan for Swanscombe Peninsula appears to show the area adjacent to Southfleet Road has been taken out of the designation. If so, pedestrian and cycle improvements are required to Southfleet Road to accommodate site users, particularly as this provides a route to the nearest Secondary School. The Applicant should liaise with Natural England regarding this section, and also whether they would consider permitting a slight widening of the A2260 (into the SSSI) to permit a segregated cycle route along the route, that the Applicant could deliver. Given time constraints, this scheme may need to come forward with a future planning application for Car Park D.

The proposals include use of the underpass between EC1 and EC2. Please provide confirmation that the underpass is under the Applicant's control and therefore cannot be closed by a third party.

7.3.1 bullet point 4 of the TA refers to the MSCPs. It is unclear how site users will be prevented from parking in the station MSCP, undermining the reduced parking provision for the site. Please also confirm that the existing drop off spaces will be re-provided.

At 2.3.1 The collision data presented is for the period 2016 – 2020 and is therefore two years out of date. This data should be updated to the latest available period and can be obtained by contacting [crashdata@kent.gov.uk](mailto:crashdata@kent.gov.uk).

## Highway Proposals

Proposed changes to junction locations are described in section 5.1 of the TA, with plans provided in Appendix E. However, the plans do not show any geometry, as requested during pre-app. The plans should be updated to show appropriate geometry including visibility splays, footways and cycle routes, and the highway and red line boundaries in order to demonstrate they meet current standards and that all of the required land is within KCC or the Applicant's control. Autotracks were provided post application but should be reviewed in line with the comments provided below. The appropriate access points should be tracked for 16.5m articulated vehicles and 12.2m electric bus but also checked for an 18m articulated bus, as has been the case for other developments. A control / monitoring system such as UTMC must be included in the detailed design proposals for all signal junctions. Additional comments that should be incorporated into the revised plans are set out below. These changes are required at this stage to ensure the appropriate layouts can be accommodated, the models show the junction is within capacity / nil detriment is achievable, and so that issues at the detailed design stage can be avoided.

A number of the proposed junctions show the cycle route narrow as it enters the site. The reason for this is unclear as the route should maintain a constant width, to LTN/120 standards.

*Thames Way / Thames Way Junction - A226 southbound ahead movement in lane 2 is poorly aligned as it leads vehicles into the kerb as they exit the junction. This is not acceptable and needs to be improved. The two-lane approaches do not have an offside primary traffic signal that will be visible at all times. A 2m central island is required on each approach to locate a pole and signal head. Consideration should be given to altering the junction alignment as Phases B and C have the highest flows. Those from phase D are more likely to accept waiting for the 'major road' right turn as opposed to the current layout where drivers will expect to be able to move ahead when they are not blocked by their own right turn movement from phase D. This effectively makes Phase A the right turn movement and phase D a separate side road stage.*

*Thames Way / Northfleet Terminal Junction – It is imperative that the two-lane length is as long as possible for capacity benefits. The central islands on the southern approach and the western island between lanes 2 and 3 need to be 2m in width to assist in maintenance and accommodate two traffic signal heads. The ped/cycle route narrows significantly as it passes under the bridge. Cyclists must not be made to dismount. Improvements are required along this key ped and cycle route to Northfleet.*

*Ebbsfleet Gateway / Thames Way Junction – The central island on the southern approach needs to be 2.0m in width. The Linsig model shows separate control for the southern arm which makes the location and view of the primary and secondary signals a key issue. The stop line should be moved to the south and possibly the 3 lanes east to retain the internal stacking space to the west. The island should be reinstated if possible. Secondary signals on the northern side of the junction are unlikely to be of use. Lane 2 requires a clear view of a primary and secondary signal head.*

*International Way (East) / Ebbsfleet Gateway Junction – A 2m central island is required on the northern approach and a minimum 3m central island is required on the southern approach to ensure vehicles in lane 3 cannot travel ahead. Island modifications may be required at detailed design. KCC do not permit junctions with an uncontrolled right turn where drivers performing this movement would need to assess safe gaps in the opposing flow of more than one lane. The Linsig model needs to be revised to reflect this requirement. The Road Safety Audit (RSA) has raised the issue of blocking back to adjacent junctions which is concerning and not acceptable.*

*Springhead Bridge / Ebbsfleet Gateway Junction – KCC welcome the revision to the junction since pre-app, as requested. The southern approach incorporates a very short right turn lane as the demand is only 1 vehicle per cycle. However, the lane will sometimes be required to accommodate a higher than predicted flow due to the natural variation in traffic flows and there will be times when*

vehicles turning right may block the ahead movement in lane 2. This lane should be lengthened so it can accept 2 or 3 vehicles before blocking lane 2.

*The International Way (west) / Ebbsfleet Gateway Roundabout* - The design shows a parallel crossing on both the western and northern arms. However, LTN 1/20 table 10.2 shows that parallel crossings are only suitable for roads that carry less than 8000 vehicles and have a speed limit of 30mph or less. This is supported by DMRB standards CD 116 pp 8.1.1. The speed limit changes at this roundabout from 40mph to 50mph. The crossings are therefore not suitable in this particular location and alternative provision needs to be considered (noting the requirement of 30m distance between a controlled crossing and the stop line of the offside kerb). There is an existing shared cycle route that runs down the eastern side of the A2260 (southern arm), however, no crossing is provided across the eastern arm to facilitate south – north east movement, meaning pedestrians and cyclists have to cross three arms of the roundabout instead of one. A crossing is therefore required. A toucan crossing should also be considered on the southern arm, particularly given the increase from two to three lanes of traffic that pedestrians and cyclists will need to negotiate. This issue was also raised in the RSA.

*Lane widths* – KCC will not generally accept lane widths of 3m. 3.6m is desirable and 4m is required where there are double turning lanes. Narrower lanes will cause safety issues for motorists with little margin for error, particularly where larger vehicles are involved. Furthermore, 2 larger vehicles will impede each other with a subsequent loss of junction capacity compared with the Linsig prediction.

*Pedestrian / Cycle Crossings* - Toucan crossings require a minimum crossing width 4.0m and a minimum island width 4.0m which should be reflected in the designs. However, LTN 1/20 raises concerns with toucans and further information should be provided to demonstrate the impact of more appropriate crossings.

*Fastrack link* - In line with previous aspirations for the site, a new Fastrack walking and cycling link is proposed to be provided across Southfleet Road, linking Eastern Quarry with International Way. During pre-app the applicant proposed three locations for the link and KCC confirmed a preference for it to be located as close to the spur on Castle Hill as possible, to reduce the time a bus would need to spend on Southfleet Road where it is likely to get caught up in congestion. This was as per the original intention of the link. It is therefore extremely disappointing that the proposed location shown on the plans in Appendix E is so far north. KCC consider this link to be too far north and is likely to impact journey times for Fastrack. The junction is shown as a priority junction on the plans in Appendix E but is described as a signal junction at paragraph 5.5.3 of the TA. To confirm, Fastrack should have priority at junctions. Considering the site has very reduced parking provision, the attractiveness of the Fastrack, public transport, walking and cycling provision are fundamental to the effective operation of the site. The location of the link should therefore minimise journey times by these modes and the location and design of the link should be secured as part of this application. The Applicant will need to work closely with Camland to deliver the link from the spur in Eastern Quarry.

It is assumed that the section adjacent to the Fastrack link is a shared ped/cycle route. In line with LTN 1/20, this should be segregated. The existing shared ped and cycle route from Southfleet Road forces users to cross International Drive and travel along its southern side. Site observations show pedestrians often walk along the verge on the northern side as this is more direct and allows them to avoid going all the way around the roundabout to the east. The proposed design retains the pedestrian link on the southern side but provides a two-way cycle route on the northern side. Whilst this is an improvement for cyclists, there is a concern that pedestrians will use the cycle lane instead of the footway, creating conflicts, and this needs to be considered further. The existing crossing facility on International Way has been removed under the proposals, but should be retained (if appropriate in line with traffic flows). Future RMAs need to consider the location of cycle parking for cyclists using this route, and cycle track to carriageway transitions to facilitate cyclists wanting to travel across the bridge.

*Priority Junctions* - The priority junction south of the railway line (EC2) does not include a right turn bay, something which KCC raised during pre-app. Junctions on A-class roads are required to be designed to DMRB standards, which require right turn lanes where the minor road flows are over 300 two-way movements per day. The minor arm flows in Appendix J do look low but please confirm the

daily flow. It is unclear if this access would permit drivers to continue through the site to International Way, or if the route is severed. If it continues through the site it will cut through one of the main ped and cycle routes and plaza, which isn't ideal. Buses should always be permitted. What measures will be implemented to stop all vehicles travelling west from using this priority junction instead of International Way? As the flows are so low, it is assumed this scenario has not yet been considered.

Paragraphs 5.4.6 and 5.4.12 of the TA refer to visibility splays of 4.5m x 70m. Whilst this corresponds with the previous version of CD123, the current version now requires the Y splay to be calculated based on 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed (see pp 3.5). Please confirm the 85<sup>th</sup> %ile speed and therefore whether the 70m is still appropriate.

*Speed Limits* - A plan should be provided demonstrating the location of the proposed speed limit reduction on Thames Way so this can be Conditioned to the Application. During pre-app KCC confirmed acceptance of the reduction in speed limit from 40mph to 30mph providing that 50% of the uses fronting Thames Way have active frontages and that there are other speed reduction measures along the route (tree lined streets (referred to in the Design and Access Statement (DAS)), cycle routes, crossings etc), to make the 30mph limit self-enforcing. The highway plans should be updated to show the verges and other measures to be implemented. The speed reduction is proposed to be introduced under Phase 1, yet most of the junctions along this route (which could help to reduce the speeds) are not being improved until Phase 2. The speed reduction should not be introduced until natural enforcing measures are in place. This will impact on the delivery of the priority junction noted in the paragraph above, which requires the 30mph speed limit for a 70m splay and therefore needs further consideration.

*Stage 1 RSA* - A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit for the proposed changes to the highway was submitted on 01.11.22. Point 2.2.1 of the report relates to driver frustration at the Thames Way / Thames Way junction (a similar point noted above) and should be considered further. Points 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 require improvements to the Thames Way cycle route, which the Applicant has declined stating this is a KCC issue and that the Green Corridors scheme will address this. At this stage there is no guarantee that the Green Corridors programme will come forward. If it doesn't, the Applicant will be required to make the required improvements due to the significant increase in walking and cycling activity the site is predicted to generate. Point 5.2.2 refers to the Springhead Bridge junction and requires a cycleway/footway between the crossings. It is understood there is currently a shared route between them and this needs to be maintained (or improved) in the proposed layout. Point 6.1.2 refers to crossings at the A2260 roundabout. As noted above, this needs to be considered in the design.

*PROW Routes* - The planning documents do not emphasise just how important the PROW network is for this site. It is not enough to simply reduce parking provision, it is vital that key links are significantly improved in order to create attractive routes for sustainable travel. This includes DS17 (a key east-west link), NU2 (link to Northfleet in the west) and NU7a (a key link to Northfleet). Further improvements are required. Please refer to the PROW response for further detail.

*Pedestrian Audit* - Appendix B contains a pedestrian audit of the route between car park C and Northfleet Station and identifies a number of issues. However, no key measures have been proposed to improve the route. Page 161 of the DAS states "*There are existing routes which connect Northfleet and Ebbsfleet Central via Thames Way or A226, however there is currently no direct and easily accessible for all north-east connection between the two areas*". Table 9-24 estimates the site will generate almost 11,000 pedestrian trips and 600 cycle trips across the day and a number of these will be to/from Northfleet Station / High Street. Improvements to the routes are therefore required to create attractive walking and cycling corridors. Given the timescales for occupation, it may be that the future footbridge link could be secured and delivered prior to the improvements being required, but improvements need to be identified and secured at this stage, as the footbridge may never be delivered. In addition, the audit must consider cyclists, and the route via NU7a.

## **Traffic Assessment**

The study area identified in Figure 9-1 of the TA covers an area "*for those junctions which provide direct access to the development, or which are being amended to accommodate the masterplan*".

The study area does not incorporate three of the four additional junctions requested during pre-app. These junctions are required to be assessed to determine whether they are able to accommodate the development or whether mitigation is required, particularly as the previous application was not only consented 20 years ago, but is also set to expire this month. These are as follows:

- Grove Road / B1275 / A226 roundabout (Appendix J shows there will be over 100 development generated trips going through this junction in each of the AM and PM peaks, in both development scenarios).
- Springhead Road / Thames Way roundabout (Appendix J shows there will be over 310 development generated trips going through this junction in each of the AM and PM peaks, under the 'max commercial' scenario).
- Hall Road / Springhead Road roundabout (it is unknown how many of the above trips will travel to/from this junction as no assessment has been provided).

Paragraph 9.4.3 of the TA states that no background growth will be added between 2032 and 2039 as there is "*no known development growth beyond this period that would result in any significant variation to background traffic volumes*". TEMPro would normally be used to add growth to any future scenarios and whilst it is understood the new version of TEMPro being released in Nov 2022 may show reduced (or even zero) growth in some areas, this needs to be evidenced in order for it to be acceptable.

Paragraph 9.4.8 of the TA refers to the Northfleet Embankment West traffic flows that have been extracted for use as committed development. However, it is understood that there have been more recent applications than 2009, including the Northfleet Embankment West Mixed Use Development Addendum to Review of Residential Access Options Report, 2019. The flows from these later applications should be compared to the 2009 flows to determine if there is a significant difference.

Paragraph 9.4.13 of the TA refers to traffic flows at the A2260 / Springhead Bridge junction and states these are based on a 2018 traffic count combined with estimated flows extracted from the LinSig model that was used to model the proposed bridge. The assessment assumes all houses were occupied at this time. KCC disagree with this approach for two reasons: 1. The flows are based on estimated data and 2. EDC planning have confirmed that only 577 residential units were occupied in Springhead in Dec 2018. An updated traffic count is required for this junction. The updated count will not only reflect current traffic volumes and turning proportions at this junction but will also provide further confirmation that traffic flows have not increased since 2018 (as data from only one ATC has been obtained to evidence this and it is quite far east of the site).

Paragraphs 9.4.15 – 19 of the TA refer to committed development flows for Eastern Quarry and states that the assessment has used the trip rates that KCC accepted for application EDC/21/0164 instead of those in the 2006 TA, and that the vehicular trip rate has been reduced by a further 15% due to its proximity to Ebbsfleet Central. The use of the revised trip rates for EDC/21/0164 were agreed during pre-app, based on the fact that it is very unlikely the full permission will ever be built out and that the recent Eastern Quarry traffic surveys show the trips are well within the target set. However, Eastern Quarry have until 2033 to submit all RMAs. Therefore, in order for a robust assessment to be undertaken, a sensitivity assessment is still required using the original Eastern Quarry trip rates. Mitigation (potentially further MAAS credits / other sustainable measures) could be secured through a Monitor and Manage approach should the full Eastern Quarry permission be built out. With regard to the further reduction of 15% of vehicle trips, Ebbsfleet Central would have already obtained its planning permission when the Eastern Quarry TA was developed and the trip rates are therefore considered appropriate. The reduction is therefore not acceptable.

Sections 9.5 and 9.6 of the TA relate to the internalisation of trips and total trip generation. Whilst it is agreed that a school would serve the Ebbsfleet Central community and therefore unlikely to generate external trips, it is questioned whether 3000sqm of leisure (E(d), F1(b), F2(c) and F2(d)) would generate any external trips on the network as the draw for e.g an ice skating rink or swimming pool would likely come from a much larger area, thereby generating trips on the network. Further information is also required on the trip generation for the student housing and other sui generis uses. In addition, why have no trips been assumed for the community element of the HEiQ? A worst-case

scenario is required to be assessed and therefore further justification is required. Paragraph 5.66 states that no external trips have been considered for the retail element as it is expected to serve the local community. It is understood that a planning condition will be applied to any permission granted, limiting the size of the retail uses, which should result in these being used as a community facility rather than generating external trips, and the approach to the retail element is therefore acceptable.

Table 9-24 of the TA presents predicted mode share information. The vehicle occupancy and pedestrian mode shares look significantly high. Further evidence / justification is required in order for this to be accepted.

Tables 10-2 and 10-5 of the TA show the A226 / Thames Way / Car Park C Roundabout and the Thames Way / Northfleet Terminal Access Roundabout are predicted to operate well within capacity during the 2032 'with Phase 1 development' scenarios (max RFC of 0.38 and 0.47 respectively). No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that these junctions actually require signalisation under Phase 2 and clarification is required.

The traffic counts have not been provided for review and are required (Excel format would be appreciated).

Transport and Parking Strategy (Appendix H) - Table 7-1 states the first car club will become operational within one year of first occupation. This is too late. Research shows sustainable travel measures often have the most impact at first occupation when those moving into / travelling to the site are considering their travel options. A minimum of one car club space should be provided upon occupation. One years free membership and £50 driving credit should be secured for site users, to encourage takeup.

Trip Generation (Appendix I) - Table 5.15 sets out the number of patient appointments that will be available at the HEiQ RD centre. Why are appoints only available for 11 hours of the day (and only 7.5hrs per day for the Ultrasound) when the centre is open 12 hours a day (supporting the argument to remove staff trips)? My pre-app response of 02.02.22 stated "*Will the working hours be conditioned? If not, the staff trips should be assumed to occur in the peak hours.*" Please confirm whether staff trips are to be conditioned or whether they will be included in the assessment.

Financial Contributions - The applicant proposes to provide a contribution of £400,000 towards the implementation of MAAS. Whilst welcomed, this is significantly less than the one years free public transport and sustainable travel vouchers for all site users, previously discussed. Free public transport (along with segregated lanes) has proven to achieve a higher Fastrack modal share, as demonstrated by The Bridge development in Dartford. The proposed parking provision for the office use is lower than the EDC standards and therefore needs further encouragement for take up of sustainable modes. The contribution proposed is low and would only apply to residents rather than all site users. Further consideration is required.

The Applicant proposes a £100,000 contribution towards sustainable travel vouchers (bikes, helmets etc) and states "*A maximum claim of £50 per dwelling will be permitted*". However, under the 'max residential scenario', this equates to only £36.66 per house and needs to be increased.

A transport fund needs to be established to be used to implement measures should the Travel Plan targets not be achieved. Other local developments have contributed between £300 and £2000 per unit (depending on bus requirements) to their transport fund and KCC seek a similar level of contribution from Ebbsfleet Central. The payments could be made in six monthly intervals in line with occupations, and used only if the targets are breached, at the discretion of the TRG.

Paragraph 7.2 bullet points 4 and 6 of the TA are confusing. Is the £100 per house in addition to the £400,000 contribution towards the implementation of MAAS stated in bullet point 4?

One years free membership to the car club and £50 driving credit should be secured for site users, to encourage takeup.

## **Framework Travel Plan**

The monitoring section at 5.1.1 does not refer to site wide vehicle monitoring surveys, which are essential. It should also include information on car club usage, and parking surveys in the local area to confirm the site is not generating on street parking issues elsewhere.

The targets should be considered alongside the trip generation set out in the TA. No remedial measures have been set out to show what action will be taken should the Travel Plan not achieve its targets. This is required. Travel Plan monitoring should occur at six monthly intervals and continue for five years post full occupation. As requested during pre-app, a TRG should be established.

### **Design and Access Statement (DAS)**

Page 163 shows laybys along Thames Way, but these are not shown on the highway layout plans so it is unclear how these will be delivered.

The primary street indicative section set out on page 167 shows 4m planted verges with 2m cycle paths and 4m footways on either side of the 6.75m carriageway. However, this doesn't reflect the highway layout plans for Thames Way. The highway plans should be updated to show this can be delivered. Whilst the layouts in the DAS are indicative, it should be noted that any bus routes require a 6.75m carriageway, and in line with DfT guidance, KCC do not generally accept shared surfaces for sites with over 25 units.

### **Masterplan Cycle Infrastructure Crossing Layouts**

Masterplan Cycle Infrastructure Crossing Layout 64997 (drawing number 103780-PEF-EC-XX-M2-Y-000019 P01) refers to 'Type 6: In line Toucan Crossing LTN 1/20 Figure 10.26'. However, Figure 10.26 (as shown in the insert) is a Circulating Cycle Stage Junction, which enables cyclists to make all movements. This also does not correspond with the plan in Appendix E which shows a standard toucan crossing. The crossing types over the priority junctions need to be appropriate for the predicted traffic flows and in line with LTN 1/20. This can be determined at RMA stage.

### **Thames Way Dualling**

The proposed development would utilise land currently safeguarded for the dualling of Thames Way, a scheme listed on the Strategic Transport Infrastructure Program (STIPS). The scheme is currently being reviewed by the Major Capital projects team to determine whether it is still required. It is anticipated that the results will be taken to the cabinet committee in Nov for a final decision on whether to remove it from the STIPS programme or not. KCC request that either this Application is not determined until a formal decision has been made on the scheme, or a Grampian condition is applied to prevent any development occurring until it has formally been removed from the list.

### **Street Lighting**

The lighting documents contain reference to all of the recognised lighting guidance documents, which is positive. The only comment to note at this stage is in Section 5, where reference is made to Correlated Colour Temperature of 3000K. Whilst this is in line with the ILP Guidance notes for illumination in the presence of Bats, KCC only use or accept Neutral White lighting of 4000K/.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion I would like to place a holding objection on the application until the above issues have been resolved. Should the application be determined before the issues have been resolved, the below conditions / S106 requests should be secured.

### **Conditions / S106**

- Best endeavours to reduce the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph along Thames Way, south of Stonebridge Roundabout to the speed limit change on Ebbsfleet Gateway. 50% of the uses fronting Thames Way need to be active and other speed reduction measures are required along the route, to assist the 30mph limit being self-enforcing. Trigger to be determined based on further discussion with the Applicant.

- Best endeavours to implement site wide TRO's prior to occupation, to prevent ad hoc parking. The cost of preparing and implementing the TRO will be at the Applicants expense. Private parking enforcement will be required on all non-adopted roads.
- All signal junctions along the Fastrack route are required to have Fastrack priority. As an absolute minimum this comprises green wave and UTMC technology.
- A dedicated Fastrack, walking and (segregated) cycling link to be provided between Southfleet Road and International Way in the vicinity of the spur from Eastern Quarry. The link (and bus route through the site) should be open for use upon first occupation of the site.
- A segregated pedestrian and cycle link to and over the bridge to nowhere.
- A signal-controlled crossing to be located on Thames Way in the vicinity of PROW NU14, and resurfacing works to the connecting PROW. See PROW response for detail.
- Improvements / financial contribution secured through the S106 for improvements to the PROW network. See PROW response for details.
- A transport hub to be provided adjacent to the station. As a minimum, this should contain: Electric car club vehicle with plug in charge point; electric bike hub with plug in charge point, docking station & bicycles, bicycle stands and lockers, bicycle repair stand, bicycle pump, and an information terminal.
- Dedicated drop off area and taxi parking areas to facilitate trips to/from the site / station.
- The development proposals shall not impose on the safeguarded land for C2E.
- A Site Wide Travel Plan is required to be submitted three months prior to first occupation of the site. The Travel Plan should contain (as a minimum) site wide vehicle targets, a monitoring strategy, an action plan to be implemented to meet the targets, remedial measures to be implemented should the targets not be met, details of a transport fund to fund the remedial measures, and details of the TRG. Full Travel Plans for each individual use meeting the appropriate thresholds should be submitted to and agreed by the Council a minimum of three months prior to occupation of their associated use. These must be in accordance with the Site Wide Travel Plan.
- The Travel Plan must be monitored on a six monthly basis and needs to record the numbers of vehicles entering and leaving the site, with the results reported to the TRG within 3 months. The surveys should also record numbers of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. Speeds should be recorded along Thames Way to ensure they are within the newly implemented 30mph speed limit. Monitoring must include on and offsite parking survey to capture any ad hoc parking, and is to be paid for by the Applicant. The extent of the survey should be agreed with KCC and set out in the Full Travel Plan.
- A KCC Travel Plan monitoring fee of £1422 every five years is required and should be secured via the S106.
- A transport fund to be secured, to implement remedial measures, should the Travel Plan not achieve it's targets or there are other issues identified that need to be rectified. Suggested contribution of between £300 and £2000 per unit.
- A minimum of £400,000 contribution to KCC's MAAS (or equivalent) scheme to be secured through the S106 and delivered prior to occupation. In the event that MAAS (or KCC scheme) is not ready to receive contributions, the money is to be spent on sustainable travel improvements, with proposals to be agreed by the TRG.
- A minimum of £50 per unit for sustainable travel vouchers for the residential units, to be secured through the S106 and delivered upon occupation.
- A financial contribution will be required for new Fastrack shelters, secured via the S106.
- A car club to be implemented on site with a minimum of six cars, with a minimum of one vehicle on site upon occupation. A number of the vehicles should be electric with associate charging facilities. It is requested that one years free membership and £50 driving credit is also secured for the site users, to encourage takeup.
- No scheme can be implemented on the Thames Way safeguarded land unless the Thames Way Dualling scheme is formally removed from the STIPS program.
- The Applicant should actively seek to secure and deliver the proposed pedestrian and cycle link between Thames Way and Northfleet Station. The Applicant should fund and undertake a detailed study of the scale and magnitude of cost and an outline design of the scheme, prior to the submission of the first RMA. The land should be safeguarded.



- Walking and cycling link to be provided over the Bridge to nowhere, prior to occupation. The connection to the western end should be safeguarded and required to come forward as part of any application for the land on Car Park D.
- The schemes for the Thames Way priority junction (EC2), Thames Way / Ebbsfleet Gateway junction, International Way / Ebbsfleet Gateway junction, Springhead Bridge / Ebbsfleet Gateway junction, International Way / Ebbsfleet Gateway roundabout and the toucan crossing on Thames Way (for future link to Northfleet) to be implemented and operational upon first occupation of EC2 (Phase 1).
- The scheme for the Thames Way / Thames Way / Car Park C roundabout, Thames Way priority junction (EC1), Thames Way / Northfleet terminal roundabout and the toucan crossing on Thames Way south to be implemented and operational upon first occupation of EC1 (Phase 2).
- In line with KDG, an emergency or secondary vehicle access point must be available prior to the occupation of the 50<sup>th</sup> dwelling and connect to the highway of the primary access. A secondary access must be available prior to the occupation of the 300<sup>th</sup> dwelling.
- Pedestrian, cycle and public transport facilities to/from buildings / phases should be operational prior to their associated use.
- Vehicle and cycle parking provision set out in any subsequent RMAs to be based on EDC's parking standards at the time, with the exception of office vehicle parking which is to be based on 1/50sqm. If EDC is no longer the planning authority at that time, parking provision will need further agreement with KCC officers to ensure the most appropriate standards are implemented.
- No on site use (other than Ebbsfleet International Station itself) to be permitted to lease parking spaces in the MSCP as this would undermine the sustainable ethos of the site and may also displace station parking.
- A Construction Management Plan will be required for future RMAs.