

The site is in a sustainable location, with short walking and cycling distances to local bus stops and both local and international railway stations. The proposals include a dedicated Fastrack route through the site and walking, cycling and car club facilities, all of which will further assist in achieving a mode shift away from the private car. However, in order for KCC to provide a robust assessment of the proposals, further information is required.

A pre-application meeting took place with the applicant on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2022 and subsequent to that the applicant was sent a letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> July 2022 setting out the local highway authority's pre-application advice. In this letter it was requested that a Transport Strategy should be prepared and submitted with the application, to demonstrate how the transport elements will be delivered over time. Although a Transport Assessment (TA) has been submitted which has considered and assessed the transport impacts upon completion of the Development, a Transport Strategy is required as a live document and umbrella to the suite of other documents including the Framework Car Park Management Plan (CPMP), Framework Travel Plan (FTP), Framework Delivery and Servicing Plan (FDSP) and Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP). The Transport Strategy should carefully consider how the phasing of transport infrastructure (which is discussed in the Design and Access Statement (DAS)) would be delivered, which is important given the scale of the site and long build out programme of approximately nine years.

Detailed comments on the application documents relevant to transport issues are set out in turn in the subsequent paragraphs.

### **Transport Assessment**

In paragraph 1.2 it should be noted that the site is nearer to Gravesend than Dartford, with it being four kilometres from Gravesend town centre.

Figure 2.2 only shows the 2 kilometre walk isochrones and not the 800 metre isochrones as well, which are helpful in illustrating what is accessible within a 10 minute walk. The 800 metre isochrones should also be provided.

Paragraph 2.13 refers to bus stops on Taunton Road. A description of the walking route between the site and the bus stops should be provided, include the crossing opportunities.

Paragraph 2.29 notes that accident data from Crashmap has been analysed and not data from Kent County Council (KCC). An analysis of the KCC data should be provided as part of a supplementary Transport Assessment.

Although not yet adopted, the applicant should consider the relevance of policies contained within the Gravesham Borough Council Regulation 18 Stage 2 Consultation Part 1: Local Plan Core Strategy Partial Review and Site Allocations and Part 2: Draft Development Management Policies documents. For each of the policy documents set out in Chapter 3, it should be demonstrated how the development proposals comply with the policies, rather than just list out the relevant policies.

A plan is required showing what is proposed at podium level. In particular, this should show the route of the proposed diversion of the A226 Galley Hill Road. The design of the diverted route will need to be assessed since it forms part of the site access arrangements. The diverted route under the podium should have a low-level verge to be maintained for emergency use by vehicle occupants and to maintain the design sight-lines on bends. A verge should be provided for an emergency walkway and it should be designed to the guidance and recommendations in the Department for Transport publication Inclusive Mobility. It is understood that this route also provides access for refuse collection at the stadium. How will this route accommodate the manoeuvres of refuse vehicles?

Figure 4.3 does not provide sufficient details of the proposals for the road layout. The changes proposed in paragraph 4.13, notably the realignment of the A226 and related junction alterations, as well as the proposed segregated Fastrack route should be shown on a plan. Further to this, what is the internal road hierarchy? What are the proposed primary route(s), secondary routes and potentially tertiary routes?

Paragraph 4.24 sets out the proposed six vehicular site access points. Although this is an outline planning application, means of access into and out of the Site from the highway network is being determined at this stage. It is therefore important that the proposals for each access point are clearly understood and assessed. As requested in the pre-application advice, site access plans (including changes to the highway) should be provided at an appropriate scale (1:500) including pedestrian and cycle access points, the highway boundary (which can be obtained by contacting [highwaydefinitionsearches@kent.gov.uk](mailto:highwaydefinitionsearches@kent.gov.uk)), appropriate vehicle visibility splays, vehicle tracking, and appropriate pedestrian and cycle crossings. Vehicle tracking is particularly important given that the diverted A226 Galley Hill Road would be used by a significant proportion of goods vehicles associated with the existing industrial units in the local area. Vehicle tracking should demonstrate that the proposed amendments to the A226 Galley Hill Road can safely accommodate 16.5 metre Heavy Goods Vehicles. The appropriate access points should be tracked for a 12.2 metre electric bus but also checked for an 18 metre articulated bus, as has been the case for other developments. KCC will not generally accept lane widths of 3 metres. 3.6 metres is desirable and 4 metres is required where there are double turning lanes at junctions. Narrower lanes will cause safety issues for motorists with little margin for error, particularly where larger vehicles are involved. Is it intended that dedicated facilities for cyclists are provided at any of the site access points? Any cycle crossing points should be designed in line with LTN 1/20 and shown on the access plans.

An adoption plan should be provided where possible and a plan of the highway land proposed to be stopped up. As Galley Hill Road is an A class road, any changes to this highway should be designed to DMRB standards.

Paragraph 4.53 states one cycle parking space will be provided for each dwelling. Whilst this is in line with SPG4, EDC's Sustainable Travel Strategy requires one per bedroom, which may be more appropriate in this location and given the low parking provision.

Paragraph 5.25 states mode share for Ebbsfleet is 60%. This is incorrect.

Paragraph 6.8 states "*public transport model and associated variable demand model calculations will not be carried out for this task order as this assessment is not required by KCC*". To be clear, whilst it was agreed not to use the KTM for this purpose, it was requested that the PT element was assessed in a desk based assessment i.e calculate journey times using timetables and modelling results.

Paragraph 8.4 refers to a signal scheme proposal for junction 4 associated with Blue Lake. To confirm, the Blue Lake site does not have planning permission, nor does it have a live application.

Appendix J contains plans showing the proposals for the A226 Thames Way / B2175 Stonebridge Road and the A226 Galley Hill Road / Northfleet Industrial Estate junctions, at a scale of 1:1000 at A3. Break lines are shown where the road continues. However, this is not sufficient and the full road layout should be shown for the diverted section of the A226. A control / monitoring system such as UTMC must be included in the detailed design proposals for all signal junctions. These plans should also be updated with the additional information requested above. The proposed speed limits should also be clarified. On the B2175 Stonebridge Road, the existing pedestrian crossing facility at the roundabout is proposed to be removed. This should instead be replaced with a signalised pedestrian crossing. What are the access proposals for the existing Plough / Golden Grill in this location? No plans have been submitted for the other site access junctions, but these are required.

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was requested as part of the pre-application advice. However, this is outstanding and should be submitted along with the Designers Response to determine the acceptability of the access proposals. Any departures from standards must be highlighted.

Further detail is required regarding the proposed Fastrack Route. Specifically, this includes the following points:

- What is the route for Fastrack across the site? How does this relate to the cross-section for the Bus Corridor shown in Figure 4.5?;
- How does the proposed segregated Fastrack route connect to the road network at either end of the segregated section? Plans showing the proposed junctions should be submitted (one of

which is noted as the Grove Road / B2175 Stonebridge Road junction), which should include Fastrack priority measures such as bus gates and green wave at signals;

- How does the mode share presented in Table 4.2 relate to the actual forecast of passenger numbers? Has this been based on 2011 or 2021 Census data?
- Where would the bus stops within the site be located (this should be shown on a plan) and what facilities would be provided at these bus stops? and
- How would the proposed segregated Fastrack route affect existing Fastrack journey times?

What are the proposals for commercial bus services? In addition to Fastrack, routes 3, 34, 306, 480 Sapphire, 490 Sapphire and X55 currently serve stops within the site. How are the bus stops known as Taunton Road impacted by the proposed diversion of the A226 Galley Hill Road?

Figure 4.4 shows the pedestrian access points. It does not show a pedestrian route connecting onto Grove Road and this should be reconsidered. The redevelopment of the site bordering the eastern side of Grove Road, along with associated pedestrian and segregated cycle upgrades to Grove Road, is uncertain. Therefore, since this site shares a boundary with Grove Road to the east, pedestrian and cycle improvements to Grove Road should be considered as part of the proposals.

How do the pedestrian routes shown in figure 4.4 relate to the proposed diversion of the Public Right of Ways referred to in paragraph 4.27, including KCC's ambition to divert the English Coastal Path through the site upon completion of the development? PROW NU1 and National Trail, the England Coast Path will be affected, and further information is required. Please see separate comments from the PROW team.

Figure 4.6 shows the cycle access points. Similarly to pedestrians, it does not show a cycle route connecting onto Grove Road. Indeed, whilst several north-south cycle routes are shown, there is a lack of east-west cycle routes shown on figure 4.6. There is likely to be an existing demand for cyclists travelling from the B2175 Stonebridge Road which should be accommodated. 3 metre shared footway / cycleways as referenced in paragraph 4.31 and shown in Figure 4.5 are not acceptable. This also applies to the realigned A226 Galley Hill Road which is proposed to provide facilities for cyclists. Cycleways should be segregated from footways to provide high quality and attractive routes for pedestrians and cyclists. This is made clear in LTN 1/20 which states that "*on urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with pedestrians.*" A 0.5m verge is proposed, but KCC require a minimum of 1 metre in width to be a functional component of the public realm.

It is assumed that the cross sections shown in Figure 4.5 relate to the realigned A226 Galley Hill Road (the HGV Access Corridor) and the segregated Fastrack route (the Bus Corridor), but this should be made clear and further commentary will subsequently be provided.

The principle of a Mobility Hub is supported. The proposed location should be shown on a plan, since it is important for it to be conveniently located and accessible by a range of sustainable modes. It should include all of the features listed in paragraph 4.36 of the TA.

Table 4.2 presents the car ownership data from the 2011 Census for the local area. This supports the assertion that the existing levels of car ownership are low for flats and maisonettes. It is also acknowledged that with appropriate sustainable travel measures, including a car club and mobility hub, there is potential for a further reduction in car use at the site. With this in place, an overall residential parking provision of 0.5 spaces per unit may be acceptable.

Please provide further evidence to show how many car club vehicles are required, so these can be secured. The EDC Sustainable Travel Strategy states "*The aim should be for every resident to have access to at least two car club parking bays within 5 minutes walking radius*".

For non-residential uses, the proposed car, EV, motorcycle and disabled parking provision for each land use should be set out against the relevant parking standard to allow the proposed provision to be assessed. The scope to reduce overall parking through shared provision can then be explored. Will any parking for the existing uses be retained? Does sufficient capacity exist on alternative modes to meet demand and ensure there are a choice of modes available as alternatives to the private car? The

Ebbsfleet United Football Stadium website currently directs drivers to park in Ebbsfleet International Car Park C. Do the proposals also include promoting the Station to park? Ebbsfleet International Car Parks are currently included in the Ebbsfleet Central application which is currently live (EDC/22/0168).

The applicant has indicated that their intention is to use the Kent Transport Model to assess the highway impacts of the proposals, which is supported. KCC looks forward to further discussions with the applicant regarding the model inputs and outputs. In the interim, some initial comments on Chapter 5 on Trip Generation and Chapter 6 on Traffic Assessment Methodology are given in the following paragraphs.

As set out in the pre-application advice, it was recommended that the traffic associated with the existing uses to be replaced by the Development was surveyed. This has not been undertaken and it has instead been decided not to discount the existing uses from the proposed development traffic. This methodology is acceptable.

Paragraph 5.8 states that Private Flats have been used to derive residential trip rates. However, the TRICS output in Appendix G shows that Mixed Private Housing trip rates have been used. The total vehicular residential trip rates presented in Table 5.4 are different from those in Appendix G. Please confirm the correct trip rates. Table 5.4 should also provide the unit (e.g., per dwelling or 100 sqm etc).

Why has the trip attraction for the stadium not been considered and why is it excluded from Table 5.4, when paragraph 6.28 states that the assessment will consider the stadium fully operational at maximum capacity of 8,000 spectators? The discrepancy should be clarified. Whilst the stadium is an existing use, the current capacity is 4,769 (of which 2,179 are seated), whilst the proposed capacity is stated to be an uplift to 8,000 seats in paragraph 4.3. The Design and Access Statement states that it could also hold major events of between 10,000 – 18,000 visitors. How often would major events take place? It is recommended that an Event Management Plan is submitted for review and secured by planning condition.

The two retail factory store surveys undertaken on a Sunday do not provide a robust basis on which to assess the weekday AM and PM peak hours, particularly since Sunday trading hours are different.

Whilst the principle of applying an internalisation factor to trip rates at a mixed use development is accepted, the factors set out in paragraph 5.18 should be supported by evidence to justify the reductions.

The mode shares are presented in Table 5.6 of the TA. For the residential development, 29% of trips as car driver appears too low, as does just 3% of trips by rail, given the convenience and attractiveness of commuting to London for work from the site. The vehicle occupancy and pedestrian mode shares look significantly high. Further evidence / justification is required in order for this to be accepted.

The assessment scenarios should also consider With and Without Ebbsfleet Central scenarios, since the Ebbsfleet Central site is located in proximity to the development site and the planning application has not yet been determined.

The traffic counts listed in paragraph 6.24 have not been provided for review and are required (Excel format would be appreciated). Plans should be provided (to scale) showing assumed geometry for the model inputs.

Paragraph 6.35 states that traffic has been distributed in accordance with existing turning movements. This is too simplistic for a development of this scale and is not acceptable. Distribution, including the use of 2011 / 2021 Census journey to work data can be discussed in more detail as part of the KTM work.

The ability of the railway network to accommodate the increase in demand should be explored and confirmed, assuming a worst-case scenario. This was requested during pre-application advice and has not been set out in the Transport Assessment.

## **Pedestrian and Cycle Audit**

A desk-based audit of the existing walking and cycling routes has been undertaken from the site boundary to Ebbsfleet International Station, Northfleet Railway Station and Swanscombe Railway Station. A desk-based audit is not sufficient to provide an accurate assessment and a site visit should be undertaken instead.

It is unclear whether the audit assesses the existing situation or the future scenario with the development in place. For example, the proposals show the need to cross the B2175 Stonebridge Road to access Northfleet rail station. However, the site access proposals provided in Appendix J of the Transport Assessment do not show a pedestrian crossing facility on the B2175 Stonebridge Road to replace the existing crossing.

In terms of the routes considered, whilst the routes to the nearest rail stations are important, routes to the nearest town centres, primary and secondary schools should be assessed as well. This is particularly the case for schools since the proposals comprise approximately 3,500 residential units.

The audit states that segregation for cyclists along the route to Northfleet rail station could make this route more attractive to cyclists. It also states that pedestrian crossings on the route to Ebbsfleet station should be moved to the desire lines. Plans illustrating the exact location of these proposals should be submitted.

A description of the facilities at Northfleet Station for pedestrians and cyclists should be included in the audit / within paragraph 2.16 of the TA. Improvements may be required.

### **Framework Travel Plan**

The FTP does not provide sufficient detail in respect of the proposed measures, monitoring and review mechanism. It should be expanded with further details provided on, but not limited to the following:

- The type of cycling parking which is proposed since residential and non-residential uses will have different requirements. Cycle parking should be high quality to ensure it will be safe and well-used. A proportion of cycle parking spaces should be designed for disabled / adapted cycles and bikes for hire should be included and costed within the FTP;
- Showers, lockers and changing facilities should be provided for use by the non-residential uses on the site;
- The Mobility Hub should be referred to in the FTP, since it could function as a focal point for the proposed travel planning measures;
- The targets should be considered alongside the trip generation set out in the TA, once it has been agreed;
- Why is the target only 5% reduction in car based trips? The standards approach is 10%.
- What remedial measures would be taken should the Travel Plan not achieve its targets?
- A proposal to establish a Transport Review Group, of which the Travel Plan Co-Ordinator would form part of as well other key stakeholders which should be identified;
- The review and reporting should be managed through the Transport Review Group;
- The monitoring mechanism should acknowledge that the development will be built in phases with the construction programme lasting over nine years, with first occupation taking place at the end of year 5 (according to the Construction Programme shown in figure 5.3 of the Construction and Demolition ES Chapter). The monitoring period will need to commence at occupation and then continue every six months for a period until at least five years after full occupation. The monitoring period in the FTP should be updated accordingly;
- An example travel survey which could be used as part of the Monitoring Programme should be provided. This should include site wide vehicle, pedestrian, cycle and public transport monitoring surveys, information on car club usage and parking surveys in the local area to confirm the site is not generating on street parking issues elsewhere;
- Details of the on-site car club should be included in the Travel Plan, including the number of spaces to be provided; and
- An adult annual Thameside bus ticket should be provided for each resident at the development and for each member of staff employed at the non-residential uses. Alternatively, the same cost may be distributed in the form of KCCs MAAS equivalent credits, if this is available at the time.

The FTP would form the framework for the development of a Side Wide Travel Plan as the development is built out.

### **Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan**

The construction programme in Table 3.1 shows that it has a construction period over at least nine years, which contradicts the 6-7 year duration referenced in paragraph 3.2.

The proposed HGV routes shown on Figure 4.1 are supported. HGV's associated with construction should be restricted to the identified routes.

Paragraph 4.6 refers to access points for vehicles and pedestrians. Where will these be located for phase one and phase two? Paragraph 5.1 notes that a limited amount of parking will be provided, but how much and where will it be located? A figure showing the construction routes and access points into the site would be helpful. Access to existing businesses and properties should be maintained.

Paragraph 5.71 and Figure 5.14 of the Demolition and Construction ES Chapter contain an estimate of HGV numbers, which could be as high as 128 HGV movements per day. The estimated numbers should be included in the FCTMP.

No mention is made of the potential for the river to be used to transport materials during construction and therefore mitigate the potential impact on the local road network. Since the site has a section of river frontage, has use of the river been considered as part of the proposals? It appears that part of the existing jetty lies within the site, whilst part of it is not in the red line boundary. Confirmation should be provided as to whether the jetty is within the applicants control and could be used during construction.

What is the anticipated mode share for construction workers? Construction workers should be encouraged to travel by sustainable means as far as possible and a Construction Worker Travel Plan should form part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

### **Framework Delivery and Servicing Plan**

The principles set out in the FDSP are supported. The FCSP should be reviewed as Reserved Matters Applications come forward for individual development plots.

### **Framework Car Park Management Plan**

Further justification is required to support the proposed parking provision referenced in paragraph 1.4 and Table 1. This document should also set out the number of disabled, motorcycle and EV car parking spaces.

The number of potential permits issued to each residential unit should correspond to the number of spaces permissible under the adopted Car Parking Standards.

The FCPMP should consider how site users will be prevented from parking in Ebbsfleet rail station car park, particularly when events are held at the stadium.

The FCPMP should be reviewed as Reserved Matters Applications come forward for individual development plots.

Paragraph 3.6 states that "*car parking will be restricted along the internal roads at the site*" and that "*parking restrictions will prevent parking at all times along the Fastrack bus route*". Gravesham Borough Council are the parking authority and will need to enforce parking restrictions on the adopted highway. Any areas that remain unadopted will need to be enforced privately.

The FCPMP should include a commitment to undertake surveys of parking on local roads (pre- and post-occupation), in co-ordination with the FTP. A plan should be provided for agreement, showing the extent of the area to be considered. Initiatives should be set out to demonstrate how the Applicant would reduce this impact, should an issue be highlighted. This may include a financial contribution towards the consultation for the introduction of parking controls.

### **Parameter Plans**

Parameter plan drawing number NFH-UNS-MAST-DR-1014 shows the Highway Access proposals and parameter plan drawing number NFH-UNS-MAST-DR-1020 shows the Highway Proposals Overview. Neither plan identifies a dedicated segregated Fastrack route, which paragraph 4.20 of the TA states will be provided. The Fastrack route should be shown on a plan accordingly. Similarly, the two bus stops referred to in paragraph 4.20 of the TA should also be shown on the plans.

### **Design and Access Statement**

Section 7.2 of the DAS concerns phasing of the road network. The provision of the realigned A226 Galley Road in the first phase during Years 0-2 is supported. The proposed junction alterations of the A226 Galley Hill Road / B2175 Stonebridge Road, A226 Galley Hill Road / Lower Road and Lower Road / Northfleet Industrial Estate junctions should also be delivered in this phase. The proposed closure of the realigned A226 Galley Hill Road in the second phase during Years 2-4 will not be supported until these works have been delivered. A stopping up order will be required for the existing section of the A226 Galley Road which will be diverted and this should form part of the programme and shown on a plan. Vehicle access to the existing industrial uses off Lower Road will need to be maintained.

### **Traffic and Transport ES Chapter**

Paragraph 7.11 states that the ATC Surveys took place between 12th July 2022 to 25th July 2022 and the MCC surveys took place on Tuesday 12th July 2022. The applicant should confirm that the ATC's were undertaken before school holidays commenced at local schools.

### **Structures**

It is assumed that the proposed tunnel will be offered for adoption and will therefore need to undergo technical approval by the structures team (as stated in pre-app). If it is not, then it will still need an element of approval due to its proximity to the adopted highway. There are 3 existing structures which look like they may be affected, dependent on the final junction layout details and additional ones which look to remain unaffected. These may also require technical approval if they are affected in any way. I note there was reference to basements and piling, if any of these works are within 3.66m of adoptable highway, they may also require approval as a highway structure. Depending on final levels, there may be retaining walls or wing walls on the tunnel approaches which may also need technical approval.

The applicant should contact the structures team as soon as they have a more advanced design so that KCC structures can begin the technical approval process and identify all the affected assets that may require approval and potentially identify items which can be altered to remove the need for approval.

### **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.

### **Suggested Conditions / Obligations**

At this stage it is envisaged that the following conditions / obligations will be sought. There may be additional requirements once the further information set out in this letter has been provided.

- Site Access points to be provided and open for use prior to occupation of the site.
- Best endeavours to implement TRO's for the segregated Fastrack route, diverted section of the A226 and internal roads, prior to occupation, to prevent ad hoc parking. The cost of preparing and implementing the TRO's 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 segregated 6.75m Fastrack route, and segregated cycle route to be provided through the site between the B2175 Stonebridge Road / Grove Road and Lower Road. It should be open for use upon first occupation of the site.
- A diverted route for the A226 between Lower Road and the B2175 Stonebridge Road and should be open for use upon first occupation of the site.

- A signalised pedestrian crossing point on the B2175 Stonebridge Road to be open for use upon first occupation of the site.
- A contribution may be required towards Northfleet Rail Station improvements.
- Improvements to be undertaken to provide pedestrian facilities and a segregated cycleway on Grove Road prior to occupation of the 500<sup>th</sup> unit.
- Improvements / financial contribution secured through the S106 for improvements to the PROW network.
- A Mobility Hub to be provided at a central location within the site. As a minimum, this should contain: Electric car club vehicle with plug in charge point; electric bike hub with plug in charge point, bike hire, docking station & bicycles, bicycle stands and lockers, bicycle repair stand, bicycle pump, and an information terminal.
- A Site Wide Travel Plan is required to be submitted three months prior to first occupation of the site, based on the FTP. 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 Transport Review Group. 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 Transport Review Group within 3 months. The surveys should also record numbers of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. 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 its targets or there are other issues identified that need to be rectified. Suggested contribution of between £300 and £2000 per unit.
- An annual Thameside bus ticket worth £820 for each resident and staff member who requests one / equivalent cost in KCC's MAAS equivalent scheme credits, if this is available, to be secured through the S106 and delivered upon occupation.
- A minimum of £50 per unit for cycle vouchers for the residential units, to be secured through the S106 and delivered upon occupation.
- A financial contribution will be required for new bus shelters at the Taunton Road bus stops, and Fastrack stops within the site, secured via the S106.
- A car club to be implemented on site with a minimum of three cars, with a minimum of one vehicle on site upon occupation. A number of the vehicles should be electric with associate charging facilities. One year's free membership and £50 driving credit should also be secured for the site users, to encourage take up.
- 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, Disabled, Motorcycle, Cycle and Electric Vehicle parking provision set out in any subsequent RMAs to be based on KCC's parking standards at the time to ensure the most appropriate standards are implemented.
- A Car Park Management Plan to be submitted and implemented prior to first occupation.
- A Delivery and Servicing Plan to be submitted prior to first occupation.
- A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be required for future RMAs, based on the Framework CTMP which has already been submitted.
- An Event Management Plan to be submitted and implemented prior to first occupation of the stadium.