

Local Transport Plan 5 - Consultation 2024

**You Said, We Did – How your
views have shaped our Local
Transport Plan 5**

December 2024

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation



Please note:

If you require this document in an alternative format or language, please email alternativeformats@kent.gov.uk ([External link](#)) or call 03000 42 15 53 (text relay service number: 18001 03000 42 15 53). This number goes to an answering machine, which is monitored during office hours.

1 Why do we need a Local Transport Plan?

- 1.1. Our responsibilities as Kent County Council (KCC) (also known as an upper tier Local Authority) include a role as the Local Transport Authority. National legislation requires us to develop policies to promote and encourage safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport. We also have responsibilities to align with government policies and guidance on climate change.
- 1.2. The Local Transport Plan (LYP) fulfils these responsibilities and develops and longer-term investment strategy for getting the funding we need to improve and expand our transport networks, improving journeys for residents, businesses, and visitors in Kent.

2 The 2024 consultation on our draft Local Transport Plan

- 1.3. Between July and October 2024, we undertook a public consultation on our draft LTP. This was further to an initial consultation undertaken in summer 2023 on our Emerging LTP (primarily the ambition, objectives, and outcomes).
- 1.4. We started recording and analysing the responses to our consultation as soon as we began to receive them into the project email inbox, via the online Let's Talk Kent website, or as we heard the public's views during drop-in sessions that were held across the county. All responses to our consultation have been considered in developing the final LTP.

3 You Said, We Did

- 1.5. We appreciate the time respondents took to reply to the consultation. We have read every response and considered every comment made, but we cannot respond to each individually and so we have addressed the key themes that emerged across consultation responses. This section sets out what those main themes were and explains what we have done to the LTP to take account of those comments.
- 1.6. We have split these out across the overarching issues raised on the plan and the proposals we set out in the plan.

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

Main overarching issues raised

You said	We did
<p>The plan is not ambitious enough or needs to be delivered quicker.</p> <p>The plan is too ambitious and won't be achieved.</p>	<p>Our plan is designed to be ambitious in what we want to achieve, whilst also striking a balance across all the modes of transport, including emerging parts of the transport sector. But we have been very clear that its delivery is contingent on a number of factors, most importantly funding.</p> <p>For every county-wide proposal, we have set out a statement of “what needs to happen next” to set expectations about how much we can deliver and by when. For example, many of our proposals need to be developed, with all the options looked at to determine the right scheme to deliver.</p> <p>In covering all modes, we have ensured the plan is adaptable to the changing priorities of government funding streams. To address these comments, we have described how government funding will affect the delivery of our plan more clearly.</p>
<p>Prioritise public transport and especially local bus services (both urban and rural) due to the improvement they need.</p>	<p>Our Local Transport Plan considers how all parts of the transport system can be improved. Every comment on bus services we received on our plan has provided further evidence to us about the extent to which bus services in general are a concern, which helps to inform our future work. Our plan already made clear that we have a comprehensive and ambitious Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) to deliver the government's National Bus Strategy. Our BSIP contains much greater detail than can be replicated in our Local Transport Plan. We have therefore more clearly described the remit of our BSIP in our final plan.</p>
<p>Concern about traffic congestion in Kent and the need to fix it.</p>	<p>This has been identified as a challenge and our plan already sets out a series of proposals across the transport mix to increase choice and provide alternatives to road-based travel for both the movement of people and goods. We have also set out a range of proposals to help address significant congestion pinch-points or where there is a need to develop options for how to reduce congestion in specific areas, such as town centres. We have considered feedback about congestion on the network and made additions to the plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>Prioritise walking and cycling and make these forms of transport safer.</p> <p>Too much focus on cycling or too much money spent on it.</p>	<p>Our plan already includes a number of proposals that will benefit cycling and walking, including the Kent Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (KCWIP), our Road Safety Strategy (called Vision Zero), as well as highways maintenance (which will benefit all highway users). Our KCWIP has been prepared using government guidance on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP) and consideration given to connectivity with District LCWIPs as well as key centres of activity for education, retail, leisure, etc.</p> <p>We also undertake a range of activities as part of our day-to-day work, such as providing school crossing patrols, cycle training, and working with Parish and Town Councils through the Highways Improvement Plan process, amongst others.</p> <p>As a proportion of the funding we received across modes of transport, walking and cycling schemes have generally received less. However, if the government make active travel more of a priority and provide funding for that then we will be able to focus more resources on it.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have provided more information on the KCWIP.</p>
<p>Not everyone can cycle or walk.</p> <p>The plan is too pro-car and building new roads / new roads proposals will only cause more car use and dependency.</p> <p>The plan does not do enough to encourage journeys to shift away from car use.</p>	<p>Our Local Transport Plan has been designed to strike a balance by considering how all parts of the transport system can be improved. The plan inevitably has a focus on the highway network because we are responsible for the Local Road Network (all roads aside from the motorway and trunk roads), and because private vehicles and goods vehicles make up the majority of journeys in Kent.</p> <p>The highways proposals we have set out in our plan can help make journeys better for all highways users and should be considered alongside the comprehensive and substantial proposals we have set out for improving public transport services. The scope for achieving a significant shift in journeys also varies place-by-place but we are confident that if our proposals for the public transport network were delivered, this would help to increase their use and encourage some journeys to shift away from the private car.</p> <p>Whatever funding becomes available, we are confident our plan contains proposals that will enable us to take opportunities to make journeys in Kent better, with a positive impact for the economy.</p> <p>Based on our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>The plan needs more detail, or the plan has too much detail / is too long.</p>	<p>We were asked to develop a new plan by the government and received funding from them to do that, on a similar basis to all other local transport authorities. The funding we received is insufficient to enable us to develop detailed proposals, such as designing specific options or undertaking traffic modelling. To do this would have required many millions of pounds. However, some of the proposals in our plan have already been funded to develop their detail, such as the North Thanet Link road scheme. Where a scheme has been developed like this, you will find more information about it on our website at www.kent.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/road-projects/planned-road-projects.</p> <p>As we work on the individual proposals, we will undertake engagement with the local communities affected. More detail will become available in due course on specific schemes, but we have added clearer descriptions to the schemes listed on the district pages.</p> <p>After benchmarking against other Local Transport Plans, we consider that for a strategic, county-wide plan, LTP5 contains sufficient detail for its purpose.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>Concern about the funding needed for the plan.</p> <p>The plan is overly reliant on government for funding the plan.</p> <p>Do not charge motorists more.</p> <p>Public transport is too expensive.</p>	<p>The Local Transport Plan is a costed but not funded plan. Its purpose is to set the ambition for what we want transport in the county to be like and set out proposals to achieve it. We do not have sufficient funding to deliver the whole plan, but it puts us in a strong position to lobby for increased funding and bid for external funding for schemes when it becomes available.</p> <p>Our situation is not unique amongst local authorities. We are also experiencing the impact of inflation in recent years, meaning that our finite funds buy less than they used to. Without exploring options such as road user charging / congestion charging, we rely on government for the money to deliver improvements to transport. We have described this more in our plan as a result of your comments.</p> <p>Public transport is largely operated by private companies who set their own fares (although some are regulated or subsidised by government, such as the bus fare caps or are supported by local transport authorities such as where they are deemed socially necessary). We have included proposals that would increase demand for public transport, and this should make them more viable and so reduce fares. However, we have no direct control over public transport fares and have therefore not made any changes to the plan on this aspect.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>There is poor transport and land use planning.</p> <p>There is too much housing which creates road congestion.</p> <p>There has not been consideration of housing growth.</p> <p>New development should have better public transport and walking and cycling links.</p>	<p>We are not the local planning authority for most development in Kent (we have responsibility for a relatively small number of developments associated with minerals and waste, schools, and transport, for example). The 12 district and borough authorities write Local Plans for where new development should be situated (although the government sets housing targets), as well as determining planning applications that are made in their areas. KCC is a statutory consultee to these processes and so we make representations on the impacts of development on transport and seek mitigations.</p> <p>We do have established policies for what we would require, such as walking and cycling links. However, sometimes what we ask for might not be delivered. This could be because the local planning authority must balance the requirements for transport with other factors, such as school and healthcare provision, or because planning decisions can be appealed to the Planning Inspectorate, and they may take a different view. Some applications can also be determined by the government if they are called-in.</p> <p>We have considered a growing population arising from housing growth in developing our plan, and you can read more about that in the Supporting Evidence Base. However, this increasing demand can also come from increased usage of existing housing stock (such as conversions to flats or house of multiple occupation, or multi-generational living). In these instances, there is not usually any financial contribution to manage the increased demand for transport.</p> <p>After consideration, we have made some changes to the plan to better explain the planning process regarding new developments and our role in that concerning transport.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>Electric vehicles are bad for the environment.</p> <p>Electric vehicles still create road congestion.</p> <p>The public sector should not be in the business of providing charging sockets – let the market do that.</p>	<p>Successive governments have placed electric vehicles at the heart of the national transport decarbonisation plan and have correspondingly asked local transport authorities to support the delivery of new charging sockets. We have been awarded funding for this purpose.</p> <p>Electric vehicles are positive for air quality and noise impacts, and Kent is seeing a reduction in the need for Air Quality Management Areas associated with roadside air quality.</p> <p>We recognise that electric vehicles will not address congestion or journey time reliability. This is why we have developed a balanced Local Transport Plan that sets out proposals across the transport mix, to support modal shift and options for making journeys.</p> <p>Based on our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>
<p>Concern about carbon emissions and climate change, and the role of vehicles in contributing to climate change.</p>	<p>Our plan considers climate change and the challenge it presents. We have aligned our approach to the government’s Decarbonising Transport Strategy, which is why we have set out a plan that is balanced across the transport mix and aims to make significant improvements to buses, railways, walking and cycling networks, and to support the shift to electric vehicles. All these aspects can make a positive contribution towards lowering carbon emissions from transport.</p> <p>Our work indicates that there may still be a shortfall in the rate and amount of carbon reduced from the transport system, and we know that this is a finding consistent across local transport authorities. The evidence set out in our Local Transport Plan (and others) will help to inform the government about the likely contribution we can make at a local level, and then they will be able to determine if more needs to be done.</p> <p>As required, proposals will be subject to the necessary carbon assessments as part of their development. We therefore have not considered it necessary to make changes to the plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
Concern about air quality and lack of any specific proposals or actions by the plan in that regard.	<p>We have considered air quality as part of the development of our plan. We understand why air quality is a concern given there are designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) associated with roadside pollution levels in parts of Kent. Kent also borders the London area where there have been high profile measures (such as the Ultra Low Emission Zone) used to charge more polluting vehicles.</p> <p>There has been a gradual improvement in air quality since we published our last Local Transport Plan 4, and the result has been a reduction in the number and/or extent of AQMAs across the county. The government has also not required the establishment of any Clean Air Zones in Kent given the levels of recorded pollution. Pollution from traffic has fallen likely due to an increase in cleaner vehicles on the roads (more hybrid and fully electric cars and vans), coupled with the volume of traffic using the network. As the vehicle fleet becomes increasingly low or zero emission in terms of the emissions generated directly from a vehicle (rather than how the energy the vehicle uses was generated i.e. renewables or non-renewable energy, in the first place), air quality as a result of transport will likely become less of a concern. Nevertheless, a range of our proposals have the potential to help improve air quality.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>
Support for return of international rail services to Kent.	<p>We understand the concern about the loss of Eurostar services from Kent's international stations and the support expressed for their return through the consultation. We will continue to call for a return of services to Kent alongside partner organisations and have set out our concerns to the government. We have done this because Eurostar's decision to stop serving Kent has had a negative effect on the county's economy, causing much uncertainty to residents, businesses, and potential investors along with the loss of international passengers at Ashford and Ebbsfleet International stations.</p> <p>We are concerned that the taxpayer is not getting the full benefit that the billions of pounds invested in the High Speed 1 rail link and the Kent international stations were meant to achieve. We believe we are doing all we can and will keep engaging with the government and the rail industry to find a way to get international services back to stopping in Kent. Based on the consideration of this issue we have not made changes to the plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>Concern about Heavy Good Vehicles using roads through villages and towns.</p> <p>Ban Heavy Goods Vehicles from using particular roads through villages.</p>	<p>We understand the concerns that people have about Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), and our plan sets out proposals aimed to help ensure that those associated with international traffic to and from Europe are better managed and use the motorway and trunk road network as far as possible.</p> <p>HGVs are used by a wide range of industries and these form an important part of the county's economy. We have an obligation to consider their needs from the transport network as well. Many rural communities have developed around main roads and crossroads, meaning traffic routes through these places. Some responses have suggested building new roads to bypass villages, but often they are located in protected landscape areas (such as the High Weald National Landscape) and therefore new roads are unlikely to be permitted without strong justification. The viability of other measures will also vary from place-to-place. For example, a weight limit would not be appropriate on a cross-county A road where there are no suitable alternative routes. In any event, where these are put in for environmental reasons then HGVs can still access the restricted areas where they have a legitimate need, such as serving rural businesses.</p> <p>Day-to-day, we work with Parish and Town Councils through the Highways Improvement Plan process to determine suitable changes to the road network that could be funded to improve journeys and their safety. Our Traffic Management Team are also continually investigating methods of managing larger vehicle movements and are working with various freight organisations to find suitable solutions to Kent's concerns.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have added a proposal to the Local Road Network section of our plan on the management of local road freight.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

Main issues raised concerning strategic and local proposals across the districts

You said	We did
<p>Support for the Lower Thames Crossing.</p> <p>Opposition to the Lower Thames Crossing.</p>	<p>This proposal received both the highest number of statements of support and the highest number of statements of opposition, showing it divides opinion. We have considered all of the issues raised by respondents. In terms of support, these were broadly that the lack of capacity and resultant congestion at Dartford warrants a new crossing. In opposition, broadly that the new crossing is too expensive, will have an adverse impact on the local area, and building new roads leads to more traffic rather than less. The concerns on both sides are not new and were covered in the Development Consent Order Examination, which was held by the Planning Inspectorate in 2023. Our position remains unchanged for the reasons set out in the Local Transport Plan and therefore given our consideration of this issue; we have not made changes to the plan.</p>
<p>Concern about congestion at M25 Junction 3 and its exclusion from the plan.</p>	<p>Following the consultation, we have further considered the junction and the challenges it faces. We have also considered the potential new development around the junction, which has been identified by the district planning authority, and the experience of the challenges the Junction 1A location now has and their relevance to this site. We have concluded that there may be some short-term improvements that National Highways could undertake to improve the junction, aside from any long-term, more significant works that may be justified.</p> <p>Following our consideration of this issue, we have added a proposal to the Strategic Road Network section of the plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>There is a need to shift freight from the Strategic Road Network to rail.</p> <p>Shift freight to rail from road to and from Sheerness and Ridham Docks.</p>	<p>We agree that there is a need to shift freight from road to rail. In our Local Transport Plan, we have proposed improvements to the national rail network that would unlock significant capacity for goods to be carried to and from Europe via the rail network through the Channel Tunnel. This proposal is supported by the owners of the Channel Tunnel and the rail freight industry. It would have the added benefit of helping to address the significant challenges associated with international traffic management, which impacts a large number of communities along the M20-A20 corridor.</p> <p>Sheerness and Ridham Docks formerly had rail freight services; however, their use waned, and some infrastructure was removed by Network Rail in 2022 following consultation with the rail freight industry and service users. The mainline connections at Ridham Junction, Queenborough Down Yard, and Sheerness Dockyard remain operational. In 2023, Network Rail determined that it would work with the rail freight industry should it wish to reinstate freight services. This was set out in the Swale section of the draft Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>The rail freight industry and its service users (the owners of the London Medway Port whose land would be required for the hosting of rail sidings) would need to work together and liaise with Network Rail to achieve operations. There is no clear role for our Council within that process, but we would be supportive of opportunities for increased rail freight, assuming that can be achieved alongside satisfactory passenger rail services.</p> <p>Having considered this issue, we have made it clearer we support shifting of freight to rail and river transport such as through the use of existing wharves and Ports.</p>
<p>Concern about the condition of local roads and the lack of maintenance undertaken.</p>	<p>Respondents to the consultation had concerns about road maintenance. The Local Transport Plan has its first priority for the Local Road Network as ‘Maintaining the Road Network.’ We have described in our funding section what is needed above our baseline budgets to further deliver on this proposal.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>A226 Galley Hill Road closure in Northfleet.</p>	<p>The A226 Galley Hill Road in Northfleet closed in 2023 due to a landslip. We agree that it is an important local road, and a solution is needed owing to its being an important link between the towns of Dartford and Gravesend, as well as Ebbsfleet, Northfleet, Stone and Swanscombe. Issues have been raised about how the road closure is lengthening the time it takes to do journeys and making it harder to reach local services for residents.</p> <p>We are already working to find a new solution to the road closure and welcomed the Future Roads Minister to view the close road and the issue affecting it on 13 September 2024.</p> <p>Following our consideration of this issue, we have added a new local road proposal in the plan.</p>
<p>Suggestions for 20 mph zones for a number of roads or areas across named locations in the county.</p> <p>Suggestions for 20 mph zones as a principle or in general.</p>	<p>We work with local communities to consider proposals for 20 mph zones and have established locations across Kent. Our plan has a proposal for the delivery of our Vision Zero Road Safety Strategy which already details our consideration of 20 mph zones as part of achieving better road safety outcomes (see section 4.3 of Vision Zero). We have also published a 20 mph toolkit through our Kent Road Safety campaign at https://kentroadsafety.info, and we have guidance for local communities on how to evidence the need for 20 mph zones on our website in the Changing Roads in Your Area section at www.kent.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/what-we-look-after/roads/changing-roads-in-your-area .</p> <p>Changes to speed limits may also be considered as part of the walking and cycling proposals that would take place from the Kent Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>Suggestions of road corridors / new road proposals to be added to the plan.</p> <p>Statements that areas have been overlooked by the proposals.</p>	<p>The proposals we have selected deal with areas of congestion, journey time unreliability or delay, or are associated with future changes in traffic owing to major changes to the network planned by other organisations (such as National Highways). If a location does not feature in the Local Transport Plan it does not mean the prospect of improvements is ruled out. We will continue to monitor circumstances and consider factors that could change the need for improvements on roads across Kent. Such future proposals would still need to align with the ambition, objectives, and outcomes of our plan.</p> <p>Having considered this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>
<p>Support for Gatwick Airport expansion.</p>	<p>Some respondents felt that a larger Gatwick Airport would provide more travel options, although others did express concern about the impact of additional flights / flight paths on communities on the approach to the airport. Our position remains per our published statement available at www.kent.gov.uk/about-the-council/strategies-and-policies/service-specific-policies/roads-paths-and-transport-policies/aviation/gatwick-airport-position-statement. We keep our position under review and if it changes, we will publish a new position statement.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>
<p>Suggestions of a tram between Kent and Thurrock / Essex.</p> <p>Suggestions of a tram as an alternative to a new road crossing.</p>	<p>We are focused on the prospect of a new road crossing of the Thames as this is the best option for meeting the needs of local and national traffic volumes, and for relieving the Dartford Crossing. A local tram network would not be capable of providing the same impact to both local and national traffic flows.</p> <p>Nevertheless, whilst we will consider proposals that are forthcoming from any organisations or companies that choose to develop them, concerning this matter we have not made changes to the plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
Specific bus service proposals including Demand Responsive Transport services.	<p>Our Local Transport Plan has been designed to strike a balance by considering how all parts of the transport system can be improved. Our plan already made clear that we have a comprehensive and ambitious Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) to deliver the government’s National Bus Strategy. Our BSIP is not fully replicated in our Local Transport Plan, but it details each specific measure we would aim to undertake if we received the necessary funding from government.</p> <p>We can only deliver as much as government is prepared to fund and not all funding the government has provided in the past has been for the purpose of improving bus services. Those measures range from street signage and wayfinding to help people with bus journeys and changing to other forms such as rail, through to the cost of supporting electrification of commercially operated bus services across the county. Every bus route proposal we received in our plan has provided further evidence to us about the extent to which bus services in general are a concern, which helps to inform our future work as a Council.</p> <p>Following our consideration of this issue, we have described our existing Bus Service Improvement Plan more clearly in our final plan.</p>
Specific rail service proposals.	<p>Our Local Transport Plan has set out a series of proposals for how rail services should be improved in Kent, for a range of reasons. Our principles-based approach concerning weekday and weekend services becoming more frequent and more direct between major towns in Kent, sets out our clear expectations to the rail industry. We also take opportunities to provide feedback to the operator, such as through the annual Kent Rail Summit or other stakeholder engagement events. The decisions over detailed timetables and scheduling of services are a decision for the rail operator, funded by government.</p> <p>We would encourage detailed issues about rail services to be sent directly to the train operator (currently Southeastern) in the first instance.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
Reintroduce the Gravesend to Tilbury Ferry link.	<p>We have existing ambitions to reinstate the link and its omission from the Local Transport Plan was not intended to give a different impression.</p> <p>We have therefore included reference to the ferry in the Gravesham section of the plan.</p>
Suggestions of specific cycle routes that should be improved or provided.	<p>The feedback we have received both through our Local Transport Plan and Kent Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (KCWIP) consultations is very helpful as we consider how the corridors and zones we have identified could be further designed in detailed. We will also consider the proposals within district Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans. How many locations we are able to make improvements to will be dependent on the amount of funding we receive.</p> <p>Based on our consideration of this issue, we have made the text clearer about the KCWIP in the Local Transport Plan and made the map of the corridors more reflective of the stage of their development (i.e. no final route has been determined).</p>
The Sheppey Sheerness to Leysdown cycling proposal should consider the Sheppey Light Rail Greenway route and serve Queenborough.	<p>The proposals we presented in the draft Local Transport Plan were further to those set out and in the draft Kent Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. At this stage, the corridors are indicative and subject to change – no final decisions have been made. As our draft Local Transport Plan stated, the next thing we need to do is progress the planning and detailed design of these corridors. Doing this next step will mean considering all the options, including the specific location of the route and where it serves.</p> <p>However, we also understand the need to provide reassurance that the Sheppey Light Rail Greenway option has not been ruled out. All of the corridors we have identified have the potential to be formed of both core routes and branches to help enable improvements to be used.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have clarified the text in the Local Transport Plan and made the map of the corridors reflective of the stage of their development.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>Concern that the walking proposals do not make improvements to travel for disabled / wheelchair users.</p>	<p>All our work to improve the transport network, including changes to the highway to facilitate easier and safer pedestrian journeys, also includes consideration of improvements that can be made for persons with reduced mobility. This approach is embedded into the design guidance we aim to follow. Our plan is also accompanied by an Equalities Impact Assessment and as future proposals are developed; they will continue to be assessed.</p> <p>Following our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>
<p>Concern that the walking and cycling proposals will not benefit short trips in towns to and from services (e.g. supermarkets, schools etc).</p>	<p>The walking and cycling proposals we have set out all entail a start or end point in towns in Kent and this reflects that these are the most popular destinations, surrounded by suburbs that generate short distance trips that could be walked or cycled. The proposals we would aim to develop from our KCWIP would include considering how improvements can be made in these urban and suburban areas as well as considering their connectivity towards neighbouring towns and villages or attractions on their route. The opportunities for improvements identified in LCWIPs, where they exist, will also be considered as part of that process.</p> <p>We are pragmatic and flexible in our approach to improving the transport network. We cannot foresee all circumstances, including any new challenges and opportunities, that could arise. If circumstances change such that a new corridor or zone in a part of Kent not currently on our initial priority list becomes more important, then we will act accordingly to give it the consideration it may merit.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>Suggestion of a Swale Station parkway.</p>	<p>This suggestion has been made owing to both a lack of station car parking at the existing Isle of Sheppey rail stations and because the station receives one of the lowest levels of use in the country (ranked 2,311th out of 2,575 stations according to latest Office of Rail and Road Station Usage statistics for 2022/23). We have considered the station's situation, including environmental designations concerning the area. The station is surrounded by land within a Ramsar and Special Protection Area, and these are likely to make delivery of the infrastructure for a parkway challenging.</p> <p>However, our plan has set out proposals to see local rail services improved and these would provide benefits to passengers at Swale, Queenborough and Sheerness. Swale Borough Council, which controls parking, could also explore the option of supporting parking for the stations through public car parking, if the train operator is not prepared to deliver further parking at stations.</p> <p>Based on our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>
<p>Suggestions for Park and Ride schemes in some Districts e.g. Canterbury, Maidstone.</p>	<p>Park and Ride schemes have previously existed in Kent towns, but some sites have closed due a lack of passenger demand. Our Bus Service Improvement Plan sets out how we plan to improve the bus network across Kent to improve journeys. Improving the network so buses can run more reliably and have shorter journeys will have positive benefits for routes serving existing or future Park and Ride sites.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

Main issues raised concerning the Supporting documentation (e.g. Evidence Base, EqIA, HIA, SEA, HRA)

You said	We did
Regarding the Supporting Evidence Base: There is evidence missing or further evidence that needs to be considered.	<p>Although this comment was the most frequent, the specific issues cited by responses varied greatly. Some of the comments concerned omission of details about proposals within the plan itself. Some of the comments concerned aspects which we are aware of but for which we do not have detailed information, such as the volume of traffic on the roads in the morning that is associated with school travel. Obtaining more detailed information would require funding for investment in surveys and traffic counts to collect data and would require consistent collection over a suitable period of time to ensure it was reliable and a good reflection of circumstances on our transport network. Doing this is beyond the funding and time available we have for completion of the plan, and we do not consider the additional evidence as essential to our ability to complete our plan.</p> <p>Having considered this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>
Regarding the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA): Disabled people need more consideration in transport.	<p>The proposals set out in our plan would make a positive contribution to the lives and journeys of disabled people. For example, our proposals for further implementation of the Bus Service Improvement Plan would help improve the accessibility of the bus system. Our proposals include step free access rail stations, which would remove barriers for disabled people. Development of our proposals for walking and cycling would include considering how wheeling can be supported. We also recognise that many people with reduced mobility will be users of, or rely on, vehicles to make journeys. Our proposals include ways to help enable the highway network to meet all journey needs.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have made an amendment to the walking and cycling section to make clear this includes wheeled journeys.</p>
Regarding the Health Impact Assessment (HIA): Concern about the impact of traffic on air pollution and health.	<p>Please see our response to the main issue raised ‘Concern about air quality and lack of any specific proposals or actions by the plan in that regard.’</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

You said	We did
<p>Regarding the Health Impact Assessment: Concern about the impact of road safety on health.</p>	<p>We recognise and understand the impact on health caused when journeys on the highway network lead to injury or death. The detailed considerations are set out in our existing Vision Zero Road Safety Strategy, available here www.kmscp.co.uk/vision-zero-kent/ along with the progress we are making towards achieving our vision. Working towards our ambition of Vision Zero is included in our LTP proposals.</p> <p>Following our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>
<p>Regarding the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA): Concern about the environmental impacts of new roads.</p>	<p>We follow national guidance and legislation in the development of proposals. The inclusion of proposals in the Local Transport Plan does not constitute planning permission for a proposal. Where new roads are proposed and will require planning permission, we will be required to follow Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework so that environmental impacts can be considered by the relevant planning authorities before determining whether to grant planning permission. Our Strategic Environmental Assessment has indicated where impacts may arise and hence may warrant mitigation. Our Habitats Regulation Assessment has indicated where proposals may pose risks to either Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas, or Ramsar sites. Where we obtain funding to develop proposals, we will take the findings of our Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment into consideration as we develop more detailed Environmental Impact Assessments.</p> <p>Given our consideration of this issue, we have not made changes to the plan.</p>
<p>Regarding the Habitats Regulation Assessment:</p> <p>Concern about whether there has been consideration in the assessment of public access / disturbance and recreational pressure on protected sites.</p>	<p>In response to this issue we have updated our Habitats Regulation Assessment by including consideration of these issues and how they relate in general to transport and the proposed outcomes and proposals of the Plan.</p>

Local Transport Plan 5

You Said, We Did – 2024 consultation

To see the full consultation report please visit:

<https://letstalk.kent.gov.uk/local-transport-plan-5-2024>