

KIG Public Inquiry
Stopkig questions for Peter Rosevear of KCC
KCC Response 17/11

Several questions which were put to the Highways Agency were answered in their document HA/1/5 by “This is a local transport matter for the Kent County Council”.

These are now formally re-directed to KCC and are as follows and the question numbers quoted are those from HA/1/5:-

Qu 9 Do you think cycling will play much of a role in serving KIG?

Qu 10 Ditto walking

KCC Response

Walking and cycling are likely to remain very much minority modes of transport to the KIG site. The best opportunities for sustainable transport will lie with the promotion of car sharing, and the implementation of the bespoke bus services promised in the Travel Plan. These services would have to evolve to meet the reducing mode share target for single occupancy vehicles (from 79% down to 70% or below)

Qu 11 Ditto bus services

KCC Response

Conventional bus services are limited, particularly at times that would be of any use to the shift workers. The bespoke services run by KIG would be the main useful bus services

Qu 13 In considering site workers, can you identify any means of transport other than the private car which could be used by people from say Medway, Swale, Tun Wells, Gravesham etc?

KCC Response

It would be inconvenient to reach the site by sustainable means from outside Maidstone, even for conventional “office hours” staff, as it would involve interchanges between bus services (or bus and train). These would take much longer than travelling by car.

Qu 14 This raises the issue of the likely difficulty of achieving the targeted modal split and seeks any known examples where very high non-car usage happens.

KCC Response

If KIG is granted permission, the Travel Plan would be implemented. It would be a very individual Travel Plan, using mode share targets and vehicle caps to try to reduce the car dependence.

This is a particularly difficult site to serve by sustainable transport, as would any out of town site dominated by shift work patterns. I could not quote a comparable recent application of this nature, with which to compare the mode share characteristics

Qu 16 This deals with the constraint imposed by the Willington Street junction and is covered by the additional question A below.

There are three additional questions which now arise from the Supplementary Proof **KCC 4.7**:-

A Paragraph 4.2 is in the section dealing with A20/Willington Street junction. The fifth line states “The junction therefore operates as efficiently as is possible”.

Do KCC have any plans to improve this junction? If not, and no further capacity enhancement is possible, do the County Council consider that it can safely accommodate the extra traffic from KIG or is there a probability that some of the traffic assumed to use this junction will instead use J8 of M20 thus exacerbating the fragile capacity situation there?

KCC Response

The long term strategy includes the construction of the SEMSL, as indicated in the South East Plan. The overall Hub Transport package must create sufficient capacity in the network to support the development targets in the South East Plan. The intention is that the SEMSL will serve longer distance trips from the urban extension, and relieve Leeds/Langley, Willington Street, and the network of rural lanes and residential roads. This would avoid the need for consideration of improvements to the A20/Willington Street junction. Willington Street is not suited to take large amounts of additional traffic. The southern end in particular is densely residential, with local shops alongside it. A capacity improvement to the A20 junction at the northern end would both draw more traffic onto this route, but also result in additional capacity problems at the A20/New Cut Road junction, and at the New Cut Road/Bearsted Road junction.

B Paragraph 6.1 refers to “... the M20 and A20 link Road junctions reaching, but not exceeding, their theoretical capacity”.

If capacity is reached as early as 2017, what will be the physical effects of the normal annual increase in traffic on conditions at these junctions? The answer given by HA to question 4 in HA/1/5 gives an indication but no substance.

KCC Response

The capacity of the whole network will be under severe pressure from growth required to fulfil the South East Plan. This will be the situation at all the M20 junctions serving Maidstone. Junction 8 holds the key to supporting the proposed urban extension, as it is the least congested at the current time. The physical effect of increased congestion, exacerbated by KIG, would be the likely diversion of increasing numbers of vehicles onto less suitable routes.

- C Paragraph 8.14 deals with the use of minor roads and states “The use of minor roads by large volumes of diverting traffic would raise safety concerns”.

What courses of action might KCC, as local highway authority consider, to keep such roads safe and what would the effects of such measures be of any re-directed traffic and on local residents?

KCC Response

The Hub package that is being developed to support the LDF will try to accommodate the required growth using positive measures. The implementation of traffic calming/management measures on the minor road network to prevent diverting traffic would be a last resort. It would be difficult to create sufficient delay by using traffic calming to deter the diversions. The most effective means to protect some of the routes would be the closure of the most unsuitable ones. This would have the impact of putting greater pressure on other routes, and could be very inconvenient for local residents and businesses.

Stopkig 14 Nov 2009