

25905

Louise Herbert

From: Adrian Fox
Sent: 03 December 2010 09:13
To: Louise Herbert
Cc: June House
Subject: FW: Whitfield SPD Consultation Draft.

From: Benge, Sally - EHW KHS
Sent: 16 November 2010 15:37
To: Dipper, Julian - E&R SP
Cc: Chandler, George - CED RE
Subject: Whitfield SPD Consultation Draft.

Hi Julian,

This is my response to the Whitfield SPD.

3.8 Highways - a dedicated bus route through the new development areas (as appropriate) should be provided to accommodate BRT.

5.4 Archers Court Road is alluded to as being of a suitable standard to accommodate additional development traffic. It should be noted that Archers Court Road narrows to the north east to a single track width country lane, unsuitable for large vehicles, to ultimately connect to Walmer. The route is of poor alignment and varying road widths through small villages and the avoidance of rat running should be a consideration as the roads are unsuitable to accommodate any significant increase in through vehicles.

Queuing issues occur at the junction of Archers Court Road and Sandwich Road at peak times with traffic unable to exit from Archers Court Road due to queues formed at the Whitfield roundabout/Sandwich Road junction.

5.8 Cycling - The sentence "This is to be implemented as part of KCC's Local Transport Plan programme" should be removed.

There is no mention of the various definitive footpaths and bridleways in the area, other than the extract from the OS map. I would have expected more detail relating to well used connections together with the status of the paths.

The following references (5.16 to 5.32) made to public rights of ways or paths across the various areas within Whitfield should be referenced, if definitive, by their numbers in accordance with the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way.

6.5 Why does Transport not feature in Table 6.1?

6.11 The provision of the new access on the A256 to the south of the Archers Court Road will be more constrained due to the Highway Design Standards pertaining to junction spacing in relation to the A2 junction to the south.

6.15 I can see no advantage of a signal controlled junction for the BRT onto the A256.

06/12/2010

The BRT should operate on an A to B and B to A linear route and should access WCBP in both directions (Whitfield's major employment area). The use of this junction would involve additional journey lengths for some journeys contrary to the intentions of providing a fast direct service. A signal controlled junction in close proximity to the roundabout is unlikely to meet the appropriate safety standards. The ideal solution would be the bridge connection over the A2 in the vicinity of the superstore. I appreciate that third party land ownership is an ongoing issue in this respect. Otherwise priority provision would need to be made for the BRT to operate via the Whitfield roundabout in both directions.

6.26 Capacity testing and monitoring of the Whitfield roundabout should be continued throughout the plan period and further measures sought if after the implemented scheme the roundabout is again failing in the latter years. New assessments need to be made throughout the delivery period of the transport impact on each phase as assumptions will also change throughout the plan period.

6.27 The promotion of walking and cycling from the new developed areas back to the existing settlement will be somewhat dependent upon the distance across the open space bearing in mind that Whitfield is on high ground and open to high winds. I am also concerned that the provision of bus gates on Archers Court Road and Napchester Road will prevent access to the community hub from the new development areas until such time as the connecting roadways are constructed. A resident of the proposed Light Hill area would have no incentive other than to rely on the private car to access the community hub through the lack of any footway connectivity other than those footways following the existing road layout, which is a long and indirect foot journey. The car journey to community facilities would involve leaving the development on the A256, travelling the Honeywood Parkway or A2 and gaining entry back into Whitfield via the Whitfield roundabout. It would be a quicker journey to access the Superstore for most provisions than to drive as far as the community hub, undermining the necessity of new facilities. It would not promote public transport use by residents of the new development until such a time that the dedicated BRT track has been built and thus allow transport habits to become established from the outset with dependence on private car use. I would like to see the evidence supporting the use of the bus gates and the logic behind their positioning as they are likely to affect integration between the new and proposed settlements.

6.36 One of the most important links would be to provide a bridge over the A2 in the vicinity of the superstore to facilitate walking cycling and BRT to allow for direct interaction between the employment land, the superstore and council offices and the residential settlement. This would be a huge contributor towards modal shift. Negotiations are ongoing between DDC and landowners. The Highways Agency have no objections to the concept of a bridge in this location. 20% modal shift is not likely without the provision of the bridge over the A2.

6.38 Query the half and half between Sandwich Road and the proposed Park & Ride. I would consider the P & R to be a terminus for the route. Please refer to my comments on 6.15 in respect of the BRT access onto the A256.

6.43 If the links for walking and cycling offer no shelter from the elements they are likely to be used seasonally and during daylight hours. Are these links to be lit for school children walking home in winter evenings or would this impact on the open space? Are any of these links overlooked or will users feel vulnerable if walking alone?

The reference to the A2 bridge should incorporate the BRT trackway.

9.7 The community hub cannot be described as accessible to the new development areas until such time as the roads and dedicated BRT trackway connects it. It is not accessible to the new areas via the existing road network due to the bus gates and there are no direct walking/cycling routes being promoted as an interim measure.

9.8 As per 9.7. I see little point of financial contributions towards existing bus services in the interim period if they cannot be accessed from the new development unless the existing route can deviate from the Sandwich Road which is unlikely given that no suitable loop is likely to exist to return them to their normal routing.

9.9 "Off bus ticket machines available at all stops" or alternative payment mechanism that does not delay the stopping time of the bus.

9.46 Parking should be provided on an unallocated basis between the mixed uses to address different parking patterns and behaviours across the day and into the evening.

9.67 Dedicated trackway for BRT within the development but not to access onto A256

9.77 The green area that could provide the BRT link over the A2 should be protected should the bridge become a viable option in the future.

Street Typology (Appendix 4)

4.4 Traffic calming may be achieved via street design by on street parking , direct frontage development and varying road widths. It would be preferable to take this approach as opposed to raised tables and specific traffic calming measures.

Access points should be in accordance with Interim Guidance Note 4 - "Residential Development Junctions"

4.5 The layout should be in accordance with Kent Design and Manual for Streets publications.

4.9 As 4.5

4.20 Garages may be considered additional to the number of spaces allocated to a dwelling in accordance with Interim Guidance Note 3 - Residential Parking.

4.21 Rear parking courts are not favoured by KCC. Evidence base surveys have indicated they are not used and thus promote an unhealthy level of on street parking problems and neighbour conflict. Survey results suggest they attract anti-social behaviour and people do not like to enter their dwelling from the rear garden as well as preferring natural surveillance over their vehicles during the night.

Extra Considerations

All residential parking must be in accordance with KCC's adopted guidance IGN3. incorporating cycle parking, motorcycle parking and parking for mobility impaired. All parking for other land uses must accord to the Dover District Core Strategy Policy DM13 or subsequent revisions.

A Construction Management Plan will need to be submitted for approval in advance of any commencement of works on site.

Kind regards

Sally Benge

Partnership Officer
Kent Highway Services
08458 247 800

06/12/2010