

488347

**Louise Herbert**

**From:** Adrian Fox  
**Sent:** 30 November 2010 08:44  
**To:** Louise Herbert  
**Subject:** FW: Whitfield Urban Extension - Transport Strategy

**From:** George.Chandler@kent.gov.uk [mailto:George.Chandler@kent.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 29 November 2010 17:51  
**To:** Adrian Fox; sally.benge@kent.gov.uk  
**Cc:** Julian.Dipper@kent.gov.uk; howard.moore@highways.gsi.gov.uk  
**Subject:** RE: Whitfield Urban Extension - Transport Strategy

Adrian,

As discussed I can give you an initial response to the WUE Transport Strategy produced by PBA to sit alongside the SPD that Sally has commented on for you. I apologise for the delay in replying.

Firstly, can I note that I fully endorse all of Sally's views on the SPD and would note that many of the issues she mentions cross-refer to the TS where PBA have effectively repeated the same information in the document and therefore our response to that issue is the same. I would note that there is little difference between the earlier draft version and the current version which is disappointing to see. There is little in the document to support the phasing or basic geographical proposition and there seems to be very little by way of transport modelling detail underpinning any of the proposals. The document reads uncannily like a partial TA to support a first phase of development with only a basic appreciation of the broader development of the WUE. I was expecting much more detail and specific additional information in the TS compared to the contents of the SPD.

To give you a little more help in terms of the areas I am concerned about, the following comments may be useful.

- The approach to BRT and P&R is badly developed and poorly articulated. It should be the main structure for transport for WUE whereas it seems to be very much an afterthought to a highways led development.
- The highways options from the WSP study have just been repeated and no analysis or additional information from the SPD planning discussion has been used to either amplify or develop the arguments.
- The Dover trip rates are simply extracted and applied to Whitfield and no explanation of why these are appropriate are given. This must be justified. The trip generation of various uses misses the fundamental aspect of workers on site and dismisses external trips which will exist and should be taken into account.
- The basic approach of accessing WUE from the corners of the triangle is stated without any justification. Spatially a triangle is best accessed from the sides not the tips. This is typical of the commentary in the document which just throws discussion in without any logic underpinning it.
- The optioneering is artificial and is heavily biased towards the "preferred" approach - it is still obvious that no real optioneering has taken place and the

30/11/2010

whole argument is built around justifying the solution that was desired before the problem was defined.

- The reasoning behind developing WUE from the southeast corner is loose to say the least. To continually assert that this corner means the development is Dover facing is fatuous to say the least.
- Access onto the A256 does not need to be grade separated from a capacity point of view (p71). this is the only argument that is necessary to articulate - the remaining arguments are spurious and capable of challenge. The access needs to be led by the masterplanning layout for the whole WUE not just the first phase planning application.
- Putting a signal controlled access onto the A256 to provide dedicated BRT track is not acceptable. The BRT system requires a proper assessment of its routing strategy before this can be determined and an access across the A2 into WCBP is essential. It has been completely missed in the TS and this must be included.
- The document mentions towards the latter stages the Transport Review Group and this issue of status and future management / governance is not well articulated. If it is a major plank of the SPD strategy it should be central to the argument throughout the document, not just mentioned towards the end when the phasing is thought about.

I hope these comments do help. I apologise for not being able to give you a complete "blow by blow" commentary on the document. Unfortunately the document will take me some more time to go through and provide a full commentary. The most serious problem I can see is that the whole tenor of the document is biased towards supporting a phase 1 planning application in the south-east sector rather than supporting the whole WUE. I want to see some output from the VISSIM model that studied the detail of the issues (such as the capacity triggers at Whitfield and Guston Roundabouts) with some supporting analysis and commentary on the problems leading to some recommendations for action.

Please take this email as a formal objection to the Transport Strategy from the County Council. I am happy to discuss this further with you and suggest we have quite a lot of liaison to undertake before we can satisfy all parties.

Regards,

**George Chandler**

Regeneration and Projects Manager

**Regeneration and Economy Division**

Chief Executive's Department, KCC

Second Floor, Invicta House, Maidstone, Kent ME14 1XX

Tel: 01622 221946

Int: (7000) 1946

Fax: 01622 691418

Blackberry: 07841 315582

30/11/2010