

**CABINET  
25 SEPTEMBER 2008**

**APPENDIX A : Summary of Core Strategy Consultation Responses**

<b>PREFERRED APPROACH 15: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INVESTMENT</b>			
Rochester Bridge Trust c/o Cluttons 785	Para 3.33	Agree that there is a need for a strategic transport tariff.	Noted
Highways Agency 46	Para 3.31	Not been able to locate within the background technical documents referred to in the CSPO, evidence to confirm or refute this statement in the paragraphs last two sentences. Evidence is needed.	The sentences reflect a judgement drawn from the evidence. Further evidence will be submitted as background documents to the Core Strategy
GOSE 398	Para 3.30	Is the programme of transport schemes of a scale and nature that would be appropriate for inclusion in the Core strategy? Should they be shown on the key diagram?	The schemes will be shown on the Core Strategy Proposals map.
Bean Residents Association 4	Para 3.30	List the Dartford Borough Schemes	The schemes will be shown on the Core Strategy Proposals map
GOSE 398	Para 3.31	Encourage the completion of the transport assessments/modelling is as soon as possible to avoid any 'show stopper'. Is it your intention to show the Park and Ride site on the key diagram?	Evidence will be submitted as background documents to the Core Strategy.  Reference to this will be deleted. The site proposed is in Gravesham.
Bean Residents Association 4	Para 3.32	Identify the location of the "park and ride facility on the A2".	Reference to this will be deleted. The site proposed is in Gravesham.

**CABINET  
25 SEPTEMBER 2008**

Highways Agency 46	Para 3.32	Support in principle schemes which have the potential to reduce congestion on the strategic road network, such as Park and Ride. However, a Park and Ride facility at the A2 Tollgate interchange could result in a significant redistribution of traffic. Are in discussion with KCC regarding appropriate improvement works that would be required to facilitate such a facility if proposals are taken forward.	Reference to this will be deleted. The site proposed is in Gravesham.
Church In Society 83	PA15	Support as long as it will not effect the developer contributions to community facilities.	Noted
Cobelfret c/o Terence O'Rourke 489	PA15	Recognise that there is a place for a tariff system for funding strategic transport investment.	Noted
Rochester Bridge Trust c/o Cluttons 785	PA15	<p>Qualified support for approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where this would result in an unviable development, lower tariffs should be applied.</li> <li>2. Tariff for redevelopment sites should be based on net increase.</li> <li>3. Policy should outline how the provision of local infrastructure will be achieved, be implemented, and include requirements for its provision before occupation of a development occurs and for large developments on a phased basis.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The tariff has been market-tested against other schemes at a strategic level and is believed to be viable in normal circumstances. Circumstances will be considered on their individual merits through the development control process.</li> <li>2. Accept. Immediate amendments to the operation of the interim tariff will be made.</li> <li>3. These issues are addressed through a proposed Operating Framework which was agreed in principle by the General Assembly of the Council on 28 January 2008.</li> </ol>
Lafarge	PA15	Support the approach.	Noted

**CABINET  
25 SEPTEMBER 2008**

Cement c/o David Lock Ass 518			
Home Builders Federation (HBF) 48	PA15	Needs more evidence and detail to be considered sound. Submission document should provide detail of how that money will be spent, on what, when it will be delivered and by whom.	These issues are addressed through a proposed Operating Framework which was agreed in principle by the General Assembly of the Council on 28 January 2008.
GOSE 398	Para 3.33 & PA15	Para refers to 10 or more homes and PA 2 or more homes.	The error will be corrected. Confirm that the tariff will apply on two homes or more.
Fairview New Homes c/o RPS 360	PA15	Object to transport tariff in addition to site transport improvements.	The case for a transport tariff has been demonstrated and received strong support through the specific transport tariff consultation (Sept 2007)
Invista Real Estate c/o NLP 969	PA15	With regard to commercial developments contributions should be: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Directly linked to level of trips generated by the scheme and how they directly impact upon the highway network.</li> <li>2. Used for improvements directly related to the development rather than remotely.</li> <li>3. Considered against other S106 requirements.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is proposed that in commercial developments, the tariff is related to the level of trips generated by way of a broad formula approach.</li> <li>2. The case for a transport tariff which addresses sub-regional infrastructure has been demonstrated and received strong support through the specific transport tariff consultation, Sept 07</li> <li>3. The tariff and other S106 requirements have been market-tested against other schemes at a strategic level and is believed to be viable in normal circumstances. Site specific consideration will continue to take place through the development control function.</li> </ol>

**CABINET  
25 SEPTEMBER 2008**

Land Securities c/o Barton Willmore 776	PA15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need commitment to use fund to address infrastructure requirements in a timely manner and avoid holding up development.</li> <li>2. Include recognition that application of levy will only take place whereby the impact of development proposals are fairly and reasonably related to the scale and type of developments.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Council recognise the need for the infrastructure to be delivered and are working in partnership with others to finalise a delivery mechanism.</li> <li>2. On the available evidence, the flat rate tariff is considered to be justified.</li> </ol>
CPRE Kent 521		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the approach.</li> <li>2. Tariff should be applied to single dwellings,</li> <li>3. commercial development contribution should be on the basis of floorspace</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> <li>2. Balancing likely receipts, administration costs and the nature of development, the Council has decided not to impose the charge on those proposing the development of single dwellings.</li> <li>3. It is proposed that in commercial developments, the tariff is related to the level of trips generated by way of a formula.</li> </ol>
GSK c/o Nathaniel Lichfield 411	PA15	<p>Object to the tariff in principle. Consider that tariff does not comply with Circ 05/2005.</p> <p>Suggest that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is a need to explore opportunities for greater level of Government funding.</li> <li>2. There is no justification is given for the sums for B1, B2, B8 and hotels.</li> <li>3. The majority of the listed schemes are remote from the GSK land.</li> </ol> <p>If the tariff is to be introduced:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Should be different contributions depending on the size of residential units in different locations – eg town centre</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Govt funding has been explored and a contribution of £74 million is being made.</li> <li>2. The draft formula is related to typical traffic generation for such uses, with an adjustment factor to exclude double counting of trips with an origin and destination in Kent Thameside.</li> <li>3. The GSK land is close to Dartford Town Centre where a £10m programme of schemes is proposed. It will also benefit from the overall</li> </ol>

**CABINET  
25 SEPTEMBER 2008**

		<p>sites</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. tariff for commercial development should be calculated on basis of person trip rate</li> <li>6. Need to take account of the transport effects of extant uses of the site</li> <li>7. Payment should be related to occupation and a significant amount should not be sought until a high proportion of the development has been occupied.</li> <li>8. Payments should be used for improvements directly related to the development and not remotely.</li> <li>9. It must be considered alongside other requirements</li> <li>10. There should be a facility for repayment of unspent contributions</li> <li>11. £5,000 per house too high. Should be reduced now that employment sites are being included for tariff.</li> </ol>	<p>programme of transport improvements.</p> <p>4, 5, 6 and 8 These issues are covered in the report and no change is proposed to the flat rate tariff</p> <p>7. The interim policy contains a requirement that developments of up to 50 dwellings will pay the tariff at the commencement of work on the site. For larger schemes, where development is phased, payments are to be made according to an agreed schedule, with the intention that payment is made by the time the development is 50% complete. The phasing of payments will be consulted on further through an SPD</p> <p>9. The tariff and other S106 requirements have been market-tested against other schemes at a strategic level and is believed to be viable in normal circumstances. Site specific consideration will continue to take place through the development control function.</p> <p>10. A standard S106 Agreement covers this issue.</p> <p>11. This amount is necessary to fund the transport programme even after allowing for employment sites. There was significant support for this level of tariff in response to the tariff consultation in Sept 2007, including from some developers/landowners</p>
--	--	--	---

**CABINET  
25 SEPTEMBER 2008**

KCC 444	PA15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Principle supported and is important that its justification and application are reflected in the Core Strategy and the scrutiny and testing that this provides for.</li> <li>2 The scale and nature of the tariff for commercial development is less clear.</li> <li>3 Relationship between treatment of tariff in Core Strategy and other LDF documents need to be clear particularly in view of the infrastructure deliverability tests to be applied in future to LDF preparation.</li> <li>4 Will Kent Thameside Strategic Tariff Document become a DPD or have the status of SPD?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Noted</li> <li>2 It is believed the approach is clear in the interim policy but amendments may be made in the SPD as it emerges.</li> <li>3 and 4 The policy will be contained in the Core Strategy with supplementary guidance on the details of the scheme and its operation set out in an SPD.</li> </ol>
KCC 444	PA15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reference to the Local Transport Plan.</li> <li>2. No preferred approach that includes the schemes that are likely to be needed in support of the new development.</li> <li>3. Are the 11 schemes referred those set out in Table 3.1 – if so include Gravesham schemes.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Local Transport Plan will be referred to in a supporting document to the Core Strategy outlining the relationship between the Core Strategy and other policies/strategies</li> <li>2. The schemes will be identified on the Core Strategy Proposals map. It is not proposed to show the Gravesham schemes, since it is inappropriate to show proposals for areas outside the borough boundaries.</li> </ol>
J Clubb Ltd c/o Alliance Planning 219	PA15	Difficult to comment further in relation to the impact of the tariff on individual proposals.	Noted.