

# Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Supplementary Agenda No.2

**A meeting of the committee will be held on:**

**Date:** Thursday, 11 August 2022

**Time:** 6.30pm

**Venue:** St George's Centre, Pembroke Road, Chatham Maritime, Chatham ME4 4UH

**Membership:** Councillors Etheridge (Chairman), Fearn (Vice-Chairman), Browne, Carr, Clarke, Curry, Edwards, Hubbard, Lammas, Andy Stamp, Tranter, Rupert Turpin and Williams

## Agenda


**6 Call-In - Future Hoo Progress Report**

**(Pages  
3 - 174)**

Appendix 4

For further information please contact Jade Hannah, Democratic Services Officer on Telephone: 01634 332008 or Email: [democratic.services@medway.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@medway.gov.uk)

**Date: 3 August 2022**



---

This agenda and reports are  
available on our website  
**[www.medway.gov.uk](http://www.medway.gov.uk)**

---

---

A summary of this information can be made available in other formats from **01634 333333**

---



## Future Hoo

# Consultation and Engagement 2020-2022

July 2022

Shaping the future of Hoo

## Contents

| Section                                | Page  |
|--|-------|
| 1 INTRODUCTION                         | 6     |
| 2 PROGRAMME AND METHODOLOGY            | 12    |
| 3 FEEDBACK - INTRODUCTION              | 35 35 |
| 4 RAIL                                 | 40    |
| 5 HIGHWAYS                             | 77    |
| 6 SEMS                                 | 136   |
| 7 GENERAL TOPICS - FEEDBACK & RESPONSE | 165   |
| 8 SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS               | 170   |

## Appendices

**APPENDIX 1: COCKHAM COMMUNITY PARKLAND (PHASE 1) STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

**APPENDIX 2: CONSULTATION SCOPE MAP**

**APPENDIX 3: ROUND 1 INFORMATION BOOKLET**

**APPENDIX 4: ROUND 2 FLYER**

**APPENDIX 5: ROUND 1 E-BULLETINS**

**APPENDIX 6: ROUND 2 E-BULLETINS**

**APPENDIX 7: ROUND 3 E-BULLETIN**

**APPENDIX 8: ROUND 1 AND ROUND 2 MEDWAY MATTERS ARTICLES**

**APPENDIX 9: LIST OF ALL STAKEHOLDERS**

**APPENDIX 10: EMAILS ISSUED TO STAKEHOLDERS FOR ROUNDS 1 AND 2**

**APPENDIX 11: ROUND 1 AND ROUND 2 EXAMPLE SOCIAL MEDIA POSTS**

**APPENDIX 12: ROUND 1 AND ROUND 2 CONSULTATION PRESS RELEASES**

- APPENDIX 13: ROUND 1 PRESS RELEASE TO PUBLICISE FEEDBACK REPORTS ISSUED AND ROUND 2 TO CONCLUDE THE CONSULTATION**
- APPENDIX 14: ROUND 1 AND ROUND 2 VILLAGE VOICES ADVERTISEMENTS**
- APPENDIX 15: LIST OF LIBRARIES WHERE ROUND 2 CONSULTATION WAS PROMOTED**
- APPENDIX 16: POSTERS ISSUED TO LIBRARIES TO ADVERTISE ROUND 2**
- APPENDIX 17: ROUND 1 FUTURE HOO WEBPAGE**
- APPENDIX 18: ROUND 2 VIRTUAL PLATFORM SCREENSHOTS**
- APPENDIX 19: ROUND 1 VIRTUAL STAKEHOLDER MEETING PRESENTATION**
- APPENDIX 20: LIST OF ROUND 1 STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**
- APPENDIX 21: LIST OF ROUND 2 STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**
- APPENDIX 22: ROUND 2 VIRTUAL STAKEHOLDER MEETING PRESENTATION**
- APPENDIX 23: ROUND 1 CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE**
- APPENDIX 24: ROUND 2 CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE**
- APPENDIX 25: ROUND 3 PHASE 2 AND 4 PLANS**
- APPENDIX 26: ROUND 3 MEDWAY MATTERS EMAILER**
- APPENDIX 27: ROUND 3 PROJECT WEBSITE**
- APPENDIX 28: ROUND 3 JUNE FUTURE HOO E-BULLETIN**
- APPENDIX 29: ROUND 3 SOCIAL MEDIA PROMOTION**
- APPENDIX 30: ROUND 3 SEMS FOUR-PAGE LEAFLET**
- APPENDIX 31: ROUND 3 SEMS CONSULTATION SCOPE**
- APPENDIX 32: FAQs FOLLOWING ROUND 1**
- APPENDIX 33: FAQs FOR ROUND 2**
- APPENDIX 34: APPROACH TO CODING IN ROUND 2**
- APPENDIX 35: ROUND 2 RAIL PRO FORMA**
- APPENDIX 36: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS WHO SUBMITTED REPRESENTATIONS**

**APPENDIX 37: ROUND 2 HIGHWAYS PRO FORMA**

**APPENDIX 38: ROUND 2 SEMS PRO FORMA**

**APPENDIX 39: ROUND 2 GENERAL PRO FORMA**

## Quality Standards Control

The signatories below verify that this document has been prepared in accordance with our quality control requirements. These procedures do not affect the content and views expressed by the originator.

This document must only be treated as a draft unless it is has been signed by the Originators

| DATE         | ORIGINATORS                      | APPROVED                            |
|--------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 14 JULY 2022 | Asha Saroy<br>Associate Director | Jo Dancy<br>Communications Director |

**Asha Saroy**

---

**Jo Dancy**

---

### Limitations

This document has been prepared for the stated objective and should not be used for any other purpose without the prior written authority of GL Hearn; we accept no responsibility or liability for the consequences of this document being used for a purpose other than for which it was commissioned.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### Future Hoo

- 1.1 Estimates of population growth in Medway indicates that a substantial number of new homes will be required by 2037 to accommodate growth within the area. Medway's new Local Plan will guide the locations for these new homes. Progress to date on the Local Plan (as seen in its consultations to date) has identified opportunities for growth particularly on the Hoo Peninsula, which could potentially deliver at least 10,600 homes through the Local Plan process.
- 1.2 However, the scale of housing growth proposed on the Hoo Peninsula is dependent on strengthened connections and significant upgrades to transport and environmental infrastructure. This cannot be achieved through piecemeal private sector investment and instead requires upfront public sector commitment.
- 1.3 Consequently, in 2017, Medway Council put forward an expression of interest for Housing Infrastructure Funding (HIF), a funding source established by the government to bring forward essential strategic infrastructure to unlock land for housing, which would allow Medway to deliver transport and environmental infrastructure on the Hoo Peninsula to support housing delivery.
- 1.4 Medway Council's expression of interest was followed by the preparation and submission of a formal bid for funding to deliver the highways improvements discussed in this report as well as a new railway station at Sharnal Street, improvements to the existing Grain railway line and re-instate a passenger mainline connection on the peninsula, alongside the creation of blue and green networks to protect existing landscape and ecology designations, providing active travel links and maintaining settlement boundaries as part of SEMS (Strategic Environmental Management Scheme)\*



\*This is the overarching term to describe all of the environmental interventions being undertaken as part of HIF.

- 1.5 The application for funding was supported by economic analysis and appraisal of the highways proposals, undertaken in accordance with standard highways project development (known as 'WebTAG'), as requested by Homes England (referred to in this document as 'the Business Case'). The Business Case highlighted that the Hoo Peninsula is currently constrained by having a single A class access road (the A228) which connects to the A289 at its western ends and links existing communities to the strategic road network. The existing highway network is close to, and in some areas, at capacity, which is creating severe congestion on the A289 and A228 during peak times. Junctions on the A289, including Four Elms Roundabout and Anthony's Way, and the A228 Main Road junction, have been shown through modelling to be at breaking point with trip growth from up to 2,000 additional homes.
- 1.6 The HIF bid demonstrated that significant further housing growth cannot be permitted on the Peninsula without significant highways investment. Additionally, given the number of environmental designations on the Peninsula, environmental improvements, through the delivery of SEMS, would be required to ensure biodiversity and landscape effects are effectively managed to avoid, mitigate or compensate against the direct and indirect impacts of housing growth. The rail scheme is also proposed, to help to make the Peninsula more sustainable by promoting a modal shift away from the car, whilst also alleviating pressure on the road network and increasing future resilience. In November 2019, the Government announced that Medway Council were successful in their bid for £170m HIF funding, to be spent between across three interventions on the Hoo Peninsula:
- A £14m Strategic Environmental Management Scheme (SEMS) to deliver large-scale new publicly accessible (where appropriate) open spaces,

covering 300 hectares of community parkland, woodland, and nature reserves, managed for both wildlife and for public access.

- A £63m investment in a new train station at Sharnal Street and a reinstated passenger service on the Grain branch line; and
- An £86m upgrade of the existing road network with the provision of new infrastructure including slip roads, junctions, and interchanges on the A228 and A289 and wider highway improvements, as well as a new relief road to access the peninsula via Woodfield Way.

## Planning

### Rail

- 1.7 For the rail element of the Medway HIF project, an application will be submitted by Medway Council for a Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) to be made by the Secretary of State under the Transport and Works Act 1992. This will be accompanied by an application for the grant of deemed planning permission under section 90(2A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Together, these decisions will enable an all-encompassing consent for the construction and operation of the rail works and can include any powers to acquire or use land, permanently or temporarily.
- 1.8 The rules associated with the TWAO process specify the documents which must be submitted with an application, and this includes a Consultation Report summarising the consultation carried out by the applicant.
- 1.9 There are specific consultation requirements which must be complied with for the TWAO, over and above the usual public consultation that any applicant might be expected to undertake with stakeholders and the general public. The Transport and

Works (Applications and Objections Procedure) (England and Wales) Rules 2006 (the “Applications Rules”) specify certain bodies and persons who must be consulted and notified of the scheme.

- 1.10 To comply with the Application Rules, a Consultation Report will be prepared for submission with the TWAO. Details are provided within this report as to how the Future Hoo rail project team, on behalf of the Applicant (Medway Council), has consulted with those bodies and persons specified as required consultees.
- 1.11 Over the coming months, the application Consultation Report will be produced, using this report as starting point, updated to reflect any further consultation and engagement, prior to submission, and submitted in March 2023 with the full TWAO, pursuant to the Application Rules.

#### Highways

- 1.12 The highways\* element of the HIF project will be submitted as a standalone (i.e., separate to rail and SEMS) planning application that will be made for all six phases of the scheme under the Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) 1990. The application will be submitted by Medway Council’s Future Hoo team (as the applicant) to Medway Council as the Local Planning Authority (LPA) under Regulation 3 of the Town and County Planning General Regulations 1992.
- 1.13 The planning application will seek planning permission for the upgrades to the existing road network, which includes slip roads, junctions, and interchanges on the A228 and A289, as well as wider highway works, such as pedestrian and cycle improvements, and a new relief road access to the Peninsula via Woodfield Way.

*\*For the purposes this document, we have referred to the road element of the project as ‘highways’ given the overall extent of the works proposed being more than simply roads.*

*Within the consultation documents, the term 'road' is used throughout; please consider these to be referring to the same part of the HIF project.*

## SEMS

- 1.14 Phase 1 (Cockham Community Parkland) already has planning permission\*. As regards Phase 2, planning will be submitted as two standalone planning applications. Discussions are on-going with Homes England (as landowner of the proposed site) as to the consenting route for Phase 2b\*\* (Lodge Hill Countryside Site); and Phase 2d (Shared-use bridge) will now be funded through Section 106 monies, outside of the HIF project funding.

*\* As the planning application for that parkland has already been subject to a Statement of Community Involvement, this report does not report in detail on any specific consultation exercises undertaken for Cockham Community Parkland, information on this is provided in Appendix 1.*

*\*\* Please note that throughout Round 2 consultation, Phase 2b was referred to as Lodge Hill Community Parkland. The name has now been changed to 'Lodge Hill Countryside Site', as the focus of the proposal is the enhancement of the existing habitats for Nightingales with the provision of a new public right of way. Access from the Public Right of Way at Chattenden Woods to the West of the site will link into Lodge Hill Countryside Site and across to Dux Court Road on the East. Access to Lodge Hill Wood, Rough Shaw and Wyborne Woods - all Sites of Special Scientific Interest - will be restricted.*

- 1.15 Phase 2 SEMS separate planning applications will be made up of:
- Phase 2a – Hoo Wetland Reserve\* (anticipated submission September 2022)
  - Phase 2c – Deangate Ridge Community Parkland – (anticipated submission from spring 2023)

*\*Please note that throughout Round 2 consultation, Phase 2a was referred to as 'Hoo Flats Community Parkland'. The name has been changed to emphasise that the site would be*

*brought into management as a wetland reserve with sensitive and controlled public access, rather than being a fully open community parkland.*

### **NPPF and Medway Council's SCI – Policy Guidelines**

- 1.16 In addition to compliance with the TWAO requirements, consultation on the HIF proposals has been undertaken by the Future Hoo team, in line with planning policy guidance on developer/ applicant consultation as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (updated in February 2019 and July 2021) and Medway Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (updated August 2020).
- 1.17 The NPPF states that applicants of major developments are expected to submit a separate Statement of Community Involvement to explain how they have built engagement into the development proposal process; it states: *'Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot'*. (NPPF 2019, paragraph 128; 2021 paragraph 132).
- 1.18 In Medway Council's August 2020 Update of the SCI, it is stated that, *'in accordance with the NPPF, [the Council] places a strong emphasis on early engagement and aims to work with applicants in a positive and pro-active manner.'* It references the following NPPF statement:
- 'Early engagement has significant potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system for all parties. Good quality pre-application discussion enables better coordination between public and private resources and improved outcomes for the community'* (NPPF 2019 and 2021 paragraph 39).

## **Purpose of this Report**

- 1.19 This document has been prepared by way of a report to Cabinet setting out the consultation and engagement activities that have been undertaken from 2020 to 2022 on the Future Hoo HIF project.
- 1.20 Its purpose is also to outline how the results of the various rounds of consultation have supported the design of each HIF element (rail, road, and SEMS) being taken forward for assessment and on-going project development – this should be read in conjunction with the ‘Design Development Report’ (DDR), also submitted to Cabinet.
- 1.21 Furthermore, this report will also be used as a starting point for the various Statements of Community Involvement required to accompany the multiple planning applications and the Consultation Report for the TWAO application, as explained in section 1.10.

## **2 PROGRAMME AND METHODOLOGY**

- 2.1 This section outlines the approach the Future Hoo team has taken towards public consultation, based on established best practice, Medway Council requirements and informed by the scale and mix of the proposed development.
- 2.2 The aim was to conduct an appropriate and robust programme of consultation, which provided the opportunity for interested individuals and groups to get involved in the development design process. This included opportunities for the public to view and ask questions about the proposals and provide feedback for the development team to consider as it progressed these into planning applications.

Based on their inter-connectivity and shared function of seeking to facilitate housing, the proposals for HIF rail, highways and SEMS were consulted on together.

## Consultation principles

- 2.3 The following principles were followed throughout the consultation programme and the development of consultation materials:
- Outline the approach to consultation and how people can get involved;
  - Identify and consult those parties who will potentially be affected by or interested in the proposals;
  - Provide the opportunity for feedback on the proposals to be submitted and reviewed by members of the project team;
  - Clearly outline timescales for the application and what happens next after the programme of consultation; and
  - Report back on the feedback that has been received and the project team's responses to that feedback.

## Programme

- 2.4 The key milestones programme for the Future Hoo consultations and next steps are shown below. More detail is provided about the approach to consultation i.e., what we consulted on in each Round\*, in the individual consultation chapters for rail, highways and SEMS.

*\*In this document, the consultation stages are referred to as Rounds 1, 2 and 3 for simplicity. In earlier consultation materials, these stages may also be referred to as 'Spring 2021' or 'First Round' (Round 1) or 'Second Round' (Round 2).*

| <b>Milestone Activity</b>                               | <b>Timescales</b>  |
|---|--|
| <b>HIF Consultation Round 1</b>                         | 11 January 2021 – 6 April 2021*<br><i>*Extended from 7 March 2021</i>  |
| <b>Feedback Review</b>                                  | April 2021-September 2021  |
| <b>Round 1 Reporting Back</b>                           | September 2021   |
| <b>HIF Consultation Round 2</b>                         | 29 November 2021 – 10 January 2022*<br><i>*Additional time given only to those with land interests to provide more time for response until 1 February 2022</i>   |
| <b>Feedback Review</b>                                  | January 2022 – April 2022  |
| <b>Round 2 Reporting Back</b>                           | June 2022  |
| <b>HIF Consultation Round 3 and Focussed Engagement</b> | 13 June 2022 – 6 weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEMS – consultation - developed designs for 2a Hoo Wetland Reserve and 2b Lodge Hill Countryside Site</li> <li>Highways – engagement - Phase 2 and Phase 4 updates</li> </ul>        |
|   | Late 2022/early 2023 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEMS – consultation - developed designs for 2c Deangate Ridge Community Parkland</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Final submissions of applications</b>                | SEMS - anticipated timescales: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 2022 (Phase 2a – Hoo Wetland Reserve)</li> <li>Spring 2023 (Phase 2c – Deangate Ridge Community Parkland)</li> </ul> Rail – March 2023<br>Highways – February 2023 |

### **Publicising the Consultation**

2.5 Due to the scale of the project and the wide-reaching implications of the proposals, it was important to the Future Hoo team that the consultation was publicised widely. The objective being to ensure that everyone who was interested in the proposals, and those with a legal interest or affected landholding, were all aware of the consultation and were able to get involved. This included those consultees identified



for statutory consultation as part of the TWAO process and in compliance with its Application Rules.

- 2.6 To ensure consistency across the two rounds of consultation, the same methods of publicity were used for both rounds to raise awareness of the project and how to get involved. These differed only where additional publicity was added to the programme to support the new 'face to face' events element of the consultation (Round 2) or where the stage in project progression meant a tweak to the original approach would be more appropriate e.g., with the move from a lengthy publicity booklet to a short flyer (see below).
- 2.7 The team sought to use a range of publicity channels to ensure maximum awareness of the consultation across the Hoo Peninsula. Details are provided below as regards the multiple streams of channels used: booklets/ flyers; ebulletins; e-newsletters; emails; social media; traditional media; and posters.

Publicity: Direct Mail – Booklet (Round 1) & Flyer (Round 2)

- 2.8 At the start of the project, the Future Hoo team mapped out an area of interest for the public consultation i.e., the geographical area that would be directly and indirectly affected by the HIF proposals. The area identified also caught all land potentially required for the (rail) Scheme as required by Application Rules. This consultation scope map is shown in Appendix 2. The area included the following postcodes which covered 24,000 addresses:
- ME2 3 - 5,828
  - ME2 4 - 3,925
  - ME3 0 – 774
  - ME3 7 - 3,193
  - ME3 8 - 4,442

- ME3 9 - 5,692
- 2.9 On the basis that Round 1 Consultation had to be undertaken online due to Covid-19 restrictions, the team considered that the direct mail publicity material (used to provide details for the online consultation) should be more detailed than a standard 2- or 4-page flyer. On the basis that it would not be sustainable to print and issue the complete 64-page consultation document (more information on this follows) to the full area of interest, the team determined that a short information booklet was an appropriate addition for Round 1.
- 2.10 As well as confirming the online consultation details, this eight-page booklet also explained the context of the proposals, provided a summary of early designs and signposted consultees to the website where the full proposals could be viewed, and feedback could be provided. It provided contact details for the Future Hoo team, should people wish to call or email with their comments, and it stated that paper copies of the consultation brochure would be issued, on request, to those with no access to a computer or with accessibility issues. A copy of the information booklet is provided in Appendix 3.
- 2.11 The information booklets were delivered to the outlined postcodes in week commencing 14 December 2020. This provided four weeks of notice to the start of the consultation period; this was a longer notice period than would usually be provided for a public consultation due to the Christmas period. A further booklet mail out to certain postcodes was undertaken in February 2021, in response to queries and concerns about non-delivery in those areas.
- 2.12 A leaflet drop to all 24,000 addresses was undertaken in March 2021 to confirm an extension to the consultation deadline (extension from 7 March to 6 April). This leaflet drop was carried out to provide all with adequate time to respond.

- 2.13 For the Round 2 consultation, it was considered that a shorter, more traditional flyer would be more appropriate as the publicity tool for the online consultation and in-person events. This was on the basis that unlike Round 1 which was conducted online, face to face events were programmed this time which meant a greater access to off-line information. In addition to that, the team wanted to encourage the public to get involved and submit their feedback by going online or coming to an event to discuss proposals with the team (now that this was possible); it was felt that a simple 'call to action' flyer would achieve this more readily. The flyer confirmed on the front page how paper copies of the consultation material could be requested. It also provided simple project context information, event dates and the web address linking to the Future Hoo webpage where the consultation brochure and feedback form could be accessed. A copy of the Round 2 flyer is provided in Appendix 4.
- 2.14 For Round 2 consultation, the flyer was delivered in week commencing 15 November 2021. This provided 2 weeks of notice in advance of the start of the online consultation and over 4 weeks before the first in-person public exhibition.

Publicity: Future Hoo e-bulletins

- 2.15 To provide another means of awareness for the HIF project and consultation, Medway Council's communications team sent out regular Future Hoo digital e-bulletins.
- 2.16 The community was able to subscribe to these project updates through the Council's website on the dedicated Future Hoo webpage and the e-bulletins were issued before, during and after both rounds of consultation to encourage maximum involvement. Various promotions of how/where to subscribe to the e-bulletins had previously taken place; for example, reference has previously been included in various multichannel communications including Medway Matters magazine, other council e-bulletins and information provided at consultation meetings and events.

- 2.17 For the Round 1 consultation, e-bulletins were issued on 14 January 2021, 9 February 2021, and 2 September 2021 (to 189, 243 and 401 recipients respectively\*); the series of e-bulletins issued is provided in Appendix 5. These were issued as 'calls to action' (directing recipients to the Future Hoo website to review materials) to ensure maximum awareness of the consultation and the availability of the feedback reports. Bulletin 'open rates' were 54%, 49% and 56% respectively – positive statistics given a 'good' email open rate is classed as being between 17-28%. (Source: Campaign Monitor).
- 2.18 On the 16 November 2021, a Future Hoo e-bulletin was sent to 475 subscribers to advise that the Round 2 consultation would be commencing. Further e-bulletins were issued on 14 December 2021, and 7 January 2022 (to 502 and 517 recipients respectively) as a reminder to get involved in the consultation. Open rates were 54%, 53%, and 55% respectively. Copies of the e-bulletins for Round 2 are provided in Appendix 6.
- \*Subscriptions to the Future Hoo e-bulletin increased from 189 to 401 recipients during Round 1 consultation, from 502 to 517 during Round 2 and, at the end of May 2022, now sits at 580.*
- 2.19 A further e-bulletin was issued to 580 recipients (achieving a 54% open rate) on 13 May 2022 to publicise Round 3 SEMS consultation on detailed designs for 2a Hoo Wetland Reserve (formally Hoo Flats Community Parkland) and 2b Lodge Hill Countryside Site (formally Lodge Hill Community Parkland), and engagement for highways on Phases 2 and 4. This Round 3 consultation e-bulletin is shown in Appendix 7.
- 2.20 Both the SEMS consultation and the engagement for Highways Phases 2 and 4 commenced on 13 June 2022, and end on 24 July 2022. (Please see paragraph 2.74 for more information on Round 3).

### Publicity: Medway Matters e-newsletter

- 2.21 The consultation programme was also promoted via the Council's e-newsletter, Medway Matters which is emailed to circa 7,500\* residents who have subscribed to the publication via [www.medway.gov.uk/signup](http://www.medway.gov.uk/signup). The Future Hoo consultation (Rounds 1 and 2) were promoted across four copies of Medway Matters: spring 2020, summer 2021, winter 2021 and summer 2022. Copies of these articles are provided in Appendix 8.

*\*Circulation was circa 7,500 at the time of Round 1 consultation but as of end May 2022, subscription numbers are 7767.*

### Publicity: stakeholder emails

- 2.22 At the start of the process, the Future Hoo team undertook extensive research into potential stakeholders to develop a database of some 360 parties. The objective of this being to ensure that it would be possible to engage all stakeholders at every stage of the consultation and throughout the project's progression.
- 2.23 The list was formulated following inputs from the teams on rail, highways and SEMS, Medway planning and other departments, plus the HIF project lawyers. All contact details for stakeholders were either compiled following research i.e., email addresses were available publicly online, or the Future Hoo teams were already working directly with individuals on the project and therefore liaised with them using existing contacts, with their consent. All details were treated in line with GDPR regulations.
- 2.24 This included both non-statutory (community, business, local interest groups/representatives plus technical stakeholders) and statutory stakeholders which, for the consultation on rail proposals, was in accordance with the Application Rules. A

list of all stakeholders (minus personal information for data protection purposes) is included in Appendix 9.

- 2.25 Contact has been made with these stakeholders at various stages of the development programme for Future Hoo, but specifically in respect of the consultation, they were invited to get involved. This group was emailed about Round 1 on 14 December 2020, with a follow up reminder to take part on 4 February 2021. For Round 2, emails were issued on 1 December 2021.
- 2.26 Copies of the information emails issued to stakeholders for Rounds 1 and 2 are provided in Appendix 10.

Publicity: social media and media

- 2.27 The Council's communications team supported the promotion of the Future Hoo Consultation through its social media platforms which include Twitter and Facebook.
- 2.28 The communications team posted 23 notifications about the Future Hoo consultation (11 on Facebook and 12 on Twitter) in support of Round 1. For Round 2, there were 52 social media posts on Twitter (26) and Facebook (26). Examples of these posts are shown in Appendix 11.
- 2.29 Media activity was undertaken prior to and during both rounds of consultation. Press releases promoting the start of the consultation were issued for Round 1 in February 2021 and November 2021 for Round 2. Copies of these press releases are provided in Appendix 12.
- 2.30 Press releases were issued to the same media outlets for Round 1, to publicise the feedback reports being issued in September 2021, and for Round 2, to conclude the consultation period on 21 January 2022. Copies of the press releases issued are provided in Appendix 13.

- 2.31 The team also placed half page advertisements in the Village Voices Community Magazine in January 2021, to publicise Round 1, and December 2021 for Round 2. This publication goes out to 16,500 properties in Allhallows, Chattenden, Cliffe, Cliffe Woods, Cooling, Frindsbury, High Halstow, Higham, Hoo, Hoo Marina Park, Isle of Grain, Lower Higham, Lower Upnor, Spendiff, St. Mary Hoo, Stoke, Upper Upnor, Wainscott. Copies of the Village Voices advertisements for Rounds 1 and 2 are provided in Appendix 14.

#### Publicity: Libraries

- 2.32 With Covid-19 restrictions largely lifted for Round 2 and more community venues now accessible to the public, the team wanted to provide further support to those within the community without access to computers but who wanted to take part in the online consultation rather than attend events.
- 2.33 With this in mind, Round 2 consultation was promoted in 15 Medway libraries (listed in Appendix 15) and community hubs within the local parishes, where free computer access for library members\* was available. Two types of posters were issued to the libraries / community hubs, one as a call to action to get involved in the consultation and the second with information about all public exhibition events and contact details for the team. Copies of the posters are provided in Appendix 16.

*\*Anyone wishing to become a library member could join, for free, in person by visiting any of Medway's libraries or by registering online.*

- 2.34 Small notices were also set up beside all public computers in the 15 libraries to provide information on how to access the consultation. Paper copies of the consultation brochure and questionnaire were held by Hoo and Grain libraries for the public to read in situ.

- 2.35 As already outlined, for those not able to access home or library computers, the materials could be requested as paper copies, and this was promoted on all publicity materials.

## **How we have Consulted and Engaged**

### Online Public Consultation

- 2.36 Due to restrictions around Covid-19 at that point, the form of consultation for Round 1 was largely two-fold: 1) online public consultation and 2) virtual stakeholder meetings.
- 2.37 For Round 1, the Future Hoo webpage, part of Medway Council's corporate website, was the principal information hub for the online consultation, with the space used to present a consultation brochure and questionnaire. This was supported by a project telephone line (01634 331166), dedicated email address [futurehoo@medway.gov.uk](mailto:futurehoo@medway.gov.uk) and the provision of paper copies of all information if required. A screenshot of the consultation page is provided in Appendix 17.
- 2.38 For Round 2, the Future Hoo website also contained all the consultation materials plus contact details and feedback mechanisms. However, when Round 2 consultation was to be undertaken, the majority of social restrictions around Covid-19 had lifted. However, Medway Council remained committed to ensuring the safety of its employees and the public and therefore the 'hybrid' digital and in-person approach was undertaken.

### Virtual consultation platform

- 2.39 In the period immediately before Round 2, there was still ongoing caution around the virus and social interactions for many people. It was for this reason, and the Council's



desire for those wishing to avoid in-person events not to miss out on that familiar exhibition experience, that the online virtual platform was introduced.

- 2.40 The online public exhibition was launched on the virtual platform on 29 November to mark the beginning of Round 2 consultation. The platform provided a virtual public exhibition space with the same materials that were displayed at the live in-person events and the ability to navigate around four key virtual areas: welcome desk, plus rail, highways, and SEMS exhibition areas. All consultation and project collateral were available to download including the brochure, questionnaire, reports from Round 1 consultation plus project Frequently Asked Questions.
- 2.41 Exhibition boards were provided within the virtual public exhibition within each of the three areas (rail, highways, and SEMS). A website link to the boards is: <https://futurehoo.medway.gov.uk/>
- 2.42 Other key features of the virtual public exhibition included:
- a written welcome message from Councillor Alan Jarrett, Leader of Medway Council, setting the context for the proposals
  - an audio recording by Janet Davies, Head of HIF, and Regeneration, providing an overview of the consultation undertaken to date and directing people how to use the platform and submit feedback
  - directions for using/ navigating the space.
- 2.43 As the team wanted as many people as possible to be able to use the web application, an Accessibility Statement was uploaded which outlined that several key features had been designed into the platform including the ability to:
- change the font size;
  - zoom in up to 300% without the text spilling off the screen;
  - navigate most of the website using just a keyboard;

- navigate most of the website using speech recognition software;
- listen to most of the website using a screen reader (including the most recent versions of JAWS, NVDA and VoiceOver).

2.44 Some screenshots from the virtual exhibition are provided in Appendix 18.

#### In-person events

2.45 For Round 2 consultation, the team also welcomed the opportunity to speak to the public in person at several public exhibitions held on the Peninsula:

2.46 The events, held over two separate weeks before and after Christmas, were arranged at accessible venues familiar to those communities and over time periods that allowed everyone to attend, whether they worked in the daytime or the evening. Communities were not restricted to attending sessions held in their own areas which provided the flexibility to find an event that worked for them.

|   |  |              |
|---|--|--------------|
| Chattenden Community Centre<br>ME3 8PH    | Wednesday 15 December 2021<br>2-8pm    | 29 attendees |
| High Halstow Hall<br>ME3 8SQ              | Thursday 16 December 2021<br>1-7pm     | 65 attendees |
| Hundred of Hoo School Hall<br>ME3 9HH     | Wednesday 5 January 2022<br>5.30-9pm   | 21 attendees |
| Hoo St Werburgh Church*<br>ME3 9AL        | Wednesday 5 January 2022<br>11am – 3pm | 50 attendees |
| Frindsbury Extra Memorial Hall<br>ME2 4LG | Friday 7 January 2022<br>2-8pm         | 49 attendees |

*\* Additional event arranged in response to community requests for a morning/ daytime event at a venue considered by the Parish Council to be more accessible to older residents*

### Meetings

- 2.47 The Future Hoo team have held meetings with a range of stakeholders throughout the design development process including during the Round 1 and Round 2 consultation periods.
- 2.48 It is also noted that these meetings should not be seen in isolation, as many of the same stakeholders have also been involved in discussions with the wider Council regarding the developing Hoo Development Framework, the emerging Local Plan, and its evidence base.
- 2.49 These have been through in person meetings and through the use of virtual platforms such as Zoom and Teams (whichever were preferred by the stakeholder group).

### *Political stakeholders*

- 2.50 In Medway Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (updated August 2020), it states: *"The Council encourages developers to present significant development proposals to councillors at early stages in the planning process, before submitting an application. These presentations are useful in advising members about the proposals and raising key issues."*
- 2.51 The Future Hoo team (as applicant), has held numerous meetings with political representatives, not just of Medway Council but also those of surrounding local authorities, parishes, parliamentary constituency, and the county. During the Round 1 and Round 2 consultation, these were formal meetings which generally comprised a 45min presentation followed by 45min question and answer session.
- 2.52 The purpose of these sessions was to ensure politicians were fully appraised of the proposals to enable individuals or parties to make informed representations to the

formal public consultation, should they wish. An example of the presentations given for Round 1 virtual meetings is provided in Appendix 19.

2.53 For Round 1 consultation, meetings were held as follows:

| <b>Political audience</b> | <b>Who attended</b>                           | <b>Dates</b>                                 |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| Medway Council            | 11 x Councillors<br>(16 invited*)             | Various dates: January, February, March 2021 |
| Gravesham Council         | 2 x Councillors<br>(6 invited)                | 1 February 2021                              |
| Parish Councils           | 15 x Parish Councils<br>(20 councils invited) | Various dates: January and February 2021     |
| Members of Parliament     | Kelly Tolhurst MP                             | Various dates – regular meetings             |

\* *Ward councillors for the project area.*

2.54 A table showing details of all meetings held for Round 1 can be found in Appendix 20.

2.55 For consistency with the previous consultation stage, for Round 2, the team engaged the same councillors across Medway, Gravesham, the parishes, county, and parliamentary constituency. A table detailing Round 2 meetings is provided in Appendix 21, but a brief summary of meetings held is provided below. The majority of these were still held virtually with some in-person sessions as requested by the consultees. An example of the presentations given for Round 2 virtual meetings is provided in Appendix 22.

| <b>Political audience</b> | <b>Who attended</b>                                | <b>Dates</b>     |
|---------------------------|--|------------------|
| Medway Council            | 6 Councillors attended<br>(16 Councillors invited) | 2 December 2021  |
| Gravesham Council         | 4 Councillors attended<br>(6 Councillors invited)  | 29 November 2021 |

| <b>Political audience</b> | <b>Who attended</b>   | <b>Dates</b>                                |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Parish councils           | 4 Parish Councils –<br>Frindsbury, High Halstow,<br>Hoo and Grain.<br>(20 Parish Council invited) | 2, 8 14 December 2021 and<br>6 January 2022 |
| Members of Parliament     | Kelly Tolhurst MP   | 25 November 2021                            |

*Non-political stakeholders ('technical' and 'local interest')*

- 2.56 Numerous meetings have been held with technical and local interest group stakeholder representatives throughout the project development process. At the time of consultation in particular, these meetings have enabled the design team to get a technical or expert steer on their work and allowed them to sound out their ideas with audiences focusing on specific interest areas. The meetings were also held to ensure all parties were fully appraised of the proposals to enable representatives or organisations to make informed representations to the formal public consultation should they wish.
- 2.57 For rail proposals, there were several rail specific stakeholders who have been consulted throughout the process. In particular, a number of meetings were held with these parties as part of Rounds 1 and 2 consultation and a special rail stakeholder workshop was held on 8 December 2021 with invitees including Network Rail, Department for Transport, GB Railfreight, GWR, London Thames Port, plus other logistics/ freight organisations, landowners, and rail-focussed local authority officers.
- 2.58 Other key engagement to date has included meetings with Medway's Rights of Way Officer and the Local Access Forum in respect of the proposals for crossings.
- 1.1 As regards highways proposals, consultation throughout Round 1 included sessions with Highways England, Environment Agency, Natural England, RSPB, Homes

England, Historic England, and Kent Wildlife Trust. For Round 2, a special highways stakeholder workshop was held on 6 December 2021 with invitees including Environment Agency, Natural England and Highways England plus landowners and local authority officers.

- 1.2 Other key engagement meetings outside of the consultation period have included discussions with the Department for Education, and local residents with regards to the proposals for Phase 6.
- 1.3 Stakeholders for SEMS proposals for Round 1 took the form of meetings with several environment-related stakeholders including Medway Urban Greenspaces, Medway Local Access Forum, Kent Wildlife Trust, RSPB, Natural England, Dickens Country Protection Society, Woodland Trust, Birdwise, British Horse Society and Kent County Council Archaeology. For Round 2, a special SEMS stakeholder workshop was held on 7 December 2021 with invitees including Friends of Grain Coastal Park, Friends of North Kent Marshes, Bumblebee Conservation, NW Kent Countryside Partnership, Woodland Trust, Kent Wildlife Trust, CPRE, RSPB, Natural England, Rural England and Buglife plus landowners, other local interest groups and local authority officers.
- 2.59 Other key engagement meetings outside of the consultation period have included working closely with Medway Local Access Forum and the British Horse Society to discuss delivering the best possible solutions for connectivity across the SEMS schemes for Public Rights of Way, bridleways, and ecological purposes.
- 2.60 Engagement is also ongoing in relation to a new initiative (referenced in Round 2 consultation) to increase wildlife areas through landowner participation in a voluntary planting scheme by working with landowners, environmental charities, and the local community.

### *Landowners*

- 2.61 Throughout the lifetime of the project, the Future Hoo team held meetings with specific landowners affected by the Future Hoo proposals on the basis that the team would need to access and acquire land necessary for the proposed infrastructure. This has included in particular the Hoo Consortium\*, MoD and Homes England, to ensure that the HIF designs align with emerging housing proposals.

*\*Made up of: Church Commissioners for England, Gladman Developments, Taylor Wimpey, and Dean Lewis Estates.*

- 2.62 Alongside ongoing engagement, letters were also issued to all landowners as part of the formal consultation process, inviting them to submit representations.

### **Consultation materials**

#### Brochure

- 2.63 It was considered that the simplest way to present information about the proposals online was to prepare and upload a consultation brochure. The Round 1, 64-page brochure, which can be viewed online ([https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/file/5586/hif\\_consultation\\_proposals\\_-\\_january\\_2021](https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/file/5586/hif_consultation_proposals_-_january_2021)) provided the context for the emerging proposals and outlined the process and timeline for consultation and planning, before it presented proposals for highways, rail and SEMS. The final chapters covered the management of environmental impacts, provided information regarding property and landowners, and outlined how everyone could get involved.
- 2.64 For Round 2, the brochure had much of the same chapter structure as Round 1 so clear comparisons could be made from one to the other as regards the team's responses to issues raised in Round 1, and the resultant development of proposals.

- 2.65 Within each of the three main chapters for rail, highways and SEMS, the following sections were provided to demonstrate a clear path of 1) consultation 2) feedback review 3) team response and 4) design development - by way of a 'you said, we did' approach.
- What we presented in first-round HIF consultation
  - Your views on the rail/ highways/ SEMS proposals presented in early 2021
  - What has changed since first-round HIF consultation
  - Our updated proposals – seeking your feedback
- 2.66 In total, 60 paper copies of the brochure and questionnaire were issued for Round 1, with 22 copies issued for Round 2 consultation. A weblink to the brochure for Round 2 is:  
[https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/file/7254/hif\\_second\\_round\\_consultation\\_brochure](https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/file/7254/hif_second_round_consultation_brochure)
- Questionnaire
- 2.67 For the Round 1 Consultation, the team was seeking very detailed responses on rail and highways proposals but feedback on more high-level principles for SEMS. With this in mind, a very detailed questionnaire (with 53 questions) was compiled which included multiple qualitative and quantitative questions across rail, highways, and SEMS, with the latter having less questions posed at this stage. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix 23.
- 2.68 Of the 53 questions within the overall questionnaire, questions 46-53 were 'About You' questions to allow the team to understand the demographics and geographical spread of the responses received and to ensure an appropriate mix of consultees had been reached. Given Medway Council's data privacy policy, and the fact that questions were asked about gender, age, disability and ethnicity, consultees were only asked to provide their postcode, not their name or full address.



- 2.69 For the Round 2 Consultation, the approach to the questionnaire was different. As Round 1 (for rail and highways) was about drawing out detailed feedback on multiple specific elements of the early options, the questionnaire was designed to direct consultees to many detailed technical matters where feedback was being sought. With Round 2 (for rail and highways), the focus of the consultation was much more about testing the evolving proposals in terms of whether they were an appropriate response or solution to the previous feedback provided. The team took the approach of “You Said, We Did”, explaining what feedback was provided at Round 1, and what the team had done in response to the feedback.
- 2.70 For SEMS, Round 2 was about the presentation of early proposals on specific sites. As this was still very high level (and later consultation would be undertaken on the detail), the very open approach to the questionnaire, used for rail and highways, was also appropriate for SEMS at this stage.
- 2.71 With the above in mind, the team wanted to ensure the questions asked for Round 2 were much more open and general, to enable respondents to talk about those matters most important to them; we were mindful that by the second stage of consultation, not every consultee wished to respond and provide comment on every element of the proposals, although it was important that there were able to if they so wished.
- 2.72 Therefore, the questionnaire was designed accordingly, to be as flexible and open as possible with only qualitative questions and no closed quantitative ones except the request for demographic information. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix 24.
- 2.73 All data has been stored as per GDPR requirements.

### Round 3

- 2.74 There will be a further round of consultation running for six weeks from 13 June to 24 July 2022 for Phases 2a and 2b of SEMS. Focussed engagement is also planned in this period in relation to specific aspects of the highways proposals.
- 2.75 The purpose of this work is to:
- Present more developed designs for SEMS Phases 2a and c, which have evolved following feedback from Round 2
  - Update the community and stakeholders in the vicinity of these phases on the development of highways proposals for Phases 2 and 4
- 2.76 The plans for Phase 2 and 4 of the highways proposals that are to be presented and discussed as part of these meetings are set out in Appendix 25.
- 2.77 Round 3 includes the following activities:

#### SEMS & Highways

- MP and Medway Ward Councillors meeting – 8 June 2022
- Public/ community events:
  - 16 June (1pm – 4pm Hoo Parish Church; 6pm-9pm Hoo School)
  - 5 July (2pm – 7pm Hoo Parish Church)
  - 13 July (4pm – 7pm Chattenden Community Centre)

At these events, the SEMS team will be available for questions on the consultation and plans. The road team will also be available as part of information sharing engagement and providing an update on Phases 2 and 4 since the Round 2 consultation.

In addition to the listed public events, from 10am on 17 June to 5pm on 24 June, exhibition boards will be on display at Hoo Library. Whilst the Future Hoo team won't be present at the library at this time, there will be printed questionnaires on the SEMS consultation on-hand for residents to complete.

2.78 Round 3 has been promoted by the Council via various methods, including:

- Medway Matters emailer, as shown in Appendix 26
- Updates to the project websites, as shown in Appendix 27
- Future Hoo e-bulletin (June edition) with an open rate of 38% (as of 14 June), as shown in Appendix 28
- Social media posts promoting the Round 3 consultation and engagement, as shown in Appendix 29
- Village Voice ½ page advert (w/c 18 to 25th June)

#### SEMS only

- SEMS pre-consultation meetings with Natural England, Environment Agency and IDB\* - May
- A four-page leaflet advertising the consultation (as shown in Appendix 30) distributed to the following addresses as per the Cockham Community Parkland consultation, (the scope is shown in Appendix 31):
  - ME2 3 - 5,828
  - ME2 4 - 3,925
  - ME3 0 – 774
  - ME3 7 - 3,193
  - ME3 8 - 4,442
  - ME3 9 - 5,692
- Online consultation from 13 June to 24 July with a questionnaire – [www.medway.gov.uk/futurehoo](http://www.medway.gov.uk/futurehoo)

*\*An Internal Drainage Board (IDB) is a type of operating authority which is established in areas of special drainage need in England and Wales with permissive powers to undertake work to secure clean water drainage and water level management within drainage districts.*

- 2.79 Informal engagement will continue to take place with statutory and non-statutory stakeholders throughout the preparation process of the applications for Future Hoo, particularly in relation to the development of the environmental and transport assessments which will be submitted with the application.

### 3 CONSULTATION FEEDBACK - INTRODUCTION

#### Format of feedback received

3.1 The Round 1 Consultation process focussed on the provision of an online brochure with accompanying questionnaire. Respondents were encouraged to submit formal responses through the questionnaire, but other forms of representation were received, accepted, and analysed.

3.2 In summary, the team received the following feedback for Round 1 consultation:


| Type of feedback                   | Number of responses |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Emails</b>                      | 240                 |
| <b>Feedback forms</b>              | 557*                |
| <b>Stakeholder representations</b> | 19                  |

*\*A total of 557 surveys were submitted, with five questionnaires not completed. Therefore, overall, a total of 552 surveys were included in this consultation.*

3.3 For Round 2, whilst a formal questionnaire was again provided, feedback was received, and accepted, through various channels as per the below.

| Type of feedback   | Number of responses |
|--|---------------------|
| Questionnaires (public, technical & political stakeholders)                      | 140                 |
| Rail pro formas (a form of email that was identical from each respondent)        | 112                 |
| Road pro formas (a form of email that was identical from each respondent)        | 112                 |
| SEMS pro formas (a form of email that was identical from each respondent)        | 112                 |
| General HIF pro formas (a form of email that was identical from each respondent) | 36                  |
| Stakeholder representations (technical & political) – email/ letter              | 32                  |
| Public representations – email/ letter   | 26                  |

3.4 As part of the formal questionnaire, respondents had the opportunity to share what age they were. This is detailed below.



## Feedback Reports

- 3.5 To report back on the Round 1 Consultation, Medway Council's Business Intelligence Team produced three feedback documents – 'HIF Consultation Response Analysis', 'Future Hoo Consultation Executive Summary' and 'HIF Email and Representations Analysis'.
- 3.6 In addition to this, the team produced an FAQ document, titled "HIF responses from consultation". This FAQ document can be found in Appendix 32. The team were able to build and identify key themes from the FAQs. A further FAQ document was produced for Round 2 Consultation, and this updated FAQ document can be found in Appendix 33.
- 3.7 As this was the first full consultation for the Future Hoo project, the questions were very detailed, the majority of respondents used the feedback forms as the mechanism for response; as a result, detailed and statistical analysis could be undertaken.
- 3.8 The HIF Consultation Response Analysis, published in August 2021 ([https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/file/6030/hif\\_first\\_consultation\\_report\\_results\\_2021](https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/file/6030/hif_first_consultation_report_results_2021)) and was a full 200-page report detailing responses to each of the 53 questions posed. As each of the rail, highways and SEMS sections contained qualitative and quantitative questions, the team was able to provide the following for each area:
- Summary of the key findings (provided in 'Round 1 Feedback Received' below for each topic area)
  - Statistics (%) for qualitative questions including graphs highlighting the most/least popular answers
  - Confirmation where responses between demographic groups differed and outline of the differences

- List of qualitative comments made in relation to those points – grouped into themes and quantified
  - List of alternative suggestions and clarifications (in appendices)
- 3.9 The 'Future Hoo Consultation Executive Summary' report, also published in August 2021, provided a shorter version of the main report (eight pages of text) with key qualitative and quantitative findings for rail, highways, and SEMS. A weblink to this report is:
- [https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/file/6031/hif\\_consultation\\_executive\\_summary\\_2021](https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/file/6031/hif_consultation_executive_summary_2021)
- 3.10 The third (28 page) report, 'HIF Email & Representations Analysis' provided:
- A list of the stakeholder representative groups that made representations
  - Analysis of emails and representations – by theme
  - List of alternative suggestions made by consultees
  - Questions and clarifications raised through the feedback

A weblink to this report is:

[https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/file/6029/hif\\_email\\_and\\_representations\\_analysis\\_2021](https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/file/6029/hif_email_and_representations_analysis_2021)

### **Feedback Consideration**

- 3.11 To enable detailed, thorough, and meaningful consideration of all feedback, the Future Hoo Rail, Highways and SEMS teams spent several months reviewing the detailed responses from Round 1 and 2 Consultations, including all comments, questions, and suggestions.



- 3.12 How the team reviewed, considered, and responded to this feedback can be seen in the next chapter (within the Rail, Highways and SEMS reports, for each consultation round) under the headings 'Response to Issues Raised' and 'Design Changes'.
- 3.13 The below sections provide the headline key findings of the analysis. These are provided as both qualitative ('key findings') and quantitative (% statistics), with the latter included where these could be formulated.

## 4 RAIL

### Round 1 - Rail

#### Topics for Consultation

For this first consultation on rail, the team introduced the concept of a reinstated passenger service on the Grain branch line and the creation of a new station south of Sharnal Street to improve connectivity and support sustainable growth on the peninsula by providing a reliable link to London and an interchange option at Gravesend to link to locations across Medway. Proposals were presented on the principal works needed to deliver this, including electrification and dualling of the line at Hoo Junction and Cooling St plus a new terminal station east of Hoo.

All these key areas were presented for consultation in Round 1 with detail presented on how these elements would be taken forward. On the basis of this level of information provided, questions were appropriately numerous and detailed in their nature. Please see below table which outlines how these important elements of the rail proposals were translated into topics for consultation and specific questions for Round 1.

| Topics presented  | 22 questions posed*  |
|---|--|
| <b>Reinstated passenger service on the Grain branch line</b> - link to London and an interchange option at Gravesend to link to locations across Medway (through electrification)                                       | Passenger rail services (5 questions): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance to consultee and local area</li> <li>• Likely usage of London or wider Kent link services</li> <li>• Benefits and concerns</li> </ul> |
| <b>New station south of Sharnal Street</b> - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design features e.g., barn style option 1; airship heritage option 2;</li> <li>• Access features (location referenced)</li> </ul> | New railway station (4 questions): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance of key design/ access features</li> <li>• Design reflecting local character</li> </ul>  |

| Topics presented  | 22 questions posed*  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel to and from station</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Passing loops</b> – installation of new sections of dual track to allow trains to pass each other and manage interface between passenger and freight services; Hoo Junction and Cooling St proposed for line dualling and a new terminal station east of Hoo</p>  | <p>Railway passing loops (2 questions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about construction of proposed passing loops</li> <li>• Other considerations</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Level crossings</b> – segregation of existing footpath and vehicular crossings to respond to electrification safety requirements i.e. bridges or diversion of route to an existing crossing</p>   | <p>Crossings (9 questions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of crossings</li> <li>• Comments on proposed changes to seven crossings</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Construction methods and general</b> - station constructed entirely offline using prefabricated parts, with all works compounds located within the station footprint and surrounding land; some works impacting on the existing freight services on the line.</p> | <p>Potential effects of railway proposals and construction (2 questions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Views on construction and impacts on residents, environment, and others</li> <li>• Other effects of rail proposals</li> </ul> |

*\* For every qualitative question asked, there was the opportunity to provide related quantitative clarifications, further comment/ suggestions or to assign a sentiment to their response.*

### Feedback Received

4.1 **Rail Services:** respondents were asked about the importance of the re-introduction of rail services to the Hoo Peninsula, the likelihood of using the service, the

perceived benefits, and concerns about the re-introduction of services. Lastly, respondents were asked about any other considerations that should be made.

#### 4.2 **Key Findings:**

- Respondents were more likely to agree that the re-introduction of passenger rail services was important for the area, than agree it was important to them.
- More than half of respondents stated they were unlikely to or wouldn't use the passenger rail service to travel to both London stations or stations on the Kent network, such as Gravesend.
- The most frequently cited benefit of re-introducing passenger rail services was to 'ensure the local area is well connected and accessible'.
- The greatest concern of respondents regarding re-introducing passenger rail services on the Hoo Peninsula was the 'increased traffic travelling to the station'.
- Other suggested considerations made by respondents regarding the re-introduction of a passenger rail service on the Hoo Peninsula were most likely to include:
  - it is not necessary / a waste of money / would not be used
  - alternative suggestions (see HIF Consultation Response Analysis' report for these)
  - issues with the train service
  - the environmental impact

#### 4.3 **Statistics (quantitative):**

- 25% agreed that the re-introduction of passenger rail services to the Hoo Peninsula was important to them and 45% disagreed

- 37% agreed that the re-introduction of passenger rail services to the Hoo Peninsula was important to the local area and 36% disagreed
- 22% said they were likely to use the London service, 29% were unlikely to use the service and 30% wouldn't use this service
- 19% said they were likely to use the service to travel on the Kent network, 31% were unlikely to use the service and 29% wouldn't use this service
- Most frequently selected benefits (from a pre-determined list) of re-introducing passenger rail services to the Hoo Peninsula were:
  - 'ensure the local area is well connected and accessible' (39%)
  - 'reduce reliance on cars' (36%)
  - 'improve local public transport' (36%)
- Most common concerns (from a pre-determined list) about re-introducing passenger rail services to the Hoo Peninsula, were:
  - 'increased traffic travelling to the station' (57%)
  - 'the environmental impact of re-introducing services' (51%)
  - 'cost of services' (50%)

4.4 **Railway Station:** respondents were asked how important or unimportant several issues were regarding the new railway station, covering: appearance, landscaping, public open space, car parking and drop off points, secure cycle parking, and connections / links to bus services, cycle paths and footpaths.

4.5 **Key Findings (qualitative):**

Respondents felt it was important:

- for the appearance of the station to reflect the character, identity, and heritage of the area
- that the station was landscaped to blend in with the local environment

- there was car parking and drop off available on site
- there was secure cycle parking available on site
- there were good connections to local bus services
- there were good links to local cycle paths
- there were good links to local footpaths
- that 'farming/agricultural heritage' best reflected the local character of the area
- When asked how they would travel to the station, the most frequently cited form of transport was 'car'
- Respondents felt it was not important that the station was provided with a public open space to create a 'station place' or Plaza
- Further considerations raised by respondents regarding the proposed new railway station were most likely to include:
  - do not build a new station / will not use a new station
  - parking issues
  - environmental impact

#### 4.6 **Statistics (quantitative):**

Asked about the proposed new station:

- 59% felt it was important that the station was landscaped to blend in with the local environment
- 57% said it was important there was car parking and drop off available on site
- 56% wanted to see good connections to local bus services, although only 16% said they would consider travelling to the station by bus
- 43% felt that it was not important that the station was provided with a public open space to create a 'station place' or Plaza – 28% felt it was important

- 52% felt that it was important there was secure cycle parking available on site – 19% of respondents felt it was not important
- 50% felt that it was important there were good links to local cycle paths - 21% felt it was not important
- 54% felt that it was important there were good links to local footpaths - 17% of respondents felt it was not important.

4.7 **Passing Loops**: respondents were asked about their concerns about construction of the passing loops and any other considerations that need to be made.

4.8 **Key Findings:**

- The greatest concern of respondents regarding the construction of the proposed passing loops was the ‘the environmental impact of construction’ on the area.
- Further considerations raised by respondents about the construction of the passing loops were most likely to include:
  - environmental impact
  - impact on existing residents
  - an objection to the railway

4.9 **Railway Crossings**: Respondents were asked about their use of crossings and if there were any further considerations that should be made.

4.10 **Key Findings:**

- Two thirds of respondents ‘don’t use any of these crossings’.
- Only 4% of respondents wanted to make any further comments about crossings.

- The suggested consideration most likely to be raised by respondents regarding changes to the crossings was the environmental impact.

4.11 **Managing potential effects of the proposals:** respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with several issues regarding the potential effects of the construction works associated with the railway proposals, asking whether the proposals to manage construction works would help to achieve the following:

- minimise the impact on local residents
- minimise the impact on the environment
- minimise the impact on users of public rights of way

4.12 **Key Findings:**

- Over a third of respondents disagreed that the proposals to manage construction works would help to minimise the impact on local residents.
- Almost two fifths of respondents disagreed that the proposals to manage construction works would help to minimise the impact on the environment.
- Over a third of respondents disagreed that the proposals to manage construction works would help to minimise the impact on users of public rights of way.
- Further considerations raised by respondents about managing the potential effects of the railway proposals were most likely to include:
  - concerns about over/further development,
  - impact on existing residents
  - environmental impact

4.13 **Statistics (quantitative):**

Asked about managing potential effects:



- 34% disagreed that the proposals to manage construction works would help to minimise the impact on local residents and 23% agreed that they would - 23% neither agreed nor disagreed
- 37% disagreed that the proposals to manage construction works would help to minimise the impact on the environment and 21% agreed that they would - 22% neither agreed nor disagreed
- 35% disagreed that the proposals to manage construction works would help to minimise the impact on users of public rights of way (e.g., pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders) and 21% agreed that they would – 24% neither agreed nor disagreed

## Round 2 - Rail

### Topics for consultation

- 4.14 For Round 2, the team wanted feedback on specific changes to the proposals (from Round 1), based on the same topic areas presented previously. On the basis that many options had been tested by this stage, and preferred solutions developed, the approach was to keep questions open and general – as previously explained in 2.67-2.70.
- 4.15 The proposed changes to each topic area, as presented for Round 2 consultation, are outlined in the table below. Consultees were invited to provide “*specific comments about the REVISIONS presented*”.

| <b>Topics presented for consultation</b>   |
|--|
| <p><b>The station:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barn style architecture being taken forward along with a simplified external design</li> </ul> |

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Topics presented for consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing consideration of rail access road – potential works to Stoke Road roundabout and potential route change not ruled out</li> <li>• Access amends – drop off bays and cycle storage</li> <li>• Additional stations at Cliffe and Church St ruled out</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Level Crossings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kings, Church Street and Wybournes Farm Crossings – existing to be retained with upgrading features/ solutions</li> <li>• Whitehall / Stoke Rd / Creek Crossings – changes now discounted from the scheme</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Passing loops/ places:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hoo Junction - limited to between Canal Road and Cliffe</li> <li>• Cooling Street - moved 650 metres west to avoid foot of an existing incline</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Service provision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DC Electrification discounted and a new option being explored</li> <li>• Switch to a link service</li> </ul>  |

### Feedback received

- 4.16 The following tables outline the key themes raised across feedback forms (online or paper copy), pro formas (description below), and email/ letter representations (stakeholder and public). These are arranged by sentiment as already referenced.

### *Questionnaire Results*

- 4.17 For reasons already outlined, the questionnaire asked only qualitative questions for Round 2 consultation. The responses to these questions were compiled, coded\* and themed as per the below.

*\*For information about how the coding process was undertaken for Round 2, please see Appendix 34.*

- 4.18 **Question: Do you have any general comments about the REVISIONS to the rail proposals presented?**

| Sentiment                  | Key comments  |
|----------------------------|---|
| Positive                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supportive of revisions to rail proposals and the rail link - a positive addition to the local infrastructure</li> <li>• Improvement and increasing viable public transport</li> <li>• Will help to ease road traffic / provide alternatives to private vehicle use</li> <li>• Supportive of use of rail and river to move materials</li> </ul>  |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No direct link to Medway or London</li> <li>• Service provision not supported – few people will catch a train to change at Gravesend to travel to Medway or London</li> <li>• Station location is not convenient – so little impact on encouraging use of train service/modal shift</li> <li>• Not viable/ negative of cost of proposals</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services: concerns with links to Gravesend</li> <li>• Viability</li> <li>• Services: concerns with lack of link to Strood and to Medway towns</li> <li>• Station location and service means people will still drive</li> </ul>   |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow horses to use crossings near bridleways</li> <li>• Link system to Gravesend not attractive, direct services to Medway/London would be better / used more / help cut traffic</li> <li>• Access – public transport should be accessible and value for money</li> <li>• Design – retain existing mature trees and woodland</li> <li>• Flexibility needed to consider future growth, freight use, passenger use, and electrification</li> <li>• Transport – bus services should be accessible and used more in Hoo to reduce reliance on cars</li> </ul> |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail service options</li> <li>• Timetable for the trains, fares, and services</li> <li>• Poor access and connectivity to the local area</li> <li>• Costs and viability</li> </ul>  |

4.19 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the REVISIONS presented on station surroundings?**

| Sentiment                  | Key comments   |
|----------------------------|--|
| Positive                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None to report</li> </ul>   |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals are not viable</li> </ul>   |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns with station location</li> </ul>   |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access – road should follow the existing Ropers Green Lane</li> <li>• Green infrastructure design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ include multiple trees / new landscaping</li> <li>➤ include trees and/or statues in roundabouts</li> <li>➤ retain existing mature trees and woodland</li> </ul> </li> <li>• needs a large car park</li> </ul> |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why the loop line has been removed</li> <li>• Where the road will be positioned</li> <li>• Access to the proposed station</li> </ul>  |

4.20 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the REVISIONS presented on Kings Crossing?**

| Sentiment   | Key comments  |
|-------------|---|
| Positive    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None to report</li> </ul>  |
| Negative    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of the line will be low demand</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that low-lying route will be susceptible to flooding</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of the line will be so low that two lines wide with the same arrangements for pedestrian safety as at Church Street should suffice</li> <li>• Footpath needs to be clean and dry and all-weather route</li> <li>• Proposals need to avoid or fully mitigate impacts to designated sites</li> <li>• New bridges that are proposed should be built to allow two rail running along the whole length of the line</li> </ul> |

| Sentiment                  | Key comments   |
|----------------------------|--|
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None to report</li> </ul> |

4.21 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the REVISIONS presented on Church Street Crossings?**

| Sentiment                  | Key comments  |
|----------------------------|---|
| Positive                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals seem reasonable and practical</li> </ul>   |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None to report</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None to report</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New bridges that are proposed should be built to allow two rail running along the whole length of the line.</li> </ul> |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None to report</li> </ul>  |

4.22 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the REVISIONS presented on Wybournes Farm and High Halstow Restricted Byway?**

| Sentiment   | Key comments  |
|-------------|---|
| Positive    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of a barrier is better than building a bridge and the costs associated with it.</li> </ul>   |
| Negative    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inconvenience to local people</li> </ul>   |
| Concerns    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Footpath – impact on privacy</li> <li>Disruption to the area</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crossing and its links to other byways should be horse-friendly</li> <li>Footpath is close to properties, could impact resident's privacy</li> </ul> |

| Sentiment                  | Key comments   |
|----------------------------|--|
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None to report</li> </ul> |

4.23 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the REVISIONS presented on Solomons Crossing?**

| Sentiment                  | Key comments  |
|----------------------------|---|
| Positive                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None to report</li> </ul>  |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Footpath proposed on one road with no pavement provision</li> <li>Footpath proposed where there is poor visibility for walkers</li> <li>Footpath location is where ground is wet so will create a 'bog'</li> </ul> |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dangerous – concern with safety of the proposals</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New bridges that are proposed should be built to allow two rail running along the whole length of the line.</li> <li>Revise the plans due to location/access points/ safety</li> </ul>                             |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None to report</li> </ul>  |

4.24 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the REVISIONS presented on Whitehall Bridleway, Stoke Road Crossing and Creek Crossing?**

| Sentiment   | Key comments   |
|-------------|--|
| Positive    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None to report</li> </ul> |
| Negative    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None to report</li> </ul> |
| Concerns    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None to report</li> </ul> |
| Suggestions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None to report</li> </ul> |

| Sentiment                  | Key comments   |
|----------------------------|--|
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None to report</li> </ul> |

4.25 **Question: Do you have any specific comments on the passing places/ loop of: Hoo Junction?**

| Sentiment                  | Key comments   |
|----------------------------|--|
| Positive                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None to report</li> </ul>   |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of loss of Medway loop line</li> <li>• Viability</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viability</li> <li>• Access points</li> <li>• Loss of the loop line to Medway</li> <li>• Habitat loss</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Future works/timetabling/ and operational should be flexible/ not impact the Hoo Branch line which serves Cliffe Rail sidings, and the marine sand and gravel works, as well as passenger trains</li> </ul> |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why the loop line has been removed</li> <li>• Have costs allowed for embankment reinforcement?</li> <li>• General signaling arrangements in the area</li> </ul>   |

4.26 **Question: Do you have any specific comments on the passing places/ loop of: Cooling St?**

| Sentiment | Key comments   |
|-----------|--|
| Positive  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None to report</li> </ul>   |
| Negative  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the work was purely for investment/profit</li> <li>• Loop location not able to support freight trains being located at the bottom of cooling bank.</li> </ul> |
| Concerns  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None to report</li> </ul>   |

| Sentiment                  | Key comments   |
|----------------------------|--|
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise the location of the new railway infrastructure to maximise opportunities for local area/better timetables</li> </ul> |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Length of the loop</li> <li>Length of the trains that are able to be stood on each of the lines</li> </ul>                  |

4.27 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the REVISIONS presented on service provision?**

| Sentiment                  | Key comments   |
|----------------------------|--|
| Positive                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General positive/supportive</li> </ul>  |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service provisions are not useful for passengers - the bus service is quicker to get to Medway towns</li> <li>No direct link to London is not beneficial</li> <li>Unnecessary/unwanted</li> </ul>   |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs of the proposals</li> <li>Train timetables / won't suit passengers</li> </ul>   |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service provision needs a regular main line to London/link to London so it will be used more</li> <li>Services into Medway e.g., Strood would better help Medway's future and residents and traffic flows</li> <li>Services should include direct links to high-speed services</li> <li>Third rail line should be considered</li> </ul> |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service provision / timetables / number of trains per day</li> <li>Viability: costs involved in modifications to other stations and costs involving battery operated trains</li> </ul>  |

*Pro forma (round 2 feedback)*

4.28 In relation to this consultation, by 'pro forma', we mean a representation with one particular viewpoint that is duplicated and submitted by multiple parties with the wording identical in each submission.



- 4.29 In the case of rail, the same representation was submitted by 112 different parties. A copy of the rail pro forma is provided in Appendix 35 and a summary of the key themes from this are provided below.

| <b>Key themes</b>   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the plans are flawed / no confidence in them</li> <li>• Slow trains will limit interest/not be attractive to users</li> <li>• Timetable information is needed</li> <li>• Concerns on costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Concern that the Council will be required to cover the maintenance costs of the rolling stock up to 2025</li> <li>➤ Budget overspend</li> <li>➤ Viability concerns / council yet to publish the full evaluation of costs/ timetable of works</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

*Stakeholder representations (email/ letter)*

- 4.30 The Future Hoo team received 32 stakeholder representations for the HIF consultation from either technical (e.g., statutory or rail/ highways/ SEMS specific) or political (party representations or individual politicians) consultees via email/letter. For rail, these were coded into themes shown below against sentiment.
- 4.31 A full list of stakeholders who submitted representations in round 1 and round 2 is provided in Appendix 36.

| <b>Sentiment</b> | <b>Key comments</b>   |
|------------------|---|
| Positive         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome future introduction of DC electrification</li> <li>• More information regarding costs of third rail DC electrification for future consideration</li> <li>• Proposals for Wybournes Crossing and Solomons Crossing offer the best options for the PROW that cross them and have taken all users into account</li> <li>• Likes revised proposals and associated benefits</li> <li>• Positive about removal of the proposed bridge</li> </ul> |
| Negative         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant development in rail proposals, specifically in design</li> <li>• Service is limited and not beneficial for modal shift away from driving</li> </ul>   |

| Sentiment                  | Key comments  |
|----------------------------|---|
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns with HIF resources, funding, and costs for rail proposals</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestion                 | <p>Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome further conversations with the council regarding station design and surrounding context connection</li> <li>Ensure heritage of area is considered crop and soil marks in barn style design</li> <li>Engage regarding car park proposals</li> </ul> <p>Service &amp; station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service provision and timetable suggestions</li> <li>Suggestions on service routes</li> <li>Impact on station congestion</li> <li>Reintroducing the Medway rail curve</li> <li>Construct the station at Cooling Street</li> </ul> <p>Electrification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DC electrification would be welcomed in the future/should be made a priority</li> <li>Request assurance that the influx passengers seeking to change trains can be accommodated with the current physical layout of Gravesend station</li> <li>Seek assurance from any potential implications for Higham Station that might arise from rail heading</li> </ul> <p>PRoW and access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Involve KCC to ensure user safety at crossing and access points</li> </ul> |
| More information requested | <p>Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarifications regarding option one - link service between Sharnal Street and Gravesend</li> <li>Clarifications regarding option three - link service between Sharnal Street, Gravesend and Ebbsfleet</li> <li>Costed figures for the Northfleet Station alterations and the buying/leasing of bi-modal rolling stock/converting of existing rolling stock to bi-modal vs the costed figures for DC electrification of the branch line from Hoo Junction to Hoo Station</li> <li>Seeking assurance that the reversal of trains is not detrimental to existing passenger and freight services and their reliability</li> <li>Provide operating costs</li> <li>How the solutions on offer fit in with timetabling of services to London, Maidstone, and the coast</li> </ul>  |

| Sentiment | Key comments  |
|-----------|---|
|           | <p>Sharnal Street Station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EV charging points for cars, taxis, and electric buses</li> <li>• Access arrangements for the communities around Cliffe, Grain and Allhallows</li> <li>• Seeking assurance that the influx of passengers seeking to change trains can be accommodated with the current physical layout of Gravesend station</li> <li>• Further detail of cycle parking storage design and capacity</li> </ul> <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity needed on extent of proposed land acquisition</li> <li>• Regarding Wybournes and Solomons crossing, what improvements will be made, who will make the improvements and what is the legal status as a byway open to all traffic?</li> <li>• Request for continued engagement with the Future Hoo rail team</li> <li>• Potential implications for Higham Station that might arise from rail heading</li> </ul> <p>The “Curve”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will Medway Council pursue the provision of the “curve” and link to Strood station ASAP?</li> </ul> <p>Construction and operation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction materials from sustainable sources</li> <li>• Carbon neutral objectives for the rail infrastructure</li> <li>• Capacity at stations outside Medway</li> <li>• Deliverability of this by 2025</li> <li>• Indicative cost for the construction of the shunting platform plus the buying/leasing of bi-modal rolling stock and the cost of conversion of existing rolling stock to bi-modal operation</li> <li>• Funding of the station in Gravesham vs arguments on connection of the peninsula with the Medway Towns via the Higham Curve</li> </ul> |

*Public representations (email)*

- 4.32 The team received representations to Round 2 consultation from the public via email in the form of 26 unique consultee submissions. These were coded into themes and whilst there are no positive, suggestions, or concerns to report, the main comment

was for more information on the access to the station, and whether the station would be manned or fully automated.

#### 4.33 Response to Issues Raised

4.34 The table below sets out the Future Hoo team's response to these issues and all other themes that have been drawn out from the feedback received across both consultations.

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Service and Operations</b>   |  |  |
| Public, Parish Councils, Political Groups, Kelly Tolhurst MP, Gravesham Council | <p>Various opinions expressed on the different service provision suggestions that were put forward in the consultation documentation with no common choice; in respect of the type of trains to be used, the station calling points and whether electrification would take place.</p> <p>All responses sought for services to be provided to London <u>and</u> the Medway towns and considered that a shuttle service would be insufficient.</p> | <p>The proposal being brought forward is a two-car (with capacity for four-car), once an hour, shuttle service from Sharnal Street to Gravesend, with the construction of a crossover at Gravesend Station; and with a station with passive provision for extended services if they are later brought forward.</p> <p>This proposal is chosen after careful consideration of a number of technical and financial factors because it provides the most cost-effective solution.</p> <p>The proposed service represents a starter service from day one that can expand as ridership increases. To encourage modal shift there needs to be an attractive integrated service that provides a real alternative to the car. Linking directly to Gravesend gives passengers access to the highspeed network into London and out into Kent as well as local trains into the Medway towns.</p> <p>Other options were considered including the creation of a dedicated</p> |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|--------------|---|
|              |              | <p>platform at Northfleet, which combined with proposed improvements to Ebbsfleet/Northfleet would have given increased access to the Highspeed network as well as the access afforded at Gravesend. However this was a costly option that provided little additional benefit.</p> <p>A direct link to Higham and on to the Medway towns was also considered but a combination of technical, financial, and operational issues made this option non-viable.</p> <p>Whilst timetabling a direct service to London is possible this would have required significant additional funding to either electrify the line or upgrade the existing rolling stock to battery operation. It was deemed that the investment required for that option was disproportionately high and could not be justified on the passenger service alone. It was determined that a smaller two or four car set would cope with initial passenger demand and the rolling stock was commercially available and due to start operation on main line service. The use of a Diesel-powered shuttle was discounted for a number of reasons including the project aim to support decarbonisation.</p> <p>The Future Hoo team will be working with Gravesham Council to consider the impacts on this proposal on the potential future development of Crossrail, but it is considered unlikely that the HIF proposals would prevent Crossrail related expansion.</p> |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|--|---|
|              |  | No proposals are therefore being brought forward at other stations or at Slade Green Depot.   |
|              | Concerned that diesel trains are not to be used as part of the passenger service.                                    | Further to the summary of the proposal above, diesel trains are not proposed to be utilised for the passenger service.  |
|              | Queried why the Higham Curve, and consequentially services to the Medway Towns, are no longer being brought forward. | <p>At the concept stage linking housing and employment on the Peninsular and in the Medway, towns were seen as a desirable outcome and was thoroughly investigated. However there were a number of technical, financial, and operational issues that could not be easily overcome, and the curve was removed from the active design with only passive provision being considered.</p> <p>Future changes to both the passenger and freight services on the line may justify the curve being reconsidered and hence the design seeks to preserve that opportunity.</p> <p>One of the principal issues is that the curve would, by necessity, pass through a section of the RAMSAR or would require significant areas of Higham to be cleared for an alternative route. This was not deemed acceptable.</p> <p>A number of alignments were considered, and it was determined that a second crossing over Canal Road would be required. This would impose a height limit of the vehicles that could access Hoo Depot by road. The additional embankments to support the track would be in either the SSSI and/or the RAMSAR areas and a flood plain. To accommodate freight traffic would</p> |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|--|---|
|              |  | <p>require additional track length further adding to the cost and if a shorter curve was implemented that did not support freight the freight operator and Network Rail would likely not support the proposal because it would have prevented any future scheme from providing a freight connection that placed trains into the less congested section of the network in Kent rather than the heavily congested routes through London.</p> <p>Providing a shuttle service to Gravesend was deemed to provide the best option that would not compromise future expansion of passenger or freight services.</p> |
|              | <p>Expressed a desire for the Council to make public the timetabling, demand modelling, and cost estimates that have been produced for each option that has been considered to date and on which the chosen option has been determined.</p>  | <p>An appropriate level of Information required for TWAO in respect of these matters will be submitted to the SoS for the determination of the application.</p>   |
| Public       | <p>Suggested that the patronage of the new link would not be high enough to make the service viable (as more than half of respondents stated that they wouldn't use the passenger rail service to travel to both London stations or stations on the Kent network, such as Gravesend)</p> | <p>Demand modelling demonstrates that the service will be profitable and will not require an ongoing subsidy.</p>   |
| Public       | <p>Suggested that the rail scheme is fundamentally unviable and unlikely to be delivered on time or on budget and that further information is required to demonstrate that this is not the</p>   | <p>The operational subsidy is needed to make the initial service affordable to the passenger before it becomes self-sustaining and moves into profit. Without the subsidy to start the service operationally there would be no modal</p>  |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|--|---|
|              | <p>case. Noted that the Council has previously recognised the need for an operational subsidy which demonstrates this is the case.</p>   | <p>shift to rail on the peninsular and the already congested road network would soon exceed capacity. The capital cost of further road improvements would exceed the level of subsidy required and in that sense the subsidy should be seen as a good value for money.</p> <p>Critically the rail proposal should not be considered in isolation but as an addition to the road improvements. By creating a transport hub with good bus and cycle access at the station fewer car journeys will be generated by the development.</p> <p>At every stage in the project development there has been consideration of the project's viability both in terms of the capital expenditure and the operational costs. The project is viable and has been tailored to deliver the best value for money and the best service possible for the passenger within the technical and budgetary constraints.</p> |
| Public       | <p>Suggested that there will need to be a reduction/restriction in train speeds when travelling adjacent to the Ramsar, SPA and SSSI designated sites due to the greater risk of wildlife mortality; and that this could have a major impact on the attractiveness of the service,</p> | <p>This is a project specific consideration, not a requirement. Line speeds will not be reduced in the RAMSAR / SSSI area for this project as it is a wetland site for wintering birds.</p>   |
| Public       | <p>Quoted Council's consultants as saying that the scheme will have a high impact on nightingales, as areas of suitable habitat for this species will be lost, and that the scheme poses several areas of complexity, risk and sensitivity</p>   | <p>These statements were a high-level overview of constraints. Additional Nightingale surveys have been undertaken to inform the development of the scheme design. An assessment of the potential impacts upon Nightingales and the requirement for</p>   |



| Consultee(s)                              | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|---|---|--|
|   | concerning operations, sustainability, safety, and ecology.   | mitigation measures will be detailed within the Ecological Impact Assessment, which will be submitted as part of the TWAO application  |
| Medway Liberal Democrats                  | Suggested that the road proposals are scrapped and replaced with an all-encompassing rail service serving the Medway Towns and London with stations at Cooling Street Loop, Hoo, Middle Stoke and Grain Industrial Zone, with other locations, especially Allhallows. | <p>The proposed capacity improvements to existing Highway Infrastructure and the additional relief road/connection to the A289 with active travel elements, all contribute to ensuring sustainable development on the peninsula for both future housing and employment.</p> <p>Without the delivery of HIF highway interventions, future housing development will likely stagnate and piece-meal improvements to the highway network under Section 106 developer contributions will not, on their own, be able to provide the uplift required to infrastructure.</p> |
| Gravesham Council                         | Requested assurance that the influx passengers seeking to change trains can be accommodated with the current physical layout of Gravesend station   | Initial modelling shows that this will be accommodated. As the service uptake increases, this will be integrated with the North Kent services.   |
| Gravesham Council                         | Sought assurance that the reversal of trains is not detrimental to existing passenger and freight services and their reliability  | The team have undertaken modelling on this, and modelling shows that this does not clash   |
| <b>Station and Construction</b>           |   |  |
| Public, Parish Councils, Political Groups | Differing views were expressed as to the proposed design for the station – some agreed, others disagreed.   | The barn style design is in keeping with the local heritage environment; and was chosen following consultation and engagement.   |

| Consultee(s)                        | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                     |   | It should also be noted that there are a number of technical difficulties with building the station on the existing line rather than off it as currently proposed. Perhaps the most challenging is the gradient of the line which at 1:150 is too steep for a station. To flatten the main line to accommodate a station would be both costly and disruptive. The track layout currently proposed does allow, passively, for a future loop to connect back to the main line allowing for a service extending beyond the station |
| Medway Labour and Cooperative Group | Emphasised the need for construction materials to be derived from sustainable sources and that rail construction should have carbon neutral objectives. | Construction traffic routing will be finalised through the production of a construction traffic management plan. An outline of this will be submitted with the planning application. The Future Hoo team will be seeking to maximise deliveries by rail wherever practicable and to minimise the use of embodied carbon.  |
| Public                              | Queried whether the station will be fully manned or automated.  | It currently expected that the station will be manned.  |
| Public                              | Concerned that the station location is too remote and too far to walk, thus encouraging car use; and that crossings to access it may be dangerous.      | The station location needs to be close to the Grain line to be viable, and the location chosen was found to be the best overall solution. The location is also constrained by the presence of gas mains north and south of Ratcliffe highway & Sharnal St. The HIF proposals will include safe crossing places of the nearest public highways for active travel, not just pedestrians.  |
| Public                              | Concerned about increased traffic travelling to the station as a result of the proposals.   | The TWAO application for rail will include an assessment of the traffic movements associated with the rail station. However, it can be confirmed that the HIF highways proposals have   |

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | been developed to account for these movements.   |
| Public, CPRE Kent   | Concerned that the station is located on best and most versatile agricultural land (grade 1).   | <p>Provisional Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) data from the 1970s for the Grain Branch Reopening shows that at the station and access road, it is ALC Grade 2 ('best and most versatile' – BMV). Of the rail line between Hoo Junction and the proposed station, approximately 3km is surrounded by ALC Grade 4 land ('poor' quality soils, not BMV) and the remaining approximately 8km is surrounded by ALC Grade 2 land.</p> <p>As an existing rail line, there would be minimal permanent landtake for the improvement works, mainly focused on the station and station access road. More recent surveys in nearby areas shows that the indicated Grade 2 soils are a mix of grades, from Grade 2 (BMV) to Grade 3b (not BMV). Temporary construction landtake would seek to firstly avoid impacts on soils, but secondly to store soils in accordance with 'best practice' guidelines and minimise degradation of quality.</p> <p>Also, works at Hoo Junction would be on previously developed land (non-agricultural).</p> |
| Natural England, CPRE Kent, Public, Medway Labour and Cooperative Group | Concerned that there is insufficient information about the green and sustainable transport infrastructure (buses, EV charging points) to be provided in the vicinity and that this should be developed as part of an integrated strategy. | The station will have car parking sufficient for modelled demand. It will be integrated with cycling/walking and bus service provision as seen in the previous consultations on the Hoo Development Framework; which forms the basis of the Council's on-going work on that document. It is the Council's aspiration that the station becomes an   |

| Consultee(s)         | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|----------------------|---|---|
|                      |   | <p>active and sustainable travel hub for the Peninsula.</p> <p>It is the general aspiration that Medway's approach to public EV charging provision will extend to the station car park. Whilst it is expected that new build housing will include for EV charging provision, inclusion of additional charging at the station would assist existing peninsular residents who may not have access to a charging point. Consideration will be given to average expected stays in the car park with an appropriate mix of slow and fast chargers. This is a developing strategy that is still to be finalised.</p> <p>As a transport hub the station will have bus and cycle links with both the new and existing development and the employment areas on the peninsular.</p> |
| CPRE Kent            | Concern that car parking and associated movements could lead to impacts to designated sites.  | The Council's assessment work will consider the impacts from car parking to designated sites and this will be provided in the planning application.   |
| Church Commissioners | Expressed continued commitment to work with the Council on station, car parking, cycle parking and station 'plaza'. Indicated that further information and detailed discussions are required. | The Council is engaging closely with the Church Commissioners and is developing the Hoo Development Framework to guide the future of the station and its surrounds.   |
| Public               | Concerned about flooding in the area - potential flooding caused by station construction where there is now open grass area and fields.   | The proposed station is not in a flood risk area and the run-off from the railway and the station area will be limited to green field run-off so as not to exacerbate existing flooding problems.   |
| Public               | Noise and Ecological impacts need to be considered in the development of the overall  | All aspects of construction and operation will be assessed in the noise   |

| Consultee(s)                                   | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--|--|--|
|  | proposals for both the construction and operational phases.  | and ecological assessments in the EIA and HRA.   |
| Public, Woodland Trust                         | The station area should have existing mature trees and woodland retained and new landscaping provided where appropriate and any roundabouts provided to be planted with trees or a statue. | <p>Existing mature trees around the station area will be retained where possible. Where these cannot be kept, this will need to be mitigated.</p> <p>The proposal does include trees in both the plaza and the car park. As the design develops, the number of trees may increase. There is not proposed to be any roundabouts in the vicinity of the station area.</p> <p>The TWAO application will be accompanied by a Landscaping Plan setting out the approach, including tree proposals/ retention for the station.</p> |
| Public   | Concern that further information as to how the station will be accessed was not included in the consultation materials.  | The second round of consultation made clear that access would be taken from Stoke Road roundabout but did not set out its detailed design. That was considered sufficient for the general public to understand the outline of our overall proposals and comment accordingly. The developed design of the junction, which is constrained by the physical and environmental constraints of that location, is being shared in June through engagement with residents and stakeholders in the vicinity of the junction.          |
| Public   | Suggested that the station access road should be along the route of the Ropers Green Lane as the shortest, most direct, option.  | This option was considered but not taken forward, for the reasons set out in the Road Design Development Report.   |
| Public, Findsbury Extra Parish Council, Medway | Suggested that stations should be built at Cliffe Woods and Cooling Street.  | The loop's purpose would be to hold a freight train to allow the unimpeded passage of the passenger train.   |

| Consultee(s)                  | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Liberal Democrats             |   | Introducing a stop at Cooling Street would create considerable difficulties for timetabling under the current circumstances. In future iterations of the timetable, once the passenger service is established the opportunity for additional stations on the line can be revisited. Furthermore, the inclusion of a station would then require another loop for freight to pass. |
| Public, Higham Parish Council | Concerned about the construction traffic impacts to/from Hoo Junction Depot and accessing Church Street crossing and Cooling Street passing place. Suggested any road traffic to be directed to use the Lower Rochester Road as the access route with penalties for those who decide to use alternative routes. | Construction traffic routing will be finalised through the production of a construction traffic management plan, an outline of which will be submitted with the planning application. The Future Hoo team will be seeking to maximise deliveries rail wherever practicable.  |
| <b>Crossings</b>              |   |  |
| Public                        | General: Queried why improvements to crossings are needed.  | The crossings need to be improved to ensure the safety of both pedestrians and passengers with the revised service.  |
| Kent County Council           | Queried who will make the improvements to Wybournes and Solomons Crossing, what are the improvements, and what the legal status as a byway open to all traffic will be.   | The improvement are: Wybournes will be barriered, and Solomons will be diverted over the existing bridge. This will be carried out by Medway Council, working with Network Rail. The TWAO will set out the proposed legal status of all PRoWs affected by the Scheme.  |
| Public                        | Solomons Crossing: Footpath proposed on one road with no pavement provision and where there is poor visibility for walkers.   | The proposed diversion is only on the northern side and, as a result, no longer has this issue.  |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--|---|--|
| Kent County Council, Gravesham Council   | General: Emphasised the need for crossing and passing place proposals to account for identified heritage designations in the vicinity and to account for impacts from removing trees.   | These designations will be considered, and impact assesses in the EIA.   |
| Natural England, Shorne Parish Council, Higham Parish Council, Gravesham Council | Church Street Crossing: Supported the proposals presented, noting that they will not impact on designated sites.  | This support is welcomed.  |
| Kent County Council  | Church Street and Kings Crossing: Emphasised that they are the managers of the PRoWs affected by the crossing proposals and the Commons Authority for the common land affected and so should be consulted on the on-going development of the proposals. | The Future Hoo team has been, and will continue to, engage with Kent County Council on these matters.          |
| RPSB   | Church Street and Kings Crossing: Concerned to understand the impacts of these proposals on their landholdings.   | The Future Hoo team will engage with RPSB to explain these impacts.  |
| Higham Parish Council, Gravesham Council   | Kings Crossing: Supported the proposals presented.  | This support is welcomed.  |
| Natural England  | Kings Crossing: Need to ensure that the proposals do not cause negative impacts to the South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI and the Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar site.  | No impacts are anticipated. The Future Hoo Team will engage with Natural England in relation to these matters. |
| Shorne Parish Council  | Kings Crossing: Expressed concern that the change here is not required given low line usage   | It is a general aspiration across the network to where possible separate the                                   |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|--|---|
|              | <p>and that the same arrangements for pedestrian safety as at Church Street could be used.</p> <p>Particularly concerned that they were unaware that there was a cattle tunnel but shared use with a footpath does not sound practical - the surface needs to be clean and dry, not covered with animal excrement in a location where it can't be avoided. Concerned that a low-lying route here may be susceptible to flooding, and therefore icing up - it needs to be an all-weather route. The diversion reduces amenity/ambience of the route Unhappy with encroachment on Common and supposedly protected areas.</p> | <p>general public from the possibility of being hit by a train.</p> <p>The "cattle arch" was identified as a likely candidate to enable pedestrians to cross the tracks without incurring a significant detour. There is also the added benefit in that the route to the crossing avoids the boardwalks installed to keep walkers out of the section of the path that floods each winter.</p> <p>The route has been developed in close consultation with the Kent PROW officer to provide the safest and most accessible route possible within the physical constraints of the location.</p> <p>There is limited work that can be done on the common land to improve the footpath and even greater limits on what can be done on the RAMSAR area. However as much improvement to the route as possible will be undertaken in those locations. Between the common land and the RAMSAR where the land is under Network Rail control the footing/path will be improved and the headroom improved as much as possible.</p> <p>A joint visit between the designer and the Kent PROW officer was undertaken on a selected day in winter when the ground was known to likely be in a poor and waterlogged condition. Assessment of the proposal demonstrated that the proposed access would be better than the existing access taking account of both the access to and across the tracks.</p> |
| Public       | Solomons Crossing: Concerned that the diverted footpath on the   | The new route will be formalised to provide an all-weather surface and  |



| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|---|--|--|
|   | north side of the railway lies on very wet land that would become a bog.   | incorporate drainage paths to prevent it being a barrier to drainage.  |
| Public, British Horse Society, Local Access Forum, Medway Public Paths Team | Solomons and Wyborne's Crossing: Concerned that these crossings should be able to be utilised by horse riders.   | Guidance from British Horse Society and Network Rail will be considered in the design. However it should be borne in mind that the warnings (sounds and beacons) at the crossing may prove a challenge for the inexperienced horse and/or rider.   |
| Public  | Wyborne's Crossing: Welcomed that a barrier rather than a new bridge is being suggested. Concerns were raised that the proposals would pass close to Wyborne's cottages; and that it could lead to development surrounding a quiet hamlet.   | Support for the proposals is welcomed. The proposals do not bring users any closer to the cottages than is currently the case. The HIF proposals do not propose development in this area – the proposals are solely to facilitate the increased passenger use of the rail line.  |
| Medway Public Paths Team  | Concerned that Ropers Green Lane has been cited in the consultation as the walking and cycling route to the station but that is currently a very muddy and heavily rutted route, used by equestrians, cyclists, walkers, off road vehicles and farm traffic. Considered that in order to be used as the active travel route to the terminal, it will need a lot of improvement work. | As part of SEMS we are looking at a PROW Improvement project. Ropers Green Lane, from the railway bridge towards High Halstow that forms the Byway is currently part of the feasibility stage, to see if we can improve the current pathway which is heavily rutted by 4WD that are permitted to use the Byway. Further updates on this will be available in early 2023. |
| <b>Passing Places</b>   |  |  |
| Public, Shorne Parish Council, RPSB, Natural England                        | Concerned that it is unclear whether the proposed passing place at Hoo Junction will be within the existing railway boundary or will encroach into the South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI and the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and  | It can be confirmed that all works are proposed to take place within existing Network Rail boundaries and will not encroach into the designated site.<br><br>A great deal of thought was given to the location of the loop and the land that would be affected. It was concluded   |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|--|---|
|              | <p>Ramsar site and cause ecological impacts.</p> <p>Queried why the Loop could not run to the south of the existing line and avoid this designated site.</p> | <p>that by ensuring that the works fell within the existing NR boundary it would cause the least impact. To place the loop on the southern side of the existing track would have required the boundary to have been extended to the south. This would have required land that is currently within designated RAMSAR areas. It was also our understanding that the SPA terminated at the NR boundary fence and therefore the works are not within it</p> |
| Public       | <p>Queried whether the location of the new railway infrastructure maximises opportunities for local area/better timetables</p>                               | <p>The locations of passing places have been chosen to provide maximum flexibility and service growth.</p>  |
| Public       | <p>Concerned that the Hoo Junction passing loop is of insufficient length, based on railway regulations, and will be too expensive to build.</p>             | <p>The length of the passing loop has been agreed with Network Rail and the freight operators and is compliant with Network Rail Standards.</p> <p>All stakeholders have been consulted on the scheme and have accepted the proposed solution</p>   |
| Public       | <p>Queried whether the Cooling Street loop will work if it is located at the bottom of a cooling bank with 2,000 ton plus trains.</p>                        | <p>The location of the loop and gradeability has been carefully considered and this is the most appropriate location.</p>   |
| Public       | <p>Queried whether the cost of embankment reinstatement or reinforcement had been considered.</p>  | <p>These works have been accounted for in scheme budgeting.</p>   |
| Public       | <p>New bridges that are proposed should be built to allow two rail running along the whole length of the line</p>  | <p>There are no new overline bridges</p>  |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--|--|---|
| Higham Parish Council  | <p>Concerned about noise impacts if Canal Road bridge was to be returned to dual use and a siding introduced at Cliffe. Suggested reverting to a double track railway from the North Kent line to at least the existing Brett sidings.</p>   | <p>It can be confirmed that no such works are now proposed.</p> <p>The creation of a twin track section from a second turnout on the North Kent Line through to Cliffe Junction was carefully considered. Creation of the second line would have implications for the North Kent Line and the Hoo Junction depot. There would also be significant cost in integrating the new junction and signals into the existing system.</p> <p>Canal Road Bridge would require significant upgrade works both to the redundant span that would be brought into use and possibly the existing span which shares a central girder with the second span.</p> <p>It was found that all freight and passenger services could be scheduled with a passing loop and signalling on the Hoo line. This is a more cost effective and less disruptive solution and, after consultation with all industry stakeholders, was adopted as the preference to be taken forward.</p> |
| Public, GB Railfreight Limited, and Brett Aggregates Limited | <p>Concerned that the rail proposals are developed such that they do not impact on freight movements. Concerned to understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why the previously proposed works at Cliffe Junction are no longer proposed, as this would give greater flexibility to the co-existence between</li> </ul> | <p>The Future Hoo team is working with all network stakeholders, including freight companies, in developing its physical and timetabling proposals to ensure that freight and passenger services will be able to co-exist.</p> <p>During the study the option to run dual line into Cliffe junction was considered. However the geometry was such that it would require significant realignment of the end of the private siding and was also likely to require the embankment</p>  |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|--|---|
|              | <p>passenger and freight movements; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The length of the loop and what lengths of train are able to be stood on each of the lines, giving the view that the loop needs to be capable of holding a 775 metres long train in each direction and each part of the loop needs to be bi-directionally signalled to provide maximum flexibility</li> </ul> | <p>works to extend beyond the current NR boundary and into the RAMSAR. This option was considered and discounted because it was determined that retaining and motorising the existing single switch combined with the modest signalling changes would provide almost equivalent functionality at a significantly reduced cost. Further, because it did not have any potential impact on the RAMSAR, it was considered to have less associated risk.</p> <p>After consultation with industry stakeholders the loop at Cliffe has been designed to allow the passing of a 775m freight with either another 775m freight or a passenger train.</p> |

### Design Changes – Rail

- 4.35 Across the two rounds of consultation and through ongoing engagement with stakeholders and those with land interests, several key changes were made to the rail proposals. Many of these amendments were in response to stakeholder and public feedback on the proposals presented and have helped to develop the best possible solutions to a challenging project.
- 4.36 The changes made to the rail scheme, following Rounds 1 and 2 consultations, up to the current timeframe of this HIF Consultation Cabinet Report, are outlined below. The team has also provided an explanation as to why these changes were made and how these linked to stakeholder and public feedback. Due to the nature of rail provision, many of these changes related to technical feedback provided by rail related stakeholders and very specific DfT requirements for the scheme.

| Headline topic        | Detail of change   | Why the change/ evolution?   |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Station               | Station design - Station solution to be based upon Barn Style local heritage   | Option preference from consultation. Although a range of views were expressed across both rounds of consultation, the barn style was the preference at Round 1.  |
| Railway passing loops | Eastern end of Cliffe loop   | The freight operator identified an issue with the way they currently operate and how they will have to operate after the works are completed. This was reviewed and a revised signalling scheme developed to reflect their feedback. |
| Crossings             | <u>Kings Crossing</u> – diversion to Church St crossing replaced with diversion to Cattle Arch underpass   | Following concerns raised by Kent CC PRow officer and the public.  |
|                       | <u>Church Street Crossing</u> - The existing vehicular and pedestrian crossings are to be retained rather than a diversion being put in place. The vehicle crossing will remain as existing, and | Following concerns raised by Kent CC PRow officer and the public.  |

| Headline topic | Detail of change  | Why the change/ evolution?   |
|----------------|---|--|
|                | the pedestrian crossing will be upgraded with new safety features   |  |
|                | Wybournes Farm Crossing - The existing pedestrian and vehicular crossing is to be retained and upgraded with new safety features rather than a diversion being put in place | Following concerns raised by Kent CC PRow officer and the public.  |
|                | Solomons crossing – removal of new southern footpath  | <p>A member of the public was concerned that a walker travelling up the new southern footpath would arrive south of the humpback bridge at Dux Court and would need to cross the bridge to travel north. The design expectation was that anyone heading north would use the north footpath and anyone heading south would use the south footpath to avoid the bridge.</p> <p>Consultation with the local landowners revealed a preference that the southern footpath, which passes close to their home, should be closed and all pedestrians diverted over Solomons Farm bridge to use the northern footpath. This was agreed with the Medway PRow officer</p> |

## 5 HIGHWAYS

### Round 1 (Highways)

#### Topics for consultation

- 5.1 This first consultation for highways introduced the six phases of works along a network comprising several key strategic A roads serving Strood and the Hoo Peninsula, namely the A289 and the A228. It also included initial suggestions for how provision could be made for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders to feed into a walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and review (WCHAR) for all phases of the highways works.
- 5.2 Additional topics presented, which feedback could be provided on, included ecological and heritage interests in close proximity to the proposed works that would be considered in the development of proposals, along with initial thoughts on ecological and environmental mitigation, particularly in relation to the SSSI area.
- 5.3 The above areas were shaped into the following specific consultation topics and questions.

| <b>Topics presented</b>  | <b>16 questions posed*</b>   |
|--|--|
| <b>General</b> - improving road links on the Hoo Peninsula   | (4 questions): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance to the individual and community</li> <li>• Considered benefits, concerns, and other considerations</li> </ul> |
| <b>Phase 1</b> - New Relief Road – Improvements to existing highways including providing new slip roads to | (2 questions per phase - with 5 parts to the first question)   |

| Topics presented   | 16 questions posed*   |
|--|---|
| Higham Road junction, new overbridge, improvements to Islingham Farm Road and Woodfield Way  | <p>Sliding scale views on how much each proposed phase of works would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improve access to the Hoo Peninsula</li> <li>• will reduce congestion in the local area</li> <li>• layout and design will minimise impacts on the local area</li> <li>• improve access for other users (e.g., pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders)</li> <li>• minimise disruptions during construction</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Phase 2</b> - New Relief Road - Proposed relief road from Upchat Roundabout to Main Road Hoo Roundabout. A228/Main Road Roundabout junction modification. New A228 roundabout and associated spur link road.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Phase 3</b> - Improvements to A228 Bell's Lane Roundabout and Dux Court Road (widening and link road)</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Phase 4</b> - Improvements to Ropers Lane Roundabout and Modification to the Stoke Road roundabout to allow access to the new station</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Phase 5</b> - Improvements to Four Elms Roundabout, an additional lane, and a dedicated slip road from the A289 Hasted Road to northbound A228, and a dedicated slip road coming down Four Elms Hill.</p>        |   |
| <p><b>Phase 6</b> - an additional lane to Wulfere Way in each direction, and capacity improvements to Sans Pareil Roundabout.</p>  |   |



*\*For every qualitative question asked, there was the opportunity to provide related quantitative clarifications, further comment/ suggestions or to assign a sentiment to their response.*

### Feedback Received

5.4 **Highways Proposals**: respondents were asked a series of questions about access to the Hoo Peninsula, their concerns, and perceived benefits of highways improvements on the peninsula and if there were any other considerations that should be made.

### 5.5 **Key Findings:**

- Respondents were more likely to agree that improving road links was important for the area but disagreed that it was important to them.
- Over a third of respondents were most likely to say that there were no benefits to improving road links on the Hoo Peninsula.
- Where a benefit was mentioned the most frequently mentioned were reducing reliance on a single road on and off the peninsula, improving connectivity and improving air quality by reducing bottlenecks.
- The greatest concern of respondents regarding improving road links on the Hoo Peninsula was the 'loss of a rural feeling' to the area.
- Comments made by respondents regarding other considerations about the proposals were most likely to include:
  - alternative suggestions (see HIF Consultation Response Analysis' report for these)
  - concerns about over / further development on the Hoo peninsula

- the environmental impact
- concerns about Phase 1 specifically

#### 5.6 **Statistics (quantitative):**

- The importance of improving road links was supported by 44% of respondents - rising to 57% in the over 65 age group - while 41% disagreed and 15% did not voice an opinion
- The most common benefits cited by residents for the overall package were to:
  - reduce reliance on a single main road on and off the Hoo Peninsula (36%);
  - ensure the local area was well connected and accessible (30%); and
  - improve air quality by reducing bottlenecks on Four Elms Hill/Four Elms Roundabout (29%)
- The three greatest concerns were:
  - loss of a rural feeling (81%);
  - increased traffic (78%); and
  - the environmental impact of improving the road links (76%)

#### 5.7 **Phase 1:** respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements regarding whether the proposed Phase 1 road changes would:

- improve access to the Hoo Peninsula
- reduce congestion in the local area
- minimise impacts on the local area

- improve access for other users

#### 5.8 **Key Findings (qualitative):**

- Respondents disagreed that Phase 1 works would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula.
- Respondents disagreed that Phase 1 works would, once completed, reduce congestion in the local area.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed layout and design would minimise impacts on the local area.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed changes would improve access for other users.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed Phase 1 works would minimise disruptions during construction.
- Comments made by respondents regarding other considerations about the proposals were most likely to include:
  - negative issues with the phase design
  - the impact of pollution
  - the impacts of the phase on existing residents

#### 5.9 **Statistics (quantitative):**

- 62% disagreed that Phase 1 would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula - 23% agreed that it would and 12% remained neutral on the issue
- 72% disagreed that Phase 1 would reduce congestion in the local area but 13% agreed that it would - with 11% neither agreeing nor disagreeing

- 79% disagreed that the proposed layout and design of Phase 1 would minimise impacts on the local area with 9% agreeing it would - 8% remained neutral
- 63% disagreed that access for other users (*e.g., pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders*) would be improved and 12% agreed that it would - 17% remained neutral
- 68% disagreed that Phase 1 works would minimise disruption during construction and 9% agreed that it would - 17% neither agreed nor disagreed on the issue

5.10 **Phase 2:** Respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements regarding whether the proposed Phase 2 highways changes would:

- improve access to the Hoo Peninsula
- reduce congestion in the local area
- minimise impacts on the local area
- improve access for other users
- minimise disruptions during construction

5.11 **Key Findings (qualitative):**

- Respondents disagreed that Phase 2 works would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula.
- Respondents disagreed that Phase 2 works would, once completed, reduce congestion in the local area.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed layout and design of Phase 2 would minimise impacts on the local area.

- Respondents disagreed that the proposed changes in Phase 2 would improve access for other users.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed Phase 2 works would minimise disruptions during construction.
- Comments made by respondents regarding other considerations about the Phase 2 proposals were most likely to include:
  - the environmental impact
  - concerns about Phase 2 specifically
  - the impact of different types of pollution

#### 5.12 **Statistics (quantitative):**

- 53% disagreed that Phase 2 would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula and 21% agreed it would - 18% remained neutral
- 63% disagreed that Phase 2 would reduce congestion in the local area and 13% agreed it would - 17% neither agreed nor disagreed
- 71% disagreed that the proposed Phase 2 layout and design would minimise impacts on the local area and 8% agreed it would - 14% remained neutral
- 56% disagreed that the proposed changes in Phase 2 would improve access for other users (e.g., pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders) and 13% agreed it would - 22% remained neutral
- 62% disagreed that proposed Phase 2 works would minimise disruptions during construction and 7% agreed it would - 21% neither agreed nor disagreed

5.13 **Phase 3:** Respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements regarding the proposed Phase 3 highways changes, covering whether the proposed Phase 3 works would:

- improve access to the Hoo Peninsula
- reduce congestion in the local area
- minimise impacts on the local area
- improve access for other users
- minimise disruptions during construction

5.14 **Key Findings (qualitative):**

- Respondents disagreed that Phase 3 works would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula.
- Respondents disagreed that Phase 3 works would, once completed, reduce congestion in the local area.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed layout and design of Phase 3 would minimise impacts on the local area.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed changes in Phase 3 would improve access for other users.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed Phase 3 works would minimise disruptions during construction.
- Comments made by respondents regarding other considerations about the Phase 3 proposals were most likely to include:
  - concerns about over / further development in the area
  - concerns about Phase 3 designs specifically
  - that it was not required / not the answer to the issues

5.15 **Statistics (quantitative):**

- 48% disagreed that Phase 3 would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula but 20% agreed that it would
- 54% disagreed that Phase 3 works would reduce congestion in the local area and 15% of respondents agreed that it would - 19% neither agreed nor disagreed
- 58% disagreed that the proposed layout and design would minimise impacts on the local area and 10% agreed that it would - 19% remained neutral
- 49% disagreed that Phase 3 proposed changes would improve access for other users (e.g., pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders) but 16% agreed that it would – 20% remained neutral
- 55% disagreed that Phase 3 works would minimise disruptions during construction and 6% agreed that it would – 23% neither agreed nor disagreed

5.16 **Phase 4:** Respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements regarding the proposed Phase 4 highways changes, covering whether the proposed Phase 4 works would:

- improve access to the Hoo Peninsula
- reduce congestion in the local area
- minimise impacts on the local area
- improve access for other users
- minimise disruptions during construction

5.17 **Key Findings (qualitative):**

- Respondents disagreed that Phase 4 works would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula.
- Respondents disagreed that Phase 4 works would, once completed, reduce congestion in the local area.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed layout and design of Phase 4 would minimise impacts on the local area.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed changes in Phase 4 would improve access for other users.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed Phase 4 works would minimise disruptions during construction.
- Comments made by respondents regarding other considerations about the Phase 4 proposals were most likely to include:
  - concerns about over / further development in the area
  - alternative suggestions
  - negative comments about the station or railway
  - the environmental impact

#### 5.18 **Statistics (quantitative):**

- 44% disagreed that Phase 4 would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula and 19% agreed that it would – 23% remaining neutral
- 52% disagreed that Phase 4 would reduce congestion in the local area and 12% agreed that it would – 22% neither agreed nor disagreed
- 55% disagreed that the proposed layout and design would minimise impacts on the local area and 9% agreed that it would - 21% remained neutral



- 47% disagrees that Phase 4 proposed changes would improve access for other users (e.g., pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders) but 14% agreed that it would – 23% remained neutral
- 50% disagrees that Phase 4 works would minimise disruptions during construction and 7% agreed it would – 26% neither agreed nor disagreed

5.19 **Phase 5:** Respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements regarding the proposed Phase 5 highways changes, covering whether the proposed Phase 5 works would:

- improve access to the Hoo Peninsula
- reduce congestion in the local area
- minimise impacts on the local area
- improve access for other users
- minimise disruptions during construction

5.20 **Key Findings (qualitative):**

- Respondents disagreed that Phase 5 works would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula.
- Respondents disagreed that Phase 5 works would, once completed, reduce congestion in the local area.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed layout and design of Phase 5 would minimise impacts on the local area.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed changes in Phase 5 would improve access for other users.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed Phase 5 works would minimise disruptions during construction.

- Comments made by respondents regarding other considerations about the Phase 5 proposals were most likely to include both positive and negative comments about the phase design.

#### 5.21 **Statistics (quantitative):**

- 40% disagreed that Phase 5 would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula but 33% agreed that it would – 17% remained neutral
- 47% disagreed that Phase 5 works would reduce congestion in the local area and 25% agreed it would – 18% neither agreed nor disagreed
- 50% disagreed that the proposed layout and design would minimise impacts on the local area and 18% agreed that it would- 22% remained neutral
- 44% disagreed that Phase 5 proposed changes would improve access for other users (e.g., pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders) and 18% agreed it would – 25% remained neutral
- 51% disagreed that Phase 5 works would minimise disruptions during construction and 10% agreed that it would- 26% neither agreed nor disagreed

#### 5.22 **Phase 6:** Respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements regarding the proposed Phase 6 highways changes, covering whether the proposed Phase 6 works would:

- improve access to the Hoo Peninsula
- reduce congestion in the local area
- minimise impacts on the local area
- improve access for other users

- minimise disruptions during construction

#### 5.23 **Key Findings (qualitative):**

- Respondents disagreed that Phase 6 works would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula.
- Respondents disagreed that Phase 6 works would, once completed, reduce congestion in the local area.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed layout and design of Phase 6 would minimise impacts on the local area.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed changes in Phase 6 would improve access for other users.
- Respondents disagreed that the proposed Phase 6 works would minimise disruptions during construction.
- Comments made by respondents regarding other considerations about the Phase 6 proposals were most likely to include:
  - increased traffic or congestion
  - alternative suggestions
  - negative comments about the phase design
  - the impact of different types of pollution

#### 5.24 **Statistics (quantitative):**

- 49% disagreed that Phase 6 would improve access to the Hoo Peninsula and 18% agreed that it would - 23% remained neutral

- 51% disagreed that Phase 6 would reduce congestion in the local area and 18% agreed that it would – 20% neither agreed nor disagreed
- 56% disagreed that the proposed layout and design would minimise impacts on the local area and 14% agreed that it would – 20% remained neutral
- 46% disagreed that Phase 6 proposed changes would improve access for other users (e.g., pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders) and 13% agreed that it would – 26% remained neutral
- 52% disagreed that Phase 6 works would minimise disruptions during construction and 9% of respondents agreeing it would – 24% neither agreed nor disagreed

## **Round 2 (Highways)**

### Topics for Consultation

- 5.25 For highways, Round 2 provided the opportunity (through 7 questions) to comment on specific revisions made to the individual road phases as presented (and outlined below), but also provide more general overarching comments about the highways proposal revisions.
- 5.26 The proposed changes to each phase, as presented for Round 2 consultation, are outlined in the table below and consultees were invited to provide “specific comments about the REVISIONS presented”.

### Topics presented for consultation

**Phase 1** - New relief road alternative Option 2 – no overbridge (i.e., “Wainscott flyover”) and instead, an at-grade signalised junction on the A289 between Higham Road and Four Elms Roundabout. As a result:

- only minor improvements/ modifications to the Higham Road / Islingham Farm Road junction required
- reduced improvements/modifications to Islingham Farm Road to maintain an existing single lane road width
- realignment of the lower section of Woodfield Way taking through traffic away from Islingham Farm Road.

**Phase 2** - Realignment of Section 1 of the relief road (Upchat Roundabout to Chattenden Lane) and realignment of spur link road (Alignment B selected from two options presented), avoiding passing through part of Deangate Ridge golf course.

**Phase 3** - Bell’s Lane Roundabout and Dux Court Road – alternative option progressed - enlarged signal-controlled roundabout plus widened roundabout to the north.

**Phase 4** – Roper’s Lane Roundabout - No changes presented for Round 2 – further work to be done to consider approach with additional engagement to be undertaken.

**Phase 5** – A289 Four Elms Roundabout - small adjustments to the layout only.

**Phase 6** - Sans Pareil Roundabout and Wulfere Way - significant change to the Wainscott Road access to this roundabout with a revised layout, plus proposed new access/junction to the Maritime Academy off Frindsbury Hill.

### Feedback Received

5.27 The following tables outline the key themes raised across feedback forms (online or paper copy), pro formas (description below), and email/ letter representations (stakeholder and public). These are arranged by sentiment as already referenced.

### *Questionnaire Results*

5.28 For reasons already outlined, the questionnaire asked only qualitative questions for Round 2 consultation. The responses to these questions were compiled, coded, and themed as per the below.

5.29 **Question: Do you have any general comments about the REVISIONS made to the road proposals as presented?**

| Sentiment | Key themes  |
|-----------|---|
| Positive  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of the Wainscott Flyover proposal is positive</li> <li>• The alternative to the flyover is much better / more positive – it reduces visual and noise pollution, and protects the local environment</li> <li>• Removal of the Wainscott Flyover proposal is cheaper and the alternative impacts residents much less than the proposed flyover</li> <li>• Pedestrian bridge and increase safe cycling routes for improved connections is positive</li> <li>• Phase 5 action needed to help ease traffic</li> </ul> |
| Negative  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signal controlled junctions are impractical</li> <li>• Proposals for improvements are only to accommodate the proposed new housing, which is not supported</li> <li>• Building more roads will not solve the problem - fix the current roads</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current roads are already at capacity</li> <li>• Traffic lights will cause more traffic</li> </ul>   |

| Sentiment                  | Key themes   |
|----------------------------|--|
|                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in pollution</li> <li>• Proposals will increase traffic congestion</li> <li>• MOD roads are subject to closure at any time</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment: more mature trees / woodland retained to be built to combat the pollution (air, noise, visual)</li> <li>• Traffic: ensure this does not add to the congestion</li> <li>• Design: roundabouts to be aesthetically pleasing</li> <li>• Speed: add speed restrictions/ cameras/traffic calming measures</li> <li>• Safe access and routes: for all pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders</li> <li>• Consider any impacts and mitigate</li> </ul>  |
| More information requested | <p>More information needed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality mitigation plans</li> <li>• How the plans will be delivered on budget</li> <li>• Will the MOD road still be subject to closures?</li> <li>• Mitigation on the impacts on environment and wildlife</li> <li>• Access: will farm traffic use the road, are lorries allowed access</li> <li>• Impact on the wider highways network</li> <li>• Access to parklands in the area</li> <li>• Carbon neutral plans during construction</li> <li>• Traffic modelling stats and information</li> </ul> |

5.30 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the Phase 1 - A289 junction/ link road plus Woodfield Way and Islingham Farm Road?**

| Sentiment | Key themes  |
|-----------|---|
| Positive  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very positive about the plans – less impact on residents and the environment</li> <li>• Removal of the Wainscott Flyover proposal is very positive</li> <li>• Pleased the council reconsidered this/listened to residents</li> </ul> |

| Sentiment                  | Key themes  |
|----------------------------|---|
|                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upgrades to Four Elms roundabout needed asap/traffic controls in place</li> </ul>  |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Woodfield Way is an MOD road subject to closure any time</li> <li>Inadequate proposals from the amount of traffic, congestion will be worse especially with more houses</li> <li>Only available to specific vehicles not HGVs</li> <li>The junction link is not required</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will increase traffic</li> <li>Negatively affect traffic flows</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Woodfield Way to Islingham Farm Road needs to be accessible for agricultural traffic</li> <li>The Four Elm roundabout improvements should create a third exit lane (separate from the roundabout) for the peninsula on the A289 so congestion will drop when going to Rochester</li> <li>Four Elms roundabout should be improved with traffic-controlled lights now – help with speeds</li> <li>The adjacent footway and cycle way should be multiuser to include equestrians</li> <li>Design and rural feel: light and noise pollution at the pedestrian crossings on Woodfield Way and the street lighting be kept to a minimum</li> </ul>                                   |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity on vehicle restrictions e.g., HGVs - how will they be enforced?</li> <li>Will there still be a vehicular continuation between Islingham farm Road and Woodfield Way?</li> <li>EIA (traffic and masterplan info) – when will it be released?</li> <li>Will agricultural vehicles be allowed on the new roads?</li> <li>Speed restrictions on Woodfield Way/MOD allowed to close the road – will these remain?</li> <li>Construction plans to ensure A289 traffic flows</li> <li>What impacts will there be on wildlife habitats / Chattenden woods/ SSSI – mitigation plans needed – clarity needed on this</li> <li>Any indirect impacts and its mitigation</li> </ul> |

5.31 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the Phase 2 – New relief road and associated spur link road?**



| Sentiment                  | Key themes   |
|----------------------------|--|
| Positive                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of the spur link road</li> <li>• Using existing infrastructure and will help ease/control traffic with little impact on residents</li> <li>• Improvements to Four Elms roundabout is a good thing and needed</li> </ul>  |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals are near the SSSI</li> <li>• Only purpose is to serve the proposed housing increase</li> <li>• Not needed/will not be used</li> <li>• More congestion and air pollution</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that Ratcliffe Highway is going to be closed</li> </ul>   |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking solutions: parking problems at the Hundred of Hoo School – an opportunity to provide parking for collection and dropping off of pupils with an access path to the schools</li> <li>• Strategy needs to be developed to ensure impacts to the SSSI habitat are avoided or mitigated wherever possible - also to explain pedestrian/cycle provision</li> </ul>  |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detail on Woodfield Way – how and when will the MOD restrict access</li> <li>• EIA (traffic and masterplan info) – when will it be released</li> <li>• Bus service provision in the future</li> <li>• SEMS connectivity – the alignment looks close to the parkland, what impacts will there be on wildlife habitats / Chattenden woods/ close to the SSSI? Information on reducing/mitigating impacts</li> <li>• Alignment A access – how will horses, cyclists and pedestrians cross safely?</li> </ul> |

5.32 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the Phase 3 - Improvements to A228 Bell's Lane Roundabout and Dux Court Road?**

| Sentiment                  | Key themes   |
|----------------------------|--|
| Positive                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will help traffic flows</li> <li>• Traffic lights/signals welcomed</li> <li>• Improvements will help and are needed now</li> </ul>  |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of traffic lights will cause more pollution and congestion</li> <li>• Improvements are an excuse for the housing proposed</li> </ul>   |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signalised roundabout will cause congestion and air pollution</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic signals at peak times only</li> <li>• Design: roundabouts to be aesthetically pleasing</li> <li>• Traffic signals should include a Pegasus crossing for horse riders to improve north side access /connect with other bridleways</li> </ul> |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of changes to Dux Court Road</li> <li>• Will this cope with large movements at peak times?</li> </ul>   |

5.33 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the Phase 4 - Improvements to Ropers Lane Roundabout and modifications to the existing highway network to facilitate access to the new station?**

| Sentiment   | Key themes  |
|-------------|---|
| Positive    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None to report</li> </ul>  |
| Negative    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough information about Stoke Road and station access road</li> </ul>   |
| Concerns    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns surrounding station access road</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to the station needs to be explained</li> <li>• Station access road should be along the route of the Roper's Green Lane</li> <li>• Footpath needs to be extended towards High Halstow / Grain and include a cycle path</li> </ul> |

| Sentiment                  | Key themes   |
|----------------------------|--|
|                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic controls needed due to help increase traffic flow</li> </ul>                                    |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detail for the road link to the station</li> <li>Will there be a third consultation on this?</li> </ul> |

5.34 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the Phase 5 - Four Elms Roundabout?**

| Sentiment                  | Key themes   |
|----------------------------|--|
| Positive                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements welcomed</li> <li>Improvements to design – traffic lights and speed limits - are welcomed and needed ASAP</li> <li>The proposed works are positive but make phase 1 and 2 unnecessary</li> <li>Supportive of the plans</li> <li>Crossing facilities for pedestrians very good</li> </ul> |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian crossing and pedestrian controlled signal will disrupt traffic flows</li> <li>Plans will increase traffic will cause more air pollution</li> <li>Four Elms roundabout is dangerous</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Congestion and traffic flow due to traffic lights</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If phase 5 carried out, phase 1 and 2 not needed</li> <li>Phase 5 should be carried out first</li> <li>A left filter lane/traffic-controlled lane at Four Elms roundabout would be beneficial</li> <li>Speed: restrictions should be imposed and enforced</li> </ul>                                  |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EIA (traffic and masterplan info) – when will it be released?</li> </ul>  |

5.35 **Question: Do you have any specific comments about the Phase 6 – Wulfere Way and Sans Pareil Roundabout?**

| Sentiment                  | Key themes   |
|----------------------------|--|
| Positive                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of the plans</li> <li>• Improvements to design are welcomed and needed ASAP</li> <li>• Positive that connected footpaths and cycleways are included</li> <li>• Will improve congestion/traffic flows</li> </ul>  |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic congestion increase</li> <li>• Green space is being destroyed</li> <li>• Negative impact on school</li> </ul>   |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximity of school and pollution impacting pupils</li> <li>• Traffic congestion and bottleneck roads</li> <li>• Proposed changes will place more pressure on local bus service</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction should be carried out outside of school times/ before the school is finished</li> <li>• Traffic lights at roundabout needed to help with traffic and speeds</li> <li>• Design: include green space to help buffer any impacts like noise/air/light pollution</li> <li>• Design: consider a grade separated junction to help traffic flow and reduce emissions</li> </ul> |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on consultation with bus companies due to impact on the school buses/public services</li> <li>• EIA and consultation on the EIA</li> <li>• Proposal states that the speed limit on Wulfere Road will be reduced – what will the speed limit be</li> </ul>   |

*Pro forma*

5.36 In the case of highways, the same pro forma was submitted by 112 different parties. A copy of the highways pro forma is provided in Appendix 37 and a summary of the key themes from this are provided below.

| Key themes  |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the plans are flawed / no confidence in them</li> <li>• Road scheme is inadequate for the scale of growth proposed on the Hoo</li> <li>• Phase 1 - design change is a worsening of the effectiveness of the scheme/current roads</li> <li>• Concern with costs and sources of funding</li> <li>• Concerns about the “relief road” and the limitations of using the 20mph Ministry of Defence (MOD) section Woodfield Way - not permitting buses and HGVs to use it / unplanned closures at any time</li> </ul> |

*Stakeholder Representations (email/ letter)*

5.37 For highways, representations were coded into themes shown below against sentiment.

| Sentiment | Key themes   |
|-----------|--|
| Positive  | <p><b>Phase 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pleased that the flyover proposal has been removed and the new route is much less impactful on local residents</li> <li>• Welcome the relocation of the new junction on the A289 with a dedicated link road to Woodfield Way</li> <li>• Supportive about increased safe cycling routes</li> </ul> <p><b>Phase 5/6 Four Elms Roundabout / Wulfere Way</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Four Elms roundabout shows a proposed pedestrian crossing on the northern side which is very much welcomed and supported - pedestrians and cyclists have been requesting a safe route across the bypass / Four Elms roundabout from Wainscott to Four Elms Hill</li> <li>• New paths and upgrading of existing routes welcomed to mitigate for any disruption caused</li> </ul> |
| Negative  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic modelling figures have not been provided</li> <li>• Have not considered the impacts of the Lower Thames Crossing</li> <li>• Impact on air quality</li> </ul>  |

| Sentiment   | Key themes   |
|-------------|--|
| Concerns    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic lights will disrupt traffic flow</li> <li>• Lack of provision of sustainable modes of transport</li> <li>• Phase 6 - additional traffic by Four Elms roundabout</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions | <p><b>Phase 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design: Consider footway/cycleway and equestrians at the old Ratcliffe Highway to have a safe route toward Hoo / Cockham Community Parkland</li> <li>• The proposed arterial road into Chattenden is constructed in an early phase of the infrastructure works</li> </ul> <p><b>Phase 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design: The pedestrian-controlled crossing facility on Bells Lane must be horse friendly</li> <li>• Design: Dux Court Road is a restricted byway – consider how horses could cross the dual Carriageway to reach the bridleways parallel to Bells Lane and also the old Ratcliffe Highway</li> <li>• Junction improvements at Bell’s Lane, Dux Court Road should only be considered once the cost of financing the primary junctions and addressing the “more dangerous junctions” has been completed</li> </ul> <p><b>Phase 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design: A signalised junction crossroads with pedestrian and cycle infrastructure in the existing location of the junction at Stoke Road for the safe crossing of Stoke Road and avoid the potential barrier effect of the road infrastructure. Roundabout would not work</li> <li>• Design: all PROW are across muddy farm tracks and need upgrading and surfacing where they are of footpath status to allow cyclists a safe route to the station and equestrians a safe access route</li> </ul> <p><b>Phase 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design: There is a footway / cycleway link proposed on the northern side of the A289 from Sans Pareil to Four Elms Roundabout. This route is intersected by the RS125 footpath/ used by cyclists - path needs to be upgraded to a bridleway and re-surfaced as it is currently narrow and the surface in bad repair</li> <li>• Design: Four Elms Roundabout - the lack of through-traffic flow from east bound traffic on Hasted Road continuing to Wulfere Way could be achieved by constructing a grade separated junction, to permit through traffic to continue without interruption</li> <li>• A grade separated option - the A289 dual carriageway be either placed in a cut-n-cover tunnel or on a viaduct over the roundabout</li> </ul> |

| Sentiment                  | Key themes  |
|----------------------------|---|
|                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An air pollution monitoring system to be set up ASAP along the Four Elms Hill, the four Elms Hill Roundabout, Wulfere Way, and the Sans Pareil Roundabout</li> </ul> <p><b>Phase 6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The A289 A228 Junction 2 - the construction of a grade separated junction, this time with the dual carriageway would be set in a cut and cover tunnel</li> <li>• Design: the traffic lights on the roundabout need to be linked to those at the new junction to avoid traffic blocking access to the roundabout</li> </ul> <p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the proposed Blue Bell Hill junction improvements and the potential for contributions towards this highway scheme</li> <li>• Consider the impact/construction of Lower Thames Crossing and London Resort - where appropriate / work with the LTC team</li> <li>• Explore all impacts on the wider environment</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and access: opportunity to improve the existing PRoW network and develop new links / upgrade</li> <li>• Look at improving existing off-road equestrian access provision in this region</li> <li>• Cycle routes provision/pathways should be looked at and explored and invested in</li> <li>• Congestion – bus service lanes/provision to encourage use for all, as well as electric bus network</li> <li>• Heritage Conservation - a comprehensive historic environment study to inform the proposals</li> <li>• Look at other junctions that could help the flow of traffic, and invest there</li> </ul> |
| More information requested | <p><b>Phase 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footpath: The new link from the A289 to Woodfield Way appears to dissect the RS119 footpath - clarify if the new link will impact this path in any way</li> <li>• Access: will the proposed separate footway / cycleway on Woodfield Way / Lochat Road also take horses?</li> <li>• Figure 17A – clarity as to the proposals at the junction of Islingham Farm Road and Woodfield Way - the link between the MOD sites in this location should not be available to the public, so that traffic on Woodfield Way has to go to the A289 and cannot access Islingham Farm Road, or alternatively is forced to turn right, so there is a disincentive for those travelling south and going north on Islingham Farm Road, there should be no right turn into Woodfield Way.</li> <li>• Congestion: how will it be managed</li> </ul>  |

| Sentiment | Key themes   |
|-----------|--|
|           | <p><b>Phase 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 24, clarity on why there is a need for a new roundabout.</li> <li>• Figure 23, clarity on why this junction would be necessary if Alignment A were to go ahead</li> </ul> <p><b>Phase 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on traffic modelling</li> </ul> <p><b>Phase 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on traffic modelling</li> <li>• Clarity needed on the modifications to the existing highway network to facilitate access to the new station</li> <li>• Why is this additional spur on the roundabout necessary?</li> </ul> <p><b>Phase 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation: further consultation meeting around traffic management for Four Elms Hill, the roundabout, Wulfere Way, and the Sans Pareil Roundabout</li> <li>• Air pollution monitoring plans</li> <li>• Electric bus service provision</li> <li>• Information on when the Habitats Regulations Assessment is to begin</li> <li>• Queried the business case for this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Phase 6</b></p> <p>Local school – information on the safety measures being taken to protect pedestrians and other road users in this area</p> <p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic modelling / information to assess the impact on the Kent highway network</li> <li>• Information on Local Plan</li> <li>• Do the improvement proposals for the A228 and A289 consider the impact of the Lower Thames Crossing and provide appropriate mitigation?</li> <li>• Carbon neutral plans during construction</li> </ul> |



*Public Representations (email)*

5.38 All public representations made related to highways were coded and are shown below.

| <b>Sentiment</b>           | <b>Key themes</b>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Positive                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None to report</li> </ul>  |
| Negative                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative impact of proposals on climate change</li> <li>• Lack of information on development, housing numbers, and location of the proposed houses</li> <li>• Not enough engagement and consultation – more needs to be offered</li> </ul> |
| Concerns                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about general HIF proposals and increase in pollution/air quality and their effects</li> <li>• Concern that housing locations are not disclosed</li> </ul>   |
| Suggestion                 | Consultation and engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of consultation as dates fell in the holiday period</li> <li>• Request for copies of documents/figures</li> <li>• Request for meeting</li> </ul>   |
| Suggestion                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medway's Climate Action Plan did not mention food production</li> </ul>  |
| More information requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to show where housing is being proposed</li> <li>• Local Plan information</li> <li>• What will be the effects of this proposal on air pollution?</li> </ul>   |
| More information requested | Climate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How scheme aligns with the Council's Climate Action Plan</li> <li>• Proposed environmental strategies</li> </ul>   |

Response to Issues Raised

5.39 The table below sets out the Future Hoo team's response to these issues and all other themes that have been drawn out from the feedback received across both consultations.

| Consultee(s)                                 | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--|--|--|
| <b>General</b>                               |  |  |
| Public, Parish Councils and Political Groups | Expressed scepticism that the proposals would be on time and have sufficient budget, noting that the draft IDP made reference to section 106 contributions also being needed above and beyond HIF funding.                                   | <p>The Future Hoo team will be putting measures in place to ensure that the programme is delivered within the constraints of Homes England's funding requirements.</p> <p>The Future Hoo team also considers that the scheme will be delivered on budget. To the extent that any contingency is required, the Council would (subject to Cabinet approval) be able to rely on future section 106 contributions being secured, as these highway improvements are inherent to future housing being able to be brought forward.</p>                            |
| Public, Parish Councils and Political Groups | Expressed a desire for more information about transport assessment, environmental impact assessments (EIA), habitats regulations assessment (HRA) and transport assessment; particularly in respect of the HIF proposals and future housing. | <p>The transport assessment, EIA and HRA are in progress and currently on-going. The potential for cumulative effects will be considered as part of the EIA and HRA, and the transport assessment will be based on traffic with the future housing in place.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that such information was not required for this early-stage consultation when the proposals are still under development and the assessment work is incomplete.</p> <p>Full assessment documentation will be presented as part of the planning application.</p> |

| Consultee(s)                                 | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--|---|--|
| Public, Parish Councils and Political Groups | Queried the source of data that will be used for traffic modelling (including how up to date the information is) and the mode share that will be applied to take account of the proposed rail link.   | The Mode Share for the HIF scheme is being determined in conjunction with work of Local Plan team and informs the ongoing development of the Hoo Transport Strategy. This will take due account of available information, pending Census results, DfT advice/guidelines relating to behavioural changes in travel forms, increased active travel and the rail service proposals and operation.   |
| Public, Parish Councils and Political Groups | <p>Expressed scepticism that the highways proposals will actually deliver its aim of supporting housing development on the Hoo Peninsula in light of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Lower Thames Crossing project;</li> <li>• that the Council's consultants have previously said that 'the increase in traffic from the proposed 12,100 units of housing would exceed the road network's capacity, even with the planning highway upgrades so a shift to rail usage is being sought'; and</li> <li>• that all elements of the proposals need to be in place for the scheme to succeed in its aims.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LTC – The Council continues to maintain key engagement with National Highways to ensure that implications from the LTC are considered along the proposed HIF Hoo project.</li> <li>• The proposed HIF infrastructure for road and rail will provide additional capacity required to accommodate planned housing growth of 10,600 homes. Several options have been assessed, ranging from hard engineering measures to softer transport behavioural and vulnerable user schemes. Upgrades to the road existing network alone will improve capacity but will not provide sufficient capacity. A Relief Road has therefore been assessed, with various routes appraised. This proposal has been found to deliver notable benefits, including traffic relief on the A289, and greater network resilience, i.e. an alternative route to and from the Peninsula. The Business Case identified that the road intervention would provide additional capacity for 8,000 homes and the rail 2,600 homes.</li> </ul> |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--|---|---|
| Public   | Disagreed that the works (across all phases) would improve access (for motorists and for non-motorised users) in the area and reduce congestion.  | The aim of scheme is to improve access to the Hoo Peninsula and proposed developments, reduce existing congestion levels and provide capacity for future growth. The phased coordination and management of the key junctions provide opportunities for enhanced active travel facilities, and these will be developed as part of the design development.  |
| Public, CPRE Kent, Medway Labour and Cooperative Group, Medway Liberal Democrats, Medway Green Party | <p>Queried how the road proposals align both with the Council's own Climate Change Action Plan and generally in meeting Net Zero, given the CPRE's own report on the failure of road building to meet its objectives and the UKFIRES report's suggestion that for the UK to achieve net zero by 2050 road use will need to be at 60% of 2050 levels.</p> <p>Stakeholders also emphasised the need for construction to be carbon neutral</p> | <p>The Hoo Highway Improvements provides a level of required road access to support planned growth in housing on the Hoo Peninsula. It does not prevent the achievement of aims and actions set out in the Climate Change Action Plan. The Future Hoo team will undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the road project (which will assess carbon impacts in the construction and operational phases) and is also exploring approaches to its construction methods and materials to minimise carbon footprint for the road project.</p> <p>The Hoo Highway Improvements will not prevent future housing proposals and planning or policy around housing on the peninsula from implementing measures to minimise road use and reliance on the private car, such as promoting sustainable transport, promoting behaviour change through walking and cycling initiatives, policy on the road user hierarchy, promoting car sharing, etc.</p> <p>Indeed, the bringing forward of the Future Hoo rail scheme (both the rail itself and the active travel hub that it will create), alongside the highways interventions,</p> |

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|---|---|---|
|   |   | <p>ensures that development on Hoo will be sustainable and encourage reductions in car use.</p> <p>Carbon - in line with current guidelines and policy the project is targeted for being carbon neutral. At the design and construction stages each works activity will be challenged to reduce the carbon footprint and balance against programme, cost, and mitigation measures.</p>  |
| <p>Public, Hoo Parish Council<br/>Medway Labour and Cooperative Group, Medway Liberal Democrats, Medway Environmental Protection Team</p> | <p>Concerns raised about the Scheme's air quality impacts in general, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how air quality impacts have informed the scheme proposals, including monitoring undertaken to date at locations such as Higham Road;</li> <li>• how air quality impacts are expected to be mitigated;</li> <li>• ensuring sufficient air quality monitoring is undertaken at key roundabouts and Four Elms Hill to provide sufficient baseline data; and</li> <li>• preventing the achievement of air quality objectives in the surrounding AQMAs; through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the traffic flows arising;</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>Air quality monitoring has been obtained using standard protocols for Environmental Impact Assessment and has included all relevant static monitoring by Medway Council within the study area, such as at Four Elms Hill. Our modelling is based on 2019 as our verification year, and therefore will not have considered the monitoring on Higham Road that commenced last year. Furthermore, data for Higham Road has not yet been released and is therefore not yet available.</p> <p>The impact assessment for air quality is on-going at the time of writing and will include specific addressing of potential impacts on AQMAs. Information about any impacts identified, their potential significance, and any proposed mitigation to avoid, reduce or offset any impact will be included in the future Environmental Statement, to be published alongside the planning proposals.</p> <p>The proposed Relief Road and Woodfield Way will have imposed weight restrictions to limit use by HGVs. Buses will be permitted to use the Relief Road. In the event of a major incident on the A228 where the proposed central reserve crossovers are not able to be accessed and a</p> |

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|---|--|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the lack of provision for electric buses, including an electric bus lane; and</li> <li>○ the inability of HGVs and buses to use the relief road.</li> </ul> | <p>road closure is implemented exemptions will be permitted to allow use for emergency diversion route.</p> <p>Dedicated Bus Lane on the approach to Four Elms Roundabout were considered in the early design stages. The additional land required for the lanes, constraint of the adjacent SSSI and additional sequencing and increased phasing times found that sufficient capacity and acceptable level of service could not be provided the roundabout. Current proposals provide a controlled phased operation of key junctions and allow access for all approaches.</p> <p>It is the general aspiration that Medway's approach to public EV charging provision will extend to the station car park. Whilst it is expected that new build housing will include for EV charging provision, inclusion of additional charging at the station would assist existing peninsular residents who may not have access to a charging point. Consideration will be given to average expected stays in the car park with an appropriate mix of slow and fast chargers. This is a developing strategy that is still to be finalised.</p> |
| Public, Parish Councils, Councillors and Political Groups | Concerned that a key aspect of minimising and avoiding impacts to traffic flows and residents would be in ensuring that sufficient traffic restrictions are put in place and properly enforced.      | The actual restrictions to be imposed and enforced will be developed in the detailed design, however the developing Transport Assessment will make appropriate assumptions and where appropriate suggest necessary restrictions. These will be discussed with and, where agreed, enforced by the Highway Authority.   |
| Public, Parish Councils,                                  | Concerned that across the road interventions a number of traffic signals and junctions are proposed  | Whole package of junction improvements, modifications and introduction of traffic signals provide a coordinated   |

| Consultee(s)                     | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Councillors and Political Groups | which could lead to queues and traffic impacts such that the scheme will not succeed in its aims and will lead to queues and gridlock on the Peninsula.  | network promoting efficient traffic flows and enhanced active travel facilities for all road users.  |
| Public                           | Concerned about the impacts of construction in relation to HGV movements affecting traffic flows and causing pollution to residents and the pollution impacts of construction movements more generally.          | The proposals for managing these matters will be set out in the outline construction environmental management plans and traffic management plans which will be submitted with the planning application, and which will take account of other HIF and committed developments.   |
| Public, Medway Liberal Democrats | Concerned that there is a lack of specific provision for cyclists across the proposals and a lack of a joined-up approach to their provision and meeting national guidelines. A variety of routes were proposed. | <p>The HIF scheme aims to promote connectivity, improve existing cycle infrastructure, and provide new facilities. Since the Business Case Medway policy on cycle provision has been reviewed to provide further improved routes with dedicated cycle lane encouraged. These improvements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dedicated cycle lane along the proposed Relief Road</li> <li>- Shared surface along Woodfield Way and resurfacing of existing shared route</li> <li>- Toucan crossings at modified/new junctions</li> <li>- Offline shared route parallel to A289 Wulfere Way</li> <li>- Shared surface on new rail access road</li> </ul> <p>The developments facilitated by the HIF Hoo infrastructure and the HDF will be required to provide sustainable cycle and pedestrian routes with connectivity</p> |

| Consultee(s)                        | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
|                                     |  | as part of the planning process to open up a much wider network and promote active travel.  |
| Public                              | General concerns were raised for all phases as potential pollution impacts and impacts to wildlife.  | The proposals have been developed with the sensitivities of the surrounding environment in mind – both human and non-human. The EIA and HRA process will assess the impacts of the proposals and appropriate mitigation will be put in place to ensure that likely significant effects are minimised.   |
| Medway Labour and Cooperative Group | Concerned that the proposals, alongside the housing will lead to a huge influx of traffic and thus a consequential need for parking and whether provision for parking has therefore been considered. | It is not anticipated that the primary highway interventions will create parking issues as these facilitate access along the peninsula. The scheme aims to mitigate any loss of parking on adjacent side roads. Future residential developments shall deliver specific parking requirements in-line with development guidelines.  |
| All Parish Councils and public      | Concerned about rat running in their villages as a result of the proposals.  | Capacity improvements to junctions will allow vehicular movement to flow in a controlled phased operation compared to existing arrangements. Increased resilience to the primary network is proposed and does not promote making side roads more attractive to through traffic. Where the Transport Assessment identifies potential issues/traffic leakage, appropriate mitigation measures will be proposed/implemented. |
| Kent County Council                 | Emphasised the importance of the application fully assessing the heritage conservation baseline of the Scheme and assessing the impacts.   | This will be undertaken as part of the EIA process.   |
| Kent County Council, Medway         | Emphasised the need for a joined-up approach to public rights of way and sustainable provision,  | Through the Hoo Development Framework, on-going engagement with landowners, and the SEMS proposals,   |



| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--|--|--|
| Labour and Cooperative Group                                 | including for PRoWs and buses, with requests for dedicated bus lanes for the latter.   | <p>the Council and the Future Hoo team is committed to ensuring that there is a joined-up approach to the provision of sustainable transport options.</p> <p>Dedicated Bus Lane on the approach to Four Elms Roundabout and Sans Pareil Roundabout were considered in the early design stages. The additional land required for the lanes, constraint of the adjacent SSSI and additional sequencing and increased phasing times found that sufficient capacity and acceptable level of service could not be provided the roundabouts. Current proposals provide a controlled phased operation of key junctions and allow access for all approaches.</p> |
| Kent County Council, Gravesham Council and National Highways | Noted that in the absence of detailed traffic modelling, detailed comments are not possible. However, general comments were made that these bodies will want to ensure that there are not negative implications to highways under their control in both the construction and operational phases, taking account of both housing and employment proposals; and the Lower Thames Crossing project. | The Council is undertaking localised modelling for the HIF planning application and continues to undertake strategic modelling as part of the evidence base development for the new Local Plan; and will be sharing this with consultees at the appropriate time. It also continues to discuss key matters in relation to the Lower Thames Crossing with Highways England.   |
| Public   | Expressed preference for existing roads to be fixed rather than new roads built.   | The majority of the proposals relating to the Highway scheme consists of junction improvements.  |
| Cliffe Woods Parish Council                                  | Set out their concerns that the proposals do not include any improvement of access for traffic to and from Cliffe Village, Cliffe Woods, Medway City Estate and the Medway Tunnel.   | HIF is looking at the infrastructure for the houses proposed on Hoo Peninsula. Improvements recently completed to A289 Berwick Way as part of the Medway City Estate slip road (Local Growth Fund) project will be   |

| Consultee(s)         | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|----------------------|---|--|
|                      |   | <p>complemented by those capacity improvements to Four Elms and Sans Pareil roundabouts.</p> <p>The proposed HIF Hoo funding does not extend to improvements to/from Cliffe Village / Cliffe Woods. A Business Case and additional funding would be required for network improvements at this location.</p>  |
| Public               | Highlighted the need for new roundabouts to be aesthetically pleasing.          | The Hoo Highway Improvements will be assessed for potential landscape and visual impacts as part of the EIA, taking account of the baseline environment and local and national landscape character. Potential mitigation and enhancement of the landscape will be put forward to be taken up as part of the project. A Landscape Masterplan will be developed that will translate the recommendations of the EIA, including any landscape and visual enhancements, into proposed design, including at roundabouts that form part of the project. |
| CPRE Kent and public | Concern that proposals are located on best and most versatile agricultural land | <p>Provisional Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) data from the 1970s for the area of the proposed road project shows that at Phases 3, 4 and 6, it is ALC Grade 2 ('best and most versatile' – BMV) and at Phases 1, 2 and 5, it is Grade 3.</p> <p>Where the land is likely to be BMV (Grade 2) at Phases 3, 4 and 6, these are 'online' sections of road improvements (i.e. expanding the existing highway network) and therefore require minimal landtake and will have minimal impact.</p>  |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | <p>The offline sections of road are mainly within the lower grade of these two grades of soil (Grade 3), which can be either Grade 3a (BMV) or Grade 3b. More recent surveys locally show that most of this land is likely to be Grade 3b, so not BMV land.</p> <p>Also, the offline section of Phase 1 currently runs through an existing balancing pond, and part of Phase 2 runs through Chattenden Barracks, which is previously developed land (non-agricultural).</p> |
| <b>Phase 1</b>   |   |   |
| All Consultees   | Welcomed the fact that the Round 1 Consultation proposals for slip roads to/from Higham Road on raised structures had been removed and replaced with a new junction on the A289.                                | The support for this change is welcomed.  |
| Public   | Queried whether the proposed separate footway/cycleway on Woodfield Way/Lochat Road will also take horses.  | The existing offline shared surface is designated for cycle and pedestrian use. Consideration could be given to providing equestrian use however this would require vegetation management and cutting back within the SSSI, so will require further discussion with Natural England.  |
| Public, Natural England and Homes England (as developer) | Sought clarification that the upgrade works to Islingham Farm Road and the upgraded cycle/footpath adjacent to Woodfield Way, and lighting proposals would not affect the Chattenden Woods and Lodge Hill SSSI. | It can be confirmed that the proposed works are either not within the SSSI or the nature of the works will not affect it. Lighting proposals are still being considered but will be designed to be sensitive to the adjacent SSSI.  |

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|---|--|--|
| Public, Medway Public Paths Team and Local Access Forum | Suggested that the adjacent footway and cycleway to Woodfield Way should be multi user to include equestrians.   | This is being considered as part of the Future Hoo team's wider consideration of public path provision on the Peninsula, including that proposed to be put in place through SEMs.  |
| Medway Public Paths Team                                | Sought clarity on the impacts to footpath RS119 as a result of the proposals.  | The footpath will be diverted as part of the HIF proposals.  |
| Public, Homes England (as developer)                    | Sought clarity as to the landownership and costs of the revised proposal; and whether it would be on a high embankment.  | <p>The new route is on Medway Council land and is less costly than the previously proposed option.</p> <p>The current anticipated design includes a multiple arched structure across the attenuation pond allowing the pond to maintain function, with approach embankments either side. The vertical level difference between to A289 and where the road will tie-in at Woodfield Way will be less than 2m.</p>   |
| Public, Cliffe Woods Parish Council                     | Sought clarity as to whether there will still be a vehicular continuation between Islingham Farm Road and Woodfield Way. Concerned that, without restrictions in place Higham Road/Islingham Farm Road could be used as a rat run. | <p>Yes. However, it is considered a benefit of the scheme that by introducing Phase 1, residents will be given the option to use more of a direct route than minor roads that will have traffic calming measures added. Additionally, Phase 5 has a free flow slip lane and therefore allowing traffic to access the peninsular more freely.</p> <p>It should be noted that a Right Turn prohibition is proposed to prevent access to the new A289 junction from the start of Woodfield Way. Drivers entering Woodfield Way from Higham Road /Bunters Hill Road and Islingham Farm Road would need to pass up Woodfield Way to Upchat Roundabout to be able to</p> |

| Consultee(s)                  | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
|                               |  | <p>access the A228 and then A289, as per the existing route.</p> <p>The potential for rat running will be considered as part of the transport assessment and any necessary mitigation measures considered.</p>  |
| Higham Parish Council         | Sought clarity that a no right turn restriction from the southbound carriageway on the A289 will be retained.  | This can be confirmed, as discussed above.  |
| Public                        | Sought clarity on whether HGVs, buses and Agricultural vehicles will be allowed on the new roads, including the potential for construction movements to go through Wainscott.  | <p>Agricultural vehicles and buses will be able to use the new roads, but HGVs will not be permitted for general use. However, emergency diversion routes are being proposed to allow access/egress to the peninsula in the event of emergency road closure of the A228.</p> <p>Construction traffic will be managed through the Construction Traffic Management Plan with agreed routes, timings defined and enforced. This will mitigate construction traffic passing through and parking in residential areas/ villages.</p> |
| Public, Higham Parish Council | Concerned that if there are blockages on the A228 and seeking to ensure that HGV vehicles do not divert to use Higham Road/Hoo Road to access Four Elms Roundabout (with associated air quality and traffic impacts); and that these areas do not become a rat run for normal traffic. | <p>The restrictions on HGVs on Higham Road will remain.</p> <p>For HGVs, additional emergency crossover points and gates are proposed on the A228 to access/contra-flow movements in the event of major incidents. Resilience for access to/from the Peninsula is also being made for emergency use by cars and buses for the relief road in the event that contra-flow arrangements cannot be introduced due the type and location of a major incident. Discussions have been held with the MoD, and</p>                       |

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|---|---|---|
|   |   | agreements are being put in place, in relation to the use of Woodfield Way for HGVs in this circumstance.   |
| Public  | Queried whether the MOD still have the option to close Woodfield Way as at present and whether the current 20mph speed restriction on Woodfield Way will remain.  | <p>The MoD will retain its ability to close Woodfield Way for troop/equipment movements. However this will be a very infrequent occurrence and will be appropriately notified, as at present.</p> <p>The 20mph speed limit on Woodfield Way will be retained.</p>   |
| Medway Liberal Democrats, Frindsbury Extra Parish Council | Concerned that the use of Woodfield Way as a relief road will not work and that it does not provide value for money; and requested to see the business case and traffic modelling which demonstrate that it will be sufficient and value for money. | <p>The provision of a secondary route on and off the Peninsula is a key part of the road proposals and one of several key elements contained within the funding bid that was made for HIF monies. As a government body, Homes England would not have granted monies for this proposal if they did not feel it was value for money for the public purse; as such, an independent body has already determined, at a business case level, that the proposals meet that requirement.</p> <p>Within the local area the SSSI severely limited the route options for a second route. The Future Hoo team is working closely with the MoD and other stakeholders to provide the most appropriate solution.</p> <p>Collectively the proposed improvements to the existing network and the proposed Relief Road provide the necessary capacity to facilitate the proposed housing growth.</p> |

| Consultee(s)                                       | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | Traffic modelling will be provided as part of the planning application which will demonstrate that the proposals as a whole are appropriate.  |
| Public   | <p>Concerned to understand how, having previously been told that no that no other option other than the flyover would allow enough traffic to flow through Four Elms, the new proposed junction, with a set of traffic lights on the bypass, can allow for the same amount of traffic.</p> <p>Sought clarity on how the same traffic levels can be accommodated by the proposed new junction, and which left/right turns will and won't be possible, and what priorities at the traffic lights will be put in place. Also sought information on the revised projected traffic flows through Islingham Farm Road and Higham Road</p> | The At-grade junction on the A289 provides a hybrid alternative option to the original promoted grade separated by free flow access layout. This new junction is required to have restricted access and operate in coordination with the proposed capacity improvements at Four Elms Roundabouts. No pedestrian or active travel facilities are able to be provided at this location in order to accommodate traffic demand and provide an acceptable level of service. The layout does introduce stop/start traffic flows compared to the original option. |
| Kelly Tolhurst MP and Homes England (as developer) | Concerned to understand how congestion will be managed on the new structure and how effective it will be in managing traffic flow.  | The phased signal controlled At-grade junction on the A289 will manage flow demands 24hrs. Traffic flows will be coordinated to provide acceptable levels of services. An additional lane has been provided over the new structure to optimise capacity and traffic release on to the A289 London bound.  |
| Public   | Queried whether the single lane Islingham Farm Road and Woodfield Way will be able to meet capacity.  | Traffic modelling demonstrates that the improved Islingham Farm Road and Woodfield Way will be able to meet anticipated traffic flows.  |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|--|---|
| Public       | Queried whether there will be a new footpath alongside Upchat Road   | This is not proposed as part of the HIF proposals but may be able to be brought forward by Homes England as part of their development.  |
| Public       | Concerned about air quality, noise and visual impacts to homes and non-motorised users arising from increased use of Woodfield Way and pedestrians crossings being put in place, particularly given the current rural environment. | Any necessary mitigation measures for noise and visual impacts will be developed through the EIA process, which will take account of the baseline position.   |
| Public       | Concerned that Chattenden will become subject to rat running and whether buses will continue to serve the village.   | <p>Capacity improvements to junctions will allow vehicular movement to flow in a controlled phased operation compared to existing arrangements. Increased resilience to the primary network is proposed and does not promote making side roads more attractive to through traffic. Where the Transport Assessment identifies potential issues/traffic leakage, appropriate mitigation measures will be proposed/implemented.</p> <p>Buses will continue to serve Chattenden village and should see an improved service offer.</p> |
| Public       | Concerned that traffic heading west from Four Elms Roundabout will be held up at a traffic-controlled junction on the A289.  | Reduce speed limit and enforcement on the A289 is proposed to managed flows between junctions. A simple 2 stage signal phasing be used to minimise the wait time on A289.   |
| Public       | Suggested that access to Woodfield Way roundabout (and the new road) could be gained at the junction after the Four Elms Road instead of creating another route next to a dual carriageway.  | The determination of the proposed layout has been through a number of design iterations to ensure that the most appropriate and sustainable solution is proposed. The option to use the existing Chattenden Lane junction was not taken forward due to capacity issues, the need  |



| Consultee(s)                                 | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | to avoid a signalised junction on Four Elms Hill and safety concerns and restriction on the side road.   |
| <b>Phase 2</b>                               |   |  |
| Public, Natural England, Kent Wildlife Trust | Concerned to ensure that the SSSI is fully accounted for in the design to ensure impacts are avoided or mitigated.  | The Future Hoo team has and will continue to design the scheme to avoid direct and indirect impacts to the SSSI; and will continue to work with Natural England to ensure a joined-up strategy to avoiding access impacts to the SSSI. |
| Natural England                              | Concerned to ensure that any non-motorised user provision on the relief road does not lead to pressure on the SSSI but acknowledged that this should be able to be managed through on-going dialogue and development of the SEMS proposals.               |  |
| Homes England (as developer)                 | Welcomed the route of the relief road but considers that a robust and jointly agreed strategy is needed to avoid and mitigate SSSI impacts, and that further discussion is needed in respect of drainage, non-motorised user, and other technical points. | The Future Hoo team has and will continue to engage with Homes England on all of these points.   |
| Local Access Forum                           | Emphasised that this phase must be designed to ensure safe provision for non-motorised users.   | The scheme will be designed with non-motorised user safety in mind.  |
| Public                                       | Queried how the spur road would be crossed by horses, cyclists, and pedestrians safely?   | Existing PROW routes will be retained. Enhanced pedestrian and cyclist crossing facilities at Main Rd junction and Bells Lane roundabout will be provided.   |
| Public, Medway Labour and Cooperative Group  | Queried why an additional roundabout is needed with Alignment B and on the A228.  | Alignment B - the roundabout is required for to accommodate a change in direction on the route that enables the approach roads to be designed to the   |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|---|---|
|              |   | <p>appropriate safe standard. This layout has the benefit of minimising the extent of land take required.</p> <p>A228 New Roundabout – This additional junction is required to assist managing traffic flows and capacity at the A228 Main Road junction and provide permeability into the development. This junction also provide additional network resilience.</p>   |
| Public       | Queried why a signalised crossroads is proposed at the Main Road Hoo Roundabout when the existing roundabout seems to work fine?  | Traffic modelling indicates that without intervention the existing roundabout will not provide sufficient capacity for all directions. Modelling demonstrated that an enlarged roundabout arrangement would not provide adequate opportunity for the side roads to access the roundabout due to the dominant A228 north/south traffic movements. The signalised junction layout provides phased access for all approaches and allows active travel connectivity across the busy A228. |
| Public       | Welcomed the spur link road but concerned that ultimately traffic will still be starting and ending on the A289 and at the top of Four Elms Hill.   | Traffic modelling indicates that without intervention the existing Four Elms Roundabout traffic would continue to queue back excessively on Four Elms Hill. In conjunction with the proposed signal-controlled junction at A228 Main Road traffic is effectively platooned and this improves flow patterns along the A228.  |
| Public       | Concerned that the original right turn off the A228 to Main Road Hoo was removed and replaced by a roundabout due the amount of traffic need to turn left to access the schools. Queried what volume of traffic is expected to now turn right in the mornings | Traffic modelling has dictated the required storage length for the dedicated right turn facility. Traffic signal phasing will be optimised to mitigate the risk of traffic queuing back beyond the dedicated space.   |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--|---|---|
|  | to access the school and how far south along the A228 will this traffic queue for?  |   |
| Public   | Concerned that the A228 relief road proposal would have adverse impacts. Suggested that A289 route between the A2/M2 junction and the Medway City estate and Medway Tunnel Traffic should be prioritised as flow data assumes principal flows are here. Also suggested that additional junction capacity for traffic leaving or gaining access to the A228 could be sought within the design. | Comments noted. The scheme is looking to futureproof the network when future housing comes forward. The 'relief road' will allow residents in Chattenden to exit the A289, therefore not having to travel through Four Elm Roundabout or the AQMA area. The TA will be published as part of the planning application which will provide more detail on anticipated traffic movements. |
| Public, Kelly Tolhurst MP, Medway Liberal Democrats, Frindsbury Extra Parish Council | Concerned that the proposed Alignment A for the spur road for this phase was located close to proposed parkland and Deangate.   | This alignment is not being taken forward for the scheme.   |
| Public   | Suggested that the Phase 2 proposals should not be used by HGVs.  | The proposed Relief Road and Woodfield Way will have imposed weight restrictions and enforcement to prohibit use by HGVs. In the event of a major incident on the A228 where the proposed central reserve crossovers are not able to be accessed and a road closure is implemented exemptions will be permitted to allow use for emergency diversion route.                           |
| Public and councillors   | Concerned about the proposals to close Ratcliffe Highway to vehicles, for use as an equestrian quiet route.   | The closure of Ratcliffe Highway is no longer proposed as part of the HIF proposals.<br><br>The shared use bridge is no longer to be brought forward as part of HIF. However, provision will be made  |

| Consultee(s)             | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--------------------------|---|--|
|                          | Queried the status of the proposed shared bridge across the A228.   | in the IDS for it to be provided through Section 106 contributions.  |
| Public                   | Concerned about footway provision on current Abbey homes development access being replaced by new footpath that is next to a very busy petrol station.  | The access to the Abbey homes development is being moved to account for the HIF designs, but the footway provision will be moved with it. The new provision adjacent to the petrol station is therefore additional provision.  |
| <b>Phase 3</b>           |   |  |
| Public                   | Concerned that a signalised roundabout will cause more congestion, air pollution, and disrupt traffic flows; and that the use of traffic signalling should be planned (e.g. only used in peak times). | The planning application for the highways project will consider these matters. However, the proposals for Phase 3, as with the highways scheme as a whole, have been designed to deal with modelled flows. Signal operation will be developed to minimise traffic queues and maximise traffic flows. |
| Public                   | Suggested that Dux Court Road should be left as it is and that the existing roundabout and junctions is inadequate.   | The planned highways improvements have been developed to enable housing development on the Peninsula and to ensure sufficient traffic capacity on key routes. Improvements to Dux Court Road are minor in nature, involving changes to existing footways due to the increase in roundabout size.     |
| Public                   | Queried whether the design will cope with large movements at peak times.  | Current modelling demonstrates that it will. This will be presented in the transport assessment submitted with the planning application.   |
| Medway Liberal Democrats | Suggestion that the roundabout should be constructed as a traffic light controlled gyratory.  | The proposed layout comprises an enlarged roundabout with signal control to allow all approach road the opportunity to access the roundabout.  |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--|---|---|
| Public, Medway Local Access Forum, Medway Public Paths Department, British Horse Society | Suggested that the design of this junction should allow for a Pegasus Crossing for horse riders to cross the A228 Peninsula Way and this junction.  | The Future Hoo team is currently exploring the potential for a Pegasus Crossing at this location. A key consideration is that the bridleway connects appropriately to Dux Court Road.   |
| <b>Phase 4</b>   |   |   |
| Public and Church Commissioners  | Concerned that details of the junction arrangements for access to the proposed station were not available as part of the Round 2 consultation.  | The second round of consultation made clear that access would be taken from Stoke Road roundabout but did not set out its detailed design. That was considered sufficient for the general public to understand the outline of our overall proposals and comment accordingly. The developed design of the junction, which is constrained by the physical and environmental constraints of that location, is being shared in June through engagement with residents and stakeholders in the vicinity of the junction. |
| Church Commissioners   | Generally supported the proposals for the improvements for Phase 4 but requested continued engagement on the details of the proposals.  | The Future Hoo team will continue to engage with the Church Commissioners.  |
| Frindsbury Extra Parish Council  | Suggested that the Stoke Road roundabout may need to be a traffic light controlled gyratory due to the increase in traffic flow generated from the increasing volume of traffic to and from Kingsnorth Industrial Estate and the eastern expansion of Hoo rural town. | As explained in the Road Design Development Report, the proposal for this junction is a traffic signal-controlled junction, which is considered to perform best in traffic terms and other criteria.  |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--|--|---|
| Public   | Suggested that the station access road should be along the route of the Ropers Green Lane as the shortest, most direct, option.  | This option was considered but not taken forward, for the reasons set out in the Road Design Development Report.  |
| Public   | The proposed footpath that passes through the station needs to be extended towards High Halstow / Grain and include a cycle path   | As part of the PROW development, considerations as part of the SEMS project will can be given to extending this footpath.   |
| Public   | Suggested that the station access road should come from the north from the A228 through the development site.  | This option was considered but not taken forward, for the reasons set out in the Road Design Development Report.  |
| Medway Labour and Cooperative Group                                  | Queried if there is to be a spur from the Ropers Lane roundabout?  | It can be confirmed that there is no spur from the Ropers Lane roundabout – the road shown on the plans is an existing private access at that location.   |
| Public, Medway Public Paths Department and Medway Local Access Forum | Noted that footpath provision at this location, although welcomed that it is to be retained, is inadequate, being muddy tracks that are not suitable for cyclists, not able to be used by horse riders and should be linked into wider PROW improvements across the Hoo Peninsula. | Such improvements at this location are not within the scope of the Future Hoo project, particularly as these are not SEMS areas. Future developers of land in and around the station will be able to propose improvements to non-motorised user provision as part of ensuring sustainable development is delivered. |
| <b>Phase 5</b>   |  |   |
| Public   | Suggested that a left filter lane and intelligent traffic signals should be utilised – particularly turning left from the A289 onto Four Elms Hill and vice versa.   | The proposed layout introduces two slip lanes to provide free flow conditions on the approaches and increase flows through the roundabout. Traffic modelling indicates that dedicated signals at the merges are not required for the expected traffic flows. Future proofing of                                     |

| Consultee(s)                        | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                     |   | this requirement will be considered as part of the next stage of design.  |
| Public                              | Suggested that this Phase should be completed first and monitored to see if the other works would then be required. Alternatively only traffic signals should be implemented first. | Modelling demonstrates that all HIF highways works are required to meet the traffic capacity demands of proposed future development. The full package of works are therefore required. Homes England funding is also time limited and would be unlikely to be available if works were not commenced until a later date. |
| Public                              | Suggested that these works should be constructed first during a holiday period.   | The construction programme (both overall and on a per phase basis) will depend on when consent is granted for the highways scheme. Construction will be phased to mitigate impact and disruption to the network as far as possible.   |
| Public                              | Suggested that upgrades should also be made to Upchat Road towards the Medway tunnel.   | This is not proposed as the focus of the HIF schemes are to improve strategic movements on the Peninsula.   |
| Public                              | Suggested that a third exit lane separate from the roundabout for the Peninsula on the A289 and the widening of Four Elms Hill to Chattenden.                                       | This is not possible due to land constraints and the nearby SSSI.   |
| Public, Cliffe Woods Parish Council | Concerned that traffic signals are needed in peak times to allow safe access from Parishes to the west and to account for school buses using the junction                           | Traffic signals will be monitored to ensure they are appropriate to the traffic flows and types for each period.  |
| Public                              | Concerned that traffic races along toward Four Elms Roundabout so the speed will have to be managed in the approach to the proposed lights and junction.                            | It is proposed that speed on the A289 will be reduced on the approach to the roundabout in a staggered approach.  |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--|---|--|
| Public, Councillors, Medway Labour Group, Medway Public Paths team | Concerned that, whilst the provision of crossings for non-motorised users was welcomed, traffic signals to facilitate those crossings could impede traffic flow, and a footbridge should be provided instead. Also considered that as the junction is complex, pedestrians will need help to ensure that crossings can be used safely.              | The pedestrian crossings will work in conjunction with the traffic lights and the signals will be controlled to work with traffic flows. A pedestrian bridge was not able to be taken forward due to a lack of space, long approach ramps and the inability to include at-grade crossing on the modified signal-controlled roundabout. Appropriate signage will be put in place at the junction.   |
| Higham Parish Council  | Suggested that the dedicated turn left lane on Hasted Road at Four Elms Roundabout should be extended so that it commences at the new traffic light junction further south. Set out that they have concerns about the ability of this roundabout, as proposed, to cope with the extra traffic the additional housing proposed near Hoo will create. | Increasing the length of the dedicated left turn lane back to the new at-grade junction will be considered as part of the stage of design. This would provide additional resilience to the junction.   |
| Public   | Expressed sentiment that respondent was not supportive of the proposed roads from Kitchener roundabout to the A289 without major changes and upgrades - concern that these proposals would not supplement an existing overused dual carriageway.  | The proposed at-grade junction on the A289 and new access road to Woodfield Way have been determined to provide the required capacity in both directions.  |
| Public, Findsbury Extra Parish Council, Medway Liberal Democrats   | Suggested that a grade separated junction or alternatively a tunnel may be the best way to deal with traffic flow and increased growth.   | This has not been taken forward as an option as it would fail the fundamental aim of relieving this junction as a bottleneck for traffic capacity. Modelling shows that if there is a free flow of traffic heading east from Hasted Road A289 then the congestion tailbacks will start from beyond Higham Road Overbridge (as existing). The new T-junction on the A289 (as part of Phase 1) will release traffic in managed flows and be phased with signals at |



| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>Four Elms Roundabout allowing all round improved traffic capacity.</p> <p>Traffic will be able to access the A289 utilising the proposed designated slip roads under phased signal control, which will be optimised for all approaches.</p>  |
| <b>Phase 6</b>   |  |   |
| <p>Public,<br/>Councillors<br/>Medway Labour<br/>and Cooperative<br/>Group</p> | <p>Concerned about the design of the proposals, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impacts to local green space and hedgerows;</li> <li>• impacts to local parking spaces;</li> <li>• the safety of the layout between Benenden Road and Wainscott Road;</li> <li>• the removal of the exit to Wainscott Road;</li> <li>• the right turn from Frittenden Road into Benenden Road;</li> <li>• the increase in traffic lanes from the kerb on Frittenden Road closest to the houses, to the kerb closest to the Maritime Academy from seven to thirteen; and</li> <li>• the new Frindsbury Road junction (with alternatives being suggested); and</li> </ul> | <p>The Future Hoo team through ongoing engagement with key stakeholders are currently reviewing and assessing residents proposals/refinements in order to find a balanced layout that is appropriate for all parties.</p> <p>Further revisions will be made to the Phase 6 proposals to account for these concerns in its planning application and will ensure that impacts to local green spaces and parking spaces will be minimised.</p> |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|---|---|
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>that that there is no option for traffic leaving the new Maritime Academy Road to proceed straight across to the new Wainscott Road.</li> </ul> <p>Suggested that a special meeting should be held to discuss impacts of Phases 5 and 6</p>  |   |
| Public       | <p>Concerned about traffic performance as a result of the proposals, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>whether this will move the traffic problem from Medway City Estate Roundabout to the Sans Pareil Roundabout;</li> <li>the likelihood of more queues in Frindsbury Hill and at the Station Road junction;</li> <li>additional build-up of traffic trying to reach the Medway Tunnel coming from Wainscott, noting that access to Four Elms roundabout to turn right from Wainscott is impossible during rush hour and that the proposals will add to the queue; and</li> <li>adding to the existing danger on Upnor Road due to the speed of downhill traffic (often in excess of 50mph) and volume of traffic on Berwick Way</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sans Pareil roundabout will undergo improvements to provide greater capacity at the junction. The free flow lane and 2 lanes turning right to the tunnel will enable traffic to move more freely and minimise delays.</li> <li>The existing queues experienced on Frindsbury Hill are improved by the proposed layout with the inclusion of the free flow lane around the Roundabout onto the A289 Wulfere Way.</li> <li>Signals will also be phase controlled to manage flows and will enable vehicles from Frindsbury Road to turn right to A289 Berwick Way/</li> <li>Vehicles existing Upnor Road will be able to make use of platooned traffic flows, improving on the existing situation.</li> </ul> |
| Public       | Concerned that there will be impacts to bus routes, particularly given that there appears to be a loss of a bus stop on the A228 northbound carriageway.  | Engagement is on-going with bus operators. The bus stops on Frindsbury Hill will be relocated on Wainscott  |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--------------|--|--|
|              | <p>Also concerned that the Bingham Road bus stop is used by local residents throughout the day. In particular, that if the Wainscott bound bus stop at Sans Pareil is moved to the location proposed in Phase 6, people going to the school site using the bus from Strood could disembark at Bingham Road stop as it would be a shorter and easier walk. The increase in the use of the pedestrian crossing next to the bus stop would cause further delays to traffic on Frindsbury Road. People leaving the school and taking the bus towards the Hoo Peninsula would need to cross the new Benenden Road extension at the junction with Wainscott Road which becomes a potential hazard.</p> <p>Suggested that land west of the Sans Pareil pub could be used as a location for relocated east bound bus stop.</p> | <p>Road and the route proposed will follow existing bus routes for public services.</p> <p>On-going engagement will continue to ensure that the most appropriate bus stop provision is put in place.</p> <p>The Future Hoo team has investigated the use of the land west of the Sans Pareil pub, and it has been found to have insufficient size for use as a bus stop.</p> |
| Public       | Queried what the reduced speed limit on Wulfere Way will be  | The speed limit is proposed to be 50mph.   |
| Public       | Suggested that only traffic light changes should be introduced at this roundabout instead.   | Traffic modelling of the proposals demonstrates that the proposed holistic solution accommodates future growth. This will be set out in the transport assessment accompanying the planning application. Traffic signals in conjunction with layout modifications are required for future capacity.   |
| Public       | Welcomed the introduction of free flow slip lanes and additional filter lanes at this junction.  | This comment is welcomed.  |

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|---|--|---|
| Public, Findsbury Extra Parish Council                                      | Welcomed the widening of Wulfere Way and its associated cycle path is a sensible proposition.  | This comment is welcomed.   |
| Public  | Concerned that widening of Wulfere Way could lead to increased noise impacts to residents.   | This will be assessed through the EIA process. However, the A289 will be reduced to 40mph speed limits and with the introduction of traffic signals on Four Elms Roundabout, impacts are considered to be unlikely.   |
| Public, Councillors, Kelly Tolhurst MP, Medway Labour and Cooperative Group | <p>Concerned about impacts of school access road being built for Maritime Academy, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the construction programme for that access road and the HIF scheme;</li> <li>• the safety of school children navigating the junction to access the school;</li> <li>• the consequential need for the proposed signalised junction on Frindsbury Hill and the traffic impacts this may cause;</li> <li>• the ability for school buses to drop off at the school;</li> <li>• the additional traffic that will arise from school movements causing the junction to struggle;</li> <li>• whether there is scope for the access road to be moved; and</li> </ul> | <p>The Future Hoo team are working closely with the Department for Education on the Maritime Academy proposals.</p> <p>In answer to the points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Maritime Academy access and junction will be constructed before the HIF scheme. The HIF scheme has taken this access into account in its proposals</li> <li>• pedestrian crossings, railings and zebra crossings are all being explored through joint working and with the Council's adoption officer</li> <li>• It is understood that school transport, i.e. those vehicles that are in use for school children only will pick up and drop off within the school grounds. However, larger buses, including those vehicles in public service, will not enter the school grounds and use the bus stop facilities on the public highway.</li> </ul> |

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|---|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>what the road constructed further down Berwick Way is to be used for if it is not suitable for through traffic.</li> </ul>                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modelling has taken into account traffic movements generated by the school development.</li> <li>The access road to the school has been granted planning permission and as such, there is no further scope for change to this element.</li> <li>The access road farther along Berwick Way is for the historic barn and, as far as the HIF team are aware, is not to be utilised as a through road due to existing restrictions.</li> </ul> |
| Public  | Concerned that the design for Benenden and Wainscott Roads will encourage drivers to use Holywood Lane into Four Elms Roundabout? Has this been accounted for in the traffic modelling? | This is not the aim of the proposals. Traffic modelling (and any necessary mitigation as a result) will be presented in the planning application.   |
| Public  | Suggested that an alternative proposal should be to build a new road from the tunnel entrance to Four Elms Roundabout   | Traffic modelling of the proposals demonstrate that the proposed holistic solution accommodates future growth without the need for a completely new road in this location. This will be set out in the transport assessment accompanying the planning application. In this context, it would not be appropriate for the Council to seek to acquire a large amount of third-party land or expend a larger amount of public money on such a proposal.                                       |
| Medway Liberal Democrat Group, Findsbury Extra Parish Council | Suggested that a grade separated junction should be brought forward instead.  | The provision of a grade separated junction would provide exceptional level of service in terms of traffic. The footprint, height, and operation of this form of junction would provide unacceptable levels of visual   |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--------------|--------------|--|
|              |              | intrusion, noise. The funding conditions aim to optimise the existing highway asset. |

### Design Changes - Highways

- 5.40 A number of important changes were made to the highways proposals as a result of the two rounds of consultation and through ongoing engagement with stakeholders, those with land interests plus parish councils and resident groups. Many of these amendments were in response to stakeholder and public feedback and helped to develop the best possible highways solutions across the multiple sites and phases proposed.
- 5.41 The changes made to the highways scheme, following Rounds 1 and 2 consultations, up to the current timeframe of this Report to Cabinet of HIF Consultation, are outlined below. The team has also provided an explanation as to why these changes were made and how these linked to stakeholder and public feedback.

| Headline topic                                     | Detail of change  | Why the change/ evolution?   |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Phase 1 - Option 2 Alternative route</b></p> | <p>At-grade signalised junction - on the A289 (between Higham Road and Four Elms Roundabout) - was taken forward for further consultation and design development.</p> | <p>Consulted option ('Option 1') was met with significant objection from councillors and residents and alternative requested to be considered. Resident's concerns centred around the perceived impact of the route and associated A289 slip roads in terms of noise, light, traffic volumes and visual intrusion. Residents were also concerned about the impacts of the proposed changes to Higham Road, Islingham Farm Road and Woodfield Way (and the junction between them) in the Option 1 layout.</p> <p>Outline traffic modelling determined that a signalised junction with restricted traffic movements could provide an appropriate junction form to consider. This is due to the relative simplicity of the junction operation, which can operate in two stages where the A289 runs in one stage and the relief road runs in a second and with no need for pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>Traffic modelling showed that a traffic signal junction phased with the Four Elms Roundabout would operate with a reasonable level of service accommodating the predicted HIF traffic flows.</p> <p>As a consequence, only minor changes to the Higham Road/Islingham Farm Road junction are required and similarly to Islingham Farm Road itself.</p> <p>The proposed modifications to Islingham Farm Road aim to retain the rural nature of the highway whilst encouraging active travel, mitigate the attraction of through traffic and reduce impact on the local environment.</p> <p>Consequential changes also arise to the design at the Woodfield Way/Islingham Farm junction which retain much of the existing carriageway, encourage active travel with new footways and cycle facilities and avoid extensive modifications to Islingham Farm Road at this location.</p> |

| Headline topic                     | Detail of change   | Why the change/ evolution?  |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Phase 2 - Relief Road</b>       | <p><u>From:</u> New relief road north and then to the east, before intersecting with Chattenden Lane and continuing to join the A228 Main Road Hoo Roundabout</p> <p><u>To:</u> Realignment of Section 1 of the relief road (Upchat Roundabout to Chattenden Lane)</p> | <p>Engagement with Homes England sought a move of the road alignment to maximise development site potential. The realignment required a change of direction roundabout and additional road length.</p> <p>In addition to this, the closure of Ratcliffe Highway is no longer proposed as part of the HIF proposals.</p>   |
| <b>Phase 2 - Spur Link Road</b>    | <p><u>From:</u> Spur link road passing through part of Deangate Ridge golf course</p> <p><u>To:</u> Consideration of two alignment options and selection of Alignment B</p>  | <p>In Round 1 consultation, a spur road was proposed from a roundabout junction with the New Relief Road to the east of Chattenden Lane, to an additional roundabout proposed between Main Road Hoo and Bell's Lane Roundabout; this would pass through a small southern part of the former Deangate Ridge golf course.</p> <p>Following engagement with affected stakeholders, a second option was put forward and the two options (Alignment A and B) were assessed. Alignment B was selected as the preferred option. This option provides improved connectivity options for future developments, facilities active travel provision, has reduced impact on the environment, avoids the former Deangate Golf Course and minimises the impact on the potential developable space.</p> |
| <b>Phase 2 – Ratcliffe Highway</b> | <p><u>From:</u> Closure of this road eastwards from Main Road Roundabout to vehicular traffic</p> <p><u>To:</u> No such closure now proposed</p>   | <p>This was proposed as part of a package of forming a quiet equestrian route that would link to the shared-used bridge previously proposed as part of the SEMS proposals. A number of concerns were expressed at consultation about this proposal.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, and that the shared-use bridge is now no longer proposed to be delivered through HIF, this closure no longer forms part of the HIF proposals.</p>  |



| Headline topic   | Detail of change  | Why the change/ evolution?  |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Phase 6 – Sans Pareil Roundabout</b></p>               | <p><u>From:</u> Improvements at roundabout including an additional lane on approaches, a dedicated slip road to the northbound A228 and a relocated Wainscott Road access to the roundabout</p> <p><u>To:</u> Same as above but significant change to the Wainscott Road access to this roundabout, with a revised layout of the road at this point</p> | <p>Ongoing consultation and engagement with councillors and residents have identified concerns regarding the modified layout of the Wainscott Road and Benenden Road, focussing on the impact on local properties, through traffic and increased footfall and traffic from the new academy. Various local improvements and realignments are being reviewed to mitigate the impact of the scheme whilst maintaining bus access to Wainscott Road and reduce the visual impact from loss of green space.</p> <p>Engagement on the development of this design at this location continues with these parties.</p> |
| <p><b>Phase 6 - Maritime Academy off Frindsbury Hill</b></p> | <p><u>From:</u> No junction</p> <p><u>To:</u> Proposed new access/junction to the Maritime Academy off Frindsbury Hill</p>  | <p>As part of the developing Local Plan and schools' requirement, the Department for Education (DfE) proposed and received planning approval for a new academy with access off Frindsbury Hill. This introduced additional traffic movements and flows therefore a new traffic signal-controlled junction will be delivered on Frindsbury Hill by the DfE.</p> <p>The HIF scheme will build from this junction with modifications to the Sans Pareil Roundabout, relocated junction for Wainscott Road to Frindsbury Hill and alterations to the Benenden Road layout.</p>                                    |
| <p><b>Phase 6 - Wulfere Way</b></p>                          | <p><u>From:</u> Speed limit of 70MPH</p> <p><u>To:</u> Reduction of speed limit to 50 MPH</p>   | <p>In response to community feedback, the speed limit at this point will be reduced.</p>  |

## Ongoing Engagement Throughout - Highways

### 6 SEMS

#### Round 1 - SEMS

##### Topics for Consultation

- 6.1 Unlike rail and highways, proposals for SEMS were developed through a more staged approach and this was reflected in the Round 1 consultation.
- 6.2 Cockham Community Parkland (Phase 1) was a front-runner project for SEMS which had already gone out to consultation between July and November 2020\* i.e., before Round 1. Therefore, Round 1 consultation for SEMS was much more about building on the success of Cockham Community Parkland (i.e. demonstrating what could be achieved and reporting back on key design evolutions), gaining feedback on a draft Vision for SEMS as a whole, and testing out key design principles for what would become multiple schemes within Phase 2 SEMS.

*\*An online public survey was undertaken over a six-week period from 27th July to 7th September 2020 (due to Covid-19) and stakeholder meetings were held between August and November 2020. Full details of the consultation undertaken for Phase 1 can be found in Appendix 1.*

- 6.3 At this point, unlike rail and highways, no specific proposals or sites for Phase 2 SEMS were tabled and therefore consultation was much more high level. It was always the intention at this stage that further, more detailed consultation would be required as site-specific proposals were developed.

##### Feedback Received

##### *Questionnaire Results*

6.4 **SEMS – enhancement and protection of the natural environment (8 questions):** respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements regarding the enhancement and protection of the natural environment, covering the following:

- enhancement and protection of green spaces
- impact of development on the environment
- new green spaces
- boundaries between green spaces

6.5 **Key Findings:**

- Respondents agreed that:
  - the enhancement and protection of green spaces on the Hoo Peninsula is important to them
  - the enhancement and protection of green spaces on the Hoo Peninsula is important to the local area
  - any development should minimise the impact to the environment on the Hoo Peninsula
  - any new green spaces should help to protect existing ecologically sensitive sites on the Hoo Peninsula
  - new green spaces should include a variety of habitats
  - any new green spaces should link with existing natural spaces
  - there should be clear boundaries between green spaces using fencing and hedgerows to provide definition
- Further comments raised by respondents about how proposed green spaces could enhance and protect the natural environment were most likely to include:
  - to protect the existing greenspaces / no new greenspaces

- concerns about over / further development
- the environmental impact on the area

#### 6.6 **Statistics (quantitative):**

- 78% agreed that the enhancement and protection of green spaces on the Hoo Peninsula was important to the local area
- 77% agreed that any development should minimise the impact to the environment on the Hoo Peninsula
- 76% agreed that any new green spaces should help to protect existing ecologically sensitive sites on the Hoo Peninsula
- 73% agreed that new green spaces should include a variety of habitats e.g., wildflower meadows, hedgerows, marshland, etc
- 69% agreed that any new green spaces should link with existing natural spaces
- 53% agreed there should be clear boundaries between green spaces using fencing and hedgerows to provide definition. 7% disagreed with this statement; whilst 24% remained neutral on this issue

#### 6.7 **SEMS – development of green spaces (questions):** respondents were asked how much they agree or disagree with a number of statements regarding how green spaces should be developed on the Hoo Peninsula, covering the following topics:

- wildlife
- use by people
- connectivity

#### 6.8 **Key Findings (qualitative):**

- Respondents agreed that:
  - there should be areas of green space close to Hoo which encouraged wildlife

- there should be areas of green space close to Hoo that people could freely enjoy without disturbing wildlife
- green spaces should be connected to help people and wildlife move safely around
- green spaces should allow them to meet others from the local community
- there should be planned paths to allow different types of users to enjoy the green space
- there should be information boards and signage to allow people to enjoy the green space
- there should be visitor facilities to allow people to enjoy the green space
- Comments raised by respondents as to how green spaces should be developed were most likely to include:
  - the protection of existing green space
  - the concerns about over / further development
  - the protection / enhancement of Deangate

#### 6.9 **Statistics (quantitative):**

- 73% agreed that there should be areas of green space close to Hoo which encouraged wildlife
- 71% agreed that there should be areas of green space close to Hoo that people could freely enjoy without disturbing wildlife
- 71% agreed that green spaces should be connected to help people and wildlife move safely around
- 60% agreed that green spaces should allow them to meet others from the local community. 19% remained neutral on this issue
- 62% agreed that there should be planned paths to allow different types of users to enjoy the green space. 15% remained neutral on this issue

- 55% agreed that there should be information boards and signage to allow people to enjoy the green space. 19% remained neutral on this issue
- 48% agreed there should be visitor facilities to allow people to enjoy the green space e.g., toilets, visitor centre, car parking, etc. 15% disagreed with this statement; whilst 21% remained neutral

6.10 **SEMS – new access routes and paths (2 questions)**: to help define the location and nature of new access routes, including opportunities for multi-user paths, respondents were asked for suggestions for new access routes and paths including:

- location e.g., giving the start and end points and links to existing pathways
- who the path is going to be used by e.g. walkers, cyclists, horse riders, etc?
- the type of surface that should be used e.g., tarmac, gravel, grass, etc

6.11 **Key Findings (qualitative)**:

- Comments raised by respondents about the location and type of new access routes and paths that could be developed on the Hoo Peninsula were most likely to include:
  - concerns about over/further development
  - maintaining existing paths
  - path surfaces
- Further considerations raised by respondents about the green spaces on the Hoo Peninsula were most likely to include:
  - concerns about over / further development in the area
  - the protection of existing green spaces
  - the protection of Deangate

## Round 2 - SEMS

### Topics for Consultation

- 6.12 Following Round 1 consultation, the team commenced a Cumulative Ecological Impact Assessment process to map the best opportunities for habitat creation, protect designated sites, and provide access to natural green space on the Hoo Peninsula.
- 6.13 Having made considerable progress on this work\*, the team was able to set out high level concepts for SEMS Phase 2 sites for Round 2, with some detail relating to their function and ecological benefits.

*\*The Cumulative Ecological Impact Assessment is currently still being developed to inform the emerging Local Plan.*

- 6.14 The table below outlines what was presented for consultation for SEMS Round 2.

| <b>Topics presented for consultation</b>  |
|---|
| <p><b>Phase 2a – Hoo Flats Community Parkland</b> <i>(now renamed Hoo Wetland Reserve)</i><br/>60 hectares of wetland habitats with wet meadow, reed beds and ponds plus new paths to help visitors access the area and watch winter-visiting birds.</p>  |
| <p><b>Phase 2b – Lodge Hill Community Parkland</b> <i>(now renamed Lodge Hill Countryside Site)</i><br/>Parts of the ex-Ministry of Defence (MOD) land at Lodge Hill (to the north of Chattenden) transformed from grazed grassland and a military camp into 60 hectares of wood pasture and scrubland.</p> |
| <p><b>Phase 2c – Deangate Ridge Community Parkland</b><br/>35 hectares of community parkland including nearly five hectares of new woodland and six kilometres of new access routes linking to the adjacent Lodge Hill SSSI.</p>  |
| <p><b>Phase 2d - Shared-use bridge</b></p>  |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Topics presented for consultation</b> |
|--|

|   |
|---|
| A bridge over the A228 – confirmed as in the feasibility stage - to connect the communities, providing an uninterrupted journey for pedestrians, cyclists, and horse-riders from Hoo to Chattenden. |
|---|

- 6.15 For Round 2 SEMS consultation, consultees were given the opportunity (through 6 open questions) to comment generally on the SEMS proposals and more specifically on each of the four phases, (2a-2d) and/ or all the community parklands.

Feedback Received

*Questionnaire Results*

- 6.16 For reasons already outlined, the questionnaire asked only qualitative questions for Round 2 consultation. The responses to these questions were compiled, coded, and themed as per the below.

- 6.17 **Do you have any general comments on the SEMS proposals?**

| Sentiment | Key comments   |
|-----------|--|
| Positive  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive about the Community Parkland</li> <li>• Like/support Hoo Flats Community Parkland Phase 2 plan</li> <li>• Support Deangate Ridge Community Parkland</li> <li>• Like/support Lodge Hill Community Parkland plans</li> <li>• Positive about the SSSI/Buffer zone</li> <li>• Welcome idea that large areas of open space will be provided for the public</li> </ul> |
| Negative  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of farmland and agricultural land</li> <li>• Leave the green spaces alone / negative for the existing wildlife</li> <li>• Do not want the extra 12,000 houses, too much development</li> </ul>   |
| Concerns  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in air pollution from traffic</li> <li>• Concern for the protection and impact on habitats and wildlife, particularly the nightingale population</li> <li>• Need to mitigate effects from the huge development proposed</li> </ul>   |



|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
|                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harmful ecological/environmental impacts</li> <li>• Impact on horse riders and their safety / little information on the provision for horse riders</li> <li>• Need to show impact of housing on the proposals</li> <li>• Impact to SSSI and the buffer</li> </ul>   |
| Suggestions      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ provision made for horse riders - dedicated bridleways are needed away from footpaths</li> <li>○ shared-use bridge connects to other SEMs sites</li> <li>○ cycle paths be added / alongside footpaths</li> <li>○ appropriate bin provision</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Environment – careful consideration of existing birds e.g., nightingales</li> <li>• Expert and effective management needed to keep the spaces green</li> <li>• Pollution – need more work done to combat noise / pollution in Wainscott Bypass area</li> <li>• The areas are already accessible – should be left alone / wildlife left</li> <li>• Suggestion that there should be information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Local Plan – plans/details/docs are needed and for consideration of these plans</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Documents – CEIA evidence base needed</p> |
| More information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General feeling that there is a lack of detailed information on the proposals</li> <li>• Lack of information on the Local Plan, the environmental impact, and the impact of new housing as per the Local Plan</li> <li>• Others asked for clarity/information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Habitat creation</li> <li>○ The SEMS interrelationship with the Habitats Regulation Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment</li> <li>○ SEMS partnership work area - what management measures are proposed within the SSSI</li> <li>○ Request for a clear set of objectives for SEMS</li> <li>○ The station location</li> <li>○ Monitoring programme for nightingales</li> <li>○ Increase of light in the area</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |

6.18 **Do you have any specific comments about the Phase 2a Hoo Flats Community Parkland?**

| Sentiment        | Key comments  |
|------------------|---|
| Positive         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like the proposals/phase 2a plans</li> <li>• positive for biodiversity and wildlife</li> <li>• Would like to see the introduction of noticeboards</li> </ul>   |
| Negative         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of general SEMS proposals but not supportive of additional housing being proposed</li> <li>• No benefits as access to this area already exists</li> <li>• Current space is sufficient</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little trust in Medway Council's management of the space</li> <li>• Area suffers from flooding - not suitable land for development</li> <li>• Prime agricultural land which is used for food production</li> </ul>   |
| Suggestions      | <p>Parklands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas should be linked</li> <li>• Accessible and circular routes should be looked at</li> <li>• Need to be bigger</li> <li>• Allow third party nature organisations be involved to properly manage impact on the area</li> <li>• Separate the fields from the existing roads and each other via hedges</li> <li>• Share information of housing/placement of housing</li> </ul> <p>Environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area floods – better protection needed</li> <li>• The agricultural land should be retained and used for food production</li> </ul> <p>Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management of the SSSI should be considered separately from the broader suite of measures within the SEMS to mitigate any ecological impacts from the local plan allocations</li> </ul> <p>Habitats: coastal realignment should be considered in the creation of habitats and the impacts of this on target species</p> |
| More information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More information on EIA for consideration</li> <li>• Impact on horses and stables from the areas near Abbots Court</li> <li>• Why has the field at the bottom of Vicarage Lane not been included in this proposal?</li> <li>• How the area be managed</li> <li>• Will seawalls be left to deteriorate to create saltwater marshes?</li> </ul>  |

6.19 **Do you have any specific comments about the Phase 2b Lodge Hill Community Parkland?**

| Sentiment        | Key comments   |
|------------------|--|
| Positive         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally positive/ supportive about phase 2b and the woodland proposals</li> <li>• Positive that the plans ensure the SSSI land is made a parkland</li> </ul>  |
| Negative         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development is too close to nightingale breeding ground</li> <li>• No benefit to proposals</li> <li>• Too much housing being proposed</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Destroying” the area which is sufficient in terms of footpaths and bridleways</li> <li>• Preserve former golf course</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions      | <p>Environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The agricultural land should be retained and used for food production</li> <li>• Land should be managed to encourage biodiversity and existing environment</li> <li>• Preserve parkland to protect nightingales and other wildlife</li> </ul> <p>Access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No vehicular access is designed from the north to ensure minimum traffic movements through the villages</li> <li>• Parkland should have bridleways</li> </ul> <p>Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSPB should be heavily involved</li> <li>• PRoW to be preserved and perhaps extended</li> </ul> |
| More information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the SSSI be accessed by local residents and also by wider Medway communities</li> <li>• Will the park be grazed in the future - will it become a managed meadow?</li> <li>• What future use this piece of land has to the community?</li> </ul>   |

6.20 **Do you have any specific comments about the Phase 2c Deangate Ridge Community Parkland?**

| Sentiment        | Key comments  |
|------------------|---|
| Positive         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive</li> <li>• Pleased to see a large area as parkland / not used for housing</li> <li>• Positive about accessibility, improved links, and connectivity</li> </ul>  |
| Negative         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative for wildlife and habitats</li> <li>• Well used and valuable community asset at Deangate (golf course) should remain</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to comment without knowing location of housing</li> <li>• Not in favour of building as Deansgate is valuable community asset</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golf course should be reinstated / use as a leisure ground</li> <li>• It should stay a parkland / woodland</li> <li>• Needs to be bigger</li> <li>• Restore and improve the health facilities at Deangate for existing and future communities</li> <li>• Parkland should have bridleways to benefit all</li> </ul> |
| More information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental concerns - EIA report needed</li> <li>• Environmental concerns - where the housing will be planned and housing impact on the SSSI</li> <li>• Public access: why was the area closed?</li> </ul>  |

6.21 **Do you have any specific comments about the Phase 2d shared-use bridge?**

| Sentiment   | Key comments  |
|-------------|---|
| Positive    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very positive and supportive of the proposals</li> <li>• Better connection and improved safe access</li> </ul>   |
| Negative    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unlikely to work/unrealistic</li> <li>• Will only be used by residents</li> <li>• Location not ideal</li> </ul>  |
| Concerns    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridge does not connect any areas and unlikely to be used</li> <li>• Keep the two areas separate from each other</li> </ul>  |
| Suggestions | <p>Improved accessibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian access between them all</li> <li>• Horse rider access/ bridleways and cycle paths included to improve safe access</li> <li>• Green bridge should be included to help access for all</li> </ul> |

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| More information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location: Why the bridge is so far from the existing housing areas?</li> <li>• Environmental concerns - EIA report needed / can't provide feedback without this</li> <li>• Environmental concerns – will the bridge be screened for wind</li> <li>• Is one bridge enough?</li> </ul> |
|------------------|---|

6.22 **Do you have any specific comments about ALL of the community parklands?**

| Sentiment        | Key comments   |
|------------------|--|
| Positive         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive</li> <li>• Welcome the development of leisure opportunities for the community</li> <li>• Looking forward to seeing more detailed plans</li> <li>• Positive about access, connectivity, biodiversity</li> </ul>   |
| Negative         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parkland is a distraction from the housing development proposed</li> <li>• Money can be put to better use</li> <li>• Question Medway Council/contractors' ability to manage the space well</li> </ul>   |
| Concerns         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not new green space, it already exists - being used to offset the housing planned for the area</li> <li>• Increased traffic and pollution</li> <li>• Impact on biodiversity and wildlife</li> </ul>   |
| Suggestions      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restore and improve the health facilities at Deangate for existing and future communities</li> <li>• The more footpaths and cycle ways the better</li> <li>• Protect the existing trees, wildlife, and biodiversity</li> <li>• Some areas need to be safe, available, and accessible to all users, others left to be wild/no access</li> <li>• More tree and hedge planting</li> </ul>    |
| More information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental concerns - EIA report needed / can't provide feedback without this</li> <li>• Looking forward to seeing more detailed plans</li> <li>• Need to maximise accessibility for dogwalkers / elderly/ disabled</li> <li>• Carparking spaces – is it enough?</li> <li>• Mixed sports and community activities needed in the area</li> <li>• Management of the parklands</li> </ul> |

*Pro forma*

- 6.23 In relation to this consultation, a pro forma is a representation with one viewpoint that is duplicated and submitted by multiple parties; the wording is identical in each submission.
- 6.24 In the case of SEMS, the same pro forma was submitted by 112 different parties. A copy of the SEMS pro forma is provided in Appendix 38 and a summary of the key themes from this are provided below.

| <b>Key themes</b>   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan proposals will cause significant harm to nationally and internationally designated sites</li> <li>• Hoo/Hoo area unsuitable location for housing, there will be a negative impact of the new housing as per the local plan</li> <li>• Concerns about the environment</li> </ul> |

*Stakeholder representations (email/ letter)*

- 6.25 For SEMS, representations were coded into themes shown below against sentiment.

| <b>Sentiment</b> | <b>Key themes</b>   |
|------------------|---|
| Positive         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of new links of footpaths and connection of PROW network and welcomes changes for the betterment of pedestrian, cyclists, and horse riders</li> <li>• Positive about any addition of wetland features in the proposals</li> <li>• Positive regarding environmental improvements proposed</li> <li>• Supportive of the shared use bridge</li> <li>• A positive response to Cockham Community Park planning permission</li> <li>• Positive for habitats and wildlife</li> </ul> |
| Negative         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equestrians have not been considered</li> <li>• Environmental impacts of the infrastructure related growth have not been considered</li> </ul>   |
| Concerns         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of environmental support</li> <li>• Need to consider heritage conservation of the sites and archaeological potential</li> <li>• Impact on the SSSI</li> <li>• Loss of farmland/agricultural land</li> </ul>  |

| Sentiment        | Key themes   |
|------------------|--|
| Suggestions      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of horses being able to use the perimeter path of Cockham community parkland</li> <li>• Requests for Medway Council to continue to work with stakeholders</li> <li>• Sites have a lot of heritage conservation/archaeological potential therefore it's recommended that full assessments are carried out to avoid damage from works</li> <li>• Protection of existing species and wildlife on site</li> </ul> |
| More information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental impacts of the SEMs proposals</li> <li>• Advanced HIF funding and the Local Plan Process</li> <li>• Precise boundaries of the proposed community parkland and boundaries of the SSSI</li> <li>• Management of the community parkland space</li> <li>• SSSI impacts</li> <li>• Engagement with RSPB</li> <li>• Supporting documents and their publications</li> <li>• Allocated costs for proposals</li> </ul> |

*Public representations (email)*

6.26 All public representations made related to SEMS were coded. Whilst there were no particular positive/negative comments nor suggestions, there were concerns raised about the parking issues currently at Cockham Park.

Response to Issues Raised

1.4 The table below sets out the Future Hoo team's response to these issues and all other themes that have been drawn out from the feedback received across both consultations.

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|----------------|---|--|
| All Consultees | Concerned about how the SEMS proposals will be managed across all parcels, both in terms of the public facilities to be provided and to ensure the management of habitats; with suggestions for various | Management proposals are currently being developed by the Future Hoo team, with there likely to be a Ranger Team in place; and funded through section 106 contributions. |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|----------------|--|--|
|                | organisations to be involved such as the RPSB.   | The management requirements will be different for each of the proposed phases, including accounting for existing infrastructure such as sea walls. The Council is ready and willing to work with other organisations in the management of the areas and has already begun exploratory discussions with these parties.  |
| All Consultees | Concerned that the SEMS will not be delivered on time or on budget.  | The Future Hoo team is committed to delivering the SEMS programme within the funding envelope and window agreed with Homes England as it is recognised that the SEMS proposals are critical to sustainable development on the Hoo Peninsula.   |
| All Consultees | Concerned that even with the SEMS proposals in place, housing on the Hoo Peninsula will cause ecological impacts. Concerned that the Peninsula is an ecologically sensitive area that is not suitable for large scale housing and that the Council has done the spatial strategy optioneering to demonstrate that housing should be brought forward in this location, even with the SEMS in place. | <p>The Local Plan process will demonstrate and evidence the spatial strategy approach that has been undertaken. As set out in Local Plan consultations to date, it is the case that large scale development is required on the Peninsula; and this will be evidenced by a robust evidence base, including a Sustainability Appraisal and Cumulative Ecological Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applications for the HIF road infrastructure will be supported by EIA and HRA documentation that will consider the cumulative impact of that infrastructure, the SEMS and future housing development.</p> <p>See the General table below for a response on why the HIF consultation was undertaken absent a Local Plan consultation.</p> |



| Consultee(s)                             | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--|---|---|
| Stakeholder Groups and Political Groups  | Requested to see copies of the finalised Cumulative Ecological Impact Assessment and SEMS Vision Document.  | <p>The SEMS Vision Document will be available in Late Summer 2022.</p> <p>The Cumulative Ecological Impact Assessment will be discussed with stakeholder groups as it has been done so to date; and will be published alongside the next iteration of the Local Plan.</p>   |
| Kelly Tolhurst MP, RPSB, Natural England | Concerned that adequate buffer zones are put in place to ensure that impacts to nightingales are avoided. RPSB particular suggested that a 400-metre buffer should be put in place.                       | <p>The Future Hoo team is working closely with Natural England to determine the appropriate buffer zones that should be put in place at each location where the SEMS (and the HIF proposals more generally) come close to the designated sites; guided by the evidence to demonstrate what is appropriate (both through work it has undertaken through the Cumulative Ecological Impact Assessment process and other national evidence). Such buffer zones will be specific to each location and a carte blanche approach of one single buffer zone being in place across the site is not appropriate.</p> <p>In particular the Council confirms that it will not as a starting point be applying a 400-metre buffer to its proposals as it is considered that there is no evidential justification for this to be applied.</p> |
| Public                                   | Suggested that there are existing public nature sites such as RSPB Cliffe Pools and Northwood Hill, and that some of the proposed SEMS sites are already accessed, so query why new proposals are needed. | <p>It can be confirmed that the existing RPSB sites are not affected by the SEMS proposals, and it is not anticipated that they will be impacted by housing proposals.</p> <p>The SEMS proposals ensure that a network of accessible new natural green spaces that are managed for</p>  |

| Consultee(s)          | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|-----------------------|---|---|
|                       |   | the needs of biodiversity are provided which will by consequence, protect existing protected sites.   |
| Public, Homes England | <p>Queried matter of detail such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• boundary hedging;</li> <li>• pathway surfacing;</li> <li>• cycling facilities;</li> <li>• dog facilities;</li> <li>• parking facilities;</li> <li>• visitor facilities (including rubbish) and</li> <li>• toilet facilities.</li> </ul>   | <p>These are aspects of detail that are being considered by the Future Hoo team in engagement with key stakeholders. Further information will be provided in the next stage of consultation on each of the SEMS parcels.</p> <p>However, it is important to note that none of the SEMS areas are proposed to be 'country park' type facilities but will be community parklands/protected areas necessary for the new local communities and local species requirements. The facilities to be provided will therefore reflect this position.</p> <p>Parking management strategies will form part of the planning conditions that are agreed to for applications for the SEMS sites (as has been the case for Cookham Community Parkland (Phase 1)).</p> |
| Public, CPRE Kent     | <p>Concerned that the SEMS proposals will use agricultural land that should be retained and used for food production; and that this impact would not be required if housing was distributed differently.</p> <p>It was also suggested that the biodiversity improvements the Council are emphasising as part of the promotion of SEMS against existing farmland practices will soon be outdated as future farming practice will need to account for</p> | <p>The proposals have where possible sought to minimise impacts to land that is actually used for farming purposes. It is considered that SEMS will provide accessible new natural green space that protects existing designated sites, enabling sustainable development to be brought forward.</p> <p>Provisional Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) data from the 1970s for the SEMS area indicates that it is a mix of ALC Grades 2 ('best and most versatile' – BMV), 3 (potentially BMV) and 4 ('poor' quality</p>   |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|--|---|
|              | <p>recent DEFRA guidance designed to increased biodiversity on farmland.</p> | <p>– not BMV). More recent surveys in nearby areas shows that the indicated Grade 2 soils are a mix of grades, from Grade 2 (BMV) to Grade 3b (not BMV).</p> <p>The SEMS will have minimal impact on soils; however, the use of these soils will change from agricultural production to other uses such as habitat / wildlife preserve, and recreation. For example, at Cockham and the Hoo Wetlands Reserve, over 60 ha of agricultural land is proposed to be changed from agricultural use to environmental purposes, including woodland and wetland. As above, some of this will be BMV land, but the proportion that is actually BMV is currently unknown.</p> <p>SEMS will address climate change in a very positive way, by providing perennial landscapes that lock in carbon (as opposed to farmland that is annually ploughed and releases carbon) providing more resilient joined up habitats for species impacted by climate change, and a lifeline to pollinator insects that are highly susceptible to the pesticides currently used in the intensively farmed arable.</p> <p>Furthermore, on sites such as Phase 2a and Phase 2b, the provision will provide more natural spaces that will benefit more species than farmland does.</p> <p>It is understood that reference is being made to DEFRA's pilots for 'Environmental Land Management Schemes', to understand the best model to bring forward new Stewardship schemes post 2024.</p> |

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | <p>While this is all positive and good news for farming and the environment, there is no guarantee that the current farmers/landowners on the Hoo Peninsula will form part of this scheme going forward. The current farming methods being used have created ecology 'deserts' with few species utilising the arable fields. Furthermore, the utilisation of fertilisers and pesticides across these arable lands will also continue to effect water quality, which in turn impacts the ecological function of waterways. Most importantly for the communities of Hoo, these sites have minimal access and by formalising them as parklands and reserves they will provide additional space for recreation and the increased well-being that being close to nature brings.</p> |
| <p>Public, British Horse Society, Medway Public Paths Team, Kent County Council, Local Access Forum</p> | <p>Emphasised the need for the SEMS to cater for active travel and vulnerable users (including cyclists and equestrians) and that SEMS is a golden opportunity to improve Medway's PROW networks.</p> <p>Also emphasised that connectivity is important for biodiversity as well as for vulnerable human users.</p> | <p>We have undertaken an audit of the current PROW and produced a plan showing how we can help join up PROWs under the SEMS proposals and any future development, this will be shared in the next stages of consultation on the SEMS proposals and through the on-going development of the Hoo Development Framework.</p> <p>The purpose of SEMS is to mitigate the impact on designated landscapes, by providing natural areas for informal recreation and acting as a green link between the designated sites that provide connectivity for insects, mammals, and birds. For example, by introducing and extending habitat at Lodge Hill that is the preferred breeding areas for nightingales we will</p>   |

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|---|--|--|
|   |  | encourage more nesting pairs into the area. Consideration of how we manage scrub close the Estuary at Cockham and Hoo Flats SEMS sites will also help provide connectivity for the Nightingales.   |
| Public  | Suggested that Cookham Community Parkland (Phase 1) should be extended west to include the woodland above Lower Upnor and Hoo Common                             | Hoo Common is an existing open space and managed by the Parish Council, so already has greenspace protection, however the Future Hoo team is looking at improving PROW between the sites. It is understood that the woodland at Lower Upnor is also part of the Parish Council's ownership so is already within the public domain. |
| Kent County Council   | Noted that for all sites, proposals should take account of the range of heritage conservation assets located on and close by the suggested sites.                | The Future Hoo team is considering heritage conservation features in the development of its design and supporting assessments; and where possible will include measures to enhance knowledge and awareness of those features. Further detail will be provided in later consultations for each phase.                               |
| Medway Labour and Cooperative Group, Medway Liberal Democrats Group, Natural England, Frindsbury Extra Parish Council, The Woodland Trust | Whilst seeking further information and subject to the wider points discussed above, welcomed the SEMS proposals in concept overall and in respect of each phase. | This support is welcomed by the Future Hoo team.   |
| Natural England   | Welcomed the SEMS proposals and looking to work closely with the Council to develop them further. Ned to ensure that management                                  | This comment is noted. No mitigation works are proposed within the SSSI itself, however, the mitigation proposals do need to be seen as  |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--|--|--|
|  | measures for the SSSI as a whole are not conflated with mitigation measures for development, which should not take place within a SSSI.  | going hand in hand with improvements that are also proposed to the SSSI – the Council is seeking to protect and improve the ecological position in general terms. Distinction on these points will be provided in the next consultations.                              |
| RPSB   | Welcomed the commitment to omitting access to the Tower Hill and Cockham Woods SSSI woodland but would like to understand how this will be effectively addressed when there is a stated aim (third bullet) for more footpaths to link up to the wider network of public footpaths. Currently the Saxon Shore Way turns inland at Lower Upnor and nowhere else through the woodland. Clarity is needed on the SSSI impacts and any such proposal will need to be subject to an HRA to understand the impacts on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA. | Fencing off of the SSSI and providing interpretation to explain the site and future management to include rangers are some of the ways the SSSI will be protected. No impacts to the SSSI and SPA were predicted in the planning application for Cookham.              |
| Medway Labour and Cooperative Group  | Queried whether land between Frindsbury and Hoo is proposed for housing as it is not included in the SEMS proposals  | There are no current proposals for housing in this area (assuming this in reference to Hog Marsh Valley).  |
| <b>Hoo Wetland Reserve (formerly known as Hoo Flats Community Parkland)</b>                      |  |  |
| Public, British Horse Society, Medway Public Paths Team, Kent County Council, Local Access Forum | Emphasised that the area needs to be linked by accessible routes, including potential circular routes between different SEMS parcels (such as Cookham Community Parkland); and accounting for existing footpaths (such as the footpath running from the church to Toad Hall Road).   | These are aspects of detail that are being considered by the Future Hoo team in engagement with key stakeholders. Further information will be provided in the next stage of consultation on each of the SEMS parcels. No existing footpaths are proposed to be closed. |
| Public   | Concerned that the proposals should not directly or indirectly impact upon   | No works are proposed on land that is within the SSSI. Development of  |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--------------|---|--|
|              | existing on-site habitats and adjacent.   | Phase 2a will account for existing habitat on site; with its ultimate aim being to improve habitat.  |
| Public       | Concerned that the proposals account for coastal realignment in the creation of habitats and the impacts of this on target species. Suggestions that this phase should be bigger. | The Future Hoo team are incorporating the plans from the MEAS Strategy into our plans for habitat creation.  |
| Public       | Queried whether the seawalls will be left to deteriorate to create saltwater marshes.   | Medway Estuary and Swale Flood and Coastal Risk Management Strategy, created by the Environment Agency and adopted in 2020 has set out that the sea wall running adjacent to the Hoo Wetland Reserve will stop being managed in 20 years' time (around 2040) there will then be a gradual degrading of the wall over a fairly long period of time. This will see an increase in salinity in the wetland area, however we are aware that this is already happening to a small degree. In designing the habitats we will be ensuring that the species of plants chosen, such as <i>Phragmites australis</i> (common reed) have resilience in both fresh and saline conditions. We are designing the wetlands with the understanding that this is a transitioning habitat, albeit over a long period of time. |
| Public       | Suggestion that the existing agricultural fields should be left to run wild and un-accessed, rather than creating a new public green space.                                       | Plans to manage the SEMS sites once they are complete are currently being developed, in order to make sure the sites are successful, these will not be typical mown parks as they will provide meadows, wetlands and other habitat types therefore require specialist nature conservation management.  |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--------------|---|--|
| Public       | Concerned that the proposal do not do much more than provide some footpaths. Concerned that it will just become a drenched field filled with ponds.   | This area of Hoo Flats does not lend itself to tree planting, geologically and for biodiversity reasons it is best suited to wetlands. This is not a simple process and requires hydrological specialists and engineering to ensure success. The potential to increase important habitat for the wintering birds that utilise the estuary is the driving factor the design of these wetlands, while also providing appropriate access for the community.     |
| Public       | Queried whether the stables and horses near Abbots Court are due to be evicted and asked why the field at the bottom of Vicarage Lane are not included in the proposal.   | The stables and horses will remain untouched. The landowners of the field referenced do not wish the land to be included in these proposals. The proposals cannot be larger due to constraints such as existing infrastructure and that landowners do not wish the land to be included in the proposals.   |
| Public       | Concerned that water in this area often has oil and rubbish in it.  | Control of litter through the proposed SEMS sites will be better managed when rangers are in place, therefore less litter will be making its way into the water ways. Reedbeds proposed for the Hoo Wetlands Reserve are known for their water cleansing properties, however if there is an issue with oil leaking into the Hoo stream that feeds the wetlands, the SEMS team will work with the Environment Agency to understand the source of the problem. |
| RPSB         | Concerned that there is an existing right of way that loops around the site. Suggested that serious consideration should be given as to how this existing network is linked up as suggested in the consultation | The Future Hoo team is considering these matters as the on-going design work for this phase. Further information will be provided in the next round of consultation.   |



| Consultee(s)                                | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|---|--|---|
|   | document, if at all. Many species of waterbirds are highly sensitive to disturbance and will actively avoid areas over time should levels of recreation reach a particular threshold. Screening appropriate to the landscape, such as raised bunds or willow screens, may provide a solution.  |   |
| Public, Kelly Tolhurst MP                   | Concerned that the area already suffers from flooding (lakes at Abbots Court breach their banks) farmland to the east of Phase 2a is used for food production and 600 homes on the Hoo Marina Park. Current drainage relies on sluice gate at the pill box, and it is well-known that the seawall can be breached in this area, and it is worrying that we are considering this when there are already flood issues in this location. Concerned that the creation of new habitat and wetland may cause more flooding throughout the year. Suggested that money would better spent on flood defences (protecting/increasing the wetlands especially) for the peninsula. | <p>It is considered that the proposals will not cause flooding issues and are likely to alleviate flooding up stream, through diverting water into the wetlands during times of high rainfall, hydrology surveys are underway to evidence the benefits to water management through Hoo out towards the proposed Wetland site.</p> <p>In terms of flood defence, there is an overriding MEAS Strategy (outside of HIF) lead by the Environment Agency that sets out the proposals for flood management in Hoo.</p> |
| <b>Phase 2b Lodge Hill Countryside Site</b> |  |   |
| Public, Homes England, Kent Wildlife Trust  | Concerned that the site is currently used for animal grazing and is located very close to nightingale breeding grounds adjacent SSSI, and that the management of these impacts and delivery of this phase (including how areas provided for access are managed, the fencing off areas for scrub, alignment with wider nightingale strategies, and careful woodland management) will need   | <p>This site will not be a parkland but will remain a countryside site with an access pathway through connecting Chattenden Woods to Dux Court Road.</p> <p>The development of the design and management of this phase and the implementation of the proposals will be undertaken in close engagement with Homes England to ensure that its development proposals are taken into</p>  |

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>careful coordination between the Council and Homes England.</p> <p>Homes England also expressed that to make clear that this phase is not a 'parkland' per se but rather a 'link' site for the establishment of habitat and a set route for active travel users, the proposals should be renamed.</p> | <p>account, and vice versa. This will include specific management measures to ensure that public access to land does not impact on the SSSI or nightingale areas. Further information will be provided at the next stage of development for this site. It can be stated however that the Future Hoo team's vision for this site is a nature conservation/reserve with one public right of way running through the site, to connect PROWs from Chattenden Woods through to Dux Court and Deangate. Fencing and hedging will form part of the design work, with wardening/rangers forming part of the future management.</p> <p>This phase has now been renamed Lodge Hill Community Site, to differentiate it from the approaches to the other parklands.</p> |
| <p>Public, British Horse Society, Medway Public Paths Team, Kent County Council, Local Access Forum</p> | <p>Suggested that the site should have bridleways enabling walkers, cyclists, and horse riders to reach Chattenden Woods, High Halstow and Cliffe Pools and beyond</p>   | <p>Linking PROW and multi-use pathways are being considered as part of the on-going design work for this phase and for all of SEMS. In particular, the Future Hoo team is considering the need to link across roads with Pegasus crossings to link up the existing bridleways at Chattenden Woods with Lodge Hill and towards High Halstow and out to Cliffe Pools. This fits with the overall purpose of SEMS is to mitigate the impact on designated landscapes, by providing natural areas for informal recreation and acting as a green link between the designated sites that provide connectivity for insects, mammals, and birds. Further</p>   |

| Consultee(s)  | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | information will be shared in forthcoming consultations.  |
| Public  | Suggested that the design of the area should be woodland rather than open grassland.   | Open grassland is a really important habitat for reptiles, birds (including feeding nightingales) and mammals and should form part of a mosaic of habitats - as is proposed in the SEMs work.   |
| Public,<br>Frindsbury Extra Parish Council,<br>Medway Liberal Democrats | Suggested that the site should be made bigger by including more land located around Lochat Road and by incorporating Lodge Hill Camp SSSI.   | <p>It is understood that this is referring to the fenced 'Ex MOD training area' North of Deangate. This will remain fenced and protected from the general public due to the Nightingale numbers in this area. There is also unexploded ordnance within the site that cannot be removed (for safety reasons and to avoid disturbance to nightingale breeding areas so the area is not safe for public access).</p> <p>The land designated SSSI close to Lochat Road is already afforded protection due to the designation status. PRow from Lochat, through Chattenden Woods up towards Lodge Hill provide a connection currently, we will look at improving the footpaths through the site.</p> |
| <b>Phase 2c Deangate Community Parkland</b>                             |  |   |
| Public  | Concerned that this site is located adjacent to Lodge Hill SSSI and in an area of a number of existing habitats that, in conjunction with adjacent housing and other associated infrastructure, could lead to impacts to the SSSI. | <p>No development of SEMs or housing is planned on the SSSI. The parkland is being provided as part of a wider package of measures which will ensure that development on the Peninsula, including at the Deangate site, does not cause impacts.</p> <p>This includes consideration of appropriate design and mitigation measures and set back distances.</p>  |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|--|---|
|              |  | Further details on these matters will be provided in the next stage of consultation on this parkland.   |
| Public       | Queried why the Council is now re-opening land for public access that it had previously been closed.   | Deangate Golf Course was closed as it was not commercially viable; but crucially it was a commercial golf course, not an area of public access. Whilst it may be accessed by the public now, this is not on the basis of agreement by the Council to such access being taken. The SEMS proposals will utilise this land in a way that enables the public to properly access it for community parkland uses.   |
| Public       | Suggested that the whole Deangate area should not be used for housing and the consequential need for parkland but should instead be reinstated for golf uses or into other forms of leisure facilities to benefit the existing community.          | SEMS is not the only greenspace that will be provided in Hoo if development comes forward. There will still be a requirement for developers to provide recreation and leisure facilities, including for any housing proposals on Deangate. Further details on proposals for Deangate will be brought forward in October/November 2022.  |
| Public, RPSB | Suggested that the whole ex golf course site should be used for parkland/biodiversity purposes rather than some of that site being used for housing; and that this will ensure that there are no impacts to the SSSI and provide suitable buffers. | <p>The SEMS proposals have been designed to ensure a large amount of parkland that will be attractive to the nearby residents of housing developments. Housing is proposed at Deangate to ensure that the Council can meet its housing needs.</p> <p>The SEMS proposals do not encroach upon the SSSI, and their existence will enable there to be a gap between the housing and nightingale habitat.</p> <p>Furthermore, further work is being done to ensure that appropriate boundary features are put in place at</p> |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | the edge of the parkland to provide further protection for nightingales.  |
| Public   | Suggested that grazing cattle should be introduced to the site  | At this time, it is considered likely that it will not be appropriate for cattle to be grazed on what is proposed. However, the Future Hoo team is continuing to develop its proposals for management across all phases and further details will be made available in due course.   |
| Public, British Horse Society, Medway Public Paths Team, Kent County Council, Local Access Forum | Suggested that the site should have bridleways enabling walkers, cyclists, and horse riders to link Chattenden Wood and Dux Court Road.   | Linking PROW and multi-use pathways are being considered as part of the on-going design work for this phase and for all of SEMS. The suggestion here is being brought forward as part of the development of this phase and further details will be provided in the next round of consultation.  |
| <b>Phase 2d Shared Use Bridge</b>  |   |   |
| All Consultees   | Generally supported by consultees. Queried as to whether its location was appropriate, including to enable the crossing of public rights of way users; and how it would be funded (including for management). | <p>The location of the bridge was chosen pursuant to the on-going development of the Hoo Development Framework as it would connect via walking/cycling provision, two new communities either side of the A228 to proposed new community facilities such as schools.</p> <p>It is now proposed that the funding of the construction, management and maintenance of the bridge is funded through section 106 contributions, rather than through HIF. This is particularly because the bridge is only needed once communities, and their proposals for active travel provision, are in place either side of the bridge –</p> |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response   |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | it is therefore not a matter for 'forward' funding.  |
| Public, Natural England, Woodland Trust, Frindsbury Extra Parish Council | Suggested that the bridge should be a green bridge rather than just a shared use bridge | To meet the requirements of the Natural England Guidance for Green Bridges, converting the bridge to be a green bridge would involve extensive additional infrastructure and as such it is currently not considered to be feasible or viable for it to be brought forward in that form.  |
| Public, Woodland Trust   | Suggested that more than one bridge is needed   | For a green bridge to function effectively for wildlife, it is required to be a minimum of 15m wide (in accordance with NE guidance) the sheer size and area required when crossing a dual carriageway that is required for above height lorries means that the cost alone will make it difficult for there to be more than the one proposed. The addition of the Heathrow Oil pipeline running adjacent to the dual carriageway until it crosses under the road to the other side means that there is only one location to cross the A228 without building over the pipeline. Additionally there needs to be masterplanning via the Hoo Development Framework to evidence where a bridge is most needed to make the investment. This has been done and indicates that the proposed provision is sufficient. |

### Design Changes - SEMS

- 6.27 SEMS has continued to evolve through the public consultation process and through ongoing engagement with stakeholders and those with land interests. As the Vision and designs presented at Rounds 1 and 2 of the consultation have been high level, there has not been design ‘changes’ arising from the consultation, instead the consultation responses have been used to inform the first iteration of the detail of each of the SEMS phases. This will be presented at the current consultation in Round 3.

## **7 GENERAL TOPICS - FEEDBACK & RESPONSE**

- 7.1 For both the Rounds 1 and 2 Consultation, open questions allowed respondents to make comments more generally on the proposals presented. In many cases, the representations made were much wider than the proposals themselves and related to the Future Hoo proposals more generally, and their context within the development of the new Local Plan for Medway.
- 7.2 The Future Hoo team considered it was important to recognise, document and respond to these more general points as they provided the context against which some people were responding to the Future Hoo consultation.
- 7.3 A high-level summary of the themes raised is provided in the table below, along with the Future Hoo’s response to these issues. The below table covers comments made across questionnaire responses, stakeholder representations, public emails and in meetings/ events. A ‘general’ pro forma was also issued to the Future Hoo team as a formal Round 2 consultation submission\* and this is provided in Appendix 39.

\*There were 36 copies of the ‘general’ pro forma submitted within Round 2 consultation.

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|----------------|---|---|
| All consultees | <p>Concern was raised by all parties that this consultation was carried out absent a Local Plan and associated evidence base also being available, as had been presumed was going to be the case.</p> <p>In particular, parties were concerned that the impacts of the HIF infrastructure should not be seen in isolation, and instead need to be seen in combination with proposed housing and employment allocations and their associated impacts, including through evidence base document such as Sustainability Appraisals. Consequentially, the presentation of a consultation of just the HIF infrastructure was considered not appropriate.</p> | <p>Estimates of population growth in Medway indicates that a substantial number of new homes will be required by 2037 to accommodate growth within the area. Medway's new Local Plan will guide the locations for these new homes. Progress to date on the Local Plan (as seen in its consultations) has identified opportunities for growth particularly on the Hoo Peninsula, which could potentially deliver at least 10,600 homes through the Local Plan delivery process.</p> <p>However, the scale of housing growth proposed on the Hoo Peninsula is dependent on strengthened connections and significant upgrades to transport and environmental infrastructure. This cannot be achieved through piecemeal private sector investment and instead requires upfront public sector commitment.</p> <p>All consultations on the new Medway Local Plan to date have provided that, in any development scenario, large scale development is needed, on the Hoo Peninsula, but have also recognised that large scale infrastructure investment is needed for such development to be able to be brought forward.</p> <p>In that context, the Council applied for funding for infrastructure which could enable such development to be brought forward from the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF). This fund works on the basis that it is forward funding infrastructure to enable later housing to come forward and it has tight timescales</p> |



| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|--------------|---|
|              |              | <p>to be spent to meet the Government's aim of unlocking housing as soon as possible.</p> <p>As such, on the basis that housing on the Hoo Peninsula will be required in a Local Plan that is brought forward, the Council is pressing ahead with the process of developing its applications for the infrastructure to put itself in a position where those monies can be spent.</p> <p>It cannot wait for the Local Plan process to take those steps and indeed the Local Plan will benefit from there being more certainty about infrastructure delivery (including the SEMS) in being taken forward.</p> <p>The consultation was a part of that process, setting out at an appropriately formative stage the Council's thinking on the Future Hoo proposals to enable consultee's views to be received and to influence the proposals.</p> <p>Following this consultation, the Future Hoo team will be continuing to develop its HIF application as the Local Plan process plays out, with submission anticipated for Spring 2023, taking account of whatever the Local Plan position may be at that time.</p> <p>The road and rail application materials will include assessments which will consider the cumulative impacts of the infrastructure and future development, to demonstrate that it will cater for and to the traffic</p> |

| Consultee(s)   | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | flows and sustainable aspirations of those developments.  |
| Parish Councils, Public, Political Groups                  | <p>Consultation Materials: Concerned that the consultation documentation lacked detail on key aspects of the HIF proposals as well as information on assessment and mitigation proposals.</p>   | <p>This consultation was carried out in accordance with good consultation principles, namely being at a formative stage of development, with sufficient information to enable consultees to consider the proposals, and with sufficient time for responses to be made and the Future Hoo team to take it into account in developing its proposals.</p> <p>The consultation reflected the stage of development that the HIF proposals had reached at the time of consultation, including that no full-scale EIA or HRA assessment work had yet been undertaken. It is therefore considered that the consultation material was appropriate.</p> <p>All EIA and HRA documentation, which will account for all of the HIF proposals and cumulative impacts with future developments, will be submitted with the planning applications in Spring 2023.</p> |
| Hoo Parish Council and Medway Labour and Cooperative Group | <p><u>Consultation process:</u> Mixed views on the consultation process by Medway Labour and Cooperative Group as much of this was carried out online due to Covid-19. Support was expressed however for a greater level of in-person consultation and engagement for Round 2.</p> <p><u>Leaflet distribution:</u> Some concerns were raised about the publicity of Round 1 consultation through the mail</p> | <p><u>Consultation process:</u> On the basis that Round 1 consultation had to be undertaken online due to Covid-19 restrictions, a number of measures were put in place to ensure wide awareness of an accessible consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More detailed 8-page mailout with information about the proposals</li> </ul>   |

| Consultee(s) | Theme Raised  | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|--------------|---|---|
|              | <p>drop as a small number of residents did not recall receiving the booklet.</p> <p>For Round 2, Hoo Parish Council queried if the distribution of leaflets had taken place in all homes in the parish. They were concerned about the delivery and circulation of the leaflets.</p> <p><u>Consultation events:</u> Concerns were raised by Hoo Parish Council over the number and timing of public events in Hoo for Round 2 - specifically that one event was not sufficient for the large number of Hoo residents, especially as this was also during a holiday period.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paper copies of the consultation brochure and questionnaire on request (or in different formats as required)</li> <li>• All information available online</li> <li>• Longer consultation period</li> <li>• Extensive publicity across a multitude of channels</li> <li>• Publicity to stakeholder groups representing hard to reach audiences</li> </ul> <p>For Round 2 where some people were still nervous about in-person events, the team created an online virtual exhibition and publicised access to this within 15 libraries (as well as on all publicity materials) where public computers could be used by library members.</p> <p><u>Leaflet distribution:</u> A further booklet mail out to certain postcodes was undertaken in February 2021, in response to concerns about non-delivery in those areas. A further full drop to all 24,000 addresses was undertaken in March 2021 to confirm an extension to the consultation deadline; this was carried out to provide those in the re-mailed areas with adequate time to respond.</p> <p>The team responded to Hoo Parish Council queries with full details on the number of leaflets distributed to</p> |

| Consultee(s)           | Theme Raised   | Future Hoo Team Response  |
|------------------------|--|---|
|                        |  | <p>each postcode. The team also explained that posters and leaflets were distributed to libraries and that the team would send out copies of the brochure to anyone who requested it.</p> <p><u>Consultation events:</u> For Round 2, an additional event was arranged from 11am – 3pm on Wednesday 5 January 2022 at Hoo St Werburgh Church, in response to community requests for a morning/ daytime event.</p> |
| All stakeholder groups | All key stakeholders set out their desire to engage with the Council on all of the various aspects of the HIF proposals. | The Future Hoo team welcome parties' desires to engage with it and is endeavouring to active engage with all stakeholders with an interest in the HIF proposals.  |

## 8 SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

- 8.1 This document has been prepared to set out the consultation and engagement activities that have been undertaken from 2020 to 2022 on the Future Hoo project.
- 8.2 Estimates of population growth in Medway indicates that a substantial number of new homes will be required by 2037 to accommodate growth within the area. The HIF bid demonstrated that without significant highways investment, significant further housing growth can or will not be able to be permitted on the Peninsula. Additionally, environmental improvements, through the delivery of SEMS, would be required to ensure biodiversity and landscape effects are effectively managed to avoid, mitigate, or compensate against the direct and indirect impacts of housing growth.

- 8.3 The rail scheme is also proposed, to help to make the peninsula more sustainable by promoting a modal shift away from the car, whilst also alleviating pressure on the road network and increasing future resilience.
- 8.4 Two rounds of extensive consultation on all Future Hoo plans have been carried out over 2020-2022, with Round 3 Consultation focusing on the next SEMS schemes and engagement on road phases 2 and 4 taking place in June/July 2022.
- 8.5 As part of the consultation process, the Future Hoo team have sought to engage a range and variety of political, technical, non-technical statutory and non-statutory stakeholders and the public to help shape the proposals. All parties have had the opportunity to engage with the proposals throughout and provide their feedback.
- 8.6 Interested parties have also been able to provide their feedback outside of organised events through a variety of channels including formal feedback forms, postal written correspondence, email correspondence or direct phone contact through a dedicated project number.
- 8.7 The Future Hoo team have consistently engaged and reviewed the feedback received to identify opportunities to improve and change the Future Hoo proposals, as detailed in this report.
- 8.8 The Future Hoo team are committed to engaging local communities when it brings forward development proposals and will continue to engage with stakeholders where necessary and appropriate.

## Appendices