

**STROOD WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT BRIEF 2018  
CONSULTATION REPORT**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Medway Council is refreshing the 2006 Strood Riverside Development Brief with the Strood Waterfront Development Brief 2018. The revised Development Brief sets out the design principles and guidelines for land to the east of the railway line, and for how development could come forward on the site. There have been considerable changes locally and nationally since 2006 and the policy basis needs to be updated to reflect current conditions and opportunities. This will support the council's ambitions to realise the regeneration opportunities presented by these exceptional sites in Strood, to secure investment and deliver quality development that boosts the area's economic, environmental and community wellbeing.
- 1.2 The Development Brief outlines the Council's ambition for two of its prime regeneration sites, the former Civic Centre and Strood Riverside. Kingswear Gardens, jointly owned by Moat and Orbit, is also included within the Development Brief, to highlight the potential of the Kingswear Gardens site. Together these sites present a rare opportunity to help establish Medway's modern waterfront as vibrant commercial and community spaces.
- 1.3 A Transport Statement was prepared along side the Development Brief so that current road conditions could be acknowledged and influence the design principles of the proposed Development Brief.
- 1.4 The Development Brief seeks to establish a clear and positive policy context, whilst setting design parameters, the council is aware of the need for commercial viability, ensuring market confidence and deliverability.
- 1.5 The Development Brief itself is not a planning application but it is expected that future planning applications for these sites will follow the guidance set out in the Development Brief.
- 1.6 In June 2018 the council adopted the Strood Waterfront Development Brief 2018 as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 1.7 The council has carried out a formal consultation on the proposed SPD. This report provides a record of the formal consultation (Regulation 12) undertaken December 2017- January 2018. The report outlines the consultation process and identifies the main themes emerging from the responses. The council has considered the comments made in formalising the Strood Waterfront Development Brief 2018. Full copies of all written responses made to the consultation have been published on the councils' website at:  
[https://www.medway.gov.uk/info/200133/planning/525/planning\\_public\\_consultations/3](https://www.medway.gov.uk/info/200133/planning/525/planning_public_consultations/3)
- 1.8 The process of preparing the revised Development Brief involved engagement of stakeholders to identifying relevant issues and how these could be addressed in preparing the guidance. The consultation process facilitated a formal platform for statutory bodies and stakeholders to comment upon the Development Brief.
- 1.9 The consultation process was largely managed through online resources, using the council's website. Council officers also arranged consultation events to support further discussions on key issues and wider participation.
- 1.10 The responses totalled 106, the majority of responses focussed on the potential redevelopment of Kingswear Gardens, transport networks, housing densities, greenspace

provision and building heights.

- 1.11 This report concludes with information on how the Strood Waterfront Development Brief 2018 will be progressed.

## **2. COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- 2.1 The consultation carried out by the council has complied with the statutory requirements under Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The legislation defines specific consultation bodies that are statutory consultees, and 'general' consultation bodies that cover a wide range of stakeholders and residents. The consultation process therefore accounted for these legal requirements.
- 2.2 Medway Council prepared its latest Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) in 2014. This statutory document sets out the approaches and standards to be followed in carrying out consultation on planning matters. The SCI provides a basis for how the council will involve the community in the preparation of planning policy documents, such as Supplementary Planning Documents, and how it consults on planning applications. The document covers consultation and engagement methods, who will be consulted and the role of elected members.
- 2.3 The Strood Waterfront Development Brief public consultation ran from 4<sup>th</sup> December 2017 to the 29<sup>th</sup> January 2018 and sought the involvement of a wide range of specific and general consultation bodies including; voluntary bodies, charities, bodies representing business interests in Medway.
- 2.4 A wide range of engagement methods, compliant with the adopted 2014 SCI, were used to promote the Strood Waterfront consultation, in order to increase awareness of the draft Development Brief to as many stakeholders as possible;
- **Emails** sent directly to all contacts on the Local Plan consultation database.
  - **Letters** sent to residents, businesses and landowners identified within or in close proximity of the boundary identified in the Development Brief.
  - **Council's website** all consultation materials (the draft Development Brief, display boards and questionnaires) were made available online to increase accessibility of the documents to all residents/stakeholders. The links to these documents were advertised on the Council's homepage.
  - **Reference copies** were made available of the draft Development Brief and questionnaires at Gun Wharf (Council offices), Rochester Community Hub and Strood Community Hub.
  - **Public Exhibition** was displayed during the entire consultation period at Strood Community Hub, which was also accessible online.
  - **Consultation Events** were held at Strood Community Hub. Two events were held one on a weekday evening and one at a weekend.
  - **Social media** was used to promote the consultation process and the consultation events.
  - **Ambassadors events** officers were present at this event to promote the consultation, and provided a display to increase awareness with local stakeholders.

2.5 People and organisations could respond to the consultation in different ways. Written comments could be made by email, an online survey form, hard copy survey or postal letter. There was an online questionnaire, which was posted on the council's website along with the relevant information. Hard copies of the questionnaire were made available at Gun Wharf, Strood Community Hub and Rochester Community Hub. Local residents were most likely to use the online questionnaire, whereas statutory and voluntary organisations were most likely to submit their responses by email.

### **Use of information gathered**

2.6 All written comments, information and personal contact details, submitted as part of the Development Brief consultation were recorded as formal responses.

2.7 Any respondent contact details are held by the council in the Development Brief consultation database for the sole purpose of the Development Brief work and will not be shared with any other council services, or used for other purposes than Planning Policy.

2.8 The written representations, excluding sensitive personal contact details, have been published on the council's website on the Strood Waterfront page, as part of a formal record of the Development Brief preparation. Information will be held until an appropriate period after the adoption of the Development Brief.

## **3. CONSULTATION PROGRAMME**

3.1 The council wishes to engage with a wide demographic of organisations, businesses and residents and other stakeholders in Medway, to ensure that the Development Brief effectively considers a broad range of interests and views. This section outlines how the council carried out consultation on the draft Development Brief.

3.2 Medway Local Plan consultation database- This is a key tool in managing consultation on planning policy documents in Medway. This has over 1100 contacts and has been collated over a number of years and continues to be expanded upon. This enables access to a wide range of organisations and people with an interest in Medway's development. These contacts consist of statutory organisations, voluntary and community groups, individuals, businesses, developers, landowners, planning consultants and representatives of partnerships. The database covers social, economic and environmental interests and is frequently updated and anyone who wishes to be can be added to the database. The majority of contacts include email addresses, but there are also many postal contacts.

3.3 Stakeholders- The various interests in Strood Waterfront Development Brief can be broadly summarised by the below categories:

- Elected member (councillor)
- Statutory consultees (defined in planning legislation)
- Interest, voluntary and Community Groups

- Residents
- The wider business community
- Medway Council officers

3.4 Elected Member involvement is crucial to ensure the democratic basis of the Development Brief and to utilise members' knowledge and views into shaping the Development Brief. The vision and principle aims of the Development Brief need to be endorsed by members to ensure the guidance is in keeping with Medway's wider strategies and plans.

Engagement was undertaken through:

- Formal decision making- Cabinet approval was given for the public consultation of the Development Brief.
- Development Plans Advisory Group- formal structure for cross party member involvement, were informed of the consultation being undertaken.
- Briefings for members during the drafting of the Development Brief via Strood Regeneration Board.

3.5 Statutory consultees are organisations defined in legislation. The government requires certain organisations such as English Heritage and the Environment Agency, to be consulted during the preparation of planning policy. This is a technical audience that will ensure that the Development Brief is consistent with national policy.

3.6 Residents and the wider business community were consulted in the initial stages of formulating the Development Brief in collaboration with the Local Plan consultations in February 2017. During the formal consultation of the Development Brief letters and emails were sent to these bodies and Interest and Community Groups, to notify these groups/sectors of an opportunity to comment and influence the document. Interest groups include environmental and amenity groups, arts and heritage groups and social welfare organisations and organisations with specific interests. Community sectors refer to young people, older people, faith communities, people with disabilities, minority ethnic communities.

3.7 Medway council officers representing service areas such as Environmental Health, Drainage, Planning Policy, Regeneration, Public Health, Highways and Greenspaces formed part of an initial workshop to highlight opportunities for improvements and current restrictions/limitations.

### **Communication and Notification**

3.8 The consultation was predominately managed through online resources and email, consistent with corporate communications protocol. The Development Brief and relevant information was made available on the council's homepage. Public events were advertised via letters, email and the council's website to promote engagement with the public.

3.9 A Public Notice was placed in the Kent Messenger to inform people of the consultation. The council contacted over 1000 people on its Local Plan consultation database. Hard copies of

the Development Brief and surveys were made accessible at Rochester and Strood Community Hubs and Gun Wharf.

#### **4. Consultation Events**

4.1 A public exhibition was on display at Strood Community Hub for the duration of the consultation. The display boards outlined;

- Why the development is necessary
- The vision for the area
- The opportunities presented by regenerating the area
- Planning and design- e.g. building heights which take into account its historic setting adjacent to Rochester Castle and Cathedral, promoting sustainable and active travel etc.
- The consultation process and next steps for adoption as a SPD.

4.2 Two public consultation events were organised over the 8 week consultation period at the Strood Community Hub. One of the events was held on a weekday starting in the afternoon and ending in the evening. The other event took place on a weekend, this was designed to try and reach a wide demographic of residents and stakeholders.

4.3 A wide variety of methods were used to promote the events from social media, KM newspaper advertisements, council webpage, letters and emails.

4.4 These events were 'drop in' style to encourage people to discuss the proposed Development Brief in a flexible manner to suit the public. This provided an opportunity for the public to directly discuss the proposals with council officers from the Regeneration Team and IBI consulting, who were appointed to undertake the revised Development Brief. The events provided a platform for residents to voice their preferences and concerns. This gave the opportunity for discussions to be resident led, which gave an insight into matters residents prioritised the most. These events were well attended by residents, with a large turn out of Kingswear Gardens, Cranmere Court and Wingrove Drive residents. Residents generally accepted the need for more housing, especially on brownfield sites within the town centre and supported the regeneration of the area.

Key matters raised during the consultation events:

- Many welcomed the housing densities and the need for more affordable housing in the area. Concerns were raised at whether flats would be suitable for family living and whether local residents, especially first time buyers would be 'priced out' of the development.
- The construction and long term impact of the quarry development on Commissioner's Road in addition to the proposed development, with noise pollution and disruption in the short term and further strain on infrastructure e.g. roads/transport and impact on services such as hospitals and schools.
- The current traffic congestion and the need for further transport infrastructure.

- Residents were supportive of the low parking ratio especially due to the proximity to the station and town centre amenities, but were sceptical as to whether it would be realistic. Many favoured parking restrictions along adjacent residential roads to ensure no spill over of parking occurred from the development.
- Many Kingswear Gardens residents voiced concerns of Kingswear Gardens being included within the Development Brief and requested further information regarding timescales and future plans for this specific area.
- Concerns over building heights for future developments were raised as with regards to residents current views.
- Residents were supportive of the improvement to public and communal open space by the river and wanted to see Strood Pier reinstated as a usable pier.

## **5. DUTY TO COOPERATE**

5.1 The Strood Waterfront Development Brief has been prepared within the context of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Localism Act 2011 and other relevant legislation. In preparation the Development Brief the council is committed to 'engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis' this was addressed through the consultation, enabling public bodies and statutory stakeholders a platform to comment upon the Development Brief. This legal obligation is known as the 'Duty to Cooperate'; a primary requirement of this is to work with relevant bodies to address strategic issues that 'cross administrative boundaries.'

5.2 The council contacted all statutory consultees who represent interests on cross border strategic matters as part of the consultation process. Responses were received from key stakeholders, community groups, statutory bodies and health, infrastructure and utility providers such as;

- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- Highways England
- Historic England
- Sport England
- NHS
- National Grid
- Southern Water
- Rochester Bridge Trust
- Diocese of Rochester
- City of Rochester Society

5.3 Key points raised by these stakeholders:

- The road networks need to be assessed and mitigation measures for the additional development need to be tested further, through planning applications.

- Support the commitment to active travel to healthier communities.
- Support for the provision of open space consideration.
- The need for water efficiency measures to be required as part of a planning application.
- The consideration of Rochester Bridge within the development and the consideration of views to and from the bridge.
- Acknowledgement of the building heights and do not feel that this will have negative impacts on the historic environment or the setting of heritage assets, one exception could be the illustrative building which is significantly higher. It was recommended to seek the continued involvement of the council's conservation staff.
- Increased demand on services and infrastructure such as health care and the need for further resources.
- Proposals must consider any adverse impacts of any development on the Medway Estuary Conservation Zone.

## **6. RESPONSE ANALYSIS**

### **Overview of responses**

6.1 The council invited comments on the matters set out in the draft Strood Waterfront Development Brief. The majority of responses received were via the online questionnaire. 82 responses to the survey were 'duly noted' (63 online and 19 paper responses). 1 online response was received outside of the consultation timeframe and has been excluded from these results. Therefore, 82 questionnaire responses, 17 email responses and 1 letter from public/community groups and 7 statutory stakeholders responses, have been analysed.

6.2 Response demographics to consultation questionnaire;

- 50% (41) respondents were female and 41% (34) male.
- The age group that returned the highest volume was those aged 35-44 at 29%.
- 88% (72) White- English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British.
- 60% (49) residents of Strood, 9% (7) from Rochester and 9% (7) from Chatham.

6.3 The most frequently raised matters have been identified and reviewed below in Table 1.



Table 1

	Comments received	Consideration of comments and refinements to the Development Brief
<p><b>1. Need for regeneration enhancements</b></p>	<p>1.1 83% of respondents confirmed that they would like to see the regeneration of the sites, acknowledging that prime sites are currently under utilised. There was recognition that the Development Brief will attract investment, helping to revive the area.</p>	<p><i>The Development Brief will reinforce the planning framework aiding the regeneration of Strood Waterfront. The increased investment will benefit Strood’s wider economy, through increased footfall and wider commercial and leisure offer.</i></p>
	<p>1.2 Community engagement and community projects would be welcomed during the construction phase.</p>	<p><i>The Development Brief encourages meanwhile uses and community engagement promoting community uses.</i></p>
	<p>1.3 Responses noted that the sites currently lack aesthetic appeal and are inaccessible to the public; therefore investment into the public realm would be appreciated.</p>	<p><i>The Development Brief prioritises the need for public and communal open space, capitalising on the sites’ positions along the waterfront, increasing public accessibility to the waterfront.</i></p>
	<p>1.4 Many expressed that Strood has been seen as the ‘poor relation to Rochester’ for too long and that investment would help meet the housing need in Medway.</p>	<p><i>The Development Brief will facilitate the regeneration of Strood’s Waterfront, increasing investment in the area helping to improve perceptions of Strood.</i></p>
	<p>1.5 Responses supported the regeneration of brownfield sites in the town centre, to help encourage a vibrant town centre while preserving greenfield sites.</p>	<p><i>Strood Waterfront is a collection of town centre brownfield sites. The regeneration of brownfield sites will help reduce pressure to develop greenfield sites to meet the housing demand.</i></p>
	<p>1.6 The need to show the Waterfront sites in context with other development site, e.g. Commissioners road development.</p>	<p><i>Illustrations have been amended to show the context of the area, which includes the Commissioners Road development.</i></p>
	<p>1.7 Residents from Kingswear Gardens raised concerns with Kingswear Gardens being included within the Development Brief; residents requested further information regarding whether Kingswear Gardens would be redeveloped and the logistics of this.</p>	<p><i>Kingswear Gardens is included within the Development Brief to highlight the potential of the area. Logistics and arrangements for any future redevelopment of Kingswear Gardens would be communicated primarily through the landowners, Orbit and Moat Homes. Map 1, Page 4 in the Development Brief highlights other third party land which would maximise the regeneration benefits.</i></p>
	<p>1.8 There is a need to mitigate construction impacts on existing residents, especially with other developments in</p>	<p><i>The Development Brief identifies that further assessments will need to be carried out by the developer such as Health</i></p>

	close proximity.	<i>Impact Assessments, Risk Assessments, Air Quality Assessments and Visual Impact Assessments, to reduce the impact of development on existing residents of the final build and during development.</i>
	1.9 Residents supported the reinstatement of Strood Pier to improve access to the river and capitalise on the established maritime connections and increase Strood's leisure offer.	<i>The reinstatement of Strood Pier is included within the Development Brief as an aspiration. The Environment Agency advised that this would require a considerable impact assessment due to its location within the Marine Conservation Zone. Strood Pier is within Peel Ports ownership</i>
<b>2. Land use</b>	2.1 Responses from the consultation highlighted that residents agreed with the majority of proposed land uses for housing, commercial/leisure and small scale retail. Hotel use received mixed support. Comments varied regarding preferred land use ranging from the need for more affordable housing, while others prioritised the benefit that restaurants and leisure facilities would bring.	<i>Responses were supportive of the majority of the proposed land uses. A commercial land use offer will remain in the Development Brief as a developer will need to carry out further soft market testing to determine the appropriate and viable option that will support the council's ambitions and principles set out for the waterfront.</i>
	2.2 65% of residents supported the vision for Strood Waterfront sites, creating the area as one of Medway's best residential locations benefiting from local shopping and transport facilities. On the whole residents supported the increasing the leisure and retail offer.	<i>The Development Brief highlights the potential for retail on the former Civic Centre site to support the existing high street offer. Cafes and restaurants along the riverfront would also support Strood's Town Centre, by diversifying the offer.</i>
	2.3 Comments were received highlighting the need for further parking facilities in Strood.	<i>In the future the parking need will be assessed and if appropriate alternative sites will be identified.</i>
	2.4 87% of respondents approved of Watermill Gardens remaining as greenspace, with 72% supportive of a café on Watermill Gardens.	<i>Watermill Gardens will remain in the Development Brief as a greenspace area which will require further investment and be upgraded.</i>
<b>3. Housing densities, building heights and views</b>	3.1 Housing densities resulted in polarising comments with some respondents seeking lower density with lower building heights, while others favoured the higher	<i>The illustrative masterplan illustrates the maximum quantum of housing that the sites could viably facilitate given a range of constraints such as greenspace provision.</i>

	densities, given the town centre location and need for housing.	<i>The Development Brief refers to the recommendations in the SHMA, offering a greater market mix.</i>
	3.2 Respondents highlighted the need for a variety of housing and inclusion of restaurants and bars should be included within the Development Brief.	<i>A range of housing typologies has been suggested in the illustrative masterplan, this is not prescriptive and subject to change following the appointment of a developer in consideration of viability and deliverability. The Development Brief outlines aspirations for restaurants and cafes along the waterfront.</i>
	3.3 Residents raised concerns of tall buildings obstructing current views. Building heights of 4-5 storeys were suggested.	<i>The illustrative masterplan indicates just one way that the design parameters could be achieved. The Development Brief identifies the need for 20m gardens along existing residential boundaries and the need to scale down to a maximum of 3 storeys where adjacent to existing properties.</i>
	3.4 It was suggested that tall buildings could create social isolation within the community.	<i>The Development Brief highlights the need for social pockets of public spaces should be woven into the fabric of residential areas at a very local level, to draw people outside to social areas. This will encourage a sense of community.</i>
	3.5 Comments reflected the need for the final proposal to consider the aesthetics of the development and the need for high quality public realm.	<i>The scale of the proposed for building heights is in line with the Building Heights (2006) policy, and does not break the natural ridge line. The Development Brief will need to take into account the massing as well as the height of building so that future development is sensitive to its surrounding environment. The Development Brief recognises the opportunities for taller buildings while respecting the setting, context and streetscape. The Development Brief sets key principles with regard to building design and public realm, such as on street surveillance from positioning of buildings, tree lined roads and public open space, providing guidance for a high quality development.</i>
<b>4. Sense of place &amp; Identity and Sense of Arrival</b>	4.1 Responses highlighted the need to re establish the community's link to the river and supported the reuse of Strood Pier to create further leisure opportunities.	<i>The Development Brief emphasises the importance of linking the sites with the river, this can be seen by altering the alignment of Canal road to give direct line of sight from the</i>

		<i>station to the river. The Development Brief also highlights the aspiration to re instate Strood Pier to improve resident access to the waterfront and waterfront walkway and cycle paths. The engaging uses proposed would attract people to the waterfront.</i>
	4.2 The majority of responses supported the need for the different sites to have individuality, with a common link throughout.	<i>The Development Brief encourages each site to have its own identity tying in to Strood's heritage and asset, especially the river. Any development should take account of the sites former industrial past and utilise the site's historic character.</i>
	4.3 Responses identified that Strood provides visitors with their first impression of Medway via rail; which could be significantly improved. Residents voiced current safety concerns going to and from Strood station, especially in the evening and that the area could be made more welcoming.	<i>The Development Brief acknowledges that improvements around the station area will help improve initial perceptions of Medway, especially via rail. It is important that this area is well lit, with an opportunity for passive surveillance from the new housing. The walkway from Station road to the station is identified as an area which would benefit from additional lighting and investment.</i>
<b>5. Greenspace, river walk and cycle paths</b>	5.1 The majority of responses support the use of the open space across from Jane's Creek for greenspace, recognising there is a shortage of greenspace within the town centre.	<i>The Development Brief identifies the use of the open space across from Jane's Creek as public greenspace.</i>
	5.2 A direct pedestrian link from the former Civic Centre site to the land across from Jane's Creek was supported.	<i>A direct pedestrian foot and cycle bridge, linking the former Civic Centre site to the greenspace is highlighted as an aspiration in the Development Brief; this would increase accessibility to greenspace and the waterfront.</i>
	5.3 Public responses supported the amount of greenspace within the illustrative masterplan, the majority of responses supported as much greenspace as possible and that this is maintained. Communal food growing areas would also be welcomed.	<i>The Development Brief identifies the amount of greenspace to be provided and the need for offsite provision. Allotments are suggested for the northern boundary of the Strood Riverside site.</i>
	5.4 82% of responses supported the inclusion of footpaths and cycle paths within the Development Brief; the	<i>The Development Brief prioritises the need for a river walk and cycle path, making this a vital feature for any future</i>

	<p>following rationale for support was received;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vital for Strood residents physical and emotional health.</li> <li>- Essential to provide active and sustainable travel options to help improve air quality, help tackle obesity and relieve congestion.</li> <li>- The riverside footpath and cycle path should link into the wider network to provide wider benefits across Strood.</li> </ul>	<p><i>housing development. The benefit of connecting to the wider network is also identified.</i></p>
	<p>5.5 The benefit of connecting the sites was recognised via a footpath under Rochester Bridge, however concerns were raised regarding safety and security of this area. The enclosed environment could attract antisocial behaviour.</p>	<p><i>Connecting the sites has remained within the Development Brief, however due to safety concerns this link underneath Rochester Bridge has been removed from the Development Brief.</i></p>
<b>6. Health and Communities</b>	<p>6.1 Responses were supportive of healthy design principles, suggestions such as pockets of sociable space throughout the development were recommended. Benches positioned strategically to encourage people outside and enable an active lifestyle for all was also suggested.</p>	<p><i>Comments regarding sociable and engaging spaces throughout the developments have been incorporated within the Development Brief, along with providing seating in the public realm.</i></p>
	<p>6.2 Dementia friendly designs were supported, along with creating safe and engaging environments for all generations.</p>	<p><i>Dementia friendly designs are highlighted within the Development Brief, promoting connections with long standing 'anchor' points. Design of homes and community areas should support all generations to live independently, while promoting social cohesion.</i></p>
	<p>6.3 Feedback supported sustainable design energy efficiency and reduction of emissions and promotion of public transport.</p>	<p><i>The Development Brief promotes the use and reuse of materials and resources and minimising energy usage and carbon emissions. Suggested lower car parking ratios, due to the links to public transport and town centre location, will help improve air quality in Strood.</i></p>
<b>7. Transport and Infrastructure</b>	<p>7.1 The majority of feedback was supportive for</p>	<p><i>The Development Brief identifies that additional housing will</i></p>

	regenerating the area, however concerns regarding infrastructure and services such as the road network GP practices, schools and additional pressures on hospitals	<i>increase the demand on local services, it highlights the need for further investment, predominately S106 contributions, for the maintenance and enhancement of heritage assets, expansion schools and health care facilities along with the additional staff resources needed.</i>
	7.2 Feedback raised concerns that the roads in Strood cannot cope with additional traffic. There are limited options for vehicle crossings over the River Medway, as a result Rochester Bridge can be heavily congested. Residents raised concerns of the impact of new developments on the road network, highlighting the need to implement mitigation solutions.	<i>Strood's transport position is detailed within the Development Brief, which is accompanied by an initial transport scoping exercise, highlighting the need for Developers to carry out a transport assessment.</i>
	7.3 Responses agreed that Strood has efficient rail links to London and wider area and that the train link should be utilised to create a sustainable development.	<i>The Development Brief recognises that the Waterfront sites are in close proximity to Strood train station, providing high speed links to London links across Kent. The strong public transport links will help make the Strood Waterfront sites a sustainable development.</i>
	7.4 Responses highlighted the need for more car parking within Strood town centre.	<i>In the future the parking need will be assessed and if appropriate alternative sites will be identified.</i>
	7.5 Lower parking standards were supported, however concerns were raised regarding the practicalities of this and potential impacts of exacerbating parking issues elsewhere.	<i>The parking recommendation takes account of the town centre location, close to local amenities and public transport services. The Development Brief focusses on creating a sustainable environment by promoting active travel. A planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment providing the robust justification for lower parking standards.</i>
	7.6 A number of measures were suggested as a result of the transport scoping exercise, which was carried out to inform the Development Brief, residents largely supported these measures; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 76% supported time slots for deliveries (drop off and pickups outside of rush</li> </ul>	<i>The transport measures in the transport statement were largely supported by residents and stakeholders, however further analysis will be necessary on submission of a planning application.</i>

	<p>hour).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- 84% supported an expansion of traffic monitoring and traffic signal control system, to update road signals to react to traffic condition.</li><li>- 77% supported parking guidance to reduce circling.</li><li>- 62% supported installation of electric charging points.</li><li>- 87% supported junction modifications</li><li>- 43% supported potential of a car club scheme with 30% undecided.</li><li>- 79% supported accessing from Commissioners road to ease congestion, without making it a 'rat run' for Medway City Estate.</li><li>- 45% supported lower parking provision on site with 26% undecided.</li></ul>	
--	--	--

## **7 Next Steps**

- 7.1 The council has collated the responses received and identified the specific matters raised. The representations have been published on the council's website for wider review. The matters raised have been assessed and the council has taken these into account in the finalisation of the Strood Waterfront Development Brief.