

Condition 2: Highways Improvements

It is noted that the proposed mini-roundabout works are located outside Medway Council's administrative boundary and therefore Medway Council has no direct highway authority role in the approval of those works. However, the introduction of any associated Traffic Regulation Orders, waiting restrictions, temporary signage or traffic management measures has the potential to displace existing on-street parking onto the Medway side of the boundary. The submitted roundabout arrangement shows proposed highway alterations/signage at the Canal Road / Church Street / Lower Rochester Road / Chequers Street junction, including relocated signage and altered kerb/carriageway arrangements. Accordingly, any TRO details and associated parking restrictions should be coordinated with Medway Council prior to implementation, to ensure that displaced parking is properly assessed and managed and does not create highway safety, access, amenity or operational issues on roads within Medway's jurisdiction

Condition 8: Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan:

From a highway's perspective, the submitted document does provide a reasonable framework for managing construction-related traffic. The applicant identifies that the remediation and redevelopment works would generate a significant number of vehicle movements, with the peak phase expected to generate approximately 686 daily two-way trips, of which 420 would be HGV trips. These HGV movements are stated to be distributed across a 10-hour working day, equating to around 42 two-way HGV trips per hour.

The applicant has proposed a defined HGV routing strategy. The submitted document states that westbound HGV traffic would use Lower Rochester Road, while eastbound HGV traffic would use Gore Green Road, with the intention of reducing the risk of two-way HGV conflict on constrained rural lanes. The document also states that the proposed route has been considered with Kent County Council and Gravesham Borough Council officers.

The submission also identifies the need for highway mitigation works. These include the conversion of the eastern end of Canal Road crossroads into a mini-roundabout, the use of temporary traffic signals at the narrow section of Canal Road near residential properties, and improvements to existing passing bays on Lower Rochester Road and Gore Green Road, including lengthening and the provision of additional passing bays where width or forward visibility is insufficient.

In relation to site access, the applicant states that the main construction access would be from Canal Road. A secure gate would be provided at the site entrance, with a security guard controlling and recording HGV movements. The plan also includes provision for an on-site HGV holding area, which would allow vehicles to wait within the site in the event of an obstruction or large delivery. This is positive, as it should reduce the likelihood of HGVs waiting on the public highway.

The document also provides for pedestrian and vehicle segregation within the site. Pedestrian routes are proposed to be protected alongside access roads using barriers, and the Principal Contractor would be responsible for managing safe and secure pedestrian and vehicle movements throughout the construction period

In terms of parking, the applicant states that a temporary car park would be provided within the construction compound for site personnel and those involved in remediation, demolition and construction. The plan also states that contractor vehicles and private cars would be parked in designated areas within the site compound. This is acceptable in principle, as it should reduce the risk of overspill parking on Canal Road or other surrounding roads.

The submitted plan also contains measures for highway cleanliness and maintenance. These include on-site wheel washing facilities where appropriate, regular road sweeping of the public highway and Canal Road, review of the frequency of sweeping with KCC, snow clearance and gritting where required, and pre- and post-construction condition surveys under a Section 59 agreement. Maintenance of Canal Road is also stated to be coordinated with Network Rail, given their ownership interests

The applicant has also proposed a Road Safety Initiative for personnel, suppliers and delivery drivers. The document states that drivers would be made aware of local hazards, including the narrowing on Canal Road, the junction with Church Street, agricultural movements, seasonal rural activity and potential additional HGV traffic associated with the Lower Thames Crossing.

Notwithstanding the above, there are some matters which should be clarified before the condition is discharged

First, although the plan refers to HGV routing, passing bay improvements, temporary signals and the mini-roundabout, it is not clear whether all necessary off-site highway works, temporary traffic management measures, legal agreements, approvals and implementation timescales have been secured. The condition requires the DCLP to be approved prior to commencement.

Second, while the document identifies the anticipated number of HGV movements, it does not appear to provide a detailed delivery management regime, booking system or maximum daily/hourly cap secured through the DCLP. Given the scale of HGV movements, particularly the stated peak of 420 HGV two-way trips per day, it would be appropriate to require confirmation of how arrivals and departures will be actively managed to prevent convoys, queuing or conflict on Canal Road and the wider rural road network.

Third, while an on-site HGV holding area is proposed, the submitted details do not appear to confirm its capacity, precise location, management arrangements, or how vehicles would be prevented from waiting on Canal Road if they arrive early or during an incident. This should be clarified.

Fourth, although the document confirms that a temporary car park would be provided on site, further detail should be provided on the number of spaces, the location of staff and visitor parking, and how parking would be managed during each construction phase. This is particularly important to ensure that no construction-related parking takes place on the surrounding highway network.

Fifth, the document refers to regular road sweeping and wheel washing, but the

specific trigger points, frequency, location of wheel wash facilities and responsibility for inspection could be more clearly defined. Given the nature of the site and the volume of HGV movements, this is important in order to protect highway safety and prevent mud, dust or debris being deposited on the highway.

Sixth, the plan relies on a number of highway measures that may require separate technical approval, such as temporary traffic signals, signage, passing bay works and junction improvements. It should be confirmed that these have either been approved by the Local Highway Authority or will be secured before commencement of the relevant phase.

Overall, from a highways perspective, the submitted DCLP is broadly acceptable in principle and demonstrates that the applicant has considered the main construction traffic impacts of the development. The proposed routing strategy, temporary signals, passing bay improvements, mini-roundabout, on-site parking, HGV holding area, wheel washing, road sweeping and driver safety initiative are all positive measures.

From a highways perspective, it is recommended that the condition is not discharged in full at this stage, but that discharge could be supported subject to an addendum or revised DCLP confirming the following:

- Details and timing of the proposed mini-roundabout, passing bay improvements, temporary traffic signals and temporary signage.
- A delivery booking or management system for HGVs, including measures to prevent queuing, convoying and early arrivals.
- The capacity, location and management of the on-site HGV holding area.
- The number, location and phasing of staff and visitor parking spaces.
- Details of wheel washing, road sweeping frequency, inspection arrangements and triggers for additional cleaning.
- Confirmation that no construction vehicles or staff vehicles will park or wait on the public highway.
- Confirmation that all construction traffic management measures will be in place before the relevant phase of works commences.

Condition 9: Construction Traffic Management Plan

The submitted CTMP provides a generally robust framework for managing construction traffic associated with the development. It includes details of the existing road network, proposed HGV routing, construction hours, vehicle movements, site access, parking, site layout, delivery management, traffic marshals, wheel washing, road cleaning, signage, road safety measures, communication procedures, monitoring and complaint handling

In respect of maximum HGV numbers both daily and hourly and HGV routing, the applicant has provided estimated construction traffic figures. The CTMP states that there will be an average of up to 50 vehicle movements per hour and provides a table setting out average two-way vehicle movements by construction activity, with phases ranging from around 20 to 91 average two-way movements per day depending on the activity. The CTMP also states that all HGVs will follow the agreed routing strategy using the M2, A289, B2000 and local roads, with a one-way routing arrangement

between the B2000 and Lower Higham.

The condition also requires a GPS tracking system covering all construction vehicles. The applicant states that the Principal Contractor will track all fleet vehicles and monitor, record and investigate road accidents, incidents, near misses and non-compliances with the HGV routing. However, the CTMP does not clearly confirm that all construction vehicles, including subcontractor vehicles, delivery vehicles and non-fleet vehicles, will be subject to GPS tracking. This requirement is therefore only partially addressed.

In respect of a detailed work programme / timetable, the applicant states that the works are expected to commence in 2026, last approximately three years, and be completed in 2029. The CTMP identifies the broad phases of work, including vegetation removal, importation of inert capping material, contamination works, site clearance, demolition, services, construction of 11 units and construction of a site office. However, the submitted programme is high-level and indicative rather than a detailed timetable. This element is therefore only partially addressed.

In respect of site HGV delivery / removal hours, the CTMP states that HGV movements will predominantly occur between 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday, with occasional Saturday working between 08:00 and 13:00. The CTMP also states that no vehicle movements will be planned outside site operating hours except for abnormal loads, and that out-of-hours deliveries would only take place where agreed with KCC and GBC. This is considered acceptable in principle.

In respect of detailed routing for demolition, excavation and construction traffic and abnormal loads, the applicant sets out the proposed HGV route and one-way routing strategy. The CTMP states that westbound vehicle movements would use Lower Rochester Road, while eastbound movements would use Gore Green Road and Lillechurch Road. The CTMP also identifies the 4.1m height restriction at the railway bridge immediately before the site and states that suppliers will be made aware of this restriction. Abnormal loads are not anticipated, but the CTMP states that they are not excluded and would be managed separately where required. This is broadly acceptable, although further detail on abnormal load procedures would be beneficial.

In respect of pre-journey information on routing and site restrictions, the CTMP states that subcontractors will be issued with a routing pack before attending site and that all new personnel will receive an induction. It also states that the CTMP will be sent out with subcontract and material purchase orders, and that delivery drivers will be briefed at the entrance gate or nominated point. This is considered to address this requirement.

In respect of a detailed plan showing on-site stores, facilities, compound, parking, turning, unloading and HGV queuing, the CTMP refers to the use of the existing Canal Road access, secure gates, internal access tracks, a main spine road, site compound, welfare facilities, temporary car parking, laydown areas, unloading areas and a holding area for HGVs. Appendix 1 provides a construction layout plan showing the main construction compound, car parking, construction traffic access route, pedestrian route and remediation area. However, the CTMP does not appear to provide a fully detailed swept-path or capacity plan showing HGV queuing, turning and unloading arrangements for each phase. This element is therefore only partially addressed.

In respect of the breakdown of number, type, size and weight of vehicles, the CTMP identifies the expected vehicle types, including vans, self-tipping vehicles, off-loading vehicles, HIABs, HGVs, grab vehicles, articulated vehicles, mobile cranes and concrete mixers. However, the CTMP states that delivery vehicles will not be restricted aside from legal size and weight limits, and it does not provide a detailed breakdown of vehicle numbers by type, size and weight over the demolition and construction period. This requirement has therefore not been fully met.

In respect of debris management, the CTMP includes wheel washing, weekly road sweeping, vehicle inspection by a traffic marshal before vehicles leave site, sheeting of vehicles loaded with arisings, and measures to avoid mud and loose material being deposited on the highway. It also states that the extent and frequency of road sweeping will be reviewed and agreed with KCC. This is acceptable in principle, although further detail on the exact wheel wash location, operational triggers and inspection frequency would strengthen the submission

In respect of public impact and protection, the CTMP considers pedestrians, cyclists, the public highway and public rights of way. It identifies that there is a PRoW across the Canal Road site access and that NCN Route 1 is located nearby. The CTMP also includes segregation measures, signage, barriers, traffic marshals and protocols for unauthorised access. However, the condition specifically requires details of TROs, road/footway/cycleway/PRoW closures and reroutings, signage, barriers and remediation. The CTMP states that a temporary traffic regulation order will be required for the one-way system, but does not appear to provide full details of all TROs, closures, diversions, signage locations, barrier arrangements or reinstatement/remediation measures. This requirement is therefore only partially addressed.

In respect of public liaison, the CTMP states that a Transport Coordinator will be appointed and will act as the day-to-day contact for CTMP matters, liaising with the planning and highways authorities, residents, businesses and community groups. However, the CTMP does not provide a named individual or direct contact details for the Transport Coordinator. Complaints are to be directed to the Site Manager, whose number will be displayed at the main entrance gate, but again the specific name and contact details are not included. This element is therefore not fully addressed.

In respect of route details covering culverts, waterways, passing places, tracking of bends/junctions and visibility splays, the CTMP describes the local road network, identifies narrow roads, informal passing places, the Canal Road constraints, the railway bridge height restriction, and the proposed one-way system. It also states that a swept path analysis has been undertaken for articulated vehicles turning within the Network Rail yard before the bridge. However, the submitted CTMP does not appear to include detailed route drawings covering culverts, waterways, all passing places, tracking of bends and junctions, and visibility splays. This requirement has therefore only been partially addressed.

In respect of the removal of TROs, temporary signage, barriers and diversions, the CTMP states that temporary signage will be installed for the duration of the construction works and that any temporary street furniture removed would be

reinstated following construction. However, the document does not provide a specific decommissioning plan for removal of TROs, temporary signs, barriers and diversions at the end of the works. This should be clarified.

In respect of temporary construction accesses and their remediation post-project, the CTMP states that the existing Canal Road access will be retained and that the main construction access will be via Canal Road. It also states that any damage to road infrastructure caused by construction traffic will be made good and that pre- and post-construction condition surveys will be undertaken. However, there is limited detail on any temporary access works, their design, approval and reinstatement. This is partially addressed.

In respect of provision for emergency vehicles, the CTMP states that emergency vehicles will be given priority right of way either on or off site. This addresses the requirement in principle, although it would be preferable for the CTMP to confirm how emergency access will be maintained during periods of traffic control, temporary signals, road closures or one-way working.

In respect of road cleaning and wheel washing facilities, the CTMP confirms that wheel washing will be provided adjacent to the site access and that cleaning will take place within the site to prevent detritus being transferred onto the public highway. It also states that road sweeping will be provided weekly and that road cleaning frequency will be reviewed and agreed with KCC. This is acceptable in principle, subject to final details of location, specification and triggers for additional cleaning.

Overall, the submitted CTMP addresses many of the key highways and construction traffic issues associated with the development. In particular, it provides useful information on HGV routing, construction hours, delivery management, traffic marshals, one-way routing, temporary traffic signals, road sweeping, wheel washing, staff parking, driver briefings, FORS/CLOCS standards, public liaison arrangements and monitoring.

However, the condition requires a full CTMP before development commences. The submitted document remains partly indicative and live, particularly in relation to Phase 2, and a number of condition-specific requirements are either not fully addressed or are deferred until later.

Medway Council Highways would not recommend full discharge of the condition at this stage. Highways would recommend that the applicant be asked to submit an addendum or revised CTMP addressing the following matters: -

- A more detailed construction programme/timetable, including key phases and expected traffic peaks.
- Maximum daily and hourly HGV numbers clearly stated as enforceable caps, rather than average estimates only.
- A detailed breakdown of vehicle numbers by type, size and weight across the demolition, remediation and construction periods.
- A detailed site layout plan showing compound, stores, parking, loading/unloading, HGV turning and HGV queuing/holding capacity for each relevant phase.

- Detailed wheel wash location, specification, inspection regime and triggers for additional road sweeping.
- Full details of TROs, one-way arrangements, temporary signals, road/footway/cycleway/PRoW closures or diversions, including signage, barriers and reinstatement.
- Named public liaison/Transport Coordinator contact, including telephone number and email address.
- Detailed route assessment drawings covering passing places, culverts, waterways, swept paths at bends/junctions and visibility splays.
- Confirmation of arrangements for removal of TROs, temporary signs, barriers and diversions at the end of the works.
- Details of any temporary construction access works and how they will be remediated post-project.
- Confirmation of how emergency vehicle access will be maintained at all times, including during temporary signals, road closures or one-way working.