

## **Additional statement from Faversham Town Council's Active Travel Committee to support Town Council's current objection to Duchy of Cornwall application 23/505533/EIHYB**

### **Introduction**

Faversham Town Council Planning Committee endorsed a report by Railton Ltd on the travel aspects of the Duchy of Cornwall (DoC) planning application and submitted this to the SBC Planning portal in June 2024. This raised concerns that severance caused by, in particular, the A2 and the railways lines, were not addressed. To date, the DoC has not responded directly to FTC's submission.

A review of the Duchy of Cornwall (DoC) development proposals on the Swale Borough Council planning portal as at June 2025 has identified several new documents relevant (directly or indirectly) to the transport links between the development and Faversham town centre. These include submissions from various stakeholders – KCC Highways and KCC PROW, National Highways, Active Travel England, Boughton Parish Council and, in particular, the DoC's Transport Vision statement (February 2025).

The Transport Vision statement includes the key phrases, such as:

*"Physical integration with existing urban area is critical..."*

*"Key priority...resilient networks...healthy modes of transport..."*

In order to deliver on these objectives, the DoC proposals will probably encourage walking and cycling within the development. With regard to severance outside the development site, the Transport Visions partly addresses one of the two key issues identified in the Railton report – severance caused by the A2 – but does not adequately deal with the severance caused by the railways.

### **A2 severance**

The severance issues are twofold:

- 1) Lack of crossings / active travel infrastructure
- 2) Environmental and safety concerns for those walking and cycling due to traffic speed and volume

While the new exit planned to meet the A251 south of Tettenhall Way may prove mitigation for the above in providing access to and from Perry Court or the Abbey School, most of the intended exits for pedestrians and cyclists from the development are still onto the A2.

Issue 1 is addressed reasonably well: the planned interventions are on the list of A2 improvements identified in FTC's LCWIP.

- 1) While shared use walking and cycling 3m wide pavement infrastructure on the north of the A2 might be reasonable in the short term, the lack of segregation is not sustainable for the medium term. We request that the develop work with highways to find a better sustainable solution.
- 2) With the caveat that detailed work is continuing on the A2 crossings, these seem to be sufficient and in the right locations for those wishing to walk or cycle on the new, wider pavement.
- 3) The crossings should prioritise those walking and cycling, with induction loops to trigger red signals for motor vehicles with little / no delay to pedestrians and cycling.

## **Additional statement re Duchy of Cornwall application 23/505533/EIHYB**

- 4) Most of the junctions on the north side of the A2 will have raised tables and narrower junction radii to slow movements in and out of the side roads.

Within issue 2:

- Reducing the carriageway width to 6m in order to accommodate the new 3m pavement on the north of the A2 will help to reduce motor vehicle speeds and enable a 20mph speed limit to be introduced.
- The lack of segregation of pedestrians and cyclists away from motor vehicles means that environmental and safety concerns will remain because of the volume of traffic. While the DoC development is aimed at minimising any increase in motor vehicles along the A2, it has not presented plans to reduce the existing volume of motor vehicles, particularly HGVs.
- Consider bringing forward the industrial area sooner, in order to alleviate the volume of commercial vehicles using the Western Link and the A2 and enable the A2 to become more suitable for active travel.

We do not yet comment on the changes to the Love Lane junction – currently not convenient for cyclists and pedestrians – as work is continuing on its design.

### **Railway severance**

Nothing in the proposal addresses the severance caused by the railway lines, a key issue for Faversham Town Council.

- Pedestrian bridge linking the development to the recreation ground and to the new East-West walking route. The proposed feasibility study for improving the bridge is limited in scope and falls short of the LCWIP's objective of making it a truly accessible crossing for those walking or cycling. As key active travel desire line, a detailed specification and design supported by a financial and implementation plan is needed to ensure that adequate improvements are achieved at this location.
- Bridge over the railway at St Catherine's and the underpasses at the station and Forbes Road: The proposals are minor and do not address accessibility issues for those walking or cycling. A solution is needed for the severance issue near the railway station. This could include reconsideration of a plan to redevelop the area around the railway station to include access over the railway line.

### **Additional recommendation**

We understand that new guidance from Active Travel England on designing active travel interventions in more rural areas is available in draft. We recommend that this guidance is reviewed and applied, particularly for connections to Boughton and Selling.

### **Public Transport**

WE remain concerned about a lack of a firm plan for improved bus service and routes for the area. Such a plan needs to include a funding commitment. We would be concerned if existing buses that use Love Lane had to do additional loops around the new development and thereby slow the journey times between Faversham and Canterbury.

## **Additional statement re Duchy of Cornwall application 23/505533/EIHYB**

Appendix: List of most relevant transport planning related documents identified to date. Awaiting updated list from DoC

### ***DoC's transport Vision 24th February 2025 (latest iteration)***

Has responded to NH and KCC comments. Key statements of Transport vision include:

"Physical integration with existing urban area is critical..."

"Key priority...resilient networks...healthy modes of transport..."

### ***Report from Bruce Bamber, Railton, 24th June 2024 commissioned by Faversham Town Council***

Critical of DoC transport plans – no response seen from DoC

### ***KCC PROW comment 29<sup>th</sup> April 2025***

Objection withdrawn. Is KCC PROW aware of the new draft guidance on active travel from ATE? It doesn't seem to have referenced the Parishes to Town recommendations. nor the Neighbourhood Plan.

### ***Boughton PC comment 9th May 2025***

Requesting s106 funding. The PC is not asking for money for active travel connections to the village. Has it considered the Parishes to Town report and/or have there been discussions with KCC PROW?

### ***Active Travel England comment 3rd April 2025***

Not supporting DoC proposals as currently laid out. No response from DoC as yet

### ***National Highways 31st March 2025***

Expressing concerns about proposal. No response to the latest from DoC, although it has responded in the past