

Statement of Common Ground pertaining to Matters 5, 7 and 11 of the Examination into the Core Strategy Review (December 2020)

Folkestone & Hythe District Council and Highways England

1. Overview

1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SCG) has been prepared by Folkestone & Hythe District Council (FHDC) together with Highways England (HE).

1.2 The purpose of this SCG is to set out the basis on which FHDC and HE have actively and positively agreed to work together to meet the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. FHDC has prepared their Core Strategy Review for submission in early 2020.

1.3 Under section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (amended by section 110 of the Localism Act 2011) and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 it is a requirement under the Duty to Cooperate for local planning authorities, county councils and other named bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in the preparation of development plan documents and other local development documents. This is a test that local authorities need to satisfy at the Local Plan examination stage and is an additional requirement to the test of soundness.

1.4 The Duty to Cooperate applies to strategic planning issues of cross boundary significance. Local authorities all have common strategic issues and as set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG):

“local planning authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters before they submit their plans for examination.”

1.5 The statutory requirements of the Duty to Cooperate are not a choice but a legal obligation. Whilst the obligation is not a duty to agree, cooperation should produce effective and deliverable policies on strategic cross boundary matters in accordance with the government policy in the NPPF, and practice guidance in the NPPG.

2.0 Strategic matters

2.1 2.1 The NPPF defines the topics considered to be strategic matters (para 20). The strategic matters relevant to FHDC and HE are

- the cross-boundary matters associated with the movement of vehicular traffic on the Strategic Road Network (SRN); and
- the impacts of development proposed and/or resulting from any adoption of the Core Strategy Review on the Strategic Road Network within the district; and

Commented [BK1]: Version received 23/12/20.

Aware it will be further amended to reflect 23/12 telecon.

Comments made in this context

Any uncommented/ unaltered text is currently agreed but could still need to change, depending on what further amendments F&H make 23/12

Commented [BK2]: t appears this SoCG hasn't been updated to reflect the Matter 5 SoCG = disappointing!

- the interplay between the Strategic Road Network and Local Road Network where any changes to, or need for mitigation of, the latter may have consequences for the former.

~~The NPPF defines the topics considered to be strategic matters (para 20). The only strategic matter relevant to FHDC and HE is the cross boundary matters associated with the movement of vehicular traffic on the Strategic Road Network (SRN), as expanded upon below.~~

2.2 Government policy places much emphasis on housing delivery as a means for ensuring economic growth and addressing the current national shortage of housing. The NPPF is very clear that:

“strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need (and any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas) can be met over the plan period.”

2.3 Following changes to the NPPF and PPG, the planning policy team has been assessing how the district can meet the new housing need for the Core Strategy Review plan period. This has involved a number of areas of work, assessing past trends as well as reviewing current and future sources of housing supply.

2.4 The Government’s new national formula calculated from household formation and housing affordability figures is published regularly by Office for National Statistics, and the most recently published figure for Folkestone & Hythe district currently stands at 738 new homes a year. FHDC’s Regulation 19 Plan outlines a housing requirement for 13,284 new homes over plan period (to 2036/37). Meeting this target over the plan period will be provided for by development in Core Strategy Review, Places and Policies Local Plan, existing planning permissions and small sites.

Table 2.1: Core Strategy Review 2019/20-2036/37– elements of housing supply

Source of housing supply	Number of homes
Current planning permissions and sites under construction (with adjustment for lapsed permissions)	4,274
Places and Policies Local Plan and 2013 Core Strategy sites without planning permission	1,703
Windfall allowance (95 homes a year over 15 years)	1,425
New garden settlement (Core Strategy Review policies SS6-SS9)	5,925
Expansion of Sellindge (Core Strategy Review policy CSD9) (part of allocation without permission)	188
Total Core Strategy Review plan period	13,515

2.5 However, DfT Circular 2/13 and the NPPF are equally clear that any development, including housing delivery, must be tempered by the requirement to ensure that it can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts on the safety, reliability and operation of the Strategic Road Network. Therefore, as necessary and appropriate, any development must be accompanied by suitable mitigation in the right places at the right time, that is to the required standards and is deliverable in terms of land availability, constructability and funding.

Transportation (strategic) – evidence base

2.5

FHDC and HE exchanged correspondence during 2017 and 2018 about HE's assessment requirements of the People and Places Local Plan to 2031 and Core Strategy Review to 2037. This was in accordance with the assessment requirements of DfT Circular 02/2013 and NPPF. The assessment covered the following junctions:

- A260 Spitfire Way / White Horse Hill / A260 / A20 Slip Roads
- Alkham Valley Road / A20 Off Slip / A20 On Slip
- A260 / Alkham Valley Road
- A20 / M20 / B2064 Cheriton Interchange
- A2034 / A20 / A259 / M20 On Slip / M20 Off Slip (Castle Hill Interchange)
- M20 / A20 / B2068 Roundabout

2.7 The assessment looked at the junction capacity and merge and diverge assessments in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standards. The findings indicated that mitigation would be required for the strategic road network under the following development scenarios:

Junctions:

A20/A260 eastbound off slip:

- 2037 CS6500 AM and PM
- 2037 CS8000 AM and PM

M20 Junction 11:

- 2037 CS6500 AM and PM
- 2037 CS8000 AM and PM

M20 Junction 13:

- 2037 CS6500 and 8000

Merges and Diverges:

M20 Junction 12:

- e/b merge 2037 – needs a parallel merge all scenarios (DM, CSR 6500 and CSR 8000)

M20 Junction 13:

- w/b merge 2037 needs a lane gain (2 lanes main carriageway +1 slip) with ghost island merge all scenarios
- e/b diverge 2037 needs ghost island all scenarios

M20 Junction 11:

- e/b diverge 2037 needs a lane drop and ghost island diverge for CSR scenarios
- e/b merge 2037 needs parallel merge for DM and lane gain for CSR scenarios
- w/b diverge 2037 – ghost island diverge needed for CSR 8000 scenario
- w/b merge 2037 – parallel merge required for DM and CSR 6500 scenarios and lane gain with ghost island for CSR 8000 scenario

2.8 As a result of this work, the Council and Highways England agreed an interim SoCG on 28 January 2020. It appears each party interpreted it slightly differently. The Council assumed all matters were concluded sufficiently to allow the CSR to progress to examination and adoption. However, Highways England assumed the SoCG was simply an interim document and awaited details of the identified, required mitigation.

2.9 Consequently, around the time the Examination process commenced in June 2020, having not heard anything from the Council since January, Highways England wrote to the Council and Programme Officer, setting out our expectations with regards what needed to be provided by the Council by way of evidence and mitigation proposals, in order to avoid any need for Highways England to object to the plan, or parts of it, at the Examination.

2.10 Since June 2020 Highways England have been working with the Council to enable them to provide the necessary evidence and mitigation proposals. It is now apparent that the evidence and mitigation can be separated into two main packages, namely:

- any related to Matter 5: Strategy for the Urban Area; and
- any related to Matters 7 & 11 relevant to the allocation and delivery of Otterpool

2.11 A Statement of Common Ground was agreed and submitted to the Examination on Matter 5 on 16 December 2020. It concluded that

- subject to the inclusion in the adopted Plan of a policy led approach that limits the delivery of windfalls to 500 dwellings (around a third of the total relied upon) in the Urban Area (to be applied from the date of the signing into the SOCG), unless the Council's monitoring and updated modelling demonstrates to the satisfaction of Highways England that further capacity exists and/or commensurate mitigation can be delivered.
- Then Highways England are content with and have no objection to the Strategy for the urban Area

Formatted: Font: Arial, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Arial, 12 pt

Formatted: List Paragraph, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 1.25 cm + Indent at: 1.89 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.62 cm, First line: 0 cm

2.12 The purpose of this Statement of Common Ground is, therefore, to set out work to-date, the current position and any remaining areas of disagreement or work to be completed with regards Matters 7 and 11. Effectively this means all matters relating to Otterpool and the SRN.

~~FHDC and HE exchanged correspondence during 2017 and 2018 about HE's assessment requirements of the People and Places Local Plan to 2031 and Core Strategy Review to 2037. This was in accordance with the assessment requirements of DfT Circular 02/2013 and NPPF. The assessment covered the following junctions:~~

~~A260 Spitfire Way / White Horse Hill / A260 / A20 Slip Roads~~

~~Alkham Valley Road / A20 Off Slip / A20 On Slip~~

~~A260 / Alkham Valley Road~~

~~A20 / M20 / B2064 Cheriton Interchange~~

~~A2034 / A20 / A269 / M20 On Slip / M20 Off Slip (Castle Hill Interchange)~~

~~M20 / A20 / B2068 Roundabout~~

~~2.6 The assessment looked at the junction capacity and merge and diverge assessments in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standards. The findings indicated that mitigation would be required for the strategic road network under the following development scenarios:~~

Junctions:

~~A20/A260 eastbound off slip:~~

~~2037 CS6500 AM and PM~~

~~2037 CS8000 AM and PM~~

~~M20 Junction 11:~~

~~2037 CS6500 AM and PM~~

~~2037 CS8000 AM and PM~~

M20 Junction 13:

~~2037 CS6500 and 8000~~

Merges and Diverges:

M20 Junction 12:

~~e/b merge 2037 needs a parallel merge all scenarios (DM, CSR 6500 and CSR 8000)~~

M20 Junction 13:

~~w/b merge 2037 needs a lane gain (2 lanes main carriageway +1 slip) with ghost island merge all scenarios~~

~~e/b diverge 2037 needs ghost island all scenarios~~

~~———— M20 Junction 11:~~

~~e/b diverge 2037 needs a lane drop and ghost island diverge for CSR scenarios~~

~~e/b merge 2037 needs parallel merge for DM and lane gain for CSR scenarios~~

~~w/b diverge 2037 —ghost island diverge needed for CSR 8000 scenario~~

~~w/b merge 2037 —parallel merge required for DM and CSR 6500 scenarios and lane gain with ghost island for CSR 8000 scenario~~

Highways England response to Core Strategy Review Regulation 19 plan document

- 2.7 Within its response to the Core Strategy Review Regulation 19 plan document (Appendix 1 refers), HE has advised that generally, the direction of, and considerations within, the Core Strategy Review appear to be sound and to concur generally with the approach and policies of HE with regard to development and its impacts on the SRN.
- 2.8 HE are satisfied that policy SS5 – District Infrastructure Planning – concurs with DfT 02/13, in that it states that planning permissions will only be granted where the development aims to reduce demands on infrastructure; does not jeopardise current or planned physical infrastructure; and allows sustainable travel patterns. HE has commented that whilst the provision of sustainable modes is included, an additional objective should be added, as follows:
- ‘to consider and manage the travel demand of new development proposals, and develop tailored solutions to limit car use generated by new developments.’*
- 2.9 HE concurs that the Core Strategy Review is necessarily ‘high-level’ and broad in scope. HE also acknowledges that the Core Strategy Review makes

reference to identified infrastructure upgrades in Figure 4.4, to include three 'key highway improvements' on the M20, A20 and A259 respectively

However, as no more detail is provided within the body of the Core Strategy Review, HE would need to be consulted further on these schemes as they progress. By progress, Highways England means that it is demonstrated prior to adoption of the Plan in order to demonstrate, in turn, that the Plan is sound.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 cm

~~However, as no more detail is provided within the body of the Core Strategy Review, HE would like to be consulted further on these schemes as they progress.~~

2.10

HE has flagged that 'critical' and 'necessary' infrastructure needed to support the spatial strategy is stated as being set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). FHDC can confirm that the IDP was published as one of the evidence base documents to the Core Strategy Review. HE need sufficient certainty that the mitigation set out in the IDP is the "right thing in the right place at the right time" and is deliverable in terms of it meeting required standards, the land being available and it being funded. Ensuring the Plan is supported by any/all mitigation is the responsibility of the promoting Council. Highways England are not able to accept any significant risks that development occurs without the necessary mitigation. Similarly, given the primacy of the Local Plan in any area, it must demonstrate in sufficient detail whether and how any development can be mitigated since this goes to the heart of the principle of development. To discover a development is not mitigatable at application stage would be too late. FHDC and HE will have regular conversations regarding the delivery of IDP mitigation throughout the life of the CSR.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 cm

~~HE has flagged that 'critical' and 'necessary' infrastructure needed to support the spatial strategy is stated as being set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). FHDC can confirm that whilst the IDP was published as one of the evidence base documents to the Core Strategy Review, HE may not have fully digested its contents and appreciated the breadth of infrastructure schemes expected to come forward in conjunction with planned growth. FHDC would welcome further conversations with HE in respect of the content of the IDP, although this activity can take place outside the SoCG.~~

2.11 Of course, HE would be consulted further on any schemes affecting the SRN as they progress.

3. Submission to the Examination in Public into the Core Strategy Review Representation made by Highways England (July 2020)

Commented [BK3]: F&H to update

3.1 Highways England representation to the Core Strategy Review Examination in Public on 3rd July 2020. A copy of the representation is appended to this statement (Appendix 5 refers). The representation made by Highways England cross-refers to three Matters to be examined, namely Matter 5: Strategy for the

Urban Area, Matter 7: Strategy for the North Downs Area (Otterpool); and Matter 11 (Other Policies).

3.2 ~~The purpose of this version of an updated Statement of Common Ground is to effectively reach agreement on those issues arising under Matters 5, 7 and 11 respectively.~~

4. ~~Work to update the SoCG following representation made by Highways England in relation to Matter 5: Strategy for the Urban Area~~

4.1 ~~Highways England has entered into a formal agreement dated 16th December 2020 on a SoCG in respect of Matter 5: Strategy for the Urban Area that effectively decouples that Matter from those that remain, which specifically are Matters 7 and 11 respectively.~~

4.2 ~~In respect of the Core Strategy Review, and in particular Matter 5: The Urban Area (which is limited to the urban centres of Folkestone and Hythe), both parties are satisfied that planned growth associated with the Urban Area has been appropriately captured and appraised as part of the modelling work undertaken by AECOM, and that it is duly resolved that there is no requirement for further discussion at Examination into the Core Strategy Review in relation to Matter 5.~~

4.3 ~~In the context of the representation made by Highways England into the submission made to the examination by Highways England in a letter dated 3rd July 2020 there is no associated requirement for the Strategy for the Urban Area to secure junction mitigations. As such, the Core Strategy Review meets the NPPF Local Plan soundness tests, as well as the transport specific NPPF and G2/13 tests.~~

5. **Work to update the SoCG following representation made by Highways England in relation to Matter 7: Strategy for the North Downs Area**

5.1 The following information is drawn from the 'Folkestone & Hythe District Council Local Plan Traffic Analysis Highways England Road Network dated 30th November 2020 (second draft)' (Appendix 8 refers) prepared by Arcadis on behalf of the promoters of Otterpool Park and explains the technical work undertaken following the representation made by Highways England dated 3rd July 2020:

'At the request of Folkestone and Hythe District Council, Arcadis Consulting (UK) Ltd (Arcadis) is providing support to the District Council for their Core Strategy Review. The support being provided as described in this note relates to the Statement of Common Ground between Folkestone and Hythe District Council and Highways

Commented [BK4]: To be updated by F&H and cross-checked with Nigel Walkden's assessment of latest modelling/TN

Commented [BK5]: Bottom line is that the text needs to reflect that

It is agreed that

1) M20J11: The Plan/ Otterpool will impact on M20J11 and will, unless a Monitor & Manage Strategy (to be agreed) demonstrates otherwise, need to mitigate that impact. Currently the means of mitigation (design/ buildability/funding) is not agreed

2) M20J12&J13: The Plan/ Otterpool will impact on M20J12 & J13 and will, unless a Monitor & Manage Strategy (to be agreed) demonstrates otherwise, need to mitigate that impact. Currently the means of mitigation (design/ buildability/funding) is not agreed.

3) A20/A260: The Plan/ Otterpool will impact on the A20/A260 junction and will, unless a Monitor & Manage Strategy (to be agreed) demonstrates otherwise, need to mitigate that impact. Currently the means of mitigation (design/ buildability/funding) is not agreed.

F&H provided the latest modelling and technical note to Highways England on 23 December. Due to staff leave and the time required to fully and appropriately assess and comment on the submitted material, it will not be possible to reach any conclusions before at least 4 January 2021.

Subject to Highways England assessment and conclusions it appears possible (but as yet not agreed) that:

- Any required mitigation will not be required until some time into the lifespan of the plan (subject to agreeing the evidence, at least 5 years)
- During this period many other factors may become clearer in their interplay with that mitigation; for example, the outcome of EU Exit, the post-Covid vaccine new normal and any Government or private sector investment in the Eurotunnel traffic management systems.
- A Monitor & Manage approach, suitably framed, governed and funded via the adopted Plan may offer a pragmatic way forward. It would identify the "worse case scenario" impacts, demonstrate the deliverability of mitigation for those impacts and set out a framework of Monitor & Management over the lifetime of the Plan/Otterpool development such as to facilitate the assessment of whether the worse case or an alternative mitigation is justified. The adopted Plan would contain policy and text that in summary would specify that X development may only be occupied once Y mitigation is in place unless Z. Monitor & Manage demonstrate that an alternative approach is justified. This would enable other factors to be taken into account, including viring any funding to mitigate Otterpool into any wider SRN schemes that may come forward.

In the meantime, F&HDC commits to

- Proving an updated technical note reflecting the latest research and findings no later than end of business 23 December
- Continuing to work up their Monitor & Manage approach in order to submit it to Highways England no later than 4 January 2021.

While Highways England commits to

- Providing comments as soon as practicable on receipt of material
- Seeking a pragmatic way forward such that it's dual responsibilities to safeguard the safety, reliability and operation efficiency of the SRN and to facilitate local plan led development can both be satisfied.

England and, specifically, the submission made to the examination by Highways England in a letter dated 3rd July 2020.

Arcadis held a meeting with Folkestone and Hythe District Council and Highways England on Monday the 14th of September to discuss the scope of work required to work towards a Statement of Common Ground between Folkestone and Hythe District Council and Highways England. Highways England expressed the view that they require further information to be able to support the local plan at the initial hearing in mid-November 2020, which is now postponed until December 2020.

A second meeting took place on Friday 25th of September, between Arcadis, Folkestone and Hythe District Council and Highways England. This meeting clarified the requirement for traffic investigations to support Highways England to determine the impact of the Folkestone and Hythe Local Plan on its road network. Since then, further meetings have been held between all three parties on Thursday 1st, Wednesday 7th, Monday 12th and Friday 30th of October to discuss progress towards the agreement of the scope, data sources and assumptions required for the study.'

- 5.2 The following comments are drawn from the conclusion section (section 11) of the 'Folkestone & Hythe District Council Local Plan Traffic Analysis Highways England Road Network dated 30th November 2020 (second draft)' report. A fuller account of the

"The purpose of the study undertaken by Arcadis is to enable Folkestone and Hythe District Council to agree on a Statement of Common Ground regarding requirements for highway schemes to mitigate impact related to the Folkestone and Hythe Local Plan on the Highways England road network, or the further work required to identify those requirements.

The methodology in the AECOM Shepway Transport Model has been retained, and the model updated using the latest available information for the DS CSR 6,500 2037 scenario. The study area has been confirmed to be limited to the Highways England road network within Folkestone and Hythe District Council following a review of traffic volumes and traffic conditions in the Ashford area.

Overall, the following junctions require physical upgrades by 2037:

- *M20 Junction 11;*
- *M20 Junction 13; and*
- *A20 / Spitfire Way / Alkham Valley Road interchange.*

M20 Junction 11 requires substantial junction upgrades, directly linked to background traffic growth and to Otterpool Park development. The traffic impact from DS CSR 6,500 on the other two junctions, however, is limited. The traffic impact is mostly the result of these junction being already saturated in the future. Otterpool Park Transport Assessment modelling assumptions take into account the garden village and active travel measures of the site. In the view of the potential positive impact of such measures, a “monitor and manage” approach to infrastructure development is recommended.”

- 5.3 As set out in the Arcadis report, M20 Junction 11 is significantly impacted by the Local Plan. It is accepted that the junction upgrade is not considered as one development stage, as the south junction might not be required as part of DS CSR 6,500. It is recommended that any mitigation scheme is subject to a ‘monitor and manage’ approach to implementation. Traffic volumes should be monitored throughout the Local Plan period to inform when or if the mitigation is required. Additional commentary pertaining to the ‘monitor and manage’ approach is provided under section 6 of this SCG.
- 5.4 The Arcadis report presents 4 options to upgrade M20 J11, and each option pays attention to the potential requirement for the scheme of mitigation required to upgrade M20 J11 in order to accommodate Core Strategy Review growth (i.e. Otterpool Park) to also incorporate modifications to operational arrangement/layout of the mainline motorway so as to provide an appropriate capacity in the event of a Eurotunnel Incident Operations occurrence as flagged by Highways England in November 2020. Fuller coverage of the situation that has arisen at Eurotunnel is set out in the Arcadis report.
- 5.5 It is highly probable that an intervention to address the Eurotunnel Incident Operations will need to be implemented in the short-medium term, which could include components of any one of the four design options presented in the Arcadis report. An alternative strategy to be explored by Highways England to address the known Eurotunnel Incident Operations will involve consideration of traffic management options on the Strategic Road Network some distance away from M20 J11a so as to provide a level of resilience to curtail the impact on queuing traffic internal to Eurotunnel beyond normal operations as/when incidents occur.
- 5.6 The timing of an intervention to address the Eurotunnel issue is very much a short-term requirement/priority, and will be required a considerable time in advance of the trigger the corresponding requirement to upgrade M20 J11 to be implemented in accordance with growth proposed to come forward under the Core Strategy Review. As such the two matters relating to the requirement for M20 J11 (mainline versus junction) to be upgraded, i.e. growth associated with the Core Strategy Review and operational incidents at Eurotunnel must be decoupled, and the appropriate governance arrangements put in place concerning the mitigation required to resolve each corresponding matter

individually, whilst maintaining a forum in which information can be shared between the relevant parties in respect of what upgrades are being made to the Strategic Road Network, and when.

- 5.7 Funding shall follow and apply the same arrangements. Without prejudice, and strictly not seeking to pre-determine the Development Management outcome of the current outline planning application relating to Otterpool Park, the promoters of the Otterpool Park scheme would, in order for a planning consent to be entered into, be responsible for entering into necessary legal agreements with the District Council so as to appropriately mitigate the impact of the development. A key infrastructure item in this regard would be the securing (be it through financial contribution or otherwise direct provision) of necessary off-site improvements to the Strategic Highway Network, and specifically the required upgrade at M20 J11 proportionate to the impact attributable to the proposed Garden Settlement (Otterpool Park).
- 5.8 Likewise, it will be for Highways England to seek and secure necessary funding to implement necessary mainline upgrade to the M20 or otherwise implement traffic management solution(s) to appropriately respond to the Eurotunnel Incident Operations matter. In the interests of clarity, any such funding strategy would not involve Highways England seeking a financial contribution from the promoters of Otterpool Park towards a scheme to resolve the Eurotunnel Incident Operations matter.

6. Work to update the SoCG following representation made by Highways England in relation to Matter 11: Other Policies

- 6.1 As already covered in section 2 of this SCG, within its response to the Core Strategy Review Regulation 19 plan document (Appendix 1 refers), HE has advised that generally, the direction of, and considerations within, the Core Strategy Review appear to be sound and to concur generally with the approach and policies of HE with regard to development and its impacts on the SRN.
- 6.2 Moreover, HE are satisfied that policy SS5 – District Infrastructure Planning – concurs with DfT 02/13, in that it states that planning permissions will only be granted where the development aims to reduce demands on infrastructure; does not jeopardise current or planned physical infrastructure; and allows sustainable travel patterns. HE has commented that whilst the provision of sustainable modes is included, an additional objective should be added, as follows:

'to consider and manage the travel demand of new development proposals, and develop tailored solutions to limit car use generated by new developments.'

- 6.3 HE concurs that the Core Strategy Review is necessarily 'high-level' and broad in scope. HE also acknowledges that the Core Strategy Review makes

Commented [BK6]: Will need updating to reflect amendments to previous sections.

reference to identified infrastructure upgrades in Figure 4.4, to include three 'key highway improvements' on the M20, A20 and A259 respectively. However, as no more detail is provided within the body of the Core Strategy Review, HE would like to be consulted further on these schemes as they progress.

6.4 In respect of the submission made to the examination by Highways England in a letter dated 3rd July 2020 it is advised that:

'While the Core Strategy, including Policy SS5 were by their nature strategic, the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) would contain the detail required to demonstrate the soundness of the plan.'

6.5 Under point 5 of the submission made to the examination by Highways England in a letter dated 3rd July 2020 Highways England it is continued:

'While not specifically mention in the SoCG, Highways England interpreted this last statement to mean that the Council, via the IDP, would provide appropriately detailed proposals regarding the mitigation to demonstrate that the plan met the tests set out in NPPF 2019 para. 35, particularly regarding:

- *The effectiveness and deliverability of the plan; and*
- *Its consistency with national policy; principally the tests set out in NPPF 2019 paras 108 to 111 regarding assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plan and DfT C2/13 paras 18 & 19 regarding local plan led capacity enhancement'*

6.6 It is agreed that an additional clause to be inserted into Policy SS5, as follows:

'A monitoring strategy shall be required to be submitted and agreed by the local planning authority in consultation with the Highways England and other relevant local authorities in relation to traffic movement and impact on the surrounding Strategic Road Network.'

6.7 The IDP is to be updated to include expanded information relating to the proposed schemes of mitigation to upgrade M20 J11. The entry is to include a clause to cross-reference the 'monitor and manage' approach, and also to assert that Highways England could bring forward a scheme to upgrade the mainline section so as to appropriately address the Eurotunnel Incident Operations problem.

6.8 Additional supporting text to Policy SS5 is to be inserted, as follows:

'A monitoring strategy is to be prepared by the applicant for submission to (and consideration by) the local planning authority in consultation with Highways England, to ensure there is an appropriate safeguard in place to require that future traffic levels are monitored to record the distribution and volume of traffic generated by occupied development is as predicted by modelling work carried

out to inform the position agreed in the signed Statement of Common Ground dated December 2020. In this manner any mitigation scheme is subject to a 'monitor and manage' approach to implementation. Traffic volumes are to be monitored throughout the Local Plan period to inform when or if the mitigation to be implemented at M20 J11 is required.'

7. Summary of actions going forward

7.1 A summary of key actions going forward is provided below.

Key issue	Agreed action
Infrastructure	<p>FHDC and HE to continue to liaise and work together on all relevant matters relating to the Strategic Road Network, including planning applications.</p> <p>HE to advise FHDC on progress made in relation to mitigation solutions to resolve the Eurotunnel Incident Operations issue</p>

Commented [BK7]: Will need to provide chapter n verse re what further work required either as part of CSR or to be done later as a CSR daughter doc or as part of any Otterpool application.



Inspector will need to have the full picture.

F&H to work this up.

8. Governance arrangements

- 8.1 Officers of FHDC meet with representatives of HE to discuss cross boundary strategic matters under the Duty to Cooperate. The narrative and outcome of these discussions is demonstrated in this Statement of Common Ground.
- 8.2 The SOCG will then be kept under ongoing review and will be updated at key stages in F&HDC plan making process and/or when new key strategic issues arise which require amendments to this SOCG. If there are any changes of the content of the SOCG these matters can be discussed at future Duty to Cooperate meetings.

9. Signatories/declaration

Signed on behalf of Folkestone & Hythe District Council (Officer)	Signed on behalf Highways England
	

Position: Strategy & Policy Senior Specialist	Position: Spatial Planning Manager
Date: XX/12/2020	Date: XX/12/2020

Appendices

Appendix 1. Highways England response to the Core Strategy Review Regulation 19 plan

Appendix 2. AECOM Shepway Transport Model Merge and Diverge Appraisal dated 3rd September 2018

Appendix 3. AECOM Briefing Note: Shepway Transport Model Update – Review & Findings dated March 2017

Appendix 4. AECOM Briefing Note: Shepway Transport Model Update – Review & Findings dated December 2017

Appendix 5. Highways England Additional Statement re FH CS Review Examination Matters 5, 7 and 11 dated 3rd July 2020

Appendix 6. Email correspondence from Highways England dated October 2018 to confirm that as part of negotiations on the district council's Places and Policies Local Plan no mitigation was required for the 2031 DS scenario in accordance with the additional modelling scenarios.

Appendix 7. Folkestone & Hythe District Council Local Plan Traffic Analysis Highways England Road Network dated 3rd October 2020 (first draft)

Appendix 8. Folkestone & Hythe District Council Local Plan Traffic Analysis Highways England Road Network dated 30th November 2020 (second draft)

Appendix 9. Folkestone & Hythe District Council Local Plan Traffic Analysis Highways England Road Network dated 21st December 2020 (third draft)

Commented [BK8]: Please add these in early this time so we can see the complete picture