

**Statement of Common Ground pertaining to  
Matters 7 and 11 of the Examination into the Core Strategy Review (June 2021)  
Folkestone & Hythe District Council and Highways England**

**1. Overview**

- 1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared by Folkestone & Hythe District Council (FHDC) and Highways England (HE) (the signatories). However, it also includes references to joint work with Kent County Highways with whom FHDC have a separate SoCG.
- 1.2 The purpose of this SoCG is to set out the basis on which FHDC and HE have actively and positively worked together to
- meet the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate in preparing FHDC's revised Core Strategy Review (CSR) in accordance with section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (amended by section 110 of the Localism Act 2011) and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019.
  - provide the CSR Examining Inspectors with the evidence they required on transport matters
  - meet the requirements set out in Department for Transport Circular 2/13 (C2/13) and NPPF regarding assessing, agreeing and mitigating the impacts of plans and proposals on the Strategic Road Network (SRN).
- 1.3 The signatories acknowledge that 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 The signatories acknowledge that the following matters.
- 2.2 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 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
  - 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.

2.3 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.”*

2.4 Following changes to the NPPF and NPPG, 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.

2.5 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**

<b>Source of housing supply</b>	<b>Number of homes</b>
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
<b>Total Core Strategy Review plan period</b>	<b>13,515</b>

2.6 However, DfT C2/13 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.

### 3.0 Early engagement between FHDC and HE

3.1 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 C2/13 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

3.2 The assessment looked at the junction capacity and merge and diverge assessments in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards (as required by C2/13). 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

3.3 The outcome of this early engagement was an agreed interim SoCG signed on 28 January 2020. It identified the above junctions as being in need of further modelling work and, in all probability, mitigation as part of the CSR.

#### **4.0 Engagement from January 2020 to Start of the Examination in November 2020**

4.1 The signatories re-engaged from June 2020 to complete the identified work. In many other local plan evidence base preparation cases, this would have been sufficient time to complete all necessary work. However, during the summer and autumn it became clear that because of the focussed nature of the CSR proposals and the local capacity and design of the SRN, that a far more granular than normal modelling approach was necessary and that a more sophisticated than usual approach to mitigation would be required.

4.2 The signatories therefore embarked on this work with the following in mind

- to use their best endeavours and a proactive and pragmatic approach to agree fit for purpose modelling and mitigation (and the means to delivery it) in the time available
- to ensure that all work also involved, where necessary, Kent County Highways and the interplay between the SRN and local highway network in order to ensure holistic modelling and mitigations would be agreed
- to fully utilise the flexibilities allowed for in, but always fully comply with national policy and guidance, and not to compromise the safety, reliability and/or operational efficiency of the SRN.

4.3 Progress was made on all fronts during this period. The outcome was that an SoCG was agreed with regards to Matter 5 Strategy for the Urban Area on 16 December 2020. The key outcome with regards a required Modification to the CSR is contained in para 4.9

4.9 The only unknown now with regards the Strategy for the Urban Area is how the delivery of windfall sites will pan out in practice. Highways England would be content with 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.

- 4.4 Therefore since December 2020 the focus has been on providing the required evidence, modelling and mitigation with regards Matters 7 Strategy for the North Downs Area and 11 Other Polices. In practice, this meant all matters relating to the proposed Otterpool new settlement and its impact on the SRN.
- 4.5 By December 2020 it had become clear that despite all parties' best endeavours, the challenges presented by way of modelling and mitigation in relation to Otterpool meant that further work was required. As a result the CSR Examination Inspectors agreed to allow a period up to June 2021 for the work to be completed. The signatories agreed that it should be feasible to complete the required work by this target date.
- 4.6 The purpose of the remainder of this SoCG is, therefore, to provide an update on the current position and any remaining areas of disagreement or work to be completed with regards to Otterpool and the SRN.

## **5.0 Engagement between January 2021 and June 2021**

- 5.1 The signatories have worked continuously by way of increasingly regular meetings and email exchanges throughout this period. As necessary the signatories have also been meeting with Kent County Highways to ensure their awareness and agreement to matters at any particular point in time. As a result, there has been considerable convergence in terms of moving from a coarser grained to a more granular form of modelling that, in turn, has provided a firmer basis by which to produce fit for purpose mitigation designs for each of the affected SRN junctions (namely M20J11, M20J12 & 13 and A20/A260), while also taking into account and agreeing their impacts on, and any necessary mitigation to, the local road network.
- 5.2 The following provides the updated picture junction by junction, noting what is agreed, what is still outstanding but will hopefully be fully concluded and agreed by the time of the intended CSR Examination sessions on transport on 29 and/or 30 June 2021

### **M20J11**

- 5.3 The signatories agree that the CSR/Otterpool will impact on M20J11 and that impact needs to be mitigated.
- 5.4 In modelling and mitigating the junction several challenges needed to be taken into account; namely:
- a) random, infrequent but persistent issues at Eurotunnel such that traffic (mainly freight) queues on the M20 coast-bound hard shoulder. On occasion the queue will reach M20J11. Any Eurotunnel incidents are managed by the Kent Resilience Forum (KRF) of which both FHDC and HE are members. The KRF manage the queues by closing M20J11 coast-bound on safety grounds. Therefore, a sensitivity test was carried out to assess the impact of these events on the M20J10a, M20J12 and the local road network (as diversion routes) to

ensure that the SRN and LRN can accommodate both the incidents and Otterpool.

The modelling demonstrates that both networks should be able to accommodate incidents and Otterpool traffic due the plan period to 2037; although as part of the Otterpool application it will be necessary to upgrade the traffic signals and install loop queue detention to better manage flows at the A20 Sellindge railway bridge signals.

FHDC and Otterpool accept this requirement in principle.

b) the location of an existing agricultural overbridge to the west of the junction and HS1 and access to an HE depot to the south of the junction.

The design has therefore sought to retain the overbridge and accommodate the safety of HS1 while maintaining access to the HE depot

5.5 The agreed modelling can be found at Appendix 9.

5.6 The agreed M20J11 mitigation is shown in drawing reference 10029956-OP-ARC-XX-DR-T-0013 M20\_J11\_ SB Diverge Option A (Appendix 22)

### **M20J12 & J13**

5.7 The signatories agree that the CSR/Otterpool will impact on M20J12 & M20J13 and that impact needs to be mitigated.

5.8 In modelling and mitigating the junction several challenges needed to be taken into account; namely:

a) The original design is a product of local access points, other existing development and topography, resulting in the two junctions being closer to each other than normally occurs. This has made modelling more of a challenge in terms of flows, routing and weaving at the individual junctions and the interplay between them. It has also made designing a suitable DMRB compliant mitigation more of a challenge for the same reasons.

However, the signatories are now agreed that the modelling is sufficiently robust to provide HE with the necessary confidence regarding the impacts of the CSR/Otterpool on the SRN. And, as a result, it has been possible to agree mitigation that has required the full use of the flexibilities offered by DMRB, but is DMRB compliant

b) the connectors into the local road network are currently not optimally used due to a combination of lining, signing and driver behaviour. Schemes of works to improve flows at the interface of the SRN and LRN have been agreed in principle.

5.9 The agreed merge and diverge modelling can be found at Appendix 16.

5.10 The agreed M20J12 & J13 mitigation is shown in

The correct drawings are currently being produced by Arcadis for FHDC. They will show

- a Type B merge coastbound from J12
- a Type B diverge coastbound to J13
- a Type A Option 2 diverge westbound to J12
- a Type C westbound merge from J13

Following a discussion involving HE and F&HDC on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2021, it has been confirmed by HE that it is both technically/physically feasible to implement the above arrangements that would be in full accordance with DMRB.

At the time of writing, and at the request of HE, further work to progress scheme design, technical modelling and scheme costing of the above arrangements is being undertaken by Arcadis. Similarly, discussions concerning funding arrangements to deliver the required scheme of mitigation are evolving, but there is sufficient confidence that these works can be funded through the monitor and manage approach and at no cost to HE or Kent County highways.

- 5.11 The agreed SRN/LRN interface mitigation schemes are shown in Technical drawing reference 10029956\_ARC-XX-XX-DR-HE-0021 (Appendix 20) and Appendix 9 schematic *Image 23*

### **A20/A260**

- 5.12 The signatories agree that the CSR/Otterpool will impact on the A20/A260 junctions and that impact needs to be mitigated.
- 5.13 In modelling and mitigating the junction several challenges needed to be taken into account; namely:
- a) The interplay between three junctions that make up the A20/A260. They are
    - The Spitfire Way/A20 off-slip/ White Horse Hill roundabout
    - The A20/A260 Canterbury Road/ Alkham Valley Road T-Junction
    - The A20/A260 Alkham Valley roundabout

It is agreed that while single junction solutions may show Nil Detriment, only an holistic review will ensure Nil Detriment across the respective SRN/LRN networks.

- b) The interplay with the Roundhill Tunnel. As a matter of highways safety, stationary traffic must not form in a tunnel. If it does, stopped traffic detectors will trigger causing the tunnel to close to protect traveller safety. This will also result in traffic diverting to other routes. Therefore, the A20/A260 junctions must allow traffic to continue to flow at all time to avoid the detectors triggering.

c) Given the variety of junctions, no one suite of modelling can cover all the junctions. Therefore, careful interpretation has been necessary to agree methodologies, assessments and outcomes.

5.14 The latest individual junction modelling can be found at Appendix 17. Further work is on-going to refine and agree it in order to support the agreed mitigation.

5.15 The agreed A20/A260 mitigation is shown in Technical drawing reference 10029956-ARC-XX-DR-HE-0018 (Appendix 19).

- HE and Kent County Highways agree to the principle of a suite of mitigations to the junctions that include the signalisation of the Spitfire Way/A20/White Horse Hill junction, and creation of additional capacity on Spitfire Way and A20 off-slip to optimally balance flows/queues that an optimal green time signal phasing can produce. In accordance with normal development management practice, the full details will be worked up via the Otterpool application and agreed prior to any permission by the highway authorities.
- FHDC/Otterpool have agreed to fully fund the to be finalised A20/A260 suite of works

5.16 It will be noted that the signatories and Kent County Highways are agreed that

- in the circumstances of the A20/A260 a cautious approach had to be taken at this time to support the CSRs soundness;
- the current scheme of mitigation is the only one so far tabled that does mitigate the CSR and does work in practice.

However, they also recognise that the passage of time and the use of the Monitor & Manage Framework may indicate an alternative mitigation scheme may be acceptable. It is also likely that HE and Kent Highways will, over the coming years, also review their respective networks and may also carry out works in the vicinity of the A20/A260 junction. Therefore, the signatories and Kent County Highways agree to continue to work together; and if appropriate explore opportunities to pool funding towards a larger or wider scheme.

## **6.0 Other Policies**

### *SS5 District Infrastructure Planning*

6.1 HE are generally content that policy SS5 – District Infrastructure Planning – concurs with C2/13, 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.'*

- 6.2 HE concurs that the CSR is necessarily 'high-level' and broad in scope. HE also acknowledges that the CSR makes reference to identified infrastructure upgrades in Figure 4.4, to include three 'key highway improvements' on the M20, A20 and A259 respectively.
- 6.3 However, HE 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. HE 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.
- 6.4 HE will be consulted further on any schemes affecting the SRN as they progress both as good practice but also as legally required. This has taken place and is reflected in subsequent sections of the SoCG.
- 6.5 HE in a letter dated 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2020 also stated:

*'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 set out above in this SoCG. All entries will include a clause to cross-reference the 'monitor and manage' approach,
- 6.8 As a result of both the general and specific junction engagement, the signatories are agreed that a Monitor & Manage Framework should be created to form a part of the suite of CSR, IDP and other documents. Work on the Framework continues. HE are content that the principle of the M&MF should be agreed as part of the CSR, while the detail should be a living document to be prepared as soon as possible and then regularly reviewed and updated during the life of the CSR. FHDC commits to this way of working, with the first M&MF to be drafted and circulated to the relevant parties no later than end of August 2021.
- 6.9 Therefore, 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 in relation to the Strategic Road Network, and specifically M20 J11, the M20 J12 to J13 proposals and the Alkham Valley Interchange (A20/A260) is required.'*

## **7.0 Sustainable transport interventions to be supported under the 'monitor and manage' approach**

- 7.1 The signatories recognise that as part of the CSRs commitment to sustainable transport a number of interventions will be promoted through the CSR and other means. HE welcomes the commitment. Via the M&MF the progress of the various interventions can be assessed, evolved or amended as necessary.
- 7.2 As part of a government push to engender greater levels of walking a cycling across the nation, the Department for Transport (DfT) launched the national Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS) in April 2017, with the objective of making cycling and walking the natural choices for shorter journeys or as part of a longer journey. The strategy aims to double cycling levels by 2025, increase walking activity, reduce the rate of cyclists killed or seriously injured (KSI), and increase the percentage of school children walking to school.

7.3 The DfT subsequently launched a funding round for technical support, and the district council was successful with their Expression of Interest announced in late 2017. Technical support was provided to the district council in 2019 under tranche 3 of the Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) programme to gather audit data of the existing network and to appraise those local routes that would most benefit from future investment. A strategy document was prepared by the district council for submission to the DfT at the end of 2019. The LCWIP is an important source document/evidence base for the improvement of the existing networks alongside the development of future walking and cycling networks across the district. The LCWIP also provides a clear basis of support for relevant external funding bids.

*The Active Travel Fund (May 2020)*

7.4 On 9 May 2020, the Government announced £2 billion funding for walking and cycling, with the first £250 million to be made available immediately to local authorities as an emergency active travel fund to deliver measures to tackle COVID-19. The grant funding supports local transport authorities with producing cycling and walking facilities.

7.5 The process to assess Active Travel Fund scheme submissions attributed weight in accordance with the scoring criteria to those local authorities that had invested officer resource to prepare an LCWIP – F&HDC being one of only three local authorities across Kent to have done so). The schemes awarded funding aim to encourage and enable active travel, which means walking or cycling as a means of transport, as well as for leisure.

7.6 Funding made available via the Active Travel Fund is to be released in 2 tranches, and tranche 1 has already led to the implementation of a new shared cycle route in the district at Hythe (phase 4B of the Cinque Ports route). Tranche 2 supports the creation of longer-term projects that seek to improve the health, wellbeing and safety of local people, as well as support the local economy. Under tranche 2 KCC has been awarded funding of £6,098,050 for the delivery of five major schemes across the county, of which two are within Folkestone and Hythe District, as follows:

- Folkestone: Central Railway Station to Cheriton
- Folkestone: Hythe to Dymchurch

7.7 This funding award represents significant investment in walking and cycling infrastructure. In January 2021 KCC completed a first round of consultation to seek views on their initial ideas for five walking and cycling improvement schemes across Kent. F&HDC responded to the consultation to offer their clear and strong support. Further consultation on the tranche 2 schemes will take place in summer 2021.

- 7.8 The Active Travel tranche 2 major scheme that will deliver major investment in walking and cycling along the B2064 Cheriton Road corridor (the scheme referenced as 'Central Railway Station to Cheriton') is of particular relevance to this statement of common ground, as the B2064 directly connects with M20 J12. The scheme currently being progressed by KCC has the potential to engender a shift in modal share from car borne journeys to walking and cycling amongst the local population, thereby generating a level of highway capacity improvement on the highway network.
- 7.9 Until such time that the walking and cycling scheme has been implemented the corresponding shift in modal share will be difficult to predict. However, what this example demonstrates is the council's commitment to maximise opportunities to support sustainable modes of travel. Similar expectations to drive behavioural change shall be at the forefront of the 'monitor and manage' approach, and the council, Otterpool Park LLP and Highways England are fully committed to exploring every possible opportunity for interventions that will bring modal shift into practice, as opposed to reverting to the past trend of implementing schemes of highway mitigation that only benefit the road vehicle user.

*The role of greater granularity of modelling and interplay with the 'monitor and manage' approach*

- 7.10 In the technical note prepared by Highways England dated 26<sup>th</sup> May 2021 is it advised that:

*'It is accepted that the evidence has been at the coarser end of the modelling spectrum and that more sophisticated modelling could show a reduced (but not eradicated) level of impact on the SRN.'*

- 7.11 The role and purpose of the 'monitor and manage' framework to be enacted by the Development Management function (i.e. linked to an assumed future planning consent for the proposed garden settlement, though without prejudice) will be to provide a 'real world' view of the actual impact of traffic generation (alongside similar approaches for other key infrastructure), such that the requirement for a scheme of highway upgrade (mitigation) to be implemented is in line with known metric of network performance (i.e. trips added to the highway network).
- 7.12 A legitimate point to be made is that the promotion and implementation of sustainable transport solutions, akin to the major walking and cycling schemes being progressed under the Active Travel Programme, could, subject to agreement of the respective consultees, form an important component part of necessary highway mitigation, as appropriate.

## **8. Summary of actions going forward**



- 8.1 A summary of key actions going forward is set out 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>FHDC &amp; HE to attend any CSR Examination sessions to assist the Inspectors or others with any queries they may have on the process followed and the outcomes agreed as evidenced in this SoCG.</p> <p>FHDC and HE to continue to work up the details of the agreed approach to provide the maximum possible information and evidence to the Examination, but without changing any matters that might prejudice the Examination process or stakeholders ability to participate in it.</p> <p>This, where appropriate, will include final versions of mitigation drawings, the content of which are agreed but not necessarily shown in their entirety</p> <p>FHDC to import the 'monitor and manage' strategy into its Annual Monitoring Report once (and assuming) planning consent is granted for the mixed use scheme at Otterpool Park. HE to be provided with annual data outputs concerning traffic flows on the Strategic Road Network generated by Otterpool Park.</p>

## 9. Governance arrangements

- 9.1 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.
- 9.2 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 Co-operate meetings.

## 10. Signatories/declaration

<b>Signed on behalf of Folkestone &amp; Hythe District Council (Officer)</b>  James Hammond  	<b>Signed on behalf Highways England</b>  Kevin Bown  
<b>Position:</b> Strategy & Policy Senior Specialist	<b>Position:</b> Spatial Planning Manager
<b>Date:</b> 04/06/2021	<b>Date:</b> 04/06/2021

### 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2020 (first draft)

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

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

**Appendix 10.** Draft SoCG relating to Matters 7 and 11 with comments from Kevin Bown of Highways England dated 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2020

**Appendix 11.** Draft 'monitor and manage' mitigation framework for the Strategic Road Network dated June 2021

- Appendix 12.** Otterpool - Monitoring and Evaluation Framework - Final Draft
- Appendix 13.** Otterpool User Centric Report - Final Draft
- Appendix 14.** Otterpool Park - Mobility Vision Report - Final Draft
- Appendix 15.** Written response from Highways England received by F&HDC 12<sup>th</sup> March 2021
- Appendix 16.** M20 J12 to J13 Weaving Assessment Highways England Road Network (April 2021) (version 2.1)
- Appendix 17.** A20 / A260 Alkham Valley/Spitfire Way Interchange - Traffic Analysis (May 2021)
- Appendix 18.** M20 Diversion Analysis report and associated appendix (May 2021)
- Appendix 19.** Spitfire Way Proposed Junction Schematic Plan – signalised junction scheme (May 2021). Technical drawing reference 10029956-ARC-XX-DR-HE-0018
- Appendix 20.** J12-13 Merge & Diverge Improvements (May 2021). Technical drawing reference 10029956-ARC-XX-XX-DR-HE-0021
- Appendix 21.** Highway England Summary Note SN1 - Folkestone Hythe Local Plan (May 2021)
- Appendix 22.** M20 J11 agreed scheme of mitigation – technical drawing reference 10029956-OP-ARC-XX-DR-T-0013 M20\_J11\_ SB Diverge Option A
- Appendix 23.** M20 J13 southern roundabout Improvement plan drawing reference 10029956-OP-ARC-XX-DR-T-0017 M20\_J13\_Improvement Plan