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i. Foreword

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for taking part in the Thanet Parkway public consultation. This consultation was an important step in the delivery of this project as it has allowed us the opportunity to listen to and act on comments raised by you to help ensure we deliver a station that best meets your needs.

Thanet Parkway continues to be a key project to enable economic growth and regeneration in East Kent. The strategic location of the station will capitalise on the line speed improvement scheme to reduce the journey time to London for a number key development sites in Thanet and Dover. This will improve the perception of East Kent as a more attractive place to live and work resulting in greater investment in the area.

I believe that as a result of your valuable input we will be able to develop a station that offers the best opportunity for local people and business in East Kent and I look forward to sharing our updated plans with you in the New Year.

Matthew Balfour
Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport
Kent County Council
ii. Executive Summary

An eight week public consultation on the initial high level design, impacts and benefits of Thanet Parkway, a new railway station to the west of the village of Cliffsend in Thanet, was run from 2nd February to 27th March 2015. The new parkway station is scheduled for delivery by January 2019, and will be served by both High Speed and Mainline rail services.

A full Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) was conducted prior to the public consultation and reviewed once the public consultation had been completed. The EqIA shaped the engagement and participation mechanisms, identifying protected characteristics of the population which had the potential to be negatively or positively impacted by the proposal, as well as ensuring that particular attention was paid to engagement with minority groups in East Kent.

A range of communication methods, given below, were used to ensure a broad range of target audiences were engaged:

- Post
- Press releases
- Social Media
- KCC website
- Libraries
- KCC Community Engagement Officers
- Pre-consultation meetings
- Posters at East Kent railway stations
- Emails

The consultation consisted of seven open consultation events held across East Kent, and was supported by a range of consultation documents which were made available at a dedicated webpage (kent.gov.uk/thanetparkway). The primary response method was by the completion of a questionnaire online or by post. A total of 529 consultation responses were received, consisting of:

- 492 questionnaire responses
- 10 written letters from stakeholders
- 27 response cards completed at the consultation events.

The analysis of the responses is categorised into the following three sections: design, impacts and benefits of the parkway station.

Design of the parkway station

- All the facilities proposed for the station and car park were deemed to be ‘more important’ than ‘not important’.
- The most important station facilities were (in order of priority):
  1. Platform lighting
  2. CCTV
  3. Real time journey information
The most important car park facilities were (in order of priority):
1. CCTV
2. Bus stop
3. Lighting

The three most commonly requested additional facilities were (in order of priority):
1. Catering facilities
2. Toilet facilities
3. Staff at the station

Other frequent comments in the consultation raised the need for:
- Good public local transport links
- Affordable parking

12% more people wanted access to the platforms via ramps as opposed to lifts (34% vs. 22%).

More than twice as many people wanted access between platforms to be via a footbridge as opposed to an underpass (44% vs. 19%).

57% of people agreed with the proposed road access arrangement while 26% disagreed and 18% didn’t know. The main reasons for disagreement were:
- Safety concerns with the proposed arrangement (29%)
- That the arrangement would increase congestion/traffic (20%)
- That respondents would prefer direct access from the Sevenscore roundabout (15%)

Potential impacts of the parkway station

The most ‘concerning’ impacts in order of priority were:
- An increase of congestion around the site and within adjacent villages due to through traffic
- The impact on wildlife
- The impact on surrounding water resources
- The impact on road safety

Particular congestion concerns raised included:
- There would be an increase in traffic through the village of Cliffsend
- The volume of traffic already using the A299/A256 Sevenscore roundabout particularly past Westwood Cross
- Additional traffic flows on Cottington Road that is already hazardous due to its capacity, lack of pavements and poor sight lines.

Other concerns commonly raised during the consultation included:
- The impact on existing stations/services
- The station adding to existing journey time
- Loss of agricultural land/green space
- Safety / increase in vandalism due to unstaffed station
**Potential benefits of the parkway station**

- 68% of respondents identified they would receive at least one benefit from the station.
- The top three benefits of the station to be realised by respondents were:
  1. Improved access to High Speed 1 (HS1) (47% of respondents)
  2. Being about an hour’s journey time to London Stratford (45% of respondents)
  3. Greater investment in East Kent due to improved accessibility (42% of respondents)
- When asked to state any other benefits felt from the station the most common responses in order of priority were:
  1. There was no benefit from the parkway station
  2. The station would help support the re-opening of Manston Airport
  3. The benefits of the parkway station would not be realised unless the airport is re-opened

**Stakeholder organisation response**

- Objections to the proposal were received from two landowners (including the principal landowner), a Parish Council and the Thanet branch of a national political party.
- Key concerns raised were that:
  o The need for the station should be kept under review depending on the future of Manston Airport
  o Congestion will get worse as a result of the parkway station
  o The station will be unsafe as it is unstaffed
  o The station will result in closure or loss of service to existing stations
  o The station will add to existing journey time
  o There will be an irreversible loss of type 1 agricultural land
  o The station will attract future housing development
  o The station will prevent the principal landowner farming his retained land

**The next steps**

This consultation was undertaken to inform the design and development of the project. The outcome of this report has already been shared with Kent County Council’s design and planning consultants so that appropriate measures can be taken into the design, planning application and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) work.

Following public consultation, Kent County Council’s project team has engaged with key stakeholders, including but not limited to the related landowners, Cliffsend Parish Council, one specific directly affected local resident, Thanet District Council, Southeastern and Network Rail. Ongoing communication will be undertaken to get feedback from key stakeholders on the design and EIA work as this work is progressed. The updated design and EIA work will be presented in a second public consultation planned for early 2016.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Kent County Council (KCC) is promoting the building of a new parkway railway station in Thanet, East Kent. The purpose of the parkway station is to attract future investment and support economic growth in East Kent by improving rail connectivity to London and other Kent centres and expanding rail accessibility to a series of key development sites in Thanet and Dover including the Manston Airport site and Discovery Park Enterprise Zone. The project is at an early feasibility stage. A second consultation on the outline design is scheduled for early 2016 with submission of a planning application in May 2016. The new parkway station will be ready for service in January 2019.

On the 22nd July 2014, KCC’s Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee supported the delivery of Thanet Parkway. Subsequently a decision was made by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to:

- Commence land acquisition work by negotiation or Compulsory Purchase
- Undertake public consultations to support the project development process and
- Undertake project development work to enable the submission of a planning application and design work for the scheme.

In line with this decision and KCC’s policy to consult on any potential service change, policy review or change a public consultation was held for this proposal between 2nd February – 27th March 2015.

1.2. Purpose of the Consultation

The purpose of the initial public consultation was to inform stakeholder organisations (including landowners) and the public about the parkway proposal and give them the opportunity to:

- Understand why we are proposing a new parkway station
- Consider the design and facilities of the proposed station
1.3. Purpose of this Report

This report presents the analysis and findings of the responses to the first public consultation on the Thanet Parkway proposal. In addition the report summarises the activities carried out during pre-consultation, consultation and post-consultation phases. The report also states how the feedback will be used to progress the proposal and identifies the next steps in the project development process.

1.4. Report Sign-off

This report was produced by the Project team and has followed a rigorous sign-off process to ensure all decision makers and key stakeholders have had an opportunity to comment on the report before completion. Figure 1.1 shows the sign-off procedure for this report.
1.5. Structure of this Report

Following this introduction the report is structured as follows:

- **Chapter 2** – outlines the process followed to deliver the public consultation and details the activities and documentation developed to support the delivery of the public consultation.
- **Chapter 3** – details how consideration was given to any potential negative impacts of the proposal on the people of East Kent because of their protected characteristics.
- **Chapter 4** – summarises the number of consultation responses received, who responded to the consultation, the stakeholders’ response to the consultation and how respondents heard about the consultation.
- **Chapter 5** – describes the response relating to the design of the station, car park and access road.
- **Chapter 6** – describes the response related to the potential impacts of the proposed station.
- **Chapter 7** – describes the response related to the potential benefits of the proposed station.
- **Chapter 8** – describes all other comments raised about the proposal, stakeholder organisation comments and response card comments.
- **Chapter 9** – describes the response from protected characteristic groups and identifies issues to be included in the Equality Impact Assessment.
- **Chapter 10** – explains the action we have taken (or will be taking) in response to the findings of the consultation.
- **Chapter 11** – identifies what will happen next in the project programme and how you will be notified and be able to contribute.

This report, the executive summary and appendices can be found online at [www.kent.gov.uk/thanetparkway](http://www.kent.gov.uk/thanetparkway).
2. Consultation Process

The consultation sought to follow ‘best practice’ as advised by the KCC Consultation team and KCC Planning Consultants. This chapter outlines the process followed to deliver the public consultation and details the activities and documentation developed to support the delivery of the public consultation. The consultation was divided into the five stages shown in Figure 2.1. Detailed information on each section is given below.

**Figure 2.1: The consultation process**
2.1. Develop Consultation and Communication Strategy

A Consultation and Communication Strategy was developed to detail the way in which the consultation would be carried out and identify the timings and frequencies of engagement activities and communications for each stakeholder group. The strategy divided the consultation into three stages:

- **Pre-consultation stage**: a 14 week period prior to the consultation whereby consultation materials were produced, events organised and engagement with stakeholders began to inform them of the upcoming consultation.
- **Consultation stage**: an 8 week consultation period in which consultation events were held and stakeholder organisations and the public were encouraged to engage via attending public events and responding to consultation questionnaire.
- **Post-consultation stage**: a period after the consultation whereby the results were analysed and the outcomes of the consultation were reported back to the public, decision makers, stakeholder organisations and project team (including consultants) for their action.

A stakeholder mapping exercise was undertaken, using a power-interest matrix, to identify all parties that would be impacted by or have an impact on the project. Each stakeholder was positioned relevant to their anticipated level of interest and influence in the project. The mapping exercise informed the engagement activities and communication methods to be carried out during the pre-consultation and consultation stages of consultation.

2.2. Pre-consultation Activity

2.2.1. Production of consultation materials

A suite of consultation materials were developed to support the delivery of the consultation. The consultation materials were produced in accordance with KCC’s branding guidelines and were fronted by a conceptual image of what the station could look like (Figure 2.2). The following materials were produced:

- Consultation booklet
- Consultation leaflet
- Consultation questionnaire (paper version and electronic version)
Consultation event banners
Consultation response cards
Promotional information posters
Dedicated website
‘Easy to read’ versions of the consultation booklet and questionnaire.

Please note: all materials are available for reference at www.kent.gov.uk/thanetparkway.

Consultation Booklet

A comprehensive public consultation booklet was prepared to provide the following information:

- the purpose of the consultation
- how respondents could get involved in the consultation
- the case for the parkway station
- alternative options investigated
- a list of stakeholder engagement exercises
- proposed station’s layout design
- consideration of the potential impacts and the benefits of the proposal
- details of the public consultation events
- the project timeline beyond the public consultation.

Consultation Leaflet

A summary of the information provided in the booklet was compiled into a tri-fold consultation leaflet. The leaflet was devised to provide a high level overview of the project and to direct people to the website and public events for more information.
Consultation Questionnaire

A questionnaire was devised as the primary method to get responses to the public consultation. The questionnaire had 18 questions and was divided into the following four sections:

A. **The proposal:** focusing on the design and facilities of the station, the car park and the access roads. (10 questions)
B. **Travel Patterns:** asking about the respondents frequency and purpose of rail use. (2 questions)
C. **About you:** a series of standard questions regarding age, race, disability and postcode. (6 questions)
D. **Future Engagement and Communication:** giving the respondent a chance to leave contact details for future information.

A questionnaire was chosen as the method for formally responding to the consultation as it meant responses were uniform and gave all respondents an equal opportunity to voice their opinions. An online version of the questionnaire was also devised (Appendix A) for those with access to the internet. A free post address was set up to enable easy return of hard copies of the questionnaire.

All respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire to formally submit their views. Where respondents provided us with written comments (in the form of a letter or email) we informed them that their response would not be considered unless it was in the form of the questionnaire. Written responses were accepted from stakeholder organisations (as they typically have their own processes and formats for responding to consultations).

Consultation Event Banners

A series of six banners were produced for use at the consultation events. The banners contained similar information to the consultation booklet with more detail on the anticipated impacts of the proposal.

Response Cards

Response cards were produced for use at the consultation events allowing attendees to leave their immediate comments at the event. Sometimes these cards were used by KCC staff to summarise comments made by attendees at events during face-to-face conversations. These comments were considered in the consultation analysis.
Information Posters

A poster in two formats was developed to advertise the consultation events and public consultation at local libraries, schools and colleges, public buildings and railway stations in East Kent. The poster contained brief information about the proposal, details of how to get involved in the consultation, the dates and addresses of the consultation events and the website address for completing the online questionnaire.

Website

A dedicated Thanet Parkway webpage was designed and hosted on the KCC website. The webpage was topped by a banner advertising the consultation and contained background information of the proposal. The website had a link to the Thanet Parkway consultation directory page via the “Have your say” button, allowing for easy access to all the consultation documentation and the online questionnaire. The webpage had the shortened, unique URL kent.gov.uk/thanetparkway to ensure it could be easily promoted, remembered and accessed.

Between 2nd February – 27th March the consultation materials and supporting documents were available for download. A count of each document download is show below:

- Consultation Booklet - 323 times
- Consultation leaflet – 90 times
- Microsoft Word version of the Consultation Questionnaire – 60 times
- Draft EqIA – 133 times
- Station Concept Layout Design Report – 113 times
- Draft Business Case Report – 83 times
- Alternative Options Analysis Report – 85 times
- Potential Environmental Impacts Report – 72 times
- Easy read consultation booklet – 30
- Easy read consultation questionnaire – 23.
2.2.2. Pre-consultation Engagement Activities

A number of engagement activities were undertaken during the pre-consultation period. Engagement at this stage in the consultation was to inform stakeholders of the project, advertise the consultation and promote the opportunity for them to engage and respond. The pre-consultation engagement activities also provided the opportunity to the project team to amend any consultation activity based on inputs from different stakeholders.

**District, Parish and Town Councils**

Every town/parish council in the Thanet District and the most impacted parishes of Dover and Canterbury Districts were contacted and given the opportunity to request further engagement. In total, 16 town/parish councils from Thanet, Dover and Canterbury were contacted during the pre-consultation phase. A presentation was also given to Thanet and Dover full Councils.

A public meeting was held for Councillors and residents of Cliffsend on 12 December 2014. The meeting was attended by five Parish Councillors and around 58 members of the public. A presentation was given followed by an hour of Q&A. A number of issues raised at the meeting were taken into account and helped shape the content of the consultation material and led to further engagement activities.

**Joint Transportation Boards (JTBs)**

A report and presentation were presented to both the Thanet and Dover JTBs for information, followed by a Q&A session. A request was made at the Dover JTB to extend the scope of the parish engagement to include Ash and Walmer Parish Councils; subsequently engagement with these councils was undertaken.

This engagement offered an additional channel to engage with District Councillors and County Councillors and promote the project in a public environment.

**Thanet Parkway Project Board**

Key stakeholder organisations (including the Department for Transport, Network Rail, Southeastern, Thanet District Council, Dover District Council and internal KCC officers) were informed of the public consultation at a Project Board meeting in October 2014. The Project Board was given the opportunity to contribute to the content of the consultation material. Sign-off of the consultation materials was also sought from the Project Board.
Distribution of consultation materials

Every household in Cliffsend was sent a consultation leaflet and questionnaire to introduce them to the consultation and inform them of the upcoming consultation.

Parish and Town Councils were sent a promotional pack of consultation material for their information and for distribution in their local communities. They were prompted to visit the consultation website to access background information and the consultation documentation.

Railway Station advertising

In order to promote the consultation to rail users, large promotional posters were displayed at a number of railway stations in East Kent throughout the entirety of the consultation period. The stations included:

- Ramsgate
- Minster
- Herne Bay
- Birchington on Sea
- Westgate on Sea
- Margate
- Broadstairs
- Dumpton Park
- Sandwich
- Deal
- Dover.

Press Release

A press released was published on the KCC media website on 30th January 2015. The purpose of the release was to introduce and advertise the consultation. The release was sent to around 100 local reporters. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport and the Thanet Parkway Project Manager took part in a teleconference interview with the local newspapers: Isle of Thanet Gazette, Thanet Extra and Kent on Sunday; whilst the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport was also interviewed by broadcasters: Meridian, BBC Southeast, Radio Kent and KMFM.

The public consultation was reported on by a number of local news providers and broadcasters, trade press and made the national pages on the BBC News website (Appendix B).
Landowner Meetings

During the pre-consultation period, our layout plan indicated that there were only two landowners with land in the proximity on the proposed site. Face-face meetings were held with the landowners during the pre-consultation stage. At these meetings, the landowners were informed of the consultation. The principal landowner was opposed to the scheme at this stage primarily due to a lack of clarity as to how access would be provided to retained land. The second landowner was supportive of the scheme as they have plans for future development on their land. Subsequently a review of alternative access arrangements has meant a third landowner has an interest in land in the proximity of the proposal. This landowner is now being engaged with along with the initial two landowners.
2.2.3. Timeline of pre-consultation engagement and communication

Below is a summary of the consultation activities undertaken during the pre-consultation period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Board</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>13/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southeastern</td>
<td>20/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department for Transport</td>
<td>27/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thanet District Council</td>
<td>03/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dover District Council</td>
<td>10/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KCC Finance</td>
<td>17/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KCC Property</td>
<td>24/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All stakeholders in group</td>
<td>01/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continual email and telephone communication</td>
<td>08/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-consultation engagement and communication as necessary</td>
<td>15/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-consultation engagement and communication as necessary</td>
<td>22/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-consultation engagement and communication as necessary</td>
<td>29/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-consultation engagement and communication as necessary</td>
<td>05/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-consultation engagement and communication as necessary</td>
<td>12/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-consultation engagement and communication as necessary</td>
<td>19/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-consultation engagement and communication as necessary</td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-consultation engagement and communication as necessary</td>
<td>02/02/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Councils</td>
<td>St. Nicholas at Wade PC</td>
<td>13/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadstairs and St. Peters PC</td>
<td>20/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minster PC</td>
<td>27/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cliffsend PC</td>
<td>03/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramsgate TC - Planning Cmtte.</td>
<td>10/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birchington PC</td>
<td>17/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manston PC</td>
<td>24/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monkton PC</td>
<td>01/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acol PC</td>
<td>08/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish of Stourmouth</td>
<td>15/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dover District Council</td>
<td>22/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandwich TC</td>
<td>29/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deal TC</td>
<td>05/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dover TC</td>
<td>12/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ash PC</td>
<td>19/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walmer PC</td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury District Council</td>
<td>02/02/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herne and Broomfield PC</td>
<td>13/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dover JTB</td>
<td>20/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thanet JTB</td>
<td>27/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Transportation Boards</td>
<td>Dover JTB</td>
<td>03/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thanet JTB</td>
<td>08/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Cliffsend Residents</td>
<td>15/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wider residents</td>
<td>22/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Release</td>
<td>Wider residents &amp; Stakeholders</td>
<td>29/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>Discovery Park Tennants</td>
<td>05/01/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3: Pre-consultation communication and engagement activities
2.3. **During Consultation Engagement Activities**

A number of engagement activities were undertaken during the consultation period. Engagement at this stage in the consultation was to inform stakeholders of the project, advertise the consultation and promote the opportunity for them to engage and respond.

2.3.1. **Consultation Events**

Seven ‘drop-in’ style consultation events were held across East Kent during the eight-week consultation period. The purpose of the events was to provide attendees with a forum to discuss the proposal with project officers and consultants, and ask any questions.

The locations and timings were designed to maximise attendance and give as many people the opportunity to attend as possible. The events at Discovery Park and Minster were arranged after requests from stakeholders indicating it would be important to host an event at these locations.

Events were held at:

- Cliffsend Village Hall
- Ramsgate Railway Station
- Sandwich Guildhall
- Ramsgate Town Council
- Discovery Park Enterprise Zone
- Minster-in-Thanet-Library
- Herne Community Centre.

![Figure 2.4: Images from the consultation events at Discovery Park (top) and Ramsgate Town Council (bottom)](image-url)
2.3.2. Electronic notification of the consultation

All stakeholder groups identified in the consultation strategy (including all landowners) were sent a notification of the consultation via email inviting them to take part in the public consultation by completing the questionnaire. The email contained the key information about the project and links to the consultation website and material. A typical consultation email can be found at Appendix C.

Table 2.1 identifies the stakeholders contacted as part of the consultation.

During the consultation, response levels for each stakeholder groups were monitored. Where groups were underrepresented in their levels of response, reminder emails were sent to encourage their participation in the public consultation.

Every school (primary and secondary) in the Thanet, Dover and Canterbury was notified of the consultation via the E-Schools bulletin, a weekly mail shot service run by Kent County Council. This was to encourage a response primarily from parents and staff living in the local area or utilising rail to access school.
Table 2.1: List of stakeholders notified of the consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Councils</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thanet District Council</td>
<td>Dover District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Councillors for</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birchington and Villages</td>
<td>Broadstairs and Sir M M'fiore</td>
<td>Margate and Cliftonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal</td>
<td>Dover North</td>
<td>Dover West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover Town</td>
<td>Herne and Sturry</td>
<td>Herne Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margate West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Businesses and Business Representative Groups |                               |                               |
| Tenants at Discovery Park | Invest in Dover Website       | St. Augustine’s Golf Club     |
| Thanet and East Kent Chamber of Commerce | Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce | Federation of Small Businesses (Kent and Medway) |
| Westwood Cross Tenants     | Saga                          |                               |

| Environmental/ Heritage Groups |                               |                               |
| Environment Agency           | Natural England               | English Heritage              |
|                               |                               | Campaign to Protect Rural England |

| Resident Groups / Local Support Groups |                               |                               |
| Thanet Volunteers Bureau       | Thanet Community Support Partnership | Thanet Community Networks       |
| Cliffsend Residents Association| Social Enterprise Kent         |                               |

| Schools, Education Services and Youth Groups |                               |                               |
| Head Teachers Forum             | Youth Advisory Group           | Kent Integrated Adolescent Support Services (Eforum) |
| University of Kent at Canterbury| Canterbury Christchurch University | Canterbury College             |
| Engage Thanet                   | Voluntary Action Within Kent   |                               |

| Elderly and disabled support groups |                               |                               |
| Thanet Disability Forum          | Age UK – Thanet               | KentAbility                    |

| Service Providers*               |                               |                               |
| Stagecoach                      | UK Power Network              | Southern Gas Networks         |
| East Kent NHS trust             | Kent Police                   | Kent Fire and Rescue          |

| Landowners                     |                               |                               |

*Note: Network Rail, Southeastern and Department for Transport were liaised with throughout the project via their role on the Project Board*
2.3.3. Distribution of consultation materials during consultation

In addition to the pre-consultation stage, consultation documentation was sent to:

- All libraries in East Kent as local community hubs to promote the consultation to the general public
- The University of Kent, Canterbury Christchurch and East Kent College to encourage participation from the ‘young adults’ age group and
- The Quarterdeck Youth Centre in Margate (for wider distribution to other youth groups) to encourage participation from the ‘youth’ age group.

The consultation documents were also distributed in the local meetings, ‘Developments in Sandwich’ and ‘Transportation in Deal’, by KCC Community Engagement Officers to promote the consultation to interested parties.

2.3.4. Social Media

The consultation was promoted through KCC Twitter account. Tweets were posted at the beginning of the consultation to promote the consultation and towards the end of the consultation to remind followers to respond.

2.3.5. Email Correspondence

A dedicated Thanet Parkway email address was set up for the consultation to be used for all enquires relating to the scheme. The email was published on all consultation material. Throughout the consultation period queries relating to the consultation or the project were responded to by the project team. People who emailed were encouraged to attend an event to find out more, or provide their comments by completing the consultation questionnaire. A total of 33 email enquiries were received.
# 2.3.6. Timeline of consultation engagement and communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>02/02/2015</th>
<th>09/02/2015</th>
<th>16/02/2015</th>
<th>02/03/2015</th>
<th>09/03/2015</th>
<th>16/03/2015</th>
<th>23/03/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group Stakeholder**
- Parish Councils
- District Councils
- County Councillors
- Businesses and business groups
- Environmental groups
- Residents groups
- Schools, education and youth groups
- Elderly and disabled support groups
- Service providers
- Joint Transportation Boards
- Landowners
- For all potential respondents
- Affecting all groups

**Key**
- Green: Consultation Event
- Blue: Materials sent to libraries
- Pink: Promotion at meetings
- Orange: Invite to consultation
- Light blue: Social media - tweet sent
- Light pink: E-Schools bulletin
- Yellow: Reminder of the consultation
- Grey: Replying to email queries
- Red: Materials sent to Universities / Colleges
- Light grey: Material sent to youth groups

**Figure 2.5:** During consultation communication and engagement activities
2.4. Post Consultation

An additional two working days, after the consultation closing date, were given to allow any further comments to be received through the post. All data was then collated and analysed by Project Officers, and this report produced to share the outcomes.

The initial findings of the public consultation and the findings presented in this final report have been shared with the scheme design and planning consultants to inform the outline design, planning application and Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) work.

The affected landowners are kept informed about the draft design and EIA work to get their views on the work. They were also given the opportunity to discuss the implications of the findings of the public consultation on the design and hence on their land. KCC is committed to work closely with the landowners throughout the station development work.

This report has also been made available on the Thanet Parkway web page for general consumption. Every attendee to the consultation events that chose to leave contact details has been informed that this report is available, and they will be kept informed about the project progress.
3. Equality and Diversity

This chapter details how consideration was given to any potential negative impacts of the proposal on the people of East Kent because of their protected characteristics: age, disability, gender, gender identity, race, religion / belief or none, sexual orientation, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership and carer’s responsibilities.

3.1. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

The Equality Impact Assessment provides a process to help us to understand how the proposed scheme may affect Kent residents from all communities.

An EqIA was completed prior to commencement of the consultation, which shaped the engagement and participation mechanisms, to provide the opportunity for participation equally across Kent communities and being mindful of communication preferences and accessibility of information. The initial screening of the EqIA was carried out which concluded that the proposed scheme has a medium positive impact and a low negative impact on the local communities. The scheme will not have a proportionally more adverse impact on any protected character group. The initial screening recommended that there is no need to undertake a full EqIA due to no negative impacts on any protected groups; however, an Action Plan was required to ensure that the consultation documents could be effectively communicated with certain protected character groups to get their views about the proposed scheme.

The following steps were defined in the Action Plan and taken to ensure the consultation was accessible to all:

- ‘Easy to read’ versions of the consultation booklet and questionnaire were produced
- Hard copies of the consultation material were available on request and at the consultation events for those who did not have access to the internet
- Hard copies were sent to all residents in Cliffsend and various stakeholders (see section 2.2.2) to ensure everyone had fair access to the materials
- A freepost address was set up so no one would be disadvantaged by cost when attempting to request documentation/submit a response
- Word versions of the consultation booklet, leaflet and questionnaire were produced to aid anyone who was unable to access the pdf. file types and allow visually impaired people to read the documents by using specialised software
- Resources were allocated to provide all the consultation material in alternative languages or formats (e.g. audio/braille)
- The consultation events were held at venues that were accessible to all.

Equality analysis of the consultation data was undertaken (Chapter 9) to identify any new issues that would impact a particular protected characteristic group. The EqIA will be updated to consider outcomes of this consultation and will be available online at www.kent.gov.uk.thanetparkway.
4. Response Profile

This chapter summarises the number of consultation responses received, who responded to the consultation, the stakeholders’ response to the consultation and how respondents heard about the consultation.

4.1. Consultation Response

There were a total of 529 responses to the consultation consisting of:

- 492 responses to the consultation questionnaire: 355 online responses and 137 hard copy responses
- An additional 10 written responses were received from stakeholder organisations
- 27 response cards were received during the consultation events
- More than 350 people attended the consultation events.
### 4.2. Stakeholder Organisation Response

Table 4.1 identifies the stakeholder organisations who responded to the consultation either via the questionnaire or a written letter.

**Table 4.1: Consultees that provided a response to the consultation (either via the questionnaire or a written letter)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Group / Residents Association</th>
<th>Stonar Gardens Residents Association</th>
<th>Margate Round Table</th>
<th>Transition Towns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Ramsgate Society</td>
<td>Thanet Basketball Club</td>
<td>Ramsgate Organisation LTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members / Councillors</td>
<td>Ramsgate Town and Thanet District Councillor</td>
<td>KCC Member for Margate and Cliftonville West</td>
<td>KCC Member for Herne Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cliffsend Parish Councillor</td>
<td>KCC Member for Ramsgate</td>
<td>Thanet District Councillor x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Parish Councils</td>
<td>Herne and Broomfield Parish Council</td>
<td>Deal Town Council</td>
<td>Broadstairs and St. Peters Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramsgate Town Council</td>
<td>Acol Parish Council</td>
<td>Cliffsend Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/Heritage Groups</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Campaign to Protect Rural England</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>KCC Biodiversity</td>
<td>National Rail User Group</td>
<td>East Kent Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Kent College</td>
<td>Supporters of Manston Airport</td>
<td>Deal and Walmer Chambers of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Water</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Landowners x 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. **Respondent Demographics**

The following section documents the demographics of the respondents. This data was collated using the ‘About You’ questions in the questionnaire.

4.3.1. **Age**

Figure 4.1 shows the distribution of respondents’ age.

A comparison of this age profile to ONS population data\(^1\) for the Thanet district indicates that the ‘Under 18’, ‘18-25’, ‘26-35’ and ‘76+’ age groups were underrepresented in the consultation, whilst all remaining age groups were overrepresented. Please see Appendix D for more information.

4.3.2. **Gender**

- 62% of respondents were men
- 35% of respondents were women
- 3% of respondents preferred not to state their gender.

In Thanet 52% of the population are female and 48% male\(^1\). Women were underrepresented and men overrepresented in the consultation responses.

4.3.3. **Race**

- 90% of respondents were White British
- 6% preferred not to state their race
- 2% were White Other
- 1% selected other ethnic group

---

1% consisted of respondents that were White Irish, Mixed White or Asian, Asian or Asian British Bangladeshi, Asian or Asian British Chinese, Asian or Asian British Other.

ONS data shows 90% of the population of Thanet are White British, and 5% are Black and Minority Ethnic (BME). The diversity response to this consultation reflects this trend and thus is relatively representative.

**4.3.4. Disability**

- 85% of responded did not consider themselves having a disability
- 10% of responded did consider themselves having a disability
- 5% preferred not to say.

Of those that stated they considered themselves having a disability, the impairments that affected each respondent are shown below in Figure 4.2.

ONS data shows 77% of residents in Thanet indicate their ‘day to day activities are not limited’ due to a long term health problem or disability. This would suggest there was an overrepresentation of respondents who did not consider themselves to have a disability and an underrepresentation of those who did consider themselves to have a disability in this consultation.

---

**Figure 4.2: Impairments of those respondents who considered themselves to have a disability (of 46 respondents)**

*Note: respondents were able to select more than one impairment and thus the percentages do not sum to 100% (E.g. 54% of percent of respondents stated they had a physical impairment, although some of these may also have a sensory impairment.*
4.4. Advertisement Channels

All respondents were asked “How did you hear about our proposal?” Figure 4.3 indicates the best channels for informing people of the consultation was via direct delivery of information (23%) followed by social media (22%) and emails (14%). 16% of respondents commented that they heard about the proposal through ‘Other’ means. These ‘other’ means can be found in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: ‘Other’ communication channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Channel</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-bulletin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local newspaper</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC Local news</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire posted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Park website</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed at work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple channels</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish press</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local news website</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearsay over a period of time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local radio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCC presentation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Parish website</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanet Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation event</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council Members</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left blank</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3: How respondents heard about the proposal (of 486 responses)
4.5. **Respondent Groups**

The 492 questionnaire responses were analysed together to give an overall picture of the attitude towards the proposal. Where this data is presented it will be described as coming from the ‘All’ group. In addition to this the responses were separated into common groups and analysed in further detail in order to better understand the benefits and impacts of the station on these specific groups.

The groupings and the methodology of how each group was defined are explained in the following sections.

**4.5.1. Local Residents (LR)**

The ‘Local Residents’ group was defined to better understand the views of respondents who reside within the direct vicinity of the proposed station. The group was defined by respondents who indicated they were a resident of the village of Cliffsend. 119 responses (24% of the total responses) met the criteria to be included in this group. The landowners were not considered in this group, but their comments have been considered separately in section 8.2.

**4.5.2. Wider Residents (WR)**

The ‘Wider Residents’ group sought to better understand the opinions of those residents who will be less likely impacted directly by the building and operation of the station but will use and access the station.

The group was defined by those respondents who live outside Cliffsend, but who identified themselves as ‘a resident’ when asked “Please let us know in what capacity you are providing comments”. 297 responses (60% of the total responses) met the criteria to be included in this group.

**4.5.3. Businesses (Bus)**

The ‘Business’ group sought to understand the opinions of those who will utilise the station with a business interest.

The group was defined by those respondents who identified themselves as ‘an owner or employee of a business’ in response to Question 1 of the consultation questionnaire.

76 responses (15% of the total responses) met the criteria to be included in this group.
4.5.4. Frequent Rail Users (FRU)

The ‘Frequent Rail Users’ group sought to understand the opinions of those who often use the railway network and would be likely to utilise or be affected by Thanet Parkway.

The group was defined by those who indicated they used the train ‘everyday’, ‘several times a week’, ‘once a week’ or ‘several times a month’ in Question 11 of the consultation questionnaire. (“How often do you use the train?”).

213 responses (43% of the total responses) met the criteria to be included in this group.

*Please note that some responses met the criteria for more than one group. Where this occurred, the response was included in both groups as the comments would still be relevant and it would be wrong to make a judgement as to which category is more relevant for the comment. As such the total number of responses in the above groupings exceeds the 492 questionnaire responses received.*
5. Consultation Results: Design

This chapter describes the response relating to the design of the station, car park and access road.

5.1. Proposed Station and Car Park Facilities

Note: ‘Important’ is defined as anyone who indicated some level of importance by selecting either ‘Very Important’ or ‘Important’ in the response to the question ‘Please can you rate each of these facilities according to what you consider to be important to you?’ ‘Not Important’ is defined as anyone that selected ‘Not Very Important’ or ‘Not Important’.

- All the proposed station facilities were deemed more ‘important’ than ‘not important’ to respondents as shown in Figure 5.1.

- Platform lighting and CCTV facilities were considered the most important facilities at the station, which suggest that as the station would be initially unstaffed, safety and security at the station is considered important by respondents.

- Pedestrian access to/from Cliffsend was considered relatively a less ‘important’ facility as compared with other station facilities.

The public consultation data confirms the importance of all of these facilities and thus all should be incorporated into the design of the station.

Figure 5.1: The importance of the proposed station facilities (‘All’ group)
All the proposed car park facilities were deemed more ‘important’ than ‘not important’ to respondents.

Similar to the station facilities, car park, CCTV and lighting were considered as two of the most important facilities.

A bus stop including timetable information was the second most important car park facility.

The provision of motorcycle parking spaces was the least important facility.

The public consultation data confirms the importance of all of these facilities and thus all should be incorporated into the design of the station car park.

Figure 5.2: The importance of the proposed car park facilities ('All' group)
5.2. Other Station and Car Park Facilities

- According to “All” respondents in Table 5.1 the most commonly requested additional facilities were: Catering facilities (with 25% of all comments suggesting these should be included), toilet facilities (with 22% of comments) and staff (with 12% of comments). There was a total of 324 comments for this question.

- Only 4% of Local Residents requested staff compared to 12% overall and 19% for Businesses. This may suggest the local residents are less concerned that the station is unstaffed.

- The facilities defined as ‘Already proposed facilities’ were those requested by respondents but were already suggested in the consultation materials. The most frequently requested of these facilities included passenger help points and step free access to access the platforms.

Table 5.1: Additional station and car park facilities requested by group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Local Residents</th>
<th>Wider Residents</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Frequent Rail Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catering facilities</td>
<td>82 (25%)</td>
<td>16 (31%)</td>
<td>56 (25%)</td>
<td>9 (21%)</td>
<td>39 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Facilities</td>
<td>72 (22%)</td>
<td>12 (23%)</td>
<td>50 (22%)</td>
<td>8 (19%)</td>
<td>28 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Staff / Security personnel</td>
<td>40 (12%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>34 (15%)</td>
<td>8 (19%)</td>
<td>22 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27 (8%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>13 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already proposed Facilities</td>
<td>23 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
<td>13 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to airport/ other locations</td>
<td>14 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booking Office</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, tourist and transport information/maps</td>
<td>11 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay phone</td>
<td>10 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting Rooms</td>
<td>9 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian / Cycle access to Cliffsend</td>
<td>8 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wifi</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter Bins</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMs</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of comments 324 (100%) 52 (100%) 227 (100%) 43 (100%) 151 (100%)
- Figure 5.3 shows a distribution of the ‘Other’ facilities requested by respondents.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of 'Other' facilities requested by respondents.](image)

The additional facilities requested in this section would be treated as passive provisions in the station design work, meaning the designs will include sufficient space and infrastructure to ensure that where it is applicable; these facilities could be incorporated into the station at a later stage after the opening of the parkway station.

We are in an on-going discussion with Southeastern about the staffing arrangements at the station.
5.3. Access to the Platforms

- Overall (Figure 5.4) there was equal preference for access to be via ramps or ‘either’ ramps or lifts. Otherwise, ramps were preferred over lifts.
- Frequent Rail Users and Wider Residents showed a preference for ‘either’ lifts or ramps to be provided (Figure 5.5).
- Local Residents and Businesses showed preference for ramps.
- In no case did any group indicate a preference for access via lifts.

Both ramp and lift options will be investigated in our design work and a decision will be made based on this feedback, feasibility, visibility, operation, cost and convenience to the rail users.

KCC will make sure that the station and access to the platforms will be accessible to all and therefore consideration will also be given to the ability of users of the station (see section 9.2).

Figure 5.4: How would you prefer to access the platforms?

![Pie chart showing preference for access to the platforms]

Figure 5.5: Preference of access to platforms by groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ramps</th>
<th>Lifts</th>
<th>Either</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Rail Users</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Residents</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Residents</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

('All' group - 447 responses to this question)
5.4. Access between Platforms

- The overall preference for access between platforms was via a footbridge compared to an overpass (Figure 5.6).
- Local Residents had a greater preference for an underpass to be provided than all other groups with 25% of them indicating a preference for lifts (Figure 5.7).
- Frequent Rail Users had the greatest preference for a footbridge with 48% of them indicating a preference for a footbridge.
- Businesses showed the least preference for either lifts or ramps.

Both footbridge and underpass options will be investigated in our design work. A decision will be made based on this feedback, feasibility, visibility impact, cost and safety to the rail users.
5.5. Proposed Highway Access Arrangement

- The majority of respondents agreed with the proposed highway access arrangement which can be found at Appendix E.
- Businesses voiced the greatest agreement with this arrangement with 65% of respondents agreeing and 16% disagreeing.
- The Wider Residents followed by Local Residents showed their greater disagreement with the proposed arrangement.
- The reasons for disagreement with the proposed access arrangements are shown in Table 5.2.
Table 5.2: Reasons for disagreement with proposed access arrangement by group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Disagreement</th>
<th>Local Residents</th>
<th>Wider Residents</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Frequent Rail Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal unsafe</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
<td>11 (29%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>5 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases Traffic/ Congestion</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>9 (24%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct access from Sevenscore Roundabout</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>5 (13%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling and pedestrian access to station required</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (16%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two way access down link roads</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming required</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total number of comments | 15 (100%) | 38 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 21 (100%) |

- Across all groups the safety of the access arrangement was the most reported reason for their disagreement with the proposal. The reasons why this arrangement was perceived as unsafe include:
  - The closeness of the access roads to the roundabout
  - Traffic existing the station onto the A299 wanting to turn right towards London would have limited space to move into the right hand lane creating a hazard
  - The speed of traffic using the A299/A256
  - Dangerous sightlines on the existing roundabout.
- The second most reported reason for disagreement was the perception that this arrangement would increase congestion at the Sevenscore roundabout as a result of more trips accessing the roundabout.
- The third most reported reason for disagreement was a suggestion to provide direct access from the Sevenscore roundabout. This option may help mitigate the primary concerns of safety and congestion.
- Notable ‘Other’ suggestions included providing direct access from Sevenscore roundabout as well as the proposed one way link roads and providing access from the local Cottington Road.
- All the defined groups followed a similar trend to the overall reasoning as to why they did not agree with the proposed arrangement.
- Businesses disagreed for two reasons: safety and suggesting direct access from the roundabout. It should be noted that there were only four comments made by Businesses for this question compared to 38 comments made by the Wider Residents group.
• A comparatively high proportion (16%) of the Wider Residents disagreed because it was felt the access arrangement did not provide adequate safe pedestrian and cycle access to the station. It should be noted that pedestrian and cycle access will be provided and that the focus of this question was on vehicular access. Nevertheless this shows likelihood that Wider Residents may wish to access the station by walking or cycling.

• 20% of comments from Local Residents stated traffic calming measures should be implemented to enable safe access to the station. No other group made a comment about this. Suggested examples include:
  o the provision of traffic lights on the Sevenscore roundabout to make it easier to join the roundabout from the Cottington Road and
  o the provision of traffic lights on the A299/A256 for people to safely enter and exit the station.

These concerns have been shared with highway design consultants and they will develop and investigate the feasibility of the alternative highway access arrangements to/from the station and car park based on the concerns raised in this section.
6. Consultation Results: Impacts

This chapter describes the response related to the potential impacts of the proposed station.

6.1. Potential Impacts

Note: ‘Concerned’ is defined as anyone who showed some level of concern by selecting either ‘Very concerned’ or ‘concerned’ in the response to the question ‘How concerned are you with the following impacts of the parkway station?’ ‘Unconcerned’ is defined as anyone that selected ‘Not very concerned’ or ‘Not concerned at all.’

- The most ‘concerning’ impacts were:
  - An increase of congestion around the site
  - The impact on wildlife
  - Surrounding water resources
  - The impact on road safety.
- The least concerning impact was vibration around the site.
- All the potential impacts were considered to be more ‘concerning’ than not by the respondents suggesting there is a need to further understand and mitigate these impacts.
- Figure 6.2 overleaf shows a trend line for the level of concern for each group. Local Residents had the highest level of concern about all potential impacts. Businesses showed the least concern for the potential impacts.

![Figure 6.1: Level of concern for potential impacts](chart.png)
Figure 6.2: Trend of levels of concern for each impact by group (492 responses)
• As with the ‘All’ group the Wider Residents, Businesses and Frequent Rail User groups all showed greatest concern for congestion around the site, the impact on wildlife, surrounding water resources, and impact on road safety.
• Local Residents showed a particular concern for noise from the site.
• The Business group were more ‘unconcerned’ about the impact of noise, vibration and loss of agricultural land. They were ‘neither concerned nor unconcerned’ with the impact on air and light pollution.

We will investigate the scale of the potential of each of the environmental impacts by completing an Environmental Impact Assessment. The assessment will also identify mitigation measures.

Potential impacts relating to congestion will be reviewed by undertaking a Transport Impact Assessment.
6.2. Further Comments on the Potential Impacts

Note: There were 191 responses to this question. Of these 54 were deemed not relevant to this question and were moved to other questions. Some responses contained several relevant comments and thus were split into more than one category giving a total of 192 comments.

Table 6.1: Further comments on the impacts of the station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will create additional congestion/emissions/road safety issues</td>
<td>38 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested mitigation measures</td>
<td>31 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure of existing stations/detriment to existing services</td>
<td>19 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of green space/agricultural land</td>
<td>16 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuisance and pollution (light, noise, Litter) during construction and operation</td>
<td>16 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will lead to problem parking due to parking charges/not enough spaces</td>
<td>15 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station will have a visual impact on the landscape</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will lead to crime/anti-social behaviour due to unstaffed station</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger to pedestrians and/or cyclists due to inadequate safe access to site</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental impact to village life</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of comments</td>
<td>192 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The most frequent comments raised concern over increased congestion, emissions and/or road safety issues as a result of an expected increase in vehicle trips to the station (Table 6.1). Specific issues raised include:
  - An increase in traffic through the village of Cliffsend
  - The volume of traffic already using the A299/A256 particularly past Westwood Cross
  - Additional traffic flows on the Cottington road that is already perceived as dangerous due to its capacity, lack of pavements and poor sight lines.
- 16% of comments suggested mitigation measures to reduce the impact of a concern. The most notable mitigation measures are outlined in Table 6.2.
- The ‘Other’ impacts are listed in Table 6.3.
- Notably concerns of closure of existing station/detriment to existing services (10%), problem parking in Cliffsend (8%), loss of green space and agricultural land (8%) and nuisance pollution (8%) were also raised.

\[[\text{"The traffic implications are horrendous" – Wider Resident}]
\[\text{"Efficient, frequent day and night bus services to Ramsgate, Westwood Cross and development sites is essential to minimise car traffic" - Frequent Rail User and Wider Resident}]
\[\text{"Some negative impacts have to be tolerated to help this very important development for Thanet" – Business} \]
Table 6.2: Suggested mitigation measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use landscaping and natural materials to help the station ‘blend in’ to the natural environment</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good public transport links to station to reduce car use</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good safe pedestrian and cycle access to the station to reduce car use</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of parking spaces to reduce likelihood of problem parking in CliffeSEND</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake road/signal improvements on the existing highway to ensure roads can cope with increased traffic</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: there were 40 comments in this category.

Table 6.3: ‘Other’ comments on impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There will be impacts, but growth is important and they will not be substantial if well managed</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The station will encourage future encroaching development</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern of the station impact on flood risk</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport connection required</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage/electrical infrastructure currently insufficient</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on wildlife/ecology</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts are unclear at this stage</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will put pressure on public transport</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will lead to a decline in house prices</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will have archaeological impact</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: there were 22 comments in this category.

Local Residents Group

- Greater concern was raised by this group compared to the others for:
  - Problem parking
  - Nuisance and pollution during construction and operation
  - Visual impact of the station and detriment to village life.

Wider Residents Group

- Greater concern was raised by this group for the impact on existing stations and services and the loss of green space/agricultural land.
- Mitigation suggestions were primarily to ensure the station is well connected with public transport to reduce the need to drive.

Businesses

- This group preferred incorporating mitigation measures into the station design work to mitigate any impacts.

Frequent Rail Users

- The most suggested mitigation measures (23% of 82 comments) were:
  - Good connections with public transport
  - Landscape the station to reduce the visual impact.
This group showed a greater level of concern than other groups for:
- The closure of Minster or Ramsgate station
- The impact on the north line rail service and services to Sandwich and Deal
- Increased journey time as a result of the additional stop.

Potential impacts relating to congestion will be reviewed by undertaking a Transport Impact Assessment. Any mitigation measures identified as part of the Traffic Assessment will be implemented.

A detailed Environmental Impact Assessment will be carried out and mitigation measures will be incorporated into the station design.

Discussions with the local Bus Operating Company have already been held to understand how to include a bus stop at Thanet Parkway to connect the station to the surrounding towns and business parks including Discovery Park Enterprise Zone. A public transport strategy is being developed to support bus connectivity to the parkway station.

We are working with our highway design consultants and Public Rights of Way Officer to identify the best option for safely connecting the station to existing Public Rights of Way and cycle network in the area.

Discussions will be held with Thanet District Council to identify the most effective way of mitigating any parking problems in Cliffsend.
7. Consultation Results: Benefits

This chapter describes the response related to the potential benefits of the proposed station.

7.1. Potential Benefits

Note: for this question respondents were allowed to select more than one benefit and as such the combined percentages add up to more than 100%. The figure shows the percentage of all respondents who believed the station would achieve each benefit.

- 68% of all respondents indicated they would realise at least one benefit from the parkway station.
  - 80% of Businesses indicated at least one benefit
  - 73% of Frequent Rail User indicated at least one benefit
  - 66% of Local Residents indicated at least one benefit
  - 66% of Wider Residents indicated at least one benefit

- Improved access to HS1 services was the most realised benefit with 47% of all respondents acknowledging the benefit.
- Better accessibility to business and reduced congestion in Ramsgate were the least realised benefits with 30% of all respondents acknowledging both benefits.

Figure 7.2 overleaf shows the distribution of benefits realised by each group.
Figure 7.2: Trend of benefits realised by each group
Businesses

- Consistently showed the most realised benefit from the proposal (Figure 7.2).
- Nearly $2/3^{rd}$ of Businesses stated they would benefit from greater investment in East Kent due to the improved accessibility offered by the parkway station.
- 61% stated they would benefit from the improved access to HS1 service and 59% stated they would benefit from better accessibility for customers and clients to businesses.

Wider Residents

- Their trend was similar to the ‘All’ group although this group found the greatest benefit was journey time of about an hour to London (45%).

Frequent Rail Users

- The greatest benefit realised was improved access to HS1 with 55% of respondents acknowledging the benefit.
- More than half of the group also indicated a benefit from:
  - Greater investment into East Kent due to improved accessibility
  - About an hour journey time to London
  - More travel choices.

Local Residents

- Often showed the lowest benefit from the proposal although 50% (higher than the wider residents and ‘All’ groups) indicated they would benefit from improved access to HS1.

KCC will keep working together with Network Rail, Southeastern, Thanet and Dover District Councils and other partners to achieve the potential benefits of the proposed parkway station.
7.2. Further Comments on the Potential Benefits

Note: There were 214 responses to this question. Of these 38 were deemed not relevant to this question and were moved to other questions. Some responses contained several relevant comments and thus were split into more than one category giving a total of 207 comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No benefit to respondents</td>
<td>61 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthens the case to reopen the airport / provides good access to Manston Airport</td>
<td>25 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits only realised in conjunction with re-opening of airport / ferry port</td>
<td>21 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will benefit business growth / economic development</td>
<td>16 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing stations could achieve the benefit</td>
<td>14 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater travel choice and/or easier access to rail</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time saving / reduced commuter time to London</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides needed additional parking / reduces problem parking</td>
<td>9 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the local area (generally) and attracts further community facilities</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the remoteness perception and/or attractiveness for investment</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opens new job markets for East Kent residents / improves journeys to work</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opens new labour markets for East Kent businesses / increases local employment</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce congestion/emissions due to mode shift</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will support housing development</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of comments</strong></td>
<td><strong>207 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 29% of comments stated that there was no benefit to them from the station (Table 7.1).
- 12% of comments stated that the station would help support the re-opening of an airport at Manston.
- 10% of comments state the benefits of parkway will not be realised unless the airport is re-opened.
Group Comparison – Further comments

Local Residents Group
- Had the highest proportion of comments across the groups stating there was no benefit (34% of 32 comments).
- 13% of comments explained that the development of the station would improve the area by attracting more money and further local facilities.

Wider Residents Group
- Had the highest proportion of comments across the groups stating the station could strengthen the case to reopen the airport (13% of 153 comments).

Businesses
- The highest proportion of their comments stated this station would benefit economic development and business growth (23% of 22 comments).
- 14% of comments stated the station would only be of benefit if Manston Airport was to re-open.
- 9% of comments stated the station would open new labour markets for East Kent business and improve local employment opportunities.

Frequent Rail Users
- The highest proportion of comments stated that there was no benefit of the station (23% of 111 comments).
- 12% of comments stated this station would benefit economic development and business growth.
- More comments in this group suggested there would be a benefit of reduced time savings when travelling to London than any other group (8%).

KCC will keep working with partners to ensure that Thanet Parkway improves rail accessibility to Discovery Park Enterprise Zone, the Manston Airport site, business parks and new development sites in East Kent.

“No benefit to Thanet residents at all”
- Wider Resident and Frequent Rail User

“It will improve the village and may attract more community facilities which are lacking, such as a supermarket.”
- Local Resident

“I am happy with a short journey to Ramsgate station and have never had a problem parking there. The parkway will have no benefits for the members of my household.”
- Local Resident

“Will help the area and the future of Manston airport”
- Wider Resident and Frequent Rail User

“No benefit for a Parkway station but definitely an asset when Manston is reopened to have a station there!”
- Wider Resident

“Being an hour away from London allows me access to continue to develop my business - I wish to be situated in East Kent but enjoy the benefits of accessing the capital.”
- Wider Resident and Business

Kent County Council
8. Consultation Results: Additional Comments

This chapter describes responses to the question ‘Do you have any further about the parkway station proposal?’ and includes those responses deemed not relevant to other questions in the questionnaire. In addition the stakeholder organisation comments and response card comments are summarised here. A full list of comments can be found in Appendix F.

8.1. Further Comments about the Proposal

*Note: This was an ‘open’ question that allowed respondents to comment on any aspect of the station. Responses have been categorised into themes.*

**Concerns**

As shown by Figure 8.1, most comments (23%) were concerned about the impacts of the station. 16 different concerns were raised in total, and of 142 comments the most common concerns were regarding:

- The impact on existing stations/services (15%)
- Congestion and the capacity of the roads (14%)
- The station adding to existing journey time (12%)
- Loss of agricultural land/green space (11%)
- Safety / increase in vandalism due to unstaffed station (10%).

See Chapter 10 for more discussion around mitigating these concerns.

**Other**

20% of comments fell into the ‘Other’ theme. In total there were 80 ‘Other’ comments made, the most common were:

- The station should be located elsewhere (23%)
- Respondent can see no need for the station (14%)
- Comments that were incomprehensible (14%)
- Challenges to statements made in the consultation material/the consultation process (11%).

![Figure 8.1: Further comments about the parkway station](image-url)
Thanet Parkway Railway Station
Consultation Report

The other suggested places for the station included: Manston Airport, Discovery Park, Westwood Cross, Ebbsfleet level crossing, Lord of the Manor roundabout, more central to Cliffsend village or simply away from the Cliffsend.

‘The Alternative Options Analysis’ report available at kent.gov.uk/thanetparkway will be updated to comment on the above mentioned alternative station locations.

Benefits of the station
14% of comments were regarding perceived benefits of the station. 15 different benefits were raised and of 63 comments the most common were:
  o Statements of support for the station (30%)
  o The station would help reopen Manston Airport (22%)
  o Station would improve travel times to London (11%)
  o Station will bring prosperity to the region (8%).

Benefits/the need for the station dependant on the airport reopening
As reflected in section 7.2 a selection of respondents focused on the reopening of Manston Airport. 13% of comments state there is no benefit without the airport. This suggests that Thanet Parkway will be beneficial if there is sufficient demand for its use.

Alternatives to the station
11% of comments suggested there were alternative transport options to the delivery of a parkway station that should be implemented in East Kent. Nine different options were suggested and of 56 comments the most common were:
  o Utilise existing stations as these are sufficient (30%)
  o Develop parking at Ramsgate station (20%)
  o Improve Ramsgate station (18%)
  o Improve existing line and convert all to High Speed (18%).

The ‘Alternative Options Analysis Report’ available at kent.gov.uk/thanetparkway investigates the potential of increased parking provision at Ramsgate station.
Facilities Provision
11% of comments were calling for certain facilities or adjustments to be made in the design of the station. 14 different facilities and adjustments were called for and of 46 comments the most common were:
- Need for good public local transport links (28%)
- The station should be staffed (13%)
- The station should have pedestrian and cycle access (11%)
- Affordable parking (11%).

The station will be part of a joined up transport approach, meaning it will be well connected with local bus routes, offer a park and ride facility and have cycle and pedestrian access. This will continue to be included in the station design.

Discussions with Southeastern will be organised about the provision of staffing arrangements at the station.

KCC will ensure that car parking charges are fair and affordable.

Unnecessary Expense/ Alternative spending suggestions
9% of comments claimed the station was an unnecessary or poor use of funding and highlighted other areas money should be spent. Nine different suggestions were made and of 40 comments the most common were:
- No explanation given, just a statement this is improper use of money (38%)
- Spend on improving local roads (15%)
- Spend on the health service (13%)
- Spend on regeneration (10%).

‘The Alternative Options Analysis’ report available at kent.gov.uk/thanetparkway will be updated with our response to the above mentioned alternative spending suggestions.

Figure 8.2 below shows a distribution of additional comments by group.
Figure 8.2: Additional comments by group
Group Comparison

Note: The number of comments for each group in Figure 8.2 does not directly correlate with the number of sub-comments in the analysis below. For example, 87 Local Residents provided further comments on the proposal (shown above). According to Figure 8.2, 33% of these comments were relating to ‘Concerns’. However in the analysis below it states there were 52 comments from Local Residents raising ‘Concerns’. This is because some respondents raised more than one concern in their response and is not an error in the data.

Local Residents

- 1/3rd of Local Residents comments were raising a concern with the proposal (Figure 8.2). This was 11% more than any other group. Of 52 comments, their greatest concerns were:
  - Congestion and the capacity of the road network (21%)
  - Loss of village aesthetic/ way of life (17%)
  - Pollutions and nuisances such as light, noise and litter (17%).

- Local Residents made the fewest comments relating to benefits.

- Of 21 comments, their most common responses were:
  - The station should be located elsewhere (33%)
  - Can see no need for the station (24%)
  - Challenging statements made in the consultation (14%).

Wider Residents

- Provided more comments relating to concerns than any other theme. Of their 81 comments, their greatest concerns were:
  - Impact on existing stations (20%)
  - Adding to additional journey time (19%)
  - Loss of agricultural land/green space (16%).

Frequent Rail Users

- Of 36 comment, there most common responses were:
  - The station should be located elsewhere (17%) – there was no clear preference on where the station should be
  - Can see no need for the station (17%)
  - Challenging statements made in the consultation (14%).
The Frequent Rail Users showed the greatest preference for alternatives to the station to be considered of all the groups. Of all the groups the Frequent Rail Users made the least comments that the benefits would only be realised if Manston Airport was to be reopened. In terms of facilities provision, the Frequent Rail Users raised 27 comments of which the most common were:
- Good connections to local transport (22%)
- Cycling and pedestrian access from Cliffsend (19%)
- Additional parking space (15%)
- Staff at the station (15%).

Businesses
- Provided more comments stating the benefits of the station are dependent on the airport than any other theme.
- The most common benefits were in order of priority:
  - Statements of support
  - Will support visitors/tourism in the area
  - Improve the accessibility to Kent
  - Good for business use.
- Had the highest percentage of comments relating to facilities provision than any other group. The most requested facilities were (in order of preference):
  - Good connections to local transport
  - Cycling and pedestrian access from Cliffsend
  - Additional parking space.
- Businesses had a lower percentage of comments suggesting the station was an unnecessary expense or suggesting alternatives than any other group.

Please see Appendix F for table showing the breakdown of comments by each theme and group
8.2. Written Stakeholder Organisation Comments

This section details other comments made in written/email responses received from stakeholders. Stakeholders have been grouped together for the sake of anonymity.

Parish Councils

Three Parish councils submitted a written response to the consultation, one of which objected to the proposal. The following points were raised:

- The need for the station should be kept under review depending on the outcome of the future of Manston Airport
- Congestion will get worse as a result of parkway, particularly on:
  - the A256, A299 and A28
  - the local roads leading to the proposed location from Cliffsend
  - the main road (The Street) through the village of Acol.
- Villages including Acol and Cliffsend will become ‘rat runs’ and will see an increase in traffic and speed of vehicles
- Emissions will increase in the vicinity of the local parishes
- There are fears for the future of existing stations, particularly Minster
- Concerns for the safety of passengers using the station as it was proposed as an unstaffed station. Particular concern was raised for those arriving in the dark or waiting on their own.
- The station will impose on village life in Cliffsend
- Additional car parking can be established at Ramsgate station.

The Parish councils have called for:

- Existing stations in Thanet to be safeguarded
- Analysis of the impact of traffic movements around Cliffsend and Acol - as a result of trips to the station from north line stations, to be completed
- An air quality assessment to be completed for Thanet Parkway.

We will investigate the scale of the potential of each of the environmental impacts by completing an Environmental Impact Assessment. The assessment will also identify mitigation measures.

Potential impacts relating to congestion will be reviewed by undertaking a Transport Impact Assessment.
Further discussions will take place with the Department for Transport to ensure that existing stations remain in service after the delivery of the parkway station.

Environmental/Heritage Groups
Two environmental/heritage groups provided comments on the proposal. The following points were raised:

- Question whether the proposed Thanet Parkway is the right solution to deliver the benefits that are claimed
- With the closure of Manston Airport the fundamental reason for Thanet Parkway has disappeared
- An unstaffed station does not offer a visionary image to improve the perception of East Kent
- Type 1 agricultural land should be safeguarded not developed
- The station will delay passengers using the existing rail network
- Benefits only felt by those who can or choose to drive to the station
- The station will lead in increased car trips
- Increased vehicle trips will impact on climate change
- The impact of the station on climate change is omitted from the Environmental Impacts Report.

The groups suggest the following should be included in the Environmental Scoping Report:

- The impact of the station on climate change
- The impact on the Anglo-Saxon cemetery at the Lord of the Manor Roundabout, St. Augustine’s Cross and two nearby listed buildings.

A full Environmental Impact Assessment will be undertaken and the above mentioned suggestions will be communicated with our Planning consultants.

Political Party Response
A response was received from the Thanet branch of a political party. The party did not support the proposal on the grounds that:

- The station will attract future housing development
- It will result in longer journey time for users travelling from Ramsgate, Margate and Broadstairs
- The station will be attract crime as it will be unstaffed
- The parking pressures in residential areas near existing stations could be alleviated by implementing resident only parking and increased traffic warden patrols negating the need for the parkway station.

Discussions will be held with Thanet District Council to identify the most effective way of mitigating any parking problems in Cliffsend.
Landowner Response
The principal land owner of land at the proposed site submitted a formal objection to the consultation on the grounds that:

- There will be a severance of land making access to retained land difficult
- The station will result in the loss of grade 1 agricultural land to the detriment of the landowner’s business
- The station will have significant visual impact.

A suggestion was made that if the station is to go ahead the car park and access arrangements should be built south of the railway line to give greater access to Cliffsend residents.

*Note: a second landowner also stated an objection to the proposal via the consultation questionnaire. The objection was on the grounds the proposal deprived access to retained land.*

*A third landowner also made comment via the questionnaire and responded positively to the scheme. The landowner requested KCC should “ensure that as part of its design and implementation it does not restrict or prejudice the future development opportunities of the adjacent landowners or that of Thanet DC in the medium or long term”.*

The station Design consultants have been informed about the all landowner’s access issues to retained land.

A full Environmental Impact Assessment will be undertaken covering all aspects including land use and visual impacts. Our planning consultants are aware of these comments.

*‘The Alternative Options Analysis’ report available at kent.gov.uk/thanetparkway will be updated with our response to the above mentioned alternative location of the station.*

Further meetings with all landowners will be arranged to discuss their concerns and relevant information to address their concerns will be provided when it becomes available.

Local Resident
During the pre-consultation period a local resident who lives in direct proximity of the proposed site raised particular concern about the proposal. The resident had concerns about the effect the construction of the station would have on the health of a family member suffering from a condition that is exacerbated by inhaled irritants such as dust, smoke and pollution. The resident was also concerned with the risk of added pollution from cars passing through the area when the parkway station is operational.
A meeting was arranged with the local resident to understand their concern and discuss a way forward to address their concerns. It was agreed to have a continuous communication about the project development and construction work.

*See chapter 10 for a discussion of what we propose to do about all the issues raised here.*
8.3. Response Card Comments

27 response cards were completed at the consultation events. Some comments where appropriate have been split into more than one theme.

The key concerns recorded on the response cards at the events were:

- Congestion and the capacity of the roads (26%)
- Loss of agricultural land/green space (16%)
- The impact on existing stations/services (11%)
- Pollution and nuisance from the station and construction (11%)
- The station would attract future harmful development (11%)
- Loss of village aesthetic (11%).

Four comments suggested that the station should be located elsewhere with suggestions including at the Discovery Park, Richborough area and Manston Green.

There were a total of five requests for the following facilities:

- Pedestrian and cycle access should be provided from Cliffsend, Ramsgate and Minster
- Parking should be free or a reasonable cost
- The station should have electronic car charging points, solar panels and subsidised parking for electric car users.

Figure 8.3: Response card comments (39 comments received)
9. Equality and Diversity Analysis

This chapter presents the analysis of the consultation responses from an equality perspective and identifies issues to be included in the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) and addressed in the station design.

9.1. Equality Responses

More than 1/5\textsuperscript{th} of respondents indicated there were further issues to be considered as part of the EqIA (Figure 9.1). These respondents were asked to provide an explanation to their answer.

Of the 99 ‘yes’ responses:
- 10 did not provide any further details
- 78 responses were considered not relevant to the question based on the following grounds:
  - They did not have any relevance to equality and diversity
  - They did not refer to an issue that had an impact on any of the 10 protected characteristics groups. (Age, Disability, Gender, Gender identity, Race, Religion or belief, Sexual orientation, Pregnancy and maternity, Marriage and Civil partnerships, Carer’s responsibilities).

Therefore there were 11 relevant responses to this question, which comprised of a total of 14 comments. The key issues raised were:

- Given the proposed station location is out of town, the following groups may not be able to access the station:
  - Young people, elderly people or people with disabilities who do not have access to a car and are unable to use public transport
- Given the station is unstaffed there are concerns for the safety of users, particularly:
  - Women
  - Elderly people
  - People with a disability.
  - People of a particular sexual orientation
  - People of a particular religion

Figure 9.1: Do you feel anything further should be considered by the EqIA? (445 responses)
There needs to be access for all to and between the platforms that could otherwise affect:
  - The elderly
  - People with pushchairs/prams.
- During construction: dust, pollution and airborne contaminants may have an impact on people with respiratory problems (Disability).
- A comment was also made that the Equality Impact Assessment was difficult for people to access unless they had an internet connection. It is difficult to assess which characteristic group this affects as some people may not have access due to living in a rural location. Whilst hard copies of this document were available on request during the consultation, there is clearly a need to ensure people are aware of this.
- Whilst income or economic status is not considered as part of an EqIA a number of comments were made stating that people would be impacted by the cost of travelling to the station by public transport if they do not have access to a car. This point will need to be considered when agreeing public transport connections to the station.

All documents relating to this consultation were available free of charge in hard copy and alternative formats where requested. Copies of the Equality Impact Assessment were made available at the seven public events. For future consultation this will be more widely promoted to ensure everyone has fair access to the documents they require to provide an informed consultation response.

9.2. Detailed Analysis

Using data collected from the ‘About You’ questions, a detailed analysis of the potential impacts of the station on the protected characteristic groups Age, Gender and disability was undertaken. The analysis found no group would be substantially impacted based by the station as a result of their characteristics (see Appendix G for the detailed analysis). However the following points were identified:

- That disabled respondents would prefer access to platforms via lifts and access between the platforms via an underpass.
- That the most elderly respondents (76+) would prefer access to platforms via lifts and access between the platforms via an underpass.
- That disabled respondents (with respiratory problems) may be impacted more by pollution from construction than able bodied people.
- That although overall levels of concern were low, women showed a greater concern for safety at the station than men.

KCC will make sure that the station and access to the platforms will be accessible to all.

Safety concerns raised by the respondents will be included within the detailed Environmental Assessment work. Further discussions would take place with Southeastern to determine measures that could be put in place to improve the perception of safety at the station.
Discussions with contractor(s) would take place next year to discuss potential methods of construction, working hours and mitigation measures to limit the disturbance to the local residents during the construction period.

9.3. Other Protected Groups

As explained in section 9.1, one respondent suggested that:

- Safety could be a potential disadvantage to:
  - People of a particular sexual orientation
  - People of a particular religion.
- Access for all to and between the platforms could be a potential disadvantage for:
  - People with pushchairs/prams.

No data was collected to be able to specifically analyse the impact on these protected groups. This is because ‘About You’ questions were only included in the questionnaire to collate data about those protected groups that were identified as positively or negatively impacted in the EqIA.

There were no comments made by any individual of one of these specific groups that they felt they would be disadvantaged in their use of the station. There was also no anecdotal evidence presented to Officers at consultation events that implied that any of these groups (or any other protected group) would feel disadvantaged in their use of the station.
10. You said, we did

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback on respondents’ opinions of various elements of the proposal and use these opinions to shape the design, development and delivery of the station. Table 10.1 below summarises the key points raised in the public consultation and how we have acted on (or will be acting on) them to ensure the station best meets the needs of everyone within the available budget and delivery timescales.

Table 10.1: KCC actions as a result of the consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You said…</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>We did (or will do)…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design of the station, car park and highway access arrangement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 All the station and car park facilities we proposed were more ‘important’ to you than not ‘important’</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>We have incorporated all the proposed station and car park facilities into the design work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 That the most important facilities to you not included in the proposal were:</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>The additional facilities requested in this section would be treated as passive provisions in the station design work, meaning the designs will include sufficient space and infrastructure to ensure that where it is applicable; these facilities could be incorporated into the station at a later stage after the opening of the parkway station. We are in an on-going discussions with Southeastern about the staffing arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Catering facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Toilets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 You do not have a strong preference of access to the platforms, but would prefer ramps instead of lifts</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>We recognise that whilst ramps offer less reliance on staff for operation, and less concerns over safety, lifts can provide easier accessibility to all including elderly people, disabled people and people with luggage/pushchairs. Both ramp and lift options will be investigated in our design work and a decision will be made based on your feedback and the technical work related to their feasibility, visibility, operation, cost and convenience to the rail users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 You would prefer access between platforms by footbridge</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Both footbridge and underpass options will be investigated in our design work. A decision will be made based on your feedback and the technical work related to their feasibility, visibility impact, cost and safety to the rail users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Potential impacts of the parkway station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You said...</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>We did (or will do)...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 You primarily agree with the proposed access arrangement although:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o You have concerns over the safety of the access arrangement</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>These concerns have been shared with highway design consultants and they will develop and investigate the feasibility of the alternative highway access arrangements to/from the station and car park based on your concerns. A decision will be made on the most suitable option based on your concerns, their feasibility, cost and convenience to rail users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o You would potentially like to see access directly from the Sevenscore roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o You (the objecting landowners) are concerned that the proposed access arrangement is preventing access to retained land.</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Highway design consultants have been informed about the landowner’s access to the retained land. Further meetings with landowners would be arranged to discuss their concerns and our design work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential impacts of the parkway station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You...</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>We did (or will do)...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 You were more concerned than not with all the potential impacts posed in the consultation documentation.</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>We will investigate the scale of the potential of each of the environmental impacts by completing an Environmental Impact Assessment. The assessment will also identify mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential impacts relating to congestion will be reviewed by undertaking a Transport Impact Assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 You (the Local Residents) were particularly concerned with the impact of noise from the station</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>A detailed Environmental Impact Assessment (which will include an assessment of noise) will be carried out and appropriate mitigation measures will be incorporated into the station design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 You (the public and stakeholder organisations) were particularly concerned with the impact of increased traffic, congestion and capacity of the roads leading to and surrounding the proposed site. You (the parish councils) have called for an analysis of the impact of the station to be carried out.</td>
<td>6.2 8.1 8.2 8.3</td>
<td>Potential impacts relating to congestion will be reviewed by undertaking a Transport Impact Assessment. Any mitigation measures identified as part of the Traffic Assessment will be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You said...</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>You were concerned with the impact on existing stations and you (the parish councils) have called for safeguarding of the existing stations</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>You (the public and stakeholder organisations) were concerned with the impact on existing rail journey time</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>You (the public and stakeholder organisations) were concerned with the loss of green space and agricultural land as a result of the development</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>You (the public and stakeholder organisations) were concerned with the safety of the station as it was proposed as being unstaffed.</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You said...</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>We did (or will do)...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You felt there were more suitable alternative locations for the Parkway Station than the proposed location.</td>
<td>8.1 8.2</td>
<td>The station needs to be built on the existing railway line, therefore the proposal of building the station at the airport site and to the west of the Sevenscore roundabout is not feasible. A parkway station at the Manston Green site is technically not feasible as it is too close to Ramsgate station which means train departures at Ramsgate would be delayed during the morning peak hour. Additionally, the Lord of the Manor roundabout is already a congestion hotspot and it is very complex to manoeuvre through the junction during peak periods. Building a new parkway station at this location would worsen the existing travel conditions and significantly affect journey times. The proposal of locating the station on the southern side of the railway line presents a significantly worse option compared with KCC’s proposed location. This is in terms of the higher project capital cost (due to expansion of the existing railway bridge), delayed delivery of the project (due to additional approvals needed to expand the existing railway bridge), a greater environmental and traffic impact on the local residents. ‘The Alternative Options Analysis’ report available at kent.gov.uk/thanetparkway will be updated with our response to your comment on the alternative location of the station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...we should use landscaping and natural materials to help the station ‘blend in’ to the natural environment</td>
<td>6.2 (Table 6.2)</td>
<td>A full Environmental Impact Assessment will be undertaken covering all aspects including visual impacts. Our Planning consultants are aware of these comments. Landscaping will be incorporated into the design to reduce the visual impact of the station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You said…</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>...we should provide good public transport links to station to reduce car use</td>
<td>6.2 (Table 6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>...we should provide good safe pedestrian and cycle access to the station to reduce car use</td>
<td>6.2 (Table 6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>...we should increase the number of parking spaces to reduce likelihood of problem parking in Cliffsend</td>
<td>6.2 (Table 6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>...we should undertake road/signal improvements on the existing highway to ensure roads can cope with increased traffic</td>
<td>6.2 (Table 6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>That the station should have affordable parking</td>
<td>6.2 (Table 6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>One local resident had serious concerns of the impact of construction and operation. You (the local resident living within direct proximity to the proposed site) wanted to further discuss the impact of construction and operational pollution on the health of your family.</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potential benefits of the parkway station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You said…</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>We did (or will do)…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The greatest benefits of the parkway station were:</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>KCC will keep working together with Network Rail, Southeastern, Thanet and Dover District Councils and other partners to achieve the potential benefits of the proposed parkway station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Improved access to HS1 services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o About an hour’s journey time to London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Greater investment in East Kent due to improved accessibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calls for action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 You (the parish councils) want us to undertake an air quality assessment for Thanet Parkway. You (the Environmental/Heritage groups) want the impact of the station on climate change to be included in the Environmental Scoping Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality and Diversity Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 …that the Equality Impact Assessment was difficult for people to access unless they had an internet connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 …that as disabled respondents you would prefer access to platforms via lifts and access between the platforms via an underpass.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consultation Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You said...</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>We did (or will do)...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>...that as the most elderly respondents you would prefer access to platforms via lifts and access between the platforms via an underpass.</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>...that as disabled respondents (with respiratory problems) you may be more greatly impacted by pollution from construction than able bodied people.</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Next Steps

The chapter identifies what will happen next in the project programme and how you will be notified and be able to contribute.

11.1. What happens next?

We will be using your feedback to inform the outline design and Environmental Impact Assessment work for the parkway station. We will then consult you on the outline design before submitting a planning application around May 2016. Pending a decision on the planning application, we will develop the detailed design and begin construction in December 2017. We plan to have the station ready for service by January 2019.

11.2. Future communication

We have sent this report to all our stakeholders and have notified all those respondents that provided us with contact details during the consultation period that this report is available.

We wish to keep you as informed as possible with the progress of the project. We will therefore keep you notified about key decisions via updates on the project website kent.gov.uk/thanetparkway

11.3. How can you be further involved?

You will have the chance to comment on the outline design of the station during the second public consultation in January 2016. We will notify you of the exact dates of the consultation.