

View Response

Answers to **Freight Action Plan for Kent**

INCOMPLETE RESPONSE

Response ID #528002. Submitted on 12 Mar 2017 15:22 by Chris Fribbins

Q1. Are you completing this questionnaire on behalf of:

Please select the option that most closely represents how you will be responding to this consultation.

Please select one option.

- Yourself as an individual
- A local community group or residents association
- A Parish / Borough / District Council in an official capacity
- A charity, voluntary or community sector organisation (VCS)
- A Trade Association (e.g. Freight Transport Association)
- A Business
- Other

If you answered 'other', please specify

«No response»

Q1a. Please tell us the name of the organisation (community group, resident association, council, business, trade association or any other organisation) you are responding on behalf of:

Railfuture

Q2. Please tell us your postcode:

We use this to help us to analyse our data. It will not be used to identify who you are.

ME3 7RB

Q3. Does road freight traffic have a negative impact on you / your local community?

Please select one option.

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Don't know

Q3a. Please add any comments you have on the impact of road freight traffic here:

Traffic Congestion - Delays to other road traffic. Air quality issues
Large Lorries on unsuitable country roads
Driver issues - Left Hand Drive
Parking up at inappropriate locations

Q4. Does inappropriate lorry parking have a negative impact on you / your local community?

Please select one option.

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Don't know

Q4a. Please add any comments you have on the impact of inappropriate lorry parking here:

Lorries parking up for rest periods/overnight - litter and waste

Action 1

Q5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with KCC's approach to tackling the problems of overnight lorry parking in Kent (pages 9 to 12 in the FAP)?

Please select one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know

Q5a. Please add any comments you have on Action 1 here:

Not enough is being done to move more of the freight traffic to rail - with suitable facilities for roll on/roll off lorries and interchange to UK freight distribution.

Action 2

Q6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the approach to finding a solution to Operation Stack (pages 13 to 14 in the FAP)?

Please select one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q6a. Please add any comments you have on Action 2 here:

Not enough is being done to transfer more freight to rail. Dedicating large areas of countryside to lorry parking relocates air quality impacts to other locations.

Action 3

Q7. To what extent do you agree or disagree with KCC's approach to managing the routing of HGV traffic to remain on the strategic road network where possible (pages 15 to 16 in the FAP)?

Please select one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q7a. Please add any comments you have on Action 3 here:

HGV traffic does need to be contained on the strategic road network where possible and away from towns and villages.

Action 4

Q8. To what extent do you agree or disagree with KCC's steps to address the problems caused by freight traffic to communities (pages 17 to 18 in the FAP)?

Please select one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q8a. Please add any comments you have on Action 4 here:

More work needs to be done to transfer from road to rail, with penalties for road usage and subsidies for rail.

Q8b. Were you aware of the Lorry Watch scheme available to residents / Parishes in the county before taking part in this consultation?

Lorry Watch is a joint project between Kent County Council and Kent Police where local residents are empowered to record the details of large vehicles using unsuitable routes or routeing through areas with a weight, height or width restriction.

Please select one option

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Action 5

Q9. To what extent do you agree or disagree that KCC makes effective use of planning and development control powers to reduce the impact of freight traffic (page 19 in the FAP)?

Please select one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q9a. Please add any comments you have on Action 5 here:

Not enough work is done to support transfer from road to rail and the use of other ports in Kent and elsewhere.

Q10. If there is anything else that you think should be included in the Freight Action Plan, or if you have any other comments please write these in below.

The consultation concentrates on how to manage or mitigate the adverse consequences of so much road borne freight that by an accident of a geography must travel through Kent. We note that this rather passive approach comes with an actual and potential great cost.

The question not posed and certainly not answered, is how the County is going to reduce the torrent of HGV traffic issuing out of the Channel Tunnel and the short sea crossing ports. It supports the modal shift from road to rail, but fails to indicate as to how this might be done. It does not ask how the vast cost of managing the effect of the HGV degradation of the County might be better spent on reduction of this torrent. The latter does of course have huge negative effects on the M25/M11-A1/M1 corridors further up country.

The Channel Tunnel was built in the expectation that the railway would carry vastly increased more tonnages soon after its opening than before and certainly much more than now. Indeed the legislation that enabled its construction told us that there would be a transfer of road borne freight onto rail. Intermodal depots were constructed across the country on that basis. There are provisions and 'promises' within that legislation that not being enacted on behalf of the long suffering neighbours to this torrent of traffic.

We are pleased to see that Kent County Council fully supports the provision of modal shift from road to rail to reduce HGV movements in the county, and furthermore acknowledges that railfreight is more environmentally friendly than roadfreight using 76% less carbon dioxide than the equivalent road freight movements but more needs to be done

Although the report notes the new Howbury (Bexley) Strategic Freight Interchange which is to be welcomed we felt that there are other opportunities that are capable of being explored.

Recognising the environmental and economic benefits there is an increase in Europe of the movement of road vehicles on rail and in particular unaccompanied lorry trailers through services such as Lohr (French) and CargDomestically across the UK railfreight is a successful industry but clearly it is not in cross channel traffic.

We urge that:

1. KCC must undertake to get the partners in the operation of railfreight to clearly state why this

is not so. The fact that it is not is clearly damaging Kent.

2. Kent CC calls these failing participants to account. A long term standing conference of the rail freight companies, Eurotunnel, Kent County Council, RFG, DfT should meet regularly to discuss what measures are required to fill up the 35 train paths still available but largely unused for the CT traffic alone. On the basis of the point made above that 7 intermodal trains can remove about 540 HGV movements a day it is clear that the 35 two way train paths reserved for CT traffic have the potential shift about 5400 HGV movements off the roads of Kent. There is no doubt other train paths can be provided over various routes including HS1 can provided. It is extraordinary that the single track branch line to Felixstowe handles 70 high capacity freight trains a day yet a Kent is flooded with HGVs.

We note that in previous years a a large number of intermodal trains ran from all parts of the UK to Many destinations across Europe. The standing conference should investigate the reestablishment of these services. Gradually transferring the finance used to manage the HGVs to establishing these railfreight intermodal services on startup (if necessary) and providing revenue support as and when needed.

3. The proposed depot at Howbury (now granted planning permission) should be supported along with others to to get other domestic as well as CT traffic on to the railway. Planning restrictions must be any HGV traffic to/from this and other terminals that are not local Deliveries of say 30 miles.

4. Support the emerging proposal by Cargobeamer Terminal GnbH

5. We note the Canton authorities in Switzerland put severe limitations on HGV traffic as a way of solving the severe degradation of the environment.

Kent CC should seek such powers too as a "stick" to force modal shift. We recommend a study of the experience of the Swiss in dealing with a very similar problem.

6. We want to see distance-based road user charging so that the costs the road freight industry imposes on society are reflected in the price it pays. This should be levied at any cross channel port including the CT terminal on any HGV crossing the Channel. This charging regime would clearly have to apply to all cross channel/ North Sea ports.

7. KCC should encourage the companies developing their railfreight "piggy back" services that carry lorries across France from Spain and Germany are extended via HS1 to Barking in east London. These "continental" gauge trains can travel through the CT and HS1 to Barking freight terminals.

8. KCC should consider the impact of BREXIT on the road freight - with possible extended customs processing at Dover/Folkestone.

About You

We want to make sure that everyone is treated fairly and equally, and that no one gets left out. That's why we are asking you these questions.

We won't share the information you give us with anyone else. We'll use it only to help us make decisions, and improve our services.

If you would rather not answer any of these questions, you don't have to but please click through to the end of the questionnaire to submit your response.

Q11. Are you...?

Please select one option.

- Male
- Female
- I prefer not to say

Q12. Which of these age groups applies to you?

Please select one option.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> 0-15 | <input type="radio"/> 16-24 |
| <input type="radio"/> 25-34 | <input type="radio"/> 35-49 |
| <input type="radio"/> 50-59 | <input type="radio"/> 60-64 |
| <input type="radio"/> 65-74 | <input type="radio"/> 75-84 |
| <input type="radio"/> 85 + over | <input type="radio"/> I prefer not to say |

Q13. Do you regard yourself as belonging to any particular religion or belief?

Please select one option.

- Yes
- No
- I prefer not to say

Q13a. Which of the following applies to you?

Please select one option

- Christian
- Buddhist
- Hindu
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Sikh
- *Other

*Any other religion, please specify:

«No response»

The Equality Act 2010 describes a person as disabled if they have a longstanding physical or mental condition that has lasted, or is likely to last, at least 12 months; and this condition has a substantial adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. People with some conditions (cancer, multiple sclerosis and HIV/AIDS, for example) are considered to be disabled from the point that they are diagnosed.

Q14. Do you consider yourself to be disabled as set out in the Equality Act 2010?

Please select one option.

- Yes
- No
- I prefer not to say

Q14a. Please tell us which type of impairment applies to you.

You may have more than one type of impairment, so please select all the impairments that apply to you. If none of these apply to you, please select 'Other', and give brief details of the impairment you have.

- Physical impairment
- Sensory impairment (hearing, sight or both)
- Long standing illness or health condition, such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, heart disease, diabetes or epilepsy
- Mental health condition
- Learning disability
- I prefer not to say
- Other*

*If you answered 'Other', please specify:

«No response»

Q15. To which of these ethnic groups do you feel you belong?

(Source: 2011 census)

Please select one option.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> White English | <input type="radio"/> White Scottish |
| <input type="radio"/> White Welsh | <input type="radio"/> White Northern Irish |
| <input type="radio"/> White: Irish | <input type="radio"/> White: Gypsy/Roma |
| <input type="radio"/> White: Irish Traveller | <input type="radio"/> White: Other* |
| <input type="radio"/> Mixed: White and Black Caribbean | <input type="radio"/> Mixed: White and Black African |
| <input type="radio"/> Mixed: White and Asian | <input type="radio"/> Mixed: Other* |
| <input type="radio"/> Asian or Asian British: Indian | <input type="radio"/> Asian or Asian British: Pakistani |
| <input type="radio"/> Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi | <input type="radio"/> Asian or Asian British: Other* |
| <input type="radio"/> Black or Black British: Caribbean | <input type="radio"/> Black or Black British: African |
| <input type="radio"/> Black or Black British: Other* | <input type="radio"/> Arab |
| <input type="radio"/> Chinese | <input type="radio"/> I prefer not to say |

*If your ethnic group is not specified in the list, please describe it here:

«No response»

Q16. Are you...?

Please select one option.

- Heterosexual/Straight
- Bi/Bisexual
- Gay man
- Gay woman/Lesbian
- Other
- I prefer not to say

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Please click the 'finish' button below, and follow the instructions on the next page to submit your response.

Privacy

Kent County Council collects and processes personal information in order to provide a range of public services. Kent County Council respects the privacy of individuals and endeavours to ensure personal information is collected fairly, lawfully, and in compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998.