



Kent International Gateway

Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
Maidstone

Supplemental Non-Technical
Summary

July 2009

1 Context

- 1.1 In October 2007 Kent International Gateway Limited (the applicant) applied for outline planning permission for a rail freight interchange with associated warehousing and subsidiary commercial space to a site on the south eastside of Maidstone, to the south of the M20 immediately to the west of Junction 8 (hereafter 'the site').
- 1.2 An Environmental Statement (ES) was prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (as amended).
- 1.3 Since that time further environmental information has been submitted in response to requests for additional information from Maidstone Borough Council under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Applications) Regulations 1988 and Regulation 19 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 1999. This information is referred to as Further Information (FI).
- 1.4 There has since been a change to the proposed development by the applicant which, specifically, has led to a reduction in the size of Units 01 and 02, the replacement of Units E and F with a single new unit, Unit E, changes to the landscaping provided and changes to the proposed layout of streams and other watercourses on the site.
- 1.5 The environmental implications of these changes have been assessed and the results of this assessment are set out in the Supplemental Environmental Statement (SES) which supplements the September 2007 Environmental Statement.
- 1.6 This Supplementary Non-Technical Summary (SNTS) updates the original Non-Technical Summary (NTS) where the changes to the development have brought about changes in its summaries or conclusions. It should therefore be read alongside the original NTS. Each section of the SNTS explains which parts of the original NTS are replaced or updated, and which parts remain unaffected.
- 1.7 Each chapter of the SES sets out which parts of the original Environmental Statement and the Further Information, together with the SES, comprise the full environmental assessment of the environmental effects of the proposed development, as amended.
- 1.8 The applicant has also submitted a revised Design and Access Statement to describe the amended development.
- 1.9 All of the above will be available for viewing at the address below:

Maidstone House
King Street
Maidstone
Kent

ME15 6JQ

- 1.10 Paper and CD copies of the Supplemental ES can be requested from Gerald Eve LLP at 7 Vere Street, London W1G 0JB, quoting reference "J5898". Printed copies can be purchased for £250 per set. CDs containing an electronic copy can be purchased for £10.

Rail Freight Interchange Background

- 1.11 The changes to the scheme have reduced the amount of warehousing and commercial space proposed for the site to approximately 300,000sqm from the 374,000sqm described in the original NTS. The two rail linked warehouses, Units 1 and 2, now comprise approximately 141,000sqm of space rather than the 171,000sqm described in the original NTS.
- 1.12 The background to the development of rail freight interchanges has not been affected by the changes to the scheme.

KIG Site and Layout

- 1.13 The proposed changes to the scheme do not result in any changes to the description set out in the KIG Site and Layout section although the balancing pond systems referred to at Paragraph 1.16 have been partially redesigned a result of the reduction in floor area and the amalgamation of Units E and F.
- 1.14 The revised illustrative masterplan is enclosed as Figure 1.1.

Phasing

- 1.15 The broad sequence of over-lapping phases of the development is as follows:
- Initial ecological and preparatory works;
 - Creation of accesses onto A20, internal construction routes and new bridge over railway;
 - Formation of intermodal rail transfer area and new railway sidings, with cut material transferred to south of railway, to provide fill for plots A-C and E;
 - Creation of development platforms A-D at eastern end of site and then plot E;
 - Creation of rail connected plots 1 and 2, with some cut and fill;
 - Whilst it is considered most likely that the creation of plots 1-2 will follow on from E, it is feasible for the sequence to be reversed. To do so would not give rise to any significant difference in environmental effects.

Operation

- 1.16 In full operation, the KIG facility would be able to accommodate up to 12-13 freight trains per day and handle around 200,000 containerised freight units per year. The site as a whole would potentially operate 24 hours a day, although activity would typically be less on

Saturday afternoons and Sundays. Up to around 2,900 jobs of diverse kinds would be created. In terms of effect on road freight movement, it is estimated that the KIG scheme would lead to a reduction of 48 million HGV kilometres travelled per year. This is a slight reduction on the levels anticipated in paragraph 1.19 of the original NTS.

Alternatives considered and reasoning behind chosen site and layout.

- 1.17 The proposed changes to the development do not result in any changes to the alternative site consideration and the rationale behind the selection of KIG and the broad layout of the site.
- 1.18 More information on the process of considering the alternative sites was provided in the June 2008 RPS Supplementary Information on other sites assessment report. This report expanded on the process used to establish long and short lists and considered eight sites which had emerged through the process or been suggested by consultees in more detail. The sites considered in this report, along with an indication of the appropriate rail route, are set out below.
- - Dover Port (Dover to Folkestone);
 - - Cheriton, Folkestone (CTRL/Ashford, Maidstone, Swanley);
 - - Ashford (CTRL/Ashford, Maidstone, Swanley);
 - - Allington Farm, Hollingbourne (Ashford, Maidstone, Swanley);
 - - Swanley/Farningham (Ashford, Maidstone, Swanley);
 - - Redhill Aerodrome (Tonbridge, Redhill, Croydon);
 - - Ebbsfleet (CTRL);
 - - Barking (CTRL).
- 1.19 This report does not change the conclusions set out in paragraphs 1.20 – 1.26 of the NTS that the KIG site is the optimal site.

Planning background

- 1.20 The proposed scheme changes do not change the planning background set out at paragraphs 1.27-1.31 of the NTS, nor do they give rise to any additional planning issues or planning policies not described in the NTS.
- 1.21 However since the submission of the planning application the policies of the South East Plan have been given significant extra importance by the publication of the complete version of the plan by the Government, which now forms part of the legally binding development plan in Kent. In doing so it replaces the policies of the July 2006 Kent and Medway Structure Plan, which now no longer forms part of the development plan.

Environmental Statement coverage

- 1.22 There are no changes to the main aspects of the environment likely to be affected by the development set out in paragraph 1.13 as a result of the proposed changes to the scheme. Where the effects themselves differ, however, from those anticipated in the original ES and summarised in the NTS the changes are described, along with proposed mitigating measures and any residual environmental effects, in the following sections of this SNTS.

2 Traffic and access conditions

- 2.1 The baseline position in terms of transport and access in the vicinity of the site is described in Chapter 5 of the SES.
- 2.2 The summary in Section 2 of the original NTS is unaffected by the scheme changes except in respect of paragraph 2.10 which noted that no specific mitigation is proposed in association with the KIG development as both the Willington Street / A20 junction and Junction 8 of the M20 would require upgrading by the highway authority in any case. However a scheme for the improvement of the merge and diverge at Junction 8 of the M20 has been developed that provides for a ghost island merge and diverge. The signalisation of the roundabout at Junction 8 is also now being proposed.
- 2.3 The changes to the proposed development reduce the amount of floorspace proposed for the site. As the number of trips generated is based on the floor area provided a reduction in floorspace will reduce traffic flow, and thus impact.

3 Landscape and visual aspects

- 3.1 The baseline information for the landscape and visual part of the environmental assessment, the effects of the proposed development on landscape and visual appearance, the proposed mitigation and any residual effects are set out in Chapter 6 of the ES and updated as necessary in Chapter 6 of the SES.
- 3.2 The summary of these in Section 3 of the original NTS is unaffected by the scheme changes except for those paragraphs described below.

Landscape Proposals

Paragraph 3.7

- 3.3 Paragraph 3.7 is superseded. The proposed Landscape Framework for the development, as amended by the scheme change, amounts to approximately 47ha, which is 42% of the site area. The component parts of the revised Landscape Framework are shown in Table 3.1

Area / Habitat	Approximate area (ha)
Conserved woodland	7.0
Proposed woodland/scrub/structure planting (including hedgerows)	18.5
Grassland (conserved and proposed)	18.4
Ponds and wetlands	3.2
TOTAL	47.1

Table 3.1

- 3.4 In particular there is a 4ha increase in the amount of existing woodland on the site that is conserved. This also reduces the need for replacement woodland.

Construction effects

Paragraph 3.9

- 3.5 The final bullet of paragraph 3.9 notes that vegetation removal would be a key aspect of the landscape and visual impacts associated with the construction phase. However the increase in the area of conserved woodland, and increase in the size of the Landscape Framework, would lessen the landscape and visual effects of the removal of vegetation.

Operational effects - Landscape

Paragraph 3.18

- 3.6 Paragraph 3.18, which previously noted the localised substantial adverse effects caused by the loss of mature trees and woodland in the central part of the site, is superseded.
- 3.7 The conservation of a significantly greater area of existing woodland and number of mature trees in this central part of the site would make a notable difference to the direct landscape effects on this part of the site. Although the effects would remain significant at a localised scale the resultant landscape effect for this area would be reduced from being substantial adverse to moderate/substantial adverse.
- 3.8 The scheme changes in the west of the site would result in some localised landscape improvements, including the changes to the rail sidings enclosure and the increase in landscaping to the north east of Unit 01. This would reduce the landscape effects on this area from moderate adverse to slight / moderate adverse. Landscape effects at the east and west of the site would therefore be limited to slight / moderate adverse.

Operational effects - Visual

- 3.9 Whilst the summary of the visual effects of the development provided in paragraphs 3.19 to 3.22 is unchanged it should be noted in addition that all the properties with views towards the central part of the development would benefit from the conservation of more existing trees and woodland in this area and the increased distance to the new built development proposed as a result of the scheme changes.
- 3.10 The changes to the central area would also improve views from footpaths and other routes crossing this area.
- 3.11 Two new viewpoints from key and sensitive locations have been added to the assessment undertaken and summarised in Paragraph 3.20. These are Thurnham Castle and the grounds of Leeds Castle. The significance of the effect on the view from these points is considered to be slight to moderate adverse and slight adverse respectively. It should be noted however, that there would not be any views to the proposed development from Leeds Castle itself or from the majority of the grounds of the Castle.

4 Lighting

- 4.1 The baseline information for the lighting conditions part of the environmental assessment, the environmental assessment of the effects of the proposed development on light conditions, the proposed mitigation and any residual effects are set out in Chapter 7 of the ES and updated as necessary in Chapter 7 of the SES.
- 4.2 The summary of these in Section 4 of the original NTS is unaffected by the scheme changes except for those paragraphs described below.

Paragraph 4.7

- 4.3 The low level lighting referred to in the railway sidings has been removed as part of the scheme changes. Consequently the number of light fittings is reduced from 536 to 498.

5 Ecology and Wildlife Conservation

- 5.1 Chapter 5 of the original NTS is replaced in its entirety by this chapter.
- 5.2 The ecology chapter assesses the impact of the proposed Kent International Gateway development on ecology and nature conservation within the defined zone of influence of the development. In particular it considers the potential impacts of habitat loss and general habitat fragmentation on the local biodiversity, with specific consideration of potential impacts to wildlife species.
- 5.3 The development involves large scale re-grading of the site as well as modifications to the existing railway line and embankments. These works will necessitate the stripping of semi natural vegetation from the site during the construction phase.
- 5.4 The site has been subject to historical data search showing the importance of the local area in terms of species and habitats and a series of ecological field surveys over a number of years to assess the value of the site for wildlife.
- 5.5 The site contains no protected habitats but does contain trees protected by tree preservation orders and hedges considered as being important under the local Biodiversity Action Plan. The site also contains bats and great crested newt both UK and European protected species, several protected bird species, and BAP priority species.
- 5.6 The changes to the scheme reduce the impacts on biodiversity with the retention of semi natural woodland and mature parkland trees. The new design layout for the scheme provides ecological continuity by retaining areas of ecological importance, mitigation for areas of loss and providing compensation land to encourage use by species using the local area.
- 5.7 All the potential effects of the scheme on wildlife have been considered under the revised layout and all effects can be mitigated or compensated for to minimise the effect on wildlife. Enhancements to areas of the site such as watercourses and waterbodies will help to promote wildlife on the site and will increase the carrying capacity of the site for wildlife.
- 5.8 The new scheme and revised layout will provide connectivity by providing areas of semi natural vegetation and/or dark corridors of movement for crepuscular and nocturnal species. The site will be further enhanced and developed with the production of a site management plan to ensure both short and long term ecological goals are achieved for the site in the future.
- 5.9 The revised scheme with all the effects considered will not adversely effect the ability of the site to operate as a unit of continued ecological functionality in the future.

6 Ground Conditions

- 6.1 The original ES Chapter 9 describes the impact of the proposed development in terms of environmental risk, geology and engineering with respect to the extent of cutting and filling the site. Since that was produced the masterplan has been revised and the impact in terms of ground conditions of the revised scheme is assessed in Chapter 9 of the SES.
- 6.2 The layout change leaves the existing woodland to its east intact and eases the difference in levels with respect to the adjacent railway. Retaining walls will be installed between the new loading area and preserved woodland to the east.
- 6.3 The process by which the cut and fill exercise will be undertaken is explained in the SES. Whilst the principals established in the ES remain unchanged the new cut and fill quantities are set out in the SES.

7 Drainage and Flood Risk

- 7.1 The baseline information regarding drainage and flood risk, the environmental assessment of the effects of the proposed development on drainage and flooding, the proposed mitigation and any residual effects are set out in Chapter 10 of the ES and updated as necessary in Chapter 10 of the SES.
- 7.2 The summary of these in Section 7 of the original NTS is unaffected by the scheme changes except for those paragraphs described below.

Baseline Conditions

- 7.3 The description of the baseline conditions in paragraph 7.2 is not affected by the changes to the proposed development. However surveys undertaken since the submission of the ES indicate that approximately 65-70% of the site is directly underlain by Gault Clay.

8 Noise and Vibration

8.1 The baseline information regarding the existing acoustic environment, the environmental assessment of the effects of the proposed development and the proposed mitigation and any residual effects are set out in Chapter 11 of the ES and updated as necessary in Chapter 11 of the SES.

8.2 The following text provides a non technical update and should be read alongside Section 8 of the NTS.

Baseline

8.3 Further surveys at Barty Farm and Woodcut Farm have been undertaken to investigate apparent discrepancies between the baseline noise levels set out in the Council's acoustic report and the original Environmental Statement

Operational Effects

8.4 The proposed noise barriers to Chestnuts, Woodcut Lane and Crismill Road are described. The barriers to Chestnuts are expected to reduce noise at this property by 15dB, and the Woodcut Lane and Crismill Road barriers will reduce noise levels by 10dB.

8.5 The attenuation due to ground effects (absorption) is also described in the SES.

8.6 The acoustic attenuation due to the proposed noise barriers and from ground effects is subtracted from the noise emission levels set out in the council's acoustic report (which do not account for such attenuation effects).

8.7 The resultant assessment, using the Council's own figures, shows that the cumulative impact at Chestnuts, Woodcut Lane Crismill Road, Fremlins Road and Roundwell (the Council's assessment receptors) reduce to, at worst, slight.

9 Air quality and dust

- 9.1 The baseline information regarding existing air quality conditions, the environmental assessment of the effects of the proposed development on both air quality and dust, the proposed mitigation and any residual effects are set out in Chapter 12 of the ES and updated as necessary in Chapter 12 of the SES.
- 9.2 The summary of these in Section 9 of the original NTS is unaffected by the scheme changes except for those paragraphs described below.

Methodology

Paragraph 9.1

- 9.3 The methodology described in paragraph 9.1 has been updated to take into account the latest technical guidance from Defra, guidance note LAQM.TG(09). The extension of Maidstone Borough Council's Air Quality Management Area to include most of the built up area of Maidstone and the M20 between Junction 6 and 8 is also described.
- 9.4 The air quality assessment also has regard to the UK Air Quality Strategy which was published in 2007. This sets policy targets, based on EU limits, for air pollutants.

Paragraph 9.5

- 9.5 The number of sensitive receptors, as described in paragraph 9.5, has been increased with additional receptors in both Tonbridge and Malling and Maidstone being added.

Paragraph 9.9

- 9.6 Verification of the assessment model's output is now provided by comparison of the '2008 existing' scenario with 2008 monitored data, rather than the '2006 existing' scenario described in paragraph 9.9.

Baseline Conditions

Paragraph 9.7

- 9.7 Paragraph 9.7 is replaced as follows. The two Air Quality Management Areas described in paragraph 9.7 have been replaced and extended by the declaration of an AQMA covering the whole of Maidstone Town, including the M20 between Junction 6 and 7 and a further area between Junctions 7 and 8 of the M20. The KIG site is not included within the AQMA boundary although it is close by and consequently has the potential to have an effect on pollutant concentrations within the AQMA at locations in the vicinity of the M20 and A20. Baseline data on local air quality is available from the monitoring undertaken by the Borough Council at two automatic monitoring stations at Fairmeadow and Detling, the latter being relatively close to the proposed development, albeit in a rural location. Concentrations of

NO₂ are recorded as well below the annual mean objective at the Detling station. No exceedences for the annual mean or daily mean objectives for PM₁₀ have been recorded at either site.

9.8 Maidstone Borough Council also measure concentrations of NO₂ at 47 diffusion tube sites across the borough, one of which breached the objectives in 2006, 2007 and 2008 and four of which breached the objective in 2007.

9.9 The study area for the assessment has also been extended to include part of Tonbridge and Malling Borough which has an AQMA along the M20 between Junctions 4 and 5.

Construction Effects

9.10 No changes to the construction effects previously predicted are anticipated.

Operational Effects on Local Air Quality

9.11 No exceedances of the national air quality objectives were predicted at any receptor in 2016.

9.12 Whilst impacts on annual average NO₂ concentrations of moderate significance are predicted at six receptors, slight adverse or negligible impacts are predicted at all other receptors. It should be noted that the traffic data used in this assessment is likely to over-estimate future traffic flows from KIG as the proposed floor space at the development has since been decreased by one sixth. Furthermore current vehicle emission factors, which have been used in this assessment, do not take into account the introduction of vehicles meeting the Euro 5 emission standard, which by 2016 are likely to make up a significant proportion of the HGVs accessing KIG. As emissions from these vehicles are predicted to be much lower than the emission factors used within this assessment, the predicted air quality impacts within this assessment can be considered very much worst-case.

Operational Effects on Regional Air Quality

9.13 KIG is considered likely to have a significant beneficial impact on emissions of regional pollutants and local air quality adjacent to the Strategic Road Network, in comparison to alternative schemes, due to the predicted reduction in freight transported by road.

Mitigation

9.14 No changes to the mitigation measures summarised are proposed.

Residual effects

9.15 The effect of increased road traffic and car parking and biomass boiler emissions as a result of the proposed development on local air quality is considered to be of moderate adverse significance at six receptors and of minor adverse significance at all other receptors.

10 Cultural Heritage

10.1 The baseline information regarding the existing built and archaeological heritage of the site, the environmental assessment of the effects of the proposed development on the cultural heritage of the site, the proposed mitigation and any residual effects are set out in Chapter 12 of the ES and updated as necessary in Chapter 13 of the SES.

10.2 The summary of these in Section 10 of the original NTS is unaffected by the scheme changes except for those paragraphs described below.

Methodology

Paragraph 10.3

10.3 There is no change to the methodology set out in Chapter 10.3 however additional research and site visits have been undertaken.

Potential Impacts of development

Paragraph 10.13

10.4 Paragraph 10.13 describes the effect of the development on the setting of Barty Barn. This paragraph is deleted as the scheme changes represent a significant improvement to the submitted plans in terms of the effect on Barty Barn. The closest building is moved from 15m from the barn to 85m from the barn and the outbuildings which form part of the barn's setting are now retained. The redirected watercourse will be set back further from the barn with the potential for tree planting along both sides. The effect of the development, as a result of the scheme changes, would be reduced to a minor adverse effect.

10.5 The SES also considers the effect of the development on Woodcut Farmhouse and Barty / Bertie House. Regarding Woodcut Farmhouse it considers that there will be no physical impacts and minor adverse indirect effects, in the worst case scenario, because the proposed landscaping may be within the building's wider setting although this will not affect the significance or the special interest of the building. Regarding Barty House it concludes the effects would be negligible as there is no indication that the setting of the building extends as far as the proposed development. The building's special interest or significance would not be affected.

Paragraph 10.14

10.6 Paragraph 10.14, which summarises the assessment of the effects of the development on Bearsted and Bearsted Holy Cross Conservation Areas, is deleted.

10.7 The SES describes the characteristics of both Conservation Areas, their settings and their views. In both cases the SES considers that the glimpses of the proposed development from

some points within the Conservation Areas are incidental and not in views integral to the interest of the areas. The impact on the conservation areas is therefore considered to be negligible.

Mitigation Measures

Paragraph 10.20

- 10.8 Paragraph 10.20 summarised the residual effect on Barty Barn. This paragraph is deleted as a result of the changes to the proposed development, which reduced the initial effect to minor adverse. Landscaping and planting as mitigation measures will still be provided but there is more scope for landscaping as a result of the scheme changes. The residual effect on Barty Barn will therefore be minor adverse.

11 Socio-economic impacts

- 11.1 The baseline information regarding the existing socio-economic context of the site, the assessment of the socio-economic effects of the proposed development, the proposed mitigation and any residual effects are set out in Chapter 14 of the ES and updated as necessary in Chapter 12 of the SES.
- 11.2 The summary of these in Section 10 of the original NTS is unaffected by the scheme changes except for those paragraphs described below.

Policy Background

Paragraph 11.2

- 11.3 The summary of policy background contained in paragraph 11.2 is not affected by the proposed scheme changes although the SES notes the recent publication of the draft government planning policy statement Planning for Sustainable Economic Development and the publication of the adopted South East Plan, which supersedes the Kent and Medway Structure Plan.

Baseline

Paragraph 11.4

- 11.4 The SES updates the detailed statistics describing the local labour market and other local socio-economic factors however the conclusions summarised in paragraph 11.4 remain valid.

Potential effect of construction

Paragraph 11.5

- 11.5 Further work has been undertaken on the construction phase of the project, and this has led to a revised estimate of on-site employment. It is now estimated that there will be 180 – 200 full-time equivalent jobs. The other summary conclusions of paragraph 11.5 on the effects on the local labour market and the employment impact of the construction phase remain valid.

Potential effect of completed development

Paragraph 11.6

- 11.6 Paragraph 11.6 is deleted. Due to the reduction in floorspace contained in the scheme changes the 3,500 full time equivalent jobs anticipated in the completed development are revised to 2,900 across a range of skill levels, comprising approximately 1,000 office based jobs and 1,900 warehouse based jobs.

Paragraph 11.7

- 11.7 Paragraph 11.7 is deleted.

Paragraph 11.9

- 11.8 To reflect the reduction in employment proposed by the scheme change the £4.7m annual spending previously predicted by a 3,500 strong workforce is revised to £3.9m. The effect remains expected to be positive and major at the local level, although probably negligible at a regional level. It would continue to contribute to indirect employment effects.

12 Energy Use

- 12.1 The examination of the impact of the development on energy use and feasible methods of reducing the predicted carbon emissions are identified in Chapter 15 of the ES.
- 12.2 The summary of these provided in Section 10 of the original NTS is unaffected by the scheme changes.
- 12.3 The SES explains that the predicted carbon emissions are based on floorspace, the reduction in floorspace proposed as part of the scheme change is likely to reduce the overall emissions further so adding to the robustness of the assessment.