

<b>Roger Elkins, Cabinet Member for Highways &amp; Infrastructure</b>	<b>Ref No: HIXX (19/20)</b>
<b>January 2020</b>	<b>Key Decision: Yes</b>
<b>Consultation by Transport for the South East on a Draft Transport Strategy</b>	<b>Part I</b>
<b>Report by Steve Read, Acting Executive Director Places Services and Matt Davey, Director of Highways, Transport &amp; Planning</b>	<b>Electoral Division(s): All</b>
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>Transport for the South East (TfSE) is the sub-national transport body, currently operating in shadow form, that covers Berkshire, East Sussex, Hampshire, Kent, Surrey, and West Sussex. It has the twin purposes of facilitating the delivery of a regional transport strategy and promoting economic growth in the South East.</p> <p>With regard to the first purpose, TfSE is consulting on a <a href="#">draft Transport Strategy</a>, which aims to shape the South East as a region economically, technologically and environmentally over the next 30 years, and change the way that investment is made in transport. It addresses issues such as connectivity, reliability, collaboration, 'smart' technology, health and well-being, air quality, accessibility, safety, carbon and climate change, and other environmental impacts.</p> <p>TfSE is consulting its constituent authorities as well as a wider audience, including the general public. Although the deadline for comments on the draft Transport Strategy is 10 January 2020, the County Council has been given permission to submit comments after the consultation closes in order to facilitate scrutiny by the Environment, Community and Fire Scrutiny Committee (ECFSC) at its scheduled meeting on 13 January 2020.</p>	
<p><b>West Sussex Plan: Policy Impact and Context</b></p> <p>If TfSE is awarded statutory status as a sub-national transport body, the review of the County Council's West Sussex Transport Plan (WSTP) will need to have regard to the finalised Transport Strategy. If statutory status is not awarded, there will still be merit in the WSTP having regard to the Transport Strategy, as it will demonstrate that effective cross-boundary collaboration is taking place with neighbouring authorities and key stakeholders across the South East, and it will help to deliver new and improved strategic transport infrastructure and services in West Sussex.</p>	
<p><b>Financial Impact</b></p> <p>Although there are a range of funding and financing mechanisms available for the implementation of the strategy, no assessment about the potential impacts on local authority finances has been undertaken by TfSE. Therefore, the draft consultation response includes several requests that, if actioned, will ensure there is a better understanding of the potential impacts on local authority finances.</p>	

## **Recommendation**

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure approves the County Council's Consultation Response (Appendix B) for submission to Transport for the South East.

### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Transport for the South East (TfSE) is the sub-national transport body, currently operating in shadow form, that covers Berkshire, East Sussex, Hampshire, Kent, Surrey, and West Sussex. It has the twin purpose of facilitating the delivery of a regional transport strategy and promoting economic growth in the South East.
- 1.2 With regard to the first purpose, TfSE is consulting on a [draft Transport Strategy \(see Executive Summary in Appendix A\)](#), which aims to shape the South East as a region economically, technologically and environmentally over the next 30 years, and change the way that investment is made in transport. It addresses issues such as connectivity, reliability, collaboration, 'smart' technology, health and well-being, air quality, accessibility, safety, carbon and climate change, and other environmental impacts.
- 1.3 TfSE is consulting its constituent authorities as well as a wider audience, including the general public. Although the deadline for comments on the draft Transport Strategy is 10 January 2020, the County Council have been given permission to submit comments after the consultation closes in order to facilitate scrutiny by ECFSC at its scheduled meeting on 13 January 2020.
- 1.4 If TfSE is awarded statutory status, the review of the County Council's West Sussex Transport Plan (WSTP) will need to have regard to the finalised Transport Strategy. If statutory status is not awarded, there will still be merit in the WSTP having regard to the Transport Strategy, as it will demonstrate that effective cross-boundary collaboration is taking place with neighbouring authorities and key stakeholders.
- 1.5 TfSE will use the Transport Strategy as the starting point for bids to Government and other bodies for funding to deliver new and improved strategic transport infrastructure, including schemes in West Sussex. Therefore, aligning the review of the WSTP to the TfSE Transport Strategy is likely to assist in delivering strategic transport improvements in West Sussex as our objectives will be closely aligned.

### **2. Draft Transport Strategy**

- 2.1 The preparation of the strategy has been informed by three themed studies (Future Transport Technology; a Freight, Logistics and Gateway Review; and Smart and Integrated Ticketing Options) and a number of background papers (Strategic Policy Context; Relationship between the South East and London; Funding and Financing Options; Potential Impacts of Brexit; and Integrated Sustainability Appraisal).
- 2.2 In addition, TfSE is in the process of commissioning five area studies to investigate the challenges and opportunities across all modes of transport

associated with the three radial areas and two orbital and coastal areas. These area studies will be completed after the consultation and will be used to inform the development of the Strategic Investment Plan. The area studies that will be most relevant to the County Council are the South Central and the Outer Orbital areas (see Appendix C for study areas). These studies will help TfSE and its constituent authorities put forward additional strategic transport initiatives for funding from the Department for Transport (DfT) and other sources, 'as and when' opportunities arise.

2.3 The draft Transport Strategy includes the following vision:

*"By 2050, the South East of England will be a leading global region for net-zero carbon, sustainable economic growth where integrated transport, digital and energy networks have delivered a step change in connectivity and environmental quality.*

*A high-quality, reliable, safe and accessible transport network will offer seamless door-to-door journeys enabling our businesses to compete and trade more effectively in the global marketplace and giving our residents and visitors the highest quality of life."*

2.4 TfSE's key principles, in effect, the strategic objectives that they are seeking to achieve through the strategy, are:

- Supporting economic growth, but not at any cost;
- Achieving environmental sustainability;
- Planning for successful places;
- Putting the user at the heart of the transport system; and
- Planning regionally for the short, medium and long term.

2.5 To inform the preparation of the strategy, TfSE identified the challenges associated with the six journey types in the region:

- *radial journeys*, e.g. A23/M23/Brighton Main Line corridor (Brighton to Coulsdon). The main challenges are capacity gaps (i.e. demand exceeds capacity), connectivity gaps (i.e. lack of competitive routes/services), and environmental impacts (i.e. air quality and noise) in urban areas;
- *orbital and coastal journeys*, e.g. A27/A259/A31/West Coastway Line/East Coastway Line corridor (Brighton to Ringwood). The main challenges are capacity gaps (i.e. demand exceeds capacity), connectivity gaps (i.e. lack of competitive routes/services), and environmental impacts (i.e. air quality and noise) in urban areas;
- *inter-urban journeys*, e.g. between Crawley and Horsham. The main challenges are quality of routes, congestion affecting bus services, gaps in the rail network, and road safety;
- *local journeys*, e.g. within the greater Bognor Regis urban area. The main challenges are conflicts between road users, air quality, road safety, lack of integration between modes of transport, and the availability and affordability of public transport;
- *journeys to international gateways and freight*, e.g. routes to/from Shoreham Harbour. The main challenges are airport expansion, port expansion, River Thames crossings, rail freight mode share, congested

freight routes, technological barriers to reducing emissions, and leaving the European Union; and

- *journeys in the future*, e.g. journeys using new mobility-based solutions such as 'on-demand ride hailing' (i.e. Uber). The main challenges are infrastructure gaps, ageing population, competing services, increasing freight traffic, and congestion.

2.6 The draft strategy presents the following key interventions to address the challenges and opportunities for each journey type:

- *radial journeys* – improve connectivity to Maidstone, North Kent, Reading – Waterloo and Hastings corridors; provide capacity on corridors such as Brighton Main Line and South Western Main Line rail corridors; improve resilience of Strategic Road Network; extend radial route public transport (e.g. Crossrail); and reduce human exposure to noise and poor air quality on radial corridors;
- *orbital and coastal journeys* - holistic demand management initiatives that address road congestion while avoiding displacement effects from one part of the network to another; electrification and dual-mode rolling stock on orbital routes; enhancements where orbital rail routes cross radial rail routes; reinstate cross country services to the east of Guildford; build consensus on a way forward for M27/A27/A259 corridor; and reduce human exposure to major orbital roads;
- *inter-urban journeys* - support scheme proposed and prioritised locally for government's National Roads Fund for the Roads Investment Plan (2020 – 2025), Large Local Major Schemes, and for the Major Road Network; increase support for inter-urban bus services; and deliver better inter-urban rail connectivity;
- *local journeys* - invest in infrastructure and subsidy for high quality public transport; improve air quality; prioritise vulnerable users, especially pedestrians and cyclists, over motorists; develop better integrated transport hubs; and advocate for a real term freeze in public transport fares;
- *journeys to international gateways and freight* - further investment in improved public transport access to Heathrow; improved road and rail access to international ports; Lower Thames Crossing; demand management policies to improve the efficiency of the transport network for road freight and to invest in sustainable alternatives; rail freight schemes; new technologies; and develop a Freight Strategy and Action Plan; and
- *journeys in the future* - future proof electric and digital infrastructure (standards, etc); incorporate Mobility as a Service into public transport networks; encourage consistency in roll out of smart ticketing systems; and develop a Future Mobility Strategy for the South East.

2.7 Additional interventions/strategic transport initiatives may also be identified in the future following the completion of the five area studies (see paragraph 2.2).

2.8 The strategy includes suggested priorities and timescales, which can be summarised as:

- *highway schemes* - a short term priority but become lower priority in the long term;
- *railway schemes* - a high priority in the short, medium and long term;
- *interchanges* - a high priority in the short, medium and long term;
- *urban transit schemes (e.g. bus rapid transit)* - are a high priority in the medium to long term;
- *public transport access to airports* - a high priority alongside plans for airport expansion;
- *road and public transport access to ports* - a high priority in the short term;
- *technology and innovation in transport* - supported but may only be realised in the medium to long term as this is dependent on technological changes;
- *planning policy interventions* - a high priority and in the short term; and
- *more significant demand management policy interventions (e.g. road charging)* - a much longer term goal.

### **3. Proposed County Council Response**

- 3.1 Overall, the County Council welcomes the draft Transport Strategy. The aspiration to plan for people and places instead of vehicles (as outlined in chapter 1 of the draft strategy) and the approach to splitting up the South East into five geographical areas (inner orbital, outer orbital, south west, south central, south east areas) (as outlined in chapter 5 of the draft strategy) seem logical, as is the identification of the six journey types. This approach captures the key strategic transport issues that are expected in West Sussex up to 2050.
- 3.2 The County Council welcomes and supports the process of embedding sustainability principles centrally within the strategy vision and strategic priorities.

#### **The Approach**

##### *Planning for people and places*

- 3.3 Although the aspiration to plan for people and places instead of vehicles is welcome, this will be challenging in locations where there are limited alternatives and routes are used to serve a range of different journey types. In such locations, there is a need to resolve conflicts between the competing demands and the Transport Strategy needs to explain how these conflicts will be resolved. The County Council suggest that the strategy is amended to explain how conflicts will be resolved potentially by explaining how the 'Movement and Place Framework' will be applied in practice.

##### *Recognising the diversity of transport needs in the South East*

- 3.4 The approach should acknowledge the diversity of transport needs in the South East. Therefore, the County Council considers that 'highway improvements' should also be included in the list of transport strategy

interventions in paragraph 1.19 of the strategy that will need to be used to deliver the outcomes that the strategy is seeking, especially in the large rural areas that are not easily served by public transport.

#### *Modelled scenarios*

- 3.5 Four modelled scenarios (Scenario 1: The London Hub; Scenario 2: Digital Future; Scenario 3: Route to Growth; Scenario 4: Sustainable Future that are summarised in chapter 1 of the draft transport strategy) were initially developed. Three of these scenarios (scenarios 2, 3 and 4) have been drawn together to build a preferred scenario called 'Sustainable Route to Growth' resulting in a total of five scenarios. These five scenarios show how different economic, social, environmental and technological trends might influence the economy, population and transport usage up to 2050. As TfSE acknowledge, forecasting 30 years into the future is quite challenging and at this early stage, the delivery risks associated with each scenario are not fully understood. Therefore, consideration should continue to be given to all the scenarios, not just the preferred scenario, because one of the other scenarios may be more likely to occur and/or preferable over time.

#### *Integrated Sustainability Appraisal/Health Impact Assessment*

- 3.6 The Integrated Sustainability Appraisal includes an appraisal of the potential economic, social and environmental impacts, including a Health Impact Assessment. The County Council consider that the approach to Health Impact Assessment is not appropriate as there is insufficient information available about the impacts of interventions on the affected population at this stage. Therefore, the draft response requests that further engagement takes place with Public Health officers, drawing on information about the affected population, as part of area or thematic studies.

#### **The Area**

- 3.7 In general, the County Council agrees with the evidence (that is summarised in chapter 2 of the draft transport strategy) but has identified a number of minor amendments that are required to the supporting evidence base reports. It is also requested that road safety be added to the list of challenges facing the highway network in the South East.

#### **The Vision, Goals and Priorities**

- 3.8 The vision, goals and priorities are outlined in chapter 3 of the draft transport strategy. The County Council has no comments on the vision as this has been developed jointly with the partners on the Shadow Partnership Board, including the County Council.

#### *Economic, social and/or environmental priorities*

- 3.9 The priority to improve air quality through initiatives to reduce congestion and encourage a shift to public transport should also recognise the role that other modes of transport and the emergence of mobility-based solutions such as ride-sharing (e.g. Faxe) may play in tackling air quality issues.

## **The Strategy**

### *Journey types*

- 3.10 The strategy is outlined in chapter 4 of the draft transport strategy. Given the challenges of providing for improvements to some journey types; e.g. additional capacity for longer distance travel into Central London, the strategy should be more explicit about the opportunities that may be easier to realise, such as greater investment in rail infrastructure away from routes into London, to support economic uplift and a more balanced economy across the South East.
- 3.11 The draft Transport Strategy rightly recognises the challenges associated with the different movement types. However, in some cases, the initiatives that have been identified do not adequately reflect the scale and nature of the interventions that are required to address these challenges. The County Council requests that the interventions are more specific and, where possible, identify the modes of transport that they apply to and reflect the nature of the changes that have been assumed in the modelled scenarios. Specifically this includes amendments to; a) recognise the poor connectivity and journey times between London and West Sussex coastal towns; b) ensure that demand management initiatives are only introduced once public transport alternatives are available; and c) state that road and/or rail enhancements are required to improve capacity and journey times for coastal journeys.

### *Airport expansion*

- 3.12 Although plans to expand Gatwick Airport are in the early stages of development and are not guaranteed to come forward, they could do so within the lifetime of the strategy. At the present time, only limited information is available about specific initiatives that will be needed to mitigate the impacts of airport expansion. Therefore, TfSE could usefully set out an ambition within the strategy to match the scale of the vision and guide any future airport expansion projects. The draft response suggests that the additional passenger and employee journeys arising due to airport expansion should be mitigated entirely by increasing the sustainable transport mode share through a combination of infrastructure and service improvements.

### *Sustainable freight*

- 3.13 The transfer of freight to more sustainable modes will help to reduce the environmental impacts of economic activity. Although the draft Transport Strategy recognises the challenge of declining rail freight and limitations on scope for improvements it does not set out initiatives to address it. To do this, the identification and establishment of distribution centres at appropriate locations should be added to the list of initiatives to help address freight journey challenges.

### *Last mile logistics*

- 3.14 The volume of goods vehicles in urban areas in West Sussex contributes to environmental issues that have led to the establishment of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA). Out of town distribution centres for the 'last mile' delivery could help to effectively tackle this challenge. Therefore, Last

Mile Logistics should be promoted extensively as an effective and sustainable solution to tackling freight and environmental issues.

#### *Parking for commercial vehicles*

- 3.15 Parking opportunities for commercial vehicles in the South East are sparsely located and are not suited to modern requirements of the industry. For example, there are lorry parks in central locations rather than close to the Strategic Road Network. This results in ad hoc parking in unsuitable locations with, in some cases, associated anti-social behaviour. Therefore, there is a need to improve the parking opportunities for commercial vehicles, particularly by ensuring they are well located and provide facilities to suit the requirements of the freight industry.

#### *Interchange facilities*

- 3.16 The initiatives needed to address radial, orbital and coastal journeys do not include enhancements to interchange facilities although they are mentioned in section 5 of the draft transport strategy; this is a significant omission that the strategy needs to address. Current provision of interchange facilities to enable switching between road, rail and bus is limited due to their availability, accessibility and the limited capacity and cost of parking at interchanges. In order to facilitate an increase in the use of sustainable modes of transport, there is a need to increase the capacity and accessibility of interchanges, which could include the creation of new interchanges such as stations or park & ride.

#### *Capital investment*

- 3.17 All the modelled scenarios assume very significant levels of transport infrastructure capital investment. Given the lead-in times for investment of this scale and the need for phasing of both expenditure and construction activity, much of this planning would need to be started very soon in order to be implemented in full by 2050. Therefore, it is suggested that area/corridor studies should identify a programme showing the key stages of work and the scale of the investment required in order to achieve the strategy.

#### *Affordability*

- 3.18 The Social Goals and Social Strategic Priorities include reference to affordability of the transport network. However the strategy does not set out how this will be achieved or clearly identify initiatives that will improve affordability. The County Council request that this should form a key part of the key principle of; 'putting users at the heart of the transport system'.

### **Implementation**

#### *Indicators*

- 3.19 The indicators outlined in chapter 5 of the draft transport strategy are quite weak and unlikely to provide sufficiently useful information to make well-informed decisions. In some cases, the information is not related to the outcome the TfSE is seeking to achieve. For example, the strategic priorities include biodiversity net gain but the focus for the indicators is on reducing



loss of biodiversity. This is not acceptable and should be amended, potentially though learning from good examples on other similar transport strategies.

#### *Funding & financing*

- 3.20 The funding and financing mechanisms are outlined in chapter 5 of the draft transport strategy. Some of the funding and financing mechanisms have not previously been used in West Sussex and would require a significant change of approach to transport investment. There is a need for TfSE to set out a clear rationale for the preferred funding mechanisms because, in most cases, the power to use these funding and financing mechanisms rests with the local authorities, not TfSE. When implementing new or novel funding and financing mechanisms, TfSE should ensure, on a case by case basis, the affected local authorities support their use.
- 3.21 The introduction of new funding and financing mechanisms should provide value for money. In line with the County Council's response to TfSE's Consultation on the Draft Proposal to Government, TfSE should conduct a value for money assessment that takes account of any potential impacts on other public bodies before seeking to use new funding and financing mechanisms.
- 3.22 In practice, some of the funding mechanisms are unlikely to be available for transport investment unless other changes are made by the Government to funding for public services. For example, building new homes places a greater burden on local authority services (non-transport) than is recovered through additional council tax income. There is also a need to take into account the expected impacts of council tax equalisation being introduced under business rate reform. Therefore, council tax increment retention is unlikely to be available for transport investment.
- 3.23 Increasing costs to beneficiaries could result in unintended and undesirable consequences, such as businesses choosing not to invest or relocating in response to these costs. There is also a need to build trust with beneficiaries to reduce the likelihood of conflict. Therefore, the Transport Strategy should include a key principle that the introduction of any new funding and financing mechanisms will be equitable economically, socially and environmentally.

#### *Dependency on other policy areas*

- 3.24 The dependencies on other public policy areas, such as energy generation and land-use planning, need to be explored more fully. As transport cannot be considered in isolation, there is likely to be merit in planning in parallel for other relevant public policy areas to ensure that the Transport Strategy can be implemented and will be effective.

#### *Priorities for interventions*

- 3.25 The order of priorities is generally welcome and the County Council agrees that highway schemes should be lower priority in the longer term. However, highway schemes are still likely to be needed in future where this is linked to major development or to tackle road safety issues. As currently presented, figure 5.1 gives the impression that highway schemes will not be needed in

the longer term and this may cause difficulty in making the case for these schemes. Therefore, the County Council request that highway schemes to facilitate major development are included in figure 5.1 as a short, medium and long term priority (but lower priority in the long term).

### **Integrated Sustainability Appraisal**

- 3.26 The use of strategic corridors as a way to present the findings of the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal means that insufficient information is provided about the findings of the appraisal outside the strategic corridors; this needs to be addressed.
- 3.27 The implementation of mitigation measures is essential to satisfactorily ameliorate the adverse effects of the strategy and deliver the vision and strategic priorities. In some cases, such as protected areas, these adverse effects could prevent scheme delivery and compromise delivery of the outcomes. Therefore, it is essential that in such cases these measures are deliverable and scheme budgets and business cases should be informed by the cost estimate of mitigation measures.

### **General comments**

#### *Monitoring and evaluation*

- 3.28 Due to uncertainty about the impacts of leaving the European Union, the Transport Strategy should be updated to reflect the impacts of the full range of possible impacts. This is just one cause of change and there are many others, so the strategy should also include a commitment to periodic review to take account of changes in circumstances.

#### *Smart and integrated ticketing*

- 3.29 The Transport Strategy should set out how TfSE intend to address the challenges of integration between modes of transport, drawing on the evidence provided by the Smart and Integrated Ticketing Options report. The Transport Strategy should also clarify the role that TfSE is expected to play in addressing this challenge, such as specific initiatives to overcome the barriers to introducing Pay As You Go (PAYG), flexible ticketing options, and mobility-based solutions such as ride hailing.

### **Factors taken into account**

## **4. Consultation – Stakeholder Engagement**

- 4.1 Consultation has taken place with the teams in the Directorate for Highways, Transport & Planning. The responses received have informed the preparation of the draft Consultation Response.
- 4.2 The draft Consultation Response will be considered by the Environment, Communities and Fire Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 13 January 2020 before it is finalised and approved by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure.

- 4.3 Notification of the TfSE consultation on the draft Transport Strategy was issued to local members and stakeholders in The Bulletin. No comments have been received by the County Council, although stakeholders were expected to submit any comments directly to TfSE.

## **5. Financial (revenue) and Resource Implications**

Although there are a range of funding and financing mechanisms available for the implementation of the strategy, no assessment about the potential impacts on local authority finances has been undertaken by TfSE. Therefore, the draft consultation response includes several requests (paragraphs 3.15-3.18) that, if actioned, will ensure there is a better understanding of the potential impacts on local authority finances

### **Impact of the proposal**

## **6. Legal Implications**

There are no legal implications for the Council in making this response.

## **7. Risk Implications and Mitigations**

There are no identifiable risks to the Council in making this response.

## **8. Other Options Considered**

The other option considered was to not provide a response to the consultation. However, improving sustainable transport infrastructure in the South East will help to meet the ambitions of the West Sussex Plan and the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-26. Therefore, it is important that the Authority continues to engage positively in the process and that it responds to the consultation.

## **9. Equality and Human Rights Assessment**

There are no equality and human rights implications in making this response as it is a response to a consultation by an external organisation.

## **10. Social Value and Sustainability Assessment**

- 10.1 A Sustainability Assessment has been completed by TfSE on the Draft Transport Strategy and the proposed consultation response includes a response to this individual report.

- 10.2 There are no sustainability impacts arising from submitting a consultation response.

## **11. Crime and Disorder Reduction Assessment**

There are no identifiable Crime and Disorder Act implications in making this response.

**Steve Read**  
Acting Executive Director

**Matt Davey**  
Director of Highways, Transport and

Place Services

Planning

**Contact Officer:** Darryl Hemmings, Transport Planning and Policy Manager  
T: 0330222 6437

## **Appendices**

Appendix A: Draft TfSE Transport Strategy: Executive Summary

Appendix B: Draft Consultation Response

Appendix C: TfSE Study Areas

## **Additional information**

[LDR18 \(16/17\) Shadow Sub-National Transport Body for the South East](#)

[HI10 \(19/20\) Transport for the South East: response to consultation about statutory status](#)