WSCC Consultation Response - Transport for the South East Strategic Investment Plan

Survey Transcript

The purpose of this document is to aid participants in filling out the digital consultation survey and not intended to be used in replacement of the digital survey. For this reason, all background information and explanatory context from the digital survey has been removed from this document. As noted on the Engagement HQ project website, we additionally recommend whilst filling out the digital survey that you have the SIP document open on another browser window.

Section 2: Investment Priorities

Which of the above investment priorities do you feel are important for the SIP to deliver? (Tick all that apply)

- ☑ Decarbonisation & Environment
- ☑ Adapting to a New Normal
- ☑ Levelling Up Left Behind Communities
- ☑ Regeneration and Growth
- ☑ World Class Urban Transit System
- ☑ East – West Connectivity
- ☑ Resilient Radial Corridors
- ☑ Global Gateways and Freight

Do you have any further comments on the SIP's investment priorities? Please limit your response to 250 words.

> The investment priorities align well with the vision and strategic objectives of the adopted West Sussex Transport Plan 2022-36 (WSTP). The WSTP has taken a considered and balanced approached to transport infrastructure and service improvement and does not rank the investment priorities. For this reason, the County Council considers that no one investment priority should be prioritised globally over others as they are all important.

Section 3: Packages of Interventions

For the purposes of data gathering and analysis, the TfSE region has been split into four geographies. Which of the following geographic areas are you most interested in? Please be aware that some local authority areas appear in more than one of the geographies and you may need to select more than one of the geographies if this is the case for your specific area of interest. Choose all that apply.

- ☑ Solent and Sussex Coast (Hampshire, Southampton, Portsmouth, Littlehampton, Worthing, Brighton, Isle of Wight)
- ☑ London – Sussex Coast (Chichester to Eastbourne, Surrey, West Sussex and East Sussex excluding the Hasting Area)
- ☐ Wessex Thames (Berkshire, Hampshire and Surrey)

- ☐ Kent, Medway and East Sussex (Kent, Medway, Hasting and Rother areas of East Sussex)

Only if you answered Solent and Sussex Coast:
To what extent do you agree that the packages of interventions for the Solent and Sussex Coast area will deliver on the priorities of the SIP?

- ☐ Definitely agree
- ☑ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Definitely disagree
- ☐ I'm not sure

Please select all of the packages for the Solent & Sussex Coast area that you feel are important in achieving the priorities of the SIP. Tick all that apply.

- ☑ South Hampshire Rail (Core)
- ☑ South Hampshire Rail (Enhanced)
- ☑ South Hampshire Mass Transit
- ☑ Isle of Wight (two Packages)
- ☑ Sussex Coast Rail
- ☑ Sussex Coast Mass Transit
- ☑ Sussex Coast Active Travel
- ☑ Solent and Sussex Coast Highways

Do you have any further comments on the Packages of Interventions for the Solent and Sussex Coast area? Please limit your response to 250 words.

Deliverability
We 'somewhat agree' that the packages of interventions will deliver on the priorities of the SIP because we have some concerns about the deliverability of elements of the packages such as a large scale improvement to the A27 at Worthing and Lancing as there is a long history of failure to deliver such improvements.

Dependencies
Successful outcomes from some packages such as the West Coastway Strategic Study (F1) Rail package would benefit from (or be dependent on) being delivered in parallel with other packages such as complimentary road based public transport (broadly covered under Mass Transit package) which improve rails catchment or compliment rail with more direct and faster services where rail is not competitive. A multi-modal delivery approach would benefit a wider range of users and encourage mode shift.

The County Council would like to see these dependencies identified where they exist such as the A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Enhancement MRN (I14) and the A259 Chichester to Bognor Regis Enhancement MRN (I16) which includes public transport infrastructure and priority in addition to improvement for car users.

Active Travel
Sussex Coast Active Travel – Rephrase the final bullet to "Significant potential shift from car to active travel, with associated health benefits".

Sussex Coast Active Travel – The LCWIPs referred to in the SIP have their own stakeholder consultation process but in general the longer distance routes proposed by the SIP do not form part of LCWIPs and would need to follow a different consultation process. Active travel interventions that are not part of the LCWIPs will need to be consulted upon before delivery of such schemes are possible to confirm that there is stakeholder support for the principle of these interventions and secure collaboration and buy-in.

Active travel schemes have been aggregated together in the Sussex Coast area so package H1 Sussex Coast Active Travel Enhancements (including LCWIPs) includes a large number of schemes across a large area which means they could become lost in the crowd and could struggle to attract the attention of potential investors. The County Council considers that the final SIP should disaggregate the Sussex Coast Active Travel package into inter-urban and local schemes focused on settlements in area. There are also concerns regarding the high annual capital maintenance and renewal costs which will impact ongoing expenditure budgets and these disaggregated packages should thus undergo detailed feasibility analysis and be prioritised.

Only if you answered London – Sussex Coast:
To what extent do you agree that the packages of interventions for the London – Sussex Coast area will deliver on the priorities of the SIP?

- ☐ Definitely agree
- ☑ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Definitely disagree
- ☐ I'm not sure

Please select all the packages for the London - Sussex Coast area that you feel are important in achieving the priorities of the SIP. Tick all that apply

- ☑ London - Sussex Coast Rail (2 Packages)
- ☑ London - Sussex Coast Mass Transit
- ☑ London - Sussex Coast Active Travel
- ☑ London - Sussex Coast Highways

Do you have any further comments on the Packages of Interventions for the London - Sussex Coast area? Please limit your response to 250 words.

We 'somewhat agree' that the packages of interventions will deliver on the priorities of the SIP because we have some concerns about the affordability and deliverability of some proposed packages such as the active travel package. We believe that further design and feasibility analysis would be required to confirm projects are deliverable.

We also believe that projects could be packaged to show multi-modal benefits and dependencies and show place based planning benefits of such approaches.

London – Sussex Coast Mass Transit – Reference is only made to BRT systems. It should be clear that the mass transit system supports multi-modal travel and seamless transfer between modes which includes rail and bus services.

London – Sussex Coast Active Travel – All active travel interventions will need to be consulted upon before delivery of such schemes are possible to secure collaboration and buy-in. The National Cycle Network routes indicated are generally longer distance routes falling outside of urban and even peri-urban developments. They will generally fall outside the geographies of the LCWIPs which have their own consultation processes. Although WSCC supports the development of National Cycle Routes, we do consider them to be of a lower implementation priority than urban cycle routes which are typically capable of serving a larger volumes and frequency of users. The LCWIP routes therefore have the potential to make a greater impact on the reduction of car trips and improved public transport ridership and are therefore seen to deliver better value and greater benefit. We believe that the National Cycle Routes should be designed to coincide with the WSCC LCWIPs where possible to reduce investment costs, maximise use of the LCWIP network and potentially generate further economic benefit to local economies.

London – Sussex Coast Highways - It would be important to note that future highways improvements would look to include components of public transport and active travel infrastructure to improve the sustainability of such investments. West Sussex County Council are working together with local authorities site promoters such as Homes England to deliver on housing needs while promoting sustainable land use development and travel patterns, promoting public transport through the provision of bus priority lanes and active travel infrastructure to major employment and commercial centres as viable alternatives to private car use. Some of these schemes should be listed as multi-modal – which include:

- N1 A22 N Corridor South Godstone to East Grinstead Enhancements
- N9 A264 Crawley – East Grinstead Dualling and Cycleway
- N10 Crawley Western Link Road and Cycleway
- the A24 scheme south of Horsham which includes bus priority through junctions to improve journey times and active travel infrastructure to promote more sustainable travel along the corridor. This scheme is not indicated in the SIP and should be included.

A24 should be highlighted/ included as a route to improve N-S movement corridor resilience. Assessments are currently being undertaken for this route. The work on the A24 south of Horsham is public transport focussed and north of Horsham towards Surrey is highway capacity focussed. The A24 Corridor Rural Bus Service Enhancements (L7) along this route alignment can be supported by the A24 highways interventions.

Note there is reference to rural bus services as Mass Transit and this perhaps creates the wrong impression and expectations (as they are unlikely to provide the same level of service as Bus Rapid Transit). This should be replaced by a more accurate description of the intervention envisaged or identified as part of the SIP.

Some references on Slide 52 are incorrectly labelled and displayed and should be checked (e.g. N3a & N3b).

Only if you answered Wessex Thames:

To what extent do you agree that the packages of interventions for the Wessex Thames area will deliver on the priorities of the SIP?

- ☐ Definitely agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Definitely disagree
- ☐ I'm not sure

Please select all of the packages for the Wessex Thames area that you feel are important in achieving the priorities of the SIP. Tick all that apply.

- ☐ Wessex Thames Rail
- ☐ Wessex Thames Mass Transit & Active Travel
- ☐ Wessex Thames Highways

Do you have any further comments on the Packages of Interventions for the Wessex Thames area? Please limit your response to 250 words.

Only if you answered Kent, Medway and East Sussex:

To what extent do you agree that the packages of interventions for the Kent, Medway and East Sussex area will deliver on the priorities of the SIP?

- ☐ Definitely agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Definitely disagree
- ☐ I'm not sure

Please select all of the packages for the Kent, Medway and East Sussex area that you feel are important in achieving the priorities of the SIP. Tick all that apply.

- ☐ Kent, Medway, and East Sussex Classic Rail
- ☐ Kent, Medway, and East Sussex High Speed Rail (two Packages)
- ☐ Kent, Medway, and East Sussex Mass Transit
- ☐ Kent, Medway, and East Sussex Active Travel
- ☐ Lower Thames Crossing
- ☐ Kent, Medway, and East Sussex Highways

Do you have any further comments on the Packages of Interventions for the Kent, Medway and East Sussex area? Please limit your response to 250 words.

Global Policy Package of Interventions
Which of the above Global Policy Interventions do you feel are important for the SIP to support? (Tick all that apply)

- ☑ Decarbonisation
- ☑ Public Transport Fares
- ☑ New Mobility
- ☑ Road User Charging
- ☑ Virtual Access
- ☑ Integration

Do you have any further comments on the SIP's Global Policy Interventions? Please limit your response to 250 words.

Road user charging as an alternative to the fuel levy – although this is a sound approach to anticipating impacts of the change in future fuel sources, careful engagement with the public would be advised, noting that these guidelines would come from National government. This engagement should respond to the needs of different users, reflecting the fact that the south-east is a mix of urban and rural communities with different transport needs and road user charging schemes have the potential to disproportionately affect some user groups (if for example different charges are applied at different times of day). Road user charging does not currently feature as part of the West Sussex Transport Plan but we welcome that TfSE are presenting this opportunity to initiate a discussion with stakeholders on potential alternatives to current taxation by setting out the role it could play in delivering the Transport Strategy for the South East.

A stronger focus needs to be placed on the needs and delivery in rural areas. The predominant interventions in rural areas are indicated as highways, long distance National Cycle Routes and some references to mass transit routes. Greater attention should be placed on the needs of rural users with a clearer understanding of the appropriate interventions to deal with their specific needs.

Section 4: Benefits and Costs
Do you think that the SIP captures the benefits and costs of the proposed packages of interventions adequately? Choose any one option.

- ☑ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I'm not sure

Please explain your answer to the above question here. Please limit your response to 250 words.

Reference to Page 28, paragraph 1 – The report indicates the expected annual benefit realised by 2050, but does not indicate the gains achieved within the immediate 28 years. A clearer understanding of potential realised gains throughout the implementation period is essential to track performance and manage the 28 year investment plan.

Reference to Page 31, bullet 1 – statistics are provided in the "Business as usual" trajectory as a percentage growth. Although this is surely accurate, a more tangible and convincing context would be the current systems ability to cope so a measure of capacity vs demand is essential.

The expected commitment and delivery programmes for each stakeholder/ authority is unclear and therefore has an element of risk associated with it. We expect that the uncertainty will be resolved through further business planning, financial evaluations and programme management before commitment to delivery and timeframes.

Section 5: Delivery of the SIP

To what extent do you agree that, as a whole, the packages of interventions will deliver on the priorities of the SIP?

- ☐ Definitely agree
- ☑ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Definitely disagree
- ☐ I'm not sure

As a general, we believe that the SIP covers the necessary activities to deliver on the SIP priorities. However, broad packages (e.g. Sussex Coast Active Travel H1) both in terms of their definition and geographic area make it difficult to identify specific projects and direct benefits. Also, achieving desired priorities/ outcomes is often dependent on multiple diverse actions (multi-modal) rather than mode specific interventions. For this reason, the County Council's strategy is to deliver a place-based approach to delivery that responds to specific local needs and factors that seeks to benefit all users of the transport system rather than users of some modes and not others

Section 6: Integrated Sustainability Appraisal and Conclusion

Do you have any comments on the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal?

Considering the overall capital expenditure and annual maintenance and renewal costs of the proposals, we have concerns regarding the financial sustainability of proposals at this stage. We do however recognise that there are required design and feasibility analysis to confirm and prioritise projects which would need to be undertake as projects progress through their design project life-cycle.

Overall, to what extent do you agree that the SIP makes the best case possible for investing in transport infrastructure in the South East?

- ☐ Definitely agree

- ☑ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Definitely disagree
- ☐ I’m not sure