

# Participation Report- Potential Solutions South Coast Corridor Multi-Modal Study

Prepared for  
**Department of Transport, Local  
Government and the Regions**  
January 2002

## **Halcrow**

In association with:

Accent

Chris Blandford Associates

DTZ Pidea

Baxter Eadie Ltd

Sustainable Futures

Camargue – PR media Consultants

Transportation Research Group, University of  
Southampton

# Participation Report- Potential Solutions South Coast Corridor Multi-Modal Study

Prepared for  
**Department of Transport, Local  
Government and the Regions**  
January 2002

## **Halcrow**

In association with:

Accent

Chris Blandford Associates

DTZ Pidea

Baxter Eadie Ltd

Sustainable Futures

Camargue – PR media Consultants

Transportation Research Group, University of  
Southampton

### **Halcrow Group Limited**

Vineyard House 44 Brook Green London W6 7BY  
Tel +44 (0)20 7602 7282 Fax +44 (0)20 7603 0095  
[www.halcrow.com](http://www.halcrow.com)

Halcrow Group Limited has prepared this report in accordance with the instructions of their client, , for their sole and specific use. Any other persons who use any information contained herein do so at their own risk.

© Halcrow Group Limited 2003

**Halcrow Group Limited**  
Vineyard House 44 Brook Green London W6 7BY  
Tel +44 (0)20 7602 7282 Fax +44 (0)20 7603 0095  
[www.halcrow.com](http://www.halcrow.com)

# Contents

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>                              | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1      | <i>Background to the Report</i>                  | 1         |
| 1.2      | <i>Consultation</i>                              | 2         |
| 1.3      | <i>Contents</i>                                  | 3         |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Participation Process</b>                     | <b>4</b>  |
| 2.1      | <i>Introduction</i>                              | 4         |
| 2.2      | <i>Wider Reference Group</i>                     | 4         |
| 2.3      | <i>Stakeholder Participation Workshops</i>       | 6         |
| 2.4      | <i>Sub-regional and Cross-Corridor Workshops</i> | 7         |
| 2.5      | <i>Local Workshops- Methodology</i>              | 11        |
| 2.6      | <i>Other Meetings</i>                            | 14        |
| 2.7      | <i>Newsletter</i>                                | 15        |
| 2.8      | <i>Website</i>                                   | 17        |
| 2.9      | <i>Communications</i>                            | 18        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>The Key Findings</b>                          | <b>19</b> |
| 3.1      | <i>Introduction</i>                              | 19        |
| 3.2      | <i>Cross-Corridor and Sub-regional Workshop</i>  | 19        |
| 3.3      | <i>Summary: Areas of agreement</i>               | 26        |
| 3.4      | <i>Areas of disagreement</i>                     | 27        |
| 3.5      | <i>The Future:</i>                               | 27        |
| 3.6      | <i>Local Workshops</i>                           | 29        |
| 3.7      | <i>Newsletter Questionnaire Response</i>         | 38        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Conclusions</b>                               | <b>39</b> |
| 4.1      | <i>Summary</i>                                   | 39        |

## **Appendix A – Presentation for Problems and Issues**

## **Appendix B – Copy of Press Release**

## **Appendix C – Local Workshop Solutions**

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 *Background to the Report*

1.1.1 The multi-modal studies being undertaken on behalf of the Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions are seeking to investigate problems on all modes of transport, and to seek solutions to those problems. The Guidance on the Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies (GOMMMS) notes that a wide range of stakeholder groups need to be involved in the study process. A fundamental requirement of the methodology is that the study is fully inclusive.

1.1.2 The Halcrow Group led consortium have been appointed by the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) to undertake the South Coast Corridor Multi-Modal Study (SoCoMMS). This study forms one of the second tranche of multi-modal studies proposed by the transport White Paper, *'A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England'* (DETR, July 1998) and builds on the work already undertaken within the following studies:

- The M27 Integrated Transport Study
- The A27, Worthing – Lancing Integrated Transport Study
- The Access to Hastings Multi-Modal Study

1.1.3 The SoCoMMS study area covers a geographic corridor that runs along the south coast between Southampton and Thanet. It crosses the counties of Hampshire, West Sussex, East Sussex and Kent. The main transport corridor lies between the South Downs and the sea, widening out at the eastern end to cover alternative corridors, such as Canterbury or Dover. A wider geographic area of influence extends beyond the coastal corridor to cover areas northwards up to London, westwards to Bournemouth and Poole and southwards to the Isle of Wight.

1.1.4 To achieve inclusion in the SoCoMMS study, while still providing a programme that is achievable and cost effective, the consultation and participation strategy aims to ensure that

- local lay knowledge, expertise and professional experience can be harnessed for the benefit of the study;

- a wide cross-section of participants are involved, including those with key information and skills, those who have influence to get things done and those who will be affected by the outcomes; and
- those who do participate are able to have some influence over decisions that affect them and can therefore take ownership of both the problems and solutions.

1.1.5 Within the SoCoMMS study it was agreed with the Steering Group that there should be three key phases of participation. These are as follows:

- An initial phase to identify the problems and issues associated with transport within the study area.
- A second phase reporting back the problems and inviting suggestions for potential solutions / measures that might be adopted in the future.
- A third phase to present the ‘preliminary strategy’ which has evolved from the study process.

1.1.6 In addition, in order to keep the public and stakeholders informed of progress the study is backed up by an ongoing information process: through the distribution of newsletters and through the website.

1.1.7 This report summarises the second stage of consultation on potential solutions that stakeholders wish to see considered in the next phase of the study.

## 1.2 **Consultation**

1.2.1 In order to understand obtain views on potential solutions for the corridor, a range of participation / consultation initiatives have been undertaken. This second phase of consultation was held in October 2001 and included:

- Direct discussions between the consultant, GOSE, and the Steering Group;
- Correspondence with local authorities;

- A regional workshop that aimed to generate thinking about solutions across the whole corridor at a strategic level, and included invitations to the business community, transport operators, local authorities, statutory agencies and regionally based Non Government Organisations (NGOs);
- Sub-regional workshops designed to generate multi-modal transport solutions at a strategic, county and sub-regional level, again involving the business community, transport operators, local authorities and sub-regionally based NGOs;
- Locally based workshops designed to generate multi-modal transport solutions at local level; involving local chambers of commerce, parish and District Councils, local transport operators and locally based NGOs;
- A newsletter which contained a questionnaire on potential solutions was issued at key locations along the corridor and distributed to those who had responded to the previous newsletter; and
- An internet website ([www.socomms.org.uk](http://www.socomms.org.uk)) providing instant access to all newsletters, reports and steering group minutes, together with providing an opportunity for stakeholders to give inputs into the study process. The website also contained a copy of the questionnaire on potential solutions.

### 1.3

#### 1.3.1

#### ***Contents***

Following this introductory chapter, chapter 2 summarises each of the elements that have been undertaken. In chapter 3 there is an outline of the findings from each of the workshops. Fuller details of the methodology and the results are provided in a series of technical notes related to each activity. It is noted that there was a great deal of material generated during the course of the consultation and this report is aimed at providing a summary of this information.

## 2 Participation Process

### 2.1 *Introduction*

2.1.1 This chapter outlines the various methods of consultation and participation that have been adopted during this second phase. The aim was to generate a list of potential solutions that the study team could consider in developing a strategy for the corridor. In many areas, this consultation phase built on the work undertaken during phase 1 of the study. This identified the current problems and issues associated with transport in the area. In addition, the consultation phase also built on work already reported by local authorities as part of the development of their Local Transport Plans and in the previous multi-modal studies undertaken for GOSE (the Access to Hastings study, Worthing-Lancing Integrated Transport Study and the M27 Integrated Transport Study).

### 2.2 *Wider Reference Group*

2.2.1 The stakeholder based participatory strategy has been designed to combine regional and local lay knowledge with regional and local expert and professional knowledge so as to confirm, augment and add to the data yielded by other data collection and modelling activities.

2.2.2 The aim is to engage a diverse range of stakeholders, including not only those who can contribute key information and skills, but also those who have influence to get things done and those who will be affected by the outcomes of the study. By engaging stakeholders at the start of the study it is hoped that individuals will feel that they are able to have some influence over decisions that affect them and will therefore develop a degree of ownership of both the problems and solutions. A wide participation and consultation strategy also builds awareness of the range of problems and the possible solutions available.

2.2.3 Any participation approach must be capable of addressing national, regional and local issues. Stakeholders have therefore been drawn from the main government bodies, transport operators and a wide range of interest groups. Table 2.1 sets out all those who have been consulted as part of the wider reference group.

**Table 2.1: The Wider Reference Group**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <u>Local authorities</u>                                       | All local transport authorities (counties and unitaries) in the study area.   |
| <u>User groups</u>   | Freight Transport Association<br>Motorcycle Industry Association<br>Road Haulage Association<br>Rail Freight Group<br>AA<br>RAC<br>Rail Users Consultative Committee<br>Cyclist Touring Club<br>Sustrans<br>Pedestrian Association                                      |
| <u>Environmental organisations</u>                             | Environment Agency<br>Campaign for the Protection of Rural England<br>Countryside Agency<br>Transport 2000<br>English Nature<br>Friends of the Earth<br>English Heritage<br>National Trust (coastal areas)<br>The South Downs Consortium<br>SE Forum for Sustainability |
| <u>Public transport infrastructure providers and operators</u> | Railtrack<br>Port and airport operators in / adjacent to study area<br>Train Operating Companies (passenger)<br>English Welsh and Scottish Railways<br>Bus operators<br>National Express  |
| <u>Business groups</u>   | CBI<br>Chambers of Commerce<br>Federation of Small Businesses<br>Institute of Directors<br>Sub-regional partnerships  |
| <u>Health, social exclusion and accessibility groups</u>       | Department of Health<br>Disabled passenger groups<br>Health Promotion Units<br>NHS Trusts<br>Voluntary sector   |
| <u>Tourism</u>   | English Tourist Board   |

### 2.3

#### ***Stakeholder Participation Workshops***

#### 2.3.1

The main element of this participation phase was a programme designed to involve participants in a series of workshops spaced equally along the corridor at a number of locations and at a number of different spatial levels.

#### 2.3.2

The levels of workshop were as follows:

- A Corridor wide Workshop- that aimed to generate thinking and solutions across the whole corridor at a strategic level;
- Sub-regional level Workshops -designed to generate multi-modal transport solutions at a strategic, county and sub-regional level;
- Local Workshops- which aimed to generate multi-modal transport solutions at local level.

#### 2.3.3

In the second stage of consultation, workshops took place across the whole study area. This was in contrast to the first stage, where in areas such as Hastings, Portsmouth and Southampton, it was generally felt that in relation to identifying transport problems and issues, SoCoMMS should build on what had gone before, utilising the findings of the Access to Hastings study and the M27 Integrated Transport Study. However, in the second stage, it was considered to be valuable to engage local stakeholders in discussion on potential solutions in all areas.

#### 2.3.4

In response to this, the second phase of the participation process, in October 2001, was centred around:

- one cross-corridor stakeholder participation workshop;
- four sub-regional stakeholder participation workshops; and
- eight locally based stakeholder participation workshops.

#### 2.3.5

A cross section of stakeholders were invited to each of the workshops. The stakeholder groups are listed below:

- Local / statutory / regional authorities;

- Business;
- Environmental groups;
- Social, health and community groups and representatives;
- Transport operators; and
- Transport user groups.

2.3.6 Over 1700 invitations were sent out to representatives of the stakeholder groups with most invitations going to businesses and local authorities (including parish councils). The largest response to the workshops came from local authorities, environmental groups and transport users groups. The response to the invitation to the workshops is outlined in the following sections.

2.4 ***Sub-regional and Cross-Corridor Workshops***

2.4.1 The sub-regional workshops were held in Ashford, Eastbourne, Brighton and Southampton. In addition, a cross-corridor workshop was held in Crawley. A total of 881 people were invited to the sub-regional and cross-corridor workshops from the six stakeholder groups (see Table 2.2). Those invited were considered to have a county, sub-regional or regional and/or strategic remit.

**Table 2.2: Numbers invited to the workshops and percentage by stakeholder group**

| Stakeholder groups              | Numbers | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|---------|------------|
| Local and Statutory Authorities | 166     | 19%        |
| Business groups                 | 208     | 24%        |
| Social groups                   | 164     | 19%        |
| Environmental groups            | 119     | 14%        |
| Transport providers             | 138     | 16%        |
| Transport user groups           | 76      | 9%         |
| Not specified                   | 10      | 1%         |
| Total                           | 881     | 100%       |

2.4.2 142 participants attended the five workshops with participant numbers spread evenly between the workshops. Regional and Local Statutory Authorities had the

highest attendance rate, followed by representatives of Environmental stakeholder groups. The attendance by each group is shown below:

- Local and Statutory Authorities 28%
- Business Groups 12%
- Social Groups 9%
- Environmental groups 21%
- Transport providers 11%
- Transport User groups 17%
- Not specified 3%

#### 2.4.3

The overall aims of these sub-regional workshops were:

- To provide an opportunity for diverse stakeholders throughout the Study Corridor to generate a range of solutions in response to issues and problems identified in the Phase 1 consultation process; and
- To provide a productive forum which could generate a wide range of transport solutions taking account of different viewpoints and priorities.

#### 2.4.4

Specific stated aims of the sub-regional and cross regional workshops were:

- To facilitate dialogue between diverse stakeholders, building shared understanding, future capacity and social capital across the corridor;
- To enable interested and informed groups and stakeholders to contribute to the study and generate a range of possible solutions for the area both now and looking towards the future; and
- To do this within the context of the needs of transport users, local, regional and national transport policies and strategies and other economic and land use policies and strategies.

#### 2.4.5

The workshops were run over a full day and were divided into four sessions. In the first session, an overview of the results of the first phase of the South Coast Multi-Modal study was presented by the consultants, Halcrow, and the mornings agenda

was outlined by Sustainable Futures. A copy of the presentation, which outlines the problems and issues is given in Appendix A.

2.4.6 During the course of the day, participants were asked to complete tasks in three further sessions. The tasks were chosen to focus on questions that would help create a range of solutions and options looking to the future of the study area within a framework of principles agreed by all the workshops participants.

2.4.7 In the sub-regional workshops, the tasks focussed on:

- developing an agreed framework of principles for the Study, in order to guide the generation of proposed solutions;
- creating detailed pictures of a number of possible alternative futures for the Study corridor for the period 2016 – 2030, as a tool to understanding how the future might look and the implications of decisions taken now and in the short term future; and
- putting forward a range of transport solutions for both the short term future, up to 2016, and for the long term future, 2016 – 2030.

2.4.8 In the Cross-corridor workshop, questions focused on all of the above areas and, in addition, created some specific objectives for putting solutions into action.

2.4.9 In the session on principles, participants were asked to develop a wider framework of principles that could guide transport solutions and actions in the future. Participants were asked to look at the suggested preliminary list of principles, to comment on the list and suggest changes, additions and alternatives. The list presented in this session included:

- Promote regeneration
- Promote social inclusion
- Address issues of accessibility
- Protect the environment

- Promote the integration of planning policies with transport planning
- Promote the integration of transport policies and the integration of transport modes
- Reduce the need to travel
- Reduce car dependency
- Reduce road congestion
- Address issues of safety
- Participants were invited to add further principles if desired.

#### 2.4.10

The third session which was unique to the cross-corridor and sub-regional workshop, was to develop solutions within the framework of six different alternative future scenarios for the corridor. Participants chose from one of the six scenarios that they were given and were asked to examine them in more detail creating small groups to work on each scenario. Not all scenarios were worked on in each workshop. The six scenarios included:

- Business as Usual
- The Linear Development Corridor
- Urban Renaissance and Rural Regeneration
- Gateway to Europe
- The Stellar Development Pattern
- Sustainable Development

#### 2.4.11

This session included a series of steps that the groups were asked to follow. In the first step, participants were asked to brainstorm a more detailed picture of the alternative scenarios for the years 2016-2030. Each scenario could be pictured in more detail by thinking about the future under a number of suggested headings which would describe:

- The social and economic infrastructure
- The patterns of mobility
- The impact of technology
- The influence of land use planning
- Attitudes towards the environment
- The role of government.

2.4.12 In this second step participants were asked to put forward any short-term transport solutions that they felt should be implemented prior to 2016 and then describe the multi-modal solutions that should be put in place between 2016 – 2030.

2.4.13 The groups were then asked to present in the plenary session each of the scenarios and the range of solutions that had been proposed by the group. Each of the groups were asked questions by the other participants and time was given to plenary discussion in the fourth session. The workshop ended with a summing up from the consultants and an explanation of the next stages of the project.

## 2.5 ***Local Workshops- Methodology***

2.5.1 During the potential solution identification phase of the study, eight local workshops were held at the following points along the corridor:

- Margate in Kent;
- Dover in Kent;
- Hastings in East Sussex;
- Polegate in East Sussex;
- Chichester in West Sussex;
- Worthing in West Sussex;

- Fareham in Hampshire; and
- Winchester in Hampshire.

### 2.5.2

A total of 837 people were invited to the local workshops from the six stakeholder groups. Those invited were considered to have a county, sub-regional or regional and/or strategic remit. Table 2.3 shows the distribution of invitees by stakeholder group. 135 people attended the local workshops.

**Table 2.3: Numbers invited to the Local Workshops and percentage by stakeholder group**

| Stakeholder groups              | Numbers | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|---------|------------|
| Local and Statutory Authorities | 233     | 23%        |
| Business groups                 | 156     | 21%        |
| Social groups                   | 171     | 19%        |
| Environmental groups            | 120     | 14%        |
| Transport providers             | 83      | 13%        |
| Transport user groups           | 54      | 8%         |
| Not specified                   | 20      | 2%         |
| Total                           | 837     |            |

### 2.5.3

Across all the local workshops, Regional and Local Statutory Authorities had the highest attendance rate, followed by representatives of Environmental stakeholder groups. The attendance by each group is shown below:

- Local and Statutory Authorities 32%
- Business Groups 17%
- Social Groups 18%
- Environmental groups 21%
- Transport providers 10%
- Transport User groups 7%
- Not specified 4%

### 2.5.4

The overall aims of each of the local workshops were as those used for the sub-regional and cross corridor workshop and were as follows:

- To facilitate dialogue between diverse stakeholders, building shared understanding, future capacity and social capital across the corridor;
- To enable interested and informed groups and stakeholders to contribute to the study and generate a range of possible solutions for the area both now and looking towards the future; and
- To do this within the context of the needs of transport users, local, regional and national transport policies and strategies and other economic and land use policies and strategies.

2.5.5 The aims identified for participants during the course of the workshop included:

- To develop an agreed framework of principles for the Study to guide the generation of proposed solutions; and
- To put forward a range of transport solutions for both the short term future, up to 2016, and for the long term future, 2016 – 2030.

2.5.6 The workshops were run as an evening session and were divided into two sessions. In the first sessions, an overview of the results of the first phase of the South Coast Multi-Modal Study was presented by the consultants, Halcrow, and the evening's agenda was outlined by Sustainable Futures. A copy of the presentation is given in Appendix A: this is the same presentation that was used for the sub-regional workshops.

2.5.7 During the second part of the evening, participants were asked to complete two tasks. The first task was to develop a wider framework of principles that could guide transport solutions and actions in the future. Participants were asked to look at the suggested preliminary list of principles, to comment on the list of principles and suggest changes, additions and alternatives. The list of principles was the same as that provided in the sub-regional workshops and included:

- Promote regeneration
- Promote social inclusion
- Address issues of accessibility

- Protect the environment
- Promote the integration of planning policies with transport planning
- Promote the integration of transport policies and the integration of transport modes
- Reduce the need to travel
- Reduce car dependency
- Reduce road congestion
- Address issues of safety
- Participants were invited to add further principles if desired.

2.5.8

The second task involved participants working in groups to discuss and list potential schemes/policies that they consider appropriate for their local area and that they wished to see tested in the study. At the end of the session there was a reporting phase to the plenary where a spokesperson for each group reported on the discussions. The workshop ended with a summing up from the consultants and an explanation of the next stages of the project.

2.6

### ***Other Meetings***

2.6.1

In addition to the workshops, additional meetings and presentations were undertaken at this phase of the study. They built on some of the earlier discussions that had been held with organisations during the consultation on problems and issues in July, which have been reported in the Consultation Report. The meetings included:

- Presentations to local authority members;
- Meetings with local authority officers/ members;
- Presentations and/or meetings with other stakeholder groups.

2.6.2 The presentation that was typically used was the presentation which was developed for the workshops, see Appendix A. The meetings sought to identify views on potential solutions that could be examined in the next phase of the project.

2.6.3 The meetings held during this phase included:

- Southampton City Council – presentation to members
- East Sussex County Council
- Kent County Council
- Hastings Borough Council
- South East Forum for Sustainability
- Wealden District Council
- Wider View Group
- Shoreham Airport
- Sussex Enterprise
- Railtrack
- Strategic Rail Authority
- Highways Agency

2.7 ***Newsletter***

2.7.1 To stimulate public interest in the study process, a newsletter was designed to provide feedback at this stage of the study. The leaflet was designed as a colour A4 leaflet with the aim of serving the following functions:

- Firstly, it set out the problems and issues that were identified for each mode from the first phase of consultation.

- Secondly, it sought to obtain views on the way forward by asking respondents to rank the order of priority of a range of interventions.

### 2.7.2

The newsletter provided the findings from the first consultation phase. Separate pages were included for each mode, which highlighted general and specific local issues. The sections outlined feedback on what was working well and where there were problems in relation to:

- cars and motorcycles;
- trains;
- buses;
- walking and cycling;
- and other transport issues- including integration, accessibility, ports and airports.

### 2.7.3

The questionnaire provided the reader with a list of alternative approaches, which could be adopted to tackle road problems in the future. They were asked to rank these in order of priority. The approaches included:

- Provide and promote additional and improved walking, cycling, and public transport opportunities;
- Make the best use of the existing road system;
- Change development plans so that less travel is generated;
- Increase travel costs by road (e.g. increased parking charges);
- Give priority for public transport and freight movement;
- Improve the integration of transport modes;
- Change lifestyles and work patterns to reduce the need for travel; and
- Provide additional road infrastructure.

- 2.7.4 A section was provided on the questionnaire, for respondents to provide comments on specific improvements to the transport network that they thought would be needed.
- 2.7.5 Additional information was also requested regarding age, gender, home postcode, and the frequency of use of public transport. Respondents were also invited to provide address, fax or email details if they wished to receive later newsletters during the course of the study.
- 2.7.6 The newsletter was distributed through a range of outlets, including those listed below:
- Railway stations in the corridor;
  - Bus stations;
  - Travel enquiry offices;
  - Local authorities;
  - Environmental groups;
  - Local businesses; and
  - The Highways Agency.
- 2.7.7 A copy of the newsletter was distributed to all invitees of the workshops. In total, 40,000 newsletters were distributed to the supply agents for circulation.
- 2.8 **Website**
- 2.8.1 A dedicated website was established for the study. The domain name ‘www.socomms.org.uk’ was registered. The website includes a number of pages covering
- a background to the study;
  - the study team;

- key events during the study;
- press releases;
- reports which could be downloaded;
- links to other sites; and
- the survey questionnaire.

2.8.2 A copy of the second newsletter was added to the website. The questionnaire was similar to that used in conjunction with the newsletter, with the addition of further issues related to walking and cycling. An email address was provided for people to write to the study team.

## 2.9 ***Communications***

2.9.1 A communications strategy has been developed for the study. This seeks to provide, throughout the study, up-to-date and relevant information for dissemination to the general public through two main communications target groups; the media and key opinion formers.

2.9.2 A press release was prepared and issued to all newspapers in the study area. This release was also available on the website and outlined some of the key findings from the first consultation phase. A copy of the press release is given in Appendix B.

## 3 The Key Findings

### 3.1 *Introduction*

3.1.1 This chapter provides a summary of findings amassed during the participation phase. It should be stressed that a vast wealth of information was collected during this phase. Much of this is collated in the background papers. This chapter can only provide a summary of the data that was obtained.

### 3.2 *Cross-Corridor and Sub-regional Workshop*

3.2.1 The views expressed in the workshops reflected the attendance lists and related geographical concerns. Participants put forward a wealth of ideas and proposals for solutions, which were all recorded, in the workshops. A full transcript of the workshops is given in a separate technical note. This summary highlights the framework of principles agreed in Session 1 of the workshop and summaries of the scenarios and solutions put forward in the workshops, however it is not a comprehensive analysis of all the proposed solutions.

3.2.2 The first session examined the statements of principle about which the strategy should be defined. At each workshop there was considerable debate on these issues, therefore an amended framework of principles was identified as shown in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1: Comparison of the original and amended framework of principles framework**

| <b>Original framework of principles</b>                              | <b>Amended framework of principles</b>   |
|--|--|
| Promote regeneration   | Promote regeneration   |
| Reduce social exclusion  | Promote social inclusion   |
| Address deprivation and accessibility                                | Address issues of accessibility  |
| Protect the environment  | Protect and enhance the environment  |
| Promote the integration of land use planning with transport planning | Promote the integration of planning policies with transport planning e.g. on housing, employment, education and health |
|  | Promote the integration of transport policies and the integration of transport modes                                   |
| Reduce the need to travel  | Reduce the need to travel  |
| Reduce car dependency  | Reduce car dependency  |
| Reduce road congestion   | Reduce road congestion   |
|  | Address issues of safety   |

3.2.3

**Session 1: Step 1: Developing alternative scenarios** - Table 3.2 below gives a summary of the main themes developed and described for each of the scenarios. Following the development of the scenarios, each group presented their main themes and ideas to the plenary. Each group was then questioned and challenged on their proposals by the other participants. This gave the opportunity for discussion of the very different ideas and proposals put forward – for instance, the Linear Development Scenario had a very different emphasis to the Stellar Development Scenario and allowed differences to be aired.

| <b>Table 3.2: Summary of descriptions of alternative future scenarios</b>   |
|---|
| <p><b>Business as Usual scenario</b></p> <p><b>Key Features</b><br/>           Existing pattern of settlements - no new towns and suburbs<br/>           Emphasis on brown field sites for development<br/>           Encouraging local industry<br/>           Focus on development at key nodes such as Brighton, Ashford and Southampton</p> <p><b>Transport Implications</b><br/>           Improved road and rail but keep existing pattern<br/>           Improved links to London</p>  |
| <p><b>Linear Development Corridor</b></p> <p><b>Key Features</b><br/>           Beads on a string of development and regeneration – high quality urban areas/bands<br/>           Open country side in between with easy access to urban areas<br/>           Concentrate on integrated multi-modal nodes/hubs</p> <p><b>Transport Implications</b><br/>           Strong East-West orientation – rail/road<br/>           South Coast Strategic Transport Authority<br/>           Fast interurban travel<br/>           New link Ashford through to Crawley/Gatwick</p> |
| <p><b>Urban Renaissance and Rural Regeneration</b></p> <p><b>Key Features</b><br/>           Development around transport infrastructure<br/>           Diverse investment and local economies<br/>           Mixed developments/facilities – housing/schools/ work – local access<br/>           Sustainable communities &amp; localised services</p> <p><b>Transport Implications</b><br/>           Local focus<br/>           Links from rural to urban areas<br/>           Solutions address conflict between environment and increased accessibility</p>           |

| <b>Table 3.2: Summary of descriptions of alternative future scenarios</b>  |
|--|
| <p><b>Gateway to Europe</b></p> <p><b>Key Features</b><br/> Focus on international hubs<br/> Increased integration with Europe<br/> Central and regional governments to set agenda for links with Europe and development of the S.E.<br/> Access to communications/information<br/> S.E. university as centres with links to Europe<br/> Environment as key economic driver - tourism</p> <p><b>Transport Implications</b><br/> Priority Links to international hubs<br/> Port/airport transport links<br/> Urban mass transit systems</p> |
| <p><b>Stellar Development</b></p> <p><b>Key Features</b><br/> Centred on London, therefore reduces need to further develop regional centres<br/> Reduces need for east – west travel<br/> Takes pressure off further road schemes, therefore protects the environment (South Downs National Park)</p> <p><b>Transport Implications</b><br/> Improved links to London – N/S infrastructure and access to N/S links<br/> CTRL to S and N London</p>  |
| <p><b>Sustainable Development</b></p> <p><b>Key Features</b><br/> Re –evaluation of economic priorities<br/> Urban renewal based on Home Zones/mixed use/local emphasis<br/> Use of brown field sites, sustainable developments<br/> Environmental audits of projects</p> <p><b>Transport Implications</b><br/> Local focus<br/> Equality in mobility/access for all<br/> Improved public transport/phase out dependency on car<br/> Better provision walking and cycling<br/> ‘Cleaner’ vehicles</p>                                      |

- 3.2.4 Since the different scenarios had differing patterns of infrastructure and development, proposals under the headings listed below did not show consensus. The Stellar Development pattern scenario described travel patterns, which orientated towards London as the main employment centre, with improved rail infrastructure and efficiency of commuting. The benefits of this scenario were seen to be the ability to concentrate resources on improving existing infrastructure on the North – South axis, rather than having to create new infrastructure along an East - West axis, with the risk of damaging environmentally sensitive areas.
  
- 3.2.5 The Linear Development scenario described how the economic benefits of having a connected band of developing and thriving towns along the South Coast, would mean less need to commute away from the area.
  
- 3.2.6 The Sustainable Development scenarios put forward suggestions for balancing more closely the number of jobs to the number of people in an area and developing local businesses so that there was less need to travel in the first place.
  
- 3.2.7 Despite these differences, many of the themes that emerged from the scenarios, were common to the different groups across the workshops. Those scenario descriptions/solutions seen as having the most support across the workshops are highlighted in bold type in Table 3.3 below.

| <b>Table 3.3</b>                       |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Scenario headings</b>               | <b>Proposed solutions/common themes</b>   |
| The social and economic infrastructure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The influence and future role of Europe was recognised and comparisons made with the infrastructure in Europe.</li> <li>- <b>The environment seen as an economic asset by attracting tourism.</b></li> <li>- <b>Tourism a key issue for the area</b></li> <li>- <b>Encouragement of diversity and importance of local businesses, economies &amp; services.</b></li> <li>- Ashford: business clusters – similar economic activity clustered together</li> <li>- local economies/communities (Eastbourne)</li> <li>- Quality of life as over-riding principle (Eastbourne)</li> <li>- Access to housing, work, leisure (Crawley)</li> </ul> |
| Patterns of mobility                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>The necessity of reducing the use of the private car.</b></li> <li>- <b>Emphasis on equality in access to transport and mobility</b></li> <li>- The need to balance people and jobs in an area, and therefore reduce commuting in some scenarios versus</li> <li>- Increased efficiency of commuting into London as the main job centre in others, therefore less need for new urban</li> </ul>   |

| <b>Table 3.3</b>                  |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Scenario headings</b>          | <b>Proposed solutions/common themes</b>   |
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>interlinking roads.</li> <li>- <b>7 days a week mobility by public transport needed.</b></li> <li>- Better provision for walking, cycling and riding.</li> <li>- Importance of international links and hubs, including airports (Kent)</li> <li>- Importance of car to rural dwellers (Eastbourne)</li> <li>- Greater mobility between South Coast towns, but no full corridor solution (Brighton)</li> </ul>  |
| The Impact of technology          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Use of the energy efficient and cleaner car technology/alternative fuels that exist and are becoming more available.</b> Increased use of ICT for improving/encouraging home working/teleworking &amp; less travel, less frequent travel but could be more local and long distance travel.</li> </ul>   |
| Influence of land use planning    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development focused on key urban nodes, such as Brighton, Ashford and Southampton.</li> <li>- <b>Emphasis across scenarios on using brown field sites for new development.</b></li> <li>- <b>Development to be located around existing transport infrastructure/nodes</b></li> <li>- Planning for the long term ( Eastbourne) Implications of National Park status on planning use (S'hampton) Need for thorough review of land use constraints (S'hampton)</li> </ul>   |
| Attitudes towards the environment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The environment was seen as an economic and social benefit to the area, needing to be protected, as attracted tourists – green tourism.</li> <li>- Proposals for tourism without traffic – solutions to problems of increased tourist traffic</li> <li>- New projects needed to have environmental audits.</li> <li>- Increase conservation of, appreciation of, town architecture in Sussex and East Kent coastal towns and strive to improve 'a sense of place' (Eastbourne)</li> </ul>  |
| The role of government            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Central and regional governments to set agenda for links to Europe and development of the South-East.</li> <li>- Proposal for a South Coast Strategic Transport Authority</li> <li>- Solutions need to be linked in to regional, local and parish transport plans</li> <li>- Needs to separate transport as long term with long-term funding and stronger regional government role (S'hampton)</li> <li>- More effective Local Transport plans (Eastbourne)</li> <li>- Sustained investment in public transport over 30 years</li> </ul> |

**Sessions 2: Step 2: Transport solutions** - In this second step participants were asked to put forward any short term transport solutions that they felt should be implemented prior to 2016 and then describe the multi-modal solutions that should be put in place between 2016 –2030. Table 3.4 outlines the suggested solutions.

**Table 3.4 Session 1 Step 2 Transport solutions**

| <b>Solutions</b>                       | <b>Specific Proposals/Quotes</b>  |
|--|---|
| Integration                            | Combined bus and rail stations at Ashford.<br>Coordination of bus and rail timetables (Ashford )<br>Integrated ticketing (Eastbourne)   |
| Reduce the need to travel              | Working locally and from home. Internet shop from home (Ashford)  |
| Regional/corridor developments         | Greater mobility between South Coast towns. Importance of connections to London. Invest in South Coast for it's own sake. No full corridor solution (Brighton).<br>Concentrate infrastructure N-S London to Brighton and then W and E. (Eastbourne)<br>High quality links between towns but with capacity constraints (Eastbourne)  |
| Transport to school                    | Provide safe routes to school. Develop green school travel plans.   |
| Regeneration                           | Need to invest to continue high growth economy leading to regeneration (S'hampton)  |
| Subsidising public transport           | Capital investment and short/medium term subsidies in public transport (S'hampton)  |
| Reduce car movement                    | Reducing car movements in towns first, then interurban (Eastbourne)<br>Car sharing  |
| Alternative public transport solutions | Expand light rail/tram/mono-rail/rapid transit systems and networks<br>Urban mass transit systems – Crawley, Portsmouth, Brighton, Southampton<br>Better use of water transport – high speed ferries (S'hampton)<br>Use of short journeys by sea (Ashford)  |
| Specific rail based solutions          | Rail link to West Port, Dover. Double and electrify Rye line (Ashford)<br>Electrification Ashford – Hastings – Uckfield line. N/S rail links (Eastbourne)<br>North-South modernisation. Shoreham Port link. Interurban tramway. (Brighton)<br>Upgrade Portsmouth to Waterloo line (S'hampton)<br>Parkways as transport hubs (Brighton)<br>Double tracks where not existing (Eastbourne) |

| <b>Solutions</b>                        | <b>Specific Proposals/Quotes</b>  |
|---|---|
|   | Upgrade coastal railway (Crawley)   |
| IITC based solutions                    | Internet shopping. Increase/tax incentives for video conferencing/ connections to work from home  |
| Cycling, walking and bridleways         | Quadruple cycle lanes by 2012 Cycle links to stations. Pedestrians have first priority, followed by cyclists (Eastbourne)<br>Bridleway link needed between Eastbourne and Folkestone  |
| Freight                                 | Improve rail infrastructure for freight. Transfer of freight from road to rail – more difficult for short journeys  |
| Investing in public transport solutions | Universal system of bus lanes and bus routes (Ashford) Local infrastructure – stations/buses, Brighton station (Eastbourne)<br>Sustained investment in public transport over 30 years (Crawley)<br>High quality public transport for short journeys (S'hampton)   |
| Development                             | Ashford expansion.<br>Development of Lydd and Manston airports(Ashford)<br>Need to invest to continue high growth economy leading to regeneration (Brighton)  |
| Business                                | Business clusters as economic centres linked with good transport infrastructure (Ashford)<br>Tourism is a key issue for the area. Car essential to rural business at present (Eastbourne)<br>Business parks/zones with good links to London (S'hampton)   |
| Development of air transport            | Connections to Manston and Lydd airports (Ashford)<br>Enhanced S.E. airports (S'hampton)<br>Carbon tax (Eastbourne)   |
| Road based solutions                    | Link roads from B roads to M and A roads, South Coast Expressway (Ashford)<br>A27 level crossings and roundabouts (Eastbourne).<br>A27, Arundel bypass and Worthing, A23 Warninglid/Handcross.<br>20mph zones (Brighton).<br>Maintain existing infrastructure with local improvements (Crawley)<br>Rye Harbour A259 interchange (Ashford) |
| Demand management                       | Traffic control, toll roads, better use of existing roads (S'hampton)<br>Shift in cultural outlook re work hours to reduce peak time loadings (S'hampton)   |
| Policy initiatives                      | Adoption of 'Tourism without traffic' policy (Eastbourne)<br>More effective Local Transport plans (Brighton)  |
| Safety                                  | Quiet lanes (Eastbourne)<br>Rural and minor roads to be made safer<br>Enforce/amend law on speeding, parking on pavements (Ashford)   |
| Park and Ride                           | Ashford, Canterbury, Dover, Folkestone  |
| Consultation                            | More possibility of workshops and feedback (Ashford)<br>Keep listening to people's views  |

### 3.3 **Summary: Areas of agreement**

3.3.1 Throughout the workshops there were areas of agreement, these are summarised in the following paragraphs.

#### **Public Transport**

3.3.2 A raft of specific solutions that reduced road use and made public transport more attractive were proposed.

- Integrated public transport systems – walking, cycling, rail, bus, light transit, trams, park and ride, air, sea – ticketing, information
- Improved public facilities and access 24/7 – investment in infrastructure, through ticketing, stations, key nodes, lighting, bike facilities, safety
- Land use planning integration – use of brown field sites before green field sites
- Emphasis on buses and bus lanes – especially in and around cities/towns
- Capital investment and short/medium term subsidies in public transport
- Fully accessible rail and bus systems, especially for disabled, elderly, and parents with young children
- Focus on cost, convenience and service provision

#### **Non-motorised modes**

3.3.3 There was considerable support for solutions that would improve travel for cyclists, walkers and horse riders

- Safe segregated cycle and walking routes – safe routes to school
- Pedestrianisation – expanded in towns, rural roads for walkers, cyclists, horses
- Walking and cycling provision and infrastructure improvements

#### **Integration**

3.3.4 A core theme that emerged throughout the five workshops.

- The Framework of principles more specifically defined different areas of integration that were required
- To promote integration of planning policies with transport planning, particularly for the juxtaposition or easy transport access between housing and employment

- To promote the integration of transport policies and the integration of transport modes and
- Strategic- Regional/national Transport Association – long term planning, not changing with each government – regional transport responsibility

### **Environmental**

3.3.5 At most of the workshops there was agreement that the environment of the South Coast and the South Downs were assets, not least for the tourist industry and therefore needed to be protected, while remaining accessible for those who lived there as well as those who wish to visit.

3.3.6 There was considerable support for:

- Extending enforcement of road penalties, speed limits
- Taxing/charging – many suggestions – main theme to use revenue from taxes, penalties, road charging etc to fund public transport

3.3.7 Penalties - A number of proposals were well supported.

- Reducing amount of car parking and increasing costs
- Congestion charging in main cities and towns – needs to be across cities/towns along South Coast to avoid competitive advantage
- Road pricing and carbon tax raises funds for public transport
- Additional fuel/licence tax hypothecated to public transport

### 3.4 ***Areas of disagreement***

3.4.1 A few differences of opinion occurred at these workshops, these related to:

- Solutions that focused on planned business hubs with business centres focusing on similar trade or business and being able to transfer resources (Kent) was a very different solution to the integration of housing and work, suggested by those who see integration of planning as the way to reduce traffic.
- Differences between differing scenarios and how to achieve the scenarios and provide a more efficient transport system.

### 3.5 ***The Future:***

3.5.1 Proposed ways forward included:

- Greater use to be made of the train, bus, walking and cycling
- Changes to land use patterns/policy and integrated development – new development to be planned and sited near existing (and improved) transport infrastructure.
- Housing and work planned to be within easy distance from each other and accessible by public transport
- Economic activity clusters – for ease of sharing resources and transferable job skills
- Change in our overall attitude to travel through education
- Investment in public transport capacity and infrastructure over 30 years
- Specific road solutions, at least to ease congestion now and in the short term

### 3.5.2

At the workshops, the groups put forward future choices that had to be made and suggested how these would need to be balanced. Points that were made include:

- Balance between economic prosperity/development and environment – limited land on coastal area for housing and transport infrastructure
- Balance between increased accessibility and need to fulfil that demand through transport infrastructure
- Costs and how to raise revenue for funding transport infrastructure
- Difficulty in changing attitudes to travelling by car and attracting people onto public transport
- Conflicts of access and infrastructure with environmental constraints

### 3.5.3

Solutions were put forward for funding for the improvement of public transport, including a range of incentives for people to change their travel patterns. Incentives were also suggested as a way of promoting reduced use of the private car. These included:

- Tax incentives to help people work from home/video conferencing
- Appropriate and accessible structure of public transport fares
- Promotion of all types of green travel plans for work and school
- Fiscal encouragement to use public transport rather than cars

### 3.5.4

Alternatively penalties were also suggested as a means to get people to take public transport or walk/cycle rather than take the car.

### 3.5.5

The workshops provided opportunities for participants to explore future options, hear other people's points of view and openly agree or disagree with others. At the

same time, they promoted dialogue and a forum for exploring the options for the future. Participants have an investment in how the proposed solutions will be integrated into a strategic plan for the South Coast and could provide a knowledgeable forum for promoting the delivery of the strategy in the future.

3.6

***Local Workshops***

3.6.1

The eight local workshops generated a considerable volume of material. A separate technical note provides a complete documentation of the discussions/reporting back from the group sessions for each of the phases. This section provides a summary of the issues covered.

3.6.2

Table 3.5 provides the key points that were raised in feedback from groups on how the proposed guiding principles that were put forward need to be applied to meet the needs, aspirations and priorities of local people. For some of the principles there was agreement, for others there were a diverse range of responses. The key themes identified are listed in the table. The discussion also generated additional principles for consideration by the study.

**Table 3.5: How do these principles need to be applied to meet the needs, aspirations and priorities of local people?**

| Principle            | Issue   |
|----------------------|---|
| Promote Regeneration | <p>Does regeneration mean economic growth?</p> <p>Need to promote urban and rural regeneration and promote the economic success of the corridor</p> <p>Is there a link between transport and regeneration?</p> <p>Promote local businesses – so to encourage less need to travel large distances to work</p> <p>Need for training</p> <p>Free/safe/clean/frequent bus services from train stations to town centres</p> <p>Tourism is important for the South Coast</p> <p>Revitalise town centres</p> <p>Reduce unemployment and stimulate new employment</p> <p>Improving the accessibility of services</p> <p>Improving the visual quality of areas (e.g. less rubbish, clean</p> |

| Principle                       | Issue  |
|---------------------------------|--|
|                                 | <p>up buildings)</p> <p>Revitalise town centres</p>  |
| Reduce Social Exclusion         | <p>We need to understand the changing needs of people</p> <p>Need to provide “co-ordinated” public transport</p> <p>Need to encourage a range of initiatives (e.g. Community Buses.)</p> <p>Walking and cycling facilities on rural roads, low cost fares (students, concessions)</p>  |
| Address Issues of Accessibility | <p>Better Public Transport/cycling/walking</p> <p>More information – timetables etc</p> <p>Better facilities for disabled.</p> <p>Better public transport more information about bus &amp; train services</p> <p>Better disabled facilities and access on public transport</p>   |
| Protect the Environment         | <p>Creating a balance between economic prosperity and the environment</p> <p>Reduce need to travel – work from home? Doesn’t always work – no social contact</p> <p>Revise planning laws work, school, health centres, housing closer together</p> <p>Stricter control of exhausts and on pollution</p> <p>Look at alternative sources and power (solar) battery cars</p> <p>Change attitudes to fuel use – particularly in larger companies</p> <p>More awareness of environmental issues</p> <p>More use of brown field sites</p> <p>Provide good public transport - cars</p> <p>Seek to enhance the environment as well as protecting the beauty of the countryside</p> |
| Integration                     | <p>Integrate cycles with trains, rail companies to provide space</p> <p>Improve pedestrian and cycling facilities</p> <p>Integration of all planning policies with transport</p> <p>Planners more flexibility</p>  |

| Principle                 | Issue   |
|---------------------------|---|
|                           | <p>Some argued for more planning controls to stop Greenfield sites being used, others argued for less planning controls, more common sense and less interference in planning issues</p> <p>More “mixed” smaller communities work, school, etc. in one locality planned like this in the first place</p> <p>Need to be “environmentally acceptable” to encourage people to live there</p> <p>More ‘mixed’ communities</p> <p>Linking transport with affordable housing – sustaining village life</p> <p>Promote brown field sites</p> <p>Bring out-of-town sites to town centres</p> |
| Reduce the need to travel | <p>Restrict use of cars to specific days by “Permits”</p> <p>Improve public transport etc</p> <p>Better community planning</p> <p>More “Home Working”</p> <p>Reduce the need to travel in unsustainable ways</p> <p>Reduce the need to travel, particularly by car</p> <p>Reduce car ownership &amp; prioritising ‘sensible’ car use - Linked to promoting the benefits of alternatives to the car.</p> <p>Decrease the necessity to own a car</p> <p>Understanding the impact of the expectations to travel.</p>   |
| Reduce car dependency     | <p>Road traffic reduction</p> <p>Reduce congestion at peak hours (business, schools etc) e.g. road pricing (access to urban areas)</p> <p>Provide better alternatives</p>   |
| Reduce road congestion    | <p>Should this be included?</p> <p>A proper strategic road network is essential</p>   |
| Address safety issues     | <p>Safety - for all users including personal safety</p> <p>Imaginative use of footpath setting and links and cycle way –separate from roads</p>   |

- 3.6.3* At each of the workshops common themes were identified. The range of potential solutions that were presented to the consultants for consideration are outlined in Table 3.6 and Table 3.7
- 3.6.4* Examples of the solutions that were put forward are given in Appendix C.

**Table 3 6 Session 1 Transport solutions which meet the needs, aspirations & priorities of local people**

| <b>Solutions</b>                        | <b>Margate</b> | <b>Dover</b> | <b>Hastings</b> | <b>Polegate</b> | <b>Worthing</b> | <b>Chichester</b> | <b>Fareham</b> | <b>Winchester</b> | <b>Quotes</b>   |
|---|----------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| Winning ‘Hearts & Minds’                | x              |              | x               | x               | x               |                   | x              |                   | <i>Parents are taking their kids to school by car – (this needs to be ) discourage – encourage alternatives (Hastings)</i><br><i>More awareness of environmental issues (Margate)</i> |
| Investing in public transport solutions | x              |              |                 | x               |                 | x                 | x              | x                 | <i>General upgrade &amp; investment in bus and train network - cleaner, safer, faster promote discounts, comfortable, reliable, and frequent ( Hastings)</i>                          |
| Information and public awareness        | x              |              | x               |                 | x               |                   |                |                   | <i>To reduce need for travel, ask people to ‘think before they travel’ – is journey really necessary ( Polegate)</i>  |
| Subsidising public transport            | x              |              | x               |                 |                 | x                 |                | x                 | <i>Subsidise train fares ( Chichester)</i><br><i>Subsidise:- more affordable public transport ( Margate)</i>  |
| Alternative solutions                   | x              |              | x               | x               | x               | x                 | x              | x                 | <i>Smaller, slower cars – less polluting, safer, - fewer &amp; less severe accidents ( Polegate)</i><br><i>Establish a Integrated Transport Authority ( Winchester)</i>               |
| Rail based solutions                    |                | x            | x               | x               |                 | x                 | x              | x                 | <i>Improve rail network and quality of rolling stock provide facilities for bicycles on trains, at stations and through ticketing ( Chichester)</i>                                   |
| ITC based solutions                     | x              |              | x               |                 |                 |                   | x              |                   | <i>You don’t know when the bus is coming if late/ cancelled – electronic information would help (Hastings)</i><br><i>Maximise use of IT/ advances in technology (Worthing)</i>        |

| Solutions                    | Margate | Dover | Hastings | Polegate | Worthing | Chichester | Fareham | Winchester | Quotes   |
|------------------------------|---------|-------|----------|----------|----------|------------|---------|------------|--|
| Cycling and walking          | x       | x     | x        | x        |          | x          |         | x          | <i>Cycling is cheap – socially inclusive, enables people on low incomes to be mobile, reach jobs, services (Polegate)</i>  |
| Sustainability and long term |         |       |          | x        | x        | x          |         |            | <i>Need to change aspirations/ ethos towards sustainability (Worthing)</i>   |
| Land use planning            | x       |       |          | x        |          | x          | x       |            | <i>More 'mixed' communities – work, school, etc. in one locality planned like this in the first place (Margate)</i>  |
| Park & ride                  |         |       | x        |          |          | x          |         |            | <i>Park &amp; ride controversial. Off-putting to visitors. Better if used by commuters. (Chichester)</i>   |
| Social need                  |         |       |          | x        |          |            | x       |            | <i>Design transport solutions around local needs ( Polegate)</i>   |
| Road based solutions         |         |       |          |          |          | x          |         |            | <i>Improve Chichester by pass and build Arundel by pass to reduce local congestion. (Chichester)</i>   |
| Policy initiatives           |         |       | x        |          | x        | x          |         |            | <i>Simultaneous delivery of as many policy objectives as possible (Hastings)</i>   |
| Affordability                | x       |       | x        | x        | x        |            |         |            | <i>Any solution to be affordable to ordinary people (Hastings)<br/>more affordable public transport ( Margate)</i>   |
| Integration                  |         |       |          |          | x        | x          |         |            | <i>Seamless transport is very important (Worthing)<br/>Improved coordination of public transport modes (Chichester)</i>  |
| The role of government       |         |       |          | x        |          | x          |         |            | <i>Role of Parish &amp; Town, District &amp; County councils is important. (Chichester)<br/>Awareness of political Influences resolved through - Community Planning (Polegate)</i> |

**TABLE 3.7 Session 2 Generating local solutions Theme Summary Table**

| <b>Location</b>          | <b>Solutions</b>   | <b>Theme</b>  |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| Margate                  | Solutions which address the needs of young people<br>Accessibility<br>Protecting the environment   | Social inclusion<br>Access<br>Environment   |
| Dover                    | Reduce car dependency and road congestion.<br>Local problem – economic depression & lack of affordable public transport<br>Road Based Issues<br>Sea and Dover Docks issues<br>Transport related planning issues  | Car dependency & road congestion<br>Public transport<br>Road based solutions<br>Sea and Docks issues<br>Integration   |
| Hastings                 | Upgrade and invest in public transport<br>Integrated & more attractive<br>Attractive public transport<br>Integrate land use planning<br>Slow Cities - Sustainable transport/locality<br>Light rail<br>Reverse decline in public transport<br>“String of Pearls” stations<br>Affordable ‘cheap’ targeted public transport | Public transport<br>Public transport<br>Public transport<br>Land use planning<br>Sustainable approaches<br>Public transport<br>Public transport<br>Public transport<br>Public transport |
| Polegate /<br>Willingdon | Designing transport solutions around local needs.<br>Transport services not a business.  | Meeting local needs<br>Meeting local needs  |

| Location   | Solutions  | Theme  |
|------------|--|--|
|            | <p>No new developments without cycling infrastructure</p> <p>Modernising bus services/travel plans</p> <p>Providing a flexible alternatives to the private car</p> <p>Long term planning at a high level public education</p> <p>Co-ordinated timetable between bus and rail</p> <p>Timetabled taxis service</p>   | <p>Land use planning</p> <p>Integration</p> <p>“Hearts and minds”</p> <p>“Hearts and minds”</p> <p>Public transport</p> <p>Public transport</p>                                      |
| Worthing   | <p>Smaller scale: vehicles (transport)</p> <p>Activity/freight deliveries</p> <p>Change aspirations to more sustainable transport (education hearts &amp; minds)</p> <p>Treat all modes equally – seamless; integration</p> <p>Improve Sustainable public transport solutions</p> <p>Holistic use of IT in transport solutions</p>   | <p>Sustainable approaches</p> <p>“Hearts and minds”</p> <p>Integration</p> <p>Sustainable approaches</p> <p>Information &amp; Communication technology</p>                           |
| Chichester | <p>All Councils need to work together</p> <p>Radically reduce long term parking slots in county towns.</p> <p>Investment Issues - Continuous funding</p> <p>Road (urban) pricing</p> <p>Separating strategic from local flow-rail &amp; roads.</p> <p>Putting employment where people are</p> <p>Arundel bypass congestion</p> <p>Chichester Access - roundabouts.</p> <p>Integrating planning policies</p> <p>Reduce the need to bring cars into the City</p> | <p>Partnership working</p> <p>Congestion</p> <p>Investment</p> <p>Road pricing</p> <p>Land use planning</p> <p>Congestion</p> <p>Congestion</p> <p>Integration</p> <p>Congestion</p> |

| Location   | Solutions   | Theme   |
|------------|---|---|
| Fareham    | <p>High frequency mass transit system – no car based feeder/interchanges.</p> <p>Reduce need to travel by: high-tech housing and integrating housing work etc.</p> <p>Co-location &amp; integration. Put shops, work &amp; leisure where transport is.</p> <p>Education &amp; information / Life long education about issues - more info about choices &amp; potentials.</p> <p>Public Transport – Regulation &amp; enforcement</p> <p>Public Transport - Quality product</p> | <p>Public transport</p> <p>Integration &amp; land use planning</p> <p>Integration &amp; land use planning</p> <p>“Hearts and minds”</p> <p>Public transport</p> <p>Public transport</p> |
| Winchester | <p>Cheap alternatives</p> <p>Priority given to the alternatives</p> <p>The need for an Integrated Transport Authority</p> <p>Aspiration Implication Manager</p> <p>Making alternative options attractive</p> <p>Local Solutions</p>   | <p>Integrated Transport Authority</p> <p>“Hearts and minds”</p> <p>Quality services and information</p> <p>Quality services and information</p>   |

### 3.7

#### ***Newsletter Questionnaire Response***

#### 3.7.1

There were a total of 1307 responses to the newsletter. It should be noted that the sample is self-selecting and therefore caution is advised in interpreting the results.

#### 3.7.2

Respondents were asked to rank a number of different approaches in relation to their importance. Each approach has been given an overall average score, the approaches were then ranked in relation to their score. The ranking is as follows:

- 1 Provide and promote additional and improved walking, cycling and public transport opportunities
- 2 Improve the integration of transport modes
- 3 Give priority for public transport and freight movement
- 4 Change development plans so that less travel is generated
- 5 Make the best use of the existing road system
- 6 Change lifestyles and work patterns to reduce the need to travel
- 7 Increase travel costs by road (e.g. increased parking charges)
- 8 Provide additional road infrastructure.

## 4

# Conclusions

### 4.1

#### *Summary*

#### 4.1.1

The second phase of consultation and participation has drawn together a vast range of material proposing solutions to improve transport related problems and issues along the south coast. A wide range of initiatives have been undertaken to obtain these views including meetings with key stakeholders, thirteen participation workshops that took place across the study area, as well as leaflet distribution and a dedicated website.

#### 4.1.2

The key themes that have been drawn out of this work include those given below:

- **Traffic Congestion** – Local congestion issues were identified at each of the workshops and meetings as well as in the newsletter responses. These included areas such as Chichester, Arundel, Worthing, Polegate, Lewes Ashford, along the A259 west of Folkestone and Thanet. Solutions put forward included a bypass in Arundel and improvements to the Chichester bypass, however there was often a lack of consensus in relation to the building of new roads.
- **Public Transport** – A number of the participation sources focused on the poor quality of the public transport system. Solutions put forward included: investment in public transport facilities and infrastructure through ticketing, stations, lighting and bicycle facilities; improved integration with other modes and travel information and fully accessible rail and bus systems especially for disabled, elderly and parents of young children. There was felt to be very few reliable alternatives to using the car particularly locally and in rural areas.
- **Integration of the transport system** – This was an issue raised by a number of sources. Comments focused on the lack of a vision for integration, the need for integration between different modes of transport, the need for co-ordinated planning of the transport system and the need for government to integrate transport planning with land use, housing allocation and development planning.
- **Environment** – Concerns for the environment were raised in a number of the workshops, a priority being limiting damage to the environment

and concerns over the loss of biodiversity. Climate change affecting the coastal area and the importance of the South Downs National Park were both highlighted.

- **Cycling / walking** – Issues relating to cycling were referred to in all the workshops and in many of the newsletter responses. Cycling and walking were part of the concerns for an integrated transport system, with the ability to put bikes on trains and further links and development of the cycle network widely mentioned as solutions
- **Freight** – Increasing freight on roads was an issue brought up in all the workshops. However, interviews with the freight operators indicate little desire for long distance movement along the corridor. The delivery of local goods and services are affected by congestion, which influences reliability of deliveries.
- **Economy** – A range of problems have been highlighted by the workshops and participation process over the state of transport links and the impact on the economy. Parts of the corridor have been identified as suffering from poor access resulting in considerable difficulties for local businesses, and discouraging new businesses from locating in the corridor. Access affects both employment and deprivation. Solutions that were put forward included: investment in public transport such as new stations and rail chords, investment in road infrastructure. However there was often a lack of consensus in relation to the building of new roads.

## **Appendix A – Presentation for Problems and Issues**

## **Appendix B – Copy of Press Release**

## **Appendix C – Local Workshop Solutions**

| <b>Location</b> | <b>Solutions</b>  | <b>Examples</b>  |
|-----------------|---|--|
| <b>Margate</b>  | <p>Solutions which address the needs of young people</p> <p>Accessibility</p> <p>Protecting the environment</p>   | <p>Regular buses at school and college time to reduce overcrowding</p> <p>Reduce the cost of fares for children (and those) under 19 years in full time education &amp; O.A.P's.</p> <p>Improved safety; lighting and more frequent night buses e.g. 11.30 p.m. – 1 p.m.</p> <p>Better training (in customer care) for bus drivers</p> <p>Student rail cards which do not have 'restricted times'</p> <p>Measures to address the personal safety of young people travelling on buses.</p> <p>Improved accessible buses, e.g. fold up seats for more room</p> <p>Increase dial and ride services</p> <p>Introduce more flexi hour arrangements in the workplace</p> <p>Provide parking facilities at rail stations for cycles</p> <p>Subsidise public transport fares for excluded groups</p> <p>Tolls (road charging) on foreign lorries at Ports/Channel Tunnel (use the income to improve) rail/bus services &amp; infrastructure (and to provide subsidised) concessionary fares on public transport</p> <p>Develop and use alternative fuel systems e.g. electric, solar etc</p> |
| <b>Dover</b>    | <p>Reduce car dependency and road congestion.</p> <p>Local problem – economic depression &amp; lack of affordable public transport</p> <p>Road Based Issues</p> <p>Sea and Dover Docks issues Transport related</p> | <p>Provide grants for new businesses that can show that only a certain ( low ) % of staff will travel by car</p> <p>Provide rural wiggly buses (like large taxis)</p> <p>Use a local tax to entitle locals to free bus service</p> <p>Provide American style free yellow bus or walking bus</p> <p>Provide adequate, inexpensive parking for train users.</p> <p>Slip roads at Junction 10 M20 would ease traffic congestion.</p> <p>Junction 11 to Romney Marsh needs to miss Hythe</p> <p>Coastal steamers for movement of freight, but accommodating passengers for tourism purposes</p> <p>Positive intervention by government needed to encourage road to rail (rail extension to Dover Docks)</p> <p>Encouraging more Green Transport Plans.</p> <p>Turning old retail areas into residential with 'built-in' footpaths, cycleways and bus routes</p>  |
| Hastings        | <p>Upgrade and invest in public transport</p> <p>Integrated &amp; more attractive</p> <p>Attractive public transport</p>  | <p>New public transport vehicles – low floor, more use of space in vehicle.</p> <p>Local transport forum – providing accountability of operators to the forum</p> <p>Ticket systems to encourage public transport including cards, 'frequent traveller' carnets to encourage choice of public transport – people (purchase) in advance to get lower price</p> <p>Need to solve the problem of peak road traffic (congestion), (at times when) rail &amp; bus fares are expensive with fare incentive to use rail/bus at peak times</p> <p>New - land use proposals must be related to public transport nodes/corridors</p>   |

| Location                     | Solutions   | Examples  |
|------------------------------|---|---|
|                              | <p>Integrate land use planning</p> <p>Slow Cities - Sustainable transport/locality</p> <p>Light rail</p> <p>Reverse decline in public Transport</p> <p>“String of Pearls” stations</p> <p>Affordable ‘cheap’ targeted public transport</p>                            | <p>Next round of Local (transport) Plans should include clear allocations to make transport systems more central to community, economic &amp; social life this means to preventing any deterioration e.g. bus service reduction. Various public transport ideas need developing – shuttle, light rail. Access to best practice elsewhere is needed.</p> <p>Innovative public transport solutions (are needed) – bendi buses, light rail, using existing lines and new street routes.</p> <p>Development around railway station as a node</p> <p>Long Term – get the balance right between cars and public transport (hidden costs need to be factored in). Access to best practice elsewhere is needed.</p> <p>Goods Yard at Hastings a great opportunity.</p> <p>High density at appropriate locations to avoid wasting valuable sites.</p> <p>More stations to provide a local transport facilities for Hastings: West Marina, Glyne Gapand Wilting tying in development around these stations.</p> <p>Resignalling and trackwork to raise capacity and rail line – so South Coast fast services can be improved as well.</p> <p>Need for all ideas to be community based. Family friendly</p> <p>Use this opportunity to work out a sustainable model for all to follow.</p> <p>How do we make school transport dominate &amp; eliminate “school run” car use? Why don’t American style school buses operate in UK?</p> <p>More secure funding for buses &amp; stable reliable timetables and routes planned by local authorities.</p> |
| <p>Polegate / Willingdon</p> | <p>Designing transport solutions around local needs.</p> <p>Transport services not a business.</p> <p>No new developments without cycling infrastructure</p> <p>Modernising bus services/travel plans</p> <p>Providing a flexible alternatives to the private car</p> | <p>Regulate services to provide a service that meets needs rather than business profit</p> <p>Bus service to meet school needs and cost effective for users.</p> <p>Parking not allowed around schools between 8.30 – 9.15 and 3.00 – 3.30</p> <p>Government legislation to develop/use pollution free cars by the year 2030 – no petrol driven cars by then.</p> <p>Comprehensive system of routes incorporating “secure cycle parking facilities”</p> <p>No new developments without provision of comprehensive safe cycle routes and bus lanes linking towns main facilities</p> <p>More roads where cycles &amp; pedestrians have priority.</p> <p>Metro links Brighton–Ashford through Polegate – Pevensy</p> <p>Light rail ( tram) and low cost alternatives</p> <p>Fast frequent buses</p> <p>Introduction of high-tech fuel systems (punitive to fossil fuels)</p> <p>Major reduction in car engine size</p> <p>Introduce small “town” occasional use vehicles and co-ownership of cars</p>   |

| Location | Solutions   | Examples  |
|----------|---|---|
|          | <p>Long term planning at a high level public education</p> <p>Co-ordinated timetable between bus and rail</p> <p>Timetabled taxis</p>   | <p>Sustainability issues to be at the heart of education</p> <p>Introduce co-ownership of cars</p> <p>More roads with pedestrian/cyclist priority</p> <p>Thorough integration of systems including secure parking and park &amp; ride</p> <p>Better transport facilities for cycles etc on trains &amp; buses</p> <p>Fiscal balance between public transport &amp; private car</p> <p>Address true costs</p> <p>Fiscal balance between public transport &amp; private car</p> <p>Train timetables which link up all services to make “non-London” train use as natural as it is now for London trips</p> <p>Bus regulation to co-ordinate/integrate</p> <p>Bus/rail interchanges at Eastbourne &amp; at Polegate &amp; at Lewes</p> <p>Integration of activities by a ‘high tech network’</p> <p>Taxis- more sharing, timetabled departures, used for children, teenagers</p> <p>Use home terminals to book taxis, work out sharing (=more devious journey but lower cost</p> <p>Train timetables which link up all services to make “non-London” train use as natural as it is now for London trips</p> <p>Bus regulation to co-ordinate/integrate</p> <p>Bus/rail interchanges at Eastbourne &amp; at Polegate &amp; at Lewes</p> <p>Annual or biannual forum at County level where bus &amp; rail operators agree timetables for a set period with local authorities, Parish Councils &amp; user groups.</p> |
| Worthing | <p>Smaller scale: vehicles (transport)</p> <p>Freight deliveries</p> <p>Change aspirations to more sustainable transport (education hearts &amp; minds)</p> <p>Treat all modes equally – seamless; integration</p> <p>Improve Sustainable public transport solutions</p> <p>Holistic use of IT in transport solutions</p> | <p>Incentives to use smaller vehicles</p> <p>Government intervention to encourage production</p> <p>Hybrid/electric cars</p> <p>Electric-power bicycles etc</p> <p>Create the infrastructure to support it e.g.: recharging facilities at workplace and secure parking at stations etc</p> <p>Reduce size of lorries</p> <p>Weigh financial savings of scale against social and environmental costs</p> <p>Serious well-funded well-designed cycle routes.</p> <p>Return all rail routes to public ownership</p> <p>Road taxation per mile</p> <p>Remote car/lorry control (speed restrictors)</p> <p>Improvement in incident reporting in cars</p> <p>Congestion charging</p>  |

| Location   | Solutions   | Examples  |
|------------|---|---|
|            |   | <p>Efficiency modelling<br/>           Computer based car sharing systems<br/>           Helping better integration<br/>           Home shopping/working made easier<br/>           Traffic control systems<br/>           Variable message signing<br/>           Integrated delivery/ordering systems<br/>           Better return load systems</p>   |
| Chichester | <p>All Councils need to work together<br/>           Radically reduce long term parking slots in county towns.<br/>           Investment Issues -<br/>           Continuous funding<br/>           Road (urban) pricing<br/>           Separating strategic from local flow-rail &amp; roads.<br/>           Putting employment where people are<br/>           Arundel bypass congestion<br/>           Chichester Access - roundabouts.<br/>           Integrating planning policies<br/>           Reduce the need to bring cars into the City</p> | <p>Radical reductions of long term parking slots may result from making a number of existing longer term places short term, or using differential pricing methods, or<br/>           Closure of some smaller (LT) car parks.<br/>           Fares should be set at levels which encourage use<br/>           Transport providers should be encouraged (or required) to ‘pilot’ novel forms of charging (e.g. car net tickets, interchangeable tickets as regards user)<br/>           Identify problem areas at peak hours- A27 Bypass etc) and ensure adequate funding<br/>           Balance environmental effects with economic benefits<br/>           Complete the strategic network – Arundel Bypass<br/>           Separating the strategic from local network.<br/>           Slow stopping trains &amp; fast through trains require passing places<br/>           Chichester flyover or underpasses. Arundel – Tunnel. Chichester northern bypass<br/>           Bognor (park and ride?) improve the A259<br/>           Integrating timetables for public transport users<br/>           Reduce local congestion by provision of an Arundel bypass (on the approved route) and major improvements to Chichester bypass with particular regard to access points &amp; roundabouts.<br/>           In the short term, the existing level of congestion and rat running makes the provision of new and improved bypasses essential. In the longer term thought should be given to developing the A259 into a coastal trunk road between Chichester &amp; Worthing<br/>           Chichester should be relieved by the construction of a new northern bypass<br/>           All new development of bypasses should allow provision of land and bridge construction to allow future widening.<br/>           Three underpasses: at Fishbourne A259, Bognor; Wittering.<br/>           Continuous dual carriageway not interrupted by cross roads or roundabouts.<br/>           Increased use of overpass for Goodwood junction.</p> |

| Location   | Solutions  | Examples   |
|------------|--|--|
|            |  | <p>Plan for transport when allowing housing and other development</p> <p>Dedicated cycle vans on trains</p> <p>Road pricing that reflects - peak time use and under occupied vehicles</p> <p>Digital display at bus stops and Internet real time information for public transport.</p> <p>Routing restrictions for peak hour constraints on car travel within major urban areas and town centres</p> <p>Investment in non polluting 'alternative technologies</p> <p>Incentives to live in city / industrial centres.</p> <p>Develop internet technology for home working and shopping</p>   |
| Fareham    | <p>High frequency mass transit system – no car based feeder / interchanges.</p> <p>Reduce need to travel by: high-tech housing and integrating housing work etc.</p> <p>Co-location &amp; integration</p> <p>Education &amp; information / Life long education about issues - more info about choices &amp; potentials.</p> <p>Public Transport - Regulation &amp; enforcement</p> <p>Public Transport - Quality product</p> | <p>Frequent and reliable high-speed express routes stopping at few stops to link with local services.</p> <p>Feeder services – community transport links, post bus, school transport, taxi</p> <p>Ticketing : As easy as possible – Smart card, technology</p> <p>Dial a car/bus from your mobile phone to take you to your destination.</p> <p>Tailor housing to style of work built close to rail station/frequent bus route or close to dedicated link.</p> <p>Develop local cottage hospital close to housing.</p> <p>Put shops, work &amp; leisure where transport is</p> <p>New developments only where there is good transport</p> <p>Collocated bus/train stations, e.g. At Fareham, Winchester or have free bus e.g. Southampton</p> <p>Bicycle parking at bus as well as railway stations</p> <p>Connect centres of population by MTR</p> <p>Long term initiative to change attitude.</p> <p>Educating people to use e-services</p> <p>Attractive/high status, Clean Comfortable (ample personal space), reliable, frequent &amp; fast</p> <p>Reasonable Cost</p> <p>Safe &amp; secure (cycle parking both ends of journey, left luggage, quality shelter/interchange)</p> <p>Tickets/Smart card/debit card Web based free credits for u/e/job seekers</p> |
| Winchester | <p>Cheap alternatives</p> <p>Priority given to the alternatives</p> <p>The need for an Integrated Transport Authority</p> <p>Aspiration Implication</p> <p>Manager</p> <p>Making alternative options attractive</p>  | <p>Make car use less attractive (e.g. Oxford)</p> <p>Bus priority: Alternatives get priority</p> <p>Costs of all modes borne on SAYE basis</p> <p>Rail cost (infrastructure) to be provided as are roads.</p> <p>Get local authorities co-operating (not competing)</p> <p>National leadership needed: Trust/participation</p> <p>Composition of Integrated Transport Authority :</p> <p>SoCoMMS</p> <p>All stakeholders</p>   |

| Location | Solutions       | Examples   |
|----------|-----------------|--|
|          | Local Solutions | <p>Steering Group</p> <p>Trains - Easy &amp; quick to understand information, Stations – Help Points Pleasant environment</p> <p>Increase capacity of Network. E.g. Ashford-Hastings (make it double track) Can we overhaul signalling to fit more trains in? Double decker trains? Longer trains – and do cater for short platforms</p> <p>Reduce level crossings - tunnel under - bridge over</p> <p>Advance purchase offers often run out. - cheapness is needed. - make offers easy to understand</p> <p>Light Railways in Town Centres</p> <p>Buses More frequent. Priority @ traffic lights &amp; pulling out @ stops.</p> <p>Flexi-time &amp; route, e.g. Brockenhurst – picks up individuals in isolated places at certain times</p> <p>Evening &amp; Sunday services - bus driver wages (subsidised)</p> <p>Think through network effect away from main routes.</p> <p>Need to serve whole of an area well.</p> <p>Through ticketing – need more of it so you can flit about.</p> <p>Links to train station – clear signposting.</p> <p>Guided Buses</p> <p>Cycling</p> <p>Routes that go somewhere quickly (long-distance)</p> <p>Separate from car &amp; people (on-road cycle routes), Preferential treatment at traffic lights.</p> <p>Convenient parking in town and in public places.</p> <p>Driver Education</p> |