

South Coast Corridor Multi-Modal Studies
Third Stage Consultation Process
Consultation and Participation Report
Prepared for
Department of Transport, Local Government
and the Regions
August 2002

Halcrow Group

In association with:

Accent

Chris Blandford Associates

DTZ Pidea

Baxter Eadie Ltd

Sustainable Futures

Camargue – PR media Consultants

Transportation Research Group, University of
Southampton

South Coast Corridor Multi-Modal Studies
Third Stage Consultation Process
Consultation and Participation Report
Prepared for
Department of Transport, Local Government
and the Regions
August 2002

Halcrow Group

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

Halcrow Group Limited has prepared this report in accordance with the instructions of their client, Government of the South East, 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

Department of Transport Local Government and the Regions South Coast Multi Modal Study (SoCoMMs)

Consultation and Participation Report- Third Stage Consultation Process

Contents Amendment Record

This report has been issued and amended as follows:

Issue	Revision	Description	Date	Signed
01	01	First Draft	18/06/0 2	NG
01	02	Second Draft	16/07/0 2	NG
01	03	Third Draft	27/09/0 2	NG

Contents

1	Executive Summary	1
	1.1 <i>Introduction</i>	1
2	Project Overview	4
	2.1 <i>Background</i>	4
	2.2 <i>The Project Objectives</i>	4
	2.3 <i>The Study Team</i>	5
	2.4 <i>The purpose of this document</i>	5
3	Consultation Overview	6
	3.1 <i>Consultation / Participation Overview</i>	6
	3.2 <i>Consultation program</i>	6
	3.3 <i>The Third Stage Consultation Process</i>	7
	3.4 <i>The Level of Response</i>	9
	3.5 <i>The Findings</i>	9
	3.6 <i>The Way Forward</i>	9
4	Consultation Activities	11
	4.1 <i>Stakeholder Database</i>	11
	4.2 <i>Public Exhibition and Workshop Venues</i>	11
	4.3 <i>Pre Launch Activity & Public Exhibitions</i>	11
	4.4 <i>Newsletter & Reply – paid Questionnaire</i>	13
	4.5 <i>Workshops</i>	13
	4.6 <i>Presentations</i>	18
	4.7 <i>Briefings</i>	18
	4.8 <i>Quantified Acceptability Surveys</i>	19
	4.9 <i>Internet Website</i>	19
	4.10 <i>Media</i>	20
5	Major Themes Raised in Consultation	21
	5.1 <i>Summary of Comments</i>	21
	5.2 <i>Project Specific Issues</i>	26
	5.3 <i>Support for the Proposed Emerging Strategy</i>	27
	5.4 <i>Suggested Deletions in the Proposed Emerging Strategy</i>	28
	5.5 <i>Suggested Additions to the Proposed Emerging Strategy</i>	28
6	Conclusion	29

<i>6.1 Conclusion</i>	29
<i>Table 1. Profile of Public exhibitions and workshops</i>	31
<i>Table 2. Profile of the number of participants</i>	34
<i>Appendix 1. Copy of Newsletter No. 4</i>	35
<i>Appendix 2. Profile of Pre Launch and Workshop Agendas</i>	36
<i>Appendix 3. Workshop Analysis</i>	37
<i>Appendix 4. Profile of Presentation Recipients</i>	59
<i>Appendix 5. Profile of Presentations</i>	60

1 Executive Summary

1.1 *Introduction*

1.1.1 The South Coast Corridor Multi-Modal Study (SoCoMMs) has investigated the problems and issues affecting transport along the south coast between Southampton and Ramsgate. The aim of the study is to develop short, medium and longer term strategies to overcome the many challenges associated with road, public transport and other sustainable modes of travel.

1.1.2 Consultation is a key component activity and has sought to involve the public and stakeholders at various stages relating to problem identification, solution generation and strategy selection. It has also sought to engender ownership amongst stakeholders and to encourage community participation throughout the study area.

1.1.3 This report covers the third stage of consultation on the proposed emerging strategy for the South Coast.

1.1.4 The third stage of consultation has involved a series of Public Exhibitions, Stakeholder Workshops, Presentations, Meetings, Media Communications and a Quantified Acceptability Survey.

1.1.5 It has also involved a wide range of expertise and experience from a number of key areas. The consultation team comprises of:

- Halcrow Group – responsible for the direction, facilitation of public exhibitions and the overall management of the consultation process;
- Sustainable Futures – responsible for Workshop Facilitation;
- Camargue – responsible for Media Communications; and
- Accent Marketing – responsible for quantified acceptability surveys.

1.1.6 The proposed emerging strategy was released for public consultation on 3rd May 2002 as 'Newsletter No.4 Transport Solutions for the South Coast – A Strategy For the Future' and concluded on 21 June 2002. Consultation activities were

undertaken to obtain public and stakeholder input and to gauge support for the proposed transport strategy.

1.1.7 This involved a touring exhibition at 14 key locations, a series of Pre Launch Activities and Workshops with key stakeholders, availability of Newsletters at various locations and on the Internet Website, and a number of presentations to local interest groups, businesses, County and District Council's, SEERA, MP's and MEP's.

1.1.8 Media work undertaken across the South Coast region consisted of circulation of press releases to regional based media in Hampshire, East Sussex, West Sussex and Kent, circulations of local press releases to weekly papers, advertisements for all public exhibitions at the 14 key locations, interviews with radio stations and television stations including BBC Radio and BBC Television.

1.1.9 1 780 submissions were received during the consultation process. Submissions came from Kent 13%, East Sussex 38%, West Sussex 27% and Hampshire 11%. The remaining 11% of responses were comments from outside the County Area.

1.1.10 Consultation identified the need to:

- Establish a balanced package of improvements;
- Develop clear links between transport planning for the region and responsible lead agencies;
- Align transport planning projects more closely with available funding levels;
- Improve integration of land use and transport planning, particularly in County/District and local government planning schemes; and
- Minimise the environmental impacts of transport infrastructure and public transport operations.

1.1.11 In addition, Quantified Acceptability Surveys were carried out through a programme of 505 telephone interviews of 10 minutes, conducted with residents in the South Coast corridor. Respondents were each sent a copy of the Emerging Preferred Transport Strategy to consult before and during the interview. The

overall levels of support for the proposed strategy, 57% supporting it and 17% supporting it strongly. Only 7% opposed the strategy, including 3% who opposed it strongly.

2 Project Overview

2.1 *Background*

2.1.1 The Halcrow Group led consortium has been appointed by the Government of the South East (GOSE) to look at the future challenges and issues facing all methods of transport and how these might be addressed to serve the needs of people, businesses and the environment.

2.1.2 As stated in the study brief, the main aims are to:

- Identify and investigate congestion, safety and environment problems of transport along the south coast between Southampton (Hampshire) and Ramsgate (Kent);
- Propose measures aimed at resolving these problems and improving access to and between regeneration areas and other areas of economic activity; and
- Consider the strategic role of the transport systems (road, rail and sea borne) in this corridor and make recommendations for an over-arching strategy, together with associated implementation plans to address the transport problems along the corridor. This strategy must take into account local, regional, national and international objectives and planning policies.

2.2 *The Project Objectives*

2.2.1 This study considers a series of detailed objectives that the study is expected to satisfy. The focus of these objectives is to:

- Make recommendations for an over-arching strategy to guide the future development of the transport systems on the South Coast Corridor;
- Consider and recommend specific local measures on sections of the A27 which have been the subject of previous road scheme proposals and their

interrelationship with the overall strategy for the South Coast and produce up to nine (9) local action plans for specific sections of the corridor;

- Develop plan(s) to address the most urgent strategic and local transport problems across all modes, looking in particular at opportunities for modal transfer, whilst ensuring that all measures are consistent with the strategy; and
- Produce a feasible implementation programme identifying potential constraints to implementation, including funding and legislative consideration.

2.3

The Study Team

2.3.1

The third stage of consultation has involved a wide range of expertise and experience from a number of key study areas. As part of this process the study team comprises of:

- Halcrow Group – responsible for the direction, facilitation of public exhibitions and overall management of the consultation process;
- Sustainable Futures – responsible for Workshop Facilitation;
- Camargue – responsible for Media Communications; and
- Accent Marketing – responsible for quantified acceptability surveys.

2.4

The purpose of this document

2.4.1

The purpose of this document is to:

- Report on the consultation activities undertaken;
- Report on the level of stakeholder participation;
- Summarise the major themes raised and how they have been considered and influenced the final strategy and strategic development plans; and
- Assess the consultation program's effectiveness.

3

Consultation Overview

3.1

Consultation / Participation Overview

3.1.1

The third stage consultation process has sought to engender ownership amongst stakeholders and to encourage community participation through out the study area. Consultation is a key component activity and has taken place at a number of different levels throughout the life of the study project. These being through:

- Direct discussion with GOSE, the Steering Group and the Wider Reference Group;
- Direct presentations and discussion with GOSE and interested parties such as individual local authorities, SEEDA, MPs and MEPs;
- Locally based workshops designed to discuss specific transport related issues within the more local areas along the corridor (involving local Chambers of Commerce, Parish and District Councils, Local transport operators and locally based NGOs);
- Meetings with public transport operators;
- Provision of Newsletters distributed at key points within the study area on the proposed emerging strategy;
- Provision of an Internet Website, with detailed information such as Newsletters, Reports, Steering Group Minutes and opportunity to provide feedback to the Study Team; and
- Public Exhibitions and Consultations on the proposed emerging strategy.

3.2

Consultation program

3.2.1

The consultation program has involved three stages of activities. The three stages are outlined below:

- Stage 1 – June/July 2001 Workshops and Meetings held to understand current and future problems;

- Stage 2 – September/October 2001 Workshops and Meetings to assist in identifying possible solutions; and
- Stage 3 – May/June 2002 Public Exhibitions, Stakeholder Workshops, Presentations and Meetings on the proposed emerging strategy.

3.2.2 This report is an analysis of the third stage of consultation. Separate reports have been produced outlining the first and second consultation stages.

3.3 ***The Third Stage Consultation Process***

3.3.1 The third public consultation commenced on 3rd May and closed on 21st June 2002, and involved:

- Distribution of Newsletters to key stakeholders;
- A touring public exhibition at 14 key locations (inclusive of one day at Lewes);
- A series of Pre Launch Activities and Workshops with key stakeholders;
- Media coverage;
- Publicity posters/leaflets at the 14 key venue locations;
- A number of presentations to local interest groups, business groups, County and District Councils, MP's and MEP's; and
- Availability of the newsletter at various key locations and via the Internet Website.

3.3.2 There has been some 55 000 third stage consultation newsletters distributed to the local community, businesses and various interest groups in the South Coast area. In addition, newsletters have been available at libraries, visitor information centres, government authorities/customer service centres, youth and education centres, bus and train stations, public transport operators and at the SoCoMMs touring exhibition.

- 3.3.3 The Internet Website has also played an important role as a provider of information with the availability of the newsletter and response to the questionnaire via electronic mail.
- 3.3.4 Public exhibitions were generally held over a period of 3 days during a 5 week period, commencing on a Thursday through to a Saturday.
- 3.3.5 Prior to the exhibition officially opening to the public, a Pre Launch Activity was held for key stakeholders in each location, providing the opportunity to discuss the proposals for the South Coast area with the study team. Stakeholder workshops were also held at each location. These workshops provided the opportunity to listen to a presentation on the proposed preferred emerging strategy and to discuss the proposals in more detail with interested parties and the study team. It also provided an avenue to listen and gauge the level of support and concerns with the proposals for the South Coast area.
- 3.3.6 The touring exhibition display outlined the:
- Aims of the study;
 - The overall study process;
 - The problems and issues that need to be addressed, both today and in the future;
 - The range of possible solutions that have been considered and reasoning behind what has been ruled out;
 - The emerging strategy and the reasons for it being recommended as the way forward;
 - The mechanism for providing comment and feedback on the proposed strategy; and
 - The next steps.

3.4

The Level of Response

3.4.1

In response to this third stage consultation some 2 196 participants attended the public exhibition, pre launch activity and workshops. The number of comments received are 1 780 submissions.

3.5

The Findings

3.5.1

Some of the common themes emerging on the proposed strategy were:

- There was general appreciation of a balanced strategy for the South Coast region;
- The need for better public transport (wider coverage, frequency, reliability and accessibility);
- Support for a realistic implementation strategy (focussing on responsibility, accountability, financial and political support);
- An Expectation of a need for future detail on local issues;
- Strong concern for economic growth and regeneration issues;
- Strong concern for parking charges, levy on private work place parking and car based cordon charges;
- A Level of scepticism concerning the level of investment and return for the taxpayer;
- Strong lobbying by groups for rejecting all major road expansion and park and ride; and
- Preservation of the countryside and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

3.6

The Way Forward

3.6.1

The results of this third stage consultation have been examined in context with the previous stages of consultations undertaken on the SoCoMMs study and the wider issues of the South Coast region.

- 3.6.2 To take this process forward, the consultation findings on the proposed emerging strategy have been discussed with the Government of the South East and the Steering Group.
- 3.6.3 The results of the consultation process will contribute to the final transport strategy and the development of strategic plans along the South Coast.
- 3.6.4 A key outcome of the consultation undertaken on the proposed emerging strategy was that the final plans should be matched to indicative funding levels and be appropriately assessed in terms of environmental and economic appraisal. This had a significant impact on the final plan, and additional analysis was needed to ensure that the highest priority projects were selected for implementation by 2006, 2016 and 2030 with the funds available. It also meant not all of the projects supported by the community could be included in the final plan.
- 3.6.5 Further consultation will be undertaken with Regional and Local Government agencies prior to finalising the Emerging Transport Strategy for consideration by the Regional Assembly.

4 Consultation Activities

4.1 *Stakeholder Database*

4.1.1 A stakeholder database compiled at the start of the SoCoMMs study consisted of some 4 000 contacts. A review and refinement process was undertaken particularly where it was felt more focus could encourage more participation from particular groups such as the business sector Youth, Education, Health, Tourism and Businesses. A detailed research process entailed creating a wider contact base of some 10 000 contacts.

4.2 *Public Exhibition and Workshop Venues*

4.2.1 Venues throughout the South Coast region were identified and contacted concerning their availability and suitability for holding public exhibitions and workshops. Arrangements were made for all venues to be inspected and to meet certain requirements such as disability access, locations within close proximity to town centres and to public transport.

4.2.2 Where possible, the location of the venue accommodated for both the public exhibitions and the workshops. There were only a few instances where Workshops were held at alternative venue locations. Table 1 gives the Profile of Public Exhibitions and Workshops.

4.2.3 Difficulty was encountered finding suitable venues. This was due to a number of reasons namely, more popular and central venues not being available, the timeframe of consultation being shortened due to Local Elections and Jubilee Celebrations, venues not being able to accommodate for disabled/mobility needs, competition for venues required for school and university examinations and limited availability of County, District and Local Government meeting rooms.

4.3 *Pre Launch Activity & Public Exhibitions*

4.3.1 There were 14 public exhibitions. 13 Public exhibitions took place between Thursday 9th May and Friday 31st May. The exhibitions ran over a period of 3 consecutive days, generally commencing on a Thursday through to Saturday. An additional public exhibition was held in Lewes on 13 June, for a day only.

- 4.3.2 At each of the venues, there were 3 to 5 staff present to answer questions from the public and explain the proposals. The staff were members of Halcrow's project team.
- 4.3.3 All exhibitions commenced with a Pre Launch Activity, held at the start of the 13 key locations along the South Coast. However Lewes was the exception, where only the public exhibition was held.
- 4.3.4 The opportunity to attend the Pre Launch was by invitation only – giving government representatives and key stakeholders the opportunity to view the display first hand, listen to an overview of the proposed emerging strategy by the study team and to discuss particular aspects of the study.
- 4.3.5 All exhibition material was presented in colour, on 21 A1 sized encapsulated display panels. The exhibition consisted of five parts:
- The first was a general introduction, setting out the context on what has happened so far;
 - The second part concentrated on the key problems, challenges and constraints;
 - Thirdly, the emerging preferred strategy;
 - Fourthly, what the strategy means in areas along the South Coast; and
 - The opportunity to 'have your say' on the strategy.
- 4.3.6 The total number of attendees at the pre launch was 152 and the total number of attendees at the public exhibitions were some 1 690 people. The study team were there to meet and greet attendees, hold discussions and provide the necessary information. Genuine attempts were made to keep an accurate record via a register of the number of attendees at each venue. However, there were circumstances where exhibitions were overwhelmed with people such as at Hastings, Chichester and Lewes, therefore there may be some discrepancy in the accuracy of the attendance records. Details of attendance for each venue are provided in **Table 2. Profile of the number of Participants.**

4.4

Newsletter & Reply – paid Questionnaire

4.4.1

A 20 page newsletter, which is attached in **Appendix 1**, was designed to serve three main functions:

- Firstly, set out an overview of the proposed emerging strategy;
- Secondly, it advertised the public exhibition; and
- Finally, it sought to obtain views on the proposals through an attached questionnaire.

4.4.2

The newsletter was distributed during the consultation process and sought to obtain information at four distinct levels, these being the respondent's:

- Personal interest (age, gender, place of residence);
- Level of agreement on the emerging transport strategy; and
- Detailed comments and reasons on elements of the emerging strategy that should be added; and
- Detailed comments and reasons on elements of the emerging strategy that should not be included.

4.4.3

A reply-paid postage address was operational during the consultation process to encourage a wider participation. From 3rd May 2002 to 21st June 2002, some 1 180 comments were either received via the reply-paid postage address or handed to staff on duty at the public exhibitions.

4.5

Workshops

4.5.1

13 workshops were held across the South Coast and are detailed in **Table 1. Profile of Public Exhibitions and Workshops.**

4.5.2

The four main objectives of each workshop were to:

- Present stakeholders with information about the emerging strategy to increase awareness and understanding, thus facilitating more informed submissions;

- Provide an opportunity for input into the emerging strategy;
- Provide an opportunity for all key stakeholders to meet with the study team face-to-face to discuss and debate the issues relating to the emerging strategy; and
- Encourage submissions relating to their concerns.

4.5.3 Each workshop gave an overview of the South Coast region and a more focused discussion on the specific sub-region in which the workshops were held.

4.5.4 The workshops were facilitated by consultants Sustainable Futures. They were held on a Thursday evening with registration from 5:15pm and commencement of proceedings at 5:30 pm. The agenda for the workshop on the ‘Emerging Transport Strategy’ comprised:

- Welcome and Introduction;
- Presentation by the Study Team;
- Session 1: Questions and discussion;
- Break;
- Session 2: Small Group Work – further consideration and feedback on the emerging transport strategy;
- Reporting back from the Groups;
- Gauging support for the options and proposals; and
- Final comments by the Study Team and confirmation of the next steps.

A copy of the agenda is at **Appendix 2**.

4.5.5 There were some 348 people who attended the workshops.

4.5.6 The workshops were promoted through invitations to all key stakeholders on the database requesting their attendance at the workshops. Participants were asked to

register via mail or email prior to the workshop to assist the study team to plan and organise the workshops.

4.5.7 Workshop participants included Local and Regional Government representatives, elected members, community interest group representatives, public transport operators and business.

4.5.8 The following information is a summary of the workshops undertaken in the four County areas. An **Appendix 3. Workshop Analysis** highlights the workshop discussion in each of the 13 key locations within each of the county areas. A more detailed report by Sustainable Futures accompanies this report.

Hampshire – Fareham, Southampton and Winchester

4.5.9 Overall there is strong support for investment in public transport as a priority. The particular elements of the strategy that was of high importance across Fareham, Southampton and Winchester workshops was support for a more integrated approach to transport with focus on better connectivity and accessibility for all between all modes of transport.

4.5.10 There was interest to protect the environment such as in significant areas (e.g. South Downs National Park) and concerns for the loss of habitat that may occur due to the limited amount of detail provided on the impacts of the strategy.

4.5.11 The main difference of opinion is the perception that the strategy is a “back door” for road building schemes. It was also felt that there should be more emphasis on the prioritisation process for elements in the strategy and that funding and value for money also plays a vital role. There were also differing opinions on whether there should be tougher targets implemented for reducing car use. However opinion was that restrictive measures such as tolling were not effective as it targets the wrong people, develops anti social inclusion and penalises those living in the town centres. Parking levies and park and ride also offered “good” and “bad” points, and overall the focus was that parking levies are too complicated to manage and should focus on out of town to encourage the economic growth of towns. In particular there are concerns that park and ride are difficult to manage.

East Sussex – Brighton/Hove, Eastbourne and Hastings

- 4.5.12 Generally the proposed emerging strategy was supported with people liking the balance of different interventions. However there were a few technical areas of contention and a considerable debate took place on how such a multi implementation stakeholder strategy could be implemented. Points were raised that increasing parking charges would be a major element in the strategy. Particularly as charges are controlled by local authorities with current views being against any increases.
- 4.5.13 The general problem areas are with cordon charging and major developments having a significant impact on the transport network e.g. Sports Stadium and the future development of Shoreham Harbour. Cycling is also a main feature, and particular emphasis on 'Bicycles on Trains' (no facilities) and 'Bicycles on Pathways' (dedication and conflict with pedestrians and cyclists).
- 4.5.14 The participants at the Hastings Workshop felt that the format of the agenda did not meet the needs of the group. It was put forward and accepted by the facilitators, that the session should cover a collection of facts concerning the emerging strategy. A range of discussions took place focussing on Road, Cycling, Local Action Plans (SDP's), future urban development, impacts on the environment and sensitive areas and how all these issues fit within the overall strategy.

Kent – Ashford, Margate and Dover

- 4.5.15 All table discussions by participant groups were very constructive despite tensions over whether to build a South Coast Motorway or not (Margate). The pro South Coast Motorway people argued that the growing level of tunnel and ferry road traffic could not continue to head west via the M25 alone – hence there was a need either to improve the M25 or build a South Coast Motorway. Others did not want any more roads.
- 4.5.16 The view was expressed that Thanet feels left out of the consideration compared to other Districts in the South East, particularly when it comes to the allocation of development resources in general, and is worried the same will happen with transport investments. Yet with Dover and Ramsgate, the area is the start and finish of many journeys. There was a strong feeling that the study would do little to change the "Cinderella" treatment that the area currently perceives it receives.

The workshop feedback forms were very positive about the evening. The area of strategic partnership was a feature, and most agreed that there should be more focus on developing better frameworks and interfacing between stakeholders. This was seen as a crucial element for where decisions on and where money is spent on improvements.

West Sussex - Arundel, Worthing and Chichester

- 4.5.17 There was a diverse range of stakeholders attending these workshops. At the Arundel and Chichester workshops there was tension around the beginning of the evening (start of the workshop) and anti road building supporters had lobbied the exhibition during the day. This however did not surface in an unproductive way during the evening. Most of the attention was focussed on how the well known and long standing A27 road bottlenecks would be addressed and there was some disappointment that firmer proposals were not available. There was strong feeling that they need to be addressed but anything less than a tunnel (s) will receive very mixed support. The public transport improvements received strong support. As with East Sussex workshops there were questions on the means and funds available for implementation. Particular focus of participant groups was not only how the strategy is implemented but how it will be translated on the ground and at various levels of government. There is also need to identify clear roles and responsibilities of both government and stakeholders.
- 4.5.18 The participant groups also focussed on the need for more incentives being the main point of focus of the strategy prior to the more restrictive measures being put in place. They suggested the need for alternative strategies to the private car prior to any punitive financial penalties being imposed.
- 4.5.19 Generally – people were not rejecting the strategy or its intent. An integrated, multi-modal approach is welcomed and people readily accepted the concept of balance. Benefits of proposed rail improvements were welcomed. However there were mixed views and understandings about proposed road improvements. A small minority remain convinced, that irrespective of the strategy study, motorway style improvements have to be the answer (e.g. Eastbourne and Chichester).
- 4.5.20 Some of the major themes that emerged from the workshops were:
- General support for the basic principles;

- The need for a better public transport network e.g wider coverage, type of services, accessibility;
- The need for better integration of a cycling network;
- The need for a better freight distribution network;
- The need to minimise impacts of transport improvements on the environment; and
- The need for commitment to funding and implementation.

4.5.21 Challenges presented during the workshops included:

- Limited venue options for workshops; and
- Workshops did not have a broad community representation.

4.5.22 Participants were given the opportunity to evaluate the workshop. Participants generally found the workshop to be informative and the facilitation and small group discussions with officials a good opportunity to express their views.

4.5.23 Suggestions for improvement included more time for questions and discussion and wider coverage to encourage better representation.

4.6 ***Presentations***

4.6.1 11 presentations on the emerging strategy were given to community and interest groups, business groups and local and regional government from May to July 2002. Appendix 4 provides a list of Presentation Recipients.

4.6.2 The presentations gave detailed information about the emerging strategy. Presentations were tailored to the group's specific interests and provided an opportunity to discuss any issues or concerns face-to-face with the consultation team. Refer to **Appendix 5 - Profile of the Presentations**.

4.7 ***Briefings***

4.7.1 Elected members of the region, unitary and European community were invited by Halcrow and Government of the South East. All members that attended were given promotional material to distribute to their area.

4.8

Quantified Acceptability Surveys

4.8.1

Following wide ranging public consultation, Accent Marketing and Research were engaged to carry out quantifiable survey to determine the attitudes towards the emerging strategy. The research was conducted through a programme of 505 telephone interviews with residents in the South Coast Corridor. Residents were selected according to a quota to ensure that the sample was broadly representative of the population as a whole. Respondents were each sent a copy of the preferred emerging strategy to review before and during the interview. The findings showed that respondents were broadly supportive of the overall emerging transport strategy. However, respondents were more likely to oppose rather than support any measures which were seen to increase the cost of using cars, such as cordon charging, increased parking charges and workplace parking levies.

4.9

Internet Website

4.9.1

The website provided up-to-date information about the emerging transport strategy consultation, through newsletters and media releases.

4.9.2

The website included:

- What is the study
- Who is behind the study
- Key Events
- Newsletters and Reports
- Press Information
- What do you think
- Links

4.9.3

Submissions and comments could also be lodged electronically through an email facility on the website. During the consultation period, the website received some 290 respondents submitting a response.

4.10

Media

4.10.1

The consultation on the emerging strategy attracted coverage in a range of media. This included:

- Media relations and coverage (including broadcast and print media);
- Advertising supporting campaign; and
- Feedback and Analysis.

4.10.2

Camargue, our media consultants were instrumental in the work undertaken across the South Coast region. The media work consisted of :

- Circulation of press release to regional based media in Hampshire, East Sussex, West Sussex and Kent;
- Circulation of local press release to weekly papers;
- Advertisement for all public exhibitions at the 14 key locations;
- Managing interviews with radio stations and television stations including BBC Radio and BBC Television;
- Managing media demands; and
- Responding to specific criticisms.

4.10.3

Some early coverage was achieved in April and May, prior to launch of the touring exhibitions. This involved coverage in the local authorities, Chamber of Commerce newsletters and websites. However early coverage was limited by the local elections held on Thursday 2 May 2002.

4.10.4

Advertisements were placed in newspapers and on radio in the Counties of Kent, East Sussex, West Sussex and Hampshire. These advertisements promoted the release of the emerging strategy for public consultation. A report on the media communication and coverage throughout the South Coast accompanies this report.

4.10.5

The focus also included communications with business organisations by building awareness of the emerging strategy.

5 Major Themes Raised in Consultation

5.1 *Summary of Comments*

5.1.1 Consultation on the emerging strategy closed on Friday 21st June 2002.

5.1.2 1 780 submissions were received from private individuals, community, business groups, associations and local and regional government agencies. There were some 10 requests for consideration as late submissions, mainly due to the timeliness of organisations internal meetings. These late submissions have also been considered.

5.1.3 As a first step in the analysis process each questionnaire and its accompanying comments were entered into a computer based databank. Replies to the multiple choice question and formal comments were recorded in Microsoft ACCESS Database Software. Each questionnaire response was given a unique reference number, allowing for cross checking to be undertaken.

5.1.4 The information in the databank was examined and sorted by postcode corresponding with each county area. Those replies that originated from postcodes outside the study area have also been included.

5.1.5 The responses have been analysed to obtain the following information:

- Overall levels of response, by postcode/county area; and
- Detailed comments on including and excluding elements of the proposed emerging strategy.

5.1.6 A profile of responses accompanies this report.

5.1.7 Comments were separated into the following categories for ease of consideration:

- Safety;
- A transport system that values our environment;

- Making better use of the existing transport system through Travel Demand Management (TDM);
- Creating transport-friendly communities through better land use planning;
- Encouraging more people to cycle and walk more often;
- Developing a high quality, integrated public transport system;
- Ensuring the efficient movement of freight; and
- Funding and implementation.

5.1.8 **Safety** – The most common social justice topics and issues raised throughout the consultation period are as follows:

5.1.9 Submitters support the need to:

- Provide well-designed and easily accessible public transport to everyone, including the mobility impaired, older persons and mothers with prams;
- Ensure personal safety through out the public transport network, particularly at bus stops and rail stations;
- Establish public transport services for new growth areas;
- Enhance public transport in poorly services areas; and
- Give priority to improving transport services for the transport disadvantaged.

5.1.10 **Valuing our environment** – The most common topics and issues raised concerning the natural environment throughout the consultation period are as follows:

5.1.11 Submitters support the need to:

- Preserve and protect sensitive corridors (flora and fauna)

- Minimise impacts of transport infrastructure on sensitive corridors;
- Limit impacts on future road networks and improvements on sensitive environments;
- Strengthen the focus on monitoring and evaluating actions relating to air pollution, noise pollution, congestion
- Aim to reduce vehicle emissions through stricter standards and cleaner fuels.

5.1.12 **Making better use of existing transport system** – The most common topics and issues raised concerning softer measures (e.g. educational programs and incentive programs to encourage voluntary change in behaviour).

5.1.13 Submitters support the need to:

- Use education of pollution and congestion issues as a deterrent to private vehicle use
- Focus on educating the young about public transport
- Provide incentives for employers to encourage staff to use public transport; and
- Assess and cost the impacts of private vehicle use.

5.1.14 **Restrictive measures** – (e.g. parking pricing and supply, cordon charging, tolls). Submitters support the need to:

- Use incentives to encourage public transport and off-peak travel;
- Increase the viability of the public transport system before implementing restrictive measures such as parking pricing and supply;
- Use a cautious approach to implementing restrictive measures in urban areas.

5.1.15 Submitters both support and oppose the need to:

- Managing travel demand by minimising parking supply, providing park and ride and implementing parking levies;
- Using levies on private vehicle use and user charges on transport as a revenue source; and
- Introduce alternative pricing options such as tolls and fuel taxes.

5.1.16

Creating transport friendly communities through better land use planning – the most common land use and transport topics and issues raised throughout the consultation period are as follows:

- Ensure government planning and policy is consistent with the study;
- Coordinate all levels of government on regional transport issues;
- Use land use policies and planning to encourage public transport use;
- Introduce more stringent guidelines to ensure developers use an integrated approach between future land development and transport provision; and
- Ensure new urban developments are designed to support good transport outcomes.

5.1.17

Encourage more people to walk and cycle more – The most common walking and cycling topics and issues raised throughout the consultation period:

- Integrate cycle and pedestrian networks into the transport network;
- Improve access to major activity centres
- Increase the provision of cycle and pedestrian networks in major projects;
- Provide end-of-trip facilities for existing and proposed cycle network; and
- Promote the potential for cycling and walking modes to contribute to a healthier society and environment.

5.1.18

Developing a high quality, integrated transport system – The most common public transport topics and issues raised throughout consultation are as follows:

- Increase focus on improving public transport in poorly serviced areas;
- Increase the integration of services between all operators and modes;
- Improve the frequency of peak and off-peak services to address evolving workplace practices such as flexible work hours and trips to schools, shops, hospitals and other services;
- Increase the availability and variety of sources for public transport information and introduce integrated ticketing programs;
- Enhance the design and quality of interchange facilities to provide better connection of services;
- Produce better contract policies that allow for the provision of efficient and effective service to patrons; and
- Expand and upgrade passenger rail infrastructure.

5.1.19

A road network to link people, goods and services – the most common road network topics and issues raised throughout the consultation period are as follows:

- Give priority to better use of existing road network over building more new roads;
- Increase provision of public transport to optimise the use of existing corridors; and
- Select and design routes carefully to minimise impacts on the environment and amenity.

Submitters were both for and against the need to:

- Construct new roads or upgrade roads to support urban development and alleviate congestion.

5.1.20

Ensuring the efficient movement of freight – the most common freight topics and issues raised throughout the consultation period are as follows:

- Separate freight traffic from general road based traffic where possible
- Ensure freight routes avoid residential areas but provide good access to industrial areas;
- Upgrade rail freight systems;
- Improve design of road freight corridors to facilitate heavy vehicle movement; and
- Address unacceptable impacts of road based freight movements such as local traffic conflicts, safety issues, noise and speeding violations.

5.1.21

Funding and implementation – one of the major themes in the consultation process was that people wanted to see commitment to the delivery of the proposed emerging strategy projects. The most common transport investment topics and issues raised throughout the consultation period are as follows:

- Clarify roles of Government;
- Obtain agreement on processes for implementation;
- Negotiate with agencies and key stakeholders on the timing and resources needed to implement the actions in the emerging strategy;
- Outline the economic cost of not improving the transport systems; and
- Increase the amount of funding available for transport.

5.2

Project Specific Issues

5.2.1

Public Transport

- Better linkages to Polegate, Hastings and Bexhill;
- Concerns of the impacts of a Light rail system;

- Upgrading of the rail line from Ashford to Southampton;
- Better linkages with Ferry services.

5.2.2

Roads

- Tunnel Bypass Lancing to Worthing;
- Arundel bypass;
- Improvements to the A259; and
- A27 improvements to bottlenecks.

5.2.3

Park and Ride

- Impacts on the environment and land-use planning;

5.2.4

Freight

- Better accessibility to Manston and Lydd Airports; and
- Better accessibility to port areas such as New Haven, Dover and Dabden Bay.

5.3

Support for the Proposed Emerging Strategy

5.3.1

The questionnaire responses are a guide for measuring the overall level of support for the emerging strategy. However it is felt that this measure should be considered in light of the strong commitment fielded from community action groups. Questionnaires response for supporting the strategy was some 59%, comprising of 33% for strong support and 26% for slight agreement. 22% strongly disagreed and 10% slightly disagreed. The remaining 9% neither agreed or disagreed.

5.3.2

The Quantified Acceptability Surveys conducted with residents along the South Coast corridor are a better representation of respondents views on the emerging strategy. The overall levels of support for the proposed strategy, 57% supporting it and 17% supporting it strongly. Only 7% opposed the strategy, including 3% who opposed it strongly.

5.3.3 Overall there is support for the emerging strategy.

5.4 ***Suggested Deletions in the Proposed Emerging Strategy***

5.4.1 There was strong opposition for the restrictive measures such as, Parking Charges, Levies and Tolls and for the Park and Ride proposals. This was mainly due to the level of scepticism of how such schemes would be managed and whether they were targeted at the right level of the community. There was also points made that charging for parking would create more congestion on the local streets.

5.4.2 There was also mixed opinion concerning road improvements, particularly for Bexhill/Hastings area, Arundel and the Worthing Bypass. Some opinion was to exclude all improvements to A27 and for more focus on the improvements to public transport, walking and cycling.

5.5 ***Suggested Additions to the Proposed Emerging Strategy***

5.5.1 There was support for road improvements particularly where there is conflict with rail (e.g. cross overs and level crossings)

5.5.2 A strong level of support for public transport as a priority, particularly bus and rail services.

5.5.3 Support for more focus on Travel Demand Management measures such as car sharing clubs and incentives in the workplace.

5.5.4 More focus on freight issues and implementation for a range of measures for taking freight off roads during peak hour and for freight on railways.

6 Conclusion

6.1 *Conclusion*

6.1.1 1780 submissions were received and 2 196 people participated in the consultation process on the emerging strategy for the South Coast.

6.1.2 Most submitters supported the underlying principles of the emerging strategy.

6.1.3 The consultation process achieved the following:

- Raised awareness and understanding of the emerging strategy;
- Provided information to community and stakeholders;
- Sought stakeholder and community participation, input and feedback;
- Incorporated stakeholder views into decision making; and
- Obtained support for and acknowledgement of the emerging strategy.

6.1.4 Consultation gauged the general issues of concern about the integrated transport planning for the South Coast, as well as specific infrastructure and policy planning issues.

6.1.5 Some difficulties did arise in the consultation process due to local elections, limited resources and the timeliness of consultation activities.

6.1.6 Despite some negativity, most respondents acknowledged the importance of the strategy and development plans and were pleased to comment on the proposed emerging strategy.

Tables

Table 1. Profile of public exhibitions and workshops

Table 2. Profile of the number of participants

Appendices

Appendix 1. Copy of Newsletter No. 4

Appendix 2. Profile of Pre Launch and Workshop Agendas

Appendix 3. Workshop Analysis

Appendix 4. Profile of Presentation Recipients

Appendix 5. Profile of Presentations

Week 2 (16th May to 18th May)

1. Southampton – Southampton Institute, Above Bar Street, Southampton

Pre launch: 'Reception Suite SM009' Thurs 16th May 10am – 12pm

Exhibition: 'Reception Suite SM009' Thurs 16th May 12.00 – 6pm

Fri 17th May 10 am – 5pm

Sat 18th May 10 am – 4pm

Workshop: 'Reception Suite SM010' Thurs 16th May 5.15pm – 8.30pm

2. Eastbourne – International Lawn Tennis Centre, Devonshire Park

Pre launch: 'Hardwick Suite' Thurs 16th May 10aam– 12pm

Exhibition: 'Hardwick Suite' Thurs 16th May 12.00 – 6pm

Fri 17th May 10am – 5pm

Sat 18th May 10am- 4pm

Workshop: 'Media Centre' Thurs 16th May 5.15pm – 8.30pm

3. Margate – Central Studios 130 Grosvenor Place, Margate

Pre launch: 'Rehearsal Room' Thurs 16th May 10am– 12pm

Exhibition: 'Rehearsal Room' Thurs 16th May 12.00 – 6pm

Fri 17th May 10am – 5pm

Sat 18th May 10am – 4pm

Workshop: 'Conference Room' Thurs 16th May 5.15pm – 8.30pm

4. Ashford – 'The Stour Centre', Tannery Lane

Pre launch: 'River Room' Thurs 16th May 10am – 12pm

Exhibition: 'River Room' Thurs 16th May 12.00 – 6pm

Fri 17th May 10am – 5pm

Sat 18th May 10am – 4pm

Workshop: 'Ashford Pilgrims Rest' Thurs 16th May 5.15pm – 8.30pm

Week 3 (22nd May to 25th May)

1. Arundel – Arundel Town Council, Maltravers Road

Pre launch: 'Council Chamber' Thurs 23rd May 10am – 12pm

Exhibition: 'Council Chamber' Thurs 23rd May 12.00 - 6pm

Fri 24th May 10am – 5pm

Sat 25th May 10am – 4pm

Workshop: 'Upper Chamber' Thurs 23rd May 5.15pm – 8.30pm

2. Worthing – Ardington Hotel, Steyne Gardens

Pre launch: 'Restaurants 1 & 2' Thurs 23rd May 10am – 12pm

Exhibition: 'Restaurants 1 & 2' Thurs 23rd May 12.00 – 6pm

Fri 24th May 10am – 5pm

Sat 25th May 10am – 4pm

Workshop: 'Venetian Room' Thurs 23rd May 5.15pm – 8.30pm

3. Chichester – Old Court Rooms, Chichester City Council, North Street

Pre launch: 'Old Court Rooms' Wed 22nd May 10am – 12pm

Exhibition: 'Old Court Rooms' Wed 22nd May 12.00 – 6pm

Thurs 23rd May 10am – 7pm

Fri 24th May 10am – 5pm

Workshop: 'Assembly Hall Room' Thurs 23rd May 5.15pm – 8.30pm

Week 4 (30th May to 31st May)

1. Dover/Folkestone – Dover Town Hall, High Street/Biggin St Dover

Pre launch: 'Connaught Hall' Thurs 30th May 10am – 12pm

Exhibition: 'Connaught Hall' Thurs 30th May 12.00 - 7pm

Fri 31st May 10am – 6pm

Workshop: 'Maison Dieu Hall' Thurs 30th May 5.15pm – 8.30pm

2. Winchester – Winchester Guild Hall

Pre launch: 'Saxon Suite' Thurs 30th May 10am – 12pm

Exhibition: 'Saxon Suite' Thurs 30th May 12.00- 7pm

Fri 31st May 10am – 5pm

Workshop: The Moat House Hotel, Worthy Lane

'Suite of Knights Room' Thurs 30th May 5.15pm – 8.30pm

WEEK 5 (13TH June)

1. Lewes – Lewes Town Hall, Corn Exchange Building, Lewes High St.

Exhibition: 'The Assembly Room' Thurs 13th June 10am – 9pm

Table 2. Profile of the number of participants

	Portsmouth	Brighton/Hove	Hastings*	Fareham	Southampton	Eastbourne	Margate	Ashford	Arundel	Worthing	Chichester*	Dover	Winchester	Lewes*
<i>Prelaunch</i>														
Number Invited	28	77	39	59	102	100	25	69	24	36	46	56	35	
Number RSVP	5	16	5	2	13	10	10	7	11	7	23	10	7	
Number of Attendees	6	12	25	5	11	14	12	7	15	14	18	8	9	
<i>Workshops</i>														
Number Invited	151	276	108	180	246	255	86	152	152	118	131	80	130	
Number RSVP	8	36	18	3	14	30	11	17	22	29	35	30	30	
Number of Attendees	12	35	30	5	40	42	15	40	28	24	38	29	10	
<i>Public Exhibition</i>														
Thursday	57	35	75	7	44	29	3	44	47	69	46	24	34	160
Friday	13	32	70	45	51	34	8	42	59	61	111	26	24	
Saturday	11	15	100	25	40	24	5	35	59	55	73	-	-	
Total	81	82	245	77	135	87	16	121	165	185	230	50	58	160
Total Number of Participants per venue	99	129	300	87	186	143	43	168	204	221	283	81	77	160

2 196 participants during the SoCoMMs Touring Exhibition and Workshops.

* Hastings, Chichester and Lewes are indicative recordings of the number of attendances. This is due to the high level of participation experienced and the difficulty in accurately recording all attendances on the day.

Appendix 1. Copy of Newsletter No. 4

Please note that a copy of Newsletter No. 4 can be downloaded from the SoCoMMs website.

Appendix 2. Profile of Pre Launch and Workshop Agendas

Pre launch Agenda

Outline Agenda

10.00 am	Registration and Refreshments
10.10 am	Opportunity to view exhibition display and refreshments
10.30am	Welcome and Presentation by Study Team outlining preferred transport strategy
10.50am	Question and Answer Session – Group and or individual basis
11.30 am	Close

Workshop Agenda

Outline Agenda

5.15 pm	Registration and Refreshments
5.30 pm	Welcome and Introduction
5.35 pm	Presentation by the Study
6.15 pm	Session 1: Questions and discussion
6.45 pm	Buffet and Refreshments
7.00 pm	Session 2: Small Group Work – further consideration and feedback on the options and proposals
7.30 pm	Report back from Groups
8.00 pm	Gauging support for the options and proposals
8.15 pm	Final comments by the Study Team and confirmation of the next steps
8.30pm	Close

Appendix 3. Workshop Analysis

BRIGHTON & HOVE

COMMON GROUND - STRATEGIES SUPPORTED

	Dos
Rail infrastructure improvements to support fast rail services along south coast	27
Road-based improvements	17
Strategic improvements	16
Rail strategies proposed	12
Quality bus partnerships, priority + bus lanes.	8
P T information	7
Park & Ride	6
Parkway interchanges (6 - 1 with some conditions = 5)	6
Rail + sea based freight initiative.	6
Improvements to public transport.	5
Strategic / Local	4
LRT – but subject to local environmental impacts	4
Local initiatives	4
Local initiatives	4
Promotion of personal safety etc.	4
Locally based public transport improvements except (**below DISAGREE)	3
P & R provided doesn't undermine rural/local bus services	1
Parking charges – properly managed/consistent	1
Relieved road upgrades	1
Charges for parking	
PNR/out of town centres – provided everywhere	
More strategic public transport improvements.	

COMMON GROUND – STRATEGIES OPPOSED

Private workplace & out of town retail parks.	6
Removing bottlenecks	5
City park & ride Brighton & Hove.	3
Public parking charges (No conclusions)	2

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION**IDEAS FOR RESOLUTION**

Car parking charges	7	Clear about why, where, when, alongside delivery of major public transport improvements	
Charging	6		
To road improvements.	4		
Effects of workplace parking levies.	4		
Cordon charging – may be v. close to city centre.	2		
By-passes on hotspots.	2		
Parking at rail stations.			
Road improvement strategies proposed		All other strategies first + road changes may be unnecessary	4
Park & Ride – does it work?		Evidence!	

GAPS

Lewes/Uckfield line – demand for study in 12m	10
Integrated ticketing on P. T.	10
Car sharing clubs	8
Inform for travellers – Realtime etc	7
Marketing Enforcement Phasing	6
Sensible level of fares on public transport +	6
Centralised changes to competition rules.	4
Implementation (revenue/capital) + strategy + funding + partners.	3
Brighton E-W feasibility	2
Financial –cross investment + integration of bus & rail. Holistic development.	2
Park & Ride used as an incentive e.g. free tickets for long distance travel. Marketing tool.	2
Real time public transport info. Integration.	1
More solutions to congestion locations	
Inform on charging structures	
Improved N-S rail capacity	
P & R as interchange facility.	
Requires changes to competition rules.	

CONCERNS

How is this going to be implemented in a co-ordinated way (fast!)	10
---	----

Some recommendations too vague.	5
---------------------------------	---

ADDITIONS

LRT → add Peacehaven etc	2
--------------------------	---

FAREHAM

COMMON GROUND - STRATEGIES SUPPORTED

	Dots
PTE – stakeholder involvement for area linked to trains with ferries, ties with ferries.	7
All measures must support an inclusive Society.	5
Waterfront ferry services.	5
Fareham interchange	4
Accessible Stations and location for disabled, elderly and mothers & children.	4
Waterlooville – Leigh Park rail link.	4
Recommendation that Delme & market roundabouts is addressed.	4
An overall framework of integrated bus services.	4
“Very well thought out and integrated”.	3
Park & Ride.	3
Recommendation that J9 is addressed.	3
Rewarding those who reduce their car use.	3
Re-open Chandlers Ford → through to Hythe.	2
Rail Improvements in locality – especially for centres of population who do not have rail access (Priddys Hard)	1
L R T via Hamble. Heavy rail by Hedge End.	1
Southampton to Ashford Rail Link.	1
Recommendation that the A27 Farlington be addressed incl. the junctions.	1
Rationalising the junctions around Chichester.	1
Quantified objectives.	1

COMMON GROUND – STRATEGIES OPPOSED

No support for improving M27 3 & 4 - 11 & 12. ‘More to do with disruption.’	
Tolling – no overall agreement – hits poor people, What about business delivered?	
Antisocial inclusion, what about residents? Penalises those living in town centres?	

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

IDEAS FOR RESOLUTION

Tougher targets for reducing car use.	4		
---------------------------------------	---	--	--

HASTINGS

CONCERNS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Attempts to get to the wider community	
Explanation of 'Sustainability'.	
Broad support for strategy. - Haven't given enough evidence of specific strategy for Hastings.	
Have not had enough time to look at the 'newsletter' & issues/proposals put forward.	
Interpretation of strategy can go in a number ways – local councils can decide.	
↓Hastings element – link road' needs to be qualified.	
<u>Qualifications</u> <u>Elements of importance.</u> ↑Does not transgress the natural Green Belt that protects Hastings. (SSSI & Countryside eg Crowhurst)	
<u>Key issue?</u> <u>new road will create new developments</u>	
Impact of improvements to A259 would move impact to another residential area.	
Any link road carries serious pos. of moving impact to another residential area.	
Any increased traffic on 'the Ridge' would have an affect on NHS – emergency traffic.	
A259 cuts off town from it's beach – it's key asset - local pressure to decrease traffic speed on A259.	
Light rail suggested as an answer to links between Bexhill & Hastings. (put it forward as a special case)	
Problem of improving rail infrastructure – need to prioritise P.T. – before road program. ↓ (S. coast metro programme – funded 1 st stage – S'oton → Havant) ↓ has this been tested in 'the model'? - deliverability? – within short time scale ↑feasibility?	
Is it possible to produce a costing between a LR (<i>light rail</i>) option & highway option? (for buses).	
- guided busway as an alternative.	

* There were no priority given – all the abovementioned treated as equally as important.

PORTSMOUTH

COMMON GROUND - STRATEGIES SUPPORTED

	Dots
Agree the cordon proposals are a blunt implement and not as attractive as attractive as work place parking charges.	5
Properly fund non-commercial public transport.	4
Agree that corridor comprises a number of sub-areas of which South Hampshire is one.	4
A key outcome is a realistic implementation strategy – financial and political.	4
Strategy needs to promote a review of methods for providing and funding bus services. (London style approach).	4
We need significantly higher quality transport interchange hubs.	3
Need for a higher profile to achieve local buy-in.	3
A new motorway is <u>not</u> the solution.	2
Charging is an essential element to the strategy.	2
Requirement for authorities to work together for common goal (P.T.A.?)	2
Workplace P. Levy needs to be brought in corridor-wide	1
There is a need to see the local detail	1
Supportive of current S. Hants rail proposals.	1
Workplace and public parking charges need to be pursued on an area wide basis.	

ASHFORD

COMMON GROUND - STRATEGIES SUPPORTED

	Dots
Junction 10 needs improvement.	11
Bus priorities on roads.	9
Need to reflect changes in economy & society <u>not</u> freeze_time.	7
Total upgrade rail line Ashford – Southampton	7
Agree with improvements to Dover from A2.	6
Safety on rural roads for cyclists & walkers <u>must</u> be improved (reinstate verges?).	6
Rail Line Capacity - speed - mix of stations.	5
Facilities for bikes on trains (SRA requirement).	5
Secure bike parking at all stations.	4
Convenience of car.	2
Doubts about implementation	1

Practicalities	
Politics – education of effects of cars.	
Canterbury – congestion!	1
Rail link between E & W docks at Dover (light rail)	1
Use of workplace levy money.	

EASTBOURNE

COMMON GROUND - STRATEGIES SUPPORTED

	Dots
Link transport and planning policy, so as to reduce travel demand	16
Strategy does not ensure public transport operators take part or invest.	15
Improvements to public transport should be carried out first.	14
There is little if anything in strategy on: - landscape, AONB, value of these - proposed National Park - biodiversity. <i>There are UNDERLYING ISSUES</i> <i>↖ eg environment</i>	12
Agree with proposed rail package BUT/AND would also like to see included the Lewes-Uckfield + Eridge-Tunbridge Wells extensions.	12
More solid information needed. Especially <u>solid data</u> . – <i>queries about Halcrow's data – what are these statistics, are they accurate.</i>	8
Road Improvements -Targeting specific areas – bottlenecks.	8
School traffic <u>significant</u> cause of congestion (A27).	5
Reduce car dependency.	5
Needs long-term policy & assured funding.	5
Safer routes & school/crocodile, walking to school/town centres/shops.	4
We want more detail on the road 'improvement' proposals before we can agree/disagree.	4
<i>We like</i> Rail improvements in strategy.	3
Rail expansion to be encouraged.	3
Interchange hubs & park & ride need to be assessed individually with particular caution to traffic generation effects.	3
Local Based Transport Improvements -Park & ride ok but concern re impact of large parking sites.	3
Local Initiatives - Support but subject to parking restrictions re house building. + more intensive infrastructure for walking, cycling.	3
There is a basic problem of information about public transport and it's marketing.	2
Welcome "flavour" of strategy.	1

Strategy lacks definition of access to public transport.	1
More emphasis on non-transport based solutions e.g. IT.	1
Support Willingdon cord	1
And through trains Southampton → Ashford.	1
Road improvements _ Adequate measures to control commuting: e.g. motorways have become local roads difficulties in small communities accessing major roads.	1
We need more detail + emphasis on objectives.	
No singles “solution”.	
Needs integrated & balanced package of measures.	
Needs some universal measure albeit with scope for local variation (EG levies for private parking).	
What matters is what works: - no dogma.	
Promote transport choices.	
Do nothing is not an option.	
“It ain’t going to be easy”.	
Buses should play a bigger role.	
P.8 (<i>of leaflet</i>) More strategic public transport improvement ?	
N.B. Safe crossings over roads.) Park & Ride & interchange with train.	
We agree that we <u>disagree</u> with the analysis that underlies traffic analysis. Is it under 25km or under 10km? <i>Statistical queries.</i>	
And extension west <i>to be</i> investigated.	
Full integration of bus and train.	
Local Based Transport Improvements - Support principal but sceptical re regulation & long term funding + quality of individual services.	
Rail & Sea - Good idea in principle, but questionable in practice.	
Promotion of Safety - Support.	
Promotion of Safety -Strategy = ok but doubts about funds.	
Promotion of Safety - New strategy in place before penalties imposed.	
Promotion of Safety - Support in principle, but why only 3 towns selected for cordon charges?	

COMMON GROUND – STRATEGIES OPPOSED

Whether there is need for targeted local road improvements.	2
Some are against congestion charging, work place parking charges and other charges BUT some are for the principle.	2
Whether a need to help local businesses by providing better access for freight	1

movements.	
No more money be spent on road improvements.	1
Railways could not absorb <i>trips generated by</i> economic growth.	1
S.D.N.P. should constrain transport choice. <i>South Downs National Park.</i>	1
We also disagree over <u>specific</u> measures + design.	1
Does area <u>need</u> more employment?	
Size of the 'stick' to entice motorists out of cars.	
Park and ride could draw passengers for rural buses.	
Punitive parking charges downtown could be counter productive.	
More consideration to roads using AONB land.	
Not convinced that the plan will reduce car use.	

MARGATE

COMMON GROUND - STRATEGIES SUPPORTED

	Dots
Local, + long distance, rail service improvements rail services to Ashford.	9
More strategic public transport improvements (includes information).	6
Public transport improvements.	6
A2 road improvement involving ↻ ↻ at docks	5
Private workplace parking & out of town retail levy on parking.	5
Sustainable travel modes (including chords).	3
Rejecting m-way proposals.	3
Sea based freight initiatives + freight partnerships.	3
Charges on motorways + major trunk roads. (i.e. must charge on trunk roads <u>and</u> motorways – otherwise traffic will divert to trunk roads) + restrictions on nearby rural roads	2
Rejecting public transport on its own.	2
Improvements within the rail system.	1
Bus card as rail card (i.e. have a bus card like existing rail cards)	1
A259 safety & environment improvements	1
Restrictions on rural roads.	
Improved interchange facilities + stations.	
Improvement of J10 of M20 + all 3 phases of East Kent access 1→3	
Promotion of personal safety, accessibility etc.	
All local initiatives agreed.	

COMMON GROUND – STRATEGIES OPPOSED

Emerging strategy does not support anything beyond Ashford (rail) i.e. EAST of Ashford.	7
Increasing short stay parking charges.	1

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

IDEAS FOR RESOLUTION

New motorway * versus M25. May alleviate traffic though! → more roads needed.	5	M25 influence out of town parking charges and shopping.	2
Travel Smart scheme. As piloted in Australia (Perth) – should be considered as a model. Education → Essential and will add to initiatives.	3	Home working money into outworking/info centres.	5
Tolls			
A2 viaduct will that need improvement?	1		
Increasing long stay parking charges.	1		

SOUTHAMPTON

COMMON GROUND - STRATEGIES SUPPORTED

	Dots
Increased investment in public transport.	18
Need to protect environment to maintain area's tourism.	14
Cheap transport <u>must be</u> both cheap <u>and</u> efficient!	14
Safety & confidence on public transport? Social behaviour.	12
Cycle tracks are too fragmented facilities for safe storage of cycles, near your destination.	9
Local focus	8
Needs to be co-ordination between local authorities for issues that cross boundaries.	7
Better – more frequent <u>integrated</u> public transport. Cost is a factor, at a reasonable cost. Makes public transport more practical.	7
Important to have the carrot first, then the stick. Encourage people not to use car.	6
Need to take more account of areas of influence.	5
Park & Ride good but must be managed to benefit local economy.	5
Exclusion of Dibden Bay from study – important role for freight.	3

Commerce has been driven towards city centres and now we are talking of penalising those who patronise them.	2
Congestion charges payable at approaches to towns & cities. Helps balance between car & public transport.	2
All agree cost is the stumbling block. Who pays? Encourage public transport use.	2
Selective improvements to M27 at M27/& M27/M3 junctions. Eases congestion, safer.	2
Workplace parking levy - new tax on business vs potential for encouraging modal shift.	1
Out of town shopping parking charges – cultural shock to businesses/users	1
More comprehensive use of sea for freight transport – needs to embrace all ports.	
Park & Ride Good: reduced congestion from existing motorists who switch to it. Bad: can increase overall car use as existing p. transport uses make bulk of journey by car. Bad: use of Greenfield sites. Good: can release urban land for uses other than car parking.	
Parking levies will be complicated to administer, they should start with out-of-town to encourage the economic growth of towns.	

COMMON GROUND – STRATEGIES OPPOSED

Money better spent in regenerating other regions. To reduce the pressure.	8
Park & ride hard to manage. Buses take as long to get to city centre. Land needed is countryside.	2
South Coast motorway not a good idea. Against environment.	1
Double taxation.	

DOVER

COMMON GROUND - STRATEGIES SUPPORTED

Support rail connections to:	Dots
a) Manston airport (freight & passengers)	6
b) Dover harbour (freight & passengers)	11
No new east-west motorway.	6

Promotion of rail & sea based freight initiatives.	5
Local public transport re-regulation to ensure uneconomic routes are served (-this is not in the strategy).	4
Improved bus services with better information.	4
Support bus services to rural areas & subsidy for school buses not in strategy plans at present but should be included.	3
1953 Flood route – Faversham – Canterbury West link line to be re-instated (Medway to Ashford).	3
Support reduction in car dependence	3
Re-instatement of Folkestone East Stn.	2
Support enhancement of rail links end to end of area.	2
Cycling 100% } Walking } Safe routes	2
All public transport must by statute be obliged to carry cycles, wheelchairs, pushchairs, etc.	2
Make rail travel more user friendly & fun! More welcoming. Make rail travel cheaper in relation to road.	2
Support ringfenced revenue collection from road use/parking space levy.	1
Hope that SoCCoMs will deliver measures & funding is available.	1
Improved rail service Ashford-Hastings (NB frequency important).	1
More strategic public transport improvements.	
Much to be commended in local initiative/local transport improvements.	
No tolls on main roads.	
Improved non-motorised choices.	
Congestion charges in city centres.	

COMMON GROUND – STRATEGIES OPPOSED

Freight issues not addressed properly.	8
Insufficient. Radical plans needed to encourage use of non car travel – monorail. Pods on Pylons, trams or electric buses for park & ride (in East Kent).	7
The strategy has a missing link – Town Wall Street, Dover	7
Need A20/A256 imp to Sandwich.	6
Too vague on costing appraisal.	5
<u>Very strongly oppose</u> strategy as no mention of A20 approaches to the Dover Port + A256 Sandwich/Eastry- Ramsgate to be dual carriageway. + improvements to A258 (A21) Whitfield Roundabout – Deal (accident prone (icy)).	3
You haven't addressed the rail-car interchange sufficiently. Not enough parking at stations.	3
Parking charges non-effective in retail car parks. Move problems to residential areas.	2

No mention of alternative route: Folkestone Central Dover Priory, avoiding Cliff falls of Shakespeare tunnel.	1
Whole strategy smacks of over generalisation	1
Lack of proposed infrastructure improvement in East Kent – study seems to be weighted in favour of western end.	1
Lack of clarity about delivery of funding.	1
Not convinced that parking charges are correct solution – fragility of economy!	1
Consider effects of climate change not addressed.	1
Failure to mention possible improvements to E Kent coastal railway.	1
Bottlenecks in system not addressed (Newhaven Bridge relief road).	
Moving freight to rail relies on French co-operation – may need to adapt policy.	

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

IDEAS FOR RESOLUTION

Routes of heavy goods vehicles vary and drivers are using short cuts after networking.		Need to understand effect of strategy on local communities	3
Radical plans needed *	1	Concentrate on provision of rail freight capacity	1
Strategy hasn't considered 'missing link' section of A256 i.e. between viaduct at Sandwich & Eastry by pass.	5	Rail links West to North East (Manston?) at an economical price (Dover-Thamet).	9
Folkestone harbour line + Folkestone East Station re-instated.	6	School run – could be overcome by removing peak hour fares.	3
A2 Dualling relieving 'hotspots'		Proper provision for pedestrians and cyclists + bus stops	1
Green Party oppose improvement A2 & other road schemes.		Reduce flow <u>NOT</u> increase road space.	2
Parking charges in town (3-1 split).	1	Improve public transport & freight transfer to rail.	5
Out of town parking charges (3-1 split)		Partial exemption for rural dwellers with minimal bus service.	3

WINCHESTER

COMMON GROUND - STRATEGIES SUPPORTED

	Dots
Greater consideration to SHRT esp. extending to Southampton.	11
↑ Unless PT improvements are done (first) the whole strategy fails.	11

M3 is a strategic route & should also be considered in strategy.	9
Short sighted not to consider effects of Dibden Bay proposals.	7
↑ HOW? Low speed limits along the route that are ENFORCED!	7
Support local, small solutions to problems.	6
What about South Downs Nat. Park & loss of habitat – SSSIs & SACs (v. difficult to see where Eastleigh rail link goes).	5
Integrated transport must be <u>REAL and effective</u> . i.e. bus stations at railway stations.	5
Any strategy must deter long journey along the corridor i.e. removing bottlenecks may encourage more car use.	4
Create better attitudes to car use from early age.	4
How will this strategy be funded?	4
Educate the public to use public transport ← provide information.	4
Welcome the multi modal approach	3
Welcome rail improvements e.g. Botley – Gosport (Integrated with cycleways) Too much environmental damage.	3
Improve local roads to make them more user-friendly without increasing them – within the present structure.	2
Equivalent funding to reduce congestion black spots, to be allocated to walking and cycling.	1
Ease congestion but make it difficult (time consuming) to travel long distance. ↓	
↑ Difficult as parents with bad attitude are major influence on child.	
<u>WHY NOT</u> a public transport only strategy?	
↓ Be aware of the environmental effects produced by increasing roads (widening railways).	

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

IDEAS FOR RESOLUTION

It is seen as a “back door” method for a road building scheme.	3	How will P.T. stations be integrated?	
Public transport element will be put on a “back burner”.			
Paying lip service!			

ARUNDEL
SESSION 1 - QUESTIONS

Group A

1. How were the Stakeholders selected?
2. How can improvement in PT be enforced? (Incl. timetabling & bus service routing?)
3. How can local people effectively influence the improvements we want?
4. How seriously does SoCoMMS take the environmental lobby's vies?
5. Has consideration been given to encouraging freight back on the Railways?
6. If a tunnel is envisaged, could this be adequately financed?
7. Does removing bottlenecks mean that a bypass is a possible solution?
8. Does the policy include changes, e.g. B'ton Football Club.
9. Has the impact of parking charges on private land on business costs been considered?

Table C – Questions of Fact

1. Why haven't we concentrated more on Arundel?
2. Justify long-distance travel statistics.
3. Is it feasible to rely on the M25 to deal with regional traffic?
4. Real potential for bulk freight transportation along the South Coast railway.
5. Links to villages along the south coast?
6. Difference between congestion maps presented here and those in the transport white paper & draft R.T.S.

Table D – Questions about Strategy

1. New Stations – where will Littlehampton Parkway be built – how will it link in to existing network?
2. What is the difference in environmental impact between a) major road and b) major public transport improvements?

Questions of Fact

1. How will improvement be paid for?
2. What plans are being considered for a much greater coordination of implementation?

Table B – Questions

1. How will the study assess the environmental impact of a bypass at Arundel
2. Are they considering a tunnel under the Arun?
3. Why has it taken so long? When is something going to be done?
4. Car parking charges – how would they be enforced on Local Authorities?
5. Do they intend to tax out-of-town parking (e.g. retail parks)?
6. Have they undertaken an appraisal of the ‘induced traffic’ caused by the bypass schemes (as recommended by SACTRA)? (1994)
7. Do bypasses keep congestion in the town?
8. Have they assess the effect of work-places charging for parking – would this lead to businesses moving away?
9. Have they taken into account the parallel ‘strategic route’ being developed by W.S.C.C. on the A259 (including Bognor bypass)
10. Is there not a danger that several bypasses (Worthing, Arundel) will encourage long distance travel?
11. Has an appraisal of the combined effects of these schemes been carried out as recommended by SACTRA?
12. Is the ‘European model’ ambition realistic?

13. How are they going to coordinate & enforce improvements to e.g. Rail? (New stations? New trains?)
14. How will they make the train companies run better timetables (e.g. late at night)?

SESSION 2

PREFERENCE FOR DISCUSSIONS IN GROUPS

TABLE A

1. Require a method of removing traffic congestion and creating an easy traffic flow around Arundel with the least possible damage to the Environment NOW. Table B as well.
2. There is no encouragement at a local level to use the rail network. E.g. Barnham Station Car park is now charging on Saturday, wheel clamps have been introduced in the Carpark, the cost of short journeys has gone up, the cheapest on a Railcard in £10.
3. Much the same goes for the local bus services which continue to get fewer & fewer. (so cut down all the stages & put up all the fares – hold very tight please – ting! ting!).

TABLE C

1. We agree there should be by-pass.
2. ~~We agree with the 'prepared route'~~
3. Car parking charges in Arundel.
4. Level-crossings?
5. Alleviation of local gridlock due to lack of alternative routes.

TABLE D

PLENARY

1. How does the study strategy relate to the regional strategy?
2. Housing forecasts?

3. M25
4. Strategic planning issues?
5. Economic regeneration of the district & concern of rural areas.

TABLE D

1. Highest priority is Arundel bypass – within 5 yrs.
2. Upgraded rail service with additional routes welcomed.
3. Better footpaths & cycle tracks from villages to Arundel.
4. A bridge to remove delays caused by level crossings at Ford & Lyminster.

Would re organisation of local govt lead to streamlining of transport provision?

5. Support Littlehampton Parkway Station asap.

TABLE B

1. By pass, but need to get it right.
2. Tunnel?

TABLE C

1. By pass – unanimous agreement.
↓
2. No view on the route.
3. Very concerned about car parking charging proposals –
Re: Arundel, - total different nature of visitors & issues.

4. Level crossings on N-S route
Re: traffic projections – car & rail.
5. Where will the Littlehampton Parkway be?
6. How easy it is for traffic around here to become grid locked – no alternative routes. (bottlenecks because of accidents & roadworks).

TABLE D

1. By pass in 5 yrs – priority.
2. Better rail services – upgraded/faster chord link.
3. Littlehampton Parkway station asap.
4. Better foot paths/cycle tracks from country into Arundel.
5. Level crossing – bridge/routes E-W routes.
6. Local Gov't reorganisation for better delivery & integration (too fragmented) – partnership?

TABLE D - PLENARY

1. Maintenance on highways (lots of coning).
2. More efficient use / timing
3. Limited distance at a time.

TABLE B

1. Should there be a bypass? 5 for 1 against

FOR:

- a) bad traffic jam at parking junctions
- b) Accidents caused by road rage

- c) Recently more traffic in town that avoids jams. (BUT that can be solved without a bypass)
- d) Makes sense as part of an integrated plan. ‘Carrots’ will be supported. ‘Sticks’ – ok if carrots
- e) Avoiding rat-runs and ‘up-round-town’
- f) Would improve conditions for local businesses
- g) Important to get to Europe by road.

AGAINST:

- a) Number of people on through journey very small
- b) If you build bypasses there would be more
- c) Environmental effects underplayed.

Questions Raised:

1. What are the local advantages of a bypass in Arundel?
- less rat-runs. To local smaller roads: takes traffic off onto more suitable roads.
2. Is it worth destroying view of Arun Valley for a bypass? Perhaps not. Has to be justified. Will it relieve Arundel of pollution & noise. But only if it goes in a tunnel. Noise come upwards of 60-70mph.

CHICHESTER

COMMON GROUND - STRATEGIES SUPPORTED

Transport must be frequent, cheap, connectable.	Dots 20
Strategy offered as good as we will get.	15
We should go for it.	12
<u>But</u> carrots needed before sticks	12
Alternative strategies to the private car be implemented before any punitive financial penalties are imposed.	12
Need for long-term coordinating organisation.	11
Lack of environmental strategy.	11
Road schemes to have minimum impact on environment (e.g. tunnels etc)	10
To improve public transport – quality, frequency, reliability & price.	9
Local initiatives for reducing traffic.	8

To reduce dependency on the car.	8
Political will is needed at all levels of government – national, regional, local – right down to parishes.	7
Acceptance of balanced approach.	5
Sceptical that £2bn over 10 years will be enough.	5
To encourage pedestrians and cyclists	5
Need more strategic road transport improvements: - Arundel by-pass - Worthing scheme.	4
Insufficient consideration of <u>freight movement</u> . - alternative routes used between parts/tunnel - coastal <u>shipping</u> ideas need much more investigation.	4
How to maintain momentum, avoid hurdles, avoid prevarication and procrastination.	4
In principle with strategic public transport improvements to rail.	4
Need to solve A27 bottlenecks round Chichester - via under-or-overpasses - resolving north-south flows.	3
Need to solve rail signalling and level crossings east of Chichester.	3
More rail halts with better accessibility <u>BUT</u> concerned about environmental impacts.	3
Agree strategic rail improvements.	3
We agree with the ‘rail’ solution.	3
The <u>selective</u> use of charging to achieve ↑	3
Car sharing to be encouraged.	3
A “park & ride” scheme for Chichester (as well as others).	2
Coordination of local plans.	2
Political leaders (at all levels – national & local) should lead by example.	2
We agree with the ‘bus’ strategy (we would recommend that the B’ton & Hove fare strategy is adopted).	2
<u>All</u> car parking spaces should be ‘taxed’ including LA’s.	2
Publicly funded school buses shared with parents.	2
Support proposals for rail.	2
Need for improved bus/rail interchanges locally.	1
Not enough discussion of “carrot and stick” approaches to implementing strategy.	1
Whose responsibility drawing together implementation plan?	1
Study & strategy <u>is needed</u>	
Need for local initiative/action plan for Chichester area.	
Agree: - “Safety = access” - “Balance”	

- Motherhood Apple pie.	
We should not cherry pick.	
Real problem = (continuous) implement ⁿ	
We agree that we don't disagree.	
Policy of an integrated strategy is agreed.	
Support P&R at B/Hove, S'ton & Ports. <u>Only</u>	

COMMON GROUND – STRATEGIES OPPOSED

Workplace parking charges	2
Should there be a motorway?	
Unblocking bottlenecks?	
Bus lanes/HO lanes.	

WORTHING

COMMON GROUND - STRATEGIES SUPPORTED

	Dots
Enhancing public transport & better co-ordination (e.g. trains to buses).	14
Highest (<i>best possible</i>) form of public transport to be subsidised as necessary	11
Removal of bottlenecks.	9
Tunnel Worthing/Lancing.	8
Priority before road building	7
Removing <u>all</u> bottlenecks (not some).	7
Encouraging cycling & walking.	6
Reduction in car use.	5
Strategic public transport improvements	5
Integrated transport system	4
Local based improvements in public transport before parking charges.	3
Park & Ride.	2
Improved rail services.	2
Short dist. private → public transport	2
Rail infrastructure (inc. freight).	2
Safer routes to school	2
Local improvements / public transport	2
Planning provision to allow reliable public transport in towns.	1
Junction for E. Worthing access road to industrial estates.	1
Chords.	1
Rail strategy fully supported.}	

Local public transport}	
Local initiatives	
Parking – some reservations about effect <u>must</u> be multilateral	
Freight (but concerned about sea freight)	
The full corridor is too large an area for us to deal with due to our local knowledge only.	
Public transport policy in long term	
Parkway stations (Shoreham & Littlehampton).	

COMMON GROUND – STRATEGIES OPPOSED

Park and ride – should be ride and ride!	4
Out of town parking charges.	

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

IDEAS FOR RESOLUTION

A27 Bottleneck removal “Dynamic equilibrium” Only congested during rush hour		↗ Slows traffic down ↘ Removal moves the problem } elsewhere	
Other new bypass.	6	} <i>(a common ground proposed from the table)</i>	
Workplace parking charges	2	Subsidy of non-economic public transport	5
Road construction.	2	1x <u>for</u> building high grade east-west road. 2x for <u>no</u> road building.	
Worthing by-pass.	1		
Sea freight		Need rail not road from/to ports	
More train stations		Staggered working hours	

Appendix 4. Profile of Presentation Recipients

May 2002

- Presentation to West Sussex County Council – District and Local Council members – (21st May)
- Several meetings with Hastings Borough Council, Mr Paul Adams – (May and June)
- Meeting with Member of European Parliament, Ms Caroline Lucas – (31st May)

June 2002

- Presentation to East Sussex County Council – District and Local Council members – (13th June)
- Meetings with Members of Parliament – Ashdown House (18th June)
- National Trust – (19th June)
- 1066 Enterprise Hastings Business Community Group – (19th June)
- Brighton and Hove Council – (21st June)
- Meeting with representatives of English Nature, English Heritage, Countryside Agency and Environment Agency – (26th June)

July 2002

- Go Folkestone Group – discussions on the implications of the strategy on the Folkestone area (2nd July)
- A27 Action Group – (19th July)
- Countryside Agency – (to be advised)

Appendix 5. Profile of Presentations

Please note that a copy of the SoCoMMs Emerging Strategy presentation will be available to be downloaded on the website.