

SOUTH COAST CORRIDOR MULTI - MODAL STUDY
STEERING GROUP
15 January 2002
MINUTES OF MEETING

Those Present:

Charlotte Dixon (Chair)	Government Office for the South East	Mike Ford	Highways Agency
Andrew Cleaver	Government Office for the South East	Colin McKenna	West Sussex County Council
Nicola Brooker	Government Office for the South East	Bob Wilkins	East Sussex County Council
Derrick Coffee	South East Forum for Sustainability	Lindsay Gardner	South East Regional Assembly
Colin Murray	South East Forum for Sustainability	John Buckett	Hampshire County Council
Anthony Slack	South East England Development Agency	John Guttridge	Freight Transport Association
Andrew Dyer	Confederation of Passenger Transport	Mark Froud	Sussex Enterprise

CONSULTANTS

Mark Brown
Paul Read
Susan Cross
Alan Peakall

APOLOGIES

Tony Cook	SEAPLAG
Mick Sutch	Kent County Council
Andrew Renaut	Brighton and Hove City Council
Paul Collins	DTLR
D. Bastow	Portsmouth City Council
R. Anderson	Southampton city Council
Matthew Lodge	Strategic Rail Authority
David Turner	HALCROW

Chair's welcome and introductions

1. Minutes of the last meeting were tabled and agreed.

SEFS raised a concern that the consultants may only produce one option and strategy for consultation / final recommendations. This they felt to be counter to GOMMMs advice.

ACTION POINT - It was agreed that that GOSE should discuss with MMSU and that a formal letter of response on this point would be framed.

Preliminary Option Testing and Strategy Development

2. The Consultants presented an overview of the option testing and the strategy development work to date. They explained that the results were being drawn together in a sifting process, and that these would be used to ultimately derive a strategy (or strategies). The work to date reflects preliminary analysis. An initial appraisal summary (at the strategic level) had been circulated to members of the Steering Group prior to the meeting. It was noted that issue of practicality and deliverability would need to be built in at a later phase in the assessment.

The following was discussed further:

- It was noted that the latest GO Via service enhancements are included in the forecast year rail modelling, and that Parkway stations will be considered;
- It was agreed that a 'concept' test should be included which includes a D2 extension as far as Ramsgate and a further scheme test examining the extension of coastal rail services from Brighton/Ashford to East Kent.
- The desirability of including an assessment of journey time reliability as a part of the wider appraisal was noted.
- An observation was made re the need to ensure a balance in terms of potential network capacity enhancements. An appreciation of this need, and the inclusion of D3 road capacity in the modelling were explained.
- The cost implications of improving long distance rail travel were also discussed alongside a need to recognise both local and out of study area benefits. It was agreed that it should be possible to identify benefits by geographic and market sector.

- The need for inclusion of ‘soft measures’ including demand management was noted and it was stressed that the effect of this is likely to prove most significant in peak hour modelling.
- The value of increased road capacity for public transport (particularly buses) was also noted and it was agreed that the preliminary appraisal material should be revisited with this in mind.
- It was also noted that GOMMMS identifies a benefit for public transport as a desirable aim of the Multi Modal study process, and as such the appraisal should reflect this.

ACTION POINT – Halcrow outlined that a report on the option testing is to be made available at the next steering group meeting. It was agreed that that this will need to be circulated as far in advance as possible.

Land Use Assumptions

3. The five land use scenarios to be used were explained and discussed. These will allow the results of strategy testing to be fine-tuned. Next steps will be to test the packages of options, and then the strategy options under different land use scenarios. The link between this and an emerging corridor vision was presented.

The following discussion noted:

- The use of the sustainable development label for one of the scenarios was felt to be undesirable, particularly when related to a falling GDP;
- It was similarly noted as probably inappropriate that the stellar development scenario assumes increased economic benefit for London only. The consultants suggested referring to this type of development as being “capital led.”
- The need to reflect the feedback effect of the impact of transport investment on land use was also noted;
- Policy issues, such as social inclusion and the reduced use of cars, were identified as important to the vision. Variants of the vision were discussed. It was noted that there will be a need to be consistent with RPG.
- The need to appreciate the weighting of policy issues in a local context was noted.

Further work will include the testing of the robustness of the emerging strategy, confirming the preliminary conclusions through modelling and weighting of the alternative visions.

The Strategy Development Procedure

4. The consultants outlined the proposed approach to deriving key elements for incorporation in a draft strategy (s). This is to be approached by means of exclusion tests, which successively remove elements of a wider strategy in an attempt to identify the contribution of individual elements.

Discussion noted:

- The need to recognise that certain key elements of infrastructure are integral to the delivery of a wider agenda re land use planning requirements and aspirations;
- Congestion charging is only likely to be relevant for major urban centres
- The need to consider a role for charging and ultimately whether this might have some wider benefit in terms of improving the scope for scheme delivery

Local Action Plan Development

5. Noting that strategy development raises issues re the requirements of future Local Action plans (LAPs), the consultants were invited to present their initial thoughts re their preferences for the requirements of the plans. These initial proposals were summarised as follows:

- East Kent Public Transport issues
- Hastings and environs
- East of Lewes

- Arundel area
- Chichester bypass requirements
- Chichester public transport
- Worthing / Lancing area
- A major urban conurbation (e.g. Portsmouth)
- The M27 Corridor
- A South Hampshire PTA
- Improved E-W corridor rail capacity
- The South Downs National Park

Discussion Followed:

- The criteria for selection were discussed at some length. It was noted that the selection of areas where a greater understanding of requirements / local issues is required is desirable.
- It was similarly noted that there is a likely need to recognise further the requirements of the schemes remitted to the study
- The need for a 'mini brief' for each of the local action plan proposals was agreed.
- The value in early work on local action plans was also noted with the benefit of the consultants being able to identify modelling requirements at an early stage recognised.

6. Following considerable discussion it was agreed that 3 action plan areas should be progressed on the strength of this meeting. Namely:

- Hastings and immediate environs.
- The A27 between Lewes and Polegate
- Arundel and environs.

It was also agreed that a mechanism would be sought to publicise the agreement to pursuing these plans and that it would be appropriate to seek to finalise the list of all the LAPs at the next of the Steering group meetings.

ACTION POINT - The consultants are to provide:

- Their outline proposals for the selection of preferred LAPs at the next of the Steering group meetings together with their reasoning / criteria for selection;
- A draft brief for each of the Action plans which outlines the extent of the work required in developing the plan;
- A diagrammatic representation of how the plans might inter-relate.
- initial views as to how particular schemes might be progressed, particularly bearing in mind any arrangements for early working on scheme delivery.

Further discussion noted:

- That there may be a benefit in progressing some aspects of further working on charging and non-road and rail schemes. It was agreed that this work would, if required, perhaps need to be commissioned separately;
- A concern was noted that it would be desirable to have a direct SRA input at the next of the SG meetings. Comments had been received from the SRA before the Steering Group and separate meetings between the consultants, the GOSE project manager and the SRA were being held. Discussion followed re the possibility of having the next meeting at the SRA;
- concern was also voiced over the non-attendance of some Steering group members and it was agreed that GOSE would follow up to see if a better attendance could be achieved at the next meeting

The consultants agreed to circulate PowerPoint presentation material to Steering group members to enable the wider presentation of work to outside parties by the Steering group.

ACTION POINT The consultants also circulated a draft newsletter for Steering Group comments. Comments were sought from the Steering Group within the week.

NEXT MEETING The next Steering group meeting is scheduled for 12 February 13.30-17.00 at GOSE or SRA. It was agreed that an additional meeting would be scheduled for 19 March 14.00 – 17.00 – Venue to be agreed.