

SOUTH COAST CORRIDOR MULTI - MODAL STUDY
STEERING GROUP
11th September

MINUTES OF MEETING

Those Present:

Charlotte Dixon (Chair)	Government Office for the South East	John Timms	Highways Agency
Andrew Cleaver	Government Office for the South East	Colin McKenna	West Sussex County Council
Alison Duddell	Government Office for the South East	Bernie Miles	Southampton City Council
Mark Amis	East Sussex County Council	John Gutteridge	Freight Transport Association
Derrick Coffee	South East Forum for Sustainability	Lindsay Gardner	South East Regional Assembly
Colin Murray	South East Forum for Sustainability		
Mick Sutch	Kent County Council		
Mark Froud	Sussex Enterprise		
Paul Collins	Department of Local Government Transport and the Regions		
Robert Saunders	Department of Local Government Transport and the Regions		

CONSULTANTS

Mark Brown
David Turner
Paul Read
Paul Stelmaszczyk
Dick Scott Kerr
Heather Pope

APOLOGIES

Tony Cook	SEAPLAG
Elizabeth Goodal	Southampton City Council
Andy Renaut	Brighton and Hove Council
Denise Bastow	Portsmouth City Council
Anthony Slack	South East England Development Agency
Andrew Dyer	Stagecoach South
Matthew Lodge	SRA
Bob Wilkins	East Sussex County Council

Chair's welcome and introductions.

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

Presentation of the Study Progress from Halcrow.

2. The Consultants presented the (previously circulated) Progress Report outlining work undertaken to the end of August.

Problems and Issues Report.

3. The Consultants presented the previously circulated Problems and Issues Report. Various issues were raised and discussed re the report including:
 - an area that could be drawn out further in the report was the major issue of parking at stations
 - the issues of inward investment and investment choices and their relationship with accessibility had not been discussed in the report
 - there was a query as to whether there were any discrepancies between the findings of the consultation and the data. The consultants response was that the observed data backs up the consultation findings

- a query was made as to the type of constraints that the rail network was restricted by. The constraints were clarified as being in relation to the number of train paths available rather than the number of available seats on the trains.
 - it was put forward that road problems do affect freight and that there is a need to prioritise use of the highway
 - poor infrastructure means that freight are using the wrong routes
 - there needs to be a mechanism to look at how accessibility will bring employment opportunities. The consultants stated that there would be a need for expert advice in this area
 - it was suggested that it would be useful to have a map naming the relevant routes
4. The report would be finished by the end of September therefore the consultants would need to receive any initial comments by the September 21st. It was also confirmed that the consultants would circulate the paragraphs missing from the report.

Forecasting – Do-minimum/Do-minimum plus

5. The consultants outlined those schemes that would be under the headings of Do-minimum and Do-minimum plus. Members of the Steering Group made the following comments in relation to these schemes including:
- in relation to the CTRL, the patterns that Kent County Council had been led to assume may not occur, and that it may be more likely to be 50% Ashford and 50% Ebbsfleet – the consultants would discuss this issue with the SRA
 - would any of the ports be added such as Dibden Bay or Manston Airport?– the consultants confirmed that these would be part of the “What if?” scenarios.

Land Use Assumptions

6. It was confirmed that the consultants would generate a demand scenario and “what if” situations. They would then come back to the Steering Group with the forecasts

Appraisal Framework

7. The consultants outlined the approach to the fourth part of the Appraisal Framework. The following comments were made:
- in relation to affordability it is hard to judge and attempt to suggest where public/private expense would fall.
 - the likelihood for developer contributions should be taken into account
 - the appraisal is an evolving process that develops with a project
8. A discussion took place as to the relationship between transport systems and the creation of jobs. It was indicated that the study should resist stating how much employment could be created by the suggested transport systems.
9. It was indicated that the key to the appraisal is that there should be transparency and sufficient time to weigh the results

Proposals for Second Stage Participation

10. The consultants outlined the approach to the next stage of the participation process. The second stage would be used to identify all possible solutions. The will be of a similar structure with Local, Sub-regional and Cross corridor workshops

11. Steering Group members would be sent a draft of the newsletter for their comments. These comments would have to be returned to the consultants by September 18th.
12. Mark Froud confirmed that it would be possible to use Sussex Enterprises mailing list for the distribution of the newsletter. It was also discussed that the consultants arrange a meeting with the Sussex Enterprise representatives.
13. The consultants outlined the approach for media strategy in the second round . It was put forward that a two-tier approach would be used. A table was circulated advising Steering Group members of those people in the relevant Local Authorities had been contacted.

Reporting

14. It was decided that the consultants would provide the Steering Group with a listing of the background papers. The Steering Group members would then be able to request from the consultants those papers they wish to view.

A.O.B

15. *Action point:* The consultants to make available a listing of background papers
16. *Action point:* The Steering Group are asked to provide comments on the newsletter by September 18th.