

SOUTH COAST CORRIDOR MULTI - MODAL STUDY
STEERING GROUP
27 November 2001

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
Lee Sambrook	Government Office for the South East	Mick Sutch	Kent County Council
Nicola Brooker	Government Office for the South East	Bob Wilkins	East Sussex County Council
Rod Anderson	Southampton City Council	John Guttridge	Freight Transport Association
Derrick Coffee	South East Forum for Sustainability	Lindsay Gardner	South East Regional Assembly
Colin Murray	South East Forum for Sustainability	Andrew Renaut	Brighton and Hove City Council
Anthony Slack	South East England Development Agency	Kevin Travers	Hampshire County Council
Paul Hudson	South East England Development Agency	Matthew Lodge	Strategic Rail Authority
Paul Collins	Department of Local Government Transport and the Regions		

CONSULTANTS

Mark Brown
David Turner
Paul Read
Christina McDonagh
Stuart Fox
Paul Stelmaszczyk
Heather Pope

APOLOGIES

Tony Cook	SEAPLAG
Mark Froud	Sussex Enterprise
Andrew Dyer	Stagecoach South

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 mid November.

Second Stage Consultation.

3. The Consultants presented an overview of the Second Stage Consultation. This consultation was intended to give invited participants an opportunity to develop potential transport solutions against the backdrop of a range of key study objectives. 1700 people were invited to attend these workshops.
4. Various issues were raised and discussed during the consultation:
 - the need to recognise 'trade offs' in potential solutions. This was identified as an area that would be considered at later consultation;
 - concerns re the relatively poor representation of the business community. This was agreed to be a problem at some, but not all, workshops. Halcrow outlined that they had also put considerable effort into addressing this issue through attending separate meetings etc. Halcrow also agreed to try and organise future follow up talks with major employers such as Rolls Royce and Ford.

- it was noted that the workshops could not be taken as providing a basis for a weighting of the general public opinion but should be considered as a mechanism for generating and developing the proposals of concerned parties.
 - Camargue, the study's PR consultant countered claims that the study's press profiles to date has been relatively low key. This was felt to be symptomatic of the stage of the study, and the fact that the second phase of consultation was not conducive to generating high profile press coverage. Camargue additionally agreed to provide a report on press coverage at the next Steering group meeting;
 - Concern that the consideration of freight issues in the consultation was light was noted. It was also noted that participants may not have a full appreciation of all issues in this area;
5. The consultants highlighted the fact that all the ideas generated in consultation would be brought forward to be considered so that the emerging strategy could be seen to draw on all these proposals. It was also noted that the consultants will be detailing the emerging issues in a consultation report.

Forecasting – Do-minimum/Do-minimum plus and approach to Testing

6. The consultants presented a description of the 2016 Do-minimum scenario and the approach that would be taken to scheme testing. Various issues were raised and discussed in more detail.
- Clarification of the consultants modelling assumptions re the status of LGV's was sought. It was noted that these are assumed as per DTLR guidance.
 - the SRA confirmed that it was acceptable to use the Go-Via timetable in the Do-minimum tests, although, it was also noted that the Go Via contract negotiation is not yet finalised. The modelling assumptions for CTRL were also confirmed as acceptable.
 - the consultants confirmed that sensitivity tests would be undertaken on the GDP growth assumptions and on the TEMPRO data.

Appraisal Framework

7. The consultants overviewed the approach to the Appraisal Framework. The following comments were made:
- It was noted that the use of GIS maps did not necessarily highlight specific problem areas and that these maps also have to be subjected to some user interpretation;
 - There was some concern that the "Fear and Intimidation Index" should not be treated as an exhaustive test of the needs of cyclists and pedestrians, but it was additionally noted that the approach is broadly consistent with the requirement for walking strategy development;
 - It was agreed that the value of the accessibility mapping might be developed further by the consultants, and that access to the continent should also be explored using this modelling tool.
8. It was agreed that written comments on the Appraisal Framework should be sent to the consultants by Thursday December 13th.

The Vision

9. The consultants presented the (previously circulated) Vision paper. This was outlined as an evolving document. The following issues were covered:
- it was suggested that a vision might best be used as a working tool for aiding the study consultants in developing the prime objectives for the study, and as a tool to be used in balancing differences and exposing conflict;
 - it was suggested that a Vision should be short and snappy;

- it was agreed that written comments of the vision paper should be sent to the consultants by Thursday December 13th.

Scheme Testing

10. The consultants outlined the mechanisms for deriving key summary statistics from model runs and the alternative approach to non-modelled scheme assessment. A discussion took place into the different schemes that would be tested. The following issues were covered:
 - Traffic generation and suppression is handled in modelling and the impact of this traffic change can be assessed;
 - blanket speed limits, charging and point charges will be being tested, although some concern was noted re the reference to the use of rural charging;
 - there might be benefit in the separate testing of freight impacts and in the measurement of the network reliability;
 - walking and cycling impacts would be acknowledged in the modal shift using a matrix based assessment.

AOB

11. It was noted that the Environmental Statutory body representatives had previously been provided with a study update note, and a listing of the study reports available from the consultant. It was additionally noted that the study is committed to providing ongoing liaison with these bodies, and would also be providing them a copy of the draft appraisal note for comment.
12. Some concern was raised by the consultants regarding their ability to adequately prepare for a March consultation on the draft strategy, and the absolute requirements of the existing timetable. The consultants were asked to monitor this situation and report back to the steering group at subsequent meetings
13. The consultants confirmed that they would provide the Steering Group with documents four to five days before the next meeting.
14. The next Steering Group meeting was confirmed for December 18th. This will provide feedback on the Publicity of the Study and the strategy development work.
 - **Action point:** The Steering Group are asked to provide comments on the Appraisal Framework and the Vision Paper by Thursday December 13th.