

**SOUTH EAST ENGLAND
REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 27 OCTOBER 2006

Present:

Board Members

Cllr Nick Skellett (Chairman)
Cllr Jill Baston
Cllr John Howarth
Mark Pearson
John Peel
Gwyn Drake
Simon Pratt
Clive King
Roland Anderson (for Paul
Plummer)
Cllr Mary Ballin

Officers

Paul Bevan
Martin Tugwell
Paul Lovejoy
Andy Barton
James Renwick
David Cooper
Lesley van Dijk

Media

Andrew Forster, Local Transport
Today
Robin Mannering, Surveyor
Magazine
Stephanie Hendries, Construction
News

In Attendance

Cllr Matthew Lock, East Sussex CC

Pat Baxter, Reading Borough Council

David Ludlow, University of West of England

Cllr. Tex Pemberton, West Sussex CC
Derek Waller, Member of Public
Cllr Helyn Clack, Surrey CC
Cllr. Antony Wood, RBWM
Louise Wilby, Regional Assembly
Cllr. Charles Mackonochie, Colts Hill/Capel
Nick Bisson, West Sussex CC
Cllr Peter Lansdon, Gosport Borough Council
Cllr. Rod Bank, Hampshire CC
Phil Caves, Milton Keynes Council
Cllr. Ricky Bower, Arun District Council
Cllr Ben Smith, Royal Borough Windsor &
Maidenhead
Adrian Fox, Dover District Council
Rob Smith, Kent County Council
John Buckett, Hampshire County Council
Carol Machonochie, Colts Hill
Diana Podson, Regional Assembly

1. Apologies for absence and declarations of interest

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Ian Coates and Pam Palmer

2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 21 July 2006

The Minutes were AGREED.

3. Matters Arising Not Elsewhere on the Agenda

- 3.1 The Board were informed that a letter had been received from the Department for Transport confirmed that the Orders for the A3 Hindhead Improvement Scheme had been confirmed. The Highways Agency would commence initial environmental works in January 2007 and the main scheme works commencing in April 2008.
- 3.2 The Board were informed that following the departure of Paul Hudson from SEEDA, his replacement Lee Amore was now in post.
- 3.3 Simon Pratt raised a question regarding the way in which Smarter Choices was being addressed. It was noted that this area required further work to ensure that any approach was practical and reaped real benefits to the region. Clarification from the Department was also required as to the approaches that could be taken. It was confirmed that a substantive report for consideration by the Board would be prepared for its next meeting.

4. Regional Funding Allocation Update

- 4.1 Subsequent to the announcement of the Government's response to the region's advice on transport priorities DfT launched a consultation seeking views from interested parties on the RFA process to date.
- 4.2 The Board considered a draft response to the consultation that drew upon its experiences of the RFA process. It was agreed that reference should be made within section 5 of the draft response to the potential for the RFA process to support delivery of proposals that advance the availability of "smarter choices".

It was AGREED that the Board would submit the response set out in Annex A.

5. Forward Programme Post 2010/11

- 5.1 The Board was advised of a number of representations received by the secretariat and Chairman of the Board. The majority of the representations concerned the potential delay to A27 scheme at Arundel, and also the A24 schemes. An annex of the representations received is attached as an annex to these minutes.
- 5.2 It was noted that the list of schemes considered in the prioritisation process was consistent with the list of major infrastructure requirements identified in the revised version of the Implementation Plan that forms part of the draft South East Plan. This meant that information had been received in respect of a total of 188 proposals.
- 5.3 The Board discussed the programme at length. Frustration was expressed at the negative impact on the timing of scheme delivery that the funding level identified by Government. A number of statements were made by Transport Portfolio Holders members from local transport authorities.
- 5.4 Simon Pratt raised concerns regarding the merits of the A24 Southwater-Ashington proposal and the A27 Wilmington proposal. A debate amongst Board members resulted in a consensus that it was not for the Board to sit in judgement on the detail of individual proposals. It was noted that the A24 proposal had received planning permission having gone through due process. It was felt inappropriate for the Board to challenge the outcome of statutory processes completed at the local level.
- 5.5 John Peel advised the Board that he wished to seek the views of the SEEDA Board on the proposed forward programme.
- 5.6 The Board were advised of concerns that had been expressed with regards to the proposal for a Folkington Link Road in association with the proposal for improvements to the A27 at Wilmington. It was agreed that the secretariat would seek clarification of the situation regarding the A27 proposal. It was also agreed that subject to the outcome of that clarification not raising a fundamental concern with the proposal, it would be included in the draft forward programme.
- 5.7 The Board restated its position that the indicative allocation identified by Government is insufficient to address the issues in the region. The secretariat was instructed to prepare a document outlining the case for additional funding. This document would draw upon the evidence base gathered as part of the prioritisation process and would need to set out what could be delivered with additional funding.
- 5.8 The Board then turned its attention to the proposal that it should identify indicative allocations for sub-regional areas for the period beyond 2016. The previous Board meeting had identified the need for such an approach as this would potentially encourage delivery agencies to commit resources to develop detailed proposals.

The Board AGREED to approve the report as the basis of its advice to Government for the Regional Funding Allocation transport programme for the period 2011 to 2016 with the following caveats:

- i) Annex C (the draft forward programme) was agreed subject to the SEEDA Board considering its content in relation to the Regional Economic Strategy;**
- ii) Annex F (title to be amended to Potential Early Starts Post 2016) would be circulated to delivery agencies to provide an initial indication of potential early starts without prejudging future Board discussions on priorities post 2016;**
- iii) Annex F was agreed subject to the SEEDA Board considering its content in relation to the Regional Economic Strategy;**

The Board AGREED to instruct the secretariat to prepare a document outlining the case for increased funding for the region.

6. Regionally Significant Infrastructure

- 6.1** The Board were updated and informed on the progress of regionally significant transport schemes within the region. The Board noted the content of the report, and were pleased with the progress being made by a number of schemes.
- 6.2** Simon Pratt highlighted the importance of ensuring that any initial work on the merits of a Lower Thames Crossing must taken into consideration the potential impact that such a proposal might have on the environment. The Planning Implementation Director confirmed that the Regional Assembly was prepared to make available some funding to support work on an initial assessment of the case for a Lower Thames Crossing.

The Board AGREED:

- i) That a meeting with the Secretary of State would be sought in order to discuss progress with Reading Station and Airtrack;**
- ii) That the Secretariat would invite the East-West Rail Consortium to present the findings of the most recent technical work to its next meeting;**
- iii) That a meeting would be set up with local authorities and potential partners in East of England to discuss the need to take forward a piece of work on the Lower Thames Crossing and how it might be taken forward;**

- iv) **A meeting would be sought with London and Continental Railways at the earliest opportunity to discuss concerns regarding the reduction in Eurostar services stopping at Ashford International.**

7. Brighton Main Line Route Utilisation Strategy – Consultation Response

- 7.1 The Board considered the paper which proposed that Option I in the consultation be supported by the Board as being the most appropriate way forward.
- 7.2 John Peel expressed concern that the issues raised in the consultation were more complex than had been identified in the report. This view was supported by representations to the Board made by Portfolio Holders from local authorities whose area would be affected by the proposal.
- 7.3 The Chairman suggested that a meeting be held between the Local Transport Authorities, the Regional Assembly and SEEDA to discuss the issues further. It was proposed that the Board's response to the consultation would be informed by the outcome of this meeting and that the Chairman of the Board be empowered to agree the content of the response on behalf of the Board.

It was AGREED that a meeting would be arranged between Regional Assembly, SEEDA, Surrey, West Sussex and East Sussex County Councils and Brighton & Hove Council.

It was AGREED that the Chairman of the Board be empowered to agree a response on behalf of the Board.

8. Freight Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS)

- 8.1 Network Rail presented to the Board the key issues identified through their work on the Freight Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS). This included an extended period of questions.
- 8.2 The Board considered a draft response to the Freight RUS that had been circulated prior to the meeting. The Board emphasised the importance of the response highlighting the need for the DfT and Network Rail to give further consideration as to how to resolve the tension between demand for capacity to support passenger and freight services. The Board expressed its support for the upgrading of the freight route from Southampton and agreed that the response should highlight the need for the final Freight RUS to provide stronger advice on the identification of locations for the provision of strategic inter-modal freight terminals.

It was **AGREED** that response to the consultation document as set out in **Annex A** to the report would be submitted, subject to the amendments identified by the **Board**.

9. Presentation by Highways Agency on Demand Management on the M25

9.1 The Highways Agency made a presentation to the Board on how demand management measures were being taken forward on the M25, and how better integration between the Agency and Local Transport Authorities was being planned to assist both parties in managing the highway networks. An invitation was extended to the Highways Agency to address members of Surrey County Council to help promote greater understanding.

10. Items for Information

10.1 Noted

11. Regional Transport Board Dates 2007

11.1 The dates for meetings in 2007 were confirmed as being (note that all meetings will start at 1400):

1 February 2007	Institute of Materials, London
26 April 2007	MWV Business Exchange, 10 Greycoat Place, London, SW1P 1SB
13 July 2007	Institute of Materials, London
26 October 2007	Institute of Materials, London

There being no other business the meeting closed at 16:40

Responses received following Publication of RTB Papers

Author	Position	Organisation	Topic	Date Received
Nick Herbert MP	Member of Parliament for Arundel & South Downs		A27 Arundel	18.10.06
Mark Miller	Chairman	Thameslink 2000 Consortium	Thameslink 2000	18.10.06
Norman Wrigglesworth	Clerk to the Council	Slaugham Parish Council	A23 Handcross to Warninglid	19.10.06
Roger House	Regional Chairman	FSB Kent & Medway Region	Improvements to Dover Road Network	19.10.06
Cllr. Watkins	Leader of the Council	Dover District Council	A2 Lydden – Dover Improvement/A20 Townwall Street, Dover	24.10.06
Christina Freeman	Chairman of the Joint Downland Area Committee and Downland County Local Committee	Arun District Council	A27 Arundel by-pass	25.10.06
Cllr. R. Bower	Cabinet Member for Planning	Arun District Council	A27 by-pass at Arundel	25.10.06
Gwyn Drake	Divisional Director	Highways Agency	A27 Wilmington/A27 Folkington Link	26.10.06