

**SOUTH EAST ENGLAND REGIONAL ASSEMBLY
REGIONAL TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION GROUP**

Meeting on Friday, 2 May 2003

ACTION NOTE

Attendees:

Paul Bevan	South East England Regional Assembly (Chair)
Martin Tugwell	South East England Regional Assembly
Paul Martin	Government Office for the South East
David Cooper	Government Office for the South East
Paul Hudson	South East England Development Agency
Stephen Clark	Strategic Rail Authority
Mike Ford	Highways Agency

Jon Freer	Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Carolyn Dwyer	Brighton & Hove City Council
Chris Pagdin	Buckinghamshire County Council
Bob Wilkins	East Sussex County Council
Mick Sutch	Kent County Council
Geoff Walters	Medway Council
Brian Matthews	Milton Keynes Council
Eddie Luck	Oxfordshire County Council
Charles Stunell	Portsmouth City Council
Pat Baxter	Reading Borough Council
Liz Motherwell	Slough Borough Council
Rod Anderson	Southampton City Council
George Burnett	Surrey County Council
Colin McKenna	West Sussex County Council
Andrew Roberts	Wokingham District Council

1. Apologies for Absence

1.1 Sheila Holden (Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead).

2. Draft Terms of Reference

2.1 The draft Terms of Reference for the group had been circulated prior to the meeting. In introducing the paper Paul Bevan emphasised that the focus of the Group initially was as set under paragraph 2.2 of the Terms of Reference.

2.2 During the ensuing discussion the following key points were raised and discussed:

- a) It was agreed that the Terms of Reference should give stronger emphasis to the role of the Group to act in a way that ensures

progress is made with the delivery of the priority schemes for the region.

- b) It was recorded that GOSE, as civil servants, would not be able to support or participate directly in any lobbying activity undertaken as part of the work of the Group.
- c) It was agreed that appropriate statutory processes associated with each scheme would provide ample opportunity for statutory consultees and other interested parties to present any concerns they may have in respect of any of the scheme. Accordingly it was accepted that it was not appropriate to broaden out the membership of the Group to include representatives of other organisations. It was agreed that the membership of the Group would, however, be kept under review.
- d) It was accepted that the focus of the Group would be to ensure progress was made with the implementation of physical infrastructure. It was acknowledged that there would be work running in parallel in support of delivery of other aspects of the RTS.

2.3 **IT WAS AGREED**, subject to the amendment identified in point (a), that the Terms of Reference be accepted.

3. Audit of Regional Transport Schemes

3.1 A copy of the Final Report of an audit undertaken as to the current status of an initial list of priority transport schemes for the region had been circulated prior to the meeting. Martin Tugwell explained that the purpose of the report was to summarise the current position in respect of each scheme. MT expressed his appreciation to those who had assisted in the collation of information set out in the audit.

3.2 The meeting proceeded to consider each scheme in turn. The lead promoters of each scheme were invited to comment on the results of the audit. The comments made are recorded on the attached summary table.

3.3 **IT WAS AGREED** that any detailed comments on the results of the audit would be submitted to the Regional Assembly at the earliest opportunity.

3.4 The meeting considered the case for including the Medway Transit scheme as a regional priority. **IT WAS AGREED** that this scheme would not be added to the list of priority schemes. There were no other schemes put forward for consideration by the meeting.

4. Actions Arising from the Audit

4.1 Having considered the results of the audit for each scheme the meeting considered what, if any, action needed to be pursued in order to ensure that

progress was made in delivering each scheme. It was agreed that each scheme would be placed in one of three categories:

Category a - regional priority schemes where, for the moment at least, everything seems in hand and where there is currently no need for additional resource or leverage to be exercised.

Category b - schemes that are, on reflection, not of the highest priority regionally, and where development and promotion of the scheme can be left to local action.

Category c - regional priority schemes which could benefit from assistance in order to ensure progress with delivery is moved forward.

- 4.2 The category ascribed to each scheme and the action agreed in support of those schemes identified as being in category c are recorded on the attached summary table.
- 4.3 It was proposed that the audit report prepared for the Group should be corrected for factual errors and/or omissions, and that it should then be used as the basis for future monitoring of progress with each of the priority schemes.

5. MMS Implementation

- 5.1 A paper prepared by GOSE had been circulated prior to the meeting.
- 5.2 Following a short discussion **IT WAS AGREED** that:
 - a) Any decision regarding the mechanisms required to support delivery of the measures supported by the Secretary of State following a MMS could only be taken once his formal views were known.
 - b) It is not appropriate to apply a uniform solution to all sub-regional areas.
- 5.3 **IT WAS AGREED** that where implementation mechanisms are agreed and established it would be appropriate for the Group to be kept informed of progress.

6. Future Meetings

- 6.1 **IT WAS AGREED** that the Group should meet on a four-monthly cycle. (Note: the Terms of Reference will be amended to reflect this change in frequency of meetings.)
- 6.2 **IT WAS AGREED** that the next meeting of the Group should take place in September. (Note: potential dates to be canvassed.)

7. Any Other Business

- 7.1 Chris Pagdin raised a concern that he had with regard to the relationship between the work underway as part of the RTS and that associated with the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Growth Area. Martin Tugwell outlined the process for ensuring that the two pieces of work were co-ordinated as far as possible within the constraints set by the timetable associated with both.

- 7.2 Stephen Clark outlined how the SRA is seeking to develop its capacity to engage with the regional agenda. He also stressed the importance of balancing aspirations with deliverability.

23 May 2003

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND AGREED ACTIONS

Scheme	Comments on audit (3.2 refers)	Scheme category	Action (4.2 refers)
1. CTRL Domestics	KCC/MC undertaking further work in support of the case for extending domestic services beyond core option.	a	To be reviewed once submission by SRA to SofS on way forward has been made - KCC/MCC to keep group advised.
2. M20 Junction 4	Public Inquiry into West Malling Bypass scheduled to finish early May 2003. HA content that appropriate methodology for securing private sector contribution has been identified.	a	-
3. Fastrack	Delivery of Phase 1 on track. Delivery of Phase 2 less certain due to the need to capture contributions from private sector/developers.	c	A Jefford (KCC) to write to Regional Assembly with further details of Phase 2 proposals. KCC/SEEDA/Land-Securities to continue to work together with a view to securing private sector contributions - KCC/SEEDA to keep group advised.
4. Crossrail	-	c	Regional Assembly to prepare letter on behalf of the region stressing the importance of a positive decision on way forward for the scheme.
5. East West Rail	Need to recognise the wider benefits and linkages with the Government's Sustainable Communities Plan.	c	Wider linkages to be raised by BCC at next meeting of the Consortium. BCC to discuss with Regional Assembly possible areas for regional support.
6. A421 Upgrade A5130 to M1 Junction 13	Queried whether this is a regional priority; improvements to M1 Junction 13 might be viewed as more significant.	a	Priority to be reviewed in light of agreed way forward for the Milton Keynes and South Midlands growth area.

Scheme	Comments on audit (3.2 refers)	Scheme category	Action (4.2 refers)
7. M20 Junction 10	-	a	-
8. Thameslink 2000	Critical nature of the scheme for delivery of the wider spatial strategy must be emphasised more strongly.	c	C McKenna (WSCC) and SRA to review current position and keep group advised.
9. South Coast Coastway	Solent Transport at the western end of the corridor could act as a delivery mechanism for specific improvements such as Eastleigh chord (and associated other works).	a	Lack of a promoting body must be addressed, but must await SofS announcement on South Coast Corridor MMS. Situation to be reviewed at next meeting of the Group and in light of proposals that will need to be discussed regarding potential delivery mechanisms post-MMS announcement.
10. Reading Station	RBC highlighted the need for assistance to supplement their resources available to progress the scheme.	c	RBC and SEEDA to discuss ways of creating greater certainty in respect of the private sector contribution towards the scheme - RBC/SEEDA to keep group advised.
11. Southampton to West Midlands freight upgrade	Nature of specific measures may need to be reviewed in light of decision on Dibden Bay proposals.	b	-
12. Airtrack	Airtrack Consortium to review resources available to progress with work on development of outline business case.	c	G Burnett (Chairman of the Consortium) to discuss with Regional Assembly/SEEDA possible areas for regional support.
13. Brighton Main Line	Any capacity enhancement likely to await re-letting of franchise (2009), which will in turn be informed by output from Route Utilisation Study.	b	-
14. M27 Improvements	-	a	To be reviewed in light of SofS's announcement on South Coast MMS.
15. A27 Worthing - Lancing	-	a	To be reviewed in light of SofS's announcement on South Coast MMS.

Scheme	Comments on audit (3.2 refers)	Scheme category	Action (4.2 refers)
16. Bus and Coach network	Agreed way forward is for Regional Assembly and GOSE to develop initial thoughts on way forward.	-	-
17. A21 Improvements	-	a	-

Notes:

Category a - regional priority schemes where, for the moment at least, everything seems in hand and where there is currently no need for additional resource or leverage to be exercised.

Category b - schemes that are, on reflection, not of the highest priority regionally, and where development and promotion of the scheme can be left to local action.

Category c - regional priority schemes which could benefit from assistance in order to ensure progress with delivery is moved forward.