

London to South West and South Wales Multi-Modal Study



Steering Group Meeting

Venue: Government Office for the South West (GOSW), The Pithay, Bristol

Date held: 8 August 2000

Present: Peter Botham (GOSW & Chair)
Mike Birkin (Sustainability SW)
Tony Carroll (National Assembly for Wales)
Nick Carter (Highways Agency – HA)
Stephen Dapah (Government Office for the South East – GOSE)
Claire Gibson (South West Regional Development Agency – SWRDA)
Matthew Lodge (shadow Strategic Rail Authority – sSRA)
Ciara Mulligan (DETR Central)
John Rider (GOSE)
Anthony Slack (South East England Development Agency – SEEDA)
Martin Tugwell (South East England Regional Assembly – SEERA)
Martin Williams (South West Regional Assembly – SWRA)
David Mills (Contract Manager, GOSW)
Andrew Page-Dove (Assistant Project Manager, GOSW)
Peter Dawson (Regional Transport Team Leader, GOSW)
Ron Davies (Regional Transport Team, GOSW)
Michele Dix (Project Director, Halcrow)
Martyn Brooks (Project Manager, Halcrow)
Gareth Walters (Project Co-ordinator, Halcrow)

Notes of Steering Group Meeting

Action

1. Apologies for absence.

- Iain Reeve (GOSE) – represented by John Rider/Stephen Dapah
- John Wilkinson (CBI)

2. Minutes of previous meeting

Steering Group (SGp) accepted that minutes of previous meeting (8th June 2000) represent a fair and accurate representation of events.

3. Matters arising not on the agenda

Consultation

Action

- 3.1 Halcrow explained that the consultation phase of the study is beginning in earnest. Main thrust of public consultation is through the newsletter and questionnaire, currently undergoing preparation.
- 3.2 The newsletter/questionnaire will be distributed in four ways:
- (1) roving exhibition to be held at a variety of places in the study area (draft itinerary discussed);
 - (2) sent directly to stakeholders (such as Steering Group & workshop invitees);
 - (3) available on the website; and
 - (4) distribute to all local authorities and request they make it available at their offices and/or libraries.
- 3.3 SGp should see the draft newsletter and questionnaire before it goes out but acknowledged that deadlines for responses would not allow for significant alterations. Agreed to send draft version to SGp members by Friday 11th August. Halcrow
- 3.4 SGp queried the format of exhibitions – specifically opening hours. Halcrow explained that the intention is to go for a notional 10:00am to 6:00pm, but that different venues may benefit from different times (typically later finish). SGp queried staffing of exhibition – intention is for minimum 2 Halcrow staff (1 who runs exhibition and will attend all sites, 1 more senior as support – identity will vary).
- 3.5 SGp asked about the promotion of exhibitions, and notification of local authorities. Halcrow said that only Mere would be ‘advertised’, being a small rural location, but the others are sited to attract ‘passing trade’. Local Authorities will receive the newsletter as part of distribution, with a list of exhibition sites included. It was agreed that GOSW letterhead would be used to inform and seek the assistance of the Local Authorities. The list will also be on the website. Agreed that a COI press release should go out with itinerary. Halcrow
/GOSW
/COI
- 3.6 SGp noted there is only one Saturday. Halcrow to look into more weekend dates, instead and/or as well as current itinerary. Halcrow
- Topic Groups – Social Inclusion*
- 3.7 Action from previous SGp meeting is for advice from GOSW about relevance and possible attendees of social exclusion topic group. SWRDA stated that there is a joint working group who deal with social exclusion issues and suggested this as the basis for a Topic Group. Chair noted Celia Carrington (GOSW) is the best person for Halcrow to contact. Halcrow
- 3.8 Sustainability SW queried whether this group would have significant transport-based social exclusion experience/knowledge. Chair indicated the brief for this group is wider SSW

Action

than just transport. Sustainability SW also has some ideas for contacts, and will send.

Topic Groups – General Comments

- 3.9 Sustainability SW said some concerns had been expressed to them about the ‘technical nature’ of the topic groups, in particular the environment one. Halcrow explained that this had been the intention of setting up the topic groups in the first place.
- 3.10 SGp asked how the topic groups had been received by Halcrow, as some members had received mixed responses, and that a ‘few’ people were feeling left out of the study process. It was accepted that this might be a result of people not fully understanding the purpose of the topic groups. Halcrow noted that at a recent internal consultants’ meeting, responses from the topic leaders had been good – pleased with the results. Halcrow to provide feedback from topic groups to attendees, and to clarify the position of topic groups in the overall study process (see also later in minutes). Halcrow
- 3.11 Question of reconvening topic groups was discussed. Halcrow said that the Planning group would almost certainly have to be reconvened, in the light of on-going issues relating to Regional Planning Guidance, but that for the others it is less clear cut, and it may be pertinent to keep in touch using correspondence. Halcrow noted that it is essential not to undermine the main participation strategy by ‘promoting’ the topic groups at the perceived ‘expense’ of the workshops. SGp considered that topic groups might be useful at a later, more detailed stage of the study, when the key knowledge and providers involved may be able/willing to advise on scheme and plan deliverability.
- 3.12 Sustainability SW did not feel this would be acceptable to the Environment topic group, who saw the topic group as a good way to be involved and use their expertise in the study process. Halcrow thought that this may be related to the request of some environment government agencies to have a place on the SGp. DETR re-iterated that the issue of these agencies not being invited to sit on the SGp of the multi-modal studies had been agreed nationally. Agreed that topic group attendees/invitees also need to receive clarification of the role of the topic groups in the whole study process (action from paragraph 3.10) to include future role. Halcrow

MP/MEP briefing

- 3.13 Briefing took place on 26th June 2000. An attendance list to be attached to the minutes of this meeting. The main areas of concern related to South Wales and Gloucestershire. Other issues related to the use of Objective 1 funding for infrastructure. It was considered a successful session, with 15 attending; larger numbers could be expected when future events are held, particularly when there are specific options/recommendations to present. GOSW

South West Air Services Study

Action

3.14 Confirmed data from this study has been made available to the consultants.

Models

3.15 Strategic public transport model is largely complete (in the end not using GW2000 model as a basis). Highway model in progress. Currently seeking to put together all the information so far provided by various authorities in the study area. The only significant model missing is Bristol, though local authorities have questioned the usefulness of this, but Halcrow still need it. HA indicated that they may have access to some models not already received. Halcrow to liaise with HA directly. Halcrow

4. Commissioning Report

4.1 Halcrow said that the final draft had been sent to the SGp recently, and were seeking swift agreement that it is complete, so that copies can be made and the report placed on the website.

4.2 SGp indicated that the participation and consultation sections should be expanded, particularly to describe how all the various elements of the study fit together. Halcrow

4.3 Section 4 on regional objectives should be amended to reflect the framework set out in the Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) for both the South West and the South East. The SGp noted that the RPG for the South East had reached the stage of proposed modifications being published by the Secretary of State. It also noted the difficulty in being prescriptive about objectives at this stage as the RPG for the South West is at a delicate position with the Panel's Report having just been published. The regional objectives for the study would need to reflect the objectives of the Regional Economic Strategies prepared by both the SWRDA and SEEDA. GOSW
/GOSE

4.4 SGp noted that all objectives currently mentioned are economic and land-use planning. Suggested that appropriate reference be made to environmental and social objectives.

5. Sub-Regional Workshop – problems and issues

5.1 Halcrow handed out a series of feedback notes from the workshops. They are intended for the SGp and workshop invitees. SSRA noted there is no reference to issues of north-south movements in the Salisbury workshop notes, but that he recalls it being mentioned. Halcrow said that this is mentioned in notes elsewhere.

5.2 Halcrow presented a diagram showing the outline of the study process relating to collection of information for problems and issues, incorporating subjective information from the workshops and objective information collected as part of the data collection. SGp queried inclusion of the model as a source. Halcrow explained it was a source of forecast future situations.

		Action
5.3	It was agreed the diagram is a good idea to explain the study process, but could benefit from expansion to cover more linkages and more of the study in general. Also, diagram to be included in letters to participants, topic group attendees and commissioning report.	Halcrow
5.4	Halcrow outlined the next aspects of the programme of workshops: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Strategic Workshop, 13th October 2000, Thistle Hotel, Exeter • Local Workshops between 27th September and 5th October at Reading, Bristol, Swindon, Andover, Yeovil and Plymouth. <p>SSRA expressed concern that there was a northern bias in the locations and consequently Cornwall and parts of Devon would be poorly served. After a short discussion SGp accepted the venues proposed by Halcrow.</p>	
5.5	Agreed to circulate lists of intended invitees to local workshops to SGp. SGp asked that time deadlines with requests for responses should not be too onerous.	Halcrow
5.6	Some members of SGp were critical of the Bristol workshop. Halcrow presented feedback histograms, taken from feedback forms, which indicated that, overall, the workshop day was well received by the participants. However, the afternoon tasks had been less well received than the morning, but nevertheless, the skew of results was towards 'highly effective'.	
5.7	A discussion of the afternoon session experiences of SGp members took place. It was agreed that the workshop attendees would benefit from more explanation of how the workshops fit into the study process. For the next strategic workshop, need to provide some steer for attendees on derivation of options and strategies.	Halcrow
5.8	Some members of the SGp said they found self-facilitation of small groups ineffective. Halcrow indicated that the effectiveness depended on participants, and that as direction and guidance improved, so did the effectiveness of group working. Also, that the level of experience of stakeholders did affect the way in which the workshops were received. Some more experienced stakeholders found it hard to argue with less experienced attendees.	
5.9	Halcrow said that the team would more heavily control the next strategic workshop, as there is a lot to cover, and time will be limited. SGp indicated that care should be taken when 'confirming' the main problems and issues at the start of the strategic workshop, in case people feel their particular point has been ignored. Agreed to send a briefing note to participants prior to the event, SGp to clear this first.	Halcrow
5.10	SGp requested clarification of the setup of the 13/10 workshop. Halcrow explained it would be similar to the previous, in that small groups will be employed at some times. The three sub-regional groups would not work in separate groupings, but will be	

Action

integrated. The full programme has not been finalised, but is likely to cover problems and issues before moving on to options.

- 5.11 In terms of options to be considered, Halcrow queried how the multi-modal studies are working on defining strategies; is there going to be a common pattern for instance? Suggested that likely strategies would be to have extreme options for each mode or type of intervention and work towards the best combination and middle ground. SGp indicated this was sensible, but that it should be stressed to participants and consultees that the 'extreme' options are not intended as potential deliverables, but as devices to use in testing. Halcrow agreed to provide a paper on strategies and scenarios for the SGp by the beginning of September 2000. Halcrow

6. London to Reading

- 6.1 Halcrow said that the original study brief and programme called for the London to Reading report to be submitted at the end of August. At the last SGp meeting, it was agreed that it would be more appropriate to derive the overarching strategy for SWARMMS beforehand and therefore the London-Reading report should be submitted at the same time, at the end of 2000.
- 6.2 GOSE noted that the scoping report on how the London-Reading multi-modal study should be run was due from Alan Lovell within a few weeks. This will point the way forward for detailed treatment of London-Reading.
- 6.3 Halcrow reiterated that the SWARMMS strategy will cover London-Reading, but will just be one input, as will Orbit for instance. Also, that the approach would be to derive an overarching Strategy for the whole study area which would include London-Reading. The study team will suggest options for Plans in the whole area, and the SGp will decide which are to be taken forward, no Plans would be suggested for the London-Reading area, although areas of concern for SWARMMS would be noted. If the London-Reading study focus is widened to cover the M3, then the area for Plans to come out of SWARMMS is reduced.
- 6.4 SGp agreed that the Commissioning Report covers the London-Reading aspects of the study in too much detail. Agreed that Halcrow would delete this chapter from the Report and replace with an appropriate form of words in the Introduction. Halcrow
- 6.5 SEERA queried the level of coverage of the South East areas. Halcrow indicated that at the strategic level, the level of detail is the same for the whole study area. SGp asked where access to Heathrow would be drawn out. Halcrow explained this should come out in the strategy, but that any details would be the preserve of the London-Reading Study.

7. Steering Group members responsibilities and links

Action

- 7.1 Sustainability SW asked if they were expected to keep informed the "environmental groups" of what was happening on the SGp. Chair expressed the view that this is not their role.
- 7.2 DETR said that SGp members were invited because of their personal expertise but recognised they also had access to appropriate networks to elicit views through their organisations. It is up to the individual SGp member to decide how and who to use to help their role in steering. It is appropriate for some documents to be passed to others for comment, but that all responses should go through the SGp member.
- 7.3 The status of documents is also relevant. Most SWARMMS documents will be publicly available and could thus be passed to colleagues for comment. In the event that a document is confidential, or contains confidential information, the SGp member should not pass it to anyone else. Reports to be clearly marked.

Halcrow

8. Programme

- 8.1 This will be a regular agenda item from now on, to report progress according to programme. In essence, the study is currently running according to the programme.

9. AOB*Local Authority meetings/presentations*

- 9.1 Local Authority meetings/presentations are partly arranged; 15th September in Newbury, covering South East Local Authorities, up to 40 people; 18th September in the Guildhall, Bath covering ex-Avon, Somerset, Wiltshire, Gloucestershire and selected authorities from Wales, up to 70 people. The final venue is proving problematic. It will be either 19th or 20th September in Exeter, covering Devon, Cornwall and Dorset, up to 60 people.

- 9.2 Query whether the South East meeting should include London authorities. Agreed to consider TfL and/or GLA. Keith Gardner is the contact.

10-year plan

- 9.3 DETR noted that the 10-year plan is now available, and that it clearly sets out that the multi-modal studies are key aspects of delivering the plan investments.
- 9.4 DETR also noted that the Multi-Modal Studies Unit had moved into the DETR's Transport Strategy Directorate.

10. Next Meeting

Date of next Steering Group meeting – 17th October 2000, at The Pithay.



Action