



Steering Group Meeting

Venue:	Government Office for the South West (GOSW), The Pithay, Bristol	
Date held:	16 November 2000	
Present:	Peter Botham (GOSW & Chair)	PB
	Richard Bayly (GOSW)	RB
	David Mills (Contract Manager, GOSW)	DM
	Andrew Page-Dove (Assistant Project Manager, GOSW)	APD
	Ron Davies (Regional Transport Team, GOSW)	RD
	Ciara Mulligan (DETR Central)	CM
	Iain Reeve (Government Office for the South East – GOSE)	IR
	Nick Carter (Highways Agency – HA)	NC
	Tony Carroll (National Assembly for Wales – NAW)	TC
	Claire Gibson (South West Regional Development Agency – SWRDA)	CG
	Ian Harrison (South West Regional Assembly – SWRA)	IH
	Mike Birkin (Sustainability SW)	MBi
	Matthew Lodge (shadow Strategic Rail Authority – sSRA)	ML
	Anthony Slack (South East England Development Agency – SEEDA)	AS
	Martin Tugwell (South East England Regional Assembly – SEERA)	MT
	Martin Williams (South West Regional Assembly – SWRA)	MW
	John Wilkinson (CBI)	JW
	David Bayliss (Project Director, Halcrow)	DB
	Martyn Brooks (Project Manager, Halcrow)	MBr
	Gareth Walters (Project Co-ordinator, Halcrow)	GW
	Andy Carlyle (Halcrow – rail)	AC
	Peter Elliott (Halcrow – highways)	PE
	Gareth James (Halcrow – appraisal/modelling)	GJ
	Alan Peakall (Halcrow – freight)	AP
	Chris Cobbold (DTZ Pieda – planning reference case)	CC

Notes of Steering Group Meeting

Action

1. Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

2.1 The following changes were proposed to the minutes.

Change para 4.7 to read : Halcrow said that the event was successful in the outputs

Action

generated, but it is acknowledged that there was some criticism. Some sessions worked better than others, and a small minority of attendees sometimes dominated questioning in plenary periods. When considering the feedback forms filled in by participants, the whole day was broadly neutral, with an almost 50:50 split of participants rating the day as 'effective' versus 'ineffective'. However, some participants did not understand the aims of some of the tasks, and for these tasks the responses were 'ineffective'. Halcrow said that the initial sessions of the workshop had brought out information from previous workshops but no critical comments were made at that stage in the proceedings.

Change para 4.9 to read : DETR said that it was important to get individual views (from key groups) as well as collective views from workshops, and that care should be taken in declaring the workshop 'successful', as individuals and individual organisations may consider the day and their contribution differently. It was queried whether individuals' comments at the workshop could be identified from workshop notes. Halcrow said no. Sustainability SW said that CPRE have already made specific comments in a letter to SGp members.

Actions noted in previous minutes all considered. Items of detail from specific actions noted below:

- Social Inclusion topic group has been discussed with relevant parties in GOSW. Ian Chancellor (GOSW) is to arrange the meeting. GOSW
- Exhibition at Paddington – Railtrack have been contacted, but said no. Since the last SGp meeting, the railways have suffered a number of well-publicised problems. Until the railway is 'back to normal', and at the earliest January 2001, Railtrack are unwilling to allow an exhibition at their stations asking about 'problems'. SEERA indicated, an alternative venue should be found by the consultants. Halcrow
- CBI uneasy about amount of formal linkage with appropriate committees of SWRA. SEERA will be kept up to speed by MT. SWRA need to do similar.

3. Study Objectives

3.1 Halcrow indicated that the draft note (provided prior to meeting) was intended as a first draft of specific study objectives to nest within the GOMMMS appraisal process. Welcome feedback from SGp on overall suggestions tabled. Happy to receive verbal comments today, as well as written comments (within 10 days).

3.2 Discussion covered issues such as; whether targets should be used, how objectives can be measured, that the wording of the objectives is too 'woolly' in places and there are too many local references in some objectives.

		Action
3.3	Suggestions included; that objectives could be 'sub-regional' or geographically based), that the effect on Tourism should be an objective, recognise in objectives that the study includes links to Wales .	
3.4	Main requirement was that the Problems & Issues report should be available prior to objectives being agreed. Halcrow said that a draft P&I report would be available by the next SGp meeting.	Halcrow
3.5	Various SGp members felt need for a methodology statement to inform the discussion about objectives, appraisal, etc. Agreed Halcrow to provide a note on the process (for the next SGp meeting).	Halcrow
4.	Planning Reference Case	
4.1	DTZ briefly outlined the process used (detailed in notes provided to SGp). In essence, a policy-driven approach (using draft RPG figures) is being followed, acknowledging that figures may change, particularly when Tempo is revised.	
4.2	Chair noted that the Secretary of State is due to indicate the South West final position soon, GOSE said it would be end of 2000 for South East.	
4.3	SEERA asked whether SERPLAN has seen figures. DTZ to check and forward to SERPLAN as necessary. SEERA cannot comment until SERPLAN has.	DTZ/ Halcrow
4.4	SEERA asked that household rates from South East are used. DTZ noted there is no other information, but that any ideas welcome.	
4.5	SEERA asked what assumptions being made beyond 2016. DTZ said this had not been covered as yet, but agreed that Tempo would be a likely starting point.	
5.	Base Case	
5.1	Includes 'committed' highway schemes as discussed previously. CBI queried impact on 'committed/given' schemes on available capital. MMS are independent of current funding decisions. Noted that M4 Jn3-4b is tied in with Heathrow Terminal 5 – i.e. not in the base. HA said that 2001 making better use (MBU) programme is committed --HA to confirm list.	HA
5.2	SEEDA queried treatment of schemes in LTPs. Halcrow noted that none are strictly committed, so will be left out of base for now.	
5.3	Halcrow noted that Railtrack has no strictly 'committed' schemes in its Network Management Statement. Consultation with sSRA has resulted in agreement to include three very likely improvements; hourly Waterloo-Exeter services, improvements to journey times on Great Western Main Line and the Virgin improved timetable (the 2002/3 timetable). sSRA noted that 30 min London-Cardiff service should also be	

Action

included (due in 2001).

6. Strategy Themes

6.2 Some discussion about content of strategy themes, significant discussion of how the process of developing the overarching strategy will actually work. Chair said that Problems & Issues Report would be helpful in informing the debate.

6.3 GOSE observed that the SGp seems to need more involvement in the study process, but noted that too heavy an involvement could slow things. Chair agreed. GOSW reiterated the need for a process note.

6.4 Halcrow asked whether the SGp would want to confirm the emerging preferred strategy. SGp said yes, noting that the strategy would likely include some contentious issues.

6.5 SGp said that a number of documents had been discussed and which Halcrow would need to prepare. Implication would be more time required for strategy preparation. Needs to be quantified. Halcrow said that the process note would also include a revised programme. Halcrow

6.6 Some members of the SGp asked to be involved in the model validation. Halcrow said that a standard (LMVR) model validation report is being prepared for the SWARMMS strategic model. Draft can be made available. Halcrow

6.7 SGp agreed to provide comments on Strategy Themes within a week (24th November 2000). SSW queried the status of the document – noted it is ‘in confidence’ for now. SGp

7. Role of Steering Group Members

Will be rolled forward to the next meeting – GOSW to prepare revised paper for next meeting. GOSW

8. Work Programme

8.1 Agreed next meeting to be 19th December as agreed at last meeting. SGp said that meeting should not be held if little new to discuss. Halcrow said that 19/12 meeting can include process note and Problems & Issues reports.

8.2 It was noted that SGp involvement as indicated by the members is more than normally expected in a SGp situation like this, and that the timetable would undoubtedly be affected. Suggested that smaller ad hoc gatherings may be required at times.

8.3 Need to produce a new work programme to reflect outcomes of this meeting. Halcrow

9. AOB

Action

9.1 GOSE noted that the London-Reading MM Study will be let in 2001, and will take the SWARMMS and ORBIT strategies as a starting point.

10. Next Meeting

Date of next Steering Group meeting – 19th December 2000, at The Pithay.