

London to South West and South Wales Multi-Modal Study



Steering Group Meeting

Venue:	Intercity House, Bristol	
Date held:	26 March 2002	
Present:	Richard Bayly (Government Office for the South West – GOSW) – chair	RB
	Mike Birkin (Sustainability South West)	MBi
	Robert Fox (DTLR – Multi-Modal Studies Unit)	RF
	Gwyn Drake (Highways Agency – HA)	GD
	Clive Farnham (Highways Agency – HA)	CF
	Claire Gibson (South West Regional Development Agency – SWRDA)	CG
	Catherine Mullin (WAG)	CM
	Iain Reeve (Government Office for the South East – GOSE)	IR
	John Wilkinson (CBI)	JW
	Ian Harrison (SWRA)	JH
	Anthony Slack (South East England Development Agency – SEEDA)	AS
	Peter Dawson (GOSW)	PD
	Andrew Page-Dove (GOSW)	APD
	David Bayliss (Project Director, Halcrow)	DB
	Martyn Brooks (Project Manager, Halcrow)	MBr
	Gareth Walters	GW

Notes of Steering Group Meeting

Action

1. Apologies for absence

- 1.1 Cliff Baston (GOSW)
Matthew Lodge (Strategic Rail Authority – SRA)
Martin Tugwell (South East England Regional Assembly – SEERDA)
Gareth James (Halcrow – appraisal/modelling)
Chris Mitchell (South West Regional Assembly – SWRA)

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 Para 4.6 – feed-back directly to JW on Bristol CC consultation Halcrow

3 Grids

Intermodal-Freight

- 3.1
- Urban distribution
 - Location of Exeter vs Plymouth – Exeter is best location, but access to be resolved as is length of train to be accommodated.

Rural Access

- 3.2 CG: 3.3.1 it is a fact that part of RDC went to SWRDA and part to CA.
IH : what to do with proposals? It's easier for infrastructure; IH is uncomfortable about what is expected to happen next, and how it will be delivered. RB – sees answer lying in terms of RA and others working together, and it being part of the next step. IH feels that funding stream difficulties needs to be discussed; JW feels that the Plan needs to bring out very strongly the financial implications. It needs to be in both the individual Plans and the Final Report.
- 3.3 JW raised the issue of Park and Ride and access to railway stations. JW concerned about the opening hours of the Park and Ride, and what can be done to resolve this.

4 Media Strategy

- 4.1 APD described the approach, and hand over to RAs. Media briefing and Questions and Answers (being developed by GOSW), and pm presentation to a wider group which gives key recommendations with informal walk around rather than formal Questions and Answers.
- 4.2 WAG (Welsh Assembly Government) may want presentation, as other RAs.

5 TVMMS

- 5.1 (Iain Reeve). Drawing to a close on Problems and Issues, round of meetings etc. starting on strategies, but being delayed due to orbit. Looking to finish by November 2002. May/June 2002 going to consultation.
- 5.2 M3 – Atkins done on paper, but on periphery of study area. They will look at it but then pass over to SRA and HA. Will copy to SWARMMS when finalised.
- 5.3 Thoughts on the Strategy – first thing is reducing the need to travel, and last thing is expand road capacity. Government is about to go to consultation on Airport Strategy.
- 5.4
- re M3, GOSE now more content on needs for SWARMMS and will cover in Technical Note and/or Interim Report.
 - RB raised post-SWARMMS and involvement of WAG. CMu happy that WAG is copied into papers.
 - JW – are we the first to report on reducing the need to travel. If so can strengthen the SWARMMS case. Robert Fox to advise on this, and get back to Halcrow.
- DTLR

6 Wider Economic Impacts

- 6.1 CMu – key regeneration areas in SW early on, but flag up Wales later on. Should it be included? DTZ responded in Claire’s letter response. Also keen to see figures on the congestion effects.
- 6.2 CG – still concerned about report. Have DTZ done the ‘additional’ work as promised, or does SWRDA need to do it? Expecting more of a quantitative analysis, and focus on Devon & Cornwall (but accept focus on GOMMMS). Feels that “growth can’t be achieved without SWARMMS” is not covered in the main part of the report. would want future meeting with DTZ. Also, discussion with Halcrow as to how the other 2 elements will be presented.
- 6.3
- RB : what could they do with the information which was surfaced for them? Doesn’t know what came through. Ask DTZ.
 - do the numbers affect CC’s conclusion? ie road doesn’t improve much but rail improvements do.
 - RB – linkage between being good or bad effects if infrastructure is improved. Which is most important for the far South West? DTZ can’t be silent.
 - Section to summarise all economic effects on combination in the Final Report.
 - JW feels quantitative would help if possible.
 - MBI – “may and might” to “will and must” and now “vitaly important” in Claire’s letter re the risk of declining economy if road elements not being implemented. Concerned that it’s now moving to less measured in terms of responses.
 - RB : if DTZ can’t reach a view then they should say so, accepting that’s difficult. Expected more discussion on this – see point above.
 - MBI – less keen to move onto quantitative analysis, as it creates a certainty of expectation. RB agreed and said C Cobbold had been honest on this previously.
 - GD WAMMS doing additional work post-WAMMS, by GOWM/HA/etc. RB keen that detailed case studies are useful, but longer term.
 - CG said that if SW is to get more spend then we must have a strong economic case, which goes beyond SWARMMS. CG is still not sure that DTZ has met the terms of their extended brief, but equally not sure that the extension was agreed.
 - CG said that it was equally important to support the rail case – not just the roads.
 - RB again queried what information the economic partners brought to DTZ, and that DTZ should reflect on this in the report. DTZ
- 6.4 Agreed to set up a sub-discussion with DTZ post-Easter. Halcrow
 JW – importance of tourism. Needs to be brought out in report. DTZ
- 6.5 IH is keen for Final Report economic section to cover both the Spatial Strategy and peripherality arguments. DTZ



Action

7 Area/Corridor Plans: Swindon

- 7.1 MBr explained the growth that had been assessed was additional to RPG (beyond 2016), but others felt it described the different ways of accommodating RPG growth. Halcrow to confirm.
- 7.2 CG said we need to show what is in the Planning Reference Case.
- 7.3 RB- base case should be RPG.
- 7.4 JW – referred again to a 30 Year Vision Report for Swindon.
- 7.5 MBi – courageous for report to say that RPG won't be capable of delivery, if this is the case.
- 7.6 MB queried as to why the land use options are different to one another if it is merely a way of reallocating RPG.
- 7.7 PD – RPG is attempting to allow Swindon to grow in terms of housing so that it balances employment. MBr said the assessment assumes a far higher degree of containment in terms of new development.
- 7.8 CG asked how does this work feed through into RPG?
- 7.9 IH feels that the report could be very helpful for authorities taking this forward. He is happy that Halcrow says 'no' if that's the case.
- 7.10 PD what assumptions do you have to make in order to make RPG work?
- 7.11 MBr confirmed that Halcrow has not looked at congestion charging for Swindon.
- 7.12 IH asked whether the report should rule out Wootton Bassett. MB said yes, on basis of evidence.

8 Area/Corridor Plans: Bristol

- 8.1 CM – not yet read.
- 8.2 APD – comments grids for all Corridor Plans are needed. Halcrow
- 8.3 RB – need to include more analytical justification of the proposed measures.
- 8.4 RB said more needed work for Emerson's Green, yet ruled out Avon Ring Road. Why? Halcrow Agreed to revisit.
- 8.5 APD – questioned the role for Cribbs Causeway as a hub for public transport as the highway is very congested.

- 8.6 CG wants land use position being explained in context.
- 8.7 CG – how significant is the traffic growth. APD is keen to see this in all Plans, and the process of how this grows over time.
- 8.8 RB is keen to know what percentage of benefits are being given to different parts of the Preferred Strategy. MB agreed can put percentage in public transport and road traffic etc. Action to take summary flows from SWARMMS model.
- 8.9 CG is keen for ex-Avon authorities to be involved and that they know they are going to be involved.
- 8.10 CF how important is ITS? Asked for greater clarity in what the measures can deliver.
- 8.11 GOSW to lead the thought process on blight. GOSW
- 8.12 IH need to quote assumptions for ITS measures (MB said small in capacity and better reliability) CF though Active Traffic Management could generate higher capacity.
- 9 Area/Corridor Plans: London-Exeter**
- 9.1 CF – concerned about depth of analysis undertaken. CF not sure about sufficient information on A358 vs A303.
- 9.2 IH still not received scheme maps – handed over by APD.
- 9.3 GD – keen for RA to have opportunity to reconsider A358 vs A303 again. Needs greater discussion on the interaction between this and the need for a new Junction 24a.
- 9.4 RB – does A303 vs A358 decision affect choice of 24a? MBr said no.
- 9.5 IH – traffic benefits in favour of A303/A30 (safety and congestion) and therefore start point has to be the remitted schemes and show why they can't be done. Is information presented in report sufficient?
- 9.6 Agreed Steering Group to re-read Appraisal Report.
- 9.7 IH – keen to see A303 measures if A358 is upgraded covered in the report.
- 9.8 CG – to what degree does A358 upgrade add extra traffic to M5, and change in seasonal traffic flows. Also, keen that report draws upon what we mean by needing two strategic routes.
- 9.9 GD – SG agreed (in absence of Mike Birkin) east of A358, but can't take final decision on A358 vs A303 until Taunton has done work in relation to PUA expansion.



		Action
9.10	Halcrow to revisit linkage of northern Taunton expansion and link to A358 upgrade, and interaction thereof.	Halcrow
9.11	CG keen to see forecast traffic flows in reports – important.	
10	Area/Corridor Plans: London-Bristol	
10.1	MB said no direct access to/from motorways for coaches/bus interchange facilities.	
10.2	Discussions on interchanges – is there too much detail in the report?	
11	Area/Corridor Plans: Bristol-Exeter	
11.1	Add chapter 3.	Halcrow
11.2	Action to circulate Coach/Express Bus Technical Note	Halcrow
12	Draft Wiring Diagrams	
12.1	MBi – it is helpful presentationally, but negative effects also need to be considered.	Halcrow
12.2	IR – questioned the need for data sources to be included. PD - sees it as very helpful.	
13	AOB	
13.1	Discuss Honiton Eastern Bypass and Saltash-Stoketon Cross and the reasons for their rejections in the Plans.	Halcrow
13.2	Working together over the next month – Steering Groups @ 11/4 and 29/4, plus one separate meeting on Wider Economic Impacts with Chris Cobbold.	
13.3	Swindon – no more debate needed at Steering Group, but would like to see changes, if they are material changes.	
13.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Start next Steering Group meeting @ 9.30- Re timetable, DB is concerned. He wants process to allow for a timetable which accommodates the Steering Group not agreeing priorities.	
13.5	IH sees A303 vs A358, Bristol and acceptability to ex-Avon authorities, and rail issues as the three big issues, with probably rail as the biggest issue.	
13.6	RB also sees Wider Economic Impacts as being important.	
13.7	JW not able to attend on 11/4. Simon Face to attend instead.	



Action