



STEERING GROUP MEETING

Venue:	Government Office for the South West (GOSW), The Pithay, Bristol	
Date held:	19 th December 2000	
Present:	Richard Bayly (GOSW)	RB
	Mike Birkin (Sustainability SW)	MBi
	Nick Carter (Highways Agency – HA)	NC
	David Cooper (GOSE)	DC
	Claire Gibson (South West Regional Development Agency – SWRDA)	CG
	Ian Harrison (South West Regional Assembly – SWRA)	IH
	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
	John Wilkinson (CBI)	JW
	Peter Dawson (GOSW, Regional Transport Team Leader)	PD
	Andrew Page-Dove (Assistant Project Manager, GOSW)	APD
	Eddie Shimmin (Regional Transport Team, GOSW)	ES
	David Bayliss (Project Director, Halcrow)	DB
	Martyn Brooks (Project Manager, Halcrow)	MBr
	Gareth Walters (Project Co-ordinator, Halcrow)	GW
	Gareth James (Halcrow – appraisal/modelling)	GJ
observer	Bernard Meakins (DETR)	

Notes of Steering Group Meeting

Action

1. Apologies for absence

Peter Botham (GOSW)
Tony Carroll (National Assembly for Wales – NAW)
Ciara Mulligan (DETR Central)
Iain Reeve (Government Office for the South East – GOSE)
Martin Williams (South West Regional Assembly – SWRA)
David Mills (Contract Manager, GOSW)

2. Minutes of previous meeting

2.1 Actions noted in previous minutes all considered. Items of detail noted below:

- Para 5.3 of minutes notes Waterloo-Exeter hourly service as an assumption. CG noted discussion after the meeting suggested this could be unlikely. However, it is

Action

consistent with recent announcements of Wessex franchise.

- Social Inclusion topic group has been discussed with relevant parties in GOSW. GOSW have provided names to Halcrow so that they can arrange a meeting.
- Local Transport Plans settlement now announced. Should include approved schemes in Base Case. Deferred schemes hold off for now, reconsider this issue after July 2001
- Exhibition at Paddington – Halcrow have been unable to arrange an alternative date with Railtrack because of recent events in the rail industry. Do not propose to seek alternative. SSRA have suspended regular data collection for the time being, and suggested that a SouthEast dimension to surveys could be sought (potentially much) later in the study.

Halcrow

3. Role of Steering Group Members

- 3.1 Revised paper issued by GOSW 15th December. GOSW received two comments prior to meeting, on the status of documentation (additional paragraph), and role of person and organisation.
- 3.2 MT noted that the inference that SGp members are ‘representatives’ of their organisations is not consistent with the treatment MM study SGp members have had in the South East. DC agreed, noting that representing an organisation could make it tricky if the SGp gives ‘clearance’ for outputs that the organisation subsequently has difficulty with. Suggested ‘be party to the process’ as another form of words, thereby ensuring their personal contributions could not be deemed as binding by the organisations they represent. Mbi - because of the vast numbers of environmental organisations he represents as a SGp member, realistically he will only be able to present those issues on their behalf if he is already aware of them. He could not possibly consult each and every one on each issue
- 3.3 Chair noted that the SGp is not formally the client and the consultants can not be managed by a committee. Suggested that members should use their "best endeavours" to consult relevant interests and bring knowledge of the organisations’ intents, but not be held accountable for having represented the interests of all respective bodies.
- 3.4 NC suggested adding something about bilateral assistance that SGp members can give to the consultants. Chair said GOSW would encourage this with both the consultants and/or GOSW, and in particular where a specific issue is of particular importance to individual SGp members such detailed points are often best dealt with outside SGp meetings.
- 3.5 AS indicated that it was important to comment on documentation because in the latter stages of the Access to Hastings MMS (which has reported), draft recommendations

Action

were 'leaked' to the press. This was embarrassing for that SGp. NC also noted that the comments should be considered as collective and not attributed to individuals.

3.6 GOSW to revise note.

GOSW

4. Study Process and Work Programme

4.1 Chair explained that GOSW/Halcrow had had the opportunity to air the revised process in front of Diane Phillips (DETR Under Secretary responsible for MM Studies), and that it had been well received.

4.2 Halcrow presented the process.

4.3 Chair thanked Halcrow for taking on board the previous discussions on processes, and noted that the revised timetable was now closer to that of the Orbit Study.

4.4 SGp was generally supportive of the revised process and timetable.

4.5 MBI and MT queried the role of objectives in the 'initial sift', Halcrow indicated that objectives feed in as part of GOMMMS at the appraisal of composite strategies, the initial sift is simply used to eliminate unsuitable interventions before deriving the composite strategies. MT thought this may be at odds with the perception workshop attendees may have. SGp agreed that a newsletter should be produced in January/February that would clarify the position. JW noted that workshop attendees should be able to understand changes.

Halcrow
for news-
letter

4.6 IH queried the issue of trip generation as part of the initial sift. Halcrow said that the facility is available in the model to consider elasticities of trip matrix size, this will be used where appropriate.

4.7 JW queried limited references to buses. Halcrow said that the strategic model only has long distance/express bus/coach services. Conscious of locally generated bus journeys importance, but difficult to model at strategic level.

4.8 AS queried interaction between the overarching strategy and subsequent detailed work on 'plans' – specifically where detailed work could show that part of the strategy may not work. Halcrow said that the number of (or existence of) unanswered questions at the end of the strategy is unknown, and that if the situation arises where the strategy cannot be implemented in detail, then it will have to be dealt with at the time. DB noted that the longer strategy development period should reduce the chances of this happening.

4.9 NC introduced the topic of 'surfacing' the strategy in the wider world. Chair suggested that this topic could be considered in detail at the next SGp meeting, but that in the meantime a paper should be prepared with details of proposed interactions. MT said that

GOSW

Action

the Regional Assembly planning committee system could be used for formal endorsement, but would need lots of notice. GOSW said that formal endorsement could be difficult, and was not absolutely required. GOSW to liaise with the Regional Assemblies and GOSE in preparing paper.

4.10 MT/IH noted that local elections are taking place on 3rd May (and this is just when the strategy would be released). This could effect who, within the local Councils, will attend. GOSW

5. Problems & Issues

5.1 Halcrow presented 'headline' results of problems and issues assessments.

5.2 MT was concerned about the way the results of the questionnaire were presented in the Summary Report, as they could be construed as being given too much weight when in fact this was not the case as only a very small section of society had participated. It was agreed the Summary Report should clearly reflect this. Halcrow

5.3 MT also queried the future problems section – a bit thin and the basis for statements not clear. Agreed to clarify basis. Halcrow

5.4 MT queried whether area-by-area presentation of problems and issues would be appropriate. Halcrow said that this will be inevitable as more detailed work progresses, but is questionable at present, given that there are many corridor issues that cannot easily be split into areas.

5.5 NC queried 'scale of problems' and content of problems versus land uses. CG suggested reference to planning reference case. Agreed to clarify 'scale' and introduce a reference to the planning reference case. Halcrow

5.6 DC said that Orbit has had some problems incorporating responses/data as the evolving process means that information has been collected in different ways, and required more and/or less interpretation. Suggested that Orbit has treated local authority responses in a different way – may be worth considering. Also noted that the study area and diversity is so large that the strategy will necessarily vary from area to area.

5.7 Chair said that the SGp could be of assistance in adding regional and local spatial dimension to the objectives. He suggested three aims :-

- Where RPG had sub regional priorities, such as support for the South West
- Where transport investment could liberate general RPG objectives, such as the use of brownfield land, or a reduction in car dependency
- Where there are local constraints or problems, such as SSAs or split communities.

Action

- 5.8 Mbi noted that explaining the role of participants is important (newsletter), and that the list of schemes did not reflect the 'non-technical' options such as the affect of green travel plans. Halcrow said that the list is purely for the strategic model, and that most 'softer' options cannot be satisfactorily modelled. However, Halcrow said that these would be included in the initial sift, and more importantly in the composite strategies.
- 5.9 MT queried inclusion of 'blue sky' issues/ideas. Halcrow noted it is important to ensure that 'blue sky' is separated from 'pie in the sky' and that the worth of many future predictions is not generally agreed. Important to consider though. GOSW asked what Orbit are doing. DC said they had not reached this stage, also, their approach is different in that the public will be able to suggest test scenarios –anticipates these could include some 'blue sky' ideas. DC said that the SWARMMS approach will necessarily need to be different to Orbit, as the problems are different.
- 5.10 Chair summed - up that the report is generally OK, and that the spatial aspects of problems and issues and objectives would be brought out with SGp assistance. Need to consider how innovative 'blue sky' ideas can be incorporated.

6. AOB*Planning Reference Case*

- 6.1 Halcrow said that the planning reference case has undergone a series of discussions with GOSW, GOSE, local authorities, etc and that the SWARMMS approach was agreed, and these figures are being used in the initial modelling sift. However, Temprow has been altered, and new RPG figures just released for S E which mean that there are some discrepancies between SWARMMS and Orbit.
- 6.2 Halcrow were requested to set up a meeting with SWARMMS and Orbit in New Year to agree a cut-off date, preferably mid to late January 2001, by which these assumptions would be agreed between each study. Halcrow will incorporate these into the model at the beginning of February 2001 ensuring that both SWARMMS and Orbit use the same basic figures. The new SWARMMS timetable gives an opportunity to revise the planning reference case (and model) prior to modelling the composite strategies. DC agreed.
- 6.3 DC noted that the published RPG dwelling numbers do not match the predictions of household formations in the SE.

'Early Wins'

- 6.4 CG asked about the status of early results from the study. Halcrow said that Dobwalls Bypass and Broadmoor Farm had previously been mentioned, Dobwalls Bypass remains a key scheme – any early determination must be consistent with a robust study process,

Action

but it is hoped to achieve this by May 2001

Newsletter contents

- 6.5 Chair requested suggestions for items that the next newsletter scheduled for release in January/February 2001 should definitely cover. Suggestions offered, – methodology for local objectives determination, process and how participants fit in.
- 6.6 DC said that Orbit would also be releasing its next newsletter at around the same time, and the London Mayor's strategy would also be out for consultation.

MP/MEP meeting

- 6.7 GOSW said that an MP/MEP meeting is planned for February – Orbit agreed they would be involved.

7. Next Meeting

Date of next Steering Group meeting – 15th February 2001, at The Pithay.