

London to South West and South Wales Multi-Modal Study



Steering Group Meeting

Venue:	Temple Quay House, Bristol	
Date held:	29 th May 2001	
Present:	Richard Bayly (Government Office for the South East – GOSW) –chair (morning)	RB
	Peter Botham (GOSW) – chair (afternoon)	PB
	Mike Birkin (Sustainability SW)	MBi
	Peter Dawson (GOSW, Regional Transport Team Leader)	PD
	Nick Carter (Highways Agency – HA)	NC
	Paul Collins (DETR – Multi-Modal Studies Unit)	PC
	Claire Gibson (South West Regional Development Agency – SWRDA)	CG
	Ian Harrison (South West Regional Assembly – SWRA)	IH
	Matthew Lodge (Strategic Rail Authority – SRA)	ML
	Iain Reeve (Government Office for the South East – GOSE)	IR
	John Rider (GOSE – Orbit Team)	JR
	Anthony Slack (South East England Development Agency – SEEDA)	AS
	Martin Tugwell (South East England Regional Assembly – SEERA)	MT
	John Wilkinson (CBI)	JW
	Cliff Baston (Highways Agency – observer)	CB
	David Mills (Contract Manager, GOSW)	DM
	Andrew Page-Dove (Assistant Project Manager, GOSW)	APD
	Ron Davies (Administration Manager MMS Team, GOSW)	RD
	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

Notes of Steering Group Meeting

Action

1. Apologies for absence

Tony Carroll (National Assembly for Wales – NAW)
Ciara Mulligan (DETR Central)

2. Minutes of previous meeting

Agreed minutes a factual record of the meeting.

3. Emerging Preferred Strategy

3.1 Detailed documentation provided to SGp in advance. DM noted that APD update note says what is required from the SGp today. This is to give general approval to proceed to seek comments on the Emerging Preferred Strategy (EPS). RB suggested comments from each SGp member.

MT

- 3.2
- London-Reading problems & issues lacking. Some particular issues of access to international access facilities. A bit SW biased perhaps – would have liked to see reference to strategic Park & Ride for London/SE.
 - Could do with 'headlines' of what strategy delivers.
 - How have tolling and induced effects been incorporated?

3.3 GJ noted that tolling had been rejected for specific routes in the initial sift, for diversion reasons. DB agreed there is a need to explain better how things have been rejected. Discussion followed that tolling of selected routes should not perhaps be dismissed in the SE, as diversion issues are different. DM suggested that strategy should dismiss tolling in the SW, but note that the SE are needs greater consideration in the London-Reading (L-R) study. MBi noted that the SW/SE regional boundary should not be used and that political acceptability should not preclude commenting. Also that wider economic effects refers to peripherality of regeneration areas, whereas peripherality is also a specific issue itself.

3.4 Agreed to take on board SW/SE differences vis-à-vis tolling, and check wording of wider economic effects sub-criteria. Halcrow

3.5 GJ/DB noted that induced effects are fully included for most issues such as route changes and mode shifts, but that land-use and locational re-distribution effects have not all been included to date. GJ noted that specific 'strategic' Park & Ride measures are not included, though facilities that are not badged P&R are included – such as selected 'parkway' rail stations.

3.6 General discussion that the strategy needs to be taken on board and/or be compatible with a number of other studies. Agreed there is a need for general liaison between relevant studies (SWARMMS, Orbit, South Midlands, etc). GOSW
Halcrow

ML

- 3.7
- The economic case for rail elements looks bad at present.
 - A303 improvements and Exeter-Waterloo upgrades together should be described as complementary/contradictory as appropriate.
 - Query source/values of reducing demand assumptions.
 - Not much emphasis on freight.

Action

- 3.8 MBr noted that there are significant differences between appraisal criteria for SRA and GOMMMS – SRA more financial. GJ indicated that farebox revenue attributable to the strategy is also not included in economic assessments at present. Similarly, estimates of the financial savings due to increased reliability.
- 3.9 Interaction between A303 and Exeter-Waterloo analyses are being carried out. Indications are that they are complementary. Later noted that some improvements to the Waterloo-Exeter service are included in the Do Minimum.
- 3.10 Assumptions for reducing the need to travel have had to be made by Halcrow, as no advice has been provided to MMS consultants (as had at one time been anticipated). Halcrow intending to meet with HETA to discuss the assumptions made. Halcrow
- 3.11 JW queried sensitivity of strategy to assumptions and individual elements, and whether the 'emerging preferred strategy' should be 'preferred'. No agreement noted. Some concerns noted that fundamentals could change if sensitivity is significant. MBr/GJ noted that some sensitivity tests would be needed, but that significant changes to the strategy should not be necessary as much work has already been done in refining to what we have now. NC suggested bringing out some of the linkages between elements (w.r.t. sensitivities). DB noted that we have to be careful not to go too far in sensitivity? assumptions analyses, else they become risk assessments – changing assumptions versus 'what if' assumptions happen differently.
- 3.12 Increasing consideration of freight already discussed at another meeting with ML. Currently ongoing. Halcrow
- IR*
- 3.13
- London-Reading previously discussed.
 - Demand management – particularly relates to local authorities and how they are going to be encouraged/made to implement
 - Travel Plans – implications for local authorities and resources to carry out
- 3.14 GJ noted that the strategy should not be too prescriptive (and isn't). MT noted that the study feeds into the regional transport strategies, which in turn frame the local transport plans. On travel plans, DB indicated it would be sensible to find out what has been achieved already, and mak recommendations based on this.
- CG*
- 3.15
- Links between problems and issues and strategies.
 - Reiterated A303/A30 and Waterloo-Exeter interaction is important, and noted it would have been nice to know the outcome of the A358 vs A30 debate.
 - For air services, only Bristol is specifically mentioned. What about other airports,

such as Exeter, in the longer term.

- Queried whether interaction between rail and sea had been considered for freight.
- Noted that economic regeneration zones in AST is just Objective 1 and 2. There are others that could be included – PC noted the AST is OK.

IH

- 3.16
- Overall fairly comfortable with strategy/appraisal.
 - Queried language relating to environment. The regional nature of the study makes impacts difficult to describe. Also that there are some 'off-line' schemes in the composite technical notes. GJ noted that this had been rectified in the emerging preferred strategy note, and the others need similar editing.
 - Local authorities and parking – PNR taxation and local park and ride not mentioned.
 - Query economics and deliverability of the costs.

PD

- 3.17 Would have liked a decision on A358 vs A30.

MBi

- 3.18
- Wider economic impacts AST entry should not include peripherality specific reference.
 - Local action includes LTPs – and what else?
 - Do composite strategies A & B do solve problems?
 - Query measures of congestion?
 - Reduced travel and capacity increase appears to be contradictory.
- 3.19
- Preperality reference is for specific regeneration areas. PC noted that language should perhaps be altered.
 - Local action includes measures in addition to current LTPs.
 - MBr noted current documentation does not include specific references to problems and strategies – this will be covered on the exhibition boards.
 - A number of definitions of congestion are available, including the definition in the 10-year plan, and average and peak V/C ratios. DB noted there is no definitive definition.
 - MBr noted that reducing the need to travel deals with reducing future growth, also existing problems remain.

JW

- 3.20
- requested more details about economic figures – GJ agreed to talk through figures.
 - queried timescale and implementation of strategy.
 - noted that bus services seem not to be emphasised.
- 3.21
- Noted the strategy includes buses – JW queried costs allowed for buses. GJ noted that some allowance had been made, but not detailed in terms of capital and revenue, also that LTPs are seen as a primary mechanism of implementing local transport initiatives.

MT noted that MMS are bringing issues of continuing revenue support being separated from capital for buses – SRA franchise process includes both.

AS

- 3.22 Queried what is needed to provide extra facilities for freight. GJ noted that particular issues are locations of intermodal terminals and rail loading gauge, though provision of rail facilities for freight is difficult. SRA is intending to provide a full review of freight facilities grants process at around the end of the year.

NC

- 3.23
- Unfortunate that A358 vs A30 debate not settled at this stage.
 - Noted that modelling work should seek to take on board HA work.
 - No references to Bristol and a comprehensive park and ride system.
 - Noted that 'junction improvements' could be very large (e.g. if Almondsbury interchange was considered).
 - No reference to local road schemes.

4. Comments Period (18th June – 20th July)

- 4.1 APD noted that the comment period is planned for after the General Election. Following discussions at the last SGp meeting, for stakeholders, there will now be three exhibitions (combined with briefings for local authorities). The exhibitions are not being 'advertised', but anyone will be welcome to attend. Also, there will be a conference for key stakeholders. Around 100 organisations are to be invited to attend and give short presentations – to give an opportunity for people to speak and hear others – anticipate around 15 presentations.

- 4.2 CG queried whether presentations and exhibition would be tailored for each venue. No, all will be the same.

- 4.3 Draft mocks of exhibition boards discussed. Agreed that GOSW would agree content. Some ideas noted:

- bring out salient points
- are specific reference to A30 appropriate given non-specific references to other elements
- try to link to previous stakeholder participation
- too much detail on 'spiral' sheet
- plain english wording

PC to see how other MMS have handled presenting information.

DETR

- 4.4 MBI queried whether organisations wishing to make presentations could have some assistance. PB/APD noted that this should be OK, but not until after the elections.

- 4.5 MBr indicated that information would be sent to all stakeholders – question is what level of detail is appropriate. IH noted that LAs wouldn't necessarily need much information – not more than other stakeholders. PC queried whether ASTs should be included. DB noted that context of ASTs is important and may be better explained individually. JW suggested a glossary. Agreed not to include ASTs.
- 4.6 CG queried coverage of Assemblies. Within comment period will be presentations to SWRDA Infrastructure advisory group, SWRA Transport sub-group and planning sub-group of SEERA already planned. Stat Env't groups have been informed of the strategy – MBr noted it was a good meeting with some comments on the appraisal (being dealt with).
- 4.7 MT asked about press releases. APD noted there will be a release in SW and SE regions, probably sometime in week after election (w/b 11th June). ML noted that the balance of the press statement will have to be carefully done – in particular vis-à-vis rail.

5. **Proposals for 'Plan Stage' of study**

- 5.1 MBr noted that plans will now cover all of the main study corridors (London-Bristol, London-Exeter, Bristol-Exeter and Exeter-Penzance – road and rail routes) as well as two urban areas (Bristol and Swindon). It was assumed initially that (due to the size of the area) some sections would not be done. In addition, it is anticipated there would be four topic-based plans, covering:
- intermodal freight
 - paying for transport
 - tourism
 - rural access to the transport system
 - reducing the need to travel
- 5.2 MBr noted that plans will involve working closely with others – local authorities SRA, Highways Agency, SEBs, etc. NC queried level of detail of plans. PC noted that for a road scheme it could be sufficient to add the scheme to the TPI list, but would need to be aware of other work carried out. NC noted that schemes will vary in detail required (as well as level of involvement).
- 5.4 CG queried development of rail plans. ML noted that the SRA strategic plan will present overall priorities, and they are already working on exactly how the MMS outputs will feed in. GJ noted that there would also (has already been) liaison with Railtrack and the TOCs. PC noted that the DETR is also assessing the SRA and rail industry's ability to cope with potential future plans.
- 5.5 PD queried whether topic plans relate to the terms of reference. MBI said yes, and asked why other urban areas (such as Plymouth) do not have an area plan. PB noted that the

Action

growth expectations of the PUAs, and Bristol/Swindon in particular, is high. APD noted that issues around other PUAs would be covered by corridor work as appropriate, but that Swindon and Bristol need a higher level of detail.

- 5.6 NC/ML queried whether there will be scope to 'loop' round when plans are complete to 'check' the strategy. This should not be an issue, and successive iterations not desirable, but interaction between plans and the strategy is inevitable.
- 5.7 General query whether 'paying for travel' is a valid issue for SWARMMS to study. RB noted that contribution to national debate could be valid. Agreed that GOSW/DETR to find out whether this is a topic that should be taken forward by SWARMMS, or some other mechanism. GOSW
DETR
- 5.8 Some presentational issues regarding the map were aired – rail should come before road, reducing the need to travel should be the first topic plan on the list. Noted that map is not intended for public consumption at this stage.
- 5.9 RB queried air services in plans. Noted that lack of National Air Services Strategy makes this difficult. Most important issue is access to Heathrow (covered by road and rail corridors).

6. Work Programme

- 6.1 Latest version sees finish to study in April 2002. MBr noted that delays are as a result of changing the process and coming into elections (which were moved) and summer time. In any case, foot and mouth issues (untypical traffic patterns and restrictions on the police) means that any survey work required cannot be done until September.
- 6.2 MT queried data required for plans. GJ/MBr noted that data would be collected as required (perhaps infill data in Bristol or on rail). Key will be scoping of plans and co-operation with other organisations.
- 6.3 IR noted London-Reading inputs shown complete, but are not. AS noted that inputs include the SWARMMS strategy as well. IR queried whether specific L-R strategy paper would be produced. Not envisaged. MT noted he had not seen draft L-R report. Draft sent to GOSW and GOSE in January 2001.
- 6.4 RB noted there is no 'Report of SWARMMS' on programme. No, the programme reflects reporting as specified in the terms of reference.

7. AOB

There was no other business.

8. Next Meeting

Date of next Steering Group meeting – 2nd August 2001, at Temple Quay House, Bristol

The following Steering Group Meeting will be held on either 21st August 2001 or 6th September 2001