

## Transport for the South East Draft Transport Strategy: consultation questionnaire

### Have your say

We are interested in your views on our draft Transport Strategy. Please read the draft Transport Strategy, which is available from our [website](#), before completing the questionnaire.

Our consultation is open from 7 October 2019 to 10 January 2020. You can submit your views in the following ways:

- Complete the questionnaire online via [transportforthesoutheast.org.uk/transport-strategy](http://transportforthesoutheast.org.uk/transport-strategy)
- Complete this form and return by email to [tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk)
- Complete this form and return by post to **Freepost TRANSPORT FOR THE SOUTH EAST**

Please submit your views by **11:59pm on 10 January 2020**.

If you are returning this form by email or by post, and do not have enough space in the following text boxes, you are welcome to include separate sheets. If so, please specify which question(s) you are responding to.

### Privacy notice

We take data protection seriously. Please be assured that your information will be used appropriately in line with data protection legislation, will be stored securely and will not be processed unless the requirements for fair and lawful processing can be met.

Information that you provide through this questionnaire will be used to inform the development of Transport for the South East's Transport Strategy and to keep you updated on our work. Responses will be shared with our suppliers responsible for the consultation analysis and reporting, though your information will never be sold for direct marketing purposes.

Our staff are trained to handle your information correctly and protect your confidentiality and privacy. Once the Transport Strategy has been completed in 2020, your records will be retained for no more than two years following that date. Our full privacy notice is available from [transportforthesoutheast.org.uk/privacy](http://transportforthesoutheast.org.uk/privacy)

A summary of responses to this consultation will be published on the TfSE website at [transportforthesoutheast.org.uk](http://transportforthesoutheast.org.uk). The summary will include a list of organisations that responded but not personal names, addresses or other contact details. If you do not wish for your organisation's name to be included in the analysis of responses, please tick the box below:

**I want my organisation's details to remain confidential in any published analysis**

If you would like to be added to our email database to receive regular updates from Transport for the South East, please tick the box below and supply your email address.

**I would like to receive news and updates from Transport for the South East by email**

**Email address:** \_\_\_\_\_

### Further information

If you have any questions about the consultation, you can contact us by email at [tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk) or call us on **0300 3309474**.

## About you

The following questions will help us to understand the range of people and organisations who have submitted responses to the consultation. The information you provide will not be used for any purpose other than assessing responses.

**1. Are you providing your own response or responding on behalf of an organisation/group?** *Please tick one of the boxes below.*

Providing my own response (please respond to Question 2)



Responding on behalf of organisation/group (please respond to Questions 3 and 4)

**2. If you are responding as an individual, please provide your name and postcode below and then continue to Question 5.**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Postcode: \_\_\_\_\_

**3. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation or group, please provide the following details:**

Organisation name: Gravesham Borough Council

Your name: Tony Chadwick

Your role: Principal Transport & NSIP Project Manager

**Please turn over.**

**4. Which category of organisation or group are you representing?**

*(Please tick all the boxes that apply)*

- Academic (includes universities and other academic institutions)
- Business
- Business representative group (includes CBI, Chambers of Commerce, LEPS)
- Campaign group
- Charity/voluntary sector group
- Elected representative (includes MPs, MEPs and local councillors)
- Environment, heritage, amenity or community group (includes environmental groups, schools, church groups, residents' associations, recreation groups and other community interest organisations)
- Local Government (includes county councils, district councils, parish and town councils and local partnerships)
- Professional body/representative group
- Statutory body
- Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation (includes transport bodies, transport providers, infrastructure providers and utility companies)
- Think tank
- Transport user group
- Prefer not to say

Other *(please tick box and specify below)*:



---

**5. Please confirm that you have read the draft Transport Strategy before completing this questionnaire? Please tick as appropriate**

- I have read the full [draft Transport Strategy](#)
- I have read the [draft Transport Strategy executive summary](#), but not the full document
- I have not read either the full draft Transport Strategy nor the executive summary

## Our Approach

6. Rather than the traditional transport planning approach of ‘predict and provide’ based on responding to trends and forecasts, we have adopted a ‘decide and provide’ approach to identify a preferred future for the South East in 2050. Please see Paragraphs 1.16 to 1.20 of the draft Transport Strategy for further information.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the use of this ‘decide and provide’ approach? Please tick one box.

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. The draft Transport Strategy advocates the evolution of transport policy away from one based on ‘planning for vehicles’ to one based on ‘planning for people’ and ‘planning for places’ Please see Paragraphs 1.21 to 1.25, and Figure 1.3, of the draft Transport Strategy for further information.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that transport policy across the South East should evolve in this way? Please tick one box.

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. In Paragraphs 1.26 to 1.30 of the draft Transport Strategy, we explain our preferred future scenario: ‘Sustainable Route to Growth’.

How important do you feel the key features of our ‘Sustainable Route to Growth’ scenario are for the future of the South East? Please tick one box for each feature.

Key feature	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important / unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Not important at all	Don't know
The South East is less reliant on London and has developed its own successful economic hubs	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The benefits of emerging technology are being harnessed	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land-use and transport planning are better integrated	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Key feature	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important / unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Not important at all	Don't know
A shift away from private cars towards more sustainable travel modes	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Targeted demand management measures, with more mobility being consumed on a 'pay as you go basis'	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The transport system delivers a cleaner, safer environment	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**9. Do you have any additional comments about our approach to developing the draft Transport Strategy? Please describe these below.**

The Borough Council welcomes the broad approach taken by Transport for the South East and the original thought that has gone into the draft Strategy. The aim of moving away from predict and provide it welcomed as a new approach is needed to a transport system that is, at peak times at least, operating at or over capacity. The major points it would raise are:

- the current lack of a clear mechanism to integrate Local Plans and the draft Transport Strategy
- the strength and urgency needed to tackle the issues of air quality and decarbonisation
- the lack of clarity on how the draft Strategy can effectively to be used to prioritise projects including reviewing those that are not being currently implemented
- the degree of influence over other bodies such as the LEP's, Highways England, Network Rail and Central Government to ensure implementation
- The Thames is not treated as a transport corridor in its own right
- The draft Strategy supports the Lower Thames Crossing, which this Council opposes, but does not address it as a strategic corridor or explicitly include it in the SEA

As context Gravesham Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) sets out a strategy that seeks to provide homes and jobs in a context of being a Green Belt authority, with extensive areas of nature conservation (Ramsar/SPA, SSSI's), significant landscape constraints (Kent Downs AoNB) and many significant historic features. In transport terms it is crossed by A2/M2, HS1, North Kent Line, Chatham mainline and has the River Thames as its northern boundary. The latter is an important freight transport corridor in its own right and has potential for much greater passenger use. The Local Plan supports public transport provision and the Council has played key role in the delivery of Fastrack bus system and enhancing the walking and cycling network. A key component of the Local Plan are the employment opportunities round Ebbsfleet International Station (whether in Gravesham or Dartford Borough's) and the Council supports the Ebbsfleet Development Corporations

endeavours to bring these forward.

The Council supports the expansion of Fastrack (especially the Gravesend Public Transport Interchange), A2 Bean & Ebbsfleet junctions enhancement and the extension of Crossrail to Ebbsfleet (the Council is part of the promoting consortium). It does not support the current Lower Thames Crossing proposals from Highways England due to the impacts on local residents, the natural and historic environments, and the implied expansion of road traffic. The costs and benefits for this scheme have yet to be made out in a robust way.

The Borough therefore finds itself trying to meet its housing and employment needs in a context of major environmental constraints and major transport infrastructure which is at peak times is currently operating at or above capacity. The regular traffic chaos on the A2, together with its status as an AQMA and the knock on effects on the local highway network, illustrate this. London commuting is a major element of local travel patterns. Whilst the aim of the Ebbsfleet development (and the possible London Resort development) is to counteract the draw of the London labour market, Gravesham is too close to avoid the major pull of the job opportunities in the metropolis. Gravesend is only 24 minutes from St Pancras, and it is standing room only on HS1 services at peak (2013 data behind the draft strategy is significantly out of date in this regard).

The scale of housing development set out in the Governments objectively assessed need requirements (and the lack of attention in the guidance to employment location which has major implications for travel patterns) suggest that further pressure will be placed on an already fragile transport system. A clear result of the modelling done to date for Lower Thames Crossing shows that a new link simply fills up (as does Dartford after initial relief) and places significant strains on the highway system elsewhere. The link makes no particular provision for public transport and it highlights the question of how freight reaches the rest of the country. Little benefit is derived for Kent from through traffic that simply wishes to get from Dover/Channel Tunnel to somewhere else in the country.

The transport network of the South East has suffered from a lack of investment, and nationally is probably perceived as being part of London. Whilst the South East benefits for investment in London this tends to be to radial routes and the documentation highlights the lack of investment in the orbital corridors. The same applies to more local infrastructure provision which tends to fall between the 'major projects' and the local access improvements that development may be able to fund.

There is an important lobbying role for TfSE in correcting the perception that may exist that investment in London is the same as investment in the South East (as defined here). This extends as noted above to lobbying other transport organisations to take on board the approach taken by the draft Strategy.

## Our Area

**10.** Chapter 2 of the draft Transport Strategy summarises the characteristics, challenges and opportunities in the South East.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that the evidence set out in Chapter 2 of the draft Transport Strategy makes a strong case for continued investment in the South East's transport system? Please tick one box.**

**Strongly agree**

**Tend to agree**

**Neither agree nor  
disagree**

**Tend to disagree**

**Strongly  
disagree**

**Don't know**



**11. Please use the space below to provide any other comments you may have about the information set out in Chapter 2, or any additional evidence that you think should be included.**

Chapter 2 provides a comprehensive overview of the South East area, necessarily at high level. An important characteristic of Kent that it is a network of relatively small places (even the Medway Towns is a set of centres as a result of its the geography and history), which gives rise to diverse and complex travel patterns rather than a focus on one large economic centre (overlain by the impact of London which does follow that model). This helps explain in part the high mode share of car trips in contrast to, for example, rail to central London. Although appreciating why the data set is being used there is a concern over how changes in work patterns, retail patterns, the impact of technology are changing travel patterns and therefore the weight to be placed on the 2011 data.

As noted above the Borough Council feels that there are two key elements that need more weight. Firstly the location of major transport hubs and employment centres has a big influence on travel patterns across the region. The River Thames is largely ignored in the Strategy but has a key role in freight transport - and the location of port facilities which have a major impact on traffic flows, particularly for HGV's. A related issue not tackled, and it is a national matter, is how freight arrives in the country. The impact of the Channel Tunnel has been to focus demand on the Tunnel itself and the Port of Dover. There needs to be a fundamental review of rail freight use (or lack of) of the Channel Tunnel and whether all the HGV traffic that passes through Dover needs to be there at all. Since a significant quantity seems to be going to the Midlands or further north, why is this traffic not having a longer sea crossing and using some of east coast ports?

Secondly the Lower Thames Crossing is being designed to serve the long distance strategic market, and does not for example provide proper links between the two sides of the river or make any specific provision for public transport. The limited junction on A13 means that many of claimed benefits for the Thames Estuary require continued use of Dartford even for traffic from East Kent. The Dartford Crossing will remain very congested and subject to incidents.

The Borough Council has held the view that there is a need for additional crossing capacity but this needs to be addressed in a number of ways. The scheme actually throws up major issues about the A2/M2 corridor and the links to the M20, all of which are in or pass through areas where major housing expansion is proposed. Highways England are promoting a scheme that fails to address the real transport issues in the area, which requires an approach that steps away from its narrow remit. At the strategic level the A2/M2 and M20/A20 corridors cannot be meaningfully separated as they are very interdependent. Disruption on one has an immediate impact on the other and local roads as drivers seek alternative routes.

The Lower Thames Crossing is not treated as a strategic corridor in its own right and should be (unless it is intended to part of M25 orbital corridor).

## Our Vision, Goals and Priorities

**12.** Our vision is that: ‘By 2050, the South East of England will be a leading global region for net-zero carbon, sustainable economic growth where integrated transport, digital and energy networks have delivered a step -change in connectivity and environmental quality.

‘A high-quality, reliable, safe and accessible transport network will offer seamless door-to-door journeys enabling our businesses to compete and trade more effectively in the global marketplace and giving our residents and visitors the highest quality of life.’

**To what extent do you support or oppose our vision for the South East?** *Please tick one box.*

Strongly support	Tend to support	Neither support nor oppose	Tend to oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know
✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**13. Do you have any further comments on our vision?** *Please provide these below.*

The Borough Council would support the broad strategy, but would asked about how it is to be translated into actual decision making. In terms of the Local Plan it does not make clear how competing/conflicting objectives should be reconciled on either a local or more strategic level.

**14.** The draft Transport Strategy sets out three strategic goals that underpin our vision. These goals will help to translate the vision into more targeted and tangible actions (*please see Paragraphs 3.3 to 3.7 for more details on our vision and goals.*)

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the goals set out within the draft Transport Strategy?** *Please tick one box for each goal.*

Goal	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Improve productivity and attract investment to grow our economy and better compete in the global marketplace	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improve health, safety, wellbeing, quality of life, and access to opportunities for everyone	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Protect and enhance the South East's unique natural, built and historic environment, and tackle climate change together	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**15.** Under each of the three goals, we set out a number of specific economic, social and environmental priorities. Further information on these priorities can be found in *Paragraphs 3.8 to 3.10 of the draft Transport Strategy.*



To what extent do you agree or disagree that these are priorities which the Transport Strategy should aim to achieve? Please tick one box for each row.

Priority	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
<b>Economic priorities</b>						
Better connectivity between our major economic hubs, international gateways and their markets	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More reliable journeys between the South East's major economic hubs and international gateways	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A more resilient transport network to incidents, extreme weather and the impacts of a changing climate	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Helping our partners meet future housing, employment and regeneration needs sustainably	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of digital technology to manage transport demand, encourage shared and efficient use of transport	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Social priorities</b>						
A network that promotes active travel and active lifestyles	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improved air quality through initiatives to reduce congestion and encourage shifts to public transport	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
An affordable, accessible transport network for all that promotes social inclusion and reduces barriers	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A seamless, integrated transport network with passengers at its heart	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A safely planned, delivered and operated transport network	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental priorities						
A reduction in carbon emissions to net zero by 2050	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A reduction in the need to travel, particularly by private car	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A transport network that protects and enhances our natural, built and historic environments	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of the principle of 'biodiversity net gain' in all transport initiatives	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimisation of transport's consumption of resources and energy	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**16. Are there any other economic, social and/or environmental priorities which you feel the Transport Strategy should aim to achieve? Please describe these below.**

The future direction of transport technology and its impact on travel patterns is unclear, though the Strategy's attempt to look into this area is welcomed. The actual impact of EV, autonomous vehicles, changes in working patterns etc. are all highly uncertain. The strategy needs to start from the current position and trends since the evolution of the future is unclear at present. Major elements of transport infrastructure are slow to respond to change given the timescales and cost involved for major projects, so regular review is required. Some elements like integrated ticketing are obvious essential steps. Congestion charging should be integrated (TfL/HE and any other bodies) so for the user perspective at least it is all in one place. It is also important for the strategy to say what is not possible where the scale of intervention necessary is too expensive, environmentally damaging or otherwise not feasible at strategic level. Such advice would be useful in the context of Local Plan making and in making decisions on major planning applications. Air Quality is an impact that needs to be addressed with urgency.

**17. The draft Transport Strategy sets out a number of principles that are used to identify the key transport issues and opportunities in the South East (see Paragraphs 3.11 to 3.38 of the draft Transport Strategy for more information).**

**To what extent do you support or oppose these principles? Please tick one box for each principle.**

Principle	Strongly support	Tend to support	Neither support / oppose	Tend to oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know
-----------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	----------------	-----------------	------------

Supporting sustainable economic growth, but not at any cost	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Achieving environmental sustainability	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning for successful places	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Putting the user at the heart of the transport system	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning regionally for the short, medium and long-term	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Our Strategy

**18.** Six key journey types are identified within Chapter 4 of the draft Transport Strategy. We identify the key challenges and opportunities for each of the six journey types, and indicate the types of schemes and policy responses that will be needed to address these challenges. Subsequent area studies will be used to identify comprehensive packages of initiatives. **We are not seeking detailed feedback on individual schemes at this stage**, but we want to make sure we have identified the key challenges and the broad types of responses that will be needed for each of the movement types.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that the key challenges relating to each of the journey types have been correctly identified? Please tick one box for each journey type.**

Journey type	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Radial journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Orbital and coastal journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Inter-urban journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
International gateways and freight journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Future journeys	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**19.** Please use the space below to make any additional comments on the key challenges that have been identified, or to explain any additional challenges that you think need to be addressed. *Please specify which movement type(s) your comments relate to.*

The major challenge is that of how the transport strategy can be integrated with land use planning and across boundaries (Thames Estuary issue from the Gravesham perspective which needs to involve TfL and Transport East). The Borough Council appreciates the difficulties of liaising with so many planning authorities but a detailed dialogue in the context of the various proposed studies would be one way forward. The problem for the local Planning Authorities is the requirements of the MHCLG guidance in terms of housing numbers, lack of attention to employment locations, and the issues of viability.

Major transportation projects are likely to produce capital costs that far exceed any uplift that can be expected from development, in a context where there are major competitors for an CIL/s.106 money, such as educations, affordable housing etc. A recent trend has been rail projects seeking funding from development, which in the North Kent context is highly implausible for viability reasons and the scale of existing permissions. There has also been a noticeable trend for a number projects trying to pray in aid the same developments to support their business cases, which risks double, or more, counting.

Additional comments on the challenges are included in the response to Q.21. It would be useful if they were uniquely numbered in some way across the categories to ease reference and avoid confusion. As noted above the classification does tend to ignore the trip purpose which is the reason people travel, not whether their trip is orbital or radial.

20. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the initiatives we have outlined to address the challenges that have been identified for each journey type? Please tick one box for each journey type.

Journey type	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Radial journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Orbital and coastal journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Inter-urban journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local journeys	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
International gateways and freight journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Future journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

21. Do you have any additional comments on the journey types which form part of our draft Strategy, including any of the initiatives we have identified for each of the journey types? Please provide details below, making clear where applicable which initiative(s) you are referring to.

*Radial journeys* - These form the overwhelming majority of demand and there needs to be a close examination of pinch points (wherever they are - for rail many are inside London due to flat junctions and lack of terminal platform capacity). There are some well known issues in North Kent but there needs to be an examination to ensure that a balanced network is produced. There is no point in major additional capacity if it then places congestion elsewhere in the system. It is important to balance improved access with the negative impacts that may arise, for example increased London commuting. Access works in both directions and is not a one-way street. The Borough Council supports the extension of Crossrail to Ebbsfleet and additional trains on HS1, though notes that pathing on the latter is dictated by the fixed international train slots in the Channel Tunnel and the impact of trains stopping at Ebbsfleet and/or Ashford.

*Orbital & coastal journeys* - As noted above these have suffered from relatively little investment and have been seen as having relatively little potential a flows are generally low compared with the radials. That said it is important that major new infrastructure meets both local and wider needs - the Lower Thames Crossing as currently proposed being an example that fails that test. The idea that Lower Thames Crossing will aid flows on M25SW is not supported by the technical evidence the Borough Council has seen and should be removed.

*Inter Urban* - The concerns locally are the impact of trips diverting off the SRN (or MRN) as a result of congestion, particularly as a result of Lower Thames Crossing. Support for the inter urban bus network is fully supported.

*Local journeys* - key issues here are the provision of walking and cycling networks that users feel are safe and bus service provision. The current legislative framework does not allow, de facto, Transport Authorities to exercise sufficient control over the bus network which is run

primarily on commercial terms. School trips are a major source of localised congestion at certain times of day. The potential role of the Thames in passenger transport both in terms of linking Kent and Thurrock as well as into London should not be ignored.

*International gateways* - As noted above there is a need to look at whether some of this traffic needs to be in the South East at all and whether in terms of national policy there should be more options that avoid some of gateways (fully accepting that traffic with destinations in the wider London or South East has to remain). Whilst these are important, the needs of local residents and businesses should be given higher priority where alternatives exist.

*Future journeys* - The impact of new technology both in transport provision and wider in impacting on demand for travel are hard to predict. Any strategy needs to monitor what is actually happening and seek to make best use of existing infrastructure in the circumstances. It may be necessary to lobby against some technologies or approaches if they impose significant external costs on users or transport authorities.

## Implementation

**22.** In Chapter 5 of the draft Transport Strategy, a number of performance indicators are set out that will be used to monitor progress of the Strategy.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with these performance indicators?** *Please select one box for each performance indicator group.*

Performance indicator group	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Economic performance indicators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Social performance indicators	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental performance indicators	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**23.** Chapter 5 of the draft Transport Strategy also sets out how the Strategy will be implemented, including Transport for the South East's role and future funding challenges.

**Do you have any comments about the implementation of the Strategy including the performance indicators, our role and/or the future funding challenges? Please describe these below.**

The proposed strategy can only work if it is integrated with land use planning in an holistic way. That said in large measure the infrastructure that exists now is what you are going to be using in the future - relatively few major schemes will get implemented. The list of key challenges could helpfully be put in a hierarchic order (be that top down or bottom up) since it is delivery at all levels is important in the overall delivery of the strategy even if the TfSE strategy is inevitable focussed more on strategic interventions.

It is also important to keep in mind that trip purposes are important, since the nature of these varies significantly at local level. Whether is trip is orbital or radial is not a consideration to somebody making a trip, though it may influence how the made it. Thus for a coastal community leisure trips are important. The local example being the influence of Bluewater which tends to produce peaks of demand when normal methodologies don't expect them (e.g. Sunday afternoons).

The availability of free parking at some major regional facilities does have the side effect of encouraging trips to them to be car based. Pricing (and investment in public transport) might encourage more sustainable trip patterns.

A strategy of this type, with the multitude of corridors, inevitably carries with it a suggestion that significant investment will occur over a wide range of areas. In reality based on recent experience the TfSE issue is how it prioritises between schemes over the whole area when the finance available has been highly limited and is unlikely to dramatically increase. Whilst Highways England is producing a programme for the next 5 year period (RIS2) the equivalent from Network Rail (CP6) is focussed on increasing the reliability of what exists rather than developing new schemes. A key variable will be how future service patterns are specified as part of whatever the franchising system becomes.

## Integrated Sustainability Appraisal

Alongside the draft Transport Strategy, we have also completed an Integrated Sustainability Appraisal, which has looked into the potential impacts that the Transport Strategy could have on a range of sustainable development indicators. This includes (but is not limited to) impacts on the environment, health, equality of access to opportunities, and community safety. You can [view this document](#) as part of the public consultation. The following questions are about the independent Integrated Sustainability Appraisal. Please therefore read the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal document before answering the following questions.

**24. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal represents a thorough assessment of the draft Transport Strategy?** *Please tick one box only.*

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**25. Do you have any additional comments regarding the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal?** *Please describe these below.*



It is very unclear how Lower Thames Crossing has been treated in this analysis. It is a proposal by Highways England which does not have permission, and the DCO has not yet been submitted. Whilst the environmental detail is for that process to deal with, it is clearly a proposal in the draft Strategy and should be taken into account as such, or as part of the base. It does have very significant implications for local residents (air quality, noise, local traffic), Kent Downs AoNB, Ramsar/SPA, a host of other SSSI's and the historic features. The Strategy also needs to address its response if it does not proceed. It should have its own corridor as a new orbital connection.

## Overall views

**26. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the draft Transport Strategy provides the mechanism that will enable Transport for the South East to achieve our mission of growing the South East's economy by delivering a safe, sustainable and integrated transport system that makes the region more productive and competitive, improves the quality of life for all residents and protects and enhances its natural and built environment. Please tick one box only.**

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**27. Are there any additional comments that you would like to make that are relevant to this consultation on the draft Transport Strategy for the South East? Please describe these below.**

One of the issue arising from the draft Strategy is the method of appraisal used to prioritise projects. Current WebTAG guidance is routed in a predict and provide methodology and therefore some form of amended guidelines, including the zero carbon objective, needs to be put in place. All organisations need to follow the same broad appraisal approach. It is important that the polluter bears the costs of their activities and local impacts. A regional distribution depot may be more 'efficient' for the business but impose unrecoverable costs on the local community.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.