

# RIS3 Route Strategies Online Feedback Form

## Introduction

TfSE is a sub-national transport body which represents sixteen local transport authorities in the south east of England. These are Brighton and Hove, East Sussex, Hampshire, Kent, Medway, Surrey, West Sussex, the Isle of Wight, Portsmouth and Southampton, and the six Berkshire unitary authorities. These authorities are represented on the Partnership Board, which is its decision-making body, along with representatives from the region's five Local Enterprise Partnerships, district and borough authorities, protected landscapes, National Highways, Network Rail and Transport for London.

TfSE provides a mechanism for its constituent authorities to speak with one voice on the transport interventions needed to support sustainable economic growth across its geography. High-quality transport infrastructure is critical to making the south east more competitive, contributing to national prosperity and improving the lives of our residents.

In 2020, TfSE published a thirty-year transport strategy for the south east that sets out an ambitious 2050 vision for the area. We undertook a programme of area studies to identify multimodal packages of interventions that will be needed to deliver the transport strategy. The outputs from the area studies have been brought together in a Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) that was published in March 2023.

National Highways are one of our key partners and are represented on our Partnership Board, as well as having been engaged as stakeholders throughout the development of our technical work programme and SIP. National Highways will be key in helping us to deliver the vision set out in our Transport Strategy and SIP.

TfSE have been actively engaged with National Highways as RIS3 and the Route Strategies have been developed collaboratively and we look forward to continuing our close work with you. We welcome the opportunity to comment on the final Route Strategies to ensure that regional priorities are reflected within the Initial Overview reports. In general, we welcome the contents of the strategies and their alignment with our own area studies and SIP, however in responding we would make a number of general observations.

It is vital that National Highways develops a stable programme of work to ensure it can maximise the efficiency and effectiveness of its overall business. It is clear that a number of lessons have been learned from RIS2 that will need to be put into practice in RIS3 to ensure a stable programme is in place.

It is important the objectives set for RIS3 align with the agreed outcomes for the south east as set out in the Transport Strategy and SIP. Delivery strategies should consider journeys and networks holistically to improve transport outcomes. Separating modes into silos for strategic development regardless of collaboration makes alignment and planning for people and their needs difficult.

**0300 3309474**

**[tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk)**

**[transportforthesoutheast.org.uk](http://transportforthesoutheast.org.uk)**

Transport for the South East, County Hall,  
St. Anne's Crescent, Lewes, BN7 1UE



Consideration of impacts and issues on the MRN and local roads should be made when planning for investment as part of a more holistic approach. Consideration of using the Strategic Road Network (SRN) funding to improve MRN and local roads for the benefit of the SRN should be given equal consideration.

Through completion of area studies, TfSE have demonstrated that several parts of the south east's highway network suffer from regular congestion, undermining the productivity of the economy. Gaps in the SRN place communities at a structural disadvantage – including coastal communities that are already among the least prosperous in England.

There are several areas in the south east where long-distance connectivity is “funnelled” through a single lane highway, with few viable alternatives for motorists caught up in disruption.

The south east serves several of the busiest ports and airports in the UK. While generally well connected, there are challenges with managing disruption on some corridors.

We do have concern that the increase required for maintenance budgets stated in the documents may be funded to the detriment of major projects. As evidenced in the TfSE Transport strategy and SIP, these schemes support the government's policies of economic growth, levelling up and facilitate a move to net zero through improved transport choices.

The RIS2 tail has created pressure on the RIS3 envelope, it appears headroom for new schemes is limited and there has been discussions over the importance of the need to prioritise from DfT through the engagement process of RIS3. It appears that small schemes that make a “real difference to users and business” are likely to get greatest traction and that more ambitious schemes will need to wait for RIS4.

We are concerned that small schemes won't necessarily deliver what is necessary. Severance has been an issue for decades and small interventions won't make the improvements required to meet government objectives for levelling up. If we really want to make change there is a need to grasp the problem and look at more ambitious solutions as investments without which there will be an inability to meet targets set by government.

Our responses to the consultation questions from the online form can be found in appendix 1. Due to six of the Route Strategies being relevant to TfSE we are responding once in a single document. National Highways questions are stated and referenced by relevant number in bold throughout the appendix. Answers specific to individual Route Strategies are highlighted as such within the answers.

We look forward to working together with the DfT and National Highways through the next stage in the development of RIS3, and we would be happy to discuss any opportunities for further collaboration to ensure that our strategy and SIP, and RIS3 are aligned.

This is an officer response. The TfSE Partnership Board next meets on 30 October 2023 when it will consider this response. A further iteration of it may follow that meeting.

Yours sincerely

Rupert Clubb  
Lead Officer  
Transport for the South East



## Appendix 1

### **1. Please tell us about you. Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?**

On behalf of an Organisation - Go to question 8-10 and then question 11 onwards

### **8. What is your Organisation's Name? Please supply your Organisation's name in full.**

Transport for the South East

### **9. If you are responding on behalf of an Organisation, please indicate which type of Organisation. Please select ONE that best applies or choose Other Organisation.**

Sub-National Transport Body

### **10. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please would you provide your contact details so that we may update our contacts database for future communications regarding Route Strategies?**

Mat Jasper  
Scheme Development Manager  
Mat.jasper@eastsussex.gov.uk

### **11. Which Initial Overview Report are you looking to provide feedback on?**

- Kent Corridors to M25
- London Orbital to M23
- London to Wales
- Solent to Midlands
- South Coast Central
- South West Peninsula

### **12. Please provide general comments on the selected route. For example: How well does this Initial Overview Report identify the challenges? How well does it map out a way forward?**

#### ***In reference to all 6 route strategies in the TfSE Area***

The challenges and way forward are generally aligned with those of TfSE as a result of our collaboration with National Highways through the Route Strategies process. TfSE welcome the opportunity to continue to work with National Highways to ensure that our priorities continue to align through the delivery period.

### **13. What specific comments would you like us to consider in relation to Chapter (1) Introduction?**

#### ***In reference to all 6 route strategies in the TfSE Area***

Overall, the document is well aligned with TfSE, our Strategy and our Strategic Investment Plan (SIP).

We support that you are exploring how to support customers' end-to-end journeys by creating travel choices that aim to deliver net zero carbon customer journeys by 2050 and National Highways role in supporting an integrated transport network that allows current and future customers to re-route, re-time, re mode and reduce their journeys.

The confirmation of STB inclusion alongside LTA's and devolved authorities noted as part of your engagement is welcomed.

We welcome the recognition of the needs of customers and neighbours and an approach to be widely accessible and integrated with the rest of the transport system where it benefits the SRN. Highways interventions remain necessary to deliver a multi modal strategy, as they can unlock mass transit, active travel routes and improve safety. Further information on the context for multi modal highways were included in TfSE's highways thematic plan.

The strategic priorities set out in the Introduction align with TfSE's. Our vision as stated in our transport strategy 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.

There is a statement in the introduction giving clarity that the document does not "Identify committed schemes for delivery as part of future RIS periods. This will be part of the wider RIS setting process ". There is also a statement that "Following the setting of RIS1 and RIS2, which covered the first road period (2015-2020) and second road period (2020 2025), we are now in our third round of route strategy planning informing RIS3 for the third road period (2025-2030) and beyond". Some clarification around the move of incomplete schemes in RIS2 which now form the schemes for delivery in Road period 3 would be of benefit here. There are no RIS3 schemes named as "RIS3" in any of the route strategies. There are only RIS2 schemes stated to be completed in Road Period 3 but they are still listed as RIS2 schemes in Chapter 7. The RIS2 schemes are followed by RIS4 pipeline schemes without logical explanation for lack of anything noted as RIS3. This could cause confusion without more explicit clarification because what the document sets out in the chapters between is therefore more relevant to RIS4 pipeline schemes rather than RIS3 (of which there are none and they are already committed but not guaranteed).

We support the improved environmental outcomes and introduction of PAS 2080 as guidance. We recommend the addition of text to explain that the hierarchy

**0300 3309474**

**[tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk)**

**[transportforthesoutheast.org.uk](http://transportforthesoutheast.org.uk)**

Transport for the South East, County Hall,  
St. Anne's Crescent, Lewes, BN7 1UE

quoted is an assessment tool which does not “favour” not undertaking construction but to ensure that specified objectives of a scheme cannot be met without construction at the early option assessment stage. We would encourage this to be clarified in order that the document is not used out of context.

We agree that the SRN is an important economic corridor for the south east, and better connectivity will support the government's levelling up programme.

Digital roads - we welcome the increase in data collection and would like to have access as we begin to monitor and evaluate the success of the SIPs interventions.

## **14. What specific comments would you like us to consider in relation to Chapter (2) The Route?**

### ***South Coast central***

The issues set out in the route chapter align with TfSE's. We welcome the recognition of the A27 being notable as the only element of the SRN running east – west to the south of the M25.

The southern section of the A21 is the least developed part of the SRN in the region.

The A259 and A2070 are often narrow and traverse several sharp turns and level crossings. Their route passes directly through the centres of Hastings and Bexhill, negatively impacting vulnerable road users and contributing to high levels of congestion in the area.

The A27/A259/A2070 corridor contains some of the most deprived wards in the South East, including Brighton, Eastbourne, Hastings and Bexhill. Median earnings are also markedly lower than the regional average. This is likely to be due in part to gaps in connectivity and remoteness from more prosperous parts of the South East.

The highway is of variable quality, passing through urban areas and flat junctions with some sections of single carriageway. Congestion is particularly acute on parts of the M27 around Southampton, and the A27 at Chichester, Lancing and Worthing. There is a lot of interaction and conflict between different types of road users and local and regional traffic.

An Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) is in place on the A27 at Lancing and Worthing. Further AQMAs are in place in urban areas including Southampton, Portsmouth and Brighton.

### ***Kent Corridors***

TfSE welcome the highlighting of Operation Brock and the Dover Traffic Access Protocol (TAP) in the chapter when highlighting the route to the channel ports. We would like to see some more highlighting of the importance of and issues around freight and facilities for Lorry drivers along this route.

We also welcome the recognition of high levels of planned housing and employment development within the region but note the absence of Medway

towns where there is an existing issue regarding housing and stress on the M2 J1. There is significant out-commuting from the Medway Towns due to an imbalance of housing and jobs in the area, putting pressure on the wider transport network, with significant further housing development planned.

Maidstone is a road congestion bottleneck in the centre of the corridor, particularly during the AM peak.

### ***Solent to Midlands***

TfSE Welcome the recognition of this route as a strategic route connecting the Solent Ports to the manufacturing areas of the Midlands, and that it sees a higher-than-average volume of freight.

There is a notable cluster of historic road traffic incidents on the corridor around the A34/A303 junction, including incidents resulting in people being killed or seriously injured.

Congestion hotspot just outside Winchester on approach to junction 9 of the M3. This junction forms the southern end of the A34.

### ***London Orbital and M23***

The M25 is the busiest road corridor in the South East. This comes with significant areas of congestion, particularly along the south-west quadrant of the M25, as well as around Oxted and further east near the Dartford Crossing.

There are road safety issues on the corridor around the Dartford Crossing. There are clusters of historic road traffic incidents in this area, including incidents resulting in people being killed or seriously injured.

There is a notable concentration of deprivation in the Dartford area.

### ***South West Peninsula***

There are several road traffic congestion hotspots on the M3, M27 corridor. These include the M3 between Winchester and Southampton, the M3 between Fleet and the M25, and some of the access roads and junctions between the M3 and the Port of Southampton (i.e., the M27, M271, A33 and A326). This congestion slows down freight movements on the corridor and has the potential to worsen as the Port of Southampton expands.

There are clusters of historic road traffic incidents on the corridor where it enters Southampton, particularly on and around the M271 and A33, including incidents resulting in people being killed or seriously injured.

There is a significant imbalance in the development of jobs and homes along this corridor. Housing development is focused on Basingstoke, while employment growth is more concentrated in Southampton.

### ***London to Wales***

We recognise the importance of the tech industry noted in the Route Strategy but there is significant socioeconomic disparity along the corridor, with several pockets of deprivation in Reading and Slough.

There are some road traffic congestion hotspots on the corridor. These are between junction 4b and junction 6 of the M4 around Slough as well as between junction 10 and junction 12 of the M4 around Reading. There are also wider problems with road safety and air quality on the M4, particularly between Reading and the M25. The proposed expansion of Heathrow Airport could add additional pressure to the highway network.

## **15. What specific comments would you like us to consider in relation to Chapter (3) Engagement with Customers and Neighbours?**

### ***In reference to all 6 route strategies in the TfSE Area.***

We welcome the mention of TfSE alongside the major stakeholders in the first paragraph.

We would like consideration of changing the sentence “Improve safety through appropriate integration of local and strategic traffic” rather than integration of local and strategic traffic we would like to see targeted, integrated interventions to deliver high quality connections for freight, private and mass transit vehicles (notably, buses) that de-conflict local and longer-distance traffic supported by public transport.

## **16. What specific comments would you like us to consider in relation to Chapter (4) Network Integration?**

### ***In reference to all 6 route strategies in the TfSE Area.***

We welcome the affirmation that the SRN forms part of a transport network and does not exist in isolation. The commitment to joint early planning of outside interventions which will ultimately improve the SRN bringing increased value for money and improved customer experience.

We are grateful to the priority from DfT as part of RIS2 that allowed National Highways and STBs to come together to collaborate and develop an engagement framework. This has led to priorities, schemes, interventions, and data that increases to align and work cohesively together. The result of our collaboration is visibly present throughout the Route Strategies.

We welcome the inclusion of the TfSE Transport Strategy within this section but would also like to request mention of our SIP.



## **17. What specific comments would you like us to consider in relation to Chapter (5) Challenges and Issues?**

### ***In reference to all 6 route strategies in the TfSE Area.***

We would like the phrase “emerging thinking from Transport for the South East (TfSE) area studies” updated as we have now completed and published our SIP following the area studies work.

We welcome the use of iRAP to assess and identify areas for safety improvement across the region and the country. This is a leading data led method of assessing safety issues and we support its use for prioritising improvements.

We welcome National Highway’s recognition of the environmental challenges. The detail in the Initial Report sets out the basis for a progressive and industry leading way forward to address carbon reduction in the highways sector. We agree that across the 6 route strategies in the south east you have identified the local issues and environmental constraints.

We welcome the improvements and enhancements to the SRN to improve air quality in local areas. We can confirm that the areas identified for air quality align with our own locations from our area studies and go into greater detail setting out the impact on receptors at both 100 and 300m.

We are pleased that the local plans have been used to shape the RIS3, and housing developments have been considered when planning for the SRN to alleviate local congestions. Taking note of increased pressures on the network as a result of housing targets.

We are pleased to see the inclusion of areas identified as priority for levelling up.

### ***South Coast Central***

We agree that the issues highlighted are aligned with our own findings and that much of the SRN within this route is below the grade required to perform its strategic function properly. The many single lane pinch points are a particular issue requiring difficult resolution considering it is the only east-west strategic road south of the M25.

We welcome National Highways recognition of the need to consider better integration with other transport modes and how to support the transition to electric cars and zero carbon heavy goods vehicles (HGVs). We would like to see support for mass transit and public transport on the SRN quoted here in more detail.

We are happy to see the TfSE area studies referenced in recognition of the need for the A27 to provide a high-quality link for communities between the Solent region and Brighton. It would be nice to see the SIP referenced here as it has now been published and contains schemes identified to improve this.

We accept that there is limited technology provision within the South Coast Central route as most roads are A-Roads of varying consistency, and do not meet motorway standards. This does highlight the lack of appropriate SRN in the region as mentioned above and reinforces our view of the need to invest in the schemes set out in the SIP such as a long-term solution at Worthing and Guildford.

### ***Solent to Midlands***

The areas identified for safety improvements align with those outlined in our SIP from our area studies.

Network performance is aligned with TfSE's understanding and we are pleased that the SIP is reflected in the key challenges flagged within network performance. Our Solent and Sussex coast chapter in the SIP sets out 9 packages that significantly reduce congestion. The packages note the Southampton access to the M27 via Junction 2 and 3 (RIS4 pipeline) and are supported by a complement of other TfSE schemes. There is further alignment to network improvements within our Wessex Thames packages.

We welcome the recognition of the status of both Portsmouth and Southampton's economic importance and levels of deprivation.

### ***Kent to M25***

Network performance is aligned with our SIP and we are pleased to see both Brenley corner and Bluebell Hill referenced but it would be good to highlight their increased importance due to LTC along with any other relevant areas of concern that have been highlighted as part of National Highways modelling of the scheme. So as to ensure that LTC's opening is a success and not passing a problem onto another part of the SRN or the local road network. We are also pleased to see mention of improvements from the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF).

We welcome the inclusion of the Kent County Council Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) which highlights a vision to improve public transport choices and encourage more travel to school by bus, which will help reduce congestion. The plan identified initiatives to embed the 'mobility as a service' concept as part of future provision in the county. We are also happy to see the consideration of rail for freight and its ability to support the ports in the Kent corridor.

We welcome the recognition of the route's importance supporting trade and freight both nationally and internationally.

We welcome identification of the housing pressures that has been included. There are currently specific issues due to a lack of alignment between house building targets and the infrastructure to support them (M2 Junction 1 as an example). Some recognition of the problem facing both local authorities' and National Highways in delivering on policy without sufficient funding would be beneficial to make the case for investment through one department or the other. This is touched on in the paragraph highlighting the expected population growth of over 16% by 2031 which could be considered an understatement that this will exacerbate pressure on the route and whether this considers the possibility of completing the housing growth plans based on capacity issues along this route.

### ***London Orbital***

We agree that it is a priority to consider and resolve the delays and congestion in the south west quadrant of the M25, the M23 and A23, and the A2 near Dartford.

### ***South West Peninsula***

There are considerable key congestion areas highlighted in this region by TfSE's area studies. This is despite most of the Route Strategy being outside of the TfSE area. Some of the key congestion areas highlighted from our corridor studies are:

- The M3 between Winchester and Southampton.
- The M3 between Fleet and the M25.
- Some of the access roads and junctions between the M3 and the Port of Southampton (i.e., the M27, M271, A33 and A326). This congestion slows down freight movements on the corridor and has the potential to worsen as the Port of Southampton expands."
- Where the A33 intersects the M4, as well as more moderate congestion along several stretches of the A33 between Swallowfield and Basingstoke."
- Just outside Winchester on approach to junction 9 of the M3. This junction forms the southern end of the A34.
- Where the A36 intersects the A3090 and M27.
- Between junction 4b and junction 6 of the M4 around Slough.
- Between junction 10 and junction 12 of the M4 around Reading.
- The A31 at Ringwood.
- Parts of the M27 around Southampton.
- The A27 at Chichester, Lancing and Worthing where there is a lot of interaction and conflict between different types of road users and local and regional traffic.

We welcome the recognition of areas that are expected to experience major economic growth. Southampton in particular with the expansion of the Port of Southampton and a potential runway expansion at Southampton Airport.

### ***London to Wales***

We welcome recognition of the air quality issues along the M4.

## **18. What general comments would you like us to consider in relation to Chapter (6) Initial Route Objectives?**

### ***In reference to all 6 route strategies in the TfSE Area***

TfSE have been heavily involved in the process to this point in collaboration with National Highways. Our relationship has improved significantly in the time between RIS2 and RIS3 and we are satisfied that we are aligned with National Highways. We welcome the reference to our transport strategy and reference to TfSE in Table 2: Evidence used to inform objectives under Integration with our partners' strategies and priorities.

We agree with the context, considerations and required outcomes. The objectives are aligned with TfSE's as a result of the level of engagement National Highways have undertaken with TfSE in the development process.

0300 3309474

[tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk)

[transportforthesoutheast.org.uk](http://transportforthesoutheast.org.uk)

Transport for the South East, County Hall,  
St. Anne's Crescent, Lewes, BN7 1UE

We would like to see SMART objectives in this section rather than those provided which “support” or “maximise opportunities”. However, we do appreciate this may not be possible without an understanding of the funding available for the RIS3 period.

We welcome the assertion that route objectives do not represent a commitment to road-based interventions but are intended to enable multimodal interventions to be explored as part of later study phases. Clarification over National Highways’ willingness to invest in “off network” solutions to improve performance/functionality of the SRN would be beneficial.

We welcome the integration with our partners strategies and priorities inclusion within the objectives table. It clearly shows National Highways’ route to alignment and shared visions.

Overall, the route objectives in each of the route strategies are a solid logical progression from the previous challenges and issues chapter.

## **19. If you have any specific feedback on any of the objectives for the Route, please provide them below.**

### ***South Coast Central***

We agree that the strategic function of the route is impeded by traffic congestion which undermines its strategic function resulting in reliability issues and delays. This contributes to the creation of local noise, air-quality and environmental impacts, as well as severance issues for local communities, which undermines opportunities for active travel and some public transport alternatives.

We agree with the identified areas of congestion and the impacts on the strategic function of the SRN in linking local communities and in enabling improved accessibility for customers.

We agree with the identified areas affected by poor air quality issues. We also recognise the constraint to the network as it passes through sensitive assets including the South Downs National Park, the A3 adjacent to the Surrey Hills AONB and the A21 running through the High Weald AONB. We appreciate the difficulty this can impose in developing any proposed interventions. But we also wish to highlight the detriment that congestion can have on the natural environment. Finding solutions may be difficult but the objectives should not be dismissed because they are difficult.

We welcome the recognition of emerging thinking from TfSE area studies and SIP consultation which identified that the A27 / M27 should provide a consistent high-quality route linking the two major conurbations in the Solent area and Sussex Coast (Worthing – Eastbourne), with travel being better supplemented by high quality public transport.

We accept that there is limited technology provision within the South Coast Central route as most of the SRN is made up of A-Roads, of varying consistency, and do not

meet motorway standards. This does highlight the lack of appropriate SRN in the region and stresses the need to invest in the schemes set out in the SIP such as long-term solutions at both Worthing and Guildford.

While we accept this as the current situation we feel this makes a very strong case for the need to upgrade the SRN in the TfSE region. The South Coast Central Route strategy is the largest in our region with the greatest proportion of schemes highlighted in the SIP. It is the largest area by far of the route strategies that affect the TfSE area and within it has no strategic routes offering end to end strategic level connectivity.

### ***Solent to Midlands***

We welcome the proposal to manage the interplay of local and strategic traffic and contribute to improving network performance but it is not clear how this will be implemented.

We welcome the importance of freight being recognised along this corridor.

### ***Kent to London***

We welcome the objective to support driver welfare and are aligned in our prioritisation of this for this corridor.

We welcome the objective to support effective local and regional connectivity through improved integration with sustainable transport modes to minimise the impact of short distance trips from key growth areas and strategic development sites to benefit the economy as we also recognise this to be a particular problem on this corridor.

## **20. What specific comments would you like us to consider in relation to Chapter (7) Locational Areas for Consideration?**

### ***In reference to all 6 route strategies in the TfSE Area***

We welcome the alignment of the route strategies to the DfT's six strategic objectives and would like to know more about how they will be used to assess the RIS3 performance metrics. We are concerned with the lack of any new schemes outlined for RIS3 and would like to know what impact this will have, particularly in reference to growing the economy & network performance.

We are pleased that the schemes which are identified for delivery as part of RIS2 (into 3) are aligned with TfSE's priority SRN schemes in the SIP. We are also aligned regarding the schemes identified for RIS4 pipeline.

Regarding schemes incomplete in RIS2 we strongly believe that the process needs to continue through to full business case and DCO (where applicable) to ensure they are ready for delivery when funds become available rather than "parking" them.

We feel it is important not to stop or delay schemes any further than is necessary to help manage expectations of stakeholders in the region and not discourage private investment due to a perceived lack of commitment. We have two major airports

0300 3309474

[tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk)

[transportforthesoutheast.org.uk](http://transportforthesoutheast.org.uk)

Transport for the South East, County Hall,  
St. Anne's Crescent, Lewes, BN7 1UE



and several international sea ports that are key to the economy and require better links to meet growth plans and support the government's policy of economic growth, both regionally and internationally.

In the TfSE region we have particular concern over delays to the Arundel scheme. It is our view that a lot of work has already been completed and to stop at this point would be wasteful. National Highways should continue to progress these schemes through the statutory process to avoid having to restart at additional cost in the future.

## **21. What specific comments would you like us to consider in relation to Chapter (8) Next Steps?**

### ***In reference to all 6 route strategies in the TfSE Area***

TfSE will provide more extensive feedback on National Highways' next steps in the Connecting the Country consultation response.

We welcome the reference to TfSE in this section and the recognition of a need for integrated and collaborative solutions and we look forward to helping National Highways consider the interaction of the SRN with other transport networks.

We welcome the objective to use communication and technology to improve user experience in times of disruption.

TfSE priorities include a seamless, integrated transport network, making it simpler and easier to plan journeys. TfSE priorities also highlight the desire for a network that is more resilient to incidents, extreme weather and the impacts of a changing climate, and a 'smart' transport network that uses digital technology to manage transport demand.

### ***London Orbital***

We welcome the support of mode choice solutions for access to the key international airports in and around London, notably at Heathrow and Gatwick. Broadening route choice and improving experience for road users travelling to the airports and sharing road space on the M25 south west quadrant and M23 in particular.

### ***South West Peninsula***

We welcome the support for shifts in modes of transport through better integration with public transport and improved active travel options to relieve pressure on the SRN, particularly in urban areas including Southampton.

### **London to Wales**

We welcome the support for delivery of regionally significant and sustainable economic development in the Berkshire authorities.

We also welcome the support for effective local connections and integration with other transport modes to reduce short-distance travel demands on the SRN and promote transfer to alternative modes and reduce carbon, particularly in the Berkshire authorities.

## **22. Considering the route selected, to what extent do you agree with the locational areas identified for further consideration in Chapter 7?**

**Please answer 1 - 5, where 1 represents Strongly Disagree and 5 represents Strongly Agree**

4

## **23. Please could you tell us why you gave this rating? Have we missed anything both in general terms or at specific locations?**

### ***In reference to all 6 route strategies in the TfSE Area***

We welcome the alignment of the schemes identified but also the general alignment of areas of interest with areas that are identified in the SIP for improvement. Most of our long-term priorities are included within schemes or areas of interest. We would however, like to identify for future areas of interest the locations set out below which do not appear to be included.

<b>SIP Scheme</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Relevant Route Strategy</b>	<b>Covered in route strategy Area of Interest?</b>
M2 Junction 4 - Junction 7 Smart Motorway (SMP)	Deliver smart motorway initiatives along the M2 between Junction 4 and 7 - to increase capacity, resilience and support freight movements.	Kent Corridors to M25	Junction 4 is within the Area of Interest: F but most of road in SIP not within the A of I
A2 Canterbury Junctions Enhancements	Deliver improvements to enhance capacity, improve resilience and reliability and safety at A2 junctions serving Canterbury.	Kent Corridors to M25	Area of Interest D (doesn't reach Eastern Junction set out in the SIP) - A2 (M2 Junction 7 Brenley Corner to Canterbury)
M25 Junction 5 Enhancements	Deliver improvements to increase capacity, improve resilience and reliability and safety at M25 Junction 5.	London Orbital and M23	No

SIP Scheme	Description	Relevant Route Strategy	Covered in route strategy Area of Interest?
A27 Falmer – Polegate Bus Stop and Layby Improvements	Inter-urban bus enhancements along the A27, along with bus priority measures to provide a faster, more frequent and reliable service between Falmer, Polegate and other rural communities along the corridor, without hindering other traffic movements.	South Coast Central	No
A27 Devils Dyke Junction Enhancements	Improvements at A27 Devils Dyke Junction to improve safety of all road users while safeguarding journey time reliability.	South Coast Central	within Area of Interest: J on the map but unclear from text if will be considered as part of A23/27 junction
A23 Hickstead and Bolney Junction Enhancements	A23 Junction enhancements at Hickstead and Bolney to increase connectivity and accommodate planned growth around Burgess Hill.	South Coast Central	NO

In addition to the schemes above we would like to remain in dialogue as an advocate for Medway in regard to the issues around Capacity on the M2 at Junction 1 in order to unlock the development identified along this corridor.

We would also like to engage further on the priorities set out as areas of interest in the table below which do not appear as priority in our SIP.

Name	Route Strategy
A259 Bexhill (between Little Common and Glynde Gap)	South Coast Central
A303 from Amesbury to Andover	South West Peninsula

### **South Coast Central**

We are unclear regarding the status of RIS4 pipeline scheme number 1 - A21 Safety Scheme. RIS4 schemes won't commence until 2030-2035 but in the description of this schemes it states "We are bringing forward a series of schemes to improve safety along this corridor, which will include, junction improvements, improvements to road alignment and visibility, changes to speed limits, improved signing, markings and road studs, amongst others. Note this scheme has been accelerated and works have started. Planned to open to traffic in 2024-25". If this is the case shouldn't this be included in the RIS2 schemes section?



**24. Considering the Initial Overview Report, how well does this report consider your needs?**

**Please answer 1 - 5, where 1 represents Not Very Well and 5 represents Very Well**

5

**25. Please could you tell us why you gave this rating?**

*In reference to all 6 route strategies in the TfSE Area*

TfSE recognise the extensive collaboration that has taken place throughout the development process and can see the alignment with both government policy and TfSE's objectives. The schemes which do not appear from our SIP in the areas of interest may be too far on the horizon to be included for RIS3 but we expect that National Highways will continue to collaborate with us and align where possible. We are very happy to see both STB's and TfSE referenced throughout the documents and are very supportive of their content and approach.