

TfSE Partnership Board
28 October 2024 14:00-17:00
Minutes
LGA, Bevin Hall, London

Partnership Board Members

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Cllr Keith Glazier (Chair) Leader East Sussex County Council | Cllr Simon Curry (Vice Chair) Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Strategic Regeneration Medway Council | Felicity Clayton Head of Network Development National Highways |
| Cllr Lulu Bowerman Executive Cabinet Member for Highways and Waste Hampshire County Council | Tim Burr Deputy Chair South Downs National Park Authority (Representative from Protected Landscapes) | Cllr Joy Dennis Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport West Sussex County Council |
| Cllr Matt Boughton Leader Tonbridge & Malling Council <i>(on behalf of District & Borough Councils)</i> | Gary Nolan Strategic Engagement Lead Transport for London | Geoff French CBE Chair Transport Forum |
| Daniel Ruiz Business Advisory Group Co- Chair Business Representative | | |

Apologies:

- Cllr Eamonn Keogh, Southampton City Council
- Cllr David Robey, Kent County Council
- Cllr Matt Furniss, Surrey County Council
- Cllr Trevor Muten, Brighton & Hove City Council
- Cllr Paul Fishwick, Berkshire Local Transport Body
- Cllr Peter Candlish, Portsmouth City Council
- Cllr Phil Jordan, Isle of Wight
- Cllr Sophie Cox, Worthing Borough Council
- Ellie Burrows, Route Managing Director for Southern Region, Network Rail
- Richard Leonard, National Highways
- Vince Lucas, Business Advisory Group, Co-Chair

Officers attended:

- Rupert Clubb, Transport for the South East
- Sarah Valentine, Transport for the South East
- Keir Wilkins, Transport for the South East
- Mark Valleley, Transport for the South East

- Emily Bailey, Transport for the South East
- Sally Haslam, DfT
- Mark Prior, Brighton & Hove City Council
- Thomas Cornwell, National Highways

| Item | Action |
|--|--------|
| 1. Welcome and Apologies | |
| 1.1 Councillor Keith Glazier (KG) welcomed Members to the meeting and noted apologies. | |
| 2. Minutes from last meeting | |
| 2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed. | |
| 3. Declarations of Interest | |
| 3.1 Cllr Glazier asked Board Members to declare any interests they may have in relation to the agenda. No interests were declared. | |
| 4. Statements from the public | |
| 4.1 Cllr Glazier confirmed that no statements from the public have been made. | |
| 5. Next steps for TfSE | |
| <p>5.1 RC introduced the item and set out the political context for government, local authorities, and TfSE.</p> <p>5.2 RC set out the options for the next steps for TfSE, including option for exploring devolved powers. Proposal to consult with partners on devolved powers, which is set out in Partnership Board Agenda Item 5, Appendix 1.</p> <p>5.3 Keir Wilkins (KW) took the Board through the options. Noted the counterfactual has been set out as per request of Audit and Governance committee, to present what the role of TfSE would look like without devolved powers.</p> <p>5.4 Cllr Bowerman (LB) asked what work is being done to work with local authorities, to make sure this work reflects devolution that may take place across the south east, referencing work that is ongoing in Hampshire. RC noted that should combined authorities be introduced within the TfSE region, they would have a seat within the Partnership Board. RC noted that the powers that we are exploring are complimentary to the powers combined authorities would want and are not duplicative. Noted the difference between TfSE having powers and not having powers is the weight of the TfSE Board's power to influence government.</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>5.5 Daniel Ruiz (DR) asked why Transport East and England’s Economic Heartland were planning to consult, but other STBs were not. RC set out context, noting that the wider South East STBs are at a similar stage in their development.</p> <p>5.6 DR further asked for rationale on the difference between the power of ‘setting’ the Road Investment Strategy and being a statutory ‘consultee’ within Item 5, Appendix 2. RC noted that the language used is intentional, to understand what our role should be (i.e., another organisation sets the strategy and we are their consultee, or we have a bigger role and set the strategy ourselves).</p> <p>5.7 Cllr Boughton (MB) welcomed the opportunity to consult, but acknowledged the risk of devolution announcement that’s due. Recommended to ask consultation questions in a specific way, so that they apply equally in any devolution landscape. KG agreed that we would – and that we were clear on what an STB’s role is and how it differs from local authorities and potentially combined authorities.</p> <p>5.8 Tim Burr (TB) asked for clarity on what the scenario would look like should we receive devolved powers, but given lesser funding for the south east. Would TfSE still be in a position to fulfil those powers, within a lower funding envelope? RC confirmed that with powers we can make the best use of any funding envelope, as the Board would be able to decide which projects were prioritised.</p> <p>5.9 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Review the options for next steps for Transport for the South East; (2) Approve for Transport for the South East to consult with Local Authorities and other key stakeholders on whether Transport for the South East having powers would help them to achieve their objectives. | |
| <p>6. Business Plan 2025/26</p> | |
| <p>6.1 KW introduced the item and set out the three scenarios for funding put to the Department for Transport (DfT). This would be based on an optimal option, a 20% increase, a rollover from 24/25, or a 20% reduction.</p> <p>6.2 KW noted that we will see real terms cut for 25/26 as we were able to spend a significant rollover for the current financial year. This highlights the ability to support our local authorities through a larger funding envelope and level of ambition.</p> <p>6.3 RC added to the optimal funding solution, recognising that there will be a large opportunity to support local transport authorities. Acknowledged the challenges TfSE could face in supporting LTAs to level we wish to should we receive the 20% reduction scenario.</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>6.4 CDR raised concerns related to the funding cut to the SIP scheme development, should we receive a lower funding allocation, noting the value it adds to local transport authorities.</p> <p>6.5 DR asked what the risks are in being awarded less, and if there is an opportunity to express this to DfT. DR further asked if there would be an opportunity for an 18 month funding settlement in order to guarantee certainty. KG confirmed that this was not possible, as DfT only provide 12 month settlements. DR asked whether we could quantify the implications of receiving less funding, citing the EV workstream as an example RC agreed that we will try to do this in our advice to DfT, to try to maximise our funding settlement.</p> <p>6.6 TB highlighted that decarbonisation will only have an allocation should we receive the optimal funding scenario. Asked for some provision to be made to this given the government priorities. MV noted that there is cross-STB work ongoing on decarbonisation, and discussions are ongoing with the DfT for a separate funding pot outside of the TfSE grant. MV also noted that although there is one workstream specifically called 'decarbonisation', most workstreams support the Government's decarbonisation mission, including work on the Transport Strategy, Scheme Development, Active Travel, EVs and freight.</p> <p>6.7 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to: (1) Approve the submission of the draft funding allocations for the Business Plan, attached at Appendix 1; and (2) That contributions should be sought from Local Authorities at the same level as last financial year.</p> | |
| <h2>7. Prioritisation</h2> | |
| <p>7.1 Sarah Valentine (SV) introduced the item and provided the context for the prioritisation exercise, explaining that DfT Officials had asked for details of priority schemes in the TfSE area for delivery in the short term, in anticipation that DfT officials will be asked to provide such advice to new Government Ministers.</p> <p>7.2 SV reminded Members that, by virtue of their inclusion within the Strategic Investment Plan, all the schemes contained within it have been identified as priorities for the region. However, the SIP contains nearly 300 schemes for delivery over 25 years and so we need to recognise that individual schemes will be delivered through a number of different funding streams and programmes over the long term. As such there is a need to filter and prioritise schemes within the SIP to aid their effective delivery.</p> <p>7.3 DfT have not provided any specific detailed criteria for the selection of schemes, aside from to consider schemes that can be delivered within the next five years. Therefore to produce lists assumptions have had to be made around what filtering to apply to the schemes, this has been done</p> | <p>ACTIONS: 1 to review the two schemes highlighted to see if they meet the criteria for inclusion within the priority lists.</p> <p>2 to consider whether it</p> |

based on existing funding streams, such as RIS, MRN and Rail, and our current understanding of emerging government priorities.

7.4 SV explained that the strategic prioritisation framework and methodology (that was approved by the Board, along with an associated governance process, at the January 2024 meeting) has been employed to filter the schemes within the SIP against a range of different criteria, representing four likely scenarios (or situations) under which priority schemes might be required, with a focus in each situation on schemes that can be fully delivered or make significant steps towards delivery in the next 5 years.

7.5 As a result, SV informed the Board that it is proposed to submit four lists of priority schemes to DfT, which align to RIS3, MRN/LLM, Rail, and Strategic local schemes which align to the SoS priorities.

7.6 The approved governance process has been followed and these lists have been reviewed by Transport Strategy Working Group (TSWG) and Senior Officer Group (SOG). The lists for Rail and RIS3 were also discussed with Network Rail and National Highways respectively.

7.7 SV confirmed that the lists are presented by the stage of scheme development that has been completed, and no relative higher or lower priority or importance should be inferred from the order in which the schemes are presented. SV also asked the Board to note that if specific criteria are subsequently provided by DfT that are different to the assumptions that have been made within the four scenarios, then we should reserve the right to amend and/or create other lists and resubmit them should that be necessary. (in which case the revised/new lists would be brought to the Board for approval)

7.8 SV then highlighted key points in relation to the proposed lists of priority schemes.

7.9 SV noted that TfSE has a strong working relationship with National Highways, and has been involved throughout the development of the third roads investment strategy (RIS3), and will continue to be involved once the draft RIS3 is published.

7.10 SV drew the Boards attention to the fact that the RIS3 list contains several schemes on the A27, which is because these schemes are named in our SIP. The recent announcement by the Chancellor regarding these A27 schemes is acknowledged, and whilst we accept that the specifically named schemes have been cancelled, we also know that east-west connectivity, journey times and reliability remains a significant challenge across our region, particularly along that south coast corridor. Therefore TfSE will continue working with the government and National Highways to explore multi-modal solutions that will address these issues along the whole south coast corridor, including at Chichester, Arundel, Worthing and east of Lewes. A meeting is set up in November to start considering how we could work together on that.

is appropriate to align all lists to government priorities

7.11 SV explained that given STB's key role in managing the MRN and LLM programmes in their areas, this list reasserts the requirement for funding the current programme of schemes.

7.12 SV reminded the Board that to realise the priorities and ambition set out in the transport strategy and SIP significant investment in rail is required. This list focusses on schemes that could be delivered within the next five years, however it is acknowledged that rail schemes often have very long development timeframes and so TfSE will continue to work with Network Rail to bring forward rail transformation in the longer term, through work on the Wider South East Rail Partnership.

7.13 The fourth list aims provides details of "strategic local schemes" and is intended to be helpful in influencing future funding streams and emerging government policy. To aid DfT's understanding, these schemes have been given a rating of their alignment with the SoS 5 priorities, although this rating was not used to select the schemes.

7.14 In response to correspondence received from Kent County Council, regarding the Fastrack extension scheme which has now progressed beyond feasibility stage, SV confirmed that with this updated information, that scheme does now meet the criteria for the "strategic local schemes" list and so could be included if the Board were minded. There has been no maximum applied to the number of schemes that can be on any one list, so it could just be added as an additional scheme.

7.15 In reference to Lower Thames Crossing (LTC), SV confirmed this would not be part of RIS3, so it would not be appropriate to include it on that list, but it could be submitted in addition to the lists as a nationally significant scheme. SC noted the impact the delay to the LTC is having on Local Transport Plans (LTPs). RC agreed we would keep this under review.

7.16 MB enquired if the Tonbridge to Gatwick rail links could be included in the prioritised list. After checking, RC noted this is included within the SIP as S22 Kent to Gatwick service enhancements. Following discussion it was agreed to review this scheme to determine whether it meets the criteria for the rail schemes list and so whether it should also be included.

7.17 Cllr Dennis (JD) asked if there was an updated Outline Business Case (OBC) for the A27. RC noted that the reasons for their cancellation is not clear, but highlighted the environmental and funding challenges. RC recognised the opportunities that might be presented with the Labour manifesto relating to leveraging private sector investment.

7.18 TB raised the recent cancellation of the Arundel Bypass scheme, and asked for clarity on why it remains a priority for TfSE. KG notes that the corridor still remains an issue, and the scheme is based on evidence. TfSE are considering the whole corridor, to improve the strategic case.

7.19 DR noted that the approach should set out that we are not looking at schemes on a 'scheme by scheme' basis, but more as a package.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>7.20 DR asked for clarity on use of ‘scenario.’ SV noted that in the absence of specific prioritisation criteria, different “scenarios” or situations have been considered that align to different potential asks from government. For example to advise, based on deliverability, where rail investment should be directed in the short term, or what our short term priorities are for the Strategic Road Network (RIS3), these two “scenarios” result in two very different priority lists.</p> <p>7.21 DR supported the table setting out the alignment to government priorities, and suggested this could be offered for all the scenarios, SV agreed to look at this possibility.</p> <p>The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board, with amendments.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The members of the Partnership Board:</p> <p>(1) Noted the process that has been followed to prepare lists of priority schemes in the TfSE area for delivery in the short term;</p> <p>(2) Agreed that the lists of priority schemes shown in Appendix 1 be submitted to the Department for Transport for their use in providing advice to Ministers, with the addition of the two schemes below if following review of additional information they are deemed to meet the selection criteria.</p> <p>- Rail Priorities (Table 2) – Kent to Gatwick service enhancements - Strategic Local Schemes (Table 4) – Fastrack Extension</p> <p>(3) Agreed that the Lower Thames Crossing scheme should also be stated as a priority for the region.</p> <p>Post meeting note:</p> <p>Following review both the Kent to Gatwick service enhancements and Fastrack schemes do meet the criteria for selection and so were added to the list of schemes in Tables 2 and 4 respectively.</p> | |
| <p>8. Audit and Governance Committee</p> | |
| <p>8.1 Cllr Joy Dennis (JD) introduced the item and talked the Partnership Board through the paper and updates to the Strategic Risk Register.</p> <p>8.2 Previous meeting held on 2 October, where the next steps Partnership Board paper was reviewed, with feedback actioned in advance of the Board meeting today. Noted the importance to recognise the changes in devolution landscape.</p> <p>8.3 Reviewed business plan and funding scenarios, following feedback at SOG, a number of changes have been made for Partnership Board to consider.</p> <p>8.4 It was agreed that the local contributions would remain at the same level for FY25/26, acknowledging local authority pressures.</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>8.5 Reviewed financial spend to date at TfSE for FY 24/25 and are satisfied the spend is in line with plans.</p> <p>8.6 Risk register amended to increase probability on devolution, and to track the uncertainty of devolution in the south east.</p> <p>8.7 The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the discussions and actions arising at the meeting of the Audit and Governance Committee.</p> | |
| <p>9. Financial Update</p> | |
| <p>9.1 KW introduced the item and summarised the paper.</p> <p>9.2 Beginning of FY24/25, there was a large amount of carry forward which we have endeavored to reduce going into FY25/26. Noting previous trends of increased spend towards final quarter when technical work concludes and is approved.</p> <p>9.3 Currently forecasted to not have carry forward for 25/26.</p> <p>9.4 CDR queried the likelihood of an underspend, and if this is factored into business planning. KW noted that if there is any forecast underspend in January, this will be brought to the Board to agree reallocation of spend.</p> <p>9.5 The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the current financial position for 2024/25 to the end of September 2024.</p> | |
| <p>10. Transport Strategy Refresh Update</p> | |
| <p>10.1 MV introduced the item and talked the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>10.2 MV noted the timescales for the Transport Strategy Refresh, and its public consultation. A copy of the draft Strategy will be presented to a Special Partnership Board meeting on 9 December seeking agreement that it can go out to public consultation.</p> <p>10.3 Engagement with local authorities is currently being undertaken to obtain feedback on the strategy prior to its presentation to the Board on 9 December.</p> <p>10.4 MV informed the Board that the consultation will launch on 10 December. Offer of meetings during the consultation period to help support the development of responses.</p> | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>10.5 JD thanked TfSE for the engagement and information that has been included as part of the Transport Strategy Refresh.</p> <p>10.6 Cllr Curry (SC) queried the 'resilience' mission, and its communication activity. MV stated that TfSE needs to engage further with its partners to define its role in delivering this Mission. This would be important to avoid replicating the communications activity that is already in place</p> <p>10.7 SC further asked what the measurable outcomes of the Mission statements are, and how we are collecting the data to make sure it is robust and fair. MV confirmed that there are a suite of performance measures that sit within the SIP delivery action plan and State of the Region Report which will support the ask in terms of indicating the outcomes that we are trying to achieve as part of the Transport Strategy.</p> <p>10.8 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) comment on the progress with the work to refresh the transport strategy; (2) agree the wording of the Vision for the strategy; (3) comment on the wording of the Missions for the strategy; (4) comment on the approach to developing the policy route maps for the strategy; and (5) comment on the draft plans for the public consultation on the strategy | |
| <h2>11. Regional Active Travel Strategy and Action Plan Development</h2> | |
| <p>11.1 MV introduced the item and talked the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>11.2 MV set out the context for the development of a Regional Active Travel Strategy (RATSAP, noting that it emerged as an ask through the SIP consultation.</p> <p>11.3 The stages of its development were summarised, noting the level of engagement to ensure that work is complements the delivery of Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plans.</p> <p>11.4 Presented the objectives and structure of the document, and talked the Board through the strategic active travel network map that has been developed to identify a strategic network.</p> <p>11.5 MV presented the action plan, noting that the Regional Active Travel Steering Group will continue, to facilitate joined up working across the TfSE area. Confirmed there is a need to enhance the data availability across the region to support this work.</p> <p>11.6 MB asked how the strategic hubs were determined, and addressed concerns based on local knowledge and the likelihood of a number of the links shown on the map being delivered. MV set out the approach,</p> | <p>ACTION 1: To recirculate the map with officers and Members for comment before finalising.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>confirming that a data mapping exercise was undertaken to identify areas where there are health, education, employment, development sites etc., to identify nodes and the connections between them.</p> <p>11.7 Noted that the map is not deterministic, but to be used as an evidence base for local authorities when developing their schemes (LCWIP/LTPs). MB identified a potential risk for LCWIP development as would not be possible to achieve all of the connections shown on the map in his District which cause difficulties during the consultation phase .</p> <p>11.8 DR recommended inclusion of ferries to Isle of Wight, which supports strategic active travel connectivity .</p> <p>11.9 SC noted the inclusion of public transport within Medway’s Healthy Streets programme of work.</p> <p>11.10 TB addressed the absence of South Downs way on the regional map. JD also the need to distinguish between leisure and commuting routes.</p> <p>11.11 JD asked that for the strategy document include walking graphics.</p> <p>11.12 MV suggested that given the number of comments that Board Members had on the map it needed to be recirculated for comment by both officers and Partnership Board Members before being finalised.</p> <p>11.13 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to agree the Transport for the South East Regional Active Travel Strategy and Action Plan subject to further amendments to the strategic active travel network map.</p> | |
| <p>12. Responses to consultations</p> | |
| <p>12.1 RC introduced the paper and talked the Partnership Board through the two consultation responses since the previous meeting.</p> <p>12.2 Kent County Council Local Transport Plan: aligns to the TfSE Transport Strategy, and could be strengthened by referring to accessibility and integration.</p> <p>12.3 National Planning Policy Framework Review: Noted some specific issues for planning authorities in relation to housing targets, and recognise the pressures.</p> <p>12.4 SC highlighted the reference to biodiversity net gain, and that it would be helpful to have reference to the local nature recovery strategies within this, noting this is a key driver.</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>12.5 JD noted need to address investment to put transport options into these developments, biggest issue is not being able to see cumulative impacts.</p> <p>12.6 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to: (1) Agree the draft response to the Kent County Council Local Transport Plan 5; and (2) Agree the draft response to the proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system.</p> | |
| 13. Chief Officer's Report | |
| <p>10.1 RC introduced this item and talked the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The Members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the activities of Transport for the South East between July-September 2024.</p> | |
| 14. Business Advisory Group | |
| <p>14.1 Daniel Ruiz introduced this item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>14.2 DR noted that first meeting held with partners such as economic growth and Chamber of Commerce and agreed that these meetings need to maintain momentum. Therefore, meeting next month.</p> <p>14.3 Context for meetings provided, with objective being able to speak with one voice to government, and complement work of government and local authorities.</p> <p>14.4 Endeavouring to ensure that a full range of potential stakeholders in business views are captured.</p> <p>14.5 DR confirmed that there would be a fuller update at the subsequent Partnership Board meeting.</p> <p>14.6 The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the recent work of the Business Advisory Group.</p> | |
| 15. Advisory Panel and Transport Forum | |
| <p>10.1 KW introduced the item and talked the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>10.2 KW noted that the Advisory Panel brings together representatives of each of the thematic groups to share knowledge and outcomes.</p> <p>10.3 Discussions at recent meeting focused on upcoming government announcements, agreeing that we need to collectively advocate for funding for the south east.</p> <p>10.4 KW updated on the recent digital forum, which comprised women from different backgrounds, providing insight in the benefits and challenges of working in the transport sector.</p> <p>10.5 KW informed the Board of the upcoming Transport Forum, which will be in person in Southampton in November. This meeting will focus on challenges women face in the transport sector, and also the transport strategy refresh.</p> <p>The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the recent work of the Transport Forum and Advisory Panel.</p> | |
| 16. Delivery of the Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) | |
| <p>16.1 SV introduced the item and talked the Partnership Board through the paper. No comments or questions were raised.</p> <p>16.2 The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the progress of a range of workstreams that support the delivery of the Strategic Investment Plan.</p> | |
| 17. Technical Programme Update | |
| <p>17.1 MV introduced the item and talked the Partnership Board through the paper. No comments or questions were raised.</p> <p>17.2 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Comment on the progress with the ongoing implementation of the Centre of Excellence; (2) Comment on the progress with the work to implement Transport for the South East's electric vehicle charging infrastructure strategy; (3) Comment on the progress with the delivery of Transport for the South East's future mobility strategy; (4) Comment on the progress with the delivery of Transport for the South East's freight, logistics and gateway strategy; (5) Comment on the work that has recently commenced on rail; and | |

| | |
|---|--|
| (6) Comment on the progress with the joint work on decarbonisation. | |
| 18. Communications and Stakeholder Update | |
| <p>18.1 KW introduced the item and talked the Board through the paper.</p> <p>18.2 KW thanked Duncan Barks for his contribution to TfSE, and noted his departure. KW noted that we have appointed a new communications and public affairs manager who will join in due course.</p> <p>18.3 KW informed the Board that we have launched a refreshed TfSE website to ensure our messaging remains clear with members of the public.</p> <p>Home - Transport for the South East</p> <p>18.4 The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the engagement and communication activity that has been undertaken since the last Board meeting.</p> | |
| 19. AOB | |
| <p>19.1 JD asked for Members to agree that TfSE should engage with Google (or other) regarding SAT NAV routing in the south east. MB supported this. RC agreed to extend an invitation to Google to a future Board meeting. GF welcomed AA/RAC to input to this.</p> <p>19.2 CDR noted that at previous Board meeting, Vince Lucas asked what TfSE should be doing in relation to LTC. Acknowledged the deference of the LTC decision, and asked that TfSE write to Secretary of State to express this disappointment. RC noted that views have been issued to representatives on the DCO. The Board supported this idea.</p> | |
| 20. Date of Next Meeting | |
| <p>20.1 KG will highlight that next meeting is an additional meeting on Monday 9 December, 9am -12pm to formally sign off the Business Plan 2025/26 and to sign off the Transport Strategy Refresh going out to consultation.</p> | |