

Report to: **Partnership Board - Transport for the South East**

Date of meeting: **03 July 2023**

By: **Lead Officer, Transport for the South East**

Title of report: **Responses to consultations**

Purpose of report: **To agree the draft responses submitted in response to various consultations**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to agree the draft responses to the following consultations:

- (1) National Highways –
A27 Worthing and Lancing Improvements scheme;**
 - (2) Office of Rail and Road –
Independent review of Network Rail’s stakeholder engagement;**
 - (3) Institution of Civil Engineers –
Does England need a national transport strategy?;**
 - (4) Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body –
Views on the issues and opportunities that will shape the region’s long-term Strategic Transport Plan;**
 - (5) Kent County Council –
North Thanet Link highway improvement scheme;**
 - (6) Department for Transport –
Draft revised national networks national policy statement;**
 - (7) Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities –
Technical consultation on the Infrastructure Levy; and**
-

1. Introduction

1.1 Transport for the South East (TfSE) has prepared responses to a number of recent consultations. This paper provides an overview of the responses to the following consultations:

- National Highways - A27 Worthing and Lancing Improvements scheme**
- ORR - Independent review of Network Rail’s stakeholder engagement**
- Institution of Civil Engineers - Does England need a national transport strategy?**
- Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body - Views on the issues and opportunities that will shape the region’s long-term Strategic Transport Plan**
- Kent County Council - North Thanet Link highway improvement scheme**
- Department for Transport - Draft revised national networks national policy statement**

- **Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities - Technical consultation on the Infrastructure Levy**

2. National Highways - A27 Worthing and Lancing Improvements scheme

2.1 The only east to west trunk road south of the M25, linking key coastal communities between Portsmouth, Eastbourne and the rest of the regional strategic road network (SRN). This stretch of the A27 already suffers from traffic congestion with journey time delays, road accidents and pollution. Significant development is planned in the area in the future; without improvements, traffic congestion, road accidents and pollution are likely to increase. Proposed improvements could begin in 2025 and be completed by 2027.

2.2 This consultation closed on 19 March 2023 and the officer level response that was submitted is contained in Appendix 1. The consultation response confirmed inclusion within the TfSE SIP as a priority scheme, pleased development work progressing.

2.3 While supporting the need for these improvements, TfSE noted it does not consider it within its remit to comment upon any particular option.

2.4 TfSE made recommendations on avoidance, mitigation of environmental impacts in relation to achievement through this project of biodiversity net gain, noting importance of a high-quality package of measures being developed and delivered as part of the scheme; further recommending consideration of opportunities for inclusion in the design of preferred option in relation to enhanced infrastructure and provision for non-motorised users.

2.5 Reference made to need for long-term solution for the A27 at Worthing as prioritised in the SIP, commenting on need for a package of further interventions that help deliver our vision for a high-quality highway between the areas' two largest conurbations.

3. Office of Rail and Road – Independent review of Network Rail's stakeholder engagement.

3.1 As the independent safety and economic regulator for Britain's railways, the Office of Rail and Road (ORR) were seeking views via a survey in this annual assessment of quality of engagement by Network Rail with its key stakeholders during Control Period 6, 2019 – 2024.

3.2 This consultation closed on 31 March 2023 and the officer level response that was submitted is contained in Appendix 2. TfSE rated them 'Very good' for inclusiveness, effectiveness and transparency of engagement with TfSE over last 12 months. More detailed information was provided, also suggesting a single point of contact to aid communication.

3.4 Due to the recent departure of TfSE Network Rail contacts within TfSE, we were unable to respond to a number of specific questions regarding Control Period 7. We did provide, however, region-specific examples of Network Rail's engagement with TfSE for this period (including a TfSE seat on the Stakeholder Challenge Panel set up by Network Rail).

3.5 TfSE described collaborative, supportive and open engagement with Network Rail on Enhancement Delivery Plans, supporting TfSE in understanding the pipeline of schemes and allowing TfSE to look further ahead with relevant strategic planning teams.

4. Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) – Does England need a national transport strategy?

4.1 The ICE invited responses to a consultation on strengthening strategic transport planning; noting that an accessible, reliable and low-carbon transport network is essential for the UK to achieve long-term strategic objectives; recognising the key role of transport in delivering net

zero and adapting to climate change, meeting the Sustainable Development Goals and levelling up the economy.

4.2 This consultation closed on 12 May 2023 and the officer level response that was submitted is contained in Appendix 3. The consultation response identified key gaps and challenges within the existing approach to transport planning in England as perceived by TfSE, along with long-term drivers of transport demand in England.

4.3 TfSE also noted a number of well-made observations within ICE's Green Paper, current transport policy and delivery responsibilities across England being fragmented; example provided in regard to responsibilities for transport policy and delivery that sit across a number of different national and regional bodies, as well as statutory bodies and agencies.

4.4 TfSE suggested number of gaps in addition to those identified in the Green Paper, responding to wide range of questions.

4.5 A number of recommendations were made, including that - in line with best practice on policy and strategy development - monitoring, evaluation and reporting on progress be undertaken on continual basis, integrated into mechanisms by which transport strategy delivered; a formal, comprehensive refresh of transport strategy recommended every 5 years.

4.6 Considering other countries' national transport strategies, TfSE commented that the national transport strategy examples set out in the Green Paper serve to demonstrate the merits of a coherent, integrated, outcome-focussed, multimodal approach to transport planning that better serves the needs of people and business using the transport system.

5. Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body – Views on the issues and opportunities that will shape the region's long-term Strategic Transport Plan.

5.1 Western Gateway invited comments on Issues and Opportunities for its Strategic Transport Plan 2025 – 2050 for the Western Gateway Region.

5.2 This consultation closed on 19 May 2023 and the officer level response that was submitted is contained in Appendix 4. As a neighbouring STB, TfSE is not fully familiar with issues within the Western Gateway region, therefore we were unable to respond fully to certain questions posed that reference and seek to rate issues faced by the Western Gateway region.

5.3 TfSE responded to what appears to be little mention in the paper of economic and social objectives, muting the possibility of providing some strengthened narrative in these areas; recognising that the paper represents the earliest stage of Western Gateway's engagement process.

6. Kent County Council – North Thanet Link highway improvement scheme

6.1 Kent County Council have proposed that without improvements, a number of issues are likely to be made worse by future developments and generate further traffic and travel demand on this particular stretch of road (high volumes of traffic with potential for congestion and road safety concerns that can act as a deterrent to pedestrians and cyclists through an intimidating environment for non-car users).

6.2 This consultation closed on 14 June 2023 and the officer level response that was submitted is contained in Appendix 5. TfSE confirmed its support for delivery of the North Thanet Link Highway Improvement Scheme identified as a priority scheme in TfSE's Strategic Investment Plan (SIP); noting that - as part of a package of improvements in the A28/A299 South East Radial Major Road Network Corridor - it will provide an alternative route to an

already congested A28 corridor. TfSE identified that the scheme continues to meet overarching MRN objectives.

6.4 TfSE recognises that scheme analysis takes account of wider objectives of government transport investment including active travel, improvements to facilitate larger buses and decarbonisation; anticipating that a high-quality package of environmental mitigation measures would be developed and delivered as part of the scheme in accordance with government policy to ensure that every effort be made to avoid and mitigate environmental impacts and ensure that biodiversity net gain is achieved through this project.

7. Department for Transport (DfT) – Draft revised national networks national policy statement

7.1 The DfT sought views on revisions to the national networks national policy statement (NNNPS) that covers the strategic road and rail networks and strategic rail freight interchanges (SRFIs), the current NNPS was designated in 2014.

7.2 The principal purpose of the consultation is to ensure the NNNPS remains fit for purpose in supporting the government's commitments for appropriate development of infrastructure for strategic road, rail and rail freight interchanges; to identify whether the draft revised national policy statement presented is fit for purpose and provides a suitable framework to support decision making for nationally-significant infrastructure road, rail and strategic rail freight interchange projects.

7.3 This consultation closed on 14 June 2023 and the officer level response that was submitted is contained in Appendix 6. TfSE summarised its degrees of agreement to a wide range of statements on the NNNPS, exploring each topic and offering suggestions going forward; noting the lack of reference to Sub-national Transport Body organisations and the vital role they play in advising ministers on priorities across regional areas based on evidence-led study work, highlighting the significant levels of engagement by STBs with both national and local stakeholders.

7.4 Among TfSE suggestions, were the provision of guidance regarding potential increased construction costs of solutions with lower environmental impacts, as well as regarding delivery costs versus wider benefits of more sensitive scheme designs; noting absence currently of Carbon Net Zero Guidance Note.

7.5 Our final comments provided background and a summary of the SIP, pointing to a wide range of benefits in its response to the need for decarbonisation.

8. Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) – Technical consultation on the Infrastructure Levy

8.1 This technical consultation will inform the design of the Infrastructure Levy (itself a reform to the existing system of developer contributions) and of regulations that will set out its operation in detail.

8.2 This consultation closed on 09 June 2023 and the officer level response that was submitted is contained in Appendix 7. TfSE has outlined in its response to the consultation, the implications and opportunities of the proposals for its 16 constituent local transport authorities, making a number of general points; welcoming the government's desire to ensure local authorities receive a fairer share of the money that typically accrues to landowners and developers, commenting on future help to support the provision of much needed infrastructure with examples that include the transport infrastructure connectivity improvements that local communities expect with new developments.

8.3 Also, a need to ensure that a good proportion of the Levy comes directly to county councils/upper tier authorities as key infrastructure providers. However, TfSE have concerns regarding the potential scope of Levy funded infrastructure.

9. Conclusion and recommendations

9.1 The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to agree the draft responses to consultations that are detailed in this report.

RUPERT CLUBB

Lead Officer

Transport for the South East

Contact Officer: Elan Morgan

Tel. No. 07849 308518

Email: elan.morgan@eastsussex.gov.uk

Emailed to: A27WorthingandLancingImprovements@nationalhighways.co.uk

March 2023

Dear Sirs

TfSE Response to the A27 Worthing and Lancing improvements scheme - Options consultation February - March 2023

Transport for the South East welcomes the opportunity to respond to the A27 Worthing and Lancing improvements scheme consultation.

Transport for the South East (TfSE) is a sub-national transport body (STB), which provides a single voice on the transport interventions needed to support sustainable economic growth across its geography. The South East is crucial to the UK economy and is the nation's major international gateway for people and business with some of the largest ports and airports in the country. High-quality transport infrastructure is critical to making the South East more competitive, contributing to national prosperity and improving the lives of our residents.

TfSE's transport strategy (2020) set out an ambitious 2050 vision for the area. Through a programme of area studies, we identified multimodal packages of transport interventions needed to deliver the strategy. Underpinned by this credible, evidence based technical programme, we consulted on our draft Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) in the autumn of 2022. When published in spring 2023, the SIP will present a compelling case for future decision making to help create a more productive, healthier, happier, and more sustainable south east.

The SIP is aligned with government priorities to rapidly decarbonise the transport system, improve public health outcomes, reduce congestion, improve road safety, level-up left-behind communities and facilitate sustainable economic growth. There is a need for more joined up planning, particularly between transport and housing, to help build more sustainable communities and enable more efficient business operations, putting the strategic transport infrastructure in place that enables communities to thrive and live happier, healthier, more active lives. Securing the right investment in the SRN is a crucial part in delivering our transport strategy.

The M27/A27 is the key highway that serves longer distance, east-west movements in the Outer Orbital area. Between Southampton and Portsmouth, the road is of Motorway grade standard. However, east of Portsmouth, there are notable gaps (and congestion hotspots) at Chichester, Arundel, Worthing, Lancing and between Lewes and Polegate.

Many local journeys are dependent on the A27 and the A259, which mirrors the A27 along much of the South Coast. Disruption on either road can have knock on effects on the other.

The A27 Worthing improvements scheme was identified by TfSE as a priority scheme for inclusion within the SIP and we are pleased to see development work progressing.

TfSE support the need for improvements to the A27 at Worthing to address daily peak hour congestion, safety and severance issues which affect journey time reliability and constrain development and regeneration. However, we consider that it is not within our remit to comment upon any particular option.

We consider that in accordance with Government policy every effort must be made to avoid and mitigate environmental impacts and ensure that biodiversity net gain is achieved through this project. We would therefore expect that a high-quality package of environmental mitigation measures is developed and delivered as part of the scheme.

We also consider that any opportunities to provide enhanced infrastructure and provision for non-motorised users should be included in the design of the preferred option. These opportunities should be delivered as part of the scheme rather than being subject to separate funding applications that are not guaranteed to be successful.

We recognise the need for these short-term measures, but TfSE still seek a long-term solution for the A27 at Worthing. Prioritised in the SIP, we maintain the need for a package of further interventions that help deliver our vision for a high-quality highway between the areas' two largest conurbations. The current condition and discontinuous nature of the road means it falls far short of the standard needed to fulfil this role, notably between Chichester and Shoreham and East of Lewes. Improving the A27 corridor remains a priority for TfSE and this requires an end-to-end approach to the improvement of this highway.

This is an officer response. The TfSE Partnership Board meets on 3 July 2023 to consider the draft response and a further iteration of the response may follow.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss any element of this response.

Yours sincerely,

Rupert Clubb
Lead Officer, Transport for the South East

Assessment of Network Rail Stakeholder Engagement

Word Version of Survey Questions

MJ submitted responses are highlighted Yellow

20 March 2023

Annual Assessment of Network Rail's Stakeholder Engagement – 01 April 2022 to 31 March 2023

The Office of Rail and Road (ORR) is the independent safety and economic regulator for Britain's railways. We hold Network Rail to account against its network licence. Network Rail's network licence contains specific requirements around how it engages with its stakeholders. More information about ORR and what we do can be found [here](#).

We would like to get your views on how Network Rail engages with you, one of its key stakeholders. Please would you take the time to share your experience of Network Rail's stakeholder engagement by taking part in this short survey? This survey is available until 30 April 2023 and covers the period **01 April 2022 to 31 March 2023**.

This survey forms one part of ORR's [annual assessment](#) of the quality of Network Rail's Stakeholder Engagement during Control Period 6 (2019 – 2024).

All Network Rail stakeholders aged at least 16 years are eligible to take part. It should take around 10-15 minutes to complete. If you have trouble viewing any part of this survey, you can enable 'accessibility mode' by clicking on the accessibility icon (person inside a circle) at the top right of the screen.

This survey is being run by Opinion Research Services (ORS), an independent research company, on behalf of ORR.

ORR is the data controller for any personal data you share within your survey response. The survey responses will be processed by Opinion Research Services (ORS) in line with data protection regulations. Only anonymous, aggregated data will be shared directly with ORR and you will not be identified in the reported results. Your contact details are held by ORR and have not been shared with ORS.

ORR's privacy notice sets out how it handles personal data including your rights and how to exercise them. ORR's privacy notice is available [here](#). ORS's privacy notice is available [here](#).

Anonymous data will be held securely by ORR until ORR's annual assessment is published in Autumn 2023 and it will then be deleted. Any information from the survey responses which could identify an individual (e.g., an IP address) will be held securely by ORS and will be deleted by the end of July 2023 when the data analysis and evaluation process has been completed.

If you have queries about the survey, please contact Alex Hymer at ORS by email on Alex.Hymer@ors.org.uk or you can contact Lynn Armstrong at ORR by email on lynn.armstrong@orr.gov.uk.

ORS also strictly adheres to the Market Research Society (MRS) Code of Conduct - You can contact the Market Research Society on 0800 975 9596.

Tell Us About You

(B1) Which stakeholder group do you belong to?

Please choose one of the following options.

- Passenger train industry
- Freight industry
- Rail industry supplier (or representative)
- Infrastructure manager
- Passenger representative
- **Public sector bodies**
- Elected representatives
- Community Rail Partnership
- Local Enterprise Partnership
- Charity
- Heritage body
- Other – please specify

(B2) Which part(s) of Network Rail did you engage with over the last 12 months?

Please select all that apply.

Please note there will be follow-up questions about your engagement with each of the areas you select.

If you wish to reduce the number of questions you are asked/length of time to complete the survey, please only select the areas for which you feel able to answer follow-up questions.

- Eastern
- North West and Central
- **Southern**
- Wales and Western
- Scotland's Railway
- System Operator (including Freight & National Passenger Operators)
- I engage with Network Rail at a general level
- I did not engage with Network Rail
- Other – please specify

(B3) Which part of Network Rail did you primarily engage with during the last 12 months?

Please select one option.

You will still be able to respond to questions regarding all the parts of Network Rail that you have engaged with:

- Eastern
- North West and Central
- **Southern**
- Wales and Western
- Scotland's Railway
- System Operator (including Freight & National Passenger Operators)
- I engage with Network Rail at a general level
- Other – please specify

Principles of Stakeholder Engagement – Part 1

As a condition of its licence, ORR require Network Rail to meet the following four principles of stakeholder engagement:

- Inclusive
- Well-governed
- Effective
- Transparent

We define the principle of being ***Inclusive*** as engagement which seeks to involve all relevant stakeholders in a fair and proportionate manner, including by adopting different approaches to reflect stakeholders' different capabilities and interests.

(B4) In your opinion, how would you rate Network Rail's engagement with you regarding the principle of being *Inclusive*?

Please rate the following part(s) of Network Rail that you engaged with.

- **Very good**
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very Poor
- Don't know

We define the principle of being ***Effective*** as engagement which supports delivery of a safer, more efficient and better used rail network, including by ensuring that stakeholders' views are duly taken into account.

(B5) In your opinion, how would you rate Network Rail's engagement with you regarding the principle of being *Effective*?

Please rate the following part(s) of Network Rail that you engaged with.

- **Very good**
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very Poor
- Don't know

We define the principle of being **Well-governed** as engagement which is underpinned by effective processes and governance arrangements that encourage meaningful engagement.

(B6) In your opinion, how would you rate Network Rail's engagement with you regarding the principle of being *Well-governed*?

Please rate the following part(s) of Network Rail that you engaged with.

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very Poor
- Don't know

We define the principle of being **Transparent** as sufficient information is made available to enable effective engagement with stakeholders.

(B7) In your opinion, how would you rate Network Rail's engagement with you regarding the principle of being *Transparent*?

Please rate the following part(s) of Network Rail that you engaged with.

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very Poor
- Don't know

Please share any further comments on Network Rail's engagement with you regarding the principles of **Inclusive, Effective, Well-governed**, and/or **Transparent** stakeholder engagement in the box below.

(B8) Please specify, if appropriate, which part of Network Rail you refer to in your feedback in the box below.

Text Box Included Here

TfSE has met with members of Network Rail's strategy teams from Southern on a regular basis to keep each other informed on relevant developments.

Annual Business Planning

Network Rail's annual business planning includes activities such as setting priorities and planning activities to operate, maintain and renew the railway - regardless of the time frame.

(B9) Did Network Rail engage with you about its annual business planning during the last 12 months.

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

[Only ask if B9 = Yes]

(B10) How would you rate Network Rail's engagement with you about its annual business planning?

Please rate the following part(s) of Network Rail that you engaged with.

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very poor
- Don't know

[Only ask if B9 = Yes]

(B11) Please include any further comments on annual business planning engagement in the box below. If possible, please give examples, any relevant details such as how you engaged and any suggestions on how engagement with Network Rail in this area could be improved.

Please specify, if appropriate, which part of Network Rail you refer to in your feedback in the box below.

Text Box Included Here

Network Rail have included TfSE as a stakeholder on schemes and projects in the South East. Including us in Working groups, strategic studies, Workshops and design solution optioneering consultation/stakeholder input.

Network Rail have a seat on the TfSE board this is sometimes delegated and occasionally no attendance at board meetings at all.

A single point of contact would be useful to help direct communications from our stakeholder and comms team.

Control Period 7 (CP7) Strategic Business Planning

ORR launched Periodic Review 23 (PR23) in summer 2021. PR23 will set the funding and outputs that Network Rail must deliver in Control Period 7 (CP7) from 2024 – 2029. As part of the process, Network Rail created Control Period 7 (CP7) Strategic Business Plans which should reflect stakeholder priorities.

(B12) Did Network Rail engage with you in relation to its Control Period 7 (CP7) Strategic Business Planning during the last 12 months?.

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

[Only ask if B12 = yes]

(B13) Did Network Rail provide sufficient information to you to inform your engagement?

Please answer for the following part(s) of Network Rail you engaged with.

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

[Only ask if B12= yes]

(B14) Did Network Rail provide you with sufficient and timely opportunities to contribute your views in the stakeholder engagement process?

Please answer for all the following part(s) of Network Rail you engaged with.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

[Only ask if B12 = yes]

(B15) Did Network Rail inform you how this engagement was subsequently used in the development of its Control Period 7 (CP7) Strategic Business Plan?

Please answer for the following part(s) of Network Rail you engaged with.

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

[Only ask if B12 = Yes]

(B16) How would you rate Network Rail's engagement with you on its Control Period 7 (CP7) Strategic Business Planning?

Please rate the following parts(s) of Network Rail you engaged with.

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very poor
- Don't know

[Only ask if B12 = Yes]

(B17) Please include any further comments on Control Period 7 (CP7) Strategic Business Plan engagement in the box below.

If possible, please give examples, any relevant details such as how Network Rail engaged with you, and any suggestions on how engagement with Network Rail in this area could be improved.

Please specify, if appropriate, which part of Network Rail you refer to in your feedback in the box below.

Text Box Included Here

Due to the departure of the Network Rail contacts within TfSE over the last 6 months I can't answer some of these questions. I know that TfSE were engaged in the CP7 Process including some input into the CP7 plans from NR Wales & Western (particularly on improvements at stations). TfSE had more input into Network Rail Southern's CP7 plans. Including a seat on the Stakeholder Challenge Panel set up by Network Rail

Enhancement Delivery Plan Engagement

Enhancements Delivery Plans set out the enhancement commitments that Network Rail has made to Department of Transport and Transport Scotland. 'Enhancements' refer to the development of new infrastructure, for example, the construction and completion of Crossrail in August 2022 which delivered a new integrated railway route through central London.

An aim of these plans is to provide visibility on infrastructure commitments and their status to stakeholders.

The Enhancements Delivery Plan for England and Wales can be accessed [here](#).

The Enhancements Delivery Plan for Scotland can be accessed [here](#).

(B18) Did the following part(s) of Network Rail engage with you on the planning and delivery of railway enhancements during the last 12 months.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

(B19) Which of the following best describes your knowledge of the Enhancements Delivery Plan(s)?

- Know very well (STRONG)
- Know a fair amount about (GOOD)
- Know just a little (LITTLE)
- Heard of but know nothing about (SOME AWARENESS)
- Never heard of (UNAWARE)

[Only ask if B19=

- Know very well
- Know a fair amount
- Know just a little]

(B20) In your opinion, does the Enhancements Delivery Plan(s), in its current format, provide you with the information you require to plan your business?

- Fully
- Partially
- Not at all

[Only ask if B20 =

- Partially
- Not at all]

(B21) You said that the Enhancements Delivery Plan(s) does not fully provide you with the information you require to plan your business. Have you discussed this with Network Rail?

- Yes
- No

[Only ask if B21 = Yes]

(B22) Did Network Rail provide you with any additional information on enhancement schemes?

- Yes
- No

[Only ask if B21 = Yes]

(B23) If there were any other outcomes from discussing information required to plan your business, with Network Rail, please provide details below.

Text box included here.

TfSE need to understand the pipeline of schemes and look further ahead which we do collaboratively with Network Rail Strategic planning teams

(B24) Considering all the sources of information you have on Network Rail's enhancements, in your opinion, would you say that you have the information you need to plan your business?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Text Box Included Here

[Only ask if B24 = No]

(B25) What further information do you require from Network Rail to plan your business?

Please specify, if appropriate, which part of Network Rail you refer to in your feedback in the box below.

Text Box Included Here

Scorecard Engagement

Network Rail scorecards capture key outputs that each route and the System Operator plan to deliver across a range of activity including financial and train performance. Network Rail's regions engage with their stakeholders to understand their priorities and determine the measures and targets to be included on scorecards for the coming year.

(B26) Did Network Rail engage with you in relation to scorecards during the last 12 months?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

[Only ask if B26 = yes]

(B27) Did Network Rail provide sufficient information to you to inform your engagement?

Please answer for the following part(s) of Network Rail you engaged with.

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

[Only ask if B26 = yes]

(B28) Did Network Rail provide you with sufficient opportunity to contribute your views on scorecards as part of the engagement process?

Please answer for the following part(s) of Network Rail you engaged with.

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

[Only ask if B26 = yes]

(B29) Did Network Rail inform you how this engagement was used in the development of its scorecards?

Please answer for the following part(s) of Network Rail you engaged with.

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

[Only ask if B26 = yes]

(B30) How would you rate Network Rail's engagement in the development of its scorecards.

Please rate the following part(s) of Network Rail you engaged with.

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very poor
- Don't know

[Only ask if B26 = yes]

(B31) Please use this space to provide any other information you would like to give on how Network Rail engaged with you around its business performance.

Please specify, if appropriate, which part of Network Rail you refer to in your feedback in the box below.

Text Box Included Here

Summary

(B32) Overall, how would you rate the quality of Network Rail's engagement with you during the last 12 months?

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very poor
- Don't know

(B33) During the last 12 months, in your opinion has the quality of Network Rail's engagement with you:

- Improved
- Somewhat improved
- Stayed the same
- Somewhat declined
- Declined
- Don't know

(B34) Finally, based on your experience and reflecting on your responses across the survey, please share any areas of good practice or areas for improvement around Network Rail's engagement with you during the last 12 months?

Please specify, if appropriate, which part of Network Rail you refer to in your feedback in the box below.

Text Box Included Here

With limited time in post and previous lead contacts for Network Rail having left TfSE I have not had chance to feedback on some of the areas in full. The engagement I have had with Network Rail has been very collaborative, supportive and open. This has been almost entirely with the Wessex Strategic planning group so far.

Institution of Civil Engineers Green Paper: Does England need a national transport strategy?

Draft Response from Transport for the South East

1. Introduction

1.1 Transport for the South East (TfSE) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Institution of Civil Engineers' (ICE) Green Paper on *Does England need a national transport strategy?*

1.2 TfSE is a sub-national transport body (STB) for the South East of England, bringing together leaders from across the local government, business and transport sectors to speak with one voice on our region's strategic transport needs. Since its inception in 2017, TfSE has quickly emerged as a powerful and effective partnership for our region. We have a [30-year transport strategy](#) in place which carries real weight and influence and will shape government decisions about where, when and how to invest in our region to 2050. The Secretary of State has confirmed that they will have regard to our strategy in developing new policy. We work closely with the Department for Transport (DfT) DfT to provide advice to the Secretary of State and our ambition is to become a statutory body with devolved powers over key strategic transport issues.

1.3 Our principal decision-making body, the [Partnership Board](#), brings together representatives from our 16 constituent local transport authorities, five Local Enterprise Partnerships, district and borough authorities, protected landscapes, Highways England, Network Rail and Transport for London.

1.4 Our [Strategic Investment Plan \(SIP\) for South East England](#) provides a framework for investment in strategic transport infrastructure, services, and regulatory interventions in the coming three decades. The plan provides a framework for delivering our Transport Strategy, which:

- is a blueprint for investment in the South East;
- shows how we will achieve our ambitions for the South East;
- is owned and delivered in partnership;
- is a regional plan with evidenced support, to which partners can link their own local strategies and plans – a golden thread that connects policy at all levels;
- provides a sequenced plan of multi-modal investment packages that are place based and outcome focused; and
- examines carbon emissions impacts as well as funding and financing options.

The plan presents a compelling case for action for investors, including government departments – notably the Treasury and Department for Transport (DfT) – as well as private sector investors. It is written for and on behalf of the South East's residents, communities, businesses and political representatives.

1.5 TfSE welcome the contribution to this debate that the Green Paper provides, particularly as it terms 'the need for a clear focus on outcomes, combined with robust evidence and a holistic view of the entire transport network.' We trust that our response to the questions posed below provide value to the ICE.

2. (Question 1). What are the key gaps and challenges within the existing approach to transport planning in England? What are the long-term drivers of transport demand in England?

2.1 A number of the observations made within the Green Paper are well-made. The current transport policy and delivery responsibilities across England are fragmented. In the TfSE area, for example, responsibilities for transport policy and delivery sit across a number of different national and regional bodies, as well as statutory bodies and agencies. This includes, but is not limited to:

- The Department for Transport, for nationally-significant transport priorities and funding of schemes and initiatives;
- National Highways, for the management and enhancement of the strategic road network;
- Network Rail, for the management and enhancement of local and strategic rail infrastructure;
- STBs, with responsibility for producing regional transport strategies;
- County councils, with their powers as local transport authorities (LTA) and local highway authorities (LHA);
- District councils, with their powers as local planning authorities, and some limited transport powers (e.g. taxi licencing);
- Unitary authorities, with the combined responsibilities of county councils and district councils;
- National parks authorities, with the planning powers associated with a local planning authority;
- Public transport operators, with the responsibility for operating public transport services either commercially or under contract.

2.2 Throughout the work of our partnership we have observed a number of gaps in addition to those identified in the Green Paper. These include the following:

- **Lack of a clear, multi-modal strategic direction aligned with funding and powers.** A significant learning experience from the development of our [transport strategy](#) is that at local, regional, and national level, there is a lack of a clear, multi-modal strategic direction for transport within England. The policy environment is characterised by siloed policy making, as ably articulated in the Green Paper, with little in the way of strategic co-ordination. STBs have attempted to overcome this issue through the development of their transport strategies and investment plans. For instance, TfSE has taken a multimodal approach to develop the proposals in its [Strategic Investment Plan](#). This has included a series of [Area Studies](#), work on [freight](#), and work on [future mobility](#). Although it needs to be emphasised that where there are issues that are modally-specific (e.g. capacity on the railway network), a modally-specific approach can add value.
- **Challenges on strategic co-ordination of priorities within and between regional areas.** TfSE understands from its collaborative work with other STBs, that the specific priorities of each region are different, even if the overall outcomes and objectives contained within transport strategies may be somewhat similar.

Strategic regional transport planning has a chequered history in England. Even within the TfSE region, there are a variety of sub-regional approaches to policy making. A notable example being that of the Solent region, where through Solent Transport there have been a variety of successes in sub-regional policy making, including securing funding for [a Future Transport Zone](#).

This is equally the case for strategic planning between regional areas. There is currently no duty for regional areas to co-operate on strategic transport and planning matters, similar in the manner to which Local Planning Authorities have a statutory duty to co-operate. Regardless of

this, many STBs do collaborate on a number of thematic areas, including work on decarbonisation, freight, rural transport, electric vehicle charging infrastructure and lately on the the establishment of a series of regional centres of excellence.

- **Lack of co-ordination between strategic planning and the ability to deliver necessary changes.**

The delivery of strategic planning and priorities requires close partnership working between a variety of partners to enact significant changes. TfSE has successfully developed and adopted a number of thematic strategies and action plans through its Partnership Board, who have successfully worked together through consensus on securing the best possible deal for transport in the South East. This focus has been key in securing the progress that TfSE has to date. But this process has also showed how different priorities and understanding of issues can cause problems in delivery.

A notable recent example is that of decarbonisation. The STBs are working together to understand the decarbonisation potential of a variety of types of transport schemes and the data and approaches needed to understand this. However, even where there is consensus that decarbonisation should be achieved, this can be interpreted differently in different locations. For instance, within a larger urban area decarbonising transport can be understood to mean encouraging the use of active travel, whereas in another area the focus could be on encouraging the uptake of electric vehicles.

3. (Question 2). Should a new national transport strategy be developed for England or the UK as a whole?

- *How would an overarching strategy strengthen decision-making, help meet the UK's long term objectives, improve infrastructure delivery and better the lives of the public?*
- *What specific issues and challenges should it address?*
- *How should a national transport strategy address connectivity between the UK's nations?*
- *How would a strategy for England be integrated with those of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland?*

3.1 TfSE would welcome the creation of a transport strategy for England. In common with Scotland's and Wales's national transport strategies this should not identify specific projects or interventions but provide a framework for making decisions to enable infrastructure interventions directly linked to the wider national outcomes being sought. This national strategy would provide the framework for the regional transport strategies and investment plans developed by STBs which would identify the interventions needed to address the specific challenges and opportunities in their areas.

3.2 The transport strategies and investment plans that have already been delivered by the STBs demonstrate the merits of a regional approach to transport planning. They have enabled the development coherent multi-modal transport strategies that serve the needs of the people business and places within their areas.

3.3 TfSE's Strategic Investment Plan is underpinned by a credible, evidence-based technical programme that has enabled TfSE and our partners to:

- understand the current and future challenges and opportunities in the south east;
- identify stakeholder priorities for their respective areas of interest;
- evaluate the impacts of a wide range of plausible scenarios on the south east's economy, society, and environment;
- develop multi-modal, crossboundary interventions;

- assess the impact of proposed interventions on transport and socio-economic outcomes; and
- prioritise the interventions that best address the south east’s most pressing challenges and unlock the south east’s most promising opportunities.

3.4 The STBs transport strategies and investment plans provide the ‘golden thread’ between national policy priorities and local transport plans developed by their constituent LTAs to ensure individual community needs are well understood and that projects at every scale complement each other, avoiding waste and duplication of effort.

3.5 There are a number of transport policy objectives and issues that are likely to be at the forefront of an English national transport strategy. A significant focus of policy making is on decarbonisation and issues of equality and fairness. We anticipate that it will be the role of the national transport strategy to articulate the meaning of these issues in a transport policy context to establish a common baseline of understanding of them across the regions of the UK. Additionally, it is likely that the economy will be a key policy priority. The strategic goals established for the TfSE transport strategy articulate some of the detail behind these policy areas:

Environmental	Social	Economic
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing carbon emission to net zero by 2050, at the latest. • Reducing the impact of, and the need to, travel. • Protecting our natural, built and historic environments. • Improving biodiversity. • Minimising resource and energy consumption. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting active travel and healthier lifestyles. • Improving air quality. • An affordable, accessible transport network that’s simpler to use. • A more integrated transport network where it is easier to plan and pay for door-to-door journeys. • A safer transport network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving connectivity between major economic hubs, ports and airports. • More reliable journeys. • A more resilient network. • Better integrated land use and transport planning. • A digitally smart transport network.

3.6 TfSE has no strong views on how this national strategy could be integrated with those of Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. We would recommend, however, that this strategy carefully considers requirements for international connections by passengers and freight, and their importance to the English economy. This is especially the case for the TfSE area, which contains a number of major international gateways including Gatwick and Southampton Airports, as well as the major freight and passenger ports of Dover and Southampton.

4. (Question 3). What role should different stakeholders play in delivering better transport outcomes in England (e.g. central government, subnational transport bodies, the National Infrastructure Commission)?

4.1 TfSE is clear about the role that STBs should play in delivering better transport outcomes for regions in England. There are a number of benefits that STBs bring:

- Delivering local democratic accountability and speaking with one voice on behalf of their constituent authorities on transport investment requirements of their the regions;
- Developing regional evidence bases ensures that the differing needs and opportunities within each region are reflected in their transport strategies

- enabling Government to deepen the use of a programme approach in confirming the allocation of funds
- strengthening the linkage between plans prepared by LTAs and those developed/delivered by national infrastructure bodies such as Network Rail and National Highways;

4.2 In order so that such benefits are fully realised, and regional transport strategies are delivered effectively, it is important that further consideration is given to providing STBs the powers and duties as set out in the Cities and Local Devolution Act at the appropriate time. Currently, the only such STB is Transport for the North. . In July 2020 TfSE made an application to become a statutory body. Statutory status would provide us with the powers and responsibilities that will be needed to deliver our transport strategy and strategic investment plan. In outline, this would result in the following powers being bestowed upon TfSE;

- Become a statutory partner in road and rail investment decisions;
- Improve bus services for passengers and provide improved alternatives to car travel;
- Coordinate the delivery of region-wide integrated smart ticketing;
- Have role in the development and implementation of transport investment schemes;

Although the Government decided not to progress with our initial request for statutory status, our board and our partners remain clear that getting the right tools from government will be critical to delivering the south east's transport investment priorities. So, we will continue to work with government and the other STBs to identify the best time to put forward our case.

4.3 Should a national transport strategy be established providing a policy framework for regional multimodal transport strategies produced by statutory STBs, then these would provide the primary mechanism for identifying transport investment priorities across the country. This presents an opportunity to drive further efficiency in the system by allowing Network Rail and National Highways to focus on maintaining an effective and safe network with the strategic investment planning work undertaken by STBs. Under this proposal LTAs would continue to produce local transport plans setting out how the needs of local communities were to be met.

5. **(Question 5). What timeframe should a strategy cover and how often should it be reviewed?**

5.1 In determining the timeframe for any such strategy, any organisation responsible for developing and delivering the strategy needs to consider a number of factors. There are no 'hard and fast' rules for what constitutes an ideal length for a transport strategy. Notwithstanding that, we would recommend that the following be considered when setting a timescale for a national transport strategy:

- A sufficiently long time frame to address the challenges that the country faces with the urgency needed and achieve the desired outcomes of the transport strategy, reflecting periods of planning, construction, operation, and payback for transport investment.
- Established statutory guidance on transport infrastructure and service investment, including timescales to be considered for projects of varying scales.
- Known or estimated timescales by which transport-related issues are expected to become acute or urgent, for example carbon emissions.

5.2 We would recommend that, in line with best practice on policy and strategy development, that monitoring, evaluation, and reporting on progress be undertaken on a continual basis. This should also

be integrated into the mechanisms by which the transport strategy is delivered. A formal, comprehensive refresh of the transport strategy should be undertaken every 5 years.

6. (Question 5). How can a strategy be made resilient to political change?

6.1 A necessary pre-condition of a strategy being resilient to political change is ensuring that it is based on a strong evidence base. Ensuring that the evidence base is sound and robust and using that to set clear vision and objectives means that it is easier to gain consensus on the current situation with regards to transport over a particular area. This makes the task of setting a clear vision and objectives that political stakeholders can sign up to much easier, and forms a good basis by which political leadership can be engaged in the strategy development process.

6.2 All of the STBs across England have extensive experience in engaging with political and other local stakeholders. Especially in the development of transport strategies that set a vision, objectives, and priorities for a region that have a significant degree of political support. This is often based on strong partnership working between the constituent authorities, often developed in the development of a transport strategy for the region. This is translating from the development of strategy into delivery plans for these regions.

6.3 Another necessity to securing ongoing political engagement is commitment to long term funding of projects. This gives a greater degree of certainty to STBs and local authorities that schemes that are in delivery plans – some of which may be suggested by political leaders – will be delivered. Short term funding arrangements make the delivery of transport schemes more prone to changes in political leadership, and increases the uncertainty that delivery plans and strategies will be successfully delivered. This makes the task of political engagement and securing ongoing political support for strategies more challenging.

6.4 Finally, ongoing political engagement is essential to securing ongoing support for transport strategies and their associated delivery plans. Cross-party consensus, on a National Transport Strategy is vital and there must be early engagement with other stakeholders and delivery partners. In this context, STBs can play an important role in gaining regional and local agreement on national transport policy objectives.

7. (Question 6). How can existing data be best used to improve transport outcomes – and what data gaps exist?

7.1 Transport for the South East has identified a number of issues concerning data that are relevant to policy making more generally, as well as specific data gaps in specific thematic areas such as freight. It is our experience that, for many areas of transport, England and the UK is not lacking in data in terms of activity however data is often not openly available. Data is available on almost all aspects of transport operations – from amount of freight through major ports to reliability on trains. The challenge is linking such data to wider impacts in a way that supports decision making.

7.2 A notable challenge in policy making is the sharing of data between partners. In many areas there can be found good quality open data, such as National Highways Traffic Flow Data, but some data is more difficult to share for reasons of commercial confidentiality and data protection. There are means of navigating such issues, and many authorities publish good quality transport data openly, but this is far from standard practice.

7.3 To tackle the challenge of linking this data to wider impacts and outcomes in a manner that supports decision making, what is essential is that monitoring and evaluation is shared openly and in an accessible manner. This could be through a repository that supports business case development. This could be enabled by a national transport strategy (and potentially enable it) through the Department for Transport putting out a call for post-scheme monitoring and evaluation reports for different types of schemes, to publish openly.

7.4 A unique challenge is the validity of the Census 2021 Travel to Work statistics. The Travel to Work statistics are often considered as a key transport statistic for planning purposes. However, this data was collected during COVID-19, and its reliability is open to question. However, data from the 2011 Census is now 12 years old, and has similar such issues. Before applying Travel to Work data to a national transport strategy, guidance on the applicability of this data is urgently needed.

8. (Question 7). What existing mechanisms and approaches could be used to achieve the desired integration if it proves impossible to get an integrated transport strategy off the ground?

8.1 Transport for the South East's preferred option would be the development of a national transport strategy for England. However, should this not be possible to achieve, our recommended approach would be to consider making all Sub-National Transport bodies statutory bodies. This would enable such bodies to influence government decisions on transport issues, as well as giving the tools necessary to deliver against their respective transport strategies.

8.2 Associated with this, however, could be an expectation placed upon STBs to co-operate on strategic matters of common interest. STBs already undertake such activities through joint working on various thematic areas such as freight, rural mobility, decarbonisation, electric vehicle charging infrastructure and the establishment of Centres for Excellence. Placing a more formal duty on STBs for similar such activities could assist in integrating policy making and best practice across England.

9. (Question 8). What lessons can be learnt from other countries with national transport strategies?

9.1 The examples of the national transport strategies set out in the Green Paper serve to demonstrate the merits of a coherent, integrated outcome focussed, multimodal approach to transport planning that better serves the needs of the people and business using the transport system .



Rupert Clubb
Lead officer, Transport for the South East

Thank you for inviting Transport for the South East (TfSE) to comment on your Issues and Opportunities for the Strategic Transport Plan 2025 – 2050 document, for the Western Gateway Region.

TfSE is a sub-national transport body that brings together 16 local transport authorities, five LEAs, 46 district and borough authorities, protected landscapes and other stakeholders to speak with one voice on the infrastructure priorities for the area, focusing on the best ways of introducing innovation in our transport network.

The South East is a powerful motor for national prosperity, covering six local authorities which include 8.3 million residents and more than 300,000 businesses. It adds more than £200 billion a year to the UK economy, through the two largest UK airports, many of its busiest motorways, a string of major ports and crucial links to London, the rest of Britain and to Europe. Our aim is to transform the South East to a world leading region for sustainable economic growth, improving the lives of residents, businesses and visitors to our area. We have developed a [Transport Strategy](#) and a [Strategic Investment Plan](#) for the region.

Taking the specific questions you have asked in turn;

Do you agree we have identified the key issues our region is facing? Are there any other issues that you think need to be addressed?

As a neighbouring STB, TfSE are not as familiar with the issues in the Western Gateway region. As such it is difficult for us to answer this question with authority.

TfSE are members of the M4 to Dorset coast steering group and sit within 3 of the 4 proposed strategic transport corridors. The Solent Ports sit adjacent to the Western Gateway area and within the Midlands to South Coast corridor. With potential expansion of Southampton improving connectivity with the Midlands and the west of England would be of benefit.

TfSE share many of the common issues and sub issues that you outline in the paper, including those around:

- Decarbonisation
- Rural journeys & connectivity
- Freight (and other vehicle) emissions
- Road congestion
- Seaports & airports
- Levelling up & deprivation

Please rank the issues in order of what you consider to be the priority in our region

It is not possible for us to answer this question as we are not located in your region. However, our recent public consultation on our Strategic Investment Plan showed that the priorities for TfSE stakeholders (in no particular order) are:

- Decarbonisation & the environment; including achieving net zero and reducing the reliance on private cars
- Public transport; including calls for reduced fares, improved connectivity between modes and improvements to network and reliability
- Active travel; including calls to prioritise active travel over other modes and improvements to active travel infrastructure

- Connectivity; including improvements to orbital and east-west connectivity and between coastal communities
- Rural transport; including requests for improved connectivity within and between rural communities

Do you agree we have identified the right range of opportunities? Are there other opportunities you think we should consider? Please rank the opportunities in order of your preferred priority.

It would not be appropriate for TfSE to comment on the opportunities in a different area as we do not have adequate local knowledge. However the list of national and local opportunities you provide align with those that have been identified by TfSE in our own region and Strategic Investment Plan.

Please let us know any other views you have on the issues and opportunities we have outlined

There is little mention of economic (improving productivity and attracting investment) and social (improving the health, safety and wellbeing for everyone) objectives in your paper and it may be worth providing some strengthened narrative in these areas.

We recognise that this paper represents the earliest stage of your engagement process and look forward to being involved further as your plans progress.

Emailed to: norththanetlink@kent.gov.uk

May 2023

Dear Sirs

**TfSE Response to the North Thanet Link Highway Improvement Scheme Consultation
May – June 2023**

Transport for the South East welcomes the opportunity to respond to the North Thanet Link Highway Improvement Scheme Consultation.

Transport for the South East (TfSE) is a sub-national transport body (STB), which provides a single voice on the transport interventions needed to support sustainable economic growth across its geography. The South East is crucial to the UK economy and is the nation's major international gateway for people and business with some of the largest ports and airports in the country. High-quality transport infrastructure is critical to making the South East more competitive, contributing to national prosperity and improving the lives of our residents.

TfSE's transport strategy (2020) set out an ambitious 2050 vision for the area. Through a programme of area studies, we identified multimodal packages of transport interventions needed to deliver the strategy. Underpinned by this credible, evidence based technical programme, we consulted on our draft Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) in the autumn of 2022. Published in spring 2023, the SIP presents a compelling case for future decision making to help create a more productive, healthier, happier, and more sustainable south east.

The SIP is aligned with government priorities to rapidly decarbonise the transport system, improve public health outcomes, reduce congestion, improve road safety, level-up left-behind communities and facilitate sustainable economic growth. There is a need for more joined up planning, particularly between transport and housing, to help build more sustainable communities and enable more efficient business operations, putting the strategic transport infrastructure in place that enables communities to thrive and live happier, healthier, more active lives. Securing the right investment in the MRN is a crucial part in delivering our transport strategy.

TfSE supports delivery of the North Thanet Link Highway Improvement Scheme. Identified as a priority scheme in the SIP. Part of a package of improvements in the A28/A299 (Faversham – Ramsgate) South East Radial Major Road Network Corridor. It will provide an alternative route to the already congested A28 corridor. The existing A28 through Birchington and Westgate-on-Sea is heavily constrained. It also suffers from congestion and air-quality issues. The scheme also supports delivery of four local plan sites providing 5600 new houses. Supports the economic growth of Thanet. Will also provide additional walking and cycling routes.

The scheme continues to meet the overarching MRN objectives which are:

- Reducing congestion
- Supporting economic growth and rebalancing
- Supporting housing delivery
- Supporting all road users

Scheme analysis has taken into account the wider objectives of Government transport investment including:

- Active travel
- Improvements to facilitate larger buses.
- Decarbonisation

We consider that in accordance with Government policy every effort must be made to avoid and mitigate environmental impacts and ensure that biodiversity net gain is achieved through this project. We would therefore expect that a high-quality package of environmental mitigation measures is developed and delivered as part of the scheme.

This is an officer response. The TfSE Partnership Board meets on 3 July 2023 to consider the draft response and a further iteration of the response may follow.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss any element of this response.

Yours sincerely,

The national networks national policy statement: 2023 draft

Personal details

Q1. Your (used for contact purposes only):

name? Mat Jasper

email? mat.jasper@eastsussex.gov.uk

Q2. Are you responding:

on behalf of an organisation?

Organisation details

Q3. Your organisations name is?

Transport for the South East

NNNPS process

Q4. In your view does the draft NNNPS provide suitable information to those engaged in the process of submitting, examining and determining applications for development consent for nationally significant infrastructure projects on the:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
strategic road network?			X			
strategic rail network?			X			
strategic rail freight interchanges?		X				

Explain why, referring to specific sections of the NNNPS in your response.

The NPS is a very important document, setting out the national policy context for the development and delivery of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) on the national road and rail networks. TfSE is pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the draft NPS, given the important role that sub-national transport bodies play in working with local and national partners to shape regional investment priorities, which includes both national and local networks.

The TfSE transport strategy (published in July 2020) was developed based on a 'decide and provide' approach to transport provision. The transport strategy utilised future demand modelling to understand how and where the transport network might experience future strain. However, instead of simply identifying capacity enhancements for those parts of the network, the transport strategy sets out how potential congestion could be alleviated through multi-modal, cross network interventions, investing in public transport alternatives, developing integrated land use planning policies, adopting emerging transport technologies, and demand management policies.

We were therefore pleased that the draft NPS document references the importance of sustainable development and supports DfT's commitment to move away from predict and provide towards a vision-led approach. However, the remainder of the document does not appear to align with a decide and provide approach.

Firstly, it presents national networks as being separate from local networks, despite most trips on national road and rail networks starting and/or finishing on local networks and often in urban areas. National networks (particularly urban motorways) are often perceived as part of the local road network by local communities, so policies across both networks need to be carefully integrated, and the wider impacts of investment in strategic networks on local networks must be carefully understood.

Secondly, the draft NPS doesn't acknowledge the inherent relationship between strategic road and rail networks and how, for example, investment in passenger and freight rail capacity and connectivity could have congestion and emissions benefits on the strategic road network. Separating road, rail, and freight as they are in the draft NPS implies policies and investment decisions for each network are also made separately, rather than taking a more integrated approach to the system as a whole.

The NPS provides broadly useful context for development consent applications, but the suitability and practical use of its information for those engaged in the process of submitting, examining and determining such applications is limited. The information is broad and contextual, and as such it will be possible to frame both support for and objections to applications on the basis of the same elements of the policy. The information on demand is out of date and potentially provides a misleading picture of the need for and benefits of strategic investment particularly in rail.

There is little demonstration that 'decide and provide', is the intended approach. The information about both need for and policy in relation to rail emphasises the needs of existing rail users. It is limited on the need for and drivers and benefits of a shift to rail from other modes. Road investment appears to be based around growth of population leading to more road capacity need. There is no consideration of demand management, road user charging or other viable means to reduce capacity requirement and support travel choices.

The document does not provide any practical guidance on how alternatives to major road and rail capacity enhancements could be explored and funded. In providing choice for example, it might be more appropriate to invest in public transport, active travel and demand management measures on the surrounding networks, as an alternative to a road capacity enhancement scheme in an urban area, but the way that scheme assessments and investment decisions are currently made does not support meaningful exploration of such alternative or hybrid packages. The NPS guidance could help to address these challenges by providing clear guidance on how integrated solutions could be assessed, developed and delivered, particularly in the context of forthcoming DfT LTP guidance and the expected emphasis on a vision-led approach to local network planning.

The draft NPS makes multiple mention of mode shift (primarily in relation to rail freight) but does not follow that through with clear guidance on the potential for modal shift as an alternative or complementary component to major capacity enhancements. It does not set any clear aspirations to reduce demand for road travel through a decide-and-provide approach. The Committee on Climate Change's 6th Carbon Budget assumes, under its balanced Net Zero Pathway scenario, that 5-7% of car journeys could be

Q4. In your view does the draft NNNPS provide suitable information to those engaged in the process of submitting, examining and determining applications for development consent for nationally significant infrastructure projects on the:

shifted to walking and cycling by 2030 and 9-14% by 2050. It is also assumed that 9-12% of car trips can be switched to public transport by 2030 (17-24% by 2040). The dataset which sits behind the Sixth Carbon Budget shows that, during the 2020s, a very significant proportion of required CO2 emissions abatement is assumed to come from demand reduction (over 36% for 2021-25 and nearly 27% for 2026-30). It would be helpful for the NPS to reference these challenges. Much of this has the potential to be achieved by widening the choice for users.

There is also no mention of PAS 2080 carbon management standards which emphasise the importance of managing carbon impacts as early as possible in a strategy or scheme's development as possible to minimise both embodied and operational carbon emissions.

The NPS gives guidance and direction in line with legislation and government targets regarding the negative effects that new NSIP infrastructure may have and that they require consideration. What is not covered is the methodology or levels of acceptability other than that this detail is set out in the TAG. There are several mentions of accepting adverse effects if schemes are imperative for reasons of overriding public interest but not what qualifies a scheme as such. There is a risk that the NPS may not improve the effectiveness of delivery as the same objections and challenges will be levelled at schemes as currently under the existing NPS. If the NPS were to quantify levels of acceptability and methods of measure this would assist applicants. Not only in terms of what is of public interest but how to measure adverse effects and what levels are acceptable/desirable/required.

The NPS sets out the need and requirements for SRFI's to a much greater degree than road and rail. By their nature it is possible to be more specific. Chapter 4 sets out the requirements for minimum number of trains and their length that an SRFI should be able to handle. The infrastructure and type of location that would be more likely suitable as it did in the 2014 release.

Developing national networks

Q5. Does the draft NNNPS adequately set out:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
the need for developing national networks?			X			
our policy for addressing the need for the development of national networks?			X			

Provide comments on improvements referring to specific sections of the NNNPS in your response.
the need for developing national networks.

The statement of need is aligned with government policy and broadly fits with TfSE's understanding of the need for transport infrastructure:

- performance,
- economic growth,
- resilience,
- environment
- and safety.

The NPS sets out a case that there is a compelling need at a strategic level for the development of the national networks, both as individual networks and "as a fully integrated system". The overarching emphasis in the statement of need, is that demand is expected to continue to grow in future decades and that the need to provide a reliable and resilient network (for both roads and rail) is likely to override most negative impacts (including carbon emissions). It therefore appears to be an assumption that additional capacity will be necessary for national networks to fulfil their objectives.

It would be helpful if the NPS gave much more nuanced guidance to scheme promoters on how to assess need in specific locations (rather than simply setting out a more generic need for investment at a national level), and how they should work with partners to explore a wider range of options to tackle a specific issue on a particular part of the network; taking into account the full range of positive and negative impacts of investment decisions, particularly where major capacity enhancements are being considered.

The draft NPS underplays the potential for new SRN capacity to induce demand for travel (it states in paragraph 3.3 that "Evidence that development on the network leads to induced demand is limited"). However, the WSP/Rand report that this paragraph refers to, whilst acknowledging that the evidence base is not definitive, in fact states that: "Induced demand continues to occur and may be significant in some situations. The evidence reviewed in this study supports the findings of the SACTRA (1994) report that induced traffic does exist, though its size and significance is likely to vary in different circumstances". The report goes on to highlight that "induced demand is likely to be higher for capacity improvements in urban areas or on highly congested routes" and that "the evidence on the existence of induced demand means that it needs to be properly accounted for in the appraisal of capacity improvements to the Strategic Road Network." Hence, the NPS should reference this evidence more accurately and give much clearer guidance on the situations where induced demand is likely to be a particularly high risk and how this should be dealt with through the exploration of a wider range of options to tackle capacity issues on the network. This would reinforce the opportunity in urban areas to explore opportunities for demand management and mode shift as an alternative to capacity enhancement schemes on strategic networks.

The NPS does not address the issues of siloed funding of transport infrastructure and how this undermines the ability to do truly integrated transport planning. The importance of modal shift and behavioural change that will be required to achieve net zero are omitted other than in 3.31 where it is stated "Equally interventions could include measures to reallocate road space to systems for journeys addressing traffic growth via a vision-led approach to that plans for modal shift." Planning should include these types of intervention as part of the solution to the need for improvement rather than as a "bolt on" to road schemes. Greater benefit may be found through consideration of options to reduce traffic through mode shift rather than add capacity/reduce congestion with an element of active travel mode shift enablement built in.

NPS rightly references the importance of transport investment in supporting economic growth and the government's levelling up agenda; and it is critical that investment in the national networks is well aligned with local plans for delivering new houses and jobs. The NPS could be more explicit about the ways in which investment in national networks can "unlock sites for housing and employment growth made accessible by sustainable transport and the regenerative impact major infrastructure can play in driving urban renewal, increasing density, as well as creating new places and communities" (para 3.8). Whilst investment in new rail infrastructure (such as delivery of new stations or line extensions) can support a "transit-oriented" development approach new development. It's less obvious how investment in the SRN will deliver urban renewal and density. This needs to be more carefully articulated and made explicit in how different network investment decisions might support sustainable new development.

The data and commentary on rail demand risks failing to set out the need for development of the rail

Q5. Does the draft NNNPS adequately set out:

network and may even undermine the perception of that need. The recovery of rail demand has moved on considerably from the position in October 2021 and the data to June 2022.

Our understanding of the industry's latest position is that overall journeys are approaching pre-Pandemic levels, with commuting journeys and journeys within London – two key drivers of capacity requirements – at or near 2019 levels. Leisure travel by rail is already in excess of 2019 levels. It should be emphasised that growth in leisure travel is in addition to the return of commuting demand.

The pattern of rail travel is also now relatively well understood and stable, with Tuesday-Thursday journeys close to 2019, Mondays and Fridays lower but still approaching pre-Pandemic levels, and weekends and bank holidays significantly higher than pre-Pandemic. This is all despite the disruptive impacts on passenger demand of industrial action over the past year.

It is therefore likely that, as the industry expects, overall rail demand and growth rates will return to pre-Pandemic levels within relatively few years. This is particularly relevant given the timescales involved in developing and approving significant rail schemes.

The draft NPS rightly recognises that the rail network has been and continues to be congested, however this can be reinforced. In addition to the rightful focus on capacity, frequency and speed shortfalls in the midlands and north, the extent of crowding on trains and in stations in the south east has historically been acute. This has often meant that rail investment in the south east was 'running to catch up' with demand and crowding. Furthermore, post-pandemic passengers' needs are likely to reflect different perceptions of and behaviour in response to crowding. The NPS should not be able to be interpreted in a way that suggests the medium and long-term need to decide on and provide for rail development in the south east has been materially reduced by a temporary reduction in demand.

Drivers of need for the development of the rail network should also include the demand likely to be created by modal shift away from private cars, and not only consider pre- and post-Covid levels of capacity. Development of the network to enable modal shift will also need to include improving access to and interchange with rail, and increasing its reliability, as well as providing capacity.

The need for development to support the growth of rail freight is well expressed and something we strongly support, recognising that a positive policy and planning environment will be needed to actively support the development of rail freight.

Policy for addressing the need for the development of national networks.

The NPS sets out a range of measures at 3.42 that can be employed to make best use of all road capacity and to reduce demand on the SRN, including:

- enabling more active travel and public transport,
- locating and designing new developments to reduce car dependency,
- use of technology to better manage use of the network,
- and ensuring that the network is well maintained,

but then goes on to conclude that "the competing demands for road space will remain or even increase with diversification in the type and number of users, the vehicle they use, or where alternative sustainable modes are prioritised", and therefore concludes that investment in capacity enhancements is inevitable, stating in para 3.46 that: "The government's wider policy is to bring forward improvements and enhancements to the existing SRN where necessary to address the needs set out earlier. Enhancements to the existing national road network will include, but are not limited to:

- New and improved junctions and slip roads
- Improvements to trunk roads, in particular, dualling of single carriageway strategic trunk roads and additional lanes on existing dual carriageways
- Measures to enhance capacity of the motorway network".

The challenges on the current SRN are well known, evidenced and understood, and we would support improvements or enhancements where this is the case. Roads are important corridors and will continue to be so. Our SIP identifies a number of targeted integrated interventions to deliver better connections for freight, private and mass transit vehicles, and de-conflict local and longer distance traffic. We can already envisage a low carbon future for road use with improvements to the SRN helping to facilitate transport choice.

The policy to improve the connectivity, capacity and reliability of the railway network in order to realise the benefits of rail is very welcome. In the context of this policy, we note that the Rail Network Enhancements Pipeline (RNEP), to which NPS refers, has not been updated since autumn 2019. For NPS to be seen to be addressing the need, it would benefit from a commitment to regular, such as annual, updates to the RNEP.

In order to demonstrate that the need for transport choices is addressed, NPS should also highlight the potential for developments that improve access to and interchange with rail, including station developments as well as 'new rail links'.

Q5. Does the draft NNNPS adequately set out:

We recognise the need, as NPS states, for choices to be made in the context of the need for financial sustainability. In this context, we would welcome a more explicit and specific confirmation in NPS that a 'decide and provide' approach is to be taken to meeting the need for development.

General policies and considerations

Q6. In your view, is there any information missing from the "General Principles and considerations" chapter?

Yes

Information missing from General Principles and considerations

Q7. Provide comments on missing information, referring to specific sections of the NNNPS in your response.

The role of Sub-National Transport Bodies (STBs) is not mentioned in the document. STBs play a vital role in advising ministers on priorities across regional areas based on extensive evidence-led study work, and significant engagement with national and local stakeholders. By overlooking the role of STBs, NPS is missing an important element of expertise, evidence and an important opportunity to better integrate priorities across both local and national networks, within the context of a coherent regional transport strategy.

the NPS should specifically refer to the evidence produced by STBs which considers integration of modes, has regard to land use and will facilitate growth and a journey towards net zero.

Supporting freight facilities

Q9. Does the NNNPS support development of:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
freight facilities on the strategic road network, including lorry parking facilities?		X				
freight interchange infrastructure that encourages modal shift from road to rail?		X				

Explain why, referring to specific sections of the NNNPS in your response.

The NPS supports freight facilities and recognises the need for improvement of facilities including lorry parking. The NPS is also strong regarding consideration of SRFI's and interchange infrastructure required to encourage modal shift from road to rail.

There is a shortage of suitable lorry parking across the South East, for warehousing / storage and for driver rest facilities, partly caused by placing higher value on other land uses. Increased demand for home deliveries has increased the need for capacious and resilient supply chains, including suitably located warehousing and storage facilities, driver welfare facilities, and vehicle depots. TfSE published our Freight Logistics and Gateways Strategy in May 2022 which identifies that increasing provision of lorry parking and driver rest facilities can be explored through adopting different funding and operational models, including local authorities working with the private sector to deliver commercially viable sites.

Specific sections of the NNNPS that support these views include:

2.2-2.4 sets out the importance of domestic freight in achieving our economic goals domestically and internationally and the need to consider freight transport holistically integrating seamless modal interchanges through improvements to infrastructure with multi-modal impacts. This section highlights the importance of identifying the infrastructure needed to support an integrated network that facilitates modal shift, prioritises decarbonisation and improves air quality outcomes, and supports the continuous improvement of the economic efficiency and reliability of end-to-end freight journeys with greater resilience built into the system.

5.280 states that applicants "should recognise the importance of providing adequate lorry parking facilities, taking into account any local shortages, to reduce the risk of parking in locations that lack proper facilities or could cause a nuisance. The applicant may increase the project's scope to avoid impacts on the surrounding transport infrastructure and improve network resilience."

The Drivers of need for strategic rail freight interchanges section contains significant support for freight interchange infrastructure that encourages modal shift from road to rail. The revised NPS seeks to ensure that SRFIs are appropriately located, and that the operational rail connection elements are brought forwards in a timely manner to enable this to take place.

Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges (SRFIs)

Q10. In your view, are the changes to the SRFI section useful for the NNNPS?

Agree

Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges (SRFIs) reasoning

Q11. Explain why, referring to specific sections of the NNNPS in your response.

The updated NPS appears to have moved away from a position of providing SRFI's based on forecast need to a need for change to support government objectives through provision of SRFIs. This is an improvement and aligns with other policies.

Environmental ambitions

Q12. Does, in your view, the NNNPS adequately address:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
carbon considerations in the development of national networks?				X		
wider environmental targets in the development of national networks?				X		

Explain why, referring to specific sections in your response.

The draft NPS does reference carbon considerations throughout the document, as you would expect given that transport is currently the largest contributor to UK domestic greenhouse gas emissions, and the scale of the challenge to achieve net zero transport emissions by 2050. However, there is a lack of clarity in the document about how trade-offs should be made between the carbon impacts of any national network enhancements and any wider public interest in improving the performance and wider economic contribution of those networks.

DfT's Transport Decarbonisation Plan (TDP) and the Climate Change Committee's (CCC's) 6th Carbon Budget are both referenced, but the main emphasis is on the importance of a rapid transition to a zero-emission vehicle fleet rather than any reduction in overall travel demand or modal shift. .

The document mentions progress to-date in decarbonising transport and at paragraph 2.21 says: "Government's Transport Decarbonisation Plan demonstrates how we will deliver transport's contribution to emissions reduction in line with net zero, much of which has already been delivered or is in progress". Further evidence supporting this would be a welcome addition to the policy.

The references to the importance of climate change resilience and adaptation in paras 3.34-3.37 and 3.67-3.69 are welcomed and further detail on how this will be achieved in practice would also be welcomed.

In chapter five there is reference to how greenhouse gas emissions should be assessed and mitigated in new national network developments, including a whole life carbon assessment. This is welcomed and may be helpful to reference the PAS 2080.

Generic impacts

Q13. In your view, is there any information missing from the Generic Impacts chapter (chapter 5)?
Yes

Missing information for Generic impacts

Q14. Provide comments on missing information, referring to specific sections of the NNNPS in your response.

There should be guidance regarding the potential higher construction costs of designing solutions with lower environmental impacts (although these are often offset by lower long-term operational and whole life costs). The NPS could usefully provide more guidance on how to weigh up delivery cost considerations against wider environment, social and economic benefits of a more sensitive scheme design.

There is no mention of Carbon Net Zero Guidance Note (publishing.service.gov.uk) There are multiple ways that those designing and executing procurements in public infrastructure and construction projects can drive decarbonisation through their approach. This could be by signing up to an environmental or carbon standard for built assets (such as PAS 2080, EN15643, PAS 2035, and BREEAM), through ensuring that they maximise the application of existing procurement policy to do so (such as the National Procurement Policy Statement, PPN 06/21 and the Social Value Model), or by setting ambitious reduction targets at project level for carbon and material use (as HS2, for example, have done).

Appraisal of sustainability (AoS)

Q16. Do you agree or disagree with the findings of the AoS?

Don't know

Habitats regulation assessment (HRA)

Q18. Do you agree or disagree with the findings of the HRA?

Don't know

Public Sector Equality Duty

Q20. Do you think the NNNPS could further support the aims of the PSED, particularly relating to the characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010?

Don't know

Final comments

Q22. Any other comments?

Transport for the South East (TfSE) is a sub-national transport body (STB), which represents sixteen local transport authorities. 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. Authorities are represented on the Shadow Partnership Board along with representatives from the region's five Local Enterprise Partnerships, District and Borough authorities, the protected landscapes in the TfSE area, Highways England, Network Rail and Transport for London.

TfSE provides a single voice on the transport interventions needed to support sustainable economic growth across its geography. The South East is crucial to the UK economy and is the nation's major international gateway for people and business with some of the largest ports and airports in the country. High-quality transport infrastructure is critical to making the South East more competitive, contributing to national prosperity and improving the lives of our residents.

TfSE supports the need for intervention, following on from the strategy TfSE have published a Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) in March 2023 to help both government and LTA's prioritise investment in our region and make the transition to a net zero network. The packages detailed in the SIP address eight investment priorities aligned with the vision and strategic goals of the TfSE Transport Strategy and the wider regional and national policy context. It provides a framework for investment in strategic transport infrastructure, services, and regulatory interventions in the coming three decades.

The SIP represents the culmination of five years of technical work, stakeholder engagement, and institutional development. It is underpinned by a credible, evidence-based technical programme that has enabled TfSE and our partners to: understand the current and future challenges and opportunities in the South East.

- identify stakeholder priorities for their respective areas of interest.
- evaluate the impacts of a wide range of plausible scenarios on the South East's economy, society, and environment.
- develop multi-modal, cross-boundary interventions.
- assess the impact of proposed interventions on transport and socio-economic outcomes; and
- prioritise the interventions that best address the South East's most pressing challenges and unlock the South East's most promising opportunities.

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.

The packages outlined in the SIP are a step-change from "predict and provide" capacity enhancements of the past. Aligned with our vision and supporting not only strategic movement of vehicles but our places and communities. They have been refined to minimise increases in carbon emissions and impact on the wider environment but there is a need for further mitigation as these packages and interventions develop. Road packages must be complimented by other interventions.

- To promote demand management and digital technology.
- To reduce the number of trips.
- To accelerate the decarbonisation of road vehicles,
- To promote sustainable travel.

The need for decarbonisation is strongly reflected within the TfSE Transport Strategy Vision, which states: "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 support this vision, it is important to recognise that:

- Decarbonisation of the transport system is not happening fast enough.
- The South East's transport systems need to adapt to a new normal- i.e., post pandemic, post Brexit environment.
- There is a need to "level up" left behind communities.
- There is a need for sustainable regeneration and growth.

RESPONSE TO THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION ON THE INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

TfSE welcomes the opportunity to comment on the technical consultation on the Infrastructure Levy. Transport for the South East has agreed the following response at officer level. A copy of this response will be presented to the July meeting of the TfSE Partnership Board on 3 July for endorsement, which means that a further iteration of it may follow.

Introductory comments

Transport for the South East (TfSE) is the Sub-national Transport Body (STB) for the south east of England. Our partnership brings together 16 local transport authorities, five local enterprise partnerships, 46 district and borough authorities and a range of wider stakeholders from the worlds of transport, business and the environment.

This unrivalled partnership of civic and business leaders is best placed to understand the potential for economic growth in our area. By speaking with one voice on our region's transport priorities, we're able to make a strong case to government for the investment the south east needs.

In reviewing the technical aspects of the Infrastructure Levy (IL), TfSE has outlined below the implications and opportunities of the proposals for our 16 constituent local transport authorities.

General points

TfSE welcome the government's desire to ensure that local authorities receive a fairer share of the money that typically accrues to landowners and developers. We hope that this will help to support the provision of much needed infrastructure such as affordable housing, schools, GP surgeries, green spaces as well as the transport infrastructure that will deliver the connectivity improvements that local communities expect with new development. We would like to ensure that a good proportion of the Levy comes directly to county councils/upper tier authorities as key infrastructure providers.

It is acknowledged that as part of the proposals the intention is to build upon and replace the Infrastructure Delivery Plans that currently support the production local plans and draw upon key documents like the Local Transport Plan (LTP) or Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIPs).

However, we have concerns regarding the potential scope of Levy funded infrastructure. The focus of Local Transport Plans will be the need to provide the transport user with options to support a shift in mode choice to meet the transport decarbonisation challenge, address air quality issues, tackle congestion and promote active travel. The consultation document for the new Infrastructure Levy fund suggests that although multi-modal infrastructure and public transport provision is desirable it is not integral to development. This would undermine the crucial need to provide users with choicest and represents a conflict between government ambitions and guidance. Responsibility of developers and local planning authorities must have

due regard to the IL to deliver sustainable places that will provide the necessary major investment in active and passenger travel infrastructure. The ambitions for the Levy fund do not align with Transport for the South East's recently published Strategic Investment Plan (SIP). This makes the case for improvements to existing infrastructure and encouraging behaviour change, to achieve modal shift and choice.

We are pleased to see that as part of the new IL, the *“Levy funded infrastructure will be used to deliver infrastructure that is required because of planned growth that will have a cumulative impact on an area and creates the need for new infrastructure to mitigate its impact”*. This will include enhancements to public transport routes, strategic walking, wheeling or cycling routes, or new and enhanced movement corridors. This aligns with the TfSE's SIP in advocating that local transport authorities and planning authorities adopt a more integrated and collaborative approach when it comes to delivering new infrastructure, to alleviate congestion on local roads.

One of the main selling points of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was that it would deliver a simplified system with a greatly reduced role for S106 agreements. However, it would appear that neither of these objectives will be delivered via the new IL. There are concerns that one complex system is being replaced with another, as it will potentially require higher levels of resourcing to monitor, process, and enforce the Levy at later stages of development. However, we do welcome the proposed system being mandatory and non-negotiable as, in theory, developers will have to take full account of the Levy when agreeing price for land and will therefore reduce the risk of them overpaying or negotiating the contributions through viability assessments.

It is TfSE's view that Local Transport Authorities should be able to have a genuine influence on Levy priorities, as well as the distribution of monies to fund those projects. This is to ensure that these proposals do not exacerbate the gap in infrastructure requirements and funding that the councils are currently experiencing. It is critical that there is a statutory requirement for Local Transport Authorities to be consulted and input into spending plans to ensure receipt of an agreed share of contributions. TfSE advocates the need for the development of Infrastructure Delivery Strategy as part of the IL process. A robust evidence base that is agreed between the Local Transport Authorities and the Local Planning Authority to validate the necessity of infrastructure and then sets out what infrastructure is necessary will be invaluable when setting out funding.

TfSE are unable to support a proposal that would further direct funds away from the delivery of key infrastructure when considering the flexibility of the use of levy funding. The proposal suggests that funds would be directed away from the delivery of key infrastructure requirements such as highways and would therefore put delivery at risk. The SIP which is a blueprint for investment up until 2050, requires authorities to be able to progress schemes in line with agreed priorities, and have dependencies on local authorities' LTP delivery and government targets, such as net zero.

Response to specific questions

Question 6: Are there other non-infrastructure items not mentioned in this document that this element of the Levy funds could be spent on?

Yes. There are several activities relating to transport infrastructure which are integral to its delivery, for instance sub-regional transport modelling, strategy development, and feasibility and design work. In addition, the use of the Levy to supplement integral multi-modal infrastructure such as e-bike/e-scooter schemes and car clubs is supported. The Levy would also be well placed to fund road safety and behaviour/education schemes including school crossing patrols, and also freight management and zero emission delivery schemes. There may also be items that cannot be foreseen at this time such as technologies relating to energy provision, digital connectivity and electric vehicles.

Any funding towards a greater number of non-infrastructure matters would not stretch the funding available across services and would not be to the detriment of the delivery of key infrastructure.

General comments from TfSE that are not covered by consultation questions.

It is reassuring that the consultation makes clear that Local Planning Authorities will be able to continue to use S278 and S38 agreements for highways matters. With pressures to deliver homes, transport is always highlighted as a key issue as part of the development management process, it is often contentious and a concern for both residents and visitors, they will want some certainty about the process and for transport infrastructure to be delivered. The proposals, as drafted, reduce authorities' ability to secure transportation infrastructure in accordance with their own priorities.



Rupert Clubb

Lead officer, Transport for the South East