



Note: This is a printout of an online questionnaire submission. Where answers are highlighted yellow or a cross is in the box, that indicates a positive response.

Transport for the South East draft Transport Strategy Public Consultation – for Organisations

Introduction

We are pleased to present the draft Transport Strategy for South East England, prepared by Transport for the South East (TfSE), the region's Sub-national Transport Body.

This strategy outlines a vision for the South East to be recognised globally for achieving sustainable prosperity and the highest quality of life.

You can view the full draft Transport Strategy and a summary document online or by requesting a paper copy.

Please consider these documents before submitting your response.

In addition to the strategy, an Integrated Sustainability Appraisal has been conducted to assess the strategy's impact on sustainability goals, including biodiversity, health, and access equity. We are also asking for comments on this.

You can view all documents online at tfse.org.uk

Feedback received in this consultation will be incorporated as part of the development of the final Transport Strategy which will be published in 2025.

You can complete this survey online at:

<https://tfse.engage-360.co.uk/>

You can also return a paper copy to us at the address below by **7 March 2025**:

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

This survey should take around 20 minutes to complete.

Our privacy notice is provided at the end of this survey so you can see how we use your data.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.



About your Organisation

Q What is the name of your organisation?

Kent County Council

Q What type of organisation do you represent?

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Local authority | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Business | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Charity of third sector | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Transport operator | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| National partner | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Town or Parish Council | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Airport or Port | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If you answered 'other' above please tell us the type of organisation you represent

Q I confirm that I am authorised to respond to this consultation on behalf of my organisation

Yes ☒

No ☐

Q What is your name?

Simon Jones

Q What is your job title?

Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport - Kent County Council



Q Please tell us your email address

Joseph.Ratcliffe@kent.gov.uk

Challenges

Since TfSE published its first Transport Strategy in 2020, the context has evolved significantly. National and local policy changes, intensified decarbonisation efforts, post Brexit trade dynamics, and shifts in travel behaviour due to the pandemic all present new challenges.

Our research has identified several key challenges that need to be tackled if the region is to succeed.

You can find full details of the challenges our region faces on page 6 of the draft Transport Strategy summary document, and from page 25 of the full draft Transport Strategy document.

Q Do you agree that the challenges we have outlined above are the right ones that the Transport Strategy should be seeking to address?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree or disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q Do you think there are any other challenges we should consider?

Financial challenges have not only impacted on the delivery of capital projects – there is a challenge that highway authorities across the South East are unable to maintain our highways to the standard that our residents expect. This has been made worse in recent years with high levels of inflation and funding not index linked so spending power on highways has reduced.

Q Are there any other comments you would like to make on the challenges?

These are not set out as “Challenges” in the Transport Strategy but rather the “Changing context of the South East” and “Case for Action,” and it would be helpful if consistent language could be used across all documents.

Where constituent members have adopted new Local Transport Plans (LTPs), this need not require a refresh of the regional Transport Strategy. Those Local Transport Plans should have regard to the TfSE Strategy. Where new infrastructure appears in those plans then the Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) could be updated with an addendum to reflect that. Otherwise, with so many constituent bodies, the TfSE Transport Strategy will need to be updated very frequently, which would be a poor use of resources that could instead help towards frontline delivery of transport infrastructure.

Most of the contextual reasons identified are not region-specific. The Transport Strategy states that the local evidence base has been extensively researched and it could therefore be expected that this would have yielded more region-specific transport challenges.

When looking at the region's challenges (page 23 of the Transport Strategy), again many of these are national issues or difficult to address through transport. For example, housing affordability may even worsen with improved transport links! However, the recognition of challenges specific to this area, such as the east-west connectivity and international trade, is welcomed.

An important challenge that should be recognised is the backlog of local road maintenance and, relatedly, the need to include appropriate funding for maintenance of new infrastructure in capital project costs. This is covered in the context of the Resilience mission but it is certainly a challenge that needs resolving for the whole transport network to operate efficiently and should be included upfront in the strategy. It is clear that the maintenance backlog has become worse since the last strategy as funding is not index linked and the cost of works has increased given inflation, leading to continued reductions in maintenance budgets.

During the time period of this consultation there has been significant progress on devolution and Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). The Transport Strategy should consider including this as a challenge. It will not only materially change the local government landscape across the region, but (in the short term) create a disparity in the way highways and transportation services are delivered and planned across the TfSE area. It will also necessitate new Local Transport Plans at the Mayoral level, and changes to the way transport and land use planning interact.

Given this background, TfSE may want to reconsider whether to finalise this refresh of the Transport Strategy or pause it to consider how these new structures might affect priorities and delivery.

As an aside, TfSE will need to consider how its membership and hosting move forward in the new Local Government landscape, particularly as a result of the separation of Local Transport Authority and Highway Authority roles within the new Mayoral Strategic Authority – Unitary Authority structure (where this is happening).

Vision and Goals

Our vision is to create a region that not only leads the way in sustainable, net zero carbon growth but also offers its residents, businesses, and visitors the highest quality of life.

This vision is supported by three goals, addressing the pillars of sustainable development: fostering a competitive economy, improving social outcomes, and safeguarding the region's natural and historic environment.

Together, these goals ensure that growth in the South East is inclusive, resilient, and sustainable.

You can find full details of our vision and goals on page 7 of the draft Transport Strategy summary document, and page 35 of the full draft Transport Strategy document.



Q How strongly do you support the visions and goals in the draft Transport Strategy?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly support | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither support or do not support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q Do you have any further comments on the vision or the goals?

The vision and goals align with the initial information on the Integrated National Transport Strategy (INTS) – a transport network that works for everyone and offers real opportunities. KCC supports the ambitious nature of the vision and goals but TfSE needs to consider how each can be achieved without detriment to the others.

KCC supports the six principles. Our recently adopted Local Transport Plan 5 also supports the vision and validate approach.



Strategic Connectivity Mission

Connectivity refers to the speed, frequency, and ease by which people and goods move between places. TfSE's focus is on strategic and regional connectivity, as local connectivity is led by our local authority partners.

You can find full details of our strategic connectivity mission on page 10 of the draft Transport Strategy summary document, and page 44 of the full draft Transport Strategy document.

Strategic Connectivity Mission



We will boost connectivity in the South East by enhancing strategic regional corridors and ensure all communities can access high-quality transport links and key services.

We will have succeeded when:

- ▶ The connectivity of all the South East's strategic corridors – in terms of journey times and reliability – is comparable to those corridors that serve London.
- ▶ Key towns, cities, and international gateways are as accessible by public transport as they are by car, and rail freight is as competitive as long-distance road freight.

Short-Term Priorities

We will improve the existing network to better serve passengers and freight by:

- ▶ Enhancing incentives for long-distance public transport through optimised fares, flexible ticketing, and improved amenities.
- ▶ Refining timetables to cater to leisure travel demand and minimising disruption from maintenance schedules.
- ▶ Advancing key connectivity projects to improve regional transport links.
- ▶ Restoring international rail services from Ebbsfleet and Ashford to ease pressure at St Pancras.
- ▶ Expanding rail capacity to support growth at Gatwick and Southampton airports.
- ▶ Safeguarding critical areas and aligning policies to enable long-term transport improvements.

Long-Term Priorities

We will focus on major upgrades and expansions to improve connectivity by:

- ▶ Upgrading the roads and railways serving the Brighton–Southampton coastal corridor to strengthen economic ties between the regions two largest built-up areas..
- ▶ Cutting journey times between London and less well-connected coastal communities.
- ▶ Improving ferry services to islands, including the Isle of Wight.
- ▶ Strengthening freight links from Southampton and the Channel Ports to the Midlands and North.
- ▶ Expanding rail connections to international gateways, including Heathrow and Gatwick.
- ▶ Reviewing the configuration of regional rail services to leverage opportunities at Old Oak Common.



Q How strongly do you support the strategic connectivity mission in the draft Transport Strategy?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly support | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither support or do not support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q How important are the key outcomes of the strategic connectivity mission to your organisation?



	Very important	Important	Neither important or not important	Not very important	Not important at all	Don't know
Journey time and reliability on strategic corridors is comparable to those serving London	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Key towns, cities and international gateways are as accessible by public transport as they are by car	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rail freight is as competitive as road freight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q How strongly do you support the priorities which will enable us to improve strategic connectivity?

Short-term and long-term priorities are shown at the top of this page.

Strongly support	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Support	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neither support or do not support	<input type="checkbox"/>
Oppose	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly oppose	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q Please tell us the one priority from the list at the top of the page you see as most important to achieving this mission?

The most important priority for Kent from the selection in the mission is the restoration of international rail services from Ebbsfleet and Ashford stations (note that it should be **both** stations not one or the other). KCC also strongly supports *Enhancing incentives for long-distance public transport by optimising fares, ticketing, and on-board amenities*.

In terms of the most important priority for achieving the mission, there is not a single priority that will alone achieve the mission but rather all work together to incrementally achieve better connectivity.

However, TfSE may want to reconsider where some priorities are placed within the Strategy as the Kent Bifurcation Strategy (the splitting of cross channel freight traffic between the M2/A2 and M20/A20 and improved links between the two strategic corridors) and delivery of the Lower Thames Crossing is a Strategic Connectivity priority as much as it is about Resilience. Furthermore, the resolving issues affecting the smooth operation of our international borders (including the impact the new Entry/Exit system will have) is also a priority affecting the region's Strategic Connectivity.

Resilience Mission



The resilience of the South East's transport network is vital to the region's economic, social, and environmental well-being.

You can find full details of our resilience mission on page 12 of the draft Transport Strategy summary document, and page 52 of the full draft Transport Strategy document.

Resilience Mission



We will safeguard the South East's connectivity and enhance the reliability and resilience of our transport systems for future generations.

We will have succeeded when:

- ▶ The transport network delivers comfortable, reliable journeys between key towns, cities, and international gateways.
- ▶ The transport network has the capacity and agility to manage, absorb, and recover from major disruptions quickly, and when the risk of major failures occurring is reduced.

Short-Term Priorities

We will strengthen the current network's resilience by:

- ▶ Assessing road disruption impacts and securing sustainable funding for maintenance.
- ▶ Establishing long-term funding pipelines for infrastructure renewals.
- ▶ Strategically planning for future risks to enhance network adaptability.
- ▶ Advocating for consistent funding for maintenance and prevention projects.
- ▶ Coordinating with utility providers to minimise disruption from roadworks.

Long-Term Priorities

We will focus on major upgrades and expansions to strengthen resilience by:

- ▶ Tackling rail bottlenecks in areas like Croydon and Woking to boost reliability on key corridors.
- ▶ Creating alternative routes, such as the Uckfield-Lewes line, to maintain connectivity during disruptions.
- ▶ Implementing the Kent Bifurcation Strategy to ease pressure on the Thames crossings and strengthen links between Channel and M25 – including improving Operation Brock and Stack.
- ▶ Resolving highway pinch points to improve flow for all users, including buses, boosting resilience to future risks.



Q How strongly do you support the resilience mission in the draft Transport Strategy?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly support | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither support or do not support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q How important are the key outcomes of the resilience mission to your organisation?

- | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|
| Very important | Important | Neither important or not important | Not very important | Not important at all | Don't know |
|----------------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|



The transport network delivers comfortable, reliable journeys between key towns, cities and international gateways

☐☒☐☐☐☐

The transport network has the agility to manage and absorb disruptions quickly

☒☐☐☐☐☐

Q How strongly do you support the priorities which will enable us to improve resilience?

Short-term and long-term priorities are shown at the top of this page.

Strongly support

☐

Support

☒

Neither support or do not support

☐

Oppose

☐

Strongly oppose

☐

Don't know

☐

Q Please tell us the one priority from the list at the top of the page you see as most important to achieving this mission?

The most important priority is to secure index linked sustainable funding for maintenance, which is a combination of the short-term priorities 2 and 4. Getting all infrastructure to a baseline acceptable level of condition will be the foundation for building up further resilience as well as for achieving the other missions. In Kent, the implementation of the Kent Bifurcation Strategy and Lower Thames Crossing is also a very high priority.

Note that the short-term priority of coordinating with utility providers will need to include reference to street works as well as road works.



Inclusion and Integration Mission

Creating an inclusive and integrated transport network should be a fundamental part of planning and decision-making. However, TfSE's engagement with socially excluded groups has revealed that many communities across the region still face barriers to access, putting them at risk of exclusion.

You can find full details of our inclusion & integration mission on page 14 of the draft Transport Strategy summary document, and page 60 of the full draft Transport Strategy document.

Inclusion & Integration Mission



We will create an inclusive, affordable, and integrated transport network across the South East, providing safe and seamless door-to-door connectivity for everyone.

We will have succeeded when:

- ▶ Everyone can affordably travel where they need to go when they need to go.
- ▶ Customer satisfaction with all aspects of the transport network is high across all sections of society.

Infrastructure Priorities

We will target infrastructure upgrades by:

- ▶ Designing inclusive infrastructure to improve accessibility for socially excluded groups.
- ▶ Enhancing connectivity in North and East Kent and East Sussex coastal areas to reduce social exclusion.
- ▶ Upgrading interchanges and providing step-free access at transport hubs for seamless connections.

Service Priorities

We will improve affordability and accessibility by:

- ▶ Offering affordable fares and concessions for vulnerable groups to improve accessibility.
- ▶ Simplifying fares with unified ticketing to lower costs and streamline journeys.
- ▶ Providing socially necessary transport to connect isolated communities with essential services.
- ▶ Implementing Bus Service Improvement Plans and exploring franchising models to better serve communities.
- ▶ Enhancing connectivity to islands and peninsulas, focusing on the Solent and Medway.



Q How strongly do you support the inclusion and integration mission in the draft Transport Strategy?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly support | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither support or do not support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q How important are the key outcomes of the inclusion and integration mission to your organisation?

- | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|
| Very important | Important | Neither important or | Not very important | Not important at all | Don't know |
|----------------|-----------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|



not
important

Everyone can affordably travel
where they need to go and when

☒☐☐☐☐☐

Customer satisfaction with the
transport network is high across
all sections of society

☒☐☐☐☐☐

Q How strongly do you support the priorities which will enable us to improve inclusion and integration?

Infrastructure and service priorities are shown at the top of this page.

Strongly support

☐

Support

☐

Neither support or do not support

☒

Oppose

☐

Strongly oppose

☐

Don't know

☐

Q Please tell us the one priority from the list at the top of the page you see as most important to achieving this mission?

Implementing the Bus Service Improvement Plans is probably the most important to achieving the aims of this mission. However, KCC also recognises the importance of affordable fares – particularly for families. Train fares especially have too many confusing options and the customer has to work out the most affordable route and time period to travel.



Decarbonisation Mission

The UK Government, TfSE, and all local authorities in the South East are committed to achieving net zero transport emissions by 2050.

You can find full details of our decarbonisation mission on page 16 of the draft Transport Strategy summary document, and page 68 of the full draft Transport Strategy document.

Decarbonisation Mission



We will lead the South East to a net zero future by 2050 by accelerating the shift to zero-emission travel, incentivising sustainable travel choices, and embracing new technologies to reduce emissions and combat climate change.

We will have succeeded when:

- ▶ All surface transport trips made across the South East are net-zero emission by 2050 (at the latest).
- ▶ We have not exceeded our carbon budgets for surface transport by 2050.
- ▶ The South East is seen as a world leader in decarbonising transport.

Short-Term Priorities

We will accelerate the transition to low-carbon transport by:

- ▶ Expanding Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure for private and freight vehicles.
- ▶ Increasing the availability of electric and hydrogen vehicles through collaborating with industry.
- ▶ Supporting EV and battery recycling to reduce the environmental impact of EVs.
- ▶ Improving public transport and active travel infrastructure to provide attractive sustainable travel options.
- ▶ Transitioning bus, freight, and ferry fleets to zero-emission vehicles.
- ▶ Promoting integrated land use and transport planning to minimise unnecessary car travel.

Long-Term Priorities

We will solidify the transition to a zero-emission system by:

- ▶ Decarbonising rail through delivering electrification, battery, and alternative fuel trains.
- ▶ Promoting low-carbon infrastructure with sustainable materials and practices.
- ▶ Supporting Government in the event they commit to roll out national road user charging, providing a financial incentive for more sustainable choices while reducing congestion.
- ▶ Working with industry to deliver a decarbonised, resilient power networks for rail and electric vehicles.
- ▶ Advancing alternative fuels for aviation and long-haul freight.



Q How strongly do you support the decarbonisation mission in the draft Transport Strategy?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Support | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither support or do not support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q How important are the key outcomes of the decarbonisation mission to your organisation?

- | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|
| Very important | Important | Neither important or not important | Not very important | Not important at all | Don't know |
|----------------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|

All surface transport trips are net zero emission by 2050



	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We have not exceeded our carbon budgets by 2025	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The South East is seen as a world leader in decarbonising transport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q How strongly do you support the priorities which will enable us to improve decarbonisation?

Short-term and long-term priorities are shown at the top of this page.

Strongly support	<input type="checkbox"/>
Support	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Neither support or do not support	<input type="checkbox"/>
Oppose	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly oppose	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q Please tell us the one priority from the list at the top of the page you see as most important to achieving this

KCC considers that the priorities to support the uptake of EVs will be most important, and this is strongly supported in Kent's Local Transport Plan 5. This includes short term priorities 1, 2 and 3. However, improving public transport and active travel infrastructure will also be important and necessary for supporting decarbonisation and there should also be a priority to develop a suitable fare strategy that encourages journeys to move from the private car to public transport.



Sustainable Growth Mission

The sustainable growth mission aims to deliver prosperity without harming the welfare of future generations. It supports the UK Government's first mission, to "kick start economic growth".

You can find full details of our strategic growth mission on page 18 of the draft Transport Strategy summary document, and page 76 of the full draft Transport Strategy document.

Sustainable Growth Mission



We will champion transport interventions that unlock investment opportunities, enable sustainable growth, and create healthy, vibrant, and well-connected communities.

We will have succeeded when:

- ▶ Population growth and economic development in the South East is underpinned by sustainable transport and infrastructure,
- ▶ The South East has created well-connected communities with easy access to key services and employment opportunities.

Policy Enablers

We will promote integrated land use and transport planning and enablers by:

- ▶ Concentrating development in areas with strong transport infrastructure.
- ▶ Coordinating housing and transport planning across authorities.
- ▶ Leveraging value capture and other mechanisms to forward-fund transport.
- ▶ Using demand management measures to improve air quality and fund services.
- ▶ Strengthening local planning capacity.

Transport Intervention Priorities

We will prioritise essential transport projects to support sustainable growth by:

- ▶ Expanding concessionary schemes to make sustainable travel more affordable.
- ▶ Developing mass transit systems in high-density areas to improve access and reduce congestion.
- ▶ Enhancing Sussex Coast and Solent suburban rail services to compete with road travel.
- ▶ Delivering Local Cycling Walking Improvement Plans and embedding active travel in all new developments..



Q How strongly do you support the sustainable growth mission in the draft Transport Strategy?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly support | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither support or do not support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q How important are the key outcomes of the sustainable growth mission to your organisation?



	Very important	Important	Neither important or not important	Not very important	Not important at all	Don't know
Population growth and economic development is underpinned by sustainable transport and infrastructure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The South East has well connected communities with easy access services and employment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q How strongly do you support the priorities which will enable us to improve sustainable growth?

Transport Intervention priorities are shown at the top of this page.

Strongly support	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Support	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neither support or do not support	<input type="checkbox"/>
Oppose	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly oppose	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q Please tell us the one priority from the list at the top of the page you see as most important to achieving this

Developing mass transit systems in high density areas, such as the Fastrack Bus Rapid Transit network in Kent Thameside and newly in Dover. Alongside this, to ensure that journeys are made on public transport, KCC considers that expanding concessionary travel to make sustainable travel more affordable must also be a high priority.

Q Do you have any further comments on any of the five missions?

Strategic connectivity:

The mission will have been achieved when the strategic corridors have journey times and reliability comparable to corridors serving London. However, not all of our rail corridors into London are as reliable or fast as they should be. Some routes have actually gotten slower in recent years (for example, Maidstone East into London Victoria).

Similarly, success is when rail freight is as competitive as long-distance road freight. This is important to us as an organisation – our own Local Transport Plan 5 proposes to work with the industry, Network Rail and government to make the case for investment to make this possible (such as rail gauge enhancements). The priority in the Transport Strategy is to strengthen freight links with reference to capacity constraints but it should be recognised that full scale infrastructure upgrades are needed too, and this is not something TfSE or constituent bodies have any control over (beyond making the case). For lots of industries, the double handling from unloading goods

wagons and transferring to road haulage for the last part of the journey also affects the competitiveness of rail. These factors make succeeding in this mission highly improbable.

Long term priority 4 should also reference the domestic rail network. Long term priority 5 states that a new chord is needed near Redhill but Network Rail have not committed to this being the only possible solution.

Short term priority 4 should say Ebbsfleet AND Ashford, KCC supports services being reinstated to both.

The Bakerloo Line Extension should be a short-term priority for the South East. It will not provide significant support for this Mission as it will release capacity for commuter trips rather than enhancing strategic connectivity. A short-term priority for TfSE should not be a scheme that has such minimal benefit to the TfSE area.

The section would benefit from some further explanation of how some of these priorities will be delivered, although perhaps that is more the role of the Strategic Investment Plan (SIP)? For example, the review of timetables and incentivisation of sustainable travel choices.

There are some priorities that cut across both the Strategic Connectivity and Resilience Mission and could be promoted in both. Specifically, the Kent Bifurcation Strategy and delivery of the Lower Thames Crossing currently fall under Resilience but they also support the region's connectivity to the Midlands and North and also internationally.

Resilience:

This section should place greater emphasis on clearing the maintenance backlog on the region's highway network within the short-term priorities or a slight change of context to priority 4, which currently implies that this is about coastal erosion and other more specific issues rather than general maintenance.

The mission is aimed at the "strategic transport network" but all journeys start and end on local roads so these also need to be resilient – if you cannot get to the strategic network then you still cannot make your journey.

KCC is looking to investigate the economic costs of street works and road works, particularly emergency street works for which there is a broad definition. The support of TfSE in undertaking this work would be welcomed, and it is the first short term priority in the resilience section. Alternatively, KCC would be able to support TfSE carrying out this study so that it has a regional perspective. A trial could be undertaken on the A25 in Kent to test any of the recommendations or proposals that might come out of the study. This has the support of the local MP.

Inclusion and integration:

The context and outcomes for this mission relate to inclusion in the sense of creating an equitable and accessible transport system (from a physical and mental health perspective as well as in terms of affordability). However, the 3rd infrastructure priority is about improving interchange facilities at stations and public transport hubs, which is about integrated transport. The context and outcomes of this section could be widened to talk more about an integrated transport system, in line with the

emerging Integrated National Transport Strategy. Alternatively, the mission could be split to cover the two separate aspects in more complete detail.

The fares and ticketing interventions need more context in how they might be applied – how much do local government boundaries currently affect passengers ability to travel? Generally, local government has no role in ticketing and it's down to the geographical range of different operators, how central government set/regulate fares (where applicable) and, in the case of rail, tickets are not operator-specific anyway.

Arguably intervention 3 under 'fares, ticketing and service priorities' could be combined with intervention 4 since the Bus Service Improvement Plans (BSIPs) and emerging models of operating the bus network will be inherently linked with the provision of socially necessary services.

There should be more priorities for the physical integration of transport – such as provision of transport hubs and roll out of Mobility as a Service (MaaS) pending successful outcomes from where it's trialled across the region. Integration across modes naturally improves accessibility and inclusion for all transport users, for example digitisation of timetables into multimodal journey planners removes a potential barrier where transport users are unable to read or match up timetables.

Decarbonisation:

This mission goes beyond what the region can achieve in isolation and therefore makes it extremely difficult to achieve. Norway is on track to be the first country to only sell new electric vehicles but it has done this by increasingly taxing Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) vehicles and providing a far superior Electric Vehicle (EV) charging network than the UK has. These demand action by central government.

From developing Local Transport Plan 5 (LTP5), KCC has demonstrated that a derived local carbon budget cannot be met with the proposals currently in the plan. Further, there is not the current national directive to meet a local budget. Without that requirement, any one area is unlikely to be able to make the very tough choices to get there.

Long term priority 6 is to support the government in the development and delivery of a national road user charging proposal. However, KCC would prefer TfSE to commit to making representation that reflects the positions of its constituent members should any government proposal come forward on this matter, such as to address the reduced taxation income from reduced fuel duty receipts due to increased uptake of electric vehicles.

Other priorities, such as ensuring the region's power network has sufficient capacity and resilience, are necessary but it is unclear how TfSE will be able to influence this.

Under the three-pronged approach to decarbonisation, it says that High Speed One (HS1) opening ensured that Eurostar replaced the London-Paris air route. However, Air France alone runs at least 5 flights a day from London to Paris and Eurostar now does not serve the Kent Stations. A priority from the Strategic Connectivity mission to reinstate services from Ebbsfleet and Ashford could be reiterated in this section.

Sustainable Growth:



The key enablers for this mission will require changes in national policy or more devolution to local leaders (pending the implementation of the English Devolution White Paper). KCC does not currently support workplace parking levies, congestion charging or tolls on new roads (outside of the existing national policy for tolled estuarial crossings). If these are put forward, then their interaction with the Inclusion and Integration mission should be considered as there will need to be viable and affordable alternatives to the private car, which these measures would affect.

Ultimately this mission will be heavily influenced by the proposals in the English Devolution White Paper, which reintegrates land use and transport planning. However, we broadly support the “infrastructure first” principle on which this mission focuses.

Global Policy Interventions

You can find full details of our global policy intervention on page 84 of the full draft Transport Strategy document.

Q How strongly do you agree that the global policy interventions are needed?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree or disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q Are there any other global policy interventions you think should feature in the Transport Strategy?

Road safety should feature as a global priority – whatever mode someone is using, they should feel and be safe. This includes personal safety on the transport network.

Trials and rollout of new technology that helps achieve the missions, subject to suitable regulation and safety provisions.

The rail freight priority should appear in this section as cross-regional (indeed, national).

The Transport Strategy should also include reference to the region's vast Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network and how this can be supported and improved to encourage active travel.

Delivery

The following tables outline the key actions TfSE must take out until 2030 to achieve our missions, and tackle known, cross-cutting delivery challenges.

You can find full details of TfSE's roles as part of our delivery plan from page 91 of the full draft Transport Strategy document.

Q How strongly do you agree with the actions that TfSE has set in the Delivery Plan?



- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree or disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q If you disagree or strongly disagree please tell us more about this?

KCC agrees with the actions that are set out for TfSE and its partners in order to deliver the Strategy. However, many of them are dependent on 3rd parties' willingness to work with TfSE. Ultimately, TfSE must actively identify funding for the interventions they want 3rd parties to deliver or there must be a sound business case that demonstrates a return on investment, unless such action is mandated by national government.

Under the Resilience mission, one of the roles for TfSE is to identify its role in strengthening resilience when this has effectively been done by the other actions below it.

Indicators

There are a number of indicators we propose to use to measure the progress of the strategy.

You can view the full table of indicators on page 96 of the full draft Transport Strategy document.

Q Are the indicators that we have identified the right ones to measure?

- | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q If you have answered 'no' above, please tell us more

The strategy is built on the principle of environmental net gain, but the indicator in Strategic Connectivity is the first mention of it in the whole Strategy and seems unconnected to the aims of this mission. As infrastructure schemes will be required to demonstrate biodiversity net gain, perhaps this is best measured across all missions?

Further, the key outcome in the strategic connectivity mission is to increase modal share using sustainable travel options but this would not be measured by the journey time reliability/performance of the road and rail networks. Arguably, reliability will increase modal share on any network but it is modal share itself that should be measured so some of these proposed indicators are not directly related.

Metrics relating to recovery time after road traffic collisions is not an appropriate measure as this is largely determined by the severity of the collision, unless this 3rd metric in the table actually pertains to fewer road traffic collisions (it is unclear). Likewise for road collisions per billion vehicle miles, unless there are measures to improve road safety included in the resilience Mission.



Reference to road safety is currently absent from any of the priorities despite it falling under the Social Goal and Target Zero being an outcome of the Inclusion and Integration mission – but to achieve that outcome there need to be some priorities working towards it.

The Resilience mission should also include a falling value of the maintenance backlog as an indicator.

The air quality objectives in the Inclusion and Integration mission are not specifically related to the measures of successfully achieving the mission (on page 53 of the strategy). Although well-being is part of the stated outcome it is not clear if this specifically encompasses human health. The air quality section on page 55 is more in terms of modal shift, but again this is not related to the successful delivery of the mission or the key outcome as it is described. A greater focus on integrated transport leading to modal shift and hence more sustainable transport would benefit air quality, and so perhaps this should be reflected in the Strategic Connectivity mission or Decarbonisation mission.

Adult activity levels under the Sustainable Growth mission will need some quantification to rule out conflating factors – are people that move to more active travel-friendly estates more likely to be active anyway, for example?

This section needs some clarity on what denotes success. These are measurable indicators but don't have any baseline data or targets set.

Integrated Sustainability Appraisal

Q To what extent do you agree or disagree that the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal represents a thorough assessment of the draft Transport Strategy?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree or disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q Do you have any specific comments regarding the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal?

Mitigation measures detailed in the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA) are thin and not proportionate to the scale of the challenge posed by current emissions, nor to increased emissions from new transport infrastructure projects. Measures are insufficient both in number and in scale of impact.

There is insufficient detail about how emission mitigation will be achieved. For example, more information is needed about the inclusion of low energy/renewables in projects and the adoption of climate-resilient construction methods.

Interdependencies are not fully taken into account. The Strategy's success is dependent upon modal shift but doesn't provide evidence to support how this will be influenced from a supply-led



perspective. Modal shift by business and residents is wholly interdependent with economic and health factors. For the TfSE strategy to be successful, it will need tight integration with wider strategies capable of exerting a stronger pull on demand-led behaviour.

Flood Risk Management is considered in the Integrated Sustainability Assessment (ISA) and “Sustainable Drainage Schemes and natural flood risk management measures” are to be considered as mitigation measures going forward through the production of Flood Risk Assessments (FRA), which would seem appropriate. As it stands, the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs’ (DEFRA) own Non-Statutory Technical Standards all require FRAs to be produced and for the use of Sustainable Drainage Schemes (SUDS) to be incorporated in major projects.

Objective ‘ISA 6’ considers the water environment, including water quality. Polluted surface water runoff from highways is a concern which is receiving greater attention than ever before. Whilst the considered topics such as Natural Capital and Ecosystem Services, Water Environment, and Climate Change and GHG Emissions within the ISA consider flooding from a risk management perspective and in relation to water quality associated with construction activities, more could be done with regards to:

- Considering the quality of surface water runoff in association with the operational phase of a highway.
- That the possibility of water reuse should be maximised as much as possible (particularly for irrigation and landscape management purposes).
- That long term management and stewardship arrangements that consider the maintenance of these systems need to be carefully considered and established.

Whilst the matters above will be somewhat technical in nature (with guidance to be found in the Ciria SUDS Manual C753), the principle of surface water being managed effectively with regards to pollution control for the lifetime of a highway, for it to be considered as an asset, and that SUDS associated with a highway should maximise the multiple benefits from a biodiversity and amenity viewpoint, could be strengthened within the Transport Strategy and ISA.

Overall Views

Q To what extent do you agree that the draft Transport Strategy sets out an ambitious yet achievable strategy to improve transport across the South East?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree or disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |



Q Are there any additional comments you would like to make on the draft Transport Strategy?

Overall, KCC fully supports the vision and missions. The Strategy has a strong focus on sustainable travel and accords with much of KCC's recently adopted fifth Local Transport Plan (LTP5). However, some of the ambitions/priorities are a little unrealistic or rely on the willingness of 3rd parties (including private utility companies) to work with TfSE.

KCC does not support all of the individual priorities, as has been set out in this response, but the bold approach to setting the vision for how transport should function in the region is good. That said, KCC would prefer for TfSE's workstreams to become more action oriented and focus on the development of schemes so that constituent authorities are in a better position to deliver them, ultimately delivering on the Strategy itself.

TfSE will need to review the emerging Integrated National Transport Strategy and forthcoming 10 Year Infrastructure Plan, as well as Industrial Strategy, when these are published throughout 2025. All of these policies will have a bearing on the priorities of the TfSE Transport Strategy (which should seek to deliver on these national strategies).

TfSE will also need to take stock of the recent announcements on Local Government Reorganisation and Devolution to Mayoral Strategic Authorities. This is going to lead to unprecedented change in the structure of local government across the South East and, temporarily, disparities in the way highways and transportation functions are managed. More fundamentally, it will also necessitate changes in the membership and, potentially, administration of TfSE. This will need to be a key workstream.

The structural changes that will be taking place will do so at different speeds across the geography and there will be disruption to the way services are run as staff navigate changes to their employment and roles. The Transport Strategy should recognise that this will inevitably impact on the timescales for delivery of the missions. Although the current draft refers to Devolution, the understanding of what is to come has moved on significantly since written.

Finally, given the rapidly evolving policy and local government landscape, TfSE should be flexible in its proposed timeline to adoption of the new Transport Strategy so that this can be done at the most appropriate timing.

Privacy Notice – Transport for the South East Transport Strategy Refresh

Overview

This Privacy Notice covers the responses to the public consultation of our draft Transport Strategy we are delivering as part of our Transport Strategy Refresh.

Transport for the South East and our host authority East Sussex County Council takes data protection seriously. Please be assured that your information will be used appropriately in line with data protection legislation, will be stored securely and will not be processed unless the requirements for fair and lawful processing can be met.

What information is being used?

In order to ensure we accurately reflect the demographic and geographic range of our region, and to keep interested parties updated with this project we will collect the following information:

Personal Data:

Name

Email address

How will your information be used?

Your name and email address will be used so we can monitor and identify duplicate responses, and where agreed so we can contact you at future stages of this project, either to seek your further views or share the outcomes of your involvement as the strategy develops.

All data will be assimilated and pseudonymised for reporting purposes.

We aim to maintain high standards, adopt best practice for our record keeping and regularly check and report on how we are doing. Your information is never sold for direct marketing purposes.

Our staff are trained to handle your information correctly and protect your confidentiality and privacy.

Your information **is not** processed outside of the European Economic Area.

What is your legal basis for processing this information?

Our legal basis for processing your data is consent.

How long will your information be kept for?

Your information will be kept for the duration of this project. You will have the option to remain on our stakeholder database beyond this and if you consent to this we will retain your name and email address until you withdraw consent.

How will your information be stored?

Your information will be stored on our secure systems and accessed only by authorised Transport for the South East officers.

Sharing your information

Your data will be shared with our contracted consultants for analysis purposes.

Your rights

Under data protection legislation, you have the right:

- to be informed why, where and how we use your information
- to ask for access to your information
- to ask for your information to be corrected if it is inaccurate or incomplete
- to ask for your information to be deleted or removed where there is no need for us to continue processing it
- to ask us to restrict the use of your information
- to ask us to copy or transfer your information from one IT system to another in a safe and secure way, without impacting the quality of the information
- to object to how your information is used



- to challenge any decisions made without human intervention (automated decision making)

Please visit www.eastsussex.gov.uk/your-council/about/keydocuments/foi/data-protection for further details.

How to find out more or complain

Should you have any further queries on the uses of your information, please speak directly to our service:
tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk

To complain about the use of your information, please contact our Customer Services Team at www.eastsussex.gov.uk/contactus/complaints or our Data Protection Officer at www.eastsussex.gov.uk/your-council/about/key-documents/foi/data-protection/data-protection-officer.

You can also contact the ICO for further information or to make a complaint:

Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire SK9 5AF

Phone: 0303 123 1113 (local rate) or 01625 545 745 if you prefer to use a national rate number or you can report a concern on the ICO website at <https://ico.org.uk/make-a-complaint/>