

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

### Have your say

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

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

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

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

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

### Privacy notice

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Further information

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

## About you

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

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

Providing my own response (please respond to Question 2)



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

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

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

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

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

Organisation name: Kent County Council

Your name: Katie Pettitt

Your role: Principal Transport Planner - Strategy

**Please turn over.**

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

(Please tick all the boxes that apply)

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

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

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

## Our Approach

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In developing the recent Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock 2016 – 2031 (LTP4), Kent County Council (KCC) positively engaged with the Local Planning Authorities and consulted with stakeholders and the wider public on the desired ambition for transport in the county and the outcomes that the transport network should achieve. KCC developed proposals for transport priorities, which were either specific schemes or the identification of issues to resolve with a scheme to be designed in the future. Transport priorities were identified at strategic, countywide and local level. Consequently, LTP4 is the most recent position on transport priorities in Kent. However, there are other complimentary strategies that also support the aims of the draft Transport Strategy for the South East. These include the Freight Action Plan for Kent and the Kent Environment Strategy.

The Kent and Medway Energy and Low Emissions Strategy is currently under development and was recently taken to public consultation. This outlines Kent and Medway's approach to achieving the target of net zero emissions by 2050, but significant action is expected by 2030. Consultation feedback clearly showed that there is a desire for a more ambitious and quicker route to net zero, including a desire to reduce the emphasis on the electric car and focus more on alternatives to the car and modal shift. Another theme in the feedback was around growth and the potential conflict between net zero and other policies, particularly those around planning and transport. It is welcome that TfSE is addressing these same concerns in the Transport Strategy. Development must be viewed through a clean growth and net zero lens, which includes minimising the need to travel by ensuring that digital and broadband infrastructure is in place and local facilities exists so people can make active travel choices.

The primary benefit of the Sub-national Transport Body model is the ability for the South East region to speak with a single voice on strategic transport infrastructure. Working together will allow the South East to provide a coherent view on where funding for transport providers such as Highways England, Network Rail and the rail franchises should be prioritised. By building consensus, national government will have to take account of prioritisation at a local level in the allocation of funds.

LTP4 set out KCC's strategic transport priorities. These are:

- Enabling growth in the Thames Estuary – including junction upgrades on the A2/M2, increased High Speed rail services to Ebbsfleet, improved connectivity between Ebbsfleet and Crossrail 1,

- New Lower Thames Crossing,
- Bifurcation of port traffic – requiring a series of junction improvements and road widening schemes on the M2/A2 and M20/A20,
- Port expansion,
- A solution to Operation Stack,
- Provision of overnight lorry parking,
- Ashford International station signalling upgrade (now almost complete),
- Journey time improvements on the Ashford to Ramsgate railway line via Canterbury West and the new Thanet Parkway station,
- Rail improvements,
- Bus improvements.

For bus and rail improvements, the key aims are to create an integrated network and greater mode share for public transport, particularly to support new development in areas such as the Thames Gateway.

Turning to the specific details of the formation of this draft Strategy, it is clear that congestion-alleviating measures ultimately result in a return to congestion once the unlocked capacity is filled. For example, the removal of the toll booths at the Dartford Crossing provided a short-term benefit of up to 15 minutes journey time saving, but a resultant increase in usage of the crossing led to a return to the crossing operating at capacity for much of the day. Building additional mileage of highway is not a long-term solution to cater for the increase in congestion in the South East, nor will it accommodate the additional traffic generated from planned homes and employment sites. Continued economic growth will be hindered without alternative ways to travel and a concurrent reduction in demand for travel. Therefore, actively planning at the regional level for a future that is sustainable, and providing the infrastructure for that future, is fundamental to delivering the vision for the South East.

Profoundly important to moving away from ‘predict and provide’ is the view at a national policy level. Currently, this has been heavily focused on investment in road building, with many ad hoc funding pots available in recent years for congestion-busting schemes of various sizes. Conversely, funding for public transport has not been so forthcoming, especially evident in cuts to supported bus services. KCC is the largest contractor of bus services in the TfSE area but has been forced to rescind support for some services due to budget constraints. The Transport Strategy for the South East must lobby policy and funding decisions taken at a national level.

KCC fully supports the Area Studies, which will look at the individual characteristics of corridor routes across the South East in more detail and identify specific interventions to achieve the vision for sustainable economic growth. These Area Studies must involve the Local Planning Authorities and also take account of existing Local Transport Plans.

Major Economic Hubs and Strategic Corridors have been identified and are the focus of the Transport Strategy. The Major Road Network and the national assets of the Strategic Road Network and rail network have also been identified as targets for TfSE (and requested powers predominantly relate to these). However, the Strategy scope includes villages and towns away from these networks, including journeys to join these networks. The scope of the Strategy’s applicability needs to be more clearly set out including how it expects Local Planning Authorities, Highway Authorities and Local Transport Authorities to apply it to their own operations and strategic planning. As per KCC’s response to the TfSE consultation on proposed powers and functions, KCC supports TfSE having powers concurrently to the constituent authorities provided that the principle of subsidiarity is adhered to.

## Our Area

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

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

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

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

Necessarily, much of the evidence base is from 2011 census data and is approaching a decade out of date. Where possible, National Travel Survey, TRICS, or similar datasets should be used to provide indicative information on likely changes to travel patterns to inform the Transport Strategy and future Area Studies. For example, residents travelling to Greater London from Ashford (Kent) and Folkestone appear relatively low (although without the size of the MSOAs shown on the map it is hard to tell conclusively). Since 2009 the domestic High Speed services have dramatically improved rail journey times from these towns and consequently more residents are now London commuters than in 2011, only shortly after the service was introduced. High Speed services at Ashford International are now running full to standing in the peak periods.

The International Gateway role of the South East is unique amongst all other regions in England. The extent to which this function supports the economies of other regions could be strengthened in the ‘Our Area’ section of the Strategy, for example including information on Just in Time (JIT) deliveries that regularly transit the Dover Straits with car parts destined for Oxfordshire, and likewise the need for Scottish seafood to cross into France within 24 hours. Without an efficient transport network in the South East, other regions would not be so successful. This is also, of course, affected by the planned withdrawal of the UK from the European Union and further highlights the threat to the national economy if the South East’s road network is congested.

Strengthening the Strategy around how the South East supports the Midlands and other regions would also help counter some political arguments. For example, ideas around economically rebalancing the UK meaning less investment in the South East or diverting investment from the South East, which would have a detrimental effect nationally.

Paragraph 2.66 refers to the airports in the area, and there is a footnote to the diagram listing other airports in the region. This has excluded Lydd Airport (London Ashford) from the Kent region, and there may also be the reopening of Manston Airport (pending the decision on the submitted DCO, expected early 2020).

Paragraph 2.73 describes the fragmented approach to transport and land use planning in the South East as a result of the differing Local Government structures across the region. The draft Transport Strategy seeks to promote integration between economic, spatial and transport planning in the South East. Whilst this approach could have clear benefits for the region and really help achieve the vision for the South East set out in the draft Strategy, the approach also generates some questions about TfSE in its current form that need to be addressed. Firstly, spatial planning (in two tier authorities) is a responsibility held by the District Councils with transport planning carried out at County level. District Councils will need much greater input to TfSE than they have had to date if there is to be a real impact on spatial planning. Further, many of the Local Planning Authorities in Kent are currently preparing their Local Plans, which typically have a 15-year horizon and increasingly challenging targets for housing growth. When the Transport Strategy for the South East becomes a statutory document, the policy it promotes for the region will have to be considered in these Local Plans at the point of their next review and update. There needs to be much greater integration between TfSE and Local Planning Authorities if there is to be a meaningful impact on land use planning as a means of reducing the need to travel and creating a self-sufficient region.

## Our Vision, Goals and Priorities

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

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

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

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

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

KCC strongly supports the strategic vision and goals, which align with the Council's own Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock.

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

Some of the strategic priorities in this response form differ from those in the draft Transport Strategy. For example, the second social priority in the draft Strategy is to improve air quality *supported by* initiatives to reduce congestion and encourage shifts to public transport, whereas in this response form the improved air quality is achieved *by* reducing congestion and shifting to public transport. The County Council supports initiatives to improve air quality, especially because of the authority's responsibility to improve the general health of everyone living in Kent.

The Strategy should make it clearer that the net zero carbon commitment is related only to the transport sector, if this is the case. It should also be clear on what parts of the transport sector this relates to, e.g. public transport funded by the public sector, logistics operations (including ferries and freighters using the ports in the South East), private personal transport, the aviation sector given the country's two largest airports are in the region, etc.

The draft Transport Strategy could consider a priority that addresses adapting to emerging transport technologies, such as connected and autonomous vehicles, and ensuring that the South East's transport network can accommodate them.

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

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

Principle	Strongly support	Tend to support	Neither support / oppose	Tend to oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know
Supporting sustainable economic growth, but not at any cost	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Achieving environmental sustainability	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning for successful places	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Putting the user at the heart of the transport system	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning regionally for the short, medium and long-term	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Our Strategy

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

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

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

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

**Radial journeys:** Challenge 1 identifies Maidstone as having poor connectivity by rail to London compared with other parts of the region. Maidstone is well-connected by rail, but journey times are slow on the Maidstone East line (to Victoria) taking around 1 hour 12 minutes. In the morning and evening peaks there are also High Speed services to St Pancras taking 53 minutes. The proposed Thameslink service between Maidstone and Cambridge would have connected Maidstone East with the City of London again, but this has been subject to indefinite delay.

A challenge that has been omitted is the potential delays on the M20/M2 corridors caused by disruption due to exiting the EU. This is a particular threat to freight journeys, but also to residents, business and tourist traffic making radial journeys between Ashford and Maidstone.

**Orbital journeys:** Challenge 3 identifies the A27 as playing a rural single carriageway role in Kent. This is incorrect as the A27 terminates at Pevensey at the junction with the A259, which runs along the East Sussex and Kent coast as far as Folkestone. Given that the A259 in Kent was detrunked, perhaps this orbital corridor would better include the A2070 from Brenzett to Ashford, where it joins the M20 coastbound.

Challenge 4 correctly assesses the gap in cross-regional road capacity between the M20 and M23, and M23 and A3. It should also make reference to the environmental constraints in this movement if the existing roads were to be substantially upgraded (such as the A272), or new expressways/motorways constructed. In west Kent and East Sussex there is the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), then the South Downs National Park, and the Surrey Hills AONB to the north.

**Inter-urban journeys:** These challenges accurately capture the issues for inter-urban journeys. However, a key challenge for inter-urban journeys (especially in Kent) is the school traffic. Where residents have a choice over which school their children attend then typically the average length of the journey to school increases.

**Local journeys:** As above, school run journeys form many of the local journeys taking place and are a challenge for the network.

**International gateways and freight journeys:** Increasing rail freight mode share is a big challenge. With cross-Channel rail services there is an issue with availability of train paths in France because of conflicts with passenger services. On the conventional railway network in the South East there is also an issue with train paths being available for freight because they would have to use routes through London that are prioritised for passengers in the peaks. Although there is demand for rail freight services, it is important to appreciate that this is not the same freight that is currently entering through the Channel Tunnel and Port of Dover.

Regarding freight passing through the South East and then being sorted in the Midlands and returned to the South East for local distribution, further research is needed. Although it may appear inefficient because of seemingly duplicate HGV movements through the region this is not necessarily the case if they are returning with a backload and would otherwise have returned empty.

Depending on the UK's future relationship with the EU, smart borders should be addressed as a potential challenge/opportunity within this section.

International gateway journeys for leisure purposes really fall into the inter-urban journey group and would be better separated from freight journeys because they have very different needs and impacts despite using the same entry/exit points in the UK. Freight is time-sensitive and economically important nationally as well as serving vital needs like the transport of medicines. Tourist journeys (outbound) are more about switching modes to more sustainable options.

Inbound tourist journeys are more centred on giving an efficient and pleasant experience, as well as providing options for tourists to visit the South East region easily and not be so London-centric.

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

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

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

**Radial journeys:** The initiatives could include reference to radial services as well as radial routes, e.g. Thameslink to Maidstone in order to get a direct rail link to the City again, and also radial coach services such as those serving north Kent (see Kings Ferry coaches).

Holistic demand management policies could include road user charging or fare price increases in the morning peak (beyond demand management fares already in place on the rail network). From the perspective of the private car, there is already a form of road user charging in fuel duty but central government policy has seen this reduced or frozen in recent years. Introducing a localised road charging scheme would need to be done in line with national policy and be subject to an extensive Equalities Impact Assessment. People who need to travel at set times of day (usually the peaks) tend to be in some of the least well-paid jobs and may disproportionately be women, for example working in retail or caring professions. Any road user charging proposals would also have to be scrutinised and approved by the relevant Local Highways Authorities before being progressed any further. KCC reserves judgement on whether it could support such proposals at this time as to date the Council has not been asked to take a view.

**Orbital journeys:** As for radial journeys, demand management policies need careful consideration to demonstrate that they can be applied in a fair and equitable way. The London congestion charge is commonly used as an example because those that can afford to pay still drive into central London, so it disproportionately disadvantages the poorer in society. Improving connectivity to Gatwick Airport must focus on public transport, including rail and coach services. To encourage

further private car journeys would be counterproductive to the aims of this Transport Strategy and to the Gatwick Airport Surface Access Strategy.

**Inter-urban journeys:** There are other possible initiatives that could help inter-urban journeys, such as guided busways and inter-urban coach services. One of the greatest limiting factors for inter-urban journeys being completed by bus is the journey time – not due to congestion but due to repeated stops. Predominantly a range of short journeys are completed on the route (village to town, intra-urban or feeding a railway station) rather than a single longer inter-urban journey. The quality of the service also reduces their effectiveness at replacing the car or train over this distance, such as a lack of heating and uncomfortable seating.

**Local journeys:** In prioritising the needs of pedestrians and cyclists the emphasis should be on good design rather than just providing facilities. For example, a cycleway on the footway where cyclists have to stop at every minor road junction is inconvenient and uncomfortable to use, probably resulting in those that would have cycled anyway using the road. Conversely, a slightly raised cycle lane that runs in what would be considered the carriageway (but is effectively segregated) that crosses all junctions as the main road does is safer and more attractive to use. Some of the measures implemented on the Continent could be applied but would need some form of driver re-education to be effective.

**International gateway and freight journeys:** The Lower Thames Crossing initiative also includes reference to Junction 9 of the M3, but it is not clear how that helps with Challenge 4. Perhaps it should be included as a separate initiative to make use to SRN and MRN funding to address congestion hot spots on key freight corridors.

The initiative to help gateways adjust to changes in trade patterns should also include reference to technology (such as timed slots on ferries) and also a solution to disruption caused by Operation Brock and Operation Stack.

**Future journeys:** As the draft Strategy correctly states, it is almost impossible to say how future innovations may change the transport network. Whether we get more drone-based deliveries (as trialled in Milton Keynes), different kinds of private vehicles, autonomous pods instead of buses for Park & Ride services, or completely car-free developments that are designed to ‘force’ residents to use shared mobility and public transport, we simply cannot say. Transport for the South East needs to work with all other regions and national government to steer the direction and regulation of such services to ensure that the region, and the country, does not end up with incompatible multi-operator ventures.

For example, the multiple independent cycle hire schemes in London mean that all operators are targeting the same market (potentially with different geographies) but the user wants access to a shared bike wherever they are without having to sign up to several different schemes in London alone – let alone when they are outside the Capital and they wish to use the Brighton & Hove scheme, for example. A more efficient and passenger-centric model would be to use the same model of revenue allocation as the railway industry does. The user signs up to one bike hire app where they can see all available bikes from all operators, they pay the hourly rate (which could vary by demand and location) and the central system proportionately allocates revenue to the individual bike hire operator. Likewise, personal banking is heading in this direction so that there is one banking app showing all available accounts making it easier to switch and exercise choice. But without a central body to coordinate these private ventures then we are likely to continue to see a fragmented system without interoperability.

An initiative should be included for TfSE to take an active role in these conversations and develop apps (or other technology) to give users a genuinely informed choice on journey times, prices, and environmental consequences.

## Implementation

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

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

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

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

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

**Economic performance indicators:** The indicator measuring improved public transport to Heathrow Airport should also include Gatwick Airport.

The indicator that assesses how many allocated Local Plan sites are done so in line with Local Transport Plans will have different meanings across the South East. In unitary authorities the two will have been developed in conjunction, and two-tier authorities will take a different approach. Kent's Local Transport Plan is deliberately strategic so that each district can develop a transport strategy to support their own Local Plan (in partnership with the County Council) that goes into the detail of individual transport schemes once the call for sites has identified likely site allocations. The indicator would not measure a new approach to planning but could instead have little substance to it.

If TfSE's aim is to properly integrate land use and transport planning to achieve the goals in this Transport Strategy, then all the Local Planning Authorities need to be involved and a more meaningful indicator would be for Local Plans newly prepared or reviewed and updated, to be done so in line with the Transport Strategy for the South East. Although this may depend on the process of TfSE becoming a statutory body and the Transport Strategy, therefore, a statutory document.

For a 'smart' transport network there is a need for an indicator around the use of technology on the road network, most likely in the future. This could include advanced in-car warning systems about congestion or incidents so that traffic uses an alternative route. It could also be related to freight being more efficiently held and routed to the ports to avoid congestion and potentially carry out customs clearances remotely, if necessary. This emphasises the importance of good digital coverage throughout the region.

**Social indicators:** Rather than measuring the absolute number of bikeshare schemes, it might be better to measure the interoperability of bike share schemes as this would be a more passenger-centric way of looking at the network. Alternatively, if data was available, the indicator could measure the use of these schemes instead. For example, 10 schemes serving 10,000 active users would appear better than 5 schemes that serve 20,000 active users if using the proposed metric.

**Environmental indicators:** The two indicators for net degradation of natural capital and net loss of biodiversity are absolute. TfSE and its constituent authorities need to fully consider how this applies to Strategic Road Network and new rail schemes in the area. For example, some options for the proposed A27 Arundel Bypass would destroy ancient woodland, which is the most biodiverse woodland in the country. Planting new woodland, or translocating soil from the

ancient woodland, is mitigation but it is not a direct replacement for the loss of that woodland and would arguably still result in a net loss of biodiversity. The Integrated Sustainability Appraisal confirms this by stating that the opportunity for biodiversity net gain from road schemes would be “challenging.” Likewise, facilities such as Motorway Service Areas and lorry parking (especially like that previously proposed by Highways England at Stanford West on the M20) would cause a failure in this indicator due to the huge biodiversity impacts, embodied carbon, loss of agricultural land, and impacts on the setting of historic assets. The final version of the Strategy should also explain whether the priorities (and therefore indicators) are intended to be balanced against one another, such that some reduction in natural capital might be acceptable where a scheme significantly reduces the number of people Killed and Seriously Injured, for example.

**Funding and financing:** Currently the funding mechanism and role for TfSE (and other Sub-national Transport Bodies) is unclear. The only role that central government has allocated to date is the prioritisation of schemes for Major Road Network and other funding. Currently transport funding sits at a range of different levels, including with the Local Enterprise Partnerships for the Local Growth Fund (LGF). This has now finished, but any successor should have due input from the Sub-national Transport Bodies as well as Local Authorities to ensure there is a regional transport planning perspective. It may be appropriate for any successor funds to LGF for transport schemes to be administered by TfSE but Kent awaits further information from Government on what these funds might be, and what the new Government’s future ambition for STBs is. Therefore, from the perspective of a resident in the South East, it might be useful to include some information on the current funding and financing role that TfSE has and what it aspires to be in the future.

To access funding for transport schemes the current method of assessment is based on best value for money, which is often criticised for being heavily weighted in terms of travel time savings by private car. The draft Transport Strategy takes a very proactive approach in planning for the future and planning for a change to sustainable travel (necessitating investment in public transport and cycling/walking infrastructure and services). However, it may be difficult to achieve a sufficiently high Benefit Cost Ratio for such schemes and so TfSE should plan to influence Government policy and consider how such schemes could be prioritised for funding when judged against more ‘traditional’ congestion-relief schemes.

**Powers and functions:** One of the powers that has *not* been requested is to set priorities for local authorities on roads that are not part of the Major Road Network. Much of this draft Transport Strategy has been focused on planning for people and for place, and the MRN is such a small part of the overall road network in the South East that it means the influence of this Strategy is potentially minimal unless the implementation plan includes how TfSE expects the constituent authorities and Local Planning Authorities to apply the principles of the Strategy, and by when. This should also be an indicator for success of the Strategy. To achieve this, the Local Planning Authorities will need to be more closely involved in TfSE in future.

As per the response to the TfSE consultation on the proposed powers and functions, KCC continues to support these on condition that the principle of subsidiarity applies. Decisions on the use of those powers must be made at the most immediate (or local) level by the constituent authorities. KCC maintains that the real power of a STB is to work at the strategic level to achieve a shared vision for the region, as well as to devolve powers from central government to give the South East more control over its future.

## Integrated Sustainability Appraisal

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

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



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

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

Until specific scheme proposals come forward it is difficult for a sustainability appraisal to be properly carried out, and consequently the Habitats Regulation Assessment is delayed until specific proposals or more plan detail is available.

Before any demand management policy is implemented, it will need to be subjected to a thorough Equalities Impact Assessment to ensure that it does not disadvantage any group with a protected characteristic. The current Equalities Impact Assessment does not assess this particular intervention (as per the point above, it is only able to assess at the broad strategy level currently).

## Overall views

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

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

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

In further developing the final Transport Strategy, TfSE should identify ways that it can influence national policy so that it is better aligned with this forward-thinking Strategy. Where TfSE is clearly learning from London in the power of planning the transport network for different functions (vehicles, place, people) this is largely at odds with national direction. The Department for Transport has launched a series of funds aimed at planning for vehicles, and for unlocking development by releasing capacity on the road network. Government policy will undoubtedly shift with the increasing focus on climate change and TfSE should ensure it is at the forefront of bidding for these funds, but also shaping how they are formed.

TfSE should try not to concentrate too much on any one idea as seems appropriate in the current paradigm, such as smart ticketing. Whatever is developed in this area needs to be future-proofed and take account of existing opportunities, for example by mobile apps. Smart ticketing could turn out to be a smart wallet, for example. And in that situation, there are already contactless cards, which Transport for London have been able to utilise leading to the rapid decline of the Oyster Card. In this way, it might be more appropriate for TfSE to provide a back-office function to permit cross-network and cross-operator travel with integrated fares rather than a physical card system.

Kent County Council is fully supportive of the development of this regional Transport Strategy and welcomes the opportunity to comment, as well as to support the development of the final Strategy in our role as a constituent authority.

---

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.