



Transport for the South East - Economic Connectivity Review

Give us your views

The closing date for the submission of comments is Tuesday 19 June 2018.

Before answering any of the questions below, please read a copy of the draft Economic Connectivity Review which is available at:

<https://transportforthesoutheast.org.uk/strategy/ecr/>

Please either e-mail your completed form to:

chloe.cook@sdgworld.net

or post it to:

Transport for the South East
c/o East Sussex County Council
CET West D
County Hall
St. Anne's Crescent
Lewes BN7 1UE

Please check the boxes as appropriate and complete your written responses within the text boxes provided. All the check boxes can be ticked electronically in Word. If you are completing the form by hand and your response is too lengthy to fit into the text boxes, please attach additional sheets as necessary, making it clear which question any additional sheets refer to.

Your responses will be used to help finalise the Economic Connectivity Review.

A privacy notice relating to this engagement exercise can be found here:

<https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/privacy/tfse/>

If you want information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please tick the box below.

I wish my response to be treated as confidential

If you have any questions about this consultation or this response form, please email tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk or call 0300 3309474

Background Information

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

Qa. Are you responding on your own behalf or on behalf of an organisation or group?

Please check one box only

- Providing my own response (**Please respond to Qb. below**)
- Providing a response on behalf of an organisation or group (**Please respond to Qc.**)

Qb. Your details

Please provide your name, address, postcode and email address. While these details are not compulsory, if you can provide your contact details, these may be used to inform you of the outcomes of the consultation.

Please write in below:

Name (optional)	
Address	
Postcode	
Email	

Qc. Details of your organisation or group. What is your name, role and the name and the contact details of the organisation or group on whose behalf you are submitting this response?

Your name (optional)	Roger Blake
Your role (optional)	Director for Infrastructure & Networks
Name of organisation or group	Railfuture
Address	70 Dynevor Road, Stoke Newington, London
Postcode	N16 0DX
Email	Roger.blake@railfuture.org.uk

Qd. What category of organisation or group are you representing?

Please check all boxes that apply

- Academic (includes universities and other academic institutions)
- Action group
- Business
- Business representative group (includes CBI, Chambers of Commerce, LEPs)
- 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 agency
- Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation (includes transport bodies, transport providers, infrastructure providers and utility companies)
- Think Tank
- Transport user group
- Other category of organisation or group (Please check box and write in details in box below)

Click here to enter text.

- Prefer not to say

Consultation questions

Draft Vision and Strategic Principles

Q1a. As set out in the Introduction to the draft Economic Connectivity Review, the following draft vision statement has been drafted to guide the development of Transport for the South East (TfSE) and its transport strategy:

“The South East is crucial to the UK economy and is the nation’s major international gateway for people and businesses.

We will grow the South East’s economy by facilitating the development of a high quality, integrated transport system that makes the region more productive and competitive, improves access to opportunities for all and protects the environment.”

To what extent do you support or oppose the draft vision statement?

(Please check one box only)

- Strongly support
- Tend to support
- Neither support nor oppose
- Tend to oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Don’t know

Q1b. Please use the space below to provide any additional comments you may have about the draft vision statement or any modification you would like to see. In particular, if you oppose the draft vision statement please explain why this is the case and what changes you would like to see.

(Please write in the box below).

That statement may be more of a declaration and objective than a vision.
As an alternative for consideration, “TfSE aspires to a growing and more productive regional economy which spreads prosperity and opportunity to all communities while protecting the environment, through a better-connected and integrated transport network offering attractive choices and delivering quality and convenience for users.”

Q1c. TfSE has established a number of draft strategic principles to support the vision, which are set out in the Introduction to the Economic Connectivity Review.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these strategic principles?

(Please check one box only on each row)

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Grow the UK and South East economy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improve opportunities for all	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Protect and enhance the environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q1d. Please let us know your comments on the draft strategic principles. In particular, if you disagree with any aspects of one or more of the strategic principles, please let us know why and what modifications you would wish to see.

(Please write in the box below)

Click here to enter text.

Economic outcomes of transport improvements

Q2a. The draft Economic Connectivity Review identifies the five main economic outcomes of transport improvements and their role in driving economic growth. These are:

- improved business connectivity,
- improved labour market efficiency,
- enabling development of housing and employment space,
- improved access to international gateways, and
- supporting deprived communities.

For more information see Section 3 of the draft Economic Connectivity Review.

Thinking about investment in the transport system in the South East, what level of importance do you think should be given to each of these economic outcomes?

(Please check one box only on each row)

	Very Important	Fairly Important	Neutral	Not very Important	Not at all Important	Don't Know
Business connectivity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Labour market efficiency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Enabling development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Access to International gateways	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Supporting deprived communities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Q2b. Please let us know your comments on these five economic outcomes of transport improvements and whether there are any other outcomes which you think should be considered. Please indicate clearly in your response which specific outcome(s) your comments relate to.

Please write in the box below.

Click here to enter text.

Key economic corridors in the South East

Q3a. Twenty four economic corridors have been identified in the TfSE area on the basis that they drive one or more of the five economic outcomes of transport improvements. These corridors are shown in Figure 9.1 in the draft Economic Connectivity Review. The approach that has been used to identify these corridors is set out in Sections 4 to 8 of the draft Economic Connectivity Review

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the approach used to identify the economic corridors? (Please check one box only)

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q3b. Are there any additional corridors which you think should be included or corridors which should be excluded? Please let us know the reason for their inclusion or exclusion?

Please write in the box below:

Table 4.1 on page 28 and Table 9.1 on pages 55-56 both appear to identify 22 corridors, while Table 5 on page 7 of the Transport Analysis Technical Note lists 23. In Q3a above, and in Q3c below, you refer to 24 so it's not entirely clear how many, and which ones, there really are.

An additional economic corridor should be Brighton-Gatwick-Tonbridge-Maidstone-Medway Towns. At either end are by far and away two of the largest urban agglomerations in the whole TfSE region (as confirmed by their ranking in the top 6 of the list of 33 Built-Up Areas on page 58 of the Economic Connectivity Review Phase 1 Report) and with an international gateway in between but which is poorly-connected from significant functional economic areas in Kent. The attached 'Sussex connections 2018' (reproduced with the kind permission of our independent adviser Jonathan Roberts Consulting Ltd) helps to illustrate the same point with circles centred on urban population agglomerations.

Q3c. The draft Economic Connectivity Review recommends an initial sequencing of the 24 corridors based on the extent to which they support the economic outcomes Table 9.1 in the documented identifies the criteria that have been used to help identify the sequence in which the corridors could be investigated further.

To what extent do you agree with the criteria that have been used?

(Please check one box only)

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q3d. Please let us know your comments on the criteria or the way they have been applied. In particular, if you disagree with the criteria that have been used or the way that they have been applied please let us know why.

Please write in the box below:

It's not obvious from all the preceding analysis and eloquent exposition of the range of policy-influencing and priority-apportioning criteria why, in the final section 9 on p.57, the first paragraph has then leapt to single out congestion and its easing as the seemingly over-riding criterion for the selection of investment interventions.

No-one doubts the economic gains from journey-time improvements, but they alone represent a limited perspective on realising the vision for and full economic potential of the TfSE area. Such a limited focus risks debasing the declared strategic principles and reducing the whole exercise to a short-term bidding war between local stakeholders for 'most congested corridor'.

An alternative, or at least additional, focus on where new growth is to be located and the transport interventions needed to support it, and where transport interventions can unlock new growth potential, might offer potential infrastructure and development investors a more inspiring view of the future.

Q3e. Are there any additional criteria that you think should be used to determine the initial sequencing and why?

Please write in the box below:

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Q3f. Are there any additional comments you may have about the initial sequencing of the corridors?

Please write in the box below:

The Transport Analysis Technical Note para 26 says “The annual business user value of a minute journey time saving on the highway is far more significant than for rail. This is a result of there being significantly higher levels of demand on roads than on rail.”

That may reflect current official appraisal methodologies but is nevertheless increasingly questionable as it adopts the crudest of indicators, raw numeric levels of demand ie usage, with no consideration for or even qualitative valuation of the usability of the time spent on the two networks.

All that demand on roads is negative economic value ie cost, as it represents time which is unusable (legally) for any economic or productive purpose. Demand on rail on the other hand has at least the potential to be economically usable and productive through on-board use of technology while travelling, as seen in the demand for wi-fi both at stations and on trains, on-board power and USB sockets, table-tops etc.

For an ‘always-on’ generation those factors are among those which have been driving increased rail usage even during the decade of austerity – and in some areas a marked decline in car ownership and usage.

Making the case for Investment

Q4a. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

‘Overall, the Economic Connectivity Review has made the case for investment in the transport system to increase productivity in the Transport for South East area’

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your response in the box below:

The Economic Connectivity Review has to make the case for transport investment which will deliver long-term growth, as well as increased productivity, in the TfSE area, and also for the benefit of the whole nation as well as for the TfSE area itself.

Q4b. Is there is any additional evidence that you are aware of that could be used to support the case for investment in the transport system in the South East? Please describe this evidence in the box below, including names of reports or links to web based documents where possible.

Please write in the box below:

Refer to “Access and Connections: East Sussex – Opportunities to align railway investment to the economic growth requirements of East Sussex” from Jonathan Roberts Consulting Ltd at <https://www.railfuture.org.uk/display603>

Additional comments

Q5. Please use the space below to make any additional comments you may have about the draft Economic Connectivity Review.

Please write in the box below:

From a national perspective and at a macro level the TfSE area is perceived by key strategic decision-makers as already-prosperous. The Transport Strategy which emerges from this Economic Connectivity Review will therefore have to make a uniquely compelling case for continued infrastructure investment based on the increased contribution of growth and productivity in the TfSE area to the national as well as to its own regional economy.

Thank you for your participation.