

## **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/

f you want information that	at you provide to be treat	ed as confidential, p	lease tick the box below

I wish m	y response to	be treated	as confidential

If you have any questions about this consultation or this response form, please email <a href="mailto:tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk">tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk</a> 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. A	Are you responding on your own behalf or on behalf of an organisation or group?
(Plea	se place an <b>x</b> in the appropriate box)
	Providing my own response (Please respond to Qb. below)
х	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)	
	Cllr. Ian Hollidge
Address	
	Town Hall, Bexhill-on-Sea
Postcode	
	TN39 3JX
Email	
	Cllr.ian.hollidge@rother.gov.uk

**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	Cllr. Ian Hollidge
(optional)	
Your role (optional)	Co Chairman
Name of	Hastings and Rother Transport Group.
organisation or	www.hartag.org.uk
group	
Address	
	Town Hall, Bexhill-on-Sea
Postcode	
	TN39 3JX
Email	Cllr.ian.hollidge@rother.gov.uk

# Qd. What category of organisation or group are you representing? (Please place an **x** in all the 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 | x | 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) www.hartag.org.uk 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."

	mproves access to opportunities for all and protects the environment."
To w	hat extent do you support or oppose the draft vision statement?
(Pleas	se place an <b>X</b> in one box only)
x	Strongly support  Tend to support  Neither support nor oppose  Tend to oppose  Strongly oppose  Don't know
the d oppo	Please use the space below to provide any additional comments you may have about raft vision statement or any modification you would like to see. In particular, if you
•	se the draft vision statement please explain why this is the case and what changes vould like to see. se write in the box below).

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 place an **X** in 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	х					
Improve opportunities for all		x				
Protect and enhance the environment		х				
you disagree we know why and (Please write in Reason for we increases then	I what modifing the box being	fications you low) / UK and SE (	would wish to	o see.		

### **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 place an **X** in one box only in each row)

	Very	Fairly	Neutral	Not very	Not at all	Don't
	Important	Important		Important	Important	Know
Business	х					
connectivity						
Labour						
market	x					
efficiency						
Enabling	х					
development						
Access to						
International		x				
gateways						
Supporting						
deprived		X				
communities						

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.

Agree with economic outcomes, Employment and Homes should be seen as more important than longer access or supporting deprived areas. If Jobs and Homes are delivered by improved transport links, either large or small scale then all other benefits follow. Low cost transport improvements encouraging Walking and Cycling for shorter journeys can reduce road/rail congestion by increasing capacity for those needing to make a longer journey. This in turn supports deprived communities who often can't afford to commute out of area.

## **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 place an <b>x</b> in one box only)
Strongly agree  x Tend to agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Tend to disagree  Strongly disagree
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:
The corridors are correct, however in figure 7.4 "Corridors enabling development" it misses out A21 / Hastings line which connects to North Bexhill and traffic is just as likely to travel inland as opposed to the A259 / East Coastway.  Figure 7.1 simply refers to Hastings, however the major planned developments are in Bexhill hence it would be more appropriate to refer to <b>Bexhill/Hastings</b> . This is significant as the Mott McDonald Final report for High Speed Rail published July 2015, page 32 shows 14978 Jobs and 12065 Homes surrounding Bexhill and Hastings: <a href="https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/media/5343/high-speed-rail-report.pdf">https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/media/5343/high-speed-rail-report.pdf</a>
Fig 8.1shows the A21 / Hastings Line corridor supporting Deprived Communities, which is correct there is also the potential for substantial economic growth if this corridor and A259 / East Coastway is improved, as above report shows.

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.

	e place an <b>X</b> in one box only)
	Strongly agree
	Tend to agree
	Neither agree nor disagree
	Tend to disagree
х	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:

The criteria is correct, however the figures for corridors A22 / Brighton Mainline & East Coastway, A21 / Hastings & A259 East Coastway should be higher up the list because the developments and jobs figures are not a true reflection of what is planned, as also stated in response to Q3b above.

- Bexhill / Hastings Rother Core strategy to 2028 & draft Development & Site Allocations Plan up to 2028 has allocations of 1200 dwellings at NE Bexhill plus 60,000 sq.m of employment/business space + North Bexhill has a draft allocation of up to 665 dwellings.
- Rother's Local Plan will be reviewed in 2019 with a likely outcome of further strategic allocations around Bexhill.
- Hastings have allocations for 70,000 employment / business space as well as additional dwellings as referred to in Mott McDonalds report.

<ul> <li>A22 / Brighton Mainline and East Coastway Line – Eastbourne / Wealden:         Eastbourne Core strategy identifies 5022 new dwellings up to 2027 + 55,430         sq.m. of employment. Wealden is due to publish it's draft Local Plan in July         2018. Allocations likely to be around 12,000 dwellings which may involve         significant development along the A22 including Hailsham.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>The fact that jobs is not reflected in Table 9.1's list effects the sequencing due to Zero GVA.</li> </ul>
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:
Create a measure to provide evidence of the value that transport corridors can bring to Rural economies.
Q3f. Are there any additional comments you may have about the initial sequencing of the

corridors?

## Please write in the box below:

Welcome this opportunity to comment and fully support the formation of Transport for South East. Whilst a regional focus is the right way forward, a mechanism for integrating with local transport schemes needs to be created or existing structure
kept in place.

# 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' (Please place an <b>X</b> in one box only)
Strongly agree  x Tend to agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Tend to disagree  Strongly disagree  Don't know
Please explain your response in the box below:
Tend to agree, reason for reservation is that we are rightly competing with a vision of a Northern Powerhouse. The case has to be very strong to receive the funding and support the SE area deserves.
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:
Although focussing on Economic Hubs around existing Towns is important, value of Rural areas and their transport needs as well as possible land utilisation and increased business investment, inward or indigenous and new commuting opportunities also has to be considered.  Ref Mott McDonalds Oct 2017: https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/media/9250/171004-executive-summary.pdf

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:
This a great document about our region, however in all publicity about the £1m allocation of money received there has been no reference to this document. This may result in only a few comments being received.

Thank you for your participation.