

# Draft proposal to government

## Consultation questionnaire

---

### Contents:

- **Background**
  - **Responding to the consultation**
  - **Next steps**
  - **Consultation questions**
  - **Your information**
- 

### Background

Transport for the South East was formed in 2017 as a partnership of 16 local transport authorities and five local enterprise partnerships to speak with one voice on the South East's strategic transport needs.

Our aim is to become a statutory sub-national transport body (STB), giving the South East a formal and unified voice with which to influence government decision making on transport issues.

We are now consulting on our draft proposal to government, which sets out the statutory powers and responsibilities we are seeking to help us deliver economic growth, improve quality of life and protect and enhance the environment.

The draft proposal has been developed in conjunction with our member authorities and agreed by our organisation's principal decision making forum, the Transport for the South East shadow partnership board.

## Responding to the consultation

Before answering the questions below, please read the draft proposal document which can be found at:

<https://transportforthesoutheast.gov.uk/about/becoming-a-statutory-body>

Some questions require only a 'yes/no' answer which can be selected from a drop-down menu, while others provide the opportunity to give a more detailed response.

Once you have answered the questions and completed the 'Your information' section, please send this completed form by email to [tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:tfse@eastsussex.gov.uk) or by post to:

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

Please note that we are only able to process responses which include completed personal information. Your contact details will not be added to our database unless you actively opt in.

**The deadline for responses is Wednesday, 31 July 2019.**

## Next steps

After the consultation period has ended, we will consider all the responses received and amend our proposal document accordingly.

The intention is that this amended version will be put before Transport for the South East's Shadow Partnership Board in September 2019, with the proposal being formally submitted to government by the end of the year.

Government will consider the proposal and will make a decision on whether TfSE should be granted statutory status. If the proposal is agreed, a statutory instrument will be laid before Parliament for the final decision.

## Consultation questions

Transport for the South East is looking to establish a statutory sub-national transport body (STB) for the South East of England. This would give the South East a formal and unified voice with which to influence government decision making on transport issues. The prime functions for an STB would be to publish a regional transport strategy and provide advice to the Secretary of State for Transport on investment opportunities across the area.

- 1. Do you, in principle, support the establishment of a sub-national transport body for the South East, including the ability to publish a transport strategy and advise central government on transport matters in the region?**

Yes

- 2. What do you regard as the benefits Transport for the South East will provide as a statutory sub-national transport body?**

A high quality, sustainable and integrated transport system, focusing on increased productivity, improved safety and quality of life, and protection for the environment.

Growth in the economy through integrated transport projects, improved connectivity, better protection of the environment, improved access to housing, jobs and education.

Increased investment, particularly in those areas in the region where such investment is likely to lead to the most effective growth.

Influencing national government, investment in pan-regional strategic corridors, effective, joined up planning. With powers that are proportionate and additional to the existing powers of the relevant authorities.

A powerful and effective partnership, bringing together 16 local transport authorities, 5 LEPs Collaboration with all significant partners, not just Network Rail and Highways England but potentially organisations such as Heathrow Airport Limited and any similar bodies operating adjacent to or otherwise in connection with the region.

Integrated travel solutions, including smart ticketing

Improved Air Quality, helped by clean air zones

*Nb please see the full Slough response in the attached supplementary document.*

Transport for the South East's draft proposal includes a list of constituent members and a number of co-opted members. [Primary legislation](#) sets out what bodies can be considered as 'constituent authorities'.

3. Do you, in principle, think your relevant local transport authority should be a member of the Transport for the South East sub-national transport body? If not, why?

Yes

Slough BC shares the TFSE commitment to support and grow the economy through integrated transport projects, to improve connectivity, speed up journeys and also to protect and enhance the environment in the region. All of these aims tally with Slough's priorities, and indeed with the essential three pillars of sustainability (Economy, Society, Environment).

However, we consider that TFSE has not yet sufficiently involved and considered the needs, requirements and priorities of all local authorities. The Berkshire Local Authorities have not received the same attention and consideration as the larger county authorities in the group. Further, the economic contribution to the region by Slough and more widely Berkshire has not been fully recognised within the proposal and related information provided by TFSE. Hence, as an active constituent member of TFSE, and part of the Berkshire membership group Slough will press for TFSE to engage more extensively.

The proposal refers to the 'natural and historic' environment of the South East. Slough BC will press for greater inclusivity, since environmental concerns in urban towns are equally important in terms of public health and social equity across the whole region. Improved air quality is a priority for Slough, specifically, as well as across the region.

There has been insufficient consideration of, and engagement with, Heathrow and the transport implications for both the South East region and Heathrow. Considerably more needs to be done by TFSE to understand the full implications and opportunities here; the potential impacts of Heathrow are huge. Slough BC will press for extensive exploration of the links with all organisations and authorities across regional boundaries.

SBC recognises the lack of adequate transport infrastructure to help deliver new housing and access to transport and education. This is a concern throughout the entire south east region, not just isolated areas. Housing is also a priority specifically for Slough.

Slough BC fully supports the proposal in relation to benefits for the travelling public, with particular reference to 'integrated travel solutions' and smart ticketing. The overall objective here must be to deliver genuine, multi-modal, sustainable, integrated transport.

Slough BC priorities better Air Quality, and we call for more focus on the issue by TFSE. Appropriate policies must be developed as an essential feature of the TFSE strategy.

As well as developing long term, sustainable transport infrastructure throughout the south east region, TFSE must develop strategies to help take advantage of the benefits offered by Travel Demand Management (TDM), focusing on reduction in travel where appropriate. This requires the development of non-travel options, drawing on technological developments. The conventional essential link between land-use planning and transport has effectively now become a triangular relationship involving digital technology as the third core contributor to the overall solution.

*Nb please see the full Slough response in the attached supplementary document.*

Beyond general functions of an STB, Transport for the South East is planning to make a proposal to the Department for Transport (DfT) for other transport functions which would be exercised concurrently and with the consent of the Secretary of State or local transport

authorities, e.g. in relation to constructing new highways. Any proposal to DfT would need formal consent from each 'constituent member' and any regulations would also need formal consent from all 'constituent members'.

**4. Are you content with the proposed functions in the draft STB proposal?**

Yes

**5. What other functions do you think an STB should have/not have and why?**

We would add the need to engage with other organisations which may not geographically lie within the TFSE region, but can be considered stakeholders in terms of impacts and contributions on a cross-regional basis. This would include Transport for London, Heathrow Airport Ltd and other any other relevant organisations or authorities of a similar stature. The various references to rail franchises and developments in this table strengthen the argument supported by Slough BC that TFSE must engage more comprehensively with all stakeholders and organisations involved. Little has been said elsewhere in this TFSE proposal relating to the Western Rail Access to Heathrow and the Southern Rail Access to Heathrow projects.

On capital grants, it is recommended that provision is made for constituent authorities to be awarded funding for transport enhancements that may cross authority boundaries, as well as within specific local authority areas. Agreements with neighbouring authorities (either within or outside of the south east region) would, of course, need to be carefully drawn up. The same principle applies to the provision of bus services, partnerships and franchises. Bus services are not confined to geographical boundaries, and may well cross regional boundaries. This also applies to integrated ticketing. Clarification on the powers and guidelines relating to these points is requested.

We support complementary and concurrent powers, However, there seems to be some conflict here with the lack of an effective veto (section 4.12). There is a risk here that individual local authorities may be in disagreement with the wider regional view and have decisions imposed upon them. Further clarity is sought on this matter.

*Nb please see the full Slough response in the attached supplementary document.*

**6. Would you be content with an STB having such functions if any use of those functions required the consent of the relevant local transport authority?**

Yes

Transport for the South East aims to maintain continuity from the governance structure that has served members effectively during shadow operation. Some key decisions may require

a vote, such as the transport strategy, annual budget and amendments to the constitution. A number of voting options have been explored, with a preferred option based on the population of the smallest individual constituent member. The preference will be to reach a consensus on all decisions, but where this cannot be achieved a weighted vote will be used. All 'constituent members' will need to consent to the final proposal to DfT.

**7. Are you content with the preferred voting mechanism, to be used when consensus cannot be reached?**

No

**8. Any other comments**



***Following up on our answer to question 7...***

Slough BC is broadly supportive of the voting principles proposed by TFSE. However, we repeat our concerns, as set out in our answer to question 6, about a possible conflict between TFSE and local authority views and wishes. More clarity is required here.

The voting option based on population may seem the simplest approach, however Slough BC notes that other factors are relevant here, including the contribution of any given authority to overall growth within the region. The biggest contributions may come from the local authority areas with small populations, for example within the Thames Valley. Hence it may be appropriate to consider alternative voting rights and procedures.

Slough BC agrees with the principle of working by consensus, but we would like to know exactly how TFSE proposes to resolve any disputes or disagreements where consensus is not achievable.

Furthermore, with specific reference to Berkshire, the table in Appendix 1 shows no votes for each of the six Berkshire unitary authorities, and 6 votes for the Berkshire Local Transport Body. This is consistent with previous correspondence with the Thames Valley LEP. It is understood that the Berkshire group will collectively have 6 votes, but only one seat on the board. Slough continues to support this original proposal, i.e. to join TFSE as both a constituent member and as part of the Berkshire group.

What is not clear in this table is what happens should any individual constituent member withdraw from the Berkshire group at any point in the future. Confirmation is requested on whether the authority will automatically be granted an individual vote. Clarification is also required on whether or not that individual member authority will also be granted a seat on the TFSE board.

***Other points, in summary, not covered in previous answers...***

***On Governance:***

There is a clear need here to ensure equality of opportunity for representation at all levels of governance within TFSE. More information is requested on the processes and procedures likely to be introduced here, with particular reference to how all authorities will have genuine opportunities to be involved.

***Nb please see the full Slough response in the attached supplementary document.***



## Your information

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Eddie Hewitt</b>
<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>Slough Borough Council</b>
<b>Job title:</b>	<b>Network Management Engineer</b>
<b>Email:</b>	<b>Eddie.Hewitt@slough.gov.uk</b>
<b>Would you like to receive news and other updates from Transport for the South East?</b>	Yes