

Committee	PTTC
Date	25/2/25
Item	6i, 7, 8, 9 & 10

REPORT	Page
<b>6i. Planning Decision DM/24/2698 – Review Approach to DP 39</b>	1
<b>7. Response to MSDC Village Parking Stakeholder Engagement</b>	3
<b>8. Budget Report</b>	4
<b>9. Outstanding Action Points</b>	5
<b>10. Consultations</b>	
<b>i. Transport for the South East</b>	7
<b>Appendix One - Letter Village Parking - Stakeholder Engagement</b>	8
<b>Appendix Two - Draft Response to TFSE Transport Strategy for the South East</b>	12

Report:	<b>6i. Planning Decision DM/24/2698 – Review Approach to DP 39: Sustainable Design and Construction)</b>
---------	--

**Summary:**

PTTC to consider how to react to MSDC's apparent acceptance that it's District Plan Policy DP 39 is not (*or cannot be?*) actively applied when considering planning applications, based on the Delegated Report for this application.

**Background:**

LPC's PTTC has increasingly sought to encourage MSDC to apply its District Plan Policy DP39: Sustainable Design and Construction:-

*Strategic Objectives: 1) To promote development that makes the best use of resources and increases the sustainability of communities within Mid Sussex, and its ability to adapt to climate change.*

*Evidence Base: Gatwick Sub Region Water Cycle Study; West Sussex Sustainable Energy Study, Mid Sussex Sustainable Energy Study.*

All development proposals must seek to improve the sustainability of development and should where appropriate and feasible according to the type and size of development and location, incorporate the following measures:

- Minimise energy use through the design and layout of the scheme including through the use of natural lighting and ventilation;
- Explore opportunities for efficient energy supply through the use of communal heating networks where viable and feasible;
- Use renewable sources of energy;
- Maximise efficient use of resources, including minimising waste and maximising recycling/re-use of materials through both construction and occupation;
- Limit water use to 110 litres/person/day in accordance with Policy DP42: Water Infrastructure and the Water Environment;
- Demonstrate how the risks associated with future climate change have been planned for as part of the layout of the scheme and design of its buildings to ensure its longer term resilience

Committee	PTTC
Date	25/2/25
Item	6i, 7, 8, 9 & 10

### Current Position

LPC's response to DM/24/2698 stated "*Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) has no objection to the overall development. In the context of DP 39 Sustainable Design and Construction, LPC asks whether consideration has been given to using renewable energy sources, noting that the south-facing front roof could potentially support a suitable solar array.*"

MSDC's Planning Decision Notice makes no reference to LPC's comment on sustainable energy and suitable solar array. The Delegated Report, underpinning the decision states:

*"The response from Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) refers to policy DP39 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, which relates to sustainable design and construction. It is the role of the Local Planning Authority to assess the scheme that is before them, which does not include solar panels. This would not prevent the applicant from potentially installing solar panels in the future and the development would still need to meet Building Regulations standards. It is therefore considered that this would not warrant the refusal of this application."*

This would appear to bring into question the efficacy of MSDC's Policy DP 39 and in particular "...All development proposals **must** seek to improve the sustainability of development and **should where appropriate and feasible** according to the type and size of development and location, incorporate the following measures...

- **Use renewable sources of energy;**" (highlighting added for this report to LPC)

### Financial Implications

#### Policy Context

#### Sustainability Implications

#### Risk Management Implications

#### Legal Implications

None for LPC

### Way Forward

LPC's Planning and Traffic Committee should consider whether to accept MSDC's current approach, which appears to render DP39 at least partially, if not completely, ineffective. If not, whether to write to MSDC seeking an understanding of how the policy is expected to be applied and enforced when planning applications are assessed.

### Recommended Action

Given global concerns in respect of sustainability and LPC's increasing activity in this space, it would appear to be appropriate to write to MSDC along the lines suggested above.

### Appendices/Background Papers

See

- MSDC's Online [Public Register](#) for the full Delegated Report on this application DM/24/2698
- [Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031](#) for the current District Plan and its policies.

David Parsons

Deputy Parish Clerk

21<sup>st</sup> February 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	25/2/25
Item	6i, 7, 8, 9 & 10

Report:	<b>7. Response to MSDC Village Parking Stakeholder Engagement</b>
---------	---

**Summary**

Report previously presented to and discussed at PTTC 4<sup>th</sup> February 2025. With the benefit of additional comments received from councillors by 14<sup>th</sup> February, LPC response drafted and, after consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of PTTC in line with the requirements of the Delegated Authority, submitted to MSDC on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2025.

For noting and considering further action, if any.

**Appendices/Background Papers**

See Appendix One – Response to MSDC

**David Parsons**  
**Deputy Parish Clerk**

21<sup>st</sup> February 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	25/2/25
Item	6i, 7, 8, 9 & 10

Report:	<b>8. Budget Report</b>
---------	-------------------------

### Summary

No expenditure incurred in year to date, although discussions are currently taking place with the SID suppliers to purchase new batteries, as the existing units are not lasting as long as they used to, meaning that the SIDs can fail to display speeds and increasing the workload for the village orderly. With the District Plan currently under (critical) scrutiny, the new governments plans for increased housebuilding, and devolution proposals, it would appear more likely that the Planning Reserve may be required in the foreseeable future.

### Current Position

Description	Cost Centre / Reserve	Budget 2024-25	Expenditure	Balance	Proposed Budget 2025-26
Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) <sup>1</sup>	4973	£400	£0	£400	£400
Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs) <sup>2,3</sup>	4960	£2,500	£0	£2,500	-
<b>sub-total Budget<sup>3</sup></b>		<b>£3,900</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£3,900</b>	<b>£400</b>
<b>Earmarked Reserve</b>					
Planning Reserve <sup>4</sup>	4995/335	£4,000		£4,000	£4,000
SID Replacement <sup>2</sup>	4936/336	£2,000		£2,000	£3,500
<b>sub-total Reserves</b>		<b>£6,000</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£6,000</b>	<b>£7,500</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>£9,900</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£9,900</b>	<b>£7,900</b>

### Notes

1. To meet RTPI annual maintenance charge
2. For the financial year 2025/6: £1,500 to be added to the SID Replacement Reserve, bringing this to £3,500 to meet the anticipated cost of repairing/replacing one of the ageing early SIDs, which are now over 5 years old and out of the manufacturers guarantee period.
3. Up to £1,000 unutilised from the 2024/5 SID budget to be added to the General Reserve.
4. Planning Reserve – in anticipation of external costs which may be incurred (e.g. reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan, addressing unforeseen planning issues, pursuing sustainable transport initiatives)

### Recommended Action

1. For noting.

**David Parsons**  
Deputy Parish Clerk

21<sup>st</sup> February 2025

Lindfield Parish Council

Committee	PTTC
Date	10/12/24
Item	6i, 7, 8, 9 & 10

Report: **9. Outstanding Action Points**

Minute	Meeting date	Subject	Action Agreed	Responsibility	Due Date	Status	Date Completed	Comments
469 37.1	22/11/22 27/6/23	Joint Neighbourhood Plan	PTTC agreed that LRPC's proposed actions should be obtained to facilitate any meeting with MSDC's Senior Planning Officer to consider the next steps as appropriate	Deputy Parish Clerk	24/9/24	Overdue		LRPC considered at 24/6/24 Meeting - Cllr Christian Bode drawing up proposals for LRPC, which can then be discussed with LPC
273.1	8/10/24	TRO - Lewes Road / High Street Junction	a) clarify expiry dates of S106 monies held by WSCC b) seek details of scheme of improvements mentioned by WSCC	Deputy Parish Clerk	29/11/24	Overdue		Email sent to WSCC 12/11/24, Chased 17/12/24, 14/1/25. 29/11/25 Highways advised that the officer who wrote the response to the Ombudsman has left WSCC and it is proving difficult to address the questions.
285.1	29/10/24	TRO	the TRO Working Group should reconvene to consider potential ways forward	Deputy Parish Clerk	29/11/24	Overdue		Email sent to WG members 14/11/24, Chased 3/1/25, 17/1/25
285.1	29/10/24	TRO	whether WSCC would be seeking to update Satnav systems to reflect the newly erected 'unsuitable for HGV signs'	Deputy Parish Clerk	29/11/24	Overdue		Email sent to WSCC 12/11/24, Chased 17/12/24, 14/1/25

**Lindfield Parish Council**

Committee	PTTC
Date	10/12/24
Item	6i, 7, 8, 9 & 10

319.2	14/1/25	Transport for the South East	Consultation closes 7th March 2025	Deputy Parish Clerk	25/2/25	In course		Meeting 4/2/25 to consider Councillors' views on Consultation presented at 14/1/25 & 4/2/25 meeting
331.1	4/2/25	Transport for the South East	consider response at PTTC meeting 4/2/25, finalising at 25/2/25	Deputy Parish Clerk	25/2/25	In course		Meeting 25/2/25
320.1	14/1/25	Blackthorns Path	Consider appropriate agenda item in conjunction with Cllr Woolley	Deputy Parish Clerk	14/2/25	Overdue		Discussion ongoing
331.2	4/2/25	MSDC Parking	Stakeholder Engagement Villages	Deputy Parish Clerk	21/2/25	Completed	18/2/25	Response sent 18/2/25

**Recommended Action**

1. To note the currently outstanding action points and agree the removal of any completed item(s).

**David Parsons**  
**Deputy Parish Clerk**

21<sup>st</sup> February 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	14/1/25
Item	6i, 7, 8, 9 & 10

Report:	<b>10. Consultations</b>
---------	--------------------------

**Original Report presented to PTTC 14<sup>th</sup> January 2025 and 4<sup>th</sup> February 2025**

**i. Transport for the South East - closes 7th March 2025**

**Summary:**

Consultation launched by Transport for the South East and presented to PTTC 14.1.25 and 4.2.25. Appendix Two shows the proposed response based on members feedback to date.– members to consider way forward.

**Background:**

Consultation on Transport for the South East draft Transport Strategy received 10<sup>th</sup> December 2025.

**Current Position**

The consultation can be found at [Transport Strategy - Transport for the South East](#) and comprises a 111 page document, together with a summary and the consultation questions. It is also available for Councillors through LPC’s Teams files for Planning and Traffic at [2025.01.14](#)

**Financial Implications**

**Policy Context**

**Sustainability Implications**

**Risk Management Implications**

**Legal Implications**

None for LPC.

**Way Forward**

Agree proposed response and any amendments

**Appendices/Background Papers**

See links above/Appendix Two.

**David Parsons**  
**Deputy Parish Clerk**

21<sup>st</sup> February 2024

Committee	PTTC
Date	14/1/25
Item	6i, 7, 8, 9 & 10

**MSDC Village Parking – Response to MSDC sent 18<sup>th</sup> February 2025**

*Lindfield Parish Council*

The Clock Tower House  
Lindfield Enterprise Park  
Lewes Road  
Lindfield  
West Sussex  
RH16 2LH

Parish Clerk: Mr A Funnell

Tel: 01444 484115  
e-mail: [clerks@lindfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerks@lindfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk)

Rob Anderton  
Assistant Director – Commercial Services and Contracts  
Mid Sussex District Council  
Oaklands Road  
Haywards Heath  
West Sussex  
RH16 1SS

18<sup>th</sup> February 2025

Dear Rob,

**Village Parking- Stakeholder Engagement**

Thank you for your letter dated 24<sup>th</sup> January.

It is obviously pleasing to know that MSDC is “...currently reviewing existing arrangements in the car parks it operates in the villages...To achieve the best possible outcomes from this work...” however, it is unclear from a Lindfield perspective precisely what issue or range of issues this work is seeking to address, whether the work would in fact address those issues, and how a positive outcome would be defined or measured.

Whilst the statement “Car parks cost money to maintain and if they are not properly managed, they can result in frustration, with drivers struggling to find a space.” is undoubtedly accurate, it is more difficult to understand how the range of options proffered would materially improve the parking situation in Lindfield Village. The reality is that there are a finite number of parking spaces within the village and simply introducing charging or further restrictions does not change that position. In Lindfield Parish Council’s (LPC) view, the impact of such charging is likely to be detrimental to residents, local businesses and visitors alike. Accordingly, **LPC is strongly against the introduction of a charging scheme and requests that MSDC does not proceed with any such proposals.**

As one of our councillors commented “...I don’t have any issues with parking in the village. On the odd occasion I need to drive to the village then I never have any trouble parking. I think the maximum stay time limits are good enough and it’s handy not having to pay if one is just quickly popping to the Post Office or something...” This view seems to reflect a wider consensus that, yes, parking can be slightly difficult on occasions but generally spaces can be found, even if it might sometimes mean parking slightly further afield, such as in one of the Common Car Parks or at Hickmans Lane Recreation Ground.

In terms of more detailed considerations, LPC requests that MSDC carefully assesses the following issues, before taking any further action in respect of parking arrangements within the village: -

- a) Any proposals to charge for parking are likely to be cost negative for MSDC if not effectively enforced, as there would insufficient income to cover the costs of implementation (e.g. surveillance and ticketing equipment, manpower requirements).
- b) MSDC’s Parking Enforcement appears to have had resourcing issues for many years. It is difficult to understand how this will be improved but unless it becomes fully resourced and effective, the cost issues identified under a) above will be amplified.



Committee	PTTC
Date	14/1/25
Item	6i, 7, 8, 9 & 10

## Appendix One

### MSDC Village Parking – Response to MSDC sent 18<sup>th</sup> February 2025


### *Lindfield Parish Council*

- c) Businesses, as well as residents, rely on the current parking arrangements and implementing a charging scheme would be likely to have a negative effect on trading and be counterproductive to countrywide efforts to support High Street businesses. Anecdotal feedback from a local business is that changes to charging arrangements in a local town had a noticeable negative effect on their trading. Lindfield currently has a dynamic and individual High Street, which must be carefully supported into the future.
- d) Parking pressures at school pick up and drop off times are likely to be exacerbated by any scheme which limits access to car parks or street parking, whether through charging or other restrictions.
- e) Residents without off-street parking would be likely to apply for residents parking schemes to be introduced, to reduce the likely knock on impact of displaced vehicles under any charging regime. This could lead to increased conflict as available parking spaces are further reduced.
- f) Charging residents with no access to off street parking seems unfair, recognising the limited alternative options available within the village.
- g) Whilst some may choose to park in the Common or Hickmans Lane car parks if charging is introduced, pressures on surrounding roads is also likely to increase. It was noted that when the 4-hour parking restriction was introduced in the High Street some years ago, it pushed the parking problems into neighbouring roads, with Chaloner Road being significantly affected.
- h) Having first clarified what it is that MSDC are trying to achieve, both for itself and the likely affected villages, a comprehensive assessment should be undertaken by the appropriate consultants for MSDC, to ensure that whatever proposals are taken forward are likely to address *all* relevant issues. Particularly that the any changes will not be detrimental to residents' experiences, local businesses' trading, or MSDC's costs, recognising a) and b) above. It would be unfortunate, to say the least, if the costs incurred by MSDC under its proposals ultimately led to increased Council Tax bills for residents and businesses to cover any deficits created by any new scheme.

If, despite LPC's strong objections and appropriate consideration of all the elements detailed above, MSDC do proceed to implement parking charges, LPC considers that there should be an initial free parking period of at least 30-45 minutes (preferably longer) to provide flexibility for users and, hopefully, at least partially offset some of the likely negative impacts identified. If a web-based parking tool is being considered, great care should be taken to ensure its efficacy recognising the limited mobile signal in several village locations.

Looking to the future, it is likely that more housing developments will put increase pressure on village amenities, including parking. Against that background, it is essential that MSDC, as the Local Planning Authority, ensures that public transport, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure is also improved to encourage more people to utilise sustainable alternatives and not wholly rely on driving.

Yours Sincerely



David Parsons  
Deputy Parish Clerk

See pages 3-4 for responses to the five questions included in your letter.

Committee	PTTC
Date	14/1/25
Item	6i, 7, 8, 9 & 10

**MSDC Village Parking – Response to MSDC sent 18<sup>th</sup> February 2025**

*Lindfield Parish Council*

**Answers to Questions posed by MSDC:**

1. **Parking Challenges:** What difficulties do you and your residents, service users, staff, and visitors face when trying to park?
  - a. Is it difficult to find a parking space when needed?
    - Whilst, on occasion, it can be difficult to find spaces, it is recognised by all that there is a finite amount of space within the village and users will usually find a solution either by parking slightly further away or through natural turnover of spaces. Adding administration and / or charges would not appear likely to change this situation.
  - b. Are the current restrictions too limiting (e.g., are maximum stay times too short)?
    - They seem about right, although the relative lack of Parking Enforcement can make the limitations somewhat academic.
  - c. Are there specific issues for commuters, shoppers, residents, and local employees?
    - As detailed elsewhere, whilst spaces are limited, the combination of alternative car parks and natural turnover makes the position generally manageable.
2. **Parking Discs:** Parking discs are hard to find, difficult for the District Council to enforce and manage, and costly to produce. This can discourage people from visiting the villages. What are your thoughts on these potential alternative solutions to achieve the same objectives:
  - a. Implementing “online” disc parking using the Council’s current pay-by-mobile operator.
    - Lindfield does not currently have a parking disc system and adding this bureaucracy would not appear to be a positive step in improving parking. Further, as advised by Lindfield Medical Centre, the village has a higher than average proportion of older residents, some of whom may be unable to use any online system.
  - b. Installing terminals that issue free tickets stating the time limit.
    - As detailed under a) and b) in the letter above, it does not seem likely that MSDC’s costs would be covered or whether effective enforcement could or would take place
    - This is perhaps the least inappropriate of the proposals, if usage remained free, that there were sufficient terminals, and the technology was accessible to all users. However, being located in a Conservation Area, great care would be needed to ensure that any terminals were not intrusive or unsightly.
  - c. Introducing pre-registration online for frequent users and others.
    - Most visitors access the parking spaces as and when they need them – enforcing a pre-booking approach is likely to be detrimental to all concerned, putting off visitors and negatively affecting High Street trading.
3. **Stricter Time Restrictions or Charges:** If stricter time restrictions or charges were introduced, what measures do you think would be needed to lessen the impact:
  - a. On different types of users, such as commuters, your employees, regular visitors, residents who use the car parks, shoppers, service users, and specific staff (e.g., teachers, doctors, administrators).



Committee	PTTC
Date	14/1/25
Item	6i, 7, 8, 9 & 10

## Appendix One

### MSDC Village Parking – Response to MSDC sent 18<sup>th</sup> February 2025

## *Lindfield Parish Council*

- b. By offering specific products, such as free or discounted permits or overnight permits which allow a few hours either side for residents.
- It seems counterproductive to propose to introduce a stricter regime and then consider ways to lessen its impact. It is important to clarify what problem is it that MSDC are trying to solve and how any increased restrictions or charges might achieve that aim. Perhaps more important, is to look to make active travel a realistic option through investing in better walking and cycling access. MSDC, as the Local Planning Authority, is well positioned to address this bigger picture and not simply focus on parking charges as ‘low hanging fruit.’
- 4. Residents' Use of Car Parks:** Do you have any information or opinions on residents and their use of village or local car parks? For example:
- a. Do many houses lack off-street parking?
    - Yes, a significant number, especially in the High Street and in some nearby roads.
  - b. Is there a concern that residents' use of car parks limits availability for other users during the day?
    - In the absence of regular, effective parking enforcement, it is quite difficult to tell whether this is the case. Anecdotally, many overnight parked cars are removed from the car parks and High Street during the day, suggesting that this is not a material issue.
    - Effectively blocking access to car parks and the High Street through charging or other restrictions is likely to make the little on-street parking available even more pressured and potentially lead to parking disputes. Where would affected residents be expected to park?
- 5. Improving Car Park Efficiency:** Do you have any ideas on how to make the car parks more efficient and help more people find parking when they need it? For example:
- a. Removing special permit-only spaces.
    - The Tollgate Car Park special permit spaces are mainly for Medical Centre Staff – no-one would benefit from reducing their access or ability to park.
    - There are a few residents parking spaces for the adjoining flats / sheltered accommodation, where contractual agreements may be in place and some residents may be unable to walk further if those spaces were taken away. It is also important to note that Compton Road, where the Car Park is situated, is also an area where there is already severe pressure on street parking.
  - b. Adjusting the balance between long-stay and short-stay parking bays.
    - All of Lindfield's MSDC operated car parks are short stay. It would not seem appropriate to change any of these to longer stay, as it would be likely to exacerbate parking issues in and around the High Street.
  - c. Introducing reasonable charges to manage demand and encourage turnover.
    - As detailed above, this would appear to be counter productive for residents, businesses and visitors. Indeed, for some users, having paid for parking may encourage them to stay longer than they do under the present regime, rather than encouraging turnover.

Committee	PTTC
Date	14/1/25
Item	8, 9, 10 & 11

**Appendix Two**

**Draft Response to TFSE Transport Strategy for the South East**

See following pages for detailed response

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

## Introduction

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

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

You can view the full draft Transport Strategy and a summary document online or by requesting a paper copy. To view these documents online go to [LINK]

### **Please consider these documents before submitting your response.**

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

You can view all document online at [LINK]

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

You can complete this survey online at:

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

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

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

This survey should take around 20 minutes to complete.

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

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

## About your Organisation

**Q What is the name of your organisation?**

Lindfield Parish Council

**Q What type of organisation do you represent?**

Local authority

Business

Charity or third sector

Transport operator

National partner

Town or Parish Council

Airport or Port

Other

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

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

Yes

No

**Q What is your name?**

David Parsons

**Q What is your job title?**

Deputy Parish Clerk

**Q Please tell us your email address**

d.parsons@lindfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk

## Challenges

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

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

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

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

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree or disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Don't know

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

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

The biggest challenge would appear to be implementation. The high level strategy is a fine starting point but without an effective implementation plan, and the resources to deliver it, runs the danger of losing credibility quite quickly.

## Vision and Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Whilst the strategy appears sound, especially in emphasising good, green credentials and seeking to provide an equal playing field for all residents, the recurrent references to organisational and financial obstacles perhaps questions its efficacy in the real world.



## Strategic Connectivity Mission

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

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

### Strategic Connectivity Mission



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

#### We will have succeeded when:

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

#### Short-Term Priorities

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

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

#### Long-Term Priorities

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

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



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

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or do not support
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Don’t know

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

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

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

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

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

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

Advancing key connectivity projects

## Resilience Mission

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

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

### Resilience Mission



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

#### We will have succeeded when:

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

#### Short-Term Priorities

- We will strengthen the current network's resilience by:
- ▶ Assessing road disruption impacts and securing sustainable funding for maintenance.
  - ▶ Establishing long-term funding pipelines for infrastructure renewals.
  - ▶ Strategically planning for future risks to enhance network adaptability.
  - ▶ Advocating for consistent funding for maintenance and prevention projects.
  - ▶ Coordinating with utility providers to minimise disruption from roadworks.

#### Long-Term Priorities

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



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

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or do not support
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Don't know

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

	Very important	Important	Neither important or not important	Not very important	Not important at all	Don't know
The transport network delivers comfortable, reliable journeys between key towns, cities and international gateways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The transport network has the agility to manage and absorb disruptions quickly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

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

# Creating alternative routes



## Inclusion and Integration Mission

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

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

### Inclusion & Integration Mission

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

**We will have succeeded when:**

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

**Infrastructure Priorities**

We will target infrastructure upgrades by:

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

**Service Priorities**

We will improve affordability and accessibility by:

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



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

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

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

	Very important	Important	Neither important or not important	Not very important	Not important at all	Don't know
Everyone can affordably travel where they need to go and when	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Customer satisfaction with the transport network is high across all sections of society	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

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

# Designing inclusive infrastructure

## Decarbonisation Mission

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

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

### Decarbonisation Mission



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

#### We will have succeeded when:

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

#### Short-Term Priorities

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

#### Long-Term Priorities

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



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

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or do not support
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Don't know


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

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

All surface transport trips are net zero emission by 2050	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We have not exceeded our carbon budgets by 2025	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The South East is seen as a world leader in decarbonising transport	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

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

**Improving public transport and active travel**



## Sustainable Growth Mission

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

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

### Sustainable Growth Mission



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

#### We will have succeeded when:

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

#### Policy Enablers

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

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

#### Transport Intervention Priorities

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

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



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

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or do not support
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Don't know

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

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

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

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

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

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

Concentrating development in areas with strong transport infrastructures

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

## Global Policy Interventions

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

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

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

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

Page 84 is Roles & Responsibilities!

In terms of EV penetration, may driver do not have access of off road parking and therefore charging. The current on road offerings are c7/8x the cost of off road householder tariffs. Unless this 'gap' can be closed EV's will remain unattractive to many.

## Delivery

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

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

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

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree or disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Don't know

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

## Indicators

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

You can view the full table of indicators on page 95 of the full draft Transport Strategy document.

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

Yes

No

Don't know

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

Page 95 is Integration and Inclusion Framework!

## Integrated Sustainability Appraisal

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

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree or disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Don't know

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

## Overall Views

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

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

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

It is clearly ambitious but its achievability is far more open to question absent central government support

## **Privacy Notice – Transport for the South East Transport Strategy Refresh**

### **Overview**

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

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

### **What information is being used?**

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

Personal Data:

Name

Email address

### **How will your information be used?**

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

All data will be assimilated and pseudonymised for reporting purposes.

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

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

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

### **What is your legal basis for processing this information?**

Our legal basis for processing your data is consent.

### **How long will your information be kept for?**

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

### **How will your information be stored?**

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

### **Sharing your information**

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



## Your rights

Under data protection legislation, you have the right:

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

Please visit [www.eastsussex.gov.uk/your-council/about/keydocuments/foi/data-protection](http://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/your-council/about/keydocuments/foi/data-protection) for further details.

## How to find out more or complain

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

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

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

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

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