

Meeting of Southbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan – Transport Theme
Group 30th April 2013

Minutes

1. Attendees: Sylvia Jezeph (SJ), Jack Moss (JM), Geoff Talbot (GT).
2. Apologies: Robert Hayes (RH).
3. Minutes of meeting 03rd April were reviewed and it was agreed that amendments should be made with the revised draft circulated for agreement. Alice Smith was no longer a member of the Group due to level of support she is giving to other groups within the SNDP. Alice was thanked her contribution to the Transport Focus Group. **Action: JM**
4. Group members reported back on progress, including points arising from the previous minutes.
 - i) Data. GT had channelled requests through Bruce Finch to CDC and had received a response on 10 April. The information has been noted and supplemented by examination of small area data provided by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) Neighbourhood Statistics. It was clear from the work of the various focus groups that there is a need to integrate various strands of information. GT referred to a series of data sheets he had prepared relating to Southbourne Parish rather than Southbourne Ward (which includes Thorney Island). He suggested a number of conclusions:
 - a) population data – the resident population had increased by some 4.4% between 2001 – 2011, population of working age had risen by 3.7%, economically active population had grown by 10.6% and the population in work by 10.5%. Those in work represented 69.7% of the resident population of the Parish – the significance of this on transport/accessibility becomes clear when examining the ONS travel data.
 - b) percentage of those in employment in 2011 who reside in the Parish but work mainly from home was 11.4% - this compared to a District wide figure 13.5%.; similarly those walking to work accounted for 5.7% compared to the District figure of 11.6% and those using a bicycle 3.9% compared to 4.3%. The conclusion is, therefore, that some 79% of those working need either public or private transport (less than 71% for the District; of these 69% use a car/van (includes over 5% as passengers) – 63% for the District.
 - c) having drawn together summaries of the policy frameworks for both the Transport and Economy & Business Focus Groups it is clear that the intention is to increase more local employment opportunities and increase sustainable travel. However, the concentration on Chichester as an employment centre, the identification of Southbourne as ideally located for employment opportunities in Hampshire and the suggestion of only a small release of employment land in the Parish suggest that and improvement in travel patterns rests heavily on the positive results of the District Infrastructure Delivery Plan (yet to be prepared) and on the achievement of the Implementation Plan for the WSCC which requires the integration of the services of transport operators to provider a better choice of sustainable transport mode. GT suggested that the importance of this becomes clearer when examining the distance travelled to work.
 - d) Travel Distance. Again comparing the Parish with the District: people travelling less than 2kms 13.3% against 23.3%; 2-5kms 9.1% against 11.1%; 5-

10kms 22.8% against 12.2%; 10-20kms 23.3% against 15.2%; comparison after this is not dissimilar. GT suggested that a conclusion is that many of the residents of the Parish were having to travel further to work than the District average thus the influence of transport provision is important.

e) GT indicated that the response (10/04/2013) to a question raised through Bruce Finch was “At this stage, the Council has not undertaken detailed discussions with transport providers. We have included Network Rail, Southern Rail and Stagecoach in Stakeholder consultations at various stages of Plan preparation. In January 2013, they were included as part of a general email to key stakeholders seeking informal comments on the draft Local Plan. However, we did not receive any comments on the Plan from any of these organisations.

We have since contacted the above organisations with a number of questions to inform the Council’s work on the Infrastructure delivery Plan and will follow this up in due course.”

Action: Questions to be raised with WSCC (Transport Authority)/CDC regarding progress/achievement on the respective implementation documents in relation to impacts at Southbourne.

ii) Buses. GT has nearly finished checking the formal location of each bus stop and the service provided. He will provide this to SJ who has produced A3 and A4 maps using the OS 1:50,000 scale base to cover the SNDP area. The maps indicate all community facilities together with the SHLAA sites and possible housing allocation. These maps could be useful for inclusion in any subsequent document. It will be necessary to clear OS copyright – GT thought Sue Talbot (ST) had been discussing use of OS bases with CDC for the housing sites assessments. SJ had also combined onto A4 format the timetables for Emsworth and District services. **Action:** GT to provide his information to SJ; GT to ask ST to contact SJ; SJ to continue work on map bases, possibly increasing scope for material for other Focus Groups.

iii) Trains. GT had compiled a list of weekday train services through Southbourne (stopping and non stopping) which he felt might be useful in discussions regarding the operation of the rail barriers. Given the lack of response by Network Rail/Southern Rail to consultation there continues to be a need to discuss the operation of the train crossing barriers and delays to vehicles. The impact on vehicles of any possible changes in train timetables and in the location of housing development sites needs to be understood. **Action:** Questions to/discussion with WSCC/CDC/Network Rail required.

iv) Road. GT was still examining the CDC Local Plan Transport Study prepared by Jacobs. He had not changed the views given at the last FG meeting which was that it concentrates on the study of impact on Chichester. The Transport Study examines a number of CDC housing allocation targets and sets out road network mitigation measures, mainly dealing with junction mitigation measures on the A27 in the vicinity of Chichester; this point is clear from examining the network plans set out at Figs J and K of the Study’s appendices.

In respect of Southbourne, the Study allocates as a maximum 400 houses over the Local Plan period (to be checked) but assessment of the impact of the allocation is contained within a single traffic zone (Zone 73) coinciding with the Parish boundary and only in terms of loading on the A259 with its junction at the Fishbourne

Roundabout. Mitigation at this point might be a “hamburger” junction **Action:** Establish whether any impact assessment work has been undertaken related to the SHLAA sites – JM to liaise with Housing Focus Group before approaching CDC/WSCC.

v) Timetable. JM indicated that the Steering Group (SG) is considering a 6 week delay in the SNDP programme in order to consider more fully proposals for consultation and the formulation of the questionnaire. He indicated that a meeting of Focus Group coordinators was being arranged to discuss this prior to the next SG meeting. **Action:** JM to report back as appropriate.

vi) Questionnaire. Consideration continues to be given to the formulation of a limited number of questions picking up on issues already identified. **Action:** JM to draft possible questions for consideration.

Next meeting: Tuesday 28th May at 18:30 **Action:** JM to confirm arrangements and circulate agenda.