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Executive Summary
Extensive consultation and close partnership working are at the heart of the Surrey Transport Plan and our approach to transport in the county.

This report describes the consultation process for the Surrey Transport Plan and how this has shaped the adopted plan which came into effect on 1 April 2011. All consultation responses received were considered in the revision of the draft strategies and other sections of the Surrey Transport Plan.

The county council has separately published the Post Adoption Environmental Statement (January 2012) which summarises how representations on the SEA Scoping Report (November 2010) and Environmental Report (January 2010) were taken into account.

Consultation and participation will continue to inform the local transport strategies and forward programmes, as these are brought forward (a process described in the Introduction to the Surrey Transport Plan). Consultations on the Surrey Rail Strategy and the Cycling Strategy were undertaken during 2013; Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes were consulted on in 2014; and the Rights of Way Improvement Plan was reviewed in 2014; all of which provided valuable additional input to these strategies.
1 Approach to Consultation

Extensive consultation and close partnership working are at the heart of the Surrey Transport Plan and our approach to transport in the county.

This report describes the consultation process for the Surrey Transport Plan and how this has shaped the adopted Plan which came into effect on 1 April 2011. For each strategy area, the report summarises the key issues which emerged from the representations received and how the strategy was revised in consequence.

The county council has separately published the Post Adoption Environmental Statement (January 2012) which summarises how representations on the SEA Scoping Report (November 2010) and Environmental Report (January 2010) were taken into account in the adopted Plan.

The county council would like to thank all those who commented on components of the Surrey Transport Plan.

1.1 Consultations undertaken
The following components of the Surrey Transport Plan have been consulted upon:

- Vision and objectives
  - Air Quality Strategy
  - Climate Change Strategy
  - Congestion Strategy
  - Freight Strategy
  - Local Transport Strategies & Forward Programmes
  - Parking Strategy
  - Passenger Transport: Part 1 – Local Bus
  - Passenger Transport: Part 2 – Information
  - Travel Planning Strategy
  - Cycling Strategy
  - Rail Strategy
  - Rights of Way Improvement Plan
- Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report
- The Environmental Report and each of the associated draft strategies developed prior to April 2011 (each of which were consulted upon for a second time).

1.2 Consultation process
At the outset of the Surrey Transport Plan, the consultation documents were published on a webpage entitled ‘Surrey Transport Plan LTP3 – have your say’ on the county council’s public website.

Each document could be viewed and, if desired, downloaded in PDF format to allow interested parties to read and respond to the consultation.

As each consultation document or group of consultation documents was published, an email alert was sent out to all statutory stakeholders, other identified key stakeholders and also to individuals who had signed up on the website to receive these alerts.
Since 2011, more recently-produced strategies have also been the subject of extensive consultation.

Appendix A lists out the wide range of statutory and other identified consultees.

A press release and the headline article on the county council’s website (see Figure 1-1 below) accompanied the start of the first consultation activity, which concerned the Climate Change Strategy.

Figure 1-1: The start of consultations on the Surrey Transport Plan was the headline on the county council’s website

1.3 Wider engagement activities and surveys of public opinion
Various engagement activities and surveys of public opinion have also been used to inform the development of the Surrey Transport Plan, including the following:

- Engagement with partners including the borough and district councils, the Government Office for the South East, business representatives, transport operators and other stakeholders through the Transport for Surrey Partnership
- Presentations, comments and feedback given at and received following the Transport for Surrey Partnership conference held in March 2010, which involved a wide variety of partners and stakeholders concerned with strategic transport issues in the county
- Direct engagement with single interest groups, particularly in the development of strategies
- Engagement with English Heritage, the Environment Agency, Natural England and other stakeholders in the preparation of the Strategic Environmental Assessment
• Local consultation carried out in the development and implementation of local highway schemes, involving the public and representatives of town and parish councils, residents associations and amenity groups. Local roads and transport consultations and other Surrey-wide highway related consultations can be viewed on our Roads and transport consultations webpage

• The annual National Highways and Transport Survey, in which the county council has participated in since 2009, which surveys public opinion on a wide range of transport issues

• Findings from the quarterly Joint Neighbourhood Survey of residents and the former 2008 Place Survey of Surrey residents

Consultation and participation will continue to inform the revision of strategies and the development of borough and district-level transport strategy and forward programmes, as these are brought forward (a process described in the Introduction to the Surrey Transport Plan).
2 Consultation on the Vision and Objectives for the Surrey Transport Plan

This chapter sets out:
- how the consultation was undertaken
- who responded to the consultation
- the key themes of the representations received
- responses to these, and
- the resulting changes to the published vision and objectives

2.1 How the consultation was undertaken

Consultation on the Proposed Vision and Objectives of the Surrey Transport Plan was undertaken from 9 April to 2 July 2010.

The consultation document was published on the ‘Surrey Transport Plan – have your say’ webpage and the standard consultation process was followed, as described earlier in section 1.2. (The consultation document can be requested from the Strategy Group, email surreytransportplan@surreycc.gov.uk.)

The consultation was based on the following questions:

1. Do you have any comments on the proposed vision?
2. Do you have any comments on the proposed objectives?
3. Do you have any other comments in relation to this consultation?

2.2 Who responded to the consultation

There were 74 responses to the consultation in total. 51 of these were from organisations (listed below) and 23 from individuals, including two from elected members of district councils.

Responses were received via the three routes; 33 responses were received by email, 9 by letter, and 32 responses were received through the web-based questionnaire.

Public sector
- Bletchingley Parish Council
- Bramley Parish Council
- Chiddingfold Parish Council
- Cranleigh Parish Council
- East Sussex County Council
- Farnham Town Council
- Frimley Park Hospital
- Highways Agency
- Lingfield Parish Council
- London Borough of Croydon
- Mid Sussex District Council
- Natural England
- Runnymede Borough Council
- St Catherine’s School, Bramley
- Tandridge District Council
- University of Surrey
- Woking Borough Council
Private sector companies or representing bodies
- Abellio Surrey
- Basilea Pharmaceuticals Ltd
- BOC
- Confirmit UK Ltd
- County Pathology Ltd
- Daikin Airconditioning UK Limited
- Deepwater EU Ltd
- Detica
- Heathrow Airport Limited
- IDBS
- J. D. Power and Associates
- Lionhead Studios
- Morpace
- PPA Energy
- Siptel
- SSP Ltd
- Stingray Geophysical Limited
- Surrey Satellite Technology Ltd
- Technology Resourcing Limited
- The Whiteley Clinic, Absolute Aesthetics and The Clinical Exchange

Voluntary groups and other third sector
- Association of British Drivers - Surrey
- The Camberley Society
- CPRE Surrey
- Epsom & Ewell LA21 Transport Group
- Guildford and Waverley Friends of the Earth
- Guildford Group Ramblers Association
- Guildford Society Transport Group
- Mole Valley Cycling Forum
- Staines Town Society
- Stanwell and Stanwell Moor Liberal Democrats
- Surrey Rural Partnership
- Sustrans
- Voluntary Action Elmbridge
- Waverley Cycle Forum

2.3 Key themes of representations, corresponding responses and changes to the published vision and objectives

Responses to the consultation, including to the open questions in the questionnaire, were reviewed, coded and analysed by issue raised.

Table 2-1 shows:
- The key themes of the representations received, and
- Responses and, if considered appropriate, changes made to the adopted vision and objectives.
Table 2-1: Key themes of representations, corresponding responses and changes made to the adopted vision and objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes made for the adopted vision and objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highlighted severe transport-related problems in specific locations e.g. around Surrey Research Park in Guildford, in Bramley (22 responses)</td>
<td>Noted. In developing the Surrey Transport Plan, it was the intention that the statement of vision should be aspirational, and that the objectives should describe the directions sought for improvement towards that vision. As such, ‘objectives’ and ‘problems’ are considered to be ‘two sides of the same coin’ (for example, see section 3 in the published Problems and Challenges of the Surrey Transport Plan. Thus, it is considered that in working towards the vision of the Surrey Transport Plan (through the objectives), severe transport-related problems in the county will be tackled. Transport strategies and forward programmes are being developed for each borough and district in the county. The plans include schemes which address location-specific transport-related problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request emphasis on the reduction of, or at least the protection of, journey times, including in relation to specific locations (19 responses)</td>
<td>Noted. In the round, however, it was considered that the vision and objectives should focus on the facilitation of journeys from origin to destination (end-to-end), which can involve the use in combination of several modes of transport, and improvement of the reliability of journey times that users are unable to predict. This emphasis was reinforced through the revision of the wording of the vision and of the objectives for ‘effective transport’ and ‘reliable transport’ for the adopted strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision is too vague and/or meaningless jargon (8 responses) Vision does not match reality and/or that it does not take account of spending reductions (3 responses)</td>
<td>Noted. As stated above, it was the intention that the statement of vision should be aspirational, and that the objectives should describe the directions sought for improvement towards that vision. This follows the approach to setting a vision and objectives outlined in the KONSULT Knowledgebase on Sustainable Urban Land Use and Transport (see Objectives, Indicators and Targets section, Transport Strategy: A Decision-Makers' Guidebook).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request more emphasis on sustainability and/or protection of environment (7 responses) Consider that the term ‘sustainable’ is too vague or requires definition, or that the definition and usage is unsatisfactory (5 responses) Request emphasis on carbon reduction in the transport system (3 responses)</td>
<td>Agreed. The vision was revised to include the rationale for helping people to meet their transport and travel needs effectively, reliably, safely and sustainably, namely: ‘in order to promote economic vibrancy, protect and enhance the environment and improve the quality of life’. This mirrors a concept of sustainability or sustainable development which integrates the economic, the environmental and the social. The ‘sustainable transport’ objective has also been revised to include reference to an ‘integrated’ transport system that ‘provides for lower carbon transport choices’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key themes of representations</td>
<td>Response and changes made for the adopted vision and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Request emphasis on the promotion of equality of opportunity and/or the provision of additional travel opportunities and choices to meet the needs and expectations of travelling public (7 responses) Emphasis on accessibility to key services needed (5 responses) | Agreed. To reflect this emphasis modifications were made to the vision (‘...improve the quality of life’ added) and to two objectives, namely; ‘effective transport’ (‘...delivering public transport services...’ added) and ‘sustainable transport’ (‘To provide a transport system...’ changed to ‘To provide an integrated transport system...’)
See also response below to the representation that vision and objectives should ‘recognise differences between urban and rural needs’. |
| Effects of through traffic and/or lorries on residents and their neighbourhoods (e.g. increased congestion, noise, local air pollution, community severance, visual impact and safety) (4 responses) | Agreed. The additional text in the revised, published vision includes the aspirations to ‘protect and enhance the environment and improve the quality of life’. |
| Recognise differences between urban and rural needs (4 responses) | Noted. The vision, both in its consultation and revised, publication versions, states the aspiration to help people to meet their transport and travel needs. Note that ‘people’ and ‘needs’ are plural nouns. It is recognised that travel and transport needs vary across the county. There are also different opportunities and challenges to the provision of the transport system. |
| Timescale required (4 responses) | Agreed. The timescale for the third Surrey Transport Plan is from April 2011 to March 2026, and has been included in the published **Introduction** to the Surrey Transport Plan (see section 1). |
| Request emphasis on reducing the need to travel (3 responses) | Noted. Reducing the need to travel is principally achieved through the land use planning system, and hence the Surrey Transport Plan complements and supports the **Local Development Frameworks** (LDFs) prepared by the eleven borough and district council local planning authorities in the county. As described in the **Introduction** to the Surrey Transport Plan, this reflects the Guidance on Local Transport Plans (DfT, July 2009) that transport and spatial planning are to be closely integrated:
‘Both need to be considered from the outset in decisions on the location of key destinations such as housing, hospitals, schools, leisure facilities and businesses, to help reduce the need to travel and to bring environmental, health and other benefits.’ (chapter 3, para 25)
Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport (updated January 2011) provides guidance on the integration of planning and transport through the preparation of development plans and in considering planning applications in order to realise the objective to ‘reduce the need to travel, especially by car’. |
In summary, the key changes resulting from the consultation feedback were:

- The vision was amended to set out the wider, desired outcomes of the Plan: the promotion of economic vibrancy, the protection and enhancement of the environment and improvements to the quality of life
- The definition of the ‘effective transport’ objective was revised to refer to facilitating end-to-end journeys and to identify the broad mechanisms through which this can be achieved
- The focus on improving journey time reliability was spelt out in the revised ‘reliable transport’ objective; it was originally defined as ‘to improve the reliability of travel in Surrey’, and
- The ‘sustainable transport’ objective was modified to describe the desired transport system as being ‘integrated’, to include a reference to providing for lower carbon transport choices, to identify the environment being protected as being Surrey’s environment, and to remove reference to providing value for money.

The vision was also amended to include reference to ‘effective transport’, as this objective had not previously been referenced in the vision.

The wording of the vision and objectives in both the consultation and adopted versions are shown in Figure 2-1 below.

**Figure 2-1: Wording of vision and objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consultation version</th>
<th>Adopted version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
<td>Helping people meet their travel needs - reliably, safely and sustainably</td>
<td>To help people to meet their transport and travel needs effectively, reliably, safely and sustainably within Surrey; in order to promote economic vibrancy, protect and enhance the environment and improve the quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effective transport</strong></td>
<td>Facilitate end-to-end journeys for residents, business and visitors by maintaining the road network, delivering public transport services and, where appropriate, providing enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To meet the needs of residents, business and visitors in Surrey by maintaining and improving the transport network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable transport: To improve the reliability of transport in Surrey</td>
<td>To improve the journey time reliability of travel in Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe transport: To improve the safety and security of the travelling public in Surrey</td>
<td>To improve road safety and the security of the travelling public in Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable transport: To provide a transport system that protects the environment, keeps people healthy and provides value for money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable transport</td>
<td>To provide an integrated transport system that protects Surrey’s environment, keeps people healthy and provides for lower carbon transport choices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Consultation on the Air Quality Strategy

This chapter sets out:
• how the consultation was undertaken
• who responded to the consultation
• the key themes of the representations received
• responses to these, and
• the resulting changes to the strategy

3.1 How the consultation was undertaken
The first consultation on the Draft Air Quality strategy of the Surrey Transport Plan was undertaken from 14 September to 9 November 2010.

The consultation document was published on the ‘Surrey Transport Plan – have your say’ webpage and the standard consultation process was followed, as described earlier in section 1.2. (The consultation document can be requested from the Strategy Group, email surreytransportplan@surreycc.gov.uk.)

The Environmental Report (January 2011) and each of the associated draft strategies, including the Draft Air Quality Strategy, were consulted upon from 11 January to 1 February 2011. This represented a second consultation period for each of the draft strategies.

Both consultations on the Draft Air Quality Strategy were based on the following questions:

1. Do you agree with the proposed objectives of the Air Quality Strategy?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

   Reason for your view:

2. Do you agree with the proposed targets for the Air Quality Strategy?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree or disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
### Reason for your view:

3. Could you rank which of the following personal interventions you would be most willing to undertake in order to improve air quality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Interventions</th>
<th>1st preference</th>
<th>2nd preference</th>
<th>3rd preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car share for journeys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use public transport more frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle more frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk more frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access more services using the internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-driving techniques to maximise fuel economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch off vehicle engine whilst waiting at level crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. For each of the following interventions and measures, would you support or oppose its implementation in order to improve air quality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of sustainable modes, car sharing and car clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace travel plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced enforcement of parking and loading restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside emissions testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential parking charges and spaces for low emission vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of air quality information in journey planning applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. From reading this strategy is it clear what Surrey County Council’s responsibilities are in relation to air quality?

6. Do you have any other comments in relation to the draft Air Quality Strategy?

### 3.2 Response to the consultation

There were 36 responses across the two consultation periods. 31 of these were from organisations (listed overleaf) and 5 from individuals, including one from an elected member of a council.

Responses were received via the three routes; 20 responses were received by email (of which 5 included the completed questionnaire), 10 by letter (of which 3 included the completed questionnaire), and 6 responses were received through the web-based questionnaire. In total, some 14 questionnaires were completed.
Public sector
- Chiddingfold Parish Council
- Cranleigh Parish Council
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
- Farnham Town Council
- Highways Agency
- Horley Town Council
- Horne Parish Council
- London Borough of Sutton
- Mole Valley District Council
- Natural England
- Reigate & Banstead Borough Council (1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} consultation periods)
- Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
- Runnymede Borough Council
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Seale & Sands Parish Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council (1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} consultation periods)
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Tandridge District Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Wonersh Parish Council
- Other Surrey boroughs and district councils were involved in the development of the strategy

Private sector companies or representing bodies
- Heathrow Airport Limited

Voluntary groups and other third sector
- Camberley Society
- CPRE Surrey
- Elmbridge Friends of the Earth
- Guildford and Waverley Friends of the Earth
- Guildford Society
- Surrey Rural Partnership
- Waverley Cycle Forum

3.3 Key themes of representations, corresponding responses and changes to the adopted strategy

Responses to the consultation, including to the open questions in the questionnaire, were reviewed, coded and analysed by issue raised.

Table 3-1 shows:
- Charts of responses to the closed questions in the formal questionnaire
- The key themes of the representations received, including to the open questions in the formal questionnaire, and
- Responses and, if considered appropriate, changes made to the adopted Air Quality Strategy.
Table 3-1: Key themes of representations, corresponding responses and changes to adopted strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of strategy</th>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim and Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Questionnaire: Q1. Do you agree with the proposed objectives of the Air Quality Strategy?</td>
<td>Noted. The objectives were revised for the adopted strategy as follows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Majority of respondees to the questionnaire agreed with the proposed objectives in the consultation version of the strategy.</td>
<td>▪ Objective 1 was revised to make reference to working with the accountable borough or district council, and additionally includes reference to bringing forward options for the enforcement of existing regulations and options for supporting smarter travel options – both of which had been included in the toolkit in the consultation version of the strategy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ A new objective was added – objective 2 – as follows:</td>
<td>▪ A new objective was added – objective 2 – as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Consultation objective 2 became objective 3 and a minor edit was made to simplify the wording only.</td>
<td>‘2. To provide assistance to the borough and district councils in producing their review and assessment reports, and Action Plan progress reports’; and,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Majority of respondees to the questionnaire agreed with the proposed objectives in the consultation version of the strategy.</td>
<td>▪ Consultation objective 2 became objective 3 and a minor edit was made to simplify the wording only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key comments:
- Support focus on Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) (2 responses)

Agreed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of strategy</th>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>Key comments:</td>
<td>Noted. However, focus is on AQMAs as limited resources and statutory responsibility relates to designated AQMAs. Nevertheless, it is recognised that there may be some other locations where air pollution levels are such that an AQMA could be declared in future if, for instance, there was a small increase in traffic (section 3.3 of adopted strategy). In relation to these, countywide air quality improvements will be delivered through other Surrey Transport Plan strategies when and where these tend to restrain traffic growth, reduce vehicle delay, reduce vehicle emissions and improve the provision of travel information to people on the air quality impacts of their travel choices (section 6.2 of adopted strategy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Would like mention of air quality in areas of elevated, but undeclared, air pollution (5 responses)</td>
<td>Agreed. Text has been added in section 3.1 of adopted strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Would like mention of air pollution impact on lowland heathlands, vegetation, soils and water (4 responses)</td>
<td>Noted. Despite flows of road traffic in Surrey being far higher than those experienced nationally (see <a href="#">Transport Statistics for Surrey: Movement Monitoring Report 2008/9</a>), the designated AQMAs are localised to limited sections of the county and Highway Agency road networks. The exception is the borough of Spelthorne which has been designated in its entirety as an AQMA. It is therefore considered that the detailed analysis of travel patterns in and around an individual Air Quality Management Area is best considered and undertaken in conjunction with the responsible borough or district council. Nevertheless, section 3.4 of adopted strategy, and the 'Problems and challenges' section of the Surrey Transport Plan, provides a weblink to the <a href="#">Transport Statistics for Surrey</a> document which provides some borough/district-level analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Would like the background context of travel demand and travel patterns in Surrey to be set out (2 responses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
### Questionnaire: Q2. Do you agree with the proposed targets for the Air Quality Strategy?

- **Agree or strongly agree:** 12 respondents
- **Neither agree or disagree:** 2 respondents
- **Disagree or strongly disagree:** 0 respondents

#### Key comments:
- Majority of respondents to the questionnaire agreed with the proposed targets in the consultation version of the strategy.
- Would like additional indicator or indicators (3 responses)

#### Response and changes to adopted strategy
- Noted. See detailed responses below.

- Suggested alternatives were considered to be either too complex to administer or not to take into account the other issues and objectives that the county council is required to take into account in its decision-making processes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of strategy</th>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators and targets (continued)</td>
<td>• Does not support or wants amendments to proposed indicator 1 ('Nitrogen dioxide annual mean concentrations in designated AQMAs located on the county road network, in comparison with 2010 baseline, based on three-year rolling averages.' ) (2 responses)</td>
<td>Agreed. The proposed outcome-type indicator was considered by these respondees to be complex, with requirements for multiple measurement locations and the setting of a concentration level below the national objective to account for margins of error. It was requested that the indicators should relate to actual improvements in air quality of a set amount by a set time. It was decided not to progress Indicator 1 as proposed in the consultation document, most particularly as the resources required to measure it are not considered reasonable given present funding constraints. An alternative outcome indicator, as was set out in the Environmental Report (January 2011) was included in the adopted strategy: AQ1 – Revocation of Air Quality Management Areas located on the county road network. The target is: The revocation of 2 AQMAs located on the county road network during 2011-2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not support proposed indicators/targets 2 and 3 (2. was 'Percentage of borough/district consultations on Local Air Quality Action Plans responded to formally by county council within specified consultation deadline during each financial year', 3. was 'Percentage of published borough/district Local Air Quality Action Plans for which the county council has agreed actions') (2 responses)</td>
<td>Agreed. Both output-type indicators and targets were removed. However, both are represented in the county council’s commitments to delivering in partnership with the borough and district councils (see section 7.2 of the adopted strategy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element of strategy</td>
<td>Key themes of representations</td>
<td>Response and changes to adopted strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interventions</td>
<td>Questionnaire: Q3. Could you rank which of the following personal interventions you would be most willing to undertake in order to improve air quality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal interventions</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car share for journeys</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home working</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use public transport more frequently</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle more frequently</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk more frequently</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access more services using the internet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-driving techniques to maximise fuel economy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch off vehicle engine whilst waiting at level crossings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- With the exception of ‘car share for journeys’, each of the options was selected as a preference by one or more respondents, the most popular being to ‘Access more services using the internet’ and ‘home working’.

Key comments:
- Personal interventions depend on circumstances, including rural living (2 responses)

Agreed. The strategy sets out that as and when the county council contributes to the development of an Air Quality Action Plan for an Air Quality Management Area, the county council will, amongst other activities, work with the borough or district council to identify and agree options for supporting travel choices that are better for air quality, and implement as and when funding becomes available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of strategy</th>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures and toolkit</td>
<td>Questionnaire: Q4. For each of the following interventions and measures, would you support or oppose its implementation in order to improve air quality?</td>
<td>All these measures were included in the adopted strategy with the exception of roadside emissions testing and the inclusion of air quality information in journey planning applications, as both were considered not to provide sufficient value for money.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures and toolkit</th>
<th>Promotion of sustainable modes, car sharing and car clubs</th>
<th>Workplace travel plans</th>
<th>Enhanced enforcement of parking and loading restrictions</th>
<th>Roadside emissions testing</th>
<th>Preferential parking charges and spaces for low emission vehicles</th>
<th>Inclusion of air quality information in journey planning applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support or oppose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each of the suggested options were supported by more respondents than opposed; the most finely balanced was the option for preferential parking charges and spaces for low emission vehicles.

Key comments:
- Would like road bypasses and/or major schemes (3 responses)

Noted. Various major schemes, including three of the four proposed by respondents, continue to be promoted by the county council, as described in the Implementation and Finance section of the Surrey Transport Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of strategy</th>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures and toolkit (continued)</td>
<td>• Would like speed limit enforcement (2 responses)</td>
<td>Noted the suggestions to consider air quality effects when setting speed limits and to lower speed limits in residential areas to help promote cycling. 'Police enforcement including speed limits' was added as a measure in the Air Quality Strategy Toolkit and 'promotion of eco-driving' remained in the adopted strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures and toolkit (continued)</td>
<td>• Support the Air Quality Strategy toolkit (2 responses)</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures and toolkit (continued)</td>
<td>• Would like more emphasis/ambition for cycle lanes, priorities and tracks, and cycle parking provision (2 responses)</td>
<td>Noted. The Cycling Strategy will develop the county council's strategic approach to cycling. Schemes to improve cycling infrastructure are included in the county council's successful Surrey TravelSMART Key Component Bid, approved by the Department for Transport in July 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures and toolkit (continued)</td>
<td>• Would like existing and future borough/district Air Quality Action Plans to be integrated or actions listed in LTP3 (3 responses)</td>
<td>Disagree. In two tier local authority areas such as Surrey, it is the borough and district councils who monitor air quality in their areas, declare AQMAs and prepare the action plans. Certain obligations are also placed on the relevant county council as described in section 2.2 of adopted strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures and toolkit (continued)</td>
<td>• Wants mention of county-led planning functions to address air quality problems (2 responses)</td>
<td>Agreed. Text has been amended in section 6.1 of adopted strategy to state that the county council will continue to consider air quality issues in its role as the minerals and waste planning authority and as a consultee on environmental permits in the Environment Agency’s waste regulation role. It is considered that minerals and waste development is a minor element of overall development in the county. Mineral production has been reducing and is anticipated to continue to do so, so its impact in air quality both directly and through its traffic generation will be diminishing. Waste development air quality impact overall is probably neither increasing nor decreasing overall, although waste arisings have been falling over recent years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element of strategy</td>
<td>Key themes of representations</td>
<td>Response and changes to adopted strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership working</td>
<td>Key comment:</td>
<td>Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support partnership working between borough/district councils and the county council, including to develop their Infrastructure Delivery Plans (3 responses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County council's responsibilities</td>
<td>Questionnaire: Q5. From reading this strategy is it clear what Surrey County Council's responsibilities are in relation to air quality? (Note: Responses were coded.)</td>
<td>Noted. Additional text on relevant powers exercisable by the county council has been added to section 2.2 of the adopted strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Majority of respondees to the questionnaire were clear as to the county council’s responsibilities in relation to air quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element of strategy</td>
<td>Key themes of representations</td>
<td>Response and changes to adopted strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other issues</td>
<td>Key comments:</td>
<td>Agreed. The focus of the strategy is therefore on AQMAs as limited resources and statutory responsibility relates to designated AQMAs. The various sources of funding are set out in the Implementation and Finance section of the Surrey Transport Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding uncertainty may hamper strategy (3 responses)</td>
<td>Noted. A new section (2.4) has been added in the adopted strategy explaining the relationship with the Climate Change Strategy. The synergies between the Air Quality Strategy and the Climate Change Strategy, both elements of the Surrey Transport Plan, were considered in the development of both strategies. Carbon dioxide (CO2), nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and particulate matter under 10 microns (PM10) are all emitted by fossil-fuelled vehicles. The county’s Air Quality Strategy for tackling local air quality problems is linked to the Climate Change Strategy because many of the emissions sources are the same and the many measures to tackle these problems are complementary. However, due to specific obligations placed upon borough and district councils and the localised nature of AQMAs, this issue is covered by this discrete strategy. Countywide, AQMAs will benefit from measures in the Climate Change Strategy and which reduce the need to travel, encourage people to use lower carbon modes and which reduce tailpipe emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Would like Air Quality Strategy integrated with the Climate Change Strategy (2 responses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In summary, the key changes resulting from the consultation feedback were:

- A new objective has been added – objective 2 – as follows: ‘2. To provide assistance to the borough and district councils in producing their review and assessment reports, and Action Plan progress reports’
- Mention added of the impact of air pollution on lowland heathlands, vegetation, soils and water
- Indicators were overhauled with an alternative outcome-type indicator being included in the adopted strategy (AQ1 – Revocation of Air Quality Management Areas located on the county road network), and,
- A new section (2.4) has been added in the adopted strategy explaining the relationships between the Air Quality and Climate Change strategies.
4 Consultation on the Climate Change Strategy

This chapter sets out:
- how the consultation was undertaken
- who responded to the consultation
- the key themes of the representations received
- responses to these, and
- the resulting changes to the strategy

4.1 How the consultation was undertaken

The first consultation on the Draft Transport Climate Change strategy was undertaken from 25 March to 17 June 2010.

The consultation document was published on the ‘Surrey Transport Plan – have your say’ webpage and the standard consultation process was followed, as described earlier in section 1.2. (The consultation document can be requested from the Strategy Group, email surreytransportplan@surreycc.gov.uk.)

A press release accompanied the start of this consultation activity, as it was the first component of the Surrey Transport Plan to be consulted upon.

The Environmental Report (January 2011) and each of the associated draft strategies, including the Draft Transport Climate Change Strategy, were consulted upon from 11 January to 1 February 2011. This represented a second consultation period for each of the draft strategies.

Both consultations on the Draft Transport Climate Change Strategy were based on the following questions:

1. Do you agree with what is included and excluded in the scope of the strategy? If not, how should this be changed?

2. Do you think we have identified the correct objectives to achieve the aim?

3. Do you think Surrey should set even more challenging targets (i.e. larger emissions reduction) than required by the national Climate Change Bill?

4. Have the most relevant challenges and opportunities been identified, with regard to achieving the aim of the strategy? If not, which should be added or removed?

5. Have any measures or policy options been omitted from the ‘long list’ that you think should be considered?
6. Which of the following policies do you support for reducing carbon emissions from transport?

- Bicycle hire scheme
- Bus smart-card ticketing
- Car club
- Car share website
- Cycle parking
- Cycle routes
- Cycle training
- Electric vehicle charging
- Increase public parking charges
- Parking charges at workplaces
- Personalised travel advice
- Safe routes to school
- Speed limits enforcement
- Variable charges for parking

7. If your organisation has been identified as a potential delivery partner or other stakeholder, has your role been correctly identified? If your organisation has a role that has not been identified, please tell us.

4.2 Who responded to the consultation

There were 44 responses across the two consultation periods, 25 of these were from organisations (listed below) and 19 from individuals.

Most responses were received through the web-based questionnaire, but some responses were received by email and letter.

Public sector
- East Horsley Parish Council
- Highways Agency
- Horsham District Council
- Reigate & Banstead Borough Council (1st and 2nd consultation periods)
- Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council
- Seale and Sands Parish Council
- Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
- Worplesdon Parish Council
- Other Surrey borough and district councils were involved in the development of the strategy

Private sector companies or representing bodies
- Freight Transport Association
- PGS Exploration (UK) Ltd.
- Samsung
- Surrey Chamber of Commerce

Voluntary groups and other third sector
- Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth
- Campaign from Protection of Rural England
- Elmbridge Friends of the Earth
- Epsom & Ewell LA21 Transport Group
- Farnham & District Ramblers Association
- Godalming College Student Union
- Godalming Cycle Campaign
- Green Mole Forum
- Guildford Environmental Forum
- Guildford & Waverley Friends of the Earth
- Guildford Society
- Mole Valley Cycling Forum
- Voluntary Action Elmbridge
- Waverley Cycle Forum

4.3 Key themes, corresponding responses and changes to the adopted strategy

Table 4-1 sets out:
- The key themes of the representations received, and
- Responses and, if considered appropriate, changes made to the adopted Climate Change Strategy
Table 4-1: Key themes of representations, responses and changes to adopted strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of strategy</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>1. Do you agree with what is included and excluded in the scope of the strategy? If not, how should this be changed?</td>
<td>The vast majority of respondents, across all sectors, agreed that the county council should be aiming to reduce carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions from transport. Support noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There was broad support for the scope of the strategy as currently defined. Support noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion to include local air pollution/quality with climate change in the same strategy. Position noted. However, the Air Quality Strategy is a related, albeit discrete, strategy given the county council’s separate statutory responsibilities for local air quality and approach to addressing air quality problems in designated location-specific Air Quality Management Areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion to address emissions from through traffic and cross boundary working. Agreed. The county council will continue cross-boundary working to address levels of through traffic, in particular through network management, bus routing and travel planning activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>2. Do you think we have identified the correct objectives to achieve the aim?</td>
<td>No major suggested changes to the objectives.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element of strategy</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Key themes of representations</td>
<td>Response and changes to adopted strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targets</strong></td>
<td>3. Do you think Surrey should set even more challenging targets (i.e. larger emissions reduction) than required by the national Climate Change Bill?</td>
<td>The proposal for a 20% reduction in CO2 emissions from transport (by 2020 vs 2007) received a variety of responses. The majority thought the target should not be lower whilst some individuals and third sector organisations felt that targets should be for even greater reductions. However, there was some concern that if the target were unrealistic to achieve, especially taking into account funding levels, then the target would not be taken seriously and there would be a risk of possibly “setting ourselves up for failure”, and that it would be preferable to set achievable targets which would received wider support.</td>
<td>The target for emissions reduction has been set as a 10% reduction in absolute emissions by 2020 increasing to 25% reduction by 2035 on 2007 levels of 2,114 k tonnes (1.9 tonnes per capita). This change was made in light of concerns expressed in the consultation about a 20% target being unrealistic and further evidence about the anticipated cumulative effect of variety of options considered when set in the context of the funding available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges and opportunities</strong></td>
<td>4. Have the most relevant challenges and opportunities been identified, with regard to achieving the aim of the strategy? If not, which should be added or removed?</td>
<td>The strategy considered weak in addressing funding challenges.</td>
<td>It is recognised that resources are more limited than at any point in the previous decade. The strategy therefore states the intention to focus staff time and funding on options that will give greatest value for money (see section 5). Measures in the preferred strategy were selected using an appraisal process which involves, as stage one of two, assessing for their potential impact on reducing remissions and their cost effectiveness (see sections 4 and 5 of the strategy). The overall approach to the finance and delivery of the Surrey Transport Plan is set out in the Implementation &amp; Finance section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy options and measures</strong></td>
<td>5. Have any measures or policy options been omitted from the 'long list' that you think should be considered?</td>
<td>The strategy considered weak addressing anticipated changes in future environmental conditions (climate change adaptation). There was considerable support from groups representing cycling for more and higher quality cycle routes, especially targeting school and commuting routes. Respondents representing workplaces and the commercial sector stated support for car sharing and measures to address freight transport emissions and movements.</td>
<td>The county council has identified flooding as a key climate change adaptation issue and has recently published the Preliminary Floodrisk Assessment. This incorporated Surrey Highways wetspot information. Other climate change adaptation issues for transport will be addressed on a prioritised basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Which of the following policies do you support for reducing carbon emissions from transport?

Of the options posed, greatest support (over 70% of all respondents to the question) was given to safe walking and cycling routes to schools, other cycle improvements to bicycle parking facilities and routes as well as smart-card ticketing for buses. The least supported measures (less than 40% of question respondents) were increasing parking charges in public car parks, introducing charging for workplace parking, variable parking prices (based on emissions) and a programme for personalised travel planning advice.

The level of support received for various measures, on the most part was consistent across different groups of respondents (public, private and third sector). The numbers of respondents in each category were too small to draw statistically significant conclusions about any variations in levels of support depending on perspective.

It was commented that the range of measures was too large and unfocused and that the plan should focus on a smaller number of the most effective measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of strategy</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery partners and other stakeholders</td>
<td>7. If your organisation has been identified as a potential delivery partner or other stakeholder, has your role been correctly identified? If your organisation has a role that has not been identified, please tell us.</td>
<td>Freight Transport Association is already working with Surrey County Council. Parish councils and voluntary sector opportunities are under-represented.</td>
<td>Noted. Ways of working in partnership with the voluntary sector will be investigated further, with regard to both voluntary sector role as employer and delivery of services e.g. through organisations such as Voluntary Action Elmbridge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some respondents made specific comments regarding cycling, freight, car sharing and smartcard public transport ticketing. These issues are addressed or covered in more detail by other strategies within the Surrey Transport Plan. For example:

- Advancements in smartcard ticketing are being made, including their introduction by Southern and South West Trains and several bus operators are in the process of installing smartcard readers on their fleet, with Stagecoach being the first to introduce these into service (see *Passenger Transport Strategy: Part 1 - Local Bus* section 5.3.9)
- A Cycling Strategy has been prepared to build on current cycle network and promotional activities
- A separate *Freight Strategy* has been developed. The aim of the strategy is ‘To assist in the effective transportation of goods whilst minimising the impact of large goods vehicles on Surrey’s environment and its residents’
- Car sharing will continue to be promoted, especially in workplace travel plans, as described in the *Travel Planning Strategy*, and
- Parking costs and provision are covered by the *Parking Strategy*. The strategy includes the recommendation (see section 5.1 of the strategy) that on street parking charges be increased, in order to reduce and eliminate the financial deficit of parking enforcement in the county, such that user, rather than the tax payer, funds this service in its entirety.

In summary, the key changes resulting from the consultation feedback were:

- Continue cross-boundary working to address levels of through traffic, in particular through network management, bus routing and travel planning activities
- Work with the borough and district councils and other key partners on climate change adaptation, to more comprehensively assess risks, identify the most effective adaptive responses and take action in prioritised areas
- Focus on the most cost-effective measures, using the best evidence available, considering the direct contribution to emissions reduction, as well as considering impacts across all the county council’s objectives for transport, and
- Review target for emissions reduction, in light of further evidence about the anticipated cumulative effect of variety of options considered and set in the context of the funding available.
5 Consultation on the Congestion Strategy

This chapter sets out:
- how the consultation was undertaken
- who responded to the consultation
- the key themes of the representations received
- responses, and
- the resulting changes to the strategy

5.1 How the consultation was undertaken

The first consultation on the Draft Congestion strategy of the Surrey Transport Plan was undertaken from 14 September to 9 November 2010.

The consultation document was published on the ‘Surrey Transport Plan – have your say’ webpage and the standard consultation process was followed, as described earlier in section 1.2. (The consultation document can be requested from the Strategy Group, email surreytransportplan@surreycc.gov.uk.)

The Environmental Report (January 2011) and each of the associated draft strategies, including the Draft Congestion Strategy, were consulted upon from 11 January to 1 February 2011. This represented a second consultation period for each of the draft strategies.

Both consultations on the Draft Congestion Strategy were based on the following questions:

1. We realise that drivers and bus users get frustrated over delays caused by roadworks, accidents, bad weather (especially in snow and ice), etc. The strategy concentrates on improving journey time reliability, particularly reducing the extreme delays experienced on occasion by these types of incidents.

   Do you think it is correct that this is the main focus of the strategy?

2. Thinking about the mix of measures outlined in section 7 of the Congestion Strategy consultation document, which elements of the preferred strategy do you think will contribute most towards improving journey time reliability and reducing the extreme delays sometimes experienced?

   - improving the day-to-day management of the network, as well as incident management and winter maintenance
   - improving the way road maintenance and other road works are integrated and managed
   - improving the provision, including the accuracy and timeliness, of information on travel conditions
   - improving the enforcement of regulations
   - working with developers and other partners to identify and implement schemes that will mitigate the impacts of additional demand

   [Checkboxes for responses]
3. Where do you think the congestion hot spots are?

4. Do you have any other comments in relation to this consultation?

5.2 Who responded to the consultation

There were 83 responses across the two consultation periods. 57 of these were from organisations (listed below) and 26 from individuals.

33 of the responses were received via the web-based questionnaire and 50 were written representations received either by email or letter.

Public sector
- Chiddingfold Parish Council
- Churt Parish Council
- Claygate Parish Council
- Cranleigh Parish Council
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
- Farnham Town Council
- Godstone Parish Council
- Guildford Borough Council
- Highways Agency
- Horley Town Council
- Mid Sussex District Council
- London Borough of Kingston
- London Borough of Sutton
- Mole Valley District Council (a confirmation also received)
- Natural England
- Puttenham Parish Council
- Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Seale & Sands Parish Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Surrey Police
- Tandridge District Council
- Transport for London
- Waverley Borough Council (a clarification followed the main response)
- Woking Borough Council
- Wonersh Parish Council

Private sector companies or representing bodies
- Arriva
- Godalming College
- Heathrow Airport Ltd
- Surrey Research Park
- Surrey Rural Partnership
- University of Surrey

Voluntary groups and other third sector
- Camberley Society
- Campaign for the Protection of Rural England
- Elmbridge Friends of the Earth
- Epsom & Ewell LA21 Transport Group
- Farnham Society
- Guildford & Waverley Friends of the Earth
- Guildford Society
- Mole Valley Cycling Forum
- Staines Town Society
- Waverley Cycle Forum
- Wrecclesham Village Society
- various Residents' Associations
5.3_key themes, corresponding responses and changes to the adopted strategy

Out of all the respondents, 48% agreed with proposed focus of the strategy being on improving journey time reliability, 21% disagreed, with the remainder not expressing an opinion.

The graph below shows the response to Question 2 about the mix of measures.

**Responses to strategy options**

Despite the apparent low priority for providing better information, comments received as part of the responses stated that better information was needed on roadworks and as part of delivering improved day-to-day management of the network.

Whilst a range of comments either accompanied the web-based consultation or were submitted by email and letter, there were several common themes:
- the need for improved day-to-day management of the network
- that a key objective should be mode shift, particularly encouraging greater cycling
- the desire to address the demand associated with travelling to and from school
- the need for better integrated land use planning and transport planning, and
- that more highway infrastructure should be built

Respondents saw infrastructure provision as important, and did not wish for the strategy to be a means of avoiding investing in the network.

In addition, some comments were received on the topics of congestion charging and varying the times of the start and end of the school day between schools.

There was also a geographical bias to the responses, with the majority or responses from private individuals being received from those living or working in Waverley, in particular from those in the Farnham area.

The questionnaire also asked for locations where congestion was thought to be a particular problem. The list below shows those locations identified, and is ordered...
according to the number of response received, with those at the top receiving the most nominations:

- A31 at Farnham, including Coxbridge roundabout and Hickley’s Corner
- Woking, including the town centre, A320 Victoria Arch, Maybury and Old Woking
- A325 at Wrecclesham, Farnham
- Farnham town centre
- Guildford town centre
- Surrey Research Park / Royal Surrey County Hospital / Tesco area, Guildford
- Epsom town centre
- Dorking and Leatherhead, including the A25 approach to Dorking from Westcott
- Weybridge, including Byfleet Road
- A22 and A264 in the vicinity of Felbridge, Smallfield and Copthorne
- M25 diversion routes, including the A24, A25 and A217 Reigate Hill
- A31 Hog’s Back
- A320 at Slyfield, Guildford
- Esher, including the town centre, the Scilly Isles and around Sandown Park
- A281 at Bramley

Comments were also received about generic locations suffering congestion, such as around schools, in the vicinity of local shops, in town centres and at level crossings.

A number of respondents identified motorways and trunk roads as congestion hotspots. These are roads for which the Highways Agency is responsible.

All comments received were reviewed and were used to refine the strategy. Based on the strength of the responses, adjustments were made in the final strategy to the following areas:

- mode shift
- travel planning and journeys to and from school, and
- proactive land use and transport planning

In addition, those comments received identifying locations where congestion is a problem will be combined with analysis work on the cost of congestion in Surrey to help inform implementation programmes.
6 Consultation on the Freight Strategy

This chapter sets out:
- how the consultation was undertaken
- who responded to the consultation
- the key themes of the representations received
- responses to these, and
- the resulting changes to the strategy

6.1 How the consultation was undertaken

The first consultation on the Draft Freight strategy of the Surrey Transport Plan was undertaken from 17 September to 12 November 2010.

The consultation document was published on the ‘Surrey Transport Plan – have your say’ webpage and the standard consultation process was followed, as described earlier in section 1.2. (The consultation document can be requested from the Strategy Group, email surreytransportplan@surreycc.gov.uk.)

The Environmental Report (January 2011) and each of the associated draft strategies, including the Draft Freight Strategy, were consulted upon from 11 January to 1 February 2011. This represented a second consultation period for each of the draft strategies.

Both consultations on the Draft Freight Strategy were based on the following questions:

1. Do you agree with the proposed aim and objectives of the freight strategy?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

   Reason for your view:

2. For each of the following measures, would you support or oppose its implementation in order to address local freight issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with local residents and elected members to monitor lorry movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More “Unsuitable for HGVs” signing and other lorry restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Quality Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Lorry Routeing to minimise vehicle miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging businesses to consolidate deliveries and consider out of hours servicing to avoid disruption at busy times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing town centre loading restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Do you have any other comments in relation to the Freight Strategy?

6.2 Who responded to the consultation
There were 33 responses across the two consultation periods. 22 of these were from organisations (listed below) and 11 were from individuals.

Responses were received through the web-based questionnaire, by email and letter.

Public sector
- Transport for London (TfL)
- London Borough of Sutton
- Royal Borough of Kingston
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Mole Valley District Council
- Tandridge Borough Council
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Guildford Borough Council
- Surrey Police (no comments on the strategy)
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- The Highways Agency
- Spelthorne Borough Council

Private sector companies or representing bodies
- Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL)

Voluntary groups and other third sector
- Wonersh Parish Council
- The Camberley Society
- Surrey Rural Partnership
- Guildford Society
- CPRE
- Cranleigh Parish Council
- Guildford and Waverley Friends of the Earth

6.3 Key themes of representations and resulting changes
Table 6-1 sets out:
- The key themes of the representations received, and
- Corresponding responses and, if considered appropriate, changes to the adopted Freight Strategy
### Table 6-1: Key themes of representations, corresponding responses and changes to adopted strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of strategy</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim and objectives</strong></td>
<td>1. Do you agree with the proposed aim and objectives of the Freight Strategy?</td>
<td>Most respondents either supported the proposed aims and objectives of the Freight Strategy or did not express an opinion. Two respondents disagreed with the aims and objectives. One on the grounds that more action should be taken on sections of A roads which were considered unsuitable for HGVs and the other felt that they were not aligned with the vision of the Surrey Transport Plan.</td>
<td>Consideration is given, and will continue to be given, to signing local alternative routes where suitable opportunities arise. It is maintained that the aims and objectives of the Freight Strategy do align with the vision of the Surrey Transport Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy options and measures</strong></td>
<td>2. For each of the following measures, would you support or oppose its implementation in order to address local freight issues?</td>
<td>One organisation felt that the measures ignored the need to mitigate carbon emissions and were not quantified.</td>
<td>All the measures have the potential to reduce emissions to a limited extent (e.g. by reducing congestion and vehicle miles). The wording of the strategy was modified to better reflect this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working with local residents and elected members to monitor lorry movements</td>
<td>This measure gained widespread support, although one respondent reported that they had had difficulty reporting a lorry incident.</td>
<td>The lorry reporting system has been reviewed to ensure that it can be more easily accessed by members of the public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More ‘Unsuitable for HGVs’ signing and other lorry restrictions</td>
<td>The measure received support or strong support from the all the respondents who commented on it.</td>
<td>This measure will be used sparingly to protect vulnerable routes at locations where lorries frequently get stuck. The county council will discuss their location with local residents and elected members to ensure that the problem is not shifted to alternative, vulnerable routes. When considering new signs the county council will continue to bear in mind that many residents desire to ‘de-clutter’ the countryside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element of strategy</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Key themes of representations</td>
<td>Response and changes to adopted strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy options and measures (cont.)</td>
<td>• Freight Quality Partnerships (FQPs)</td>
<td>Widespread support for this measure but some concern that there is little detail of their content in the strategy.</td>
<td>FQPs will be set up as and when there is a significant range of issues to be dealt with within a definable area (e.g. a town). Single issues can also be dealt with using a partnership approach but without setting up a formal partnership group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective lorry routeing to minimise vehicle miles</td>
<td>Generally supported although some respondents commented on the apparent conflict between travelling the shortest routes where this may adversely affect residents.</td>
<td>The county council will identify the most appropriate routes to avoid 'rat-running' by goods vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encouraging businesses to consolidate deliveries and consider out of hours servicing to avoid disruption at busy times</td>
<td>Generally supported although one respondent thought focus should be on encouraging off peak deliveries.</td>
<td>Out of hours deliveries will be encouraged at locations where delays and congestion are experienced throughout the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviewing town centre loading restrictions</td>
<td>Generally supported.</td>
<td>The county council will only consider new or changes to existing Traffic Regulation Orders if there is a substantial congestion or environmental problems in a town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>3. Do you have any other comments in relation to the Freight Strategy?</td>
<td>Other local authorities and organisations welcomed the collaborative approach outlined in the strategy and urged more joint working. Some local planning authorities would like more guidance on freight issues to assist them in the preparation of Local Development Framework documents and in their consideration of planning applications.</td>
<td>The county council will follow up opportunities for further collaboration as and when they arise (e.g. with Heathrow Airport Limited). Where appropriate, the county council will continue to address freight issues within its responses to Local Development Framework consultations and will consider distributing published guidance on freight issues such as on loading and delivery and servicing planning to the borough and district councils.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Freight Strategy, its aims and objectives and the range of measures were generally well received. Changes were made to the strategy as a result of the consultation feedback, the key changes being:

- Greater emphasis was placed on
  - (i) the collaborative approach already being carried out, and
  - (ii) how the proposed measures can contribute to reducing congestion.
  (The county council will continue to work closely with adjoining authorities to share knowledge and develop good practice), and
- The county council will ensure that the adverse impacts of HGV traffic are fully considered when consulted on evolving Local Development Frameworks and planning applications.
7 Consultation on the Parking Strategy

This chapter sets out:
- how the consultation was undertaken
- who responded to the consultation
- the key themes of the representations received
- responses to those, and
- the resulting changes to the strategy

7.1 How the consultation was undertaken

The first consultation on the Draft Parking Strategy of the Surrey Transport Plan was undertaken from 14 September to 9 November 2010.

The consultation document was published on the ‘Surrey Transport Plan – have your say’ webpage and the standard consultation process was followed, as described earlier in section 1.2. (The consultation document can be requested from the Strategy Group, email surreytransportplan@surreycc.gov.uk.)

The Environmental Report (January 2011) and each of the associated draft strategies, including the Draft Parking Strategy, were consulted upon from 11 January to 1 February 2011. This represented a second consultation period for each of the draft strategies.

Both consultations on the Draft Parking Strategy were based on the following questions:

1. Do you have any comments about our preferred approach to civil parking enforcement?

2. Do you have any comments about our proposed management of on street parking?

3. Do you have any comments about our policies relating to parking provision?

4. Which of the following parking issues affects you the most?
   - Inconsiderate parking
   - School run parking
   - Commuter parking
   - Other (please specify)

5. Are there any measures not included in the Parking Strategy that you think we should consider?

7.2 Who responded to the consultation

There were 139 responses across the two consultation periods. 46 of these were from organisations (listed below) and 93 from individuals, including 5 from elected members of councils.

Responses were received via the three routes; 62 responses were received through the web-based questionnaire, 70 by email and 7 by letter.
Public sector
- Caterham Valley Parish Council
- Churt Parish Council
- Chiddingfold Parish Council
- Cranleigh Parish Council
- Farnham Town Council
- Horne Parish Council
- Claygate Parish Council
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
- Epsom & Ewell Liberal Democrat Councillors
- Guildford Borough Council
- Highways Agency
- Horley Town Council
- London Borough of Sutton
- Mole Valley District Council
- Reigate & Banstead Borough Council (1st and 2nd consultation periods)
- Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Seale & Sands Parish Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Surrey Police
- Tandridge District Council
- Transport for London
- Waverley Borough Council
- Woking Borough Council
- Wonersh Parish Council

Private sector companies or representing bodies
- Arriva Southern Counties
- Epsom Framing Company
- The Footcare Centre
- Heathrow Airport Limited
- V.M. Hi-Fi Services
- Walton Park Dental Practice

Voluntary groups and other third sector
- Ashley Road Residents Association
- The Camberley Society
- Campaign to Protect Rural England, Surrey
- Elmbridge Friends of the Earth
- Guildford and Waverley Friends of the Earth
- Guildford Society
- Lincoln Road Residents' Association
- Natural England - London & South East Region - Eastern Area Team
- Surrey Rural Partnership
- Town Ward Residents' Association, Epsom
- University of Surrey
- Waverley Cycle Forum

7.3 Key themes of representations and resulting changes
Table 7-1 sets out:
- The key themes of the representations received, and
- Corresponding responses and, if considered appropriate, changes to the adopted Parking Strategy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of strategy</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating civil parking enforcement efficiently, effectively and economically</td>
<td>1. Do you have any comments about our preferred approach to civil parking enforcement?</td>
<td>Need more enforcement ‘out of hours’ i.e. late at night and on weekends, especially on double yellow lines.</td>
<td>’Out of hours’ enforcement has been increasing as the need for controls beyond the working week has grown. The arrangements for parking enforcement beyond April 2012 are currently under discussion but this will need to be considered in future plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Management of on street parking                 | 2. Do you have any comments about our proposed management of on street parking? | Remove or lower charges in railway station and council owned car parks. | Although the county council can discuss the levels of charges with the owners of these car parks (usually Network Rail and/or district and borough councils), it has no direct control over them. Having said that, in some areas district and borough councils have reduced some of their charges.  
Increase numbers of residents and visitors permits available in permit zones.  
Discourage demand for parking.  
Encourage modal change | This is already included in the strategy.  
Note. The county council recognises that by restricting parking where demand exceeds supply, and providing alternative means of access to such areas, the pressure on the space available can be better controlled. The county council will consider sustainable travel measures to reduce demand for on street parking, particularly in busy town centres, as stated in section 4.4 of the adopted strategy. The principal strategies of the Surrey Transport Plan which are designated as the lead for such measures are the Passenger Transport strategy, the Climate Change Strategy, the Travel Planning Strategy, and the Cycling and Walking strategies  
This is not an objective of the Parking Strategy, but it is considered in the Climate Change Strategy (see its objective 2). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of strategy</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking provision and policies</td>
<td>3. Do you have any comments about our policies relating to parking provision?</td>
<td>More off street parking should be provided in new developments.</td>
<td>The county council produces guidance on parking provision in new developments, reflecting its role as local highway authority, and the current guidance allows for a flexible approach at a local level. Ultimately however decisions on the required level of parking provision are the responsibility of the borough and district councils in their role as local planning authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy toolkit</td>
<td>5. Are there any measures not included in the Parking Strategy that you think we should consider?</td>
<td>Motorcycle and other powered two wheeler parking</td>
<td>This had mistakenly been overlooked and although there has not been a high demand for this sort of parking in the past in Surrey it has been added to the strategy as a consideration in future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many of the comments from individuals related to concerns about parking in specific roads, including requests for the introduction of parking controls in those roads. These comments did not therefore relate to the Parking Strategy as a whole but were added to the lists of similar requests for changes to parking controls that are reviewed by the county council’s Parking Team on a periodic basis.

There were many other comments, both supportive of specific details and/or of the strategy as a whole, as well as critical of particular details, which did not result in any changes to the final strategy.

In summary, the key changes resulting from the consultation feedback are:

- Addition of a section considering parking for powered two wheelers
- Addition of a section on parking on footways, and considering the issues surrounding the practice
- Addition of a section on permits for businesses in Controlled Parking Zones
- Addition of a section considering the use of smaller parking bays in order to encourage the use of smaller (more environmentally friendly) vehicles
- Addition of an extra paragraph in the section considering the relaxation of the limit on the number of residents’ permits available to a household, to allow for tighter controls where local circumstances make them necessary, and
- Clarification of the extent of a parking bay suspension
8 Consultation on the Passenger Transport Strategy: Part 1 – Local Bus

This chapter sets out:
- how the consultation was undertaken,
- who responded to the consultation,
- the key themes of the representations received,
- responses to those, and
- the resulting changes to the strategy

8.1 How the consultation was undertaken

The first consultation on the Draft Passenger Transport Strategy Part 1: Local Bus of the Surrey Transport Plan was undertaken from 14 September to 9 November 2010.

The consultation document was published on the ‘Surrey Transport Plan – have your say’ webpage and the standard consultation process was followed, as described earlier in section 1.2. (The consultation document can be requested from the Strategy Group, email surreytransportplan@surreycc.gov.uk.)

The Environmental Report (January 2011) and each of the associated draft strategies, including the Draft Passenger Transport Strategy Part 1: Local Bus, were consulted upon from 11 January to 1 February 2011. This represented a second consultation period for each of the draft strategies.

Both consultations on the Draft Passenger Transport Strategy Part 1: Local Bus were based on the following questions:

1: Do you agree with the aim and objectives? If not, please suggest alternatives/additions.  
[Aim: To deliver and maintain an effective, safe and sustainable bus network in Surrey.  
Objectives:  
1. To provide reliable and punctual bus services  
2. To maintain a sustainable network of financially-supported bus services  
3. To improve the accessibility of bus services for passengers]  

2. Do you agree with our targets (section 4.2)? If not, please suggest alternatives/additions.  
[Target 1. We aim to maintain bus patronage at current levels or above.  
Target 2. Bus reliability and punctuality should be maintained at today’s levels. In areas with Bus Punctuality Partnerships, bespoke targets for improvement will be set.]  

3. Are there any additional options (section 5) we should include in our preferred strategies?  

4. If you could choose only one of the eight elements of our preferred strategy (section 7), which would it be?  
- Low-cost measures to improve bus service punctuality and reliability  
- Encouraging commercial bus services and commercially driven initiatives from bus operators  
- Providing supported bus services where prioritised  
- Continuation and development of partnership arrangements between the county council and bus operators  
- Continued support for Park and Ride  
...
Q4 cont.

- Support the development and provision of Demand Responsive Transport, Community Transport and coach services
- Development of a strategy for delivery of passenger transport information
- Works to improve infrastructure and enhance integration with other modes

5. Do you have any other comments in relation to this Local Bus Strategy?

8.2 Who responded to the consultation

There were 60 responses across the two consultation periods. 42 of these were from organisations (listed below) and 18 were from individuals, including one from an elected member of a borough council and one from an elected member of a parish council.

Most responses were received by email and letter.

Public sector
- Bletchingley Parish Council
- Chichester District Council
- Chiddingfold Parish Council
- Churt Parish Council
- Claygate Parish Council
- Cranleigh Parish Council
- Early Years Inspection Service
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Guildford Borough Council
- Highways Agency
- Horley Town Council
- London Borough of Sutton
- Mole Valley District Council (a confirmation also received)
- Natural England
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
- Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council
- Seale and Sands Parish Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Tandridge District Council
- Transport for London
- University of Surrey
- Waverley Borough Council
- Wonersh Parish Council
- Other Surrey borough and district councils were involved in the development of the strategy

Private sector companies or representing bodies
- Abellio Surrey
- Arriva
- Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL)
- Epsom Coaches
- Metrobus

Voluntary groups and other third sector
- Camberley Society
- Council for the Protection of Rural England
- Epsom and Ewell LA21 Transport Group
- Guildford Society
- Guildford and Waverley Friends of the Earth
- Leatherhead Area Partnership
- Passenger Focus
- Surrey Coalition of Disabled People
- Surrey Local Involvement Network
- Surrey Rural Partnership
- Waverley Cycle Forum

8.3 Key themes of representations and resulting changes

Table 8-1 sets out:
- The key themes of the representations received, and
- Corresponding responses and, if considered appropriate, changes to the adopted Passenger Transport Strategy Part 1: Local Bus
### Table 8-1: Key themes of representations, corresponding responses and changes to adopted strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of strategy</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim and Objectives</strong></td>
<td>1. Do you agree with the aim and objectives?</td>
<td>Generally the aims and objectives were accepted, with reliability and punctuality considered especially important.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Do you agree with our targets?</td>
<td>Generally no outright objection to the targets but several respondents said they were not ambitious enough.</td>
<td>The targets were retained because they are considered realistic in a time of considerable uncertainty for the bus industry and reduced public spending, but it has been made clearer that these targets can be reviewed in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targets</strong></td>
<td>3. Are there any additional options (section 5) we should include in our preferred strategies?</td>
<td>General acceptance of the options.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for section 106 funding are more positive than presented.</td>
<td>Comments relating to section 106 funding were revised (see section 5.1.6 in the strategy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park and Ride schemes divided opinion with some support and some concern over their impact.</td>
<td>Park and Ride schemes are not universally popular. The opportunity has been taken to stress that Guildford Park and Ride should become cost-neutral in the medium term rather than requiring continued public sector support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td>4. If you could choose only one of the eight elements of our preferred strategy (section 7), which would it be?</td>
<td>Various elements were supported, largely reflecting local circumstances. Demand Responsive Transport and low-cost measures to improve bus service punctuality and reliability were mentioned several times.</td>
<td>The views expressed were considered in the overall appraisal. The appraisal process is described in section 6 of the strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred Strategy</strong></td>
<td>5. Do you have any other comments in relation to this Local Bus Strategy?</td>
<td>Insufficient focus on work with major out-of-county partners such as significant travel demand generators and neighbouring local authorities.</td>
<td>Agreed. This has been addressed in the adopted strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor levels of bus provision and/or expensive bus fares, particularly when compared to London.</td>
<td>The county council is unable to afford a fares regime and service frequency similar to the heavily subsidised network in London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opposition to the criteria used by the county council for supporting bus services.</td>
<td>These criteria are not part of the Local Bus Strategy. However, these criteria were approved separately and earlier by the council’s Cabinet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some respondents made specific comments regarding Demand Responsive Transport (which was supported particularly in more rural areas of Surrey). This will be covered in greater detail in a forthcoming Community Transport Strategy.

In summary, the key changes resulting from the consultation feedback were:

- More detail added on positive opportunities for section 106 funding of local bus initiatives
- More detail added on the reliability and punctuality of bus services, with more explanation of how other measures proposed also assist in achieving these, and
- Recognition of the importance of working with out-of-county partners
9 Consultation on the Passenger Transport Strategy: Part 2 – Information

This chapter sets out:
- how the consultation was undertaken
- who responded to the consultation
- the key themes of the representations received
- responses to those, and
- the resulting changes to the strategy document

9.1 How the consultation was undertaken

The first consultation on the Draft Passenger Transport Strategy Part 2: Information of the Surrey Transport Plan was undertaken from 17 September to 12 November 2010.

The consultation document was published on the ‘Surrey Transport Plan – have your say’ webpage and the standard consultation process was followed, as described earlier in section 1.2. (The consultation document can be requested from the Strategy Group, email surreytransportplan@surreycc.gov.uk.)

The Environmental Report (January 2011) and each of the associated draft strategies, including the Draft Passenger Transport Strategy Part 1: Information, were consulted upon from 11 January to 1 February 2011. This represented a second consultation period for each of the draft strategies.

Both consultations on the Draft Passenger Transport Strategy Part 2: Information were based on the following questions:

1: Do you agree with the aim and objectives?  
[Aim: To ensure that both users and potential new users have access to comprehensive, up to date, and easily accessible journey planning information for passenger transport  
Objectives:  
1. Promote shift towards sustainable modes of travel  
2. Promote equality of opportunity by publicising passenger transport options  
3. Improve passenger transport information  
4. Improve confidence in passenger transport reliability]

2. Do you agree with our targets? If not, please suggest alternatives/additions.  
[Target 1: Maintain access to passenger transport information via the Surrey County Council website at current levels.  
Target 2: Maximise opportunities to improve live travel information provision]

3. Are there any additional options we should include in our preferred strategies?

4. Which of the following types of passenger transport information is most useful? And why?  
- Printed paper timetables  
- Timetables on a website  
- Timetables and other information at bus stops / railway stations  
- Town and/or countywide public transport maps showing all bus operators and rail routes
**Q4. cont.**
- Live journey planning tools for passenger transport (eg. National Rail journey planner website)
- Real time information on electronic displays at bus stops / railway stations
- Real time bus/train running information by text message to mobile phones
- Other, please specify

5. Do you have any other comments in relation to this Passenger Transport Information Strategy?

---

3. **Who responded to the consultation**
There were 30 responses across the two consultation periods in total. All 30 were received from organisations (listed below).

Most responses were received by email and letter.

**Public sector**
- Claygate Parish Council
- Cranleigh Parish Council
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
- Guildford Borough Council
- Highways Agency
- Horley Town Council
- London Borough of Sutton
- Mole Valley District Council (a confirmation also received)
- Natural England
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Seale and Sands Parish Council
- Shere Parish Council
- Tandridge District Council
- Transport for London
- University of Surrey
- Waverley Borough Council
- Wonersh Parish Council
- Other Surrey boroughs and district councils were involved in the development of the strategy

**Private sector companies or representing bodies**
- Abellio Surrey
- Arriva
- BAA Heathrow
- Epsom Coaches
- Metrobus

**Voluntary groups and other third sector**
- CPRE
- Guildford Society
- Surrey Local Involvement Network
- Surrey Rural Partnership
- The Camberley Society
- Waverley Cycle Forum

9.2 **Key themes of representations and resulting changes**
Table 9-1 sets out:
- The key issues and themes of the representations received; and
- Corresponding responses and, if considered appropriate, changes to the adopted Passenger Transport Strategy Part 2: Information
Table 9-1: Key themes of representations, corresponding responses and changes to adopted strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of strategy</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Key issues and themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to final strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aim and Objectives</td>
<td>1. Do you agree with the aim and objectives?</td>
<td>Generally the aims and objectives were accepted</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>2. Do you agree with our targets?</td>
<td>Generally no outright objection to the targets.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>3. Are there any additional options we should include in our preferred strategies?</td>
<td>General acceptance of the options.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information channels</td>
<td>4. Which of the types of passenger transport information is most useful? And why?</td>
<td>There was a spread of support for different channels of information. Real Time Passenger Information was supported, especially in areas where it is not currently available but seen as desirable.</td>
<td>No change. The strategy outlines the various information channels which can be used depending on budgets and changing needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paper-based publicity still useful for those without electronic access.</td>
<td>Understand. The strategy does not rule out the production of printed publicity but we will seek the most cost effective ways of producing and disseminating information. At the moment budgets are constrained, but this might change in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New media channels such as smartphone applications (‘apps’) and social media feeds need to be considered.</td>
<td>Agreed. This has been addressed in the adopted strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>5. Do you have any other comments in relation to this Passenger Transport Information Strategy?</td>
<td>Better integration of Surrey County Council website with bus/train operator website information is needed.</td>
<td>Agreed. This has been addressed in adopted strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the key changes resulting from the consultation feedback are:

- Inclusion of new electronic media channels for passenger transport information
- More detail on integration between Surrey County Council passenger transport website and other transport operators’ web-based information, and
- Recognition of the importance of working with out-of-county partners
10 Consultation on the Travel Planning Strategy

This chapter sets out:

- how the consultation was undertaken
- who responded to the consultation
- the key themes of the representations received
- responses to those, and
- the resulting changes to the strategy document

10.1 How the consultation was undertaken

The first consultation on the Draft Travel Planning Strategy of the Surrey Transport Plan was undertaken from 15 October to 10 December 2010.

The consultation document was published on the ‘Surrey Transport Plan – have your say’ webpage and the standard consultation process was followed, as described earlier in section 1.2. (The consultation document can be requested from the Strategy Group, email surreytransportplan@surreycc.gov.uk.)

The Environmental Report (January 2011) and each of the associated draft strategies, including the Draft Travel Planning Strategy, were consulted upon from 11 January to 1 February 2011. This represented a second consultation period for each of the draft strategies.

Both consultations on the Draft Travel Planning Strategy were based on the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation questions for School Travel Planning Strategy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Do you agree with the proposed school travel planning objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Reason for your views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Do you agree with our intended targets as set out in section 4.3?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Reason for your views</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3a. Do you agree that schools should be prioritised for travel planning resources on a needs basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3b. Reason for your views

4. Is there anything that we should have included in this travel planning strategy that we have not?

5. Do you have any additional comments in relation to our proposed strategy for school travel planning?

**Consultation questions for Workplace Travel Planning Strategy:**

1. Do you have any opinions of the current workplace travel planning support from Surrey County Council? If so, please outline.

2. Do you have any comments on the objectives for workplace travel planning (page 10)? If so, please outline.

3. Do you have any suggestions for improving the preferred strategy (pages 17 and 18)?

4. Any other comments or concerns?

---

10.2 Who responded to the consultation

**School Travel Planning Strategy consultation questions**

There were 33 responses across the two consultation periods. 12 of these were from organisations (listed below) and 21 were from individuals.

Most responses were received through the web-based questionnaire.

**Public sector**
- Guildford Borough Council
- Horley Town Council
- London Borough of Sutton
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Seale & Sands Parish Council
- Tandridge District Council
- Transport for London
- University of Surrey
- Woking Borough Council

**Voluntary groups and other third sector**
- Natural England
- Surrey Rural Partnership
Workplace Travel Planning Strategy consultation questions
There were 31 responses across the two consultation periods in total. 15 of these were from organisations (listed below) and 16 were from individuals.

Again, most responses were received through the web-based questionnaire.

Public Sector
- Guildford Borough Council
- London Borough of Sutton
- Mole Valley District Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Seale & Sands Parish Council
- Tandridge District Council
- Transport for London
- University of Surrey
- Woking Borough Council

Voluntary groups and other third sector
- CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
- Guildford Society
- Natural England
- Surrey Local Involvement Network (LINK)
- Surrey Rural Partnership

10.3 Key themes of representations and resulting changes
Table 10-1 sets out:
- The key themes of the representations received, and
- Corresponding responses and, if considered appropriate, changes to the adopted Travel Planning Strategy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key themes of representations</th>
<th>Response and changes to adopted strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerns were raised about the possible conflict between encouraging schoolchildren to walk and cycle and the perceived increase in risk associated with these modes of transport.</td>
<td>Text added to section 2.2 of adopted strategy as follows: ‘The county council acknowledges that increasing the proportion of schoolchildren that are walking and cycling to school potentially increases the number of vulnerable road users. However, investment in pedestrian and cycle training, as well as initiatives such as the walking bus, can help to reduce the risk of child casualties on the school journey. Furthermore, school travel planning measures can contribute to a reduction in the number of vehicles on the road, particularly in the immediate vicinity of schools, which can also reduce the instances of conflict between pedestrians and cars at busy times of the day.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was noted that hospitals and healthcare services were not specifically mentioned.</td>
<td>Text added to section 2.3 of the adopted strategy as follows: ‘Service users includes non-emergency patients travelling to and from healthcare facilities such as hospitals. In these cases they are covered by the hospitals’ own workplace travel plan. There are cases where non emergency patient transport is arranged by Surrey County Council and this will be covered in the forthcoming Community Transport Strategy’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was queried as to why powered two wheel vehicles were not specifically mentioned. These can provide good environmental and congestion relieving benefits.</td>
<td>The work required to assess the benefits of two wheelers is still ongoing and is very variable depending on a range of factors (e.g. vehicle type and size). It was therefore thought pragmatic to omit mention of them within the strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems caused by on street parking are a result of under provision of parking spaces. Businesses expanding in Surrey should provide comprehensive travel planning for their employees.</td>
<td>The topic of on street parking is covered in the Parking Strategy. Businesses expanding in Surrey can be required to provide their employees with travel planning (through a workplace travel plan). Further details are provided in the ‘Travel Plans Good Practice Guide: For organisations submitting planning applications’ (Surrey County Council, July 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key themes of representations</td>
<td>Response and changes to adopted strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no mention of developing or maintaining cycle lanes and routes and dual use paths. Travel plans for new developments should refer to existing cycle lanes and routes, and the process of travel planning should identify new infrastructure such as off-highway cycle routes.</td>
<td>Cycle lanes, routes and paths are covered in the Cycling Strategy. The process of travel planning for new developments can identify the provision of new off-highway cycle routes but this will be dependent upon various factors including the size and nature of the development and any related planning obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient resources to ensure travel plans are implemented and monitored should be put in place for compliance purposes, and financial penalties need to act as sufficient incentives.</td>
<td>An auditing fee is requested for all Development Related Travel Plans. Direct financial penalties have yet to be agreed within the county; this is ongoing work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was mentioned that powered two wheelers were not specifically mentioned in relation to school travel planning.</td>
<td>Powered two wheelers are considered as a mode of transport that the pre driver age group can use. It should be noted that the county council’s award winning production Safe Drive Stay Alive already offers guidance in relation to powered two wheelers. When working with schools or colleges, officers commonly refer users of powered two wheelers to other agencies that offer specific training services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has been noted that there was a distinct lack of integration with infrastructure improvements and maintenance of such improvements e.g. cycle paths</td>
<td>Cycle lanes, routes and paths are covered in the Cycling Strategy. The process of travel planning for new developments can identify the provision of new off-highway cycle routes but this will be dependent upon various factors including the size and nature of the development and any related planning obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a comment made regarding the centralisation of school travel planning resources and the deployment of services, and that it was more effective on a local level.</td>
<td>Resources, although held centrally, will be deployed at a targeted local level, ensuring that the school travel planning process involves the school and its pupils, and also the neighbouring community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has been noted that school travel planning should include the use of bus services as another mode of transport.</td>
<td>School bus services were part of the county councils’ School Special Services Bus Review, which was implemented in 2010. It should be noted that all modes of transport are considered in the school travel planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets in the draft strategy were overly complicated and numerous.</td>
<td>The number of targets was reduced between following consultation, from seven to one target for school travel planning and from four to one target for workplace travel planning (see section 4.3, Table 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key themes of representations</td>
<td>Response and changes to adopted strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy states that much of the work will be dependent on resources. It would be appropriate to include areas and actions that will be considered a priority within the strategy.</td>
<td>The application of travel planning resources is prioritised according to a range of factors on a site by site basis, rather than on specific areas or actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural parts of Surrey have their own specific issues including a lack of passenger transport links and IT facilities. This should be recognised, most particularly in relation to reductions in subsidised bus services in some areas.</td>
<td>Position noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was noted that encouraging children to walk and cycle to school would make them more vulnerable and potentially increase child casualties.</td>
<td>Position noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A need for the Travel Planning Strategy to be linked to the other strategies within the Surrey Transport Plan was identified.</td>
<td>A Travel Planning Strategy toolkit was incorporated into the adopted strategy (as Table 4). This demonstrates the links between with the various strategies of the Surrey Transport Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station travel plans have not been specifically included within the strategy.</td>
<td>Station travel plans were added to the strategy. Station travel plans were included in the ‘Travel Planning –Options for Work Places’ and ‘Travel Planning Tool Box School Travel Planning’ diagrams in section 5, and text was also inserted into Section 7 stating: ‘we will… … Work with train operators in Surrey to provide advice and support for Station Travel Plans and the measures and actions arising from them.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy should be expanded to include the smaller and medium sized businesses in Surrey, and to cover area wide travel plans specifically in deprived areas, affluent high car use areas, and locations of good public transport access.</td>
<td>Position noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county council should be working with the voluntary sector to maximise the effectiveness of travel plans.</td>
<td>Position noted. The county council frequently work with the voluntary sector, often acting as a facilitator between developers and voluntary organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve public transport.</td>
<td>This is addressed by the Passenger Transport Strategy Part 1: Local Bus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county council should require travel plans be provided for certain planning applications.</td>
<td>This already happens as set out in the document ‘Travel Plans Good Practice Guide: For organisations submitting planning applications’ (Surrey County Council, July 2010).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 Consultation on the Cycling Strategy

This chapter sets out:
- how the consultation was undertaken
- who responded to the consultation, and
- the key themes of the representations and resulting changes

11.1 How the consultation was undertaken
The Draft Cycling Strategy Consultation took place for six weeks between 6 September and 1 November 2013.

The consultation document was published on the ‘Surrey Transport Plan – Roads and transport consultations’ webpage and the standard consultation process was followed, as described earlier in section 1.2.

The Environmental Report (September 2013) was consulted at the same time as the strategy. The post-adoption environment statement is located on the same web page as the Cycling Strategy.

11.2 Who responded to the consultation
Responses to the consultation were received from 3,562 individuals and 128 organisations. Responses came in different formats including completion of an online or hardcopy survey, letters and emails, as well as minutes of meetings.

The following types of organisations responded:
- Action Group - 1
- Cycling Club/Groups - 14
- Disability Group/Forum - 5
- Education - 10
- Environmental Group - 2
- Equestrian Group - 6
- Government Department - 1
- Health Sector - 1
- Local Authority - 19
- Not for Profit - 8
- Parish/Town Council – 16
- Political Group - 3
- Private Sector - 12
- SCC - 4
- Sports - 4
- Transport Sector - 2
- Village/Residents Association - 10
- Voluntary Sector – 2

11.3 Key themes of representations and resulting changes
Many responses were supportive of Surrey County Council’s active promotion of cycling and welcomed that the strategy had been developed.
The analysis of responses\(^1\) found that:

- 76% of respondents agreed with the aim of the cycling strategy
- 69% of respondents said they liked the idea of local cycling plans
- 65% of respondents thought cycling events were good for Surrey

Amendments have been made to the draft Cycling Strategy in response to several of the comments received. These amendments include:

- Discussion of road user behaviour in chapter 6.9 and managing high levels of sports cycling on Surrey's roads in chapter 7.4.
- A section on the condition of the road network has been added.
- Issues relating to conflict with pedestrians on footpaths are outlined in the 'cycle routes' section of this document and in section 6.1 of the strategy.
- Issues relating to cyclists passing horses safely are discussed in section 6.9 of the strategy (campaigns on cycling safety and sharing the road).
- An implementation plan has been added in chapter 9 of the strategy, with actions, owners and timescales that will be monitored by the partnership board. There will be a publicly available annual report on progress.
- Our implementation plan, under 'cycling the health', includes encouraging the correct use of helmets.
- Some discussion of shared use paths and pavements has been added within chapter 6.1.
- More detail has been added to the section on infrastructure funding (chapter 6.7) and strategy delivery.
- The structure of the strategy has been changed to include 'overarching approach', 'cycling as a means of transport', and 'health, leisure, sport and events', and the detail in relation to cycling for transport has been added.
- A requirement that event organisers demonstrate the economic benefits of an event before it is approved has been added.
- Our approach to cycling infrastructure design and delivery has been clarified in chapter 6.1 of the strategy.
- We have also highlighted the right of cyclists to use the road in preference to dedicated cycle facilities, and that certain types of cycle path may not be suitable for all cyclists (Chapter 6.1 and 6.9 of the strategy).
- Our aims in relation to segregated cycle routes within our principles for infrastructure design and delivery have been clarified, while outlining some of the challenges in terms of delivery (chapter 6.1). We have also highlighted the right of cyclists to use the road, and that certain types of cycle path may not be suitable for all cyclists.
- A sentence has been added under possible infrastructure solutions to say that one-way roads with contra flow cycling may not be appropriate in every case, and need to be considered according to local circumstances (chapter 6.1).

\(^1\) Surrey News December 2013: http://news.surreycc.gov.uk/2013/12/02/county-council-calls-for-new-law-on-unregistered-cycling-events/
- Our position on shared pavements has been added to the strategy, as part of chapter 6.1.
- Appropriate speed reductions as part of our list of elements that local cycling plans should consider, and clarification of the role of local committees have been included in chapter 5.2.
- Further details of Local Cycling Plans and their fit with wider plans and policies is discussed in chapter 5.2.
- A commitment to allocate funding to ensure that cost is not a barrier to learning to ride a bike has been set out in the strategy.
- Our current training offer and future training plans has been clarified in chapter 5.3 of the strategy.
- A section on licensing and taxation has been added to the strategy (chapter 6.10).
- The text on Bikeability has been clarified in chapter 5.3 of the strategy.
- The commitment to allocate funding to subsidise people in target groups and areas, and support those that are less able to pay, has been included in section 5.3 of the strategy.
- Safe routes to schools has been added to our list of elements to consider when developing local cycling plans in chapter 5.2.
- Cycle parking at schools will be added to our list of elements to consider within local cycling plans in section 5.2.
- Further information on the Golden Boot Challenge in section 6.8 on information, promotional activities and practical support has been added.
- Chapter 7.4 of the strategy has been added which sets out a commitment that we will only close a road once a year for a major event. Additional major events would involve road closure only where there is clear evidence that there is strong local residents’ and business support to do so.
- Chapter 7.4 of the strategy sets out our approach to road closures in relation to their impact on local businesses. This will ensure that all future decisions are carried out in accordance with the Framework for Coordinating and Approving Events on the Highway.
- Section 5.4 has been added which includes more detail on plans to secure economic benefits from cycling events.
- Section 7.4 describes plans to ensure that major events bring benefit to Surrey, and text has been added to section 7.3 describing plans to lobby central government for a change to regulations to require currently unregulated sportive events to notify the police and the highways authority.
- The proposals regarding the economic and tourism potential of events have been set out in chapter 5.4.
- Chapter 6.9 has been added which describes campaign plans for cycling safety and sharing the road, and enforcement plans which we are working with Surrey Police to develop and deliver.
- Section 7.3 provides further details on our plans to manage the impacts of sports cycling.
We have stated that local cycling plans will involve consultation with local residents in chapter 5.2 of the strategy.

Chapter 5.2 describes an evidence base that includes casualty data, surveys, areas of deprivation and poor health, and local knowledge.

Chapter 5.2 considers appropriate targets.

Chapter 5.2 explains that the cycling plans will feed into local transport strategies, and the principles for infrastructure design and delivery in chapter 6.1 outline the need for infrastructure to consider all road users.

The proposals regarding the economic and tourism potential of events are set out in chapter 5.4.

Chapter 7.4 sets out the requirement for future major events to demonstrate economic, health, social and environmental benefits to Surrey.

Our commitment on stakeholder involvement has been set out in chapter 5.1 of the strategy.

Chapter 6.1 has been amended to include our commitment to ensure that those commissioning and designing schemes within Surrey County Council's highways department are suitably trained in the latest best practice in cycling infrastructure design, and to seek expert advice as appropriate.

The introduction of cycle safety requirements for HGV fleets within future SCC contracts is discussed in chapter 6.9.
12 Consultation on the Surrey Rail Strategy

This paper sets out:
- how the consultation was undertaken
- who responded to the consultation
- key themes of representations and resulting changes.

12.1 How the consultation was undertaken

The main purpose of consulting and engaging on the Surrey Rail Strategy was to:

a) Obtain the views of certain key bodies, most notably the Train Operating Companies, Transport for London and Network Rail
b) Get buy-in to thinking about more aspirational schemes to tackle strategic challenges.

Early Engagement

A ‘partnership approach’ was adopted on the Surrey Rail Strategy and consultation has taken place with a number of partners as the strategy has been developed, not least with relevant partners in the rail industry.

A Task and Finish Group was created with representation from Surrey County Council and Surrey districts and boroughs. Nominations for this group were sought from Surrey Planning Working Group.

At the start of the process Arup (the appointed consultant) held several one-on-one sessions with members and officers. These sessions included meetings with:
- Councillor Steve Renshaw, (at the time Chairman of the Environment and Transport Select Committee)
- Councillor John Furey, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Transport
- Councillor Simon Gimson (Formerly of South West Trains and a former member of the Environment and Transport Select Committee)
- Mark Pearson (Chairman of Surrey Connects and the Transport for Surrey Partnership)
- All Surrey boroughs and districts (planning and transport officers).

Meetings and teleconferences were also held with the Local Enterprise Partnerships, neighbouring local authorities, Network Rail, Transport for London, the Train Operating Companies and Passenger Focus.

A Member Seminar was held in January 2013. Members received a presentation on the rail issues identified and discussed early options to address those issues.

Two workshops were held to inform the strategy. An Options workshop (January 2013) included representatives from Surrey districts and boroughs, Surrey County Council, the Train Operating Companies, Network Rail, Heathrow Airport Limited and the Local Enterprise Partnerships Enterprise M3 and Coast to Capital.

A further draft Surrey Rail Strategy workshop (March 2013) included neighbouring local authorities.
The consultation document was published on the ‘Surrey Transport Plan – have your say’ web page.

Press releases were issued. Coverage has included BBC Surrey, the Surrey Advertiser, the Guildford Dragon and other media.

**Public Consultation**

There was a 14-week public consultation on the rail strategy from 29 March to 28 June 2013. The extended consultation period allowed the strategy to be discussed by certain local committees.

We consulted using two products:
1. An Executive Summary document highlighting the key elements of the strategy.
2. The main strategy document.

Information was sent by post to:
- Surrey Residents Associations
- Surrey Parish and Town Councils
- Surrey MPs
- All Elected Members
- Surrey libraries
- District and borough portfolio holders, and to all borough and district members where requested.

Information was sent electronically to:
- Members of the Transport for Surrey Partnership
- The Local Transport Plan email distribution list
- Business contacts:
  - Business representative groups such as Surrey Chambers of Commerce, the Institute of Directors and Federation of Small Businesses.
  - Surrey Connects business contacts.

Neighbouring transport authorities, the Train Operating Companies and several other groups and bodies had the opportunity to comment on the strategy. Five local committees (Elmbridge, Guildford, Mole Valley, Reigate and Banstead and Woking) received an item on the strategy, as well as the Local Committee Chairmen.

The consultation was based on the following questions:

- Do you agree with the strategies for each area/topic?
- Do you agree with the priority options?
- Do you agree with the action plan?

**12.2 Who responded to the consultation**

There were 151 responses to the consultation. The bodies that responded are listed below. In response to a campaign led by the Westborough Community Association, there were several responses in favour of a new station at Park Barn in Guildford. A petition on the same subject was presented to the Guildford Local Committee. A letter was also received from the Rt Hon Michael Gove MP. Respondents included the following organisations:
Public sector
- Aldershot Borough Council
- Ash Parish Council
- Bletchingley Parish Council
- Bracknell Forest Borough Council
- Chiddingfold Parish Council
- Chobham Parish Council
- Claygate Parish Council
- East Sussex County Council
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
- Farnham Town Council
- Guildford Borough Council
- Hampshire County Council
- Horley Town Council
- Horne Parish Council
- Kent County Council
- Limsfield Parish Council
- Lingfield Parish Council
- London Borough of Wandsworth
- Mole Valley District Council
- Natural England
- Ockley Parish Council
- Pirbright Parish Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
- Runnymede Borough Council
- Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council
- Seale and Sands Parish Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey County Council Empowerment Boards (TBC)
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Surrey Wildlife Trust
- Tandridge District Council
- Transport for London
- University of Surrey
- Waverley Borough Council
- West Sussex County Council
- Witley Parish Council
- Woking Borough Council
- Wokingham Borough Council
- Worplesdon Parish Council.

Private sector companies or representing bodies
- Enterprise M3 LEP
- Gatwick Airport Limited
- Graham Warren Ltd
- Heathrow Airport Limited
- Interlinking Transit Solutions Limited
- Kempton Park Racecourse/ Jockey Club Estates Ltd
- Martin Grant Homes (MDS Transmodal)
- Metrobus
- Network Rail
- Rail Planning Consulting
- South West Trains

Voluntary groups and other third sector
- Alton Line User's Association
- Burpham Community Association
- Burpham Neighbourhood Forum
- East Surrey Transport Committee
- Edenbridge & District Rail Travellers’ Association
- Fetcham Residents Association
- Guildford Environmental Forum
- Guildford Residents’ Associations
- Guildford, Waverley and Woking Friends of the Earth
- Holy Trinity Amenity Group
- Mayford Village Society
- Merrow Residents Association
- Molesey Residents Association
- Railfuture
- Rowledge Residents Association
- St Catherine’s Village Association
- St Clare’s Church, Park Barn
- Staines Town Society
- Surrey Green Party
- The Camberley Society
- The Reigate Society
- Watercolour Residents Association
- Westborough Parking Group
- Westfield Residents Association
- Wood Street Village Association
12.3 Key themes of representations and resulting changes

Many responses were supportive of Surrey County Council’s active engagement in rail and welcomed that the strategy had been developed.

Amendments have been made to the draft Surrey Rail Strategy in response to several of the comments received. These amendments include:

- Car parking and more broadly access to stations came through strongly in the consultation responses and it is suggested that this is a priority going forward.
- Access to London from Camberley, Bagshot and Frimley also came through strongly and might also be a priority going forward.
- More references have been made to the Uckfield line and by extension Tandridge district.
- There are now further and stronger references to Woking’s status as a key economic centre and rail town.
- Reference has been made to improvements to signalling and level crossing management which are considered to have significant impacts on level crossing downtimes and consequently on traffic congestion and air quality within Runnymede Borough.
- The section on Crossrail 2 has been clarified to ensure that its costs/benefits are clear.
- Worplesdon Park and Ride has been removed as an option.
- A section on the Mole Valley Line has been included.
13 Consultation on the Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes

The county council is producing Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes for each district and borough in the county. The purpose of these strategies is to support the growth set out within district and borough local plans and provide a programme of transport infrastructure required to deliver this growth. They also provide an evidence base for future funding bids.

The strategies are 'live documents' which we intend to update at regular intervals to ensure they remain relevant and current. They have been approved by Surrey's Cabinet and are part of the Surrey Transport Plan.

They contain two main elements. The main documents provide commentaries on the transport provision and transport problems in each district or borough. They also provide possible solutions to the identified problems.

The annex to each strategy contains a forward programme of transport infrastructure that we would like to see implemented in each district or borough, subject to funding. The forward programme would seek to address the problems identified in the main document of the strategy and mitigate the impact of future growth on the transport network.

Public consultation has been undertaken for all eight Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes produced to date. A consultation report following the format of other Surrey Transport Plan consultation was produced and submitted to the relevant Local or Joint Committee. You can view the consultation report for each strategy and forward programme by clicking on the links below:

- [Elmbridge Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme Consultation Report](#)
- [Epsom & Ewell Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme Consultation Report](#)
- [Mole Valley Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme Consultation Report](#)
- [Reigate & Banstead Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme Consultation Report](#)
- [Spelthorne Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme Consultation Report](#)
- [Surrey Heath Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme Consultation Report](#)
- [Tandridge Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme Consultation Report](#)
- [Woking Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme Consultation Report](#)
14 Consultation on the Rights of Way Improvement Plan

- How the consultation was undertaken
- Responses to the consultation
- key themes of representations and resulting changes.

14.1 How the consultation was undertaken

The main purpose of consulting and engaging on the Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Surrey 2014 Revision was to:

a) Obtain the views of certain key bodies, most notably users of the public rights of way network.
b) Ensure that the revised document accurately reflected changes to other policy documents and funding opportunities.

Local authorities are required to review their Rights of Way Improvement Plans every ten years. The first plan for Surrey was produced in 2007.

At the start of the review process, the Surrey Countryside Access Forum were asked for their views on how the original plan, produced in 2007, addressed the differing needs of public rights of way users and other stakeholders with an interest in countryside access issues within the county. The Surrey Countryside Access Forum is an independent body that advises the County Council on countryside access issues. It was agreed that the plan was still broadly relevant, but needed updating to ensure that it’s aims and objectives aligned well with other strategies and policies, seven years after the original document. It was agreed that the document should continue in its current format and be updated following a full consultation exercise. It was agreed that summary information on what progress had been made since the original plan in 2007 would also be included.

An Environmental Report was also undertaken to assess any environmental impacts associated with the plan.

The consultation document was published on the ‘Rights of Way Improvement Plan’ page with the ‘Explore Surrey’ section of the County Council’s web site.

We consulted on:
1. The Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Surrey 2014 Revision. The consultation was open from 13th March 2014 to 9th May 2014.

2. The Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Surrey 2014 Revision Environmental Report. The consultation was open from 17th April 2014 to 13th June 2014.

We consulted the following organisations:

All Surrey Parish Councils
Surrey County Council Members (81)
Surrey local Committees (11)
Surrey Members of Parliament (11)
Surrey District and Boroughs Councils(11)
Surrey Local Partnership Committees (11)

County Councils
- Hampshire
- West Sussex
- East Sussex
- Kent
- Buckinghamshire
- Berkshire

Neighbouring London Boroughs
- Bromley
- Croydon
- Sutton
- Kingston
- Richmond
- Hounslow
- Hillingdon

- Greater London Authority & Transport for London

Surrey Countryside Access Forum
Walk London and Walking 4 Life
Local Enterprise Partnerships (2)
- M3
- Capital to Coast

The Highways Agency
Natural England
National Farmers Union
Country Landowners Association
Campaign Protection Rural England

User Groups representing:
- Easy access
- Cyclists
- Walkers
- Horse Riders

14.2 Responses to the consultation
There were 77 responses to the consultation.

14.3 Key themes of representations and resulting changes
Many responses were supportive of Surrey County Council’s Rights of Way Improvement Plan Review.
Amendments have been made to the document in response to many of the comments received.
Issues that arose from the comments included:
- Potential for user conflict on rights of way (ROW) network, particularly in relation to the increase in off-road cycling.
- Maintenance of ROW network should not be reduced
• Accessibility/equality issues were important and more needed to be done (the Countryside Access Equalities Impact Assessment is due to be reviewed).
• Connectivity remained a significant problem for users, particularly equestrians and cyclists.
• Local impacts should be fully considered when implementing improvements to ensure any negative impacts are addressed.
• Some specific route improvements were suggested.
• Lack of progress and resources for delivery of improvements for equestrians.
Appendix A: Statutory and other identified consultees for Surrey Transport Plan web based consultation activities

Section A: Statutory consultees based on Local Transport Act 2008 requirements

Highways Agency

*Surrey’s local planning authorities:*
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
- Guildford Borough Council
- Mole Valley District Council
- Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Tandridge District Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Woking Borough Council

*Rail operators:*
- Network Rail
- Association of Train Operating Companies

*Bus operators:*
- Confederation of Passenger Transport
- Abellio
- Arriva Southern Counties
- Arriva Guildford and West Sussex
- Ashford Luxury Coaches
- Atbus Ltd
- Bear Buses
- Carlone Buses
- Compass Travel
- Countryliner
- Countryliner Coach Hire
- Countywide Travel
- Dickson Travel
- Edward Thomas & Son
- Epsom Coaches & Quality Line
- First Beeline Buses Ltd
- First Berkshire

*Flights Hallmark Ltd*
- London General
- Metro Bus
- Reptons Coaches
- Safeguard Coaches
- Southdown PSV
- Stagecoach South
- Sullivan Buses
- Sunray Travel
- Travel London
- Tellings Golden Miller
- Turbostyle
- W&H Motors

*Community transport operators:*
- East Surrey Partnership
- East Surrey Rural Transport Partnership
- Esher Care and Car Service
- Runnymede Dial-a-Ride
- Waverley Hoppa
- Woking Community Transport

*Organisations considered to represent the interests of users of transport services and facilities in Surrey:*

*Public transport:*
- Passenger Focus
- London Transport Users Committee
- Bus Users UK

*Local Access Forums:*
- Access Forum Reigate and Banstead
- Access Group Mole Valley
- Disability Access Surrey Heath
- Elmbridge Access Group
- Epsom & Ewell Access Group
- Guildford Access Group
- Reigate and Banstead Access Forum
- Access Group Runnymede - Runnymede Disability Access Liaison Group
- Access Group Spelthorne - Spelthorne Committee for Access Now
- Tandridge Access Group
Cycling:  
- CTC  
- Cycle Rights, Farnham  
- Epsom & Ewell Action Group  
- Godalming Cycle Campaign  
- Guildford Cycle Forum  
- Mole Valley Cycle Forum  
- Sustrans  
- Waverley Cycle Forum  
- Woking Cycle Users Group  

Motorcycling:  
- British Motorcyclists Federation  
- Motorcycle Action Group  

Driving:  
- Association of British Drivers  
- AA  
- RAC Foundation  

Freight:  
- Freight Transport Association  
- Road Haulage Association  

Equestrian:  
- British Horse Society  

Regional development agency:  
- South East England Development Agency  

Section B: Other stakeholders identified

All 80 Surrey County Councillors  
[From September 2010 onwards] All councillors from the 11 borough and district councils in Surrey

**Surrey parish and town councils:**  
- Abinger Parish Council  
- Albury Parish Council  
- Alfold Parish Council [Letter sent as email address not available]  
- Artington Parish Council  
- Ash Parish Council  
- Betchworth Parish Council  
- Bisley Parish Council  
- Bisley Parish Council  
- Bletchingley Parish Council  
- Bramley Parish Council  
- Brockham Parish Council  
- Buckland Parish Council  
- Burstow Parish Council  
- Busbridge Parish Council  
- Capel Parish Council  
- Caterham on the Hill Parish Council  
- Caterham Valley Parish Council  
- Chaldon Parish Council  
- Charlwood Parish Council  
- Chelsham & Farleigh Parish Council  
- Chiddingfold Parish Council  
- Chobham Parish Council  
- Churt Parish Council  
- Claygate Parish Council  
- Compton Parish Council  

**Cranleigh Parish Council**  
**Crowhurst Parish Council**  
**Dockenfield Parish Council [Letter sent as email address not available]**  
**Dormansland Parish Council**  
**Dunsfold Parish Council [Letter sent as email address not available]**  
**East Clandon Parish Council**  
**East Horsley Parish Council**  
**Effingham Parish Council**  
**Elstead Parish Council**  
**Ewhurst Parish Council with Ellen’s Green**  
**Farnham Town Council**  
**Felbridge Parish Council**  
**Frensham Parish Council**  
**Godalming Town Council**  
**Godstone Parish Council**  
**Hambledon Parish Council**  
**Hascombe Parish Council [Letter sent as email address not available]**  
**Haslemere Town Council**  
**Headley Parish Council**  
**Holmwood Parish Council**  
**Horley Town Council**  
**Horne Parish Council**  
**Leigh Parish Council**  
**Limpfield Parish Council**
Lingfield Parish Council
Mickleham Parish Council
Newdigate Parish Council
Normandy Parish Council
Nutfield Parish Council
Ockham Parish Council
Ockley Parish Council
Outwood Parish Council
Oxted Parish Council
Peper Harow Parish Meeting
Pirbright Parish Council
Puttenham Parish Council
Ripley Parish Council
Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council
Seale and Sands Parish Council
Send Parish Council
Shackleford Parish Council [Removed from email alert list following instruction]
Shalford Parish Council
Shere Parish Council
St Martha's Parish Council
Tandridge Parish Council
Tatsfield Parish Council
Thursley Parish Council
Tilford Parish Council
Titsey Parish Meeting [Letter sent as email address not available]
Tongham Parish Council
Wanborough Parish Council
Warlingham Parish Council
West Clandon Parish Council
West End Parish Council
West Horsley Parish Council
Whyteleafe Parish Council
Windlesham Parish Council
Witley Parish Council
Woldingham Parish Council
Wonersh Parish Council
Worthington Parish Council
Wotton Parish Council
Surrey County Association of Parish & Town Councils
Hampshire County Council
Hart District Council
Horsham District Council
Kent County Council
London Borough of Bromley
London Borough of Croydon
London Borough of Hillingdon
London Borough of Hounslow
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
London Borough of Sutton
Mid Sussex District Council
Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (unitary)
Rushmoor Borough Council
Sevenoaks District Council
Slough Borough Council (unitary)
Wealden District Council
West Sussex County Council

Adjoining transport authorities and transport partnerships:
Transport for London
SWELTRAC [ceased end March 2011]

Regional bodies:
Government Office for the South East (GOSE)
Improvement Efficiency South East (IESE)
South East England Partnership Board

Statutory environmental bodies:
English Heritage
Environment Agency
Natural England

Airports in close proximity to Surrey:
Heathrow Airport Ltd
Gatwick Airport Ltd

Recreational walking groups:
Ramblers Association - East Surrey Group
Ramblers Association - Epsom & Ewell Group
Ramblers Association - Farnham & District Ramblers
Ramblers Association - Godalming & Haslemere Ramblers
Ramblers Association - Guildford Group
Ramblers Association - Reigate
Ramblers Association - Surrey Area
Ramblers Association - Surrey Under 40s Ramblers Group
Ramblers Association - Surrey Area Weekend Walkers
Surrey Walking Club

**Taxi and private hire vehicle organisations:**
Licensed Private Hire Car Association
National Private Hire Association
National Taxi Association

**Other community sector organisations:**
Action for Blind People Southern Counties
Age Concern Surrey
Disabled Citizen’s Advice and Support Services (DisCASS)
East Surrey Empowerment Board (PEP_talk)
Farnham Humanists
Gay Surrey
Gender Identity Research and Education Society
Guidedogs for the Blind
Help The Aged
North West Surrey Association of Disabled People
Regional Action and Involvement South East - RAISE
South East England Faiths Forum (SEEFF)
Surrey Association for Visual Impairment - SAVI
Surrey Coalition of Disabled People
Surrey Council for Voluntary Youth Service
Runnymede Association of Voluntary Services (RAVS)
Surrey Community Action
Surrey 50 Plus Network
Surrey Local Involvement Network
Surrey Minority Ethnic Forum
Surreywide Tenants Involvement Group
Surrey Travellers Community Relations Forum

Surrey Youth Focus
Surrey Youth Parliament
Voluntary Action Elmbridge
Voluntary Action South West Surrey

**Rural interest groups:**
CPRE Surrey
Surrey Hills Board
Surrey Rural Partnership

**Environmental interest groups:**
Friends of the Earth
Friends of the Earth (Blackwater Valley)
Friends of the Earth (Guildford & Waverley)
Guildford Environmental Forum

**Heritage:**
National Trust South East

**Groups representing or providing advice to local businesses:**
Business Link Surrey
CBI South East offices
Elmbridge Business Network
Federation of Small Businesses - Surrey and West Sussex Region
Institute of Directors - Surrey Downs branch
Institute of Directors - West Surrey branch
National Farmers Union – South East
Surrey Chambers of Commerce
Surrey Economic Partnership
Waverley Business Forum

**Universities:**
Royal Holloway University of London
University for the Creative Arts (UCA) - Farnham and Epsom
University of Surrey

Surrey Research Park

**NHS health providers:**
NHS Surrey (formerly Surrey PCT)
Ashford and St Peter’s Hospitals NHS Trust
Epsom and St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust
Frimley Park Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
Royal Surrey County Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
Surrey and Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust
Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust

Ambulance trust:
South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Trust

Police:
Surrey Police Authority
Surrey Police

Other:
Thames Valley Housing Association