Outline Transport Strategy Engagement Report

1. Context

1.1. This report presents a summary of written responses made during the period of engagement on England's Economic Heartland's *Outline Transport Strategy: Framework for Engagement*.

1.2. The period of engagement opened on July 16, 2019 and ended on October 31.

1.3. The Outline Transport Strategy provided the framework for a conversation with people and businesses about the future of the region's transport system.

1.4. Organisations, residents and businesses were encouraged to take part in the engagement in order to shape development of the Transport Strategy, due to be published in draft form for formal consultation, in summer 2020.

1.5. The Transport Strategy will set out the policy framework for investment in the region over the next 30 years.

2. The Engagement Process

2.1. Production of and engagement on the Outline Transport Strategy (including analysis of responses) was carried out 'in house' by the EEH Business Unit.

2.2. The Outline Transport Strategy – and the subsequent period of engagement - was launched at EEH's annual conference at the University of Hertfordshire on July 16.

2.3. During the period of engagement the EEH Business Unit attended more than 35 meetings with stakeholders.

2.4. These included with our partners and external organisations including the Chiltern Conservation Board, Motorcycle Action Group, Silverstone Park and Milton Keyes Youth Cabinet.

2.5. The EEH Business Unit also hosted roundtables at the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Conservative party conferences where it gained the views of MP, peers, council and LEP leaders, and think tanks.

2.6. A workshop-style event was held at the CIHT offices for partners and consultants on October 29.

2.7. Publicity for the engagement included through the media, the EEH and partners' newsletters, and social media. A summary document also appeared as a supplement in Local Transport Today in September.

2.8. Information regarding the Outline Transport Strategy and the period of engagement was prominent on the EEH website, which experienced a 137% increase in hits during the engagement compared to the same period in 2018. The Outline Transport Strategy document was viewed online 3,736 times during the period of engagement.

2.9. The Outline Transport Strategy featured 21 specific questions on which written responses were invited. All of these questions encouraged long-form qualitative responses. Feedback on the four 'Future Visions' was also sought.

2.10. Comments not specifically related to any of the questions were also welcomed.

3. Engagement Responses Overview

3.1. A total of 108 written responses were received during the period of engagement.

3.2. 66 of the written responses came from organisations, while 42 were made on an individual basis.

3.3. Around 40% of written responses answered all or several of the questions contained within the strategy. The other responses tended to focus on one or two key issues, including those not specifically covered by the questions.

3.4. The analysis of responses is split into two parts. These are:

- Written responses to the 21 questions which were asked in the Outline Transport Strategy
- The 12 key messages which have been identified from the engagement period

4. Analysis of Written Responses by Question

Question 1: Does the draft vision ('connecting people and places with opportunities and services') provide sufficient focus for the Transport Strategy?

Of all responses that gave an explicit view on this, 70% suggested changing the vision in some way. However, our partners and district councils were evenly split on the issue. Overall, responses suggested the vision was a good starting point but should be amended to emphasise 'sustainable' connectivity in the context of climate change. Other comments said it should better reflect the EEH geography; the area's role in transport innovation; emphasise reducing the need to travel; and emphasise access to services over connectivity.

Whilst the vision covers key principles needed for our region to thrive, it is considered more weight should be given to social and environmental impacts our transport systems have (Hertfordshire County Council).

The vision should recognise and inspire a step change in approach (Milton Keynes Development Partnership).

Question 2: Is the ambition to have a zero-carbon transport system by 2050 sufficiently challenging?

Of the 47 responses which expressed a view on this, 68% believed there was a strong case for bringing the date forward. The remaining responses felt that 2050 was sufficiently challenging and/ or realistic. However, our partners and district councils were split on whether the target must be brought forward. Of responses which indicated a different date, 2030 was the most popular target.

A number of responses indicated that 2050 cannot be an 'ambition' - given that it is the Government's target, and is therefore a 'worst case' baseline. There was a demand for more detail on how EEH will get to carbon neutral and the terminology we use. Several responses indicated that the strategy should set out a phased approach to cutting carbon, with periodic targets for reduction. Many of our partners and district councils indicated that they had declared climate emergencies and this needed to be recognised in the strategy.

As mentioned in our introduction, this 2050 target may not align with the 2030 target that many Local Authorities will be committing to in supporting the LGA motion on declaring a 'Climate Emergency'. This is something that should be explored further when drafting the full strategy (Central Bedfordshire Council).

We therefore feel that a more ambitious, but still achievable, target should be set for your strategy. Given the Heartland's noted innovation in the transport sector, it does not seem unreasonable that a more challenging target should be achievable for the Heartlands than for the UK as a whole. A more ambitious target could allow the strategy to explore further opportunities not just for multi-modal approaches to transport and connectivity, but also for a modal shift away from the internal combustion engine (Environment Agency).

Question Three: Do the three key principles provide an appropriate framework within which to develop the Transport Strategy?

Of all responses which gave a view, just more than half were comfortable with the three key principles. 80% of our partners and district councils supported the three themes or slightly amended variations of them. While there was general support for the three principles, there were two key challenges emerging from the responses. The first was how these key principles are ordered and prioritised - several thought the 'environment' should be the top priority. A related challenge was over a perceived assumption that economic growth is always positive - there was a strong feeling that 'economic growth' should be defined as being sustainable.

The Strategy should have a single focus on delivering economic growth by improving accessibility, inclusion, quality of life and the environment. That is, the four items should be identified as building blocks enabling ongoing economic growth to be achieved (Daventry District Council).

Economic growth: This would appear to be a Ponzi-like objective. And pursuing growth without effectively controlling 'carbon growth' is a recipe for disaster. Possibly contravening the law! (Cyclox)

Question Four: What are the key factors influencing people's choice of travel mode?

The most popular responses were cost, ease/ convenience and journey time. Several responses highlighted the way places are spatially planned, whether they are compact and their topography as being important factors. Perceived safety and quality of different modes also featured highly, as did the importance of the first/last mile of journeys. Several responses also stressed that mode choice is a creature of habit which is difficult to break and that better ticketing and information would help people move to public transport. There was also a submission from the Motorcycle Action Group which said EEH should do more to encourage use of motorcycles to ease congestion and reduce carbon. The need lack of charging points was also referred to in a couple of responses as limiting use of electric modes.

Buckinghamshire residents have reported to us over several studies that their travel choice is influenced by perception of buses, convenience, time, rural nature of the county, cost, distance, reliability, safety, purpose of travel and availability of transport. However, it seems very likely that attitudes are also a significant factor. In traffic engineering terms there are several places in EEH where cycling is just as possible as in Cambridge but with levels ten times lower. (Buckinghamshire Councils)

Home location in relation to work location. People would tend to choose options based on time taken and not just cost e.g. favouring quicker rail over road even when far more expensive. Those able to live closest to work places can choose walking, cycling or public transport. Those living in poor locations to access quick public transport may choose the car to get to work. (Extinction Rebellion)

Question Five: What are the key barriers that need to be addressed if we are to achieve frictionless travel?

There was a large degree of similarity in answers between this and the previous question. However, challenges around payment/ ticketing, information, reliability, interchange, accessibility, public perception and the regulatory framework featured strongly.

Having to make individual payments for individual services is a significant barrier to use. This applies both to the practicalities of payment (for example, buses and pay and display machines which require cash, and electric vehicle charging points which are tied to one operator) and to the certainty and value-for-money of the overall trip cost. There is therefore a clear case for London-style payment systems, using credit and debit cards (and specific smart cards for those unable to use these) on 'touch' and simple overall journey costs, irrespective of mode and operator. (Daventry District Council)

The strategy will also need to recognise that in order to offer a 'frictionless' journey there will be a requirement for close partnership working with all stakeholders, both on an operational level but also when planning and designing major infrastructure improvements.
We also welcome the recognition that the strategy gives to addressing the cultural and digital barriers that may influence investment priorities in the future. (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Question Six: What performance measures should be used to identify the levels of service users require of the transport system?

Journey time, reliability, environmental impact, cost and frequency were the most popular responses. In terms of environmental impact, carbon emissions and air quality were popular measures. Other responses featured modal shift/share and interconnectivity - for example a '% residents in X proximity to an interchange'. Another idea was to measure the productivity of users on transport - through provision of on-board wifi (and presumably being able to sit). Another response suggested measuring health outcomes of transport users. The quality and coverage of digital infrastructure also featured - as a means of reducing the need to travel.

In considering investment and funding for transport projects, you should also give consideration to the environmental risks and opportunities presented. We would therefore welcome environmental performance indicators to be included as part of this series (Environment Agency).

Is it more attractive to travel by sustainable means than private car to key destinations? Is it cheaper and more accessible to make key journeys by sustainable means rather than private car? Is provision available for disabled people to have more attractive and convenient options for all modes (walking, cycling, public transport) than private car? (Becky Cox, Swindon)

Question Seven: Should the strategy include and define appropriate 'nudge principles' (small changes which can influence user behaviour) to encourage more people to use public transport in the Heartland area?

Responses to this question were overwhelmingly supportive of an approach which includes use of nudge principles. Many responses said that it is vital that the right infrastructure and services are in place first to ensure that 'nudges' have maximum impact. Other responses questioned whether a 'nudge' was enough given the scale of the challenge, and there may be the need to use the 'stick as well as the carrot'.

[We] are very much in favour of the EEH strategy in proposing 'nudge' measures to help drivers consider and experience alternative modes of travel. We understand such an approach is viewed more favourably versus any measures which seek to limit or prohibit car use altogether - evidence shows small individual changes can lead to larger collective benefits, so even switching one journey per week per person away from the car would be beneficial (Intu MK)

Some 'sticks' as well as 'carrots' will be needed, such as higher car-parking fees or other road charges or restrictions. In particular, road infrastructure must be designed to give priority in all cases to public transport, notably buses, where the costs and degradation in service associated with being caught up in general congestion has been identified as the biggest single factor in the decline in commercial bus services. (Chiltern Society)

Question Eight: What weight should be given to the changes in travel demand arising from the delivery of transformational infrastructure?

The vast majority of responses said significant weight should be given to changes in travel demand from transformational infrastructure. A theme from the responses was how crucial it is to plan for the impact of transformational infrastructure on more local infrastructure - and that impact can often be uncertain. Transformational infrastructure needs to be sustainable and must not lead to more car journeys - indeed several responses criticised the Outline Transport Strategy for being too roads-centric. There was the suggestion that transformational infrastructure should be defined as infrastructure which leads to significant levels of modal shift. Several responses said infrastructure must be delivered ahead of housing growth and there was a need for the strategy to be bold - putting forward schemes which may not have sufficient cost-to-benefit ratios measured under the traditional formulas.

Unless transformational infrastructure is not changing travel demand it is clearly failing. There is an urgent need to rapidly decarbonise transport and not just through going electric, but also to get a shift to public transport and active travel. That means investing in these modes and not in damaging new roads, which would otherwise increase traffic, congestion and pollution, undermining many of the objectives of this outline strategy (Transport Action Network)

We consider that the local impacts and opportunities resulting from proposed transformational/strategic scale transport infrastructure should be further explored by developing the evidence base and scenario testing. This should also aim to better understand the opportunities for making future travel options more efficient, reducing carbon emissions and incorporating healthy place shaping principles within the design. (West Oxfordshire District Council)

Question Nine: What weight should be given to the potential of the rail network to accommodate a higher proportion of future travel demand?

There was consensus that rail offers a sustainable alternative to the car and therefore increasing mode share was crucial to realising decarbonisation – in this sense the importance of rail being electrified was also raised. Several responses were critical of the limited reference to specific rail interventions in the Outline Transport Strategy, other than East West Rail.

Several responses also said it was critical that public transport modes to and from railway stations were improved. Some responses also highlighted that rail cannot be the only solution - given the Heartland's rural geography there will be some places that are not suitable for rail. Another challenge is inconsistent pricing (including car parks) and regressive timetable changes.

The EEH area has several other abandoned rail alignments which could and should be reopened. But your Strategy doesn't even mention these as a possibility. (Smart Growth UK)

Very substantial weight. Rail is a key mode for moving large numbers of people in relatively environmentally sustainable ways, and for supporting high value economic development particularly in town and city centres. The final Strategy should support the development of existing rail lines and stations, and the opening (or re-opening) of lines and stations where these would support the overall Vision.(Daventry District Council)

Question 10: Have we identified the key strategic transport corridors?

There were around 40 suggestions in the responses naming specific transport corridors, while there were around 50 suggestions for specific schemes/ infrastructure/ interventions. These have been fed into EEH's technical work, including its rail study and connectivity studies. However, a number of themes have emerged from the responses. This includes the need to look at strategic corridors beyond EEH's borders; the importance of north-south as well as east-west connectivity; the desire for EEH to examine the impact of transformational infrastructure on these corridors; and a need for more evidence to show why certain corridors had been chosen.

A focus on corridors – natural when looking at a map of the Heartland – must not be at the exclusion of consideration of strategic interventions within the places making up the Heartland. Typically the volume of trips within those places will far exceed those on inter-urban trips. Therefore perhaps 'strategic transport interventions' rather than 'corridors' should be referenced in the final Strategy. Some of these interventions will doubtless be corridor-based, others would be focused on major settlements and others may be programmatic in nature (such as, for example, systematic roll out of electric cycle hire) but equally strategic in their impacts. (Daventry District Council)

[There] should be further consideration of key settlements outside of the EEH area within the Outline Transport Strategy, such as Leicester and Coventry which act as destinations for residents and influence travel patterns. (North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit)

Question 11: Are there specific issues that should be taken into consideration as part of the connectivity studies?

The most popular suggestions were for the connectivity studies to embrace the role that innovation and technology will play in the future, for example autonomous/ smart vehicles and electrification. The impact on the environment and ensuring connectivity studies are not roads-centric was also a popular response. There was also a demand that the connectivity studies consider local routes, not just longer distance ones, and also how we can connect areas to transformational infrastructure. Another response warned of the risks of speculative land purchase as a result of the connectivity studies. Other responses highlighted: digital connectivity; making efficient use of road space; considering the needs of different types of people; flood risk; energy capacity; reducing the need to travel; employment areas; need to consider freight movements; international gateways; connecting rural communities; and impact on house prices.

It is worth considering the family connections of people in the affected area and questioning whether the connectivity needs to be improved at a more local level across the whole region. Prestigious connections over long distances typically attract high levels of investment, while more mundane connections over short distances are disregarded. (Oxford Bus Company)

The OTS should also acknowledge the potential risk of speculative development and land purchasing along the routes of any future Transport Infrastructure plans. The body should address this by working with local authorities and central government to ensure that mechanisms are in place that allow the compulsory purchase of land at existing values and the ability to capture any increase in land value following investment in infrastructure. (Royal Town Planning Institute)

Question 12: To what extent should we look to the growth in digital services to change the nature and scale of future travel demand?

Key themes in responses to this question included utilising digital capacity for 'smart' transport solutions, including CAVs and charging points. There was a general agreement that digital connectivity was important for reducing the need to travel, though CILT said it believed it could encourage more journeys.

We do not believe that greater availability of digital services will significantly reduce transport demand – on the contrary, evidence to date suggests that, by encouraging greater economic activity, it actually increases the demand for transport. (CILT)

Very much. We support the focus in the strategy on "connecting" rather than 'transporting" to reflect that existing and future digital technology means that much of this is connection is likely to be virtual rather than requiring actual travel (Chilterns Conservation Board).

Question 13: What are the core connectivity requirements for businesses operating from the region?

Many respondents felt that business connectivity requirements were broadly similar to those of people, ie reliability, time, convenience. Other common themes included the impact of digital connectivity and flexible working; the ability of employers to access workforces; the importance of connectivity to international gateways (though others warned of the carbon emissions caused by aviation), and the need to connect businesses to similar clusters.

For the next stage of the transport strategy development, OCC believe it will be useful to understand better how business can practically contribute towards delivery of the wider transport strategy. For example, understanding their travel impacts as well as connectivity requirements will be important in helping identify and prioritise any measures and interventions across the EEH area. (Oxfordshire County Council)

Having reviewed the content of the Framework Document, we see a strong correlation between the areas supported by TVCC and the three key principles set out in the Outline Transport Strategy – enabling economic growth, accessibility and inclusion, quality of life and environment. (Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce)

Question 14: What are the key performance measures for the Transport System from a business perspective?

Most responses acknowledged that performance measures for businesses are largely the same as for the general user, and in particular reliability, journey time and cost. The most popular suggestion for a business-specifc performance measure was around productivity - the ability of businesses to use digital connectivity to work while on public transport, or to track commercial vehicle movements.

Time is money. There is a need to minimise delays; There are also concerns around mileage costs for congested roads. Goods need to be delivered on time and businesses need to be able to attract staff – both of which rely on a healthy network, along with a choice of transport modes.(Huntingdonshire District Council)

Journey time reliability and connectivity, as recognised in your Freight Strategy report, is key for businesses who need to factor this into their business modelling to estimate costs and human resources." (Port of Southampton)

Question 15: What measures should the overarching Transport Strategy include in order to enable the potential that exists within the four Grand Challenges of the Industrial Strategy to be realised?

Responses considered the following:

- **Artificial intelligence:** High quality mobile data; designing innovations such as CAVs into new infrastructure now; using data to evidence strategy; AI on the railways such as digital signalling leading to greater capacity; ensuring region has access to right skills
- **Ageing Society**: Need for social interaction; active travel; inclusive connectivity; 'telecommuting'; safety - eg separate walking and cycling
- **Clean Growth:** Carbon reduction; biodiversity; transport system needs to be energy efficient; active travel.
- **Mobility:** Access to travel info; payment options; inclusivity; EEH as test bed; need for flexible regulatory framework to encourage innovation.

Data collation and analysis and mapping work is part of a much wider and comprehensive piece of work that acts as a foundation to a successful growth strategy. This work requires significant resource and funding and is likely to go beyond the capability and responsibility of one organisation. The setting up of a Regional Data Observatory should be promoted but as a shared and collective initiative. (Stuart Turner, Architect & Urbanist, Milton Keynes)

The future of mobility should be based around protection of land and reduction of travel and the need to travel through development patterns which are based around compact development, based on existing conurbations and employing higher densities than the car-dependent sprawl implicit in your Strategy, public transport and active travel. (Smart Growth UK)

Question 16: To what extent is investment in digital infrastructure more significant and/or urgent than physical infrastructure?

Several responses stated that digital infrastructure should be prioritised over road building. Digital is seen as a way to fundamentally change- and reduce - travel. Given its importance, it is essential that digital connectivity is inclusive. There was an appetite for the impact of digital connectivity to be modelled on the policy model tool. The importance of wider infrastructure such as utilities as a barrier to growth was also highlighted.

Another key area of investigation with regard to digital infrastructure is the potential cost of internet and data packages for low income households and small businesses; it is recommended that further work is conducted in this area to understand the implications of achieving a comprehensive and accessible digital infrastructure network. (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Investment in digital infrastructure is critical for increasing connectivity and productivity as well as helping reduce the need to travel. This should be given a greater priority than any new road building. (Oxford Friends of the Earth)

Question 17: How will the way we access goods and services continue to change, and what are the key issues that need to be addressed in the Transport Strategy?

The key theme from the responses was the need for a more efficient means of delivery and reducing freight/ logistics impact on Co2, congestion and neighbourhoods, especially given the rise in home deliveries. This is both in terms of strategic movements and at a local level. At a strategic level, there was a strong appetite for more freight on rail, alongside the provision of associated distribution hubs.

At the local level, future delivery modes such as drones, parcel bikes, e-vehicles and autonomous vehicles were referenced. Three responses also referenced the impact of 3D printing on potentially reducing the need for physical freight movements. Related to this was the idea around having more localised production and warehousing, reducing the need for longer journeys. Responses also stressed that while town centres are changing due to online

shopping, people still want access to public places, with shopping hubs located near to transport hubs, and the rise of places offering 'instore experiences'.

A key CO2 emitter in the area is lorry freight, with North Northamptonshire sitting within the 'Golden Triangle of Logistics' with the A14 (a 'Trans European Route' (E24)) providing linkages to the M1 and M6 as well as to the East Coast ports. It is felt that the focus on freight should be strengthened within the Transport Strategy, with increased emphasis on moving freight onto rail, which would support moving towards decarbonisation and modal shift. It is noted that the Freight Study was published on 16th July 2019, which can inform the transport strategy as it is developed. (North Northamptonshire Joint Planning and Delivery Unit).

Despite all the changes in how the public access goods and services, the role of rail's heavy freight traffic, whether it is consumer or bulk traffic, to service the supply chain will continue to be a vital part of the supply chain. In fact, the changes to urban logistics and the need to reduce emissions and road congestion, make rail freight's case even stronger. Rail can be used for the long-distance trunk operations to the edge of conurbations or into city terminals for onward transfer to low emissions vehicles. (Freight on Rail)

Question 18: What freight and logistics services are important for people and businesses? For example, accessing goods (via delivery or in person); a thriving high street; access to health, education and leisure facilities?

Responses to this question were very similar to the answers to questions 17 and 19.

This is likely to vary by area typology, and the requirements of the transport systems should be identified at the beginning of any studies undertaken. As already noted, the identification of regional freight infrastructure is a crucial area where EEH's geographical scale would suggest it is ideally positioned to lead on future planning. (Hertfordshire County Council)

The need should be investigated for a full range of delivery points (amazon boxes, delivery to workplaces, collection points at loading bays etc.) to provide choice for customers on how they will access their deliveries. Consideration should be given as to how to better coordinate home deliveries as the huge number of LGV currently being used are hardly conducive to reduction in carbon emissions nor the impact on congestion and highways wear and tear. (Buckinghamshire Councils)

Question 19: Just in time and last minute operations are affecting the way people and businesses access goods and services. How should this growing trend affect the way we plan transport now, and in the future?

The most popular responses included the unknown impact of Brexit on 'just-in-time', and society's expectations of immediacy. There was also a warning that emerging JIT technologies require upgraded digital infrastructure.

There could be opportunities to use drones / robots for low volume JIT operations. Starship Technologies and the Co-operative have already implemented this in MK.It could also be worth making provision for these within urban transport plans, such as through air corridors or suitable routes for autonomous robots. Growing use of Internet of Things sensors are likely to expand opportunities in this area, enabling more consumer choice. However, this would be dependent on 5G or Low Power Wide Area Networks (LPWAN).(SEMLEP)

This is of concern because the appetite for online ordering and convenient home deliveries within a day (or even an hour) has implications for traffic, safety, tranquility and air quality. There is a risk of affluent residents in the Chilterns AONB generating multiple home delivery journeys per day along remote rural lanes. Rather than fueling unfettered consumer demand, retail systems should balance this against environmental impacts, for instance focusing on zero-carbon aggregated deliveries. (Chilterns Conservation Board)

Question 20: Do you agree with our approach to investment?

On the whole responses agreed in principle to the Outline Transport Strategy's approach to delivery. Three strong themes emerged:

1) Further clarification was sought in terms of the funding envelope and EEH's role in this. How does the region decide its priorities; will the funding be enough (and does EEH have a role in lobbying for more funding); at what regional level will the funding be handled and how will governance look; how do we ensure that different funding streams can be combined and are not used in silo.
2) Importance of revenue funding, not only for maintenance but also behaviour change schemes and environmental monitoring.
3) Investment should be focussed on tackling climate change, with only limited investment on roads (such as maintenance and local schemes which reduce congestion).

We also note that you are intending to "review whether the current balance between capital and revenue investment is consistent with our ambition for the region's transport system." We advise that this should also consider the long-term monitoring, management and maintenance of sites delivered to achieve environmental net gain for future projects. (Environment Agency)

Given the scale of development in the Oxford- Cambridge arc, whilst transformational infrastructure focussed on E-W Rail and the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway is important, also need to take account of local connectivity. (Luton Borough Council)

Question 21: Do you agree with our approach to delivery?

Responses overwhelmingly supported the partnership approach involving the public and private sectors, and the need for collaboration and a co-ordinated approach. There was support for EEH's regional 'Centre of Excellence' plans. There was also reference to the powers EEH required in order to deliver the strategy.

Ultimately the ambitions set out in the Outline Transport Strategy: Framework for engagement cannot be achieved by working in isolation. This must be a collaborative approach and Highways England is committed to working with EEH to develop their Transport Strategy and tackle the connectivity challenge going forward. (Highways England)

We consider the approach to delivery is probably the correct one, but would emphasise the need for strong leadership and strategic focus. Multi-agency approaches have a habit of spending considerable sums of money - and years of precious time - in analysis and debate, when what is needed is rapid analysis and action. We would encourage EEH not to get bogged down in endless analysis, experiments and trials, but to focus on the key strategic imperatives and make it clear to partners and suppliers that delivery, on time and on budget, of the agreed scheme is what matters. (CILT)

Future Visions

Overall, the four Future Visions featured in the Outline Transport Strategy, designed by Fifth Studio in conjunction with EEH (Rural; High Street; Business Park; and New Development) were welcomed as adding a useful visual element to the strategy. However, one response said their use would be more appropriate in planning documents rather than a transport strategy. There were suggestions for additional visions at 'neighbourhood scale' and depicting an 'older residential area'. Comments on specific elements within the four Visions have been collated. These comments were very useful and indeed have contributed to identifying the 12 key messages below. A decision on how Future Visions may be used and/ or amended in the future will be taken in due course.

Overall the Future Vision imagery set out is compelling, showing a more efficient, better connected future that meets the desires of the people commenting in the report. However, there is a massive disconnect between the Future Visions and the Immediate strategic infrastructure priorities on p42/3. (Oxfordshire Cycling Network)

We cannot help but be reminded of Sir Humphrey Appleby. However ambitious and desirable [the visions] may be, their attainability will depend on whether the decisions of those charged with such responsibilities are just 'brave' (lose votes), or more 'courageous' (lose elections). (Rail Future)

5. Analysis by key message

5.1. Taking into account the responses to the 21 questions, plus additional comments (from written responses and engagement meetings), 12 key messages from the engagement have been identified.

5.2. These are:

- **The imperative to respond to the climate emergency**: This was the most significant message to come out from the responses, and is also implicit in several of the other themes below. For example, The Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning & Transport (ADEPT) said: "Other sectors contributing to carbon emissions have made significant cuts over the past decades but emissions from transport have remained stubbornly high. Therefore, more leadership of transport policy is required to support the required reductions in emissions from transport sources."
- **Harness technology and innovation**: Responses agreed that the Heartland's USP lies in its world leading expertise in science, technology and innovation. We were told that the strategy should demonstrate how it will harness opportunities for innovation by working with the region's universities and businesses to develop a bold, alternative and ambitious approach to achieving its objectives. For example, the Environment Agency said: "Given the Heartland's noted innovation in the transport sector, it does not seem unreasonable that a more challenging target should be achievable for the Heartlands than for the UK as a whole."
- **Work closely with planning authorities:** The importance of spatial planning's role in improving the transport system was highlighted during the engagement, and thus the critical need for EEH to work with planning colleagues in developing the strategy. For example, the Royal Town Planning Institute said: "The Outline Transport Strategy needs to clearly emphasise how it plans to work with local planning and transport authorities, alongside any potential development corporations to ensure better integration of spatial planning and transportation developments."
- **Put environment at forefront of strategy**: Alongside the imperative of decarbonisation, responses emphasised the need for infrastructure to achieve net environmental gain. We were also told that the transport system must be resilient to the consequences of climate change; that we need to consider its role in water management; and develop specific policies for AONBs in the region (Chiltern Conservation Area alone covers 15% of EEH area).
- **The need to be bold – not business as usual**: Responses welcomed the Outline Transport Strategy's acknowledgement that a 'business as usual' approach will not be sufficient, particularly in light of the climate emergency. For example, the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Delivery Unit said: "Inevitably, this necessitates a shift from 'business as usual' and the adoption of ambitious proposals, some of which will be radical and transformational, so that economic growth can go hand-in-hand with environmental 'net gain' and improved public health."
- **Reduce need to travel:** Responses were clear on the need to reduce the need for people to travel, particularly journeys taken by private car. Improving digital infrastructure, alongside better spatial planning, were seen as key ways of achieving this. For example, SEMLEP said: "It is important that, when considering incentives for greater use of sustainable transport options, thought is also given to options that reduce or mitigate the use of transport altogether, such as – and as clearly recognised elsewhere in the Outline Transport Strategy – improved digital connectivity."
- **Increase emphasis on sustainable modes**: Engagement responses said the Strategy must not be car-centric and wherever possible should make the case for sustainable transport modes and active travel. For example, Hertfordshire County Council said: "It is felt that the fundamentals of the EEH strategy must support sustainable transport as the priority for the region to be acceptable."

- **Support health outcomes:** We were told that the strategy should recognise the major role transport plays in people's health, for instance through provision of active travel; increasing air quality; reducing isolation; and connecting people to centres of health and green spaces/ leisure. For example, the Oxfordshire Councils told us the strategy should ensure 'that policy priorities reflect the need to develop an inclusive and accessible transport system that supports better health outcomes'.
- **Place greater emphasis on wider strategic linkages:** Responses told us that the strategy needs to strengthen its recognition of the importance of strategic linkages from outside the EEH region. For example, Buckinghamshire Councils told us: "A potential gap in the strategy is explaining how it sits with what is emerging in the area outside and around the EEH Transport Strategy area."
- **Use nudges and demand management:** There was overwhelming support for the use of 'nudges' which seek to change user behaviour, but there was also recognition that demand management policies may also be required. For example, the Chiltern Society said: "But use of nudge principles, and other 'soft' methods, such as extending choice and improving information, will not be sufficient nor rapid enough to deliver the scale and pace of behavioural change necessary. Some 'sticks' as well as 'carrots' will be needed, such as higher car-parking fees or other road charges or restrictions."
- **Remember smaller schemes and maintenance:** Responses suggested that smaller, local schemes and maintenance of existing assets can be just as important to improving connectivity as bigger, 'transformational' schemes. For example, Welwyn Hatfield District Council told us that the strategy, 'needs to make sure that investment is spread beyond a few key projects and that successful local projects are copied and replicated wherever possible'.
- **Show how EEH will deliver:** Many responses touched upon EEH's role in delivering infrastructure improvements, including possible statutory powers and how it can add value to the work already being carried out by local authorities, LEPs, and Arc work streams. For example, Oxfordshire County Council said: "OCC believe that the level and detail of any investment programme across the EEH area will need careful consideration by partners, in particular to understand what best 'fits' at the EEH level, rather than at a more local or national level. This discussion will also need to consider the role of EEH in helping to deliver this programme, including any relevant statutory powers that may be needed, funding considerations, and any prioritisation frameworks."