

Transport **MINUTES**

Website www.yourtestvalley.com

The TAG workshop held on 26th January 2007 in Crosfield Hall, Romsey was well attended. Those present were:

John Perry	Broughton Parish Council
Carolyn Nixon	Friends of the Earth
Tony Seddon	Grateley Parish Council
Linda Bagwell	John Hanson School Governor
John White	Romsey Good Neighbours
Pete Robinson	Stagecoach Bus
Janet Whiteley	Stockbridge Parish Council
Roy Clough	Test Valley Association of Parish Council and Vernham Dean Parish Council
Viv Messenger	Test Valley Borough Council
Marion Woods	Test Valley Borough Council
Alison Murley	Test Valley Borough Council
Sam Cornick	Test Valley Borough Council
Dick Hewett	Test Valley Community Services
Mrs Bell	Test Valley Taxi Association
Mr Bell	Test Valley Taxi Association
Councillor David Bidwell	Test Valley Borough Councillor
Matthew Callow	Wilts and Dorset Bus Company
Philip Tarling	Winchester and Eastleigh Healthcare Trust
Lee Kinrade	Winchester and Eastleigh Healthcare Trust
Sheila Ridge	ENHAM

There were apologies from:

Peter Kenneson	Houghton Parish Council
Hannah Baker	Hampshire County Council
Annie Tomlinson	Test Valley Borough Council
Councillor Roy Perry	Hampshire County Councillor
Councillor Michael Woodhall	Hampshire County Councillor
Councillor Robin Hughes	Hampshire County Councillor

The workshop was facilitated by Marion Woods, Test Valley Partnership Manager and was based on an approach called Outcomes Based Accountability.

The group were asked to define an overall aim which was agreed. See Appendix 1

The group were then asked what would be different if the aim was achieved. The list, under the stated aim in the appendix, documents the outcomes that were suggested during discussion.

Transport

MINUTES

The group were then asked to consider each outcome in relation to progress on each in Test Valley whether progress is good, bad or patchy.

The group were then given four votes and were asked to assign one to each of the outcomes labelled bad or patchy.

The outcomes in appendix 1 that received votes are scored accordingly.

The chosen outcomes that have been submitted for the draft community plan have been slightly re-worded in order to convey their full meaning and are as follows:

- **Public and community transport services and facilities are well co-ordinated**
- **Vulnerable groups will not suffer disadvantage when accessing services and facilities**
- **The transport infrastructure is maintained and enhanced**
- **People have access to essential services and facilities.**

Transport **MINUTES**

Appendix 1

Overall aim ' a place with a sustainable efficient and integrated transport network based on the real needs and choices of local people and visitors'

How would we know that we had achieved our aim – what would be different?

Vehicle pooling

Disadvantaged groups would be able to get around (Local Area Agreement)
e.g. young people, older people, people with mobility impairments, no car scored 2

Less cars on the road and public using more transport systems
Scored 4

More joined up cycle routes

Co-ordination of voluntary car scheme

Less traffic congestion

Less call on the public purse to subsidise transport

Reduction in the use of resources
Scored 1

More passengers on buses
Scored 2

The right mode of transport for people's particular journey
Freedom of choice of transport for all
These two were combined and scored 4

Access to essential services
Scored 5

There would be links between different modes of service
Scored 6

Co-ordinated transport provision/ancillary services
Scored 14

Cross boundary co-ordination in accessing services
Scored 1

Transport

MINUTES

People with disabilities would not be disadvantaged (travel tokens)
Scored 7

Static infrastructure
Scored 7

More community transport in rural areas