

**SOUTH EAST ENGLAND REGIONAL ASSEMBLY
REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER 2005

Present:

Board Members

Andy Roberts
Cllr Jill Baston
Mike Ford
Ian Hepburn
Cllr John Howarth
Tim Lockwood
Pam Palmer
John Peel
Cllr Nick Skellett

Officers

Andy Barton
Paul Bevan
Dawn Brown
Lesley van Dijk
Giuseppe Tripodi
Martin Tugwell
David Cooper
Paul Hudson
Nigel Rose

Media

Catherine Early, Planning
John Harvey, South East Business
Jon Masters, Transportation Professional

In Attendance

John Devine, Brethrens Gospel Trust
Cllr Tim Knight, Hampshire CC
Mike Knowles, RPS
Carol Mackonochie, Colts Hill
Cllr Tex Pemberton, West Sussex CC
Iain Reeve, Hampshire CC
Cllr David Robertson, Oxfordshire
Cllr Jonathan Glen, Hampshire
Greg Clark MP, Tunbridge Wells

1. Appointment of Chairman

- 1.1 The Head of Regional Transport Planning advised the Board that Cllr Nick Skellett had been confirmed as Chairman of the Regional Transport Board, taking over from Mr Andy Roberts.
- 1.2 Cllr Nick Skellett, the new Chairman reiterated that infrastructure was recognised as a critical element for the whole region. Therefore reasonable adjustments would be made, using the best information and advice available before recommendations were put forward to Government. A key role had already been played in championing for the southeast, often in the face of difficult judgements with the funds available.

2. Apologies and Substitutions

- 2.1 Apologies were received from Mr P Bevan (part meeting), Gwyn Drake and Clive King. The following substitutions were declared:
Mr Mike Ford for Mr Gwyn Drake.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 8 July 2005

- 3.1 Page 2, item 2.3 - Mr Hepburn asked that this be reworded to reflect that he had stated that “we should have standards and clear approach in dealing with views put forward especially regarding timing”.
- 3.2 Page 3, item 3.3 - Mr Ian Hepburn asked for it to be minuted that he did not agree with the wording of the first sentence stating that he felt the methodology focused on journey ambience.
- 3.3 Cllr Helyn Clack of Surrey County Council to be included in the minutes as an attendee.
- 3.4 Cllr Jonathan Glen, as an observer asked how the RTB Board was going to work in terms of observers speaking and asked whether the discussion was going to be limited to Board members. This would be revisited later.
- 3.5 Page 4, item 4.1 - Mr I Hepburn requested an update on the progress with the preparation of guidance on mobility management. The Head of Regional Transport Planning reported that this was being progressed through the Transport Advisory Group. The next meeting of TAG is scheduled for 24 October where this would be further discussed.

The Minutes were AGREED subject to the above amendments.

4. Matters Arising Not Elsewhere on the Agenda

- 4.1 Board members, assembly staff and observers all introduced themselves. It was agreed that for future meetings that there would be a clear designation of seating.

5. Regional Transport Board: Update

- 5.1 The Head of Regional Transport Planning informed Board members that agenda item 5 afforded an overview of developments since the last meeting held on 8 July 2005. This included the Regional Assembly accepting the invitation from GOSE to take over the Chairmanship of the Regional Transport Board.
- 5.2 The paper set out recommendations on how the Board could liaise with stakeholders, especially local transport authorities. At officer level this will be realised through the Regional Transport Co-ordination Group. There is still however a need to ensure that input is received from portfolio holders. The proposal was that this would be achieved by inviting elected members to attend future meetings.

- 5.3 In order to ensure the timely process of meeting agenda items The Chairman suggested that with regards to outside contributions that:
- If an outside representative wanted to speak then as far as possible they should give notice.
 - Those representatives be limited to 3 minutes, amounting to no more than 45 minutes in total at each meeting.
- 5.4 The Chairman asked members for their comments. After discussion, it was **AGREED** that the rules for outside contributions would be put in place. It was further **AGREED** that the subject of constitutional issues would be brought forward for discussion at the next meeting.
- 5.5 It was confirmed that the Chairman would report back on the outcomes of the Regional Transport Board to the Executive Committee of the Assembly.
- 5.6 Mr Hepburn stated that he was unclear about his position on the Board. The Head of Regional Transport Planning clarified that Mr Ian Hepburn was a member of the transport board in the capacity of Environmental Partner. Mr Ian Hepburn confirmed that he would be passing this responsibility to Mr Nigel Rose to be the representative for the Environmental Group and that he would no longer be in attendance at future meetings.
- 5.7 **The following recommendations on Agenda Item 5 were AGREED.**

That the Regional Transport Board:

- i) **continues to operate as a partnership board, meeting in public, for the time being as currently constituted;**
- ii) **invited Network Rail to replace the Strategic Rail Authority on the Board;**
- iii) **allows for the promoters of specific proposals to participate in debates relating to those proposals;**
- iv) **in order to improve engagement with Local Transport Authorities specifically invites relevant elected council members to attend board meetings as observers.**

6. Regional Funding Allocation

- 6.1 The Head of Regional Transport Planning referred to agenda item 6. He highlighted the present allocation of £135M funding for transport in the region in 2004/05. The total would be increased to £167M by 2015/16. This represents a small proportion of the total £1,658M. Guidance given by Ministers is very clear. Advice is being sought on expenditure from 2007/08 onwards. Previous Board discussions have confirmed that there is to be no re-examination of committed schemes.

This Board have been asked to co-ordinate work on transport priorities, which would then be added to work on priorities for housing and economic development. Advice to Ministers is required by end January 2006.

6.2 The Head of Regional Transport Planning indicated that the cost for infrastructure needed to support planned levels of growth was likely to be higher than the allocation. There is a need to start developing the case, using information from local transport authorities as to why additional resources should be made available. This will need to draw on the information provided by the sub-regional groups that will be submitted to the Regional Assembly on 9th December. It was **AGREED** that this should be followed up.

6.3 **The following recommendation on Agenda Item 6 was AGREED.**

That the Regional Transport Board notes the announcement of regional funding allocations for transport, housing and economic development and endorses the process suggested for producing advice on transport priorities.

7. Commitments

7.1 The Head of Regional Transport Planning referred to agenda item 7. Annex I identified current commitments within the regional funding allocation.

7.2 The A3 Hindhead is on a strategic corridor and the Assembly has consistently agreed that it should be a national priority. Whilst the region would continue to seek national funding for the scheme, for the purposes of this exercise the proposal would have to be funded from the RFA. The Board confirmed the importance of the proposal and that it should continue to be treated as a commitment. However, if it were to be funded in a conventional way this would place huge pressure on the rest of the RFA. It was, therefore, agreed that urgent discussion be undertaken to explore whether alternative funding mechanisms may be a preferable way forward. It was confirmed that if the alternative funding mechanisms were not successful the scheme would remain a commitment, and as such would need to be funded via the RFA. In that situation the indicative programme would need to be reviewed.

7.3 It was **AGREED** that the Head of Regional Transport Planning would arrange for discussions to be held with the Highways Agency and Partnerships UK to explore alternative sources of funding and how this could be delivered. This was deemed essential in order to allow other schemes to be realised.

7.4 **The following recommendations on Agenda Item 7 were AGREED.**

That the Regional Transport Board:

- i) **confirms its policy approach to commitments'**
- ii) **advises the Government that the schemes listed in Annex 1 are considered commitments for the purposes of regional funding allocations and that accordingly funds be made available to deliver these schemes according to the schedule of dates set out in Annex 1.**

7.5 Mr Hepburn asked that it be noted that did not agree with the approach that was being taken.

8. Regional Prioritisation Methodology

8.1 The Head of Regional Transport Planning talked through the paper, which looked in detail at sensitivity tests that had been undertaken. Following on from the advice given by Board members at the previous meeting these had focused on:

- Environmental factors
- Safety
- 'Smarter choices'
- Economic factors

8.2 The outcome was that the 4 schemes ranked priority 1 remained the same for all sensitivity tests. This was due to the fact that the high priority schemes were ready for delivery and had already undergone an extensive process to minimise any negative impact through public consultation and enquiries. The lower ranked schemes had a longer timeframe and were therefore at a much earlier stage in the decision making process, hence there could be some movement at the lower end.

8.3 The question was raised as to what a significant factor was that could change the priority order of the schemes. This was clarified as around 30%, giving a total of 60% weighting. The officer view was that this would represent an imbalance in sustainable development and would therefore not be a feasible option.

8.4 Mr J Peel and Mr Paul Hudson both felt that this was an excellently written paper.

8.5 **The following recommendation on Agenda Item 8 was AGREED.**

That the Regional Transport Board note the outcome of the sensitivity testing.

9. Regional Priorities: Draft Programme

- 9.1 The Head of Regional Transport Planning referred to Annex 1.
- 9.2 At was recommended that all identified priority 1 and 2 items should be included in the forward programme to 2010/11. However, from 2010/11 there would be a need to think about priorities. In doing so there is a need to work through sub regional strategies and their infrastructure requirements. The recommendation is that a forward working programme is agreed for 2010/11 as a starting point to feed into the debate.
- 9.3 The process had identified that there would be a need to explore alternative funding resources for some proposals. Account needed to be taken with regards to leverage that public investment could bring.
- 9.4 Concern was expressed with regard to the Colts Hill proposal. Information on the A228 had been provided by Kent County Council. The Head of Regional Transport Planning undertook to discuss with Kent County Council possible ways forward for this proposal.
- 9.5 It was **AGREED** that consideration needed to be given as to how often the list of priorities is to be reviewed.
- 9.6 It was **AGREED** that information on the sensitivity tests would be made available for the Colts Hill proposal.
- 9.7 **The following recommendation on Agenda Item 9 was AGREED.**

That the Regional Transport Board endorses the programme set out in Annex 1 as the transport priorities for investment in the period 2010-11.

10. Future Work Programme

- 10.1 **The following recommendation on Agenda Item 10 was AGREED.**

The views of the Board on potential future areas of work are sought.

11. Any Other Business

There was none.

12. Dates of Future Meetings

It was noted that there might need to be an interim meeting before the next planned meeting on 27 January 2006.

The meeting ended at 16.45 hrs.