Berkshire Local Transport Body – Meeting held on Thursday, 18th July, 2013.

	Members	Authority
Present:-	Councillor Page (Chair)	Reading Borough Council
	Steve Capel-Davies (Deputy Chair)	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Councillor Bale	West Berkshire Council
	Councillor Brunel-Walker	Bracknell Forest Council
	Councillor Hill	The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
	Councillor Munawar	Slough Borough Council
	Melvyn Hale	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Deputy Member In Attendance	
	Councillor Simpson	West Berkshire Council
Apologies for Absence:-	Councillor Baker	Wokingham Borough Council
	Ian Frost	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Robert Lynch	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Philip von Heydebreck	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP

PART 1

1. Declarations of Interest

None were received.

2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 14th March 2013

Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting of the Berkshire Local Transport Body held on 14th March 2013 be approved as a correct record.

3. Addendum to the Founding Document

Ruth Bagley reported that the DfT had provided feedback on the BLTB Founding document and had made a number of comments, particularly in relation to governance issues and the role of the accountable body. The proposed response to this feedback was set out the Addendum to the Founding Document / Assurance Framework which had been circulated as Appendix A to the report. Members attention was drawn to the requirement to establish and maintain a Register of Interests and a transparent process to manage conflicts of interests.

Ruth Bagley informed Members that as part of emerging Government policy on Growth Deals, there was a possibility that the hosting of Local Transport Bodies could pass to LEPs in the future. Further guidance was awaited in the Autumn and it was therefore agreed to amend recommendation (a) to reflect the potential need to review the BLTB governance arrangements. After due

consideration it was agreed to adopt the Addendum to BLTB's Assurance Framework.

Resolved –

(a) That the Addendum to the Berkshire Local Transport Body's Assurance Framework as set out in Appendix A to the report be adopted, pending further advice from DfT regarding the future hosting of Local Transport Bodies;

(b) That the feedback from DfT be noted; and

(c) That the Outline Process diagram as set out in Appendix B to the report be noted.

4. Prioritisation methodology

Ruth Bagley introduced a report which proposed the detailed prioritisation methodology for schemes. It was noted that the methodology had been developed by the Berkshire Strategic Transport (Officers) Forum in accordance with the DfT guidelines for Assurance Frameworks. Richard Tyndall drew Members attention to the specific aspects of the methodology that had been revised following the Berkshire Strategic Transport (Members) Forum in March 2013 and confirmed that the points agreed at that meeting had been incorporated. The methodology being proposed had been supported by Officers from all six Councils across Berkshire.

Members noted a tabled letter sent to all Local Transport Bodies from DfT dated 16th July 2013 which confirmed Local Transport Body Funding Allocations for the period 2015/16 to 2020/21 inclusive. It was noted that the allocation for Berkshire of £14.5m was significantly below the £22m provisional allocation, however more funding may be available via bids to the single Local Growth Fund.

A range of issues were considered by Members during discussion of the methodology including the implications of the lower than anticipated allocation; the process following submission of the list of prioritised schemes to DfT by the end of July 2013; and the circumstances under which new schemes could be considered in the future. In response, Richard Tyndall highlighted that if the value of schemes qualified at programme entry stage fell below 200%, then there would be a fresh call for proposals and further use of the methodology. It was also noted that it was important that prioritised schemes had sufficient certainty that the sponsors could proceed with confidence in the development of their schemes but that clearly defined milestones were required by the BLTB to monitor progress and ensure the programme could be properly managed.

Councillor Hill expressed a number of concerns about the methodology, primarily that it was a Berkshire wide fund that should include schemes in all six authorities, and that the methodology allowed very large schemes to

swallow up almost all of the fund. Ruth Bagley and Richard Tyndall responded that the fund was for major schemes which would deliver maximum strategic impact across Berkshire and that the guidance from DfT clearly stated that the schemes proposed had to be assessed on merit.

Councillor Hill emphasised the importance the schemes submitted by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, particularly the Stafferton Way Multi-Story Car Park which was strategically located near to a key Crossrail station. Richard Tyndall stated that he acknowledged the aspiration behind this scheme and commented that Thames Valley Berkshire would work with the Council to try to secure alternative funding in view of the potential value of the scheme to the economic regeneration of Maidenhead.

On the conclusion of the discussion the recommendations were put to the vote and were agreed by Members, with the exception of Councillor Hill who voted against.

Resolved –

(a) That the Prioritisation Methodology and Scheme Pro-forma set out at Appendices A and B be adopted.

(b) That Officers be asked to conduct a review of the first use of the Prioritisation Methodology and bring back further proposals for its refinement later in the year.

5. Assessment of Bids and Prioritisation

Richard Tyndall introduced a report which described the application of the methodology to the 28 schemes that were submitted for consideration by the six local transport authorities. He informed Members of the process that had been undertaken and commented that flexibility had been shown by all parties in view of the fact that this had been the first time the methodology had been applied.

The outcome was that the 8 schemes ranked 1st to 5th= were being unanimously recommended by Officers to be prioritised for Programme Entry. It was noted that these schemes totalled over £63m which was over-programming of nearly 300% of the £22m provisional allocation which was anticipated at the time the methodology was applied. Members considered in detail the implications of the confirmed lower allocation of £14.5m for Berkshire.

Members discussed the size of some of the schemes in the prioritised list, several of which exceeded the overall allocation now confirmed for Berkshire. Members were also mindful of the issues raised during consideration of the previous item on the methodology, which also applied to prioritisation. After discussion, the prioritised list as set out was agreed on the basis that the methodology had been applied with the provisional allocation in mind but that scheme promoters, especially of the larger schemes, should be working to

review the level of BLTB contribution sought for example by levering in additional match funding.

The overall view of Members was that the robust methodology adopted had produced a prioritised pipeline of key projects which would deliver significant strategic economic impact across Berkshire. It was agreed that the list should therefore be submitted for Programme Entry as proposed. It was further agreed that the prioritised list be incorporated into the Strategic Economic Plan with work undertaken to review BLTB contributions and secure additional resources to deliver schemes in the programme where possible.

Resolved –

(a) That the following schemes ranked 1st to 5th= be approved for programme entry.

Rank	Scheme Promoter and No.	Short Name
1	West Berkshire - 1	Kings Road Link Road: Supporting successful industry – enabling Newbury's growth
2	Reading - 1	Reading GreenPark Railway Station
3	Reading - 3 (with Wokingham)	Eastern Thames Valley Mass Rapid Transit
4	Bracknell Forest - 1	Coral Reef Roundabout
5=	Slough -1	Slough to Heathrow Mass Rapid Transit: Western Section (Slough Trading Estate to Three Tuns)
5=	Slough - 2	Slough to Heathrow Mass Rapid Transit: Central Section (Three Tuns to Brands Hill)
5=	Wokingham - 4	South Wokingham Distributor Road
5=	Wokingham - 2	North Wokingham Full Northern Distributor Road

(b) That thee very large schemes be referred to the LEP Strategic Infrastructure Process.

	Scheme Promoter	Short Name
	Reading - 2	Southern Thames Valley Mass Rapid Transit
	Reading – 4 (with Wokingham and Bracknell Forest)	South Eastern Thames Valley Mass Rapid Transit
	Reading - 9 (with Wokingham)	Third Thames Crossing

(c) That all other schemes be referred back and scheme promoters be invited to continue to develop and improve the proposals.

(d) That Officers be asked to conduct a review of the first use of the Prioritisation Methodology and that further proposals for its refinement be brought back later in the year.

6. BLTB Forward Plan

Members considered the Forward Plan for the period November 2013 to March 2014. It was noted that the scheme promoters of the 9 top priority projects would compile progress reports for consideration by BLTB at future meetings.

Resolved – That the BLTB Forward Plan be noted.

7. Date of next meeting

It was confirmed that the next meeting of BLTB would be held on Thursday 14th November, 2013 at 4.00pm at The Centre, Farnham Road, Slough.

Chair

(Note: The Meeting opened at 4.02 pm and closed at 5.15 pm)