

**SCR TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**23<sup>rd</sup> FEBRUARY 2017**

**SHEFFIELD TOWN HALL**

No.	Item	Action
1	<p><b><u>Welcome and Apologies</u></b></p> <p>Present:</p> <p><u>Board Members</u>            Cllr Julie Dore, SCC - CHAIR            Martin McKervey, Nabarro / LEP            Simon Carr, Henry Boot / LEP</p> <p><u>In Attendance / Advisory Members</u>            Damien Wilson, RMBC            Matt Gladstone, BMBC            Neil Firth, DMBC            Tom Finnegan-Smith, SCC            Jim Seymour, DCC            Mark Lynam, SCR Exec Team            Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit</p> <p>+ Gareth Finch (Peel) for item 5 and Rich Marshall (Highways England) for item 6</p> <p>Apologies were received from Board Members Cllr John Burrows (CBC), Diana Terris (BMBC), Neil Taylor (BaDC) + Steve Edwards (SYPTTE), Katie Jackson (SCC / SCR Exec Team), Peter Dale (DMBC) and Mike Ashworth (DCC)</p>	
2	<p><b><u>Minutes of the Previous Meeting</u></b></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> January were agreed to be an accurate record.</p>	
3	<p><b><u>Declarations of Interest</u></b></p> <p>No declarations noted.</p>	
4	<p><b><u>Urgent Items / Announcements</u></b></p>	

	None requested.	
5	<p><b><u>Doncaster Sheffield Airport Rail Station</u></b></p> <p>The Board received a presentation on the ambitions for a rail station at DSA.</p> <p>The presentation covered the economic case for a station, the background to the project and previous iterations, the various economic benefits to the wider City Region and other partners, comparative information regarding rail station provision at other UK airports, the route refinement objectives and business case development requirements.</p> <p>The Board was advised of other benefits the station would create include the mitigation of the need for a £20m rail bridge at Rossington and the alleviation of congestion at Doncaster Station. It was further noted Network Rail have commented favourably on the plan, referring to it as ‘innovative and exciting’, comments mirrored by the press.</p> <p>It was noted the primary issue to address will be how the initial business case development, and then the actual station itself will be funded and it was suggested a package of support will be needed to bring the project to fruition.</p> <p>It was suggested that sources of funding to be considered for business case development could be DfT Large Local Major funding or HS2 Growth Strategy funding.</p> <p>It was noted the airport is classed as a major investment opportunity in the SCRIP.</p> <p>It was suggested that whilst the argument for the station had been won locally, a major issue will be the lack of due recognition the airport has across the north and nationally. A new communications approach will therefore be needed to address this situation and ensure DSA is appropriately championed by TfN and other agencies.</p> <p>It was noted the wider DSA vision will be presented to the next IEB meeting.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board notes its continued support for the ambition to realise an East Coast Mainline station at DSA</b></p>	
6	<b><u>Highways England Update</u></b>	

	<p>The Board welcomed Rich Marshall from Highways England who delivered a presentation on Highways England's recent history, new objectives and medium term plans for the Yorkshire and North East region focussing on planned South Yorkshire schemes in particular.</p> <p>It was noted Highways England now has 5 strategic objectives; to develop a safe and sustainable network, to support economic growth, to create a freer flowing network, an improved environment and an accessible and integrated network.</p> <p>These objectives are to be achieved through the delivery of Road Investment Strategy (RIS) vehicles with 5 year timeframes (RIS1 to 2010) which list discrete schemes including 14 schemes in RIS1 for the Yorkshire and North East Region at a cost of £1.4bn.</p> <p>A question was raised regarding what engagement is in place between Highways England and HS2 Ltd to discuss the HS2 Parkway Station ambition. It was noted this matter would be addressed at the next HS2 Programme Board meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that Highways England now has a clearer ambitions around the creation of collaborative working relationships with its partners to deliver value for money and promote best practise. Opportunities for more engagement are therefore welcomed.</p> <p>It was acknowledged air quality issues remain a subject requiring further consideration.</p>	
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b><u>Modelling Tools – Request for Change and Update</u></b></p> <p>A paper was received to clarify the scope of the work and provide an updated spend profile for the delivery of SCR's Strategic Testing Tools (approved by the CA on 28/10/16).</p> <p>The Board was reminded the CA approved the expenditure of £3m for consultants to build new modelling tools for appraising, at a region-wide level and to Government standards, transport and other major infrastructure schemes coming forward for funding, both from SCR and DfT, the new tools including a transport model and a land use model which will replace existing versions that are time-expired.</p> <p>The report provided a summary of progress made to date.</p> <p>It was noted the spend profile for these tools has been refined as work has progressed. It is now expected that they can be</p>	

	<p>delivered with a reduced budget and the Board was ask to endorse a reduction in the funding allocation of £0.9m</p> <p>It was confirmed the models will be available for use by the districts for local modelling purposes.</p> <p>Further information was requested in respect of what the ongoing maintenance liabilities of the models will be, noting the costs quoted to-date are only for the capital outlay for the development of the models.</p> <p><b>Action: Mark to enquire and provide further information</b></p> <p>The Board discussed the need for modelling proportionality protocols going forward with a focus on testing strategic plans and options rather than undertaking detailed modelling for individual schemes which, it was suggested, might be prohibitively expensive.</p> <p><b>Action: Mark to feedback the Board’s comments to the project team</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board endorse the revised spend profile and reduction in the funding allocation of £0.9m.</b></p>	<p><b>ML</b></p> <p><b>ML</b></p>
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b><u>HS2 Update</u></b></p> <p>A report was received setting out the context of the current HS2 Ltd route consultation and the proposed content of the SCR response.</p> <p>The draft response was attached as an appendix to the report.</p> <p>It was noted the findings of the mitigation study will be appended to the consultation response. The Board was provided with information regarding the findings and informed these would be discussed in detail at the next HS2 Programme Board.</p> <p>It was noted the response’s reference to 2 trains per hour is in relation to the figures quoted in the HS2 Command Paper (less than the 4-6 trains originally conceived). It was suggested it may still be appropriate to push back on this matter via the response.</p> <p>It was confirmed the response takes account of past discussions on a number of contentious issues.</p>	

	<p>It was suggested the section on HS2's relevance to international connectivity should be expanded and strengthened.</p> <p>Martin advised the Board of a private sector led HS2 event taking place in Sheffield on 2<sup>nd</sup> March.</p> <p><b>Action: Martin to send details to Mark for circulation.</b></p> <p><b>Action: ALL to provide comments on the draft to Mark by <u>Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> February</u></b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board agrees the approach being taken to the HS2 consultation response, approves the draft response at Appendix A for submission (subject to any further comments to be received by the above deadline) and delegates authority to the Chair to agree any final amendments before the 9th March deadline.</b></p>	
9	<p><b><u>Transport Strategy</u></b></p> <p>An update was provided on the Strategy's development.</p> <p>It was noted a draft prospectus will be presented to the next TEB meeting. This will help generate debate and will set out the strategy's national, regional and local tiers.</p> <p>It was noted the intention is to complete work on the prospectus by the end of April to ensure this work can feed into the SEP refresh. The Strategy's conditional outputs will then be developed in June and public consultation will be undertaken in September.</p>	
10	<p><b><u>Transport for the North Freight Strategy</u></b></p> <p>A report was received to update the Board on work to date by Transport for the North (TfN) in relation to freight transport across the pan-Northern region.</p> <p>It was noted the local context for this work is that improvements to the efficiencies of freight movements will assist the SCR districts and their partners in delivering economic growth and supporting local businesses.</p> <p>The group discuss the wider pan-thematic benefits afforded by an effective freight strategy.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board notes the work done to date and the next steps of TfN's Freight Workstream and notes</b></p>	

	<b>the intention to feed local freight transport issues into the TfN Strategic Transport Plan process</b>	
<b>11</b>	<b><u>Forward Plan</u></b>  Provided for information	
<b>12</b>	<b><u>Any Other Business</u></b>  1) <u>TransPennine Matters</u> The Board was informed of work with colleagues in Greater Manchester to develop a 'soft comms' plan the continuation of lobbying for trans-Pennine connectivity improvements (including options for tunnelling).	
<b>13</b>	<b><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></b>  6 <sup>th</sup> April, 2.00pm at Sheffield Town Hall	