

TfSE Partnership Board
03 July 2023 - 10:00-13:00
Minutes

In Person – 18 Smith Square, LGA, London

Partnership Board Members

Cllr Keith Glazier (Chair) Leader East Sussex County Council	Vince Lucas Director South East LEP <i>(jointly representing LEPs)</i>	Daniel Ruiz Smart Mobility and Transport Lead Enterprise M3 LEP <i>(jointly representing LEPs)</i>
Cllr Rob Humby Leader of the Council Hampshire County Council	Cllr Joy Dennis Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport West Sussex County Council	Cllr Leslie Pumm Chair, Equalities, Community Safety & Human Rights Committee Brighton and Hove City Council <i>(attending on behalf of Cllr Muten)</i>
Geoff French CBE Chair Transport Forum	Cllr Dan Watkins Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport Kent County Council	Cllr Matt Furniss Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure Surrey County Council
Richard Leonard Head of Network Development, Strategy & Planning National Highways	Cllr Eamonn Keogh Cabinet Member for Transport and District Regeneration Southampton City Council	Cllr Vince Maple Leader Medway Council
Heather Preen Head of Local Communities and Partnerships Transport for London	Stuart Kistruck Director Planning & Franchising Southern Region Network Rail <i>(attending on behalf of Ellie Burrows)</i>	

Guests:

- Elliot Shaw, Chief Customer and Strategy Officer, National Highways
- Philip Andrews, Head of Future Roads Strategy and Investment, DfT

Apologies:

- Cllr Trevor Muten, Chair, Transport and Sustainability Committee, Brighton & Hove City Council
- Cllr Gerald Vernon-Jackson, Cabinet Member for Transport, Portsmouth City Council
- Cllr Phil Jordan, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, Isle of Wight Council
- Ellie Burrows, Route Managing Director for Southern Region, Network Rail
- TBC, South Downs National Park Authority, (Representative from Protected Landscapes)
- TBC, (representing Berkshire Local Transport Body)

- TBC, (jointly representing District and Borough Councils)
- TBC, (jointly representing District and Borough Councils)

Officers attended:

- Rupert Clubb, Transport for the South East
- Rachel Ford, Transport for the South East
- Sarah Valentine, Transport for the South East
- Mark Valleley, Transport for the South East
- Lucy Dixon-Thompson, Transport for the South East
- James Gleave, Transport for the South East
- Jasmin Barnicoat, Transport for the South East

- Andy Rhind, DfT

- Matt Davey, West Sussex County Council
- Lyndon Mendes, Surrey County Council
- Dee O'Rourke, Medway Council
- Felicity Tidbury, Portsmouth City Council

Item	Action
1. Welcome and Apologies	
<p>1.1 Cllr Keith Glazier (KG) welcomed Partnership Board members to the meeting and noted apologies.</p> <p>1.2 Cllr Glazier welcomed the following new Board members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cllr Vince Maple, Medway Council ▪ Cllr Gerald Vernon-Jackson, Portsmouth City Council ▪ Cllr Trevor Muten, Brighton & Hove County Council <p>1.3 Cllr Glazier welcomed all the guests attending the meeting including Cllr Leslie Pumm who is attending on behalf of Cllr Trevor Muten.</p> <p>1.4 Cllr Glazier thanked the following representatives for their contributions over the past few years, as they have now stepped down from the Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cllr Tony Page (BLTB rep – Reading) ▪ Cllr Alan Jarrett (Medway) ▪ Cllr Elaine Hills (Brighton) ▪ Cllr Lynne Stagg (Portsmouth) ▪ Cllr Colin Kemp (D&B rep - Woking) ▪ Cllr David Monk (D&B rep - Folkestone & Hythe) ▪ Ian Phillips (National Parks rep - SDNPA) 	
2. Minutes from last meeting	

2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.	
3. Declarations of interest	
3.1 Cllr Glazier asked Board members to declare any interests they may have in relation to the agenda. No interests were declared.	
4. Governance	
<p>4.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) introduced the item and requested nominations for Chair of TfSE for 2023/24. Cllr Keith Glazier was nominated and elected unopposed.</p> <p>4.2 Cllr Glazier sought nominations for Vice-Chair of TfSE for 2023/24. Cllr Rob Humby was nominated, seconded and elected unopposed.</p> <p>4.3 Cllr Glazier sought nominations for Chair of the Transport Forum for 2023/24. Geoff French was nominated and elected unopposed.</p> <p>4.4 The Board agreed to co-opt for 2023/24; the Chair of the Transport Forum; two people nominated by the Local Enterprise Partnerships; a person nominated by the national parks and other protected landscape designations; two people nominated by the district and borough authorities; and a representative each from National Highways, Network Rail and Transport for London.</p> <p>4.5 The nominations for the board representatives from the national parks and district and borough authorities will be confirmed in due course.</p> <p>4.6 Cllr Joy Dennis was nominated as Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee for 2023/24. Membership of the Committee will be picked up as part of Item 8.</p> <p>4.7 ACTION - Board Members will be contacted by the TfSE secretariat with register of interest forms they are required to complete.</p> <p>4.8 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to: (1) Nominate and elect a Chair and Vice-Chair for the period of one year; (2) Agree to co-opt for a period of one year to the Partnership Board: a. The Chair of the Transport Forum; b. Two people nominated collectively by the Local Enterprise Partnerships; c. A person nominated by the National Parks and other protected landscape designations; d. Two people nominated by the district and borough authorities; and e. A representative from National Highways, Network Rail and Transport for London.</p>	TfSE Secretariat

<p>(3) Allocate voting rights of one vote each for the two Local Enterprise Partnership representatives, the Chair of the Transport Forum and the nominated representatives of the district and borough authorities and the protected landscapes;</p> <p>(4) Appoint for a period of one year the Chair for the Transport Forum;</p> <p>(5) Appoint a Chair and membership of the Audit and Governance Committee for a period of one year; and</p> <p>(6) Note the request for members to return completed register of interest forms.</p>	
<p>5. Statements from the public</p>	
<p>5.1 Cllr Glazier confirmed that no statements from the public have been made.</p>	
<p>6. RIS 3 presentation</p>	
<p>6.1 Philip Andrews (PA) introduced the item and outlined the purpose of the strategic investment planning process for the third road investment strategy (RIS3). PA also outlined the high-level objectives the DfT have given National Highways for RIS3.</p> <p>6.2 Richard Leonard (RL) outlined the 5 key priorities that are the focus of RIS3. These are; improving safety for all, making the most of our network, evolving our customer and community services, drive decarbonisation and environment sustainability and taking a targeted approach to enhancing our network.</p> <p>6.3 RL also outlined the 2050 ambitions and proposed road categorisation. RL explained that storymaps can be found on National Highways website, and they show a condensed version of route strategies with interactive maps that can be used to explore the routes and learn more about the initial areas of investigation.</p> <p>6.4 Elliot Shaw explained the difficult financial situation they are now operating in and alongside an aging network, prioritisation is important. RIS3 will be a shift away from the types of big infrastructure schemes that may have been taken forward previously, with a focus more on safety enhancements and smaller schemes.</p> <p>6.5 Cllr Keith Glazier (KG) raised the concern regarding the recent written ministerial statement on the A27 corridor, particularly around Arundel. Work on planning should not stop.</p> <p>6.6 Cllr Joy Dennis added that she is also concerned and disappointed with the announced cancelling, deferring and reduction in funding of schemes on the A27 through West Sussex. As the only strategic east/west route south of the M25, that at points are single carriageway, the impact of this will be significant.</p>	

<p>6.7 RL explained that National Highways do appreciate how important this corridor is, but there is still some work happening in the background and it is important to have a robust evidence base in place. It is also important to not look at just schemes, but the movement of people and goods across the network.</p> <p>6.8 ES outlined how difficult it has been in the past to get consensus and broad public support for work on the A27 corridor. Therefore, it is important to identify how everyone can come together to show unity on a solution (both politically and from a community perspective) and this would help move this forward.</p> <p>6.9 Cllr Rob Humby commented on the importance of bringing together all relevant agencies to ensure there is that joined up thinking that needs to take place. For example, increasing the inclusion of Homes England in the strategic conversations.</p> <p>6.10 Other comments shared by the Board are; that there needs to be realistic conversations happening around funding and also that clarity is needed to enable future planning. In addition, that sometimes issues on the network are caused by issues off the network, so improving the SRN will have positive consequences on the pressures on the network.</p> <p>6.11 Regarding a question on smart motorways, PA reiterated no new smart motorways will be installed, just retrofitting of the refuge areas. The smart motorways and associated technology also need to be considered as part of an evolving future.</p> <p>6.12 RC explained that although the emphasis on maintenance and smaller schemes is understandable however, this is only effective when you have a well-developed network. It would also be helpful to set out in a clearer way what the new hierarchy means in 'Connecting the Country'. TfSE are grateful for the collaboration on the route corridor work. TfSE have invited the Minister to visit the area and see the A27 corridor for himself. With the ministerial statement, seeds of doubt will have been sown for business, investment, housing etc. In addition, prioritisation is key and TfSE and the Board have demonstrated many times their ability to prioritise strategically with a strong evidence base alongside this. This raises the question as to whether regional funding allocations need to be in place for STBs to prioritise.</p> <p>6.13 RC would welcome any opportunity for the DfT consultation deadline to be extended as it is currently only for 8 weeks.</p> <p>6.14 In response to a question regarding freight, logistics and technology, PA and ES confirmed that the DfT now has a much stronger grip on logistics in cluing how technology can be improved and used. They have been engaging a lot with freight in recent years and working with key partners, for example, working with network rail to identify opportunities to move freight from road to rail.</p>	
<p>7. Transport Strategy Refresh</p>	
<p>7.1 Mark Valleley (MV) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p>	

7.2 MV outlined the background to the transport strategy refresh including what occurred for production of the first TfSE transport strategy including the scenario planning, the 2050 vision and also the lessons learned from the development of that strategy.

7.3 MV explained the preliminary activity that has been carried out and the two possible options for how a refresh could be undertaken. MV outlined the details of a basic option and a comprehensive option and set out the main differences between them, (including financial and length of time to develop them) and outlined a timeline route map for each.

7.4 The Board discussed the options and although were supportive of the comprehensive option, they sought clarification on some elements of this option. There were concerns as to the length of time it would take to carry out this refresh and the costs involved. MV confirmed that a supplier is not yet engaged on this piece of work, so there might be an opportunity to adjust the timeline and the potential costs, but this needs to be discussed with the supplier.

7.5 In addition, it was requested that a refresh of the strategy should ensure multi-modal corridors are clear and it is not just a collection of the work of different agencies.

7.6 Cllr Vince Maple also advised that he is very supportive of the collaborative approach, but it will mean more challenging conversations will occur.

7.7 MV also confirmed that the data used to create the original transport strategy will be updated. Sarah's data and analysis team are working to provide a mechanism via the analytical framework for a more continuous feed of data and information in real time rather than through periodic refreshes.

7.8 The Board queried whether now is the right time to refresh the transport strategy in light of a general election on the horizon and possible subsequent changes to governmental transport policy. MV explained that any change in policy (white papers etc), following a general election would take time, so it would be best to ensure a robust strategy is produced now. RC confirmed that officials from the DfT will be included as part of the refresh process so they can keep ministers apprised. It could also help to lead the conversation with the department and help to influence and shape policy.

7.9 Richard Leonard confirmed National Highways are supportive of the comprehensive refresh option.

7.10 The recommendations were **agreed** by the Partnership Board.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:

(1) Agree that a refresh of the transport strategy is needed; and

<p>(2) Agree that comprehensive refresh option (Option 2) should be pursued, rather than the basic option (Option 1).</p>	
<p>8. Audit and Governance Committee Update</p>	
<p>8.1 As the Committee entered this meeting without a Chair, Rupert Clubb (RC) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>8.2 RC explained the main risks that have been identified in the risk register.</p> <p>8.3 Cllr Vince Maple was pleased the levelling up risk had been identified. He also noted that some conversations are progressing with Government on devolution deals within the TfSE region, so the likelihood score will increase for this risk.</p> <p>8.4 With regards to membership of the Committee, the two LEP representatives confirmed they are happy to work together and alternate attendance at meetings.</p> <p>8.5 ACTION - Two more board members from local authorities are required to join the Committee. No volunteers were forthcoming, so this will be followed up outside the meeting.</p> <p>8.6 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <p>(1) Note the discussions at the first meeting of the Audit and Governance Committee;</p> <p>(2) Agree membership of the Audit and Governance Committee; and</p> <p>(3) Agree the strategic risk register.</p>	<p>Rupert Clubb / Rachel Ford</p>
<p>9. SIP Summary Document</p>	
<p>9.1 Rachel Ford (RF) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>9.2 The only comment received from the Board was to consider a change on the last page from '<i>Steer has prepared this material for TfSE...</i>' to '<i>Steer has prepared this material with TfSE...</i>' to reflect that TfSE has been heavily involved in the work.</p> <p>9.3 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p>	

<p>(1) Agree the summary document for the Strategic Investment Plan; (2) Agree that the summary document will be published on the TfSE website; and (3) Note the response from the Department for Transport to the Strategic Investment Plan.</p>	
10. Delivery of the Strategic Investment Plan	
<p>10.1 Sarah Valentine (SV) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>10.2 SV explained how the delivery action plan forms the baseline from which future monitoring and evaluation of the delivery of schemes within the SIP can be measured.</p> <p>10.3 SV also explained that an interactive map is being developed as a useful way of engaging stakeholders in the story of the SIP and showing the interactions between schemes and in specific areas.</p> <p>10.4 With regards to prioritisation of schemes identified in the SIP, initial work has been undertaken to enable schemes within the SIP to be filtered by a range of criteria, such as mode, timescale etc and this ensures that we could identify priority schemes if we were asked to do so. However, this is dependent on the exact parameters of the question being asked. Any prioritised lists produced will be brought to the Partnership Board for approval at that time.</p> <p>10.5 SV confirmed that development of a ‘corridor study’ case study is underway. It is hoped that this will demonstrate that taking a holistic, multi-modal sequenced approach to delivering both schemes and policy interventions along a specific corridor through a devolved long-term funding settlement would deliver additional benefits over the current shorter term, modally based centralised approach. This work will involve testing delivery of all the SIP schemes and policies along a particular corridor against a number of different scenarios so that the relative benefits can be compared.</p> <p>10.6 The TfSE budget for 2023/24 includes allocations to work with partners to undertake and support scheme development work to deliver schemes identified in the SIP. We are aware that several schemes are awaiting DfT / Treasury approval for their business cases, and we are liaising with DfT officials on this issue.</p> <p>10.7 The first TfSE State of the Region report has been completed and subject to Board approval, it will be published on the TfSE website with an accompanying dashboard to provide a more easy to access summary.</p> <p>10.8 SV confirmed work is underway to develop TfSE’s analytical capability including a range of updates to our SEELUM model. The DfT have also given Transport for the North (TfN) funding to work with the other 6 STBs to develop a common analytical framework to complement individual frameworks. In addition, we are working with TfN on the roll out of their D-Log system which will provide a standard method for collecting and maintaining local plan data, and also the roll out of TfN’s EVCI (electric</p>	

<p>vehicle charging infrastructure) tool. We are looking at how to share these tools more widely to benefit all of our local authorities.</p> <p>10.9 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <p>(1) Agree a Delivery Action Plan and accompanying interactive story map for the SIP;</p> <p>(2) Note the progress with developing a prioritisation framework and scheme development work including progress with the delivery of TfSE’s programme of Major Road Network and Large Local Major schemes;</p> <p>(3) Note the progress with the development of a TfSE Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and agree the first “State of the Region” baseline report and the production of a supporting dashboard; and</p> <p>(4) Note the progress with the development of an analytical framework to support business cases and the delivery of the schemes within the SIP.</p>	
<h2>11. Financial Update</h2>	
<p>11.1 Rachel Ford (RF) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>11.2 RF highlighted the main points of the 2022/23 end of year report. Total expenditure was £2.3m with £1.5m spent on the technical programme.</p> <p>11.3 RF outlined the proposed 2023/24 budget based on the indicative funding allocation from the DfT of £2.065m. Formal confirmation has not yet been received from the DfT, but is imminent.</p> <p>11.4 RF suggested adjusting recommendation 2 of the financial update report to read <i>‘agree the proposed budget for 2023/24, subject to receiving the formal letter of confirmation from the DfT.’</i> Andy Rhind (DfT) gave apologies and reassured the Board that a funding allocation letter is imminent. He confirmed that the DfT are content with the proposed budget outlined in the report in order to keep work progressing in the interim.</p> <p>11.5 In response to a query regarding whether the staffing budget for 2023/24 is realistic, RF confirmed that the calculations have shown a full complement of the team will be under £1.6m and the forecasts will be adjusted to reflect this in future reports. The figure takes into account the additional recruitment taking place and also the expected cost of living salary increases.</p> <p>11.6 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board as amended below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <p>(1) Agree the end of year position for 2022/23;</p>	

<p>(2) Agree the proposed budget for 2023/24, <u>subject to receiving the formal letter of confirmation from the DfT</u>; and</p> <p>(3) Note the financial update to end of May 2023.</p>	
<h2>12. A Rail Partnership for the Wider South East</h2>	
<p>12.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>12.2 RC explained why the 3 STBs have decided to propose a new rail partnership for the wider south east. Following the Williams-Shapps review, it was noted how important it was to bring together the sub-national transport bodies, Network Rail, Transport for London, DfT and Great British Railways (GBR) and develop the key relationships between these organisations to move forward with improving the rail infrastructure in this area.</p> <p>12.3 The STBs do recognise the creation of Great British Railways and what this organisation could give in terms of a partnership and cohesion, however, there is now a delay in legislation to create this new body and it is important in the meantime, to bring these organisations closer together to look at the strategic rail infrastructure.</p> <p>12.4 RC briefly outlined the governance proposal and remit of the proposed partnership.</p> <p>12.5 The Board welcomed this proposed new partnership and could see how this would be a useful partnership to tackle rail issues in this area and the rail relationship with London.</p> <p>12.6 Network Rail confirmed they view this proposed partnership very positively and it is important to keep it focussed on the strategic oversight.</p> <p>12.7 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <p>(1) Agree the high level scope for a rail partnership in the wider south east;</p> <p>(2) Agree the proposed governance arrangements for the partnership; and</p> <p>(3) Agree the Lead Officer progresses discussions on the partnership.</p>	
<h2>13. Lead Officer's Report</h2>	
<p>13.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>13.2 RC highlighted the recent work of TfSE including the joint working with other STBs.</p>	

<p>13.3 RC also highlighted that Rachel Ford is leaving TfSE to work for Transport for the North. Cllr Glazier gave his thanks for Rachel's contribution to TfSE over the past 6 years and wished her well in her new role.</p> <p>13.4 The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the activities of Transport for the South East between April-June 2023.</p>	
<h2>14. Technical Programme Update</h2>	
<p>14.1 Mark Valleley (MV) introduced this item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>14.2 MV briefly highlighted the progress of some of the technical workstreams. MV confirmed that the lorry parking study is still being finalised but the procurement of the additional freight work has been delayed as a query has arisen.</p> <p>14.3 MV also confirmed that the DfT are still to release their Local Transport Plan guidance. The carbon assessment tool that has been developed will be able to be used by the local transport authorities once this guidance is published. TfSE will also assist the DfT in delivering regional seminars to launch the guidance.</p> <p>14.4 In response to a query from Cllr Joy Dennis regarding EV charging infrastructure and the pressures on the power network, MV confirmed that TfSE are encouraging collaboration from across sectors, so the two distribution network operators are members of the TfSE EV forum to enable this joined up thinking to take place.</p> <p>14.5 Cllr Joy Dennis also raised a concern regarding the local transport authorities' abilities to deliver the bus service improvement plan (BSIP) projects within the timescales required by the DfT due to resource and financial constraints. RC agreed this is an issue felt across many authorities and TfSE will feed these concerns back to the DfT. It is hoped that the new bus centre of excellence will also assist local transport authorities with some of the issues raised.</p> <p>14.6 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Note the progress with the ongoing work to assist local transport authorities with the implementation of their bus service improvement plans (BSIP); (2) Note the progress with the work to implement the regional electric vehicle infrastructure strategy; (3) Note the progress with the delivery of TfSE's future mobility strategy; 	

<p>(4) Note the progress with the delivery of TfSE's freight logistics and gateways strategy;</p> <p>(5) Note the progress with the joint work on decarbonisation; and</p> <p>(6) Note the progress with the work to develop a regional active travel strategy.</p>	
15. Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Update	
<p>15.1 Lucy Dixon-Thompson (LDT) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>15.2 LDT highlighted some of the key items within the paper, including post SIP publication communications (including an interactive map for the website) and a recent update of the stakeholder database for GDPR purposes.</p> <p>15.3 Work is just about to commence on the transport strategy refresh and the regional active travel strategy, both of which will involve some significant stakeholder engagement. Introductions for new Board members have also been taking place in the past few weeks, along with a positive meeting of the Universities group. The funding and finance group are also due to meet again soon.</p> <p>15.4 Work is underway to organise TfSE's Connecting the South East event in September and invitations have been sent to Board members.</p> <p>15.5 In response to a question on how TfSE engages with district and borough authorities, LDT explained that due to the volume of members in those authorities, engagement is not straightforward. However, there are 5 district and borough leaders (drawn from each area's leaders' groups) that attend the Transport Forum meeting and not only represent the wider views but feed back to their colleagues. 2 of these representatives are also nominated to have seats on the Partnership Board. In addition, Cllr Glazier attends those leaders' group meetings on request to update them on the work of TfSE and answer their questions.</p> <p>15.6 In response to a question regarding active travel and the work and engagement that will be undertaken on the new strategy (in light of concerns around the future funding of these schemes), LDT and RC confirmed it is a priority for TfSE, especially as the SIP encourages having a multi-modal perspective on transport. TfSE has an important role to be able to 'join the dots' on the regional perspective. In addition, Active Travel England now attend the Transport Strategy Working Group meetings which is a positive move forward.</p> <p>15.7 The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the engagement and communication activity that has been undertaken since the last board meeting.</p>	

16. Transport Forum Update	
<p>16.1 Geoff French (GF) introduced this item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>16.2 GF outlined the most recent meeting of the Transport Forum where the main agenda items were the transport strategy refresh and the review of the Transport Forum. GF highlighted some comments received by the Forum for both these items and outlined the next steps for the Transport Forum review.</p> <p>16.3 The Board were supportive of reviewing the Transport Forum and were keen to ensure views are heard from a wide ranging group of organisations as part of the stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>16.4 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Note the recent meeting of the Transport Forum; (2) Note and consider the comments from the Forum: and (3) Note that feedback from the Transport Forum will be given to the Audit and Governance Committee for consideration as part of their review. 	
17. Responses to consultations	
<p>17.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) introduced this item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>17.2 RC outlined the consultations that TfSE has responded to and sought views from Board members on the responses that were submitted.</p> <p>17.3 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to agree the draft responses to the following consultations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) National Highways – A27 Worthing and Lancing Improvements scheme; (2) Office of Rail and Road – Independent review of Network Rail’s stakeholder engagement; (3) Institution of Civil Engineers – Does England need a national transport strategy?; (4) Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body – Views on the issues and opportunities that will shape the region’s long-term Strategic Transport Plan; (5) Kent County Council – North Thanet Link highway improvement scheme; (6) Department for Transport – Draft revised national networks national policy statement; and (7) Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities – Technical consultation on the Infrastructure Levy. 	

18. AOB	
<p>18.1 Vince Lucas raised an observation regarding bus provision across the South East (including the financial issues and low patronage being experienced) and the mechanisms TfSE might have to improve transport in this area.</p> <p>18.2 ACTION – RC agreed that it would be useful to report back to the Board at the meeting in October to give Board members an overview of the issues being faced across the South East (costs, demand etc), the differences within the region and how the work TfSE is undertaking could positively influence this area of transport.</p>	TfSE Secretariat
19. Date of Next Meeting	
<p>19.1 The date for the next Partnership Board meeting will be Monday 30 October 2023 – 10:00-13:00, held virtually.</p>	

20. Technical Call Off Contract	
<p>20.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) introduced this item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>20.2 RC briefly outlined the background to this procurement and the outcome of the procurement process, including the recommendation to proceed with the bid consortium led by Steer.</p> <p>20.3 RC clarified for the Board how the price v quality weighting worked for this procurement.</p> <p>20.4 The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to award the technical call off contract to the consortium of Steer (lead bidder) and their supply chain partners.</p>	