

TfSE Partnership Board
30 October 2023 – 13:00-16:00
Minutes
Virtual – Microsoft Teams

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 Paul Nann Deputy Chair Transport & Sustainability Committee Brighton and Hove City Council <i>(attending on behalf of Cllr Muten)</i>
Geoff French CBE Chair Transport Forum	Cllr Jason Brock Leader Reading Borough Council Berkshire Local Transport Body	Cllr Matt Furniss Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure Surrey County Council
Cllr Peter Candlish Portsmouth City Council <i>(attending on behalf of Cllr Vernon- Jackson)</i>	Cllr Phil Jordan Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport Isle of Wight Council	Cllr Vince Maple Leader Medway Council
Heather Preen Head of Local Communities and Partnerships Transport for London	Thomas Cornwell National Highways Regional Strategy & Stakeholder Engagement Manager <i>(attending on behalf of Richard Leonard)</i>	Tim Burr Deputy Chair South Downs National Park

Guests:

- Steven Bishop, Steer
- Andrew Summers, Lead Officer, Transport East

Apologies:

- Cllr Trevor Muten, Chair, Transport and Sustainability Committee, Brighton & Hove City Council
- Cllr Gerald Vernon-Jackson, Cabinet Member for Transport, Portsmouth City Council
- Ellie Burrows, Route Managing Director for Southern Region, Network Rail
- Cllr, David Robey, Deputy Cabinet Member, Kent County Council
- Cllr, Vince Maple, Leader, Medway Council

- Cllr Matt Boughton, Leader, Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council (jointly representing District and Borough Councils)
- Cllr Dr Beccy Cooper, Leader, Worthing Borough Council (jointly representing District and Borough Councils)

Officers attended:

- Rupert Clubb, Transport for the South East
- Sarah Valentine, Transport for the South East
- Mark Valleley, Transport for the South East
- Jessica Lelliott, Transport for the South East
- Duncan Barkes, Transport for the South East
- Emily Bailey, Transport for the South East
- Jasmin Barnicoat, Transport for the South East
- Lewis Miligan, Transport for the South East
- Elan Morgan, Transport for the South East
- Mat Jasper, Transport for the South East
- Tia Shelley, Transport for the South East

- Dan Taylor, DfT
- Peter Duggan, DfT

- Alex Pringle, SDNPA

- Mark Prior, Brighton and Hove City Council
- Matt Davey, West Sussex County Council
- Joe Ratcliffe, Kent County Council
- Mark Breathwick, Medway Council
- Pete Boustred, Southampton City Council
- Chris Maddocks, Berkshire Local Transport Body
- Felicity Tidbury, Portsmouth City Council
- Natalie Wigman, Hampshire County Council

Item	Action
1. Welcome and Apologies	
1.1 Cllr Keith Glazier (KG) welcomed Partnership Board members to the meeting and noted apologies.	
1.2 Cllr Glazier welcomed the following new Board members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cllr David Robey, Kent County Council ▪ Cllr Dr Beccy Cooper, Worthing Borough Council ▪ Cllr Matt Boughton, Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council ▪ Tim Burr, South Downs National Park 	
1.3 Cllr Glazier welcomed all the guests attending the meeting including Cllr Paul Nann attending on behalf of Cllr Muten, Cllr Peter Candlish attending on behalf of Cllr Vernon-Jackson and Thomas Cornwell attending on behalf of Richard Leonard.	

<p>1.4 Cllr Glazier thanked the following representative 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 Dan Watkins (Kent County Council) 	
<p>2. Minutes from last meeting</p>	
<p>2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.</p>	
<p>3. Declarations of interest</p>	
<p>3.1 Cllr Glazier asked Board members to declare any interests they may have in relation to the agenda. No interests were declared.</p>	
<p>4. Statements from the public</p>	
<p>4.1 Cllr Glazier confirmed that no statements from the public have been made.</p>	
<p>5. Strategic Prioritisation</p>	
<p>5.1 Sarah Valentine (SV) introduced the item and outlined the rationale and need for a prioritisation framework. SV outlined that a framework and methodology is being developed which is robust, and evidence led.</p> <p>5.2 SV highlighted the three main areas where Transport for the South East (TfSE) might need to take around prioritisation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus study money for scheme development 2. Defining the timing and relative priority for interventions that require further development up to advanced design 3. Defining the timing and relative priority for interventions that advance to delivery. <p>5.3 SV confirmed that the framework will be used to support decisions and that the board remain decision makers.</p> <p>5.4 Steven Bishop (SB) outlined the framework development process with the draft structure of the framework.</p> <p>5.5 SB highlighted the principles we have embodied which must be: evidence, support decisions, resource efficient / carry forward analysis and manage uncertainty.</p> <p>5.6 SB also highlighted the proposed framework steps: organise, score, evaluate and finalise action plans. The final two steps would be iterative and collaborate. The tool has flexibility to ask questions and then bring the information to the Board to make those decisions.</p>	

5.7 SB outlined that the proposed prioritisation scenarios are based on three levels of funding and a set of scenarios for devolved decision making.

5.8 SB discussed the next steps: seeking endorsement from the board, developing the tool with officers and bringing the tool back to the Board in January 2024.

5.9 Cllr Rob Humby (RH) conscious that there has already been a large amount of work put into this, but would like to note that there will still be more work to be done locally with local transport authorities. Additionally, noting the financial constraints.

5.10 Daniel Ruiz (DR) asked for clarity on 5-year window. Asked if we are being smart on the schemes as a whole, recognising the fiscal uncertainty and remote working and other globally changing factors for transport.

5.11 Geoff French (GF) stated for the record that he wants to ensure its adaptable and adoptable.

5.12 SV explained the importance of developing a deliverable pipeline of schemes. We are considering how different funding environments may affect prioritisation, and whether the types of schemes prioritised might be different with more or less funding, for example it may not just mean we can take forward fewer schemes if there is less funding, it might be that priorities become a greater number of smaller scale schemes.

5.13 SB notes that we are testing from a peer review position and will be looking at credible actions that will emerge from this. In response to DR query on adaptability, it will link with monitoring and evaluation reports that have been brought to previous Partnership Board meetings. For example, if we are not decarbonising quick enough, this will be reflected in the prioritisation matrix to be flexible and reactive. DR feels that our role is an 'overlay' and therefore has a responsibility to integrate with other organisations that work in this space.

5.14 Rupert Clubb (RC) notes that this acts as a tool to support the Board in decision making. Supports DR point, but notes that the STB strategies should be given due regard.

5.15 Dan Taylor (DT) notes that there will be new policy and notes that the prioritisation should not be overcomplicated.

5.16 The recommendation was **agreed** by the Partnership Board.

RECOMMENDATION:

The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to endorse a framework methodology to support prioritisation decisions, and to agree to the development of a tool to aid that process.

6. Audit and governance committee update

<p>6.1 Cllr Joy Dennis (JD) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>6.2 JD highlighted her appointment of Chair of the audit and governance committee, and the agreed Terms of Reference and welcomed of new members; Vince Lucas, Daniel Ruiz and Cllr Trevor Muten.</p> <p>6.3 JD also highlighted that the work programme for the next 12 months was reviewed by the committee. The Committee have asked for officers to report back on how TfSE secure value for money through procurement activity.</p> <p>6.4 JD explained that The Committee had reviewed the finance update and the revised budget agreed. The local contribution proposal to remain the same was also discussed and agreed.</p> <p>6.5 JD also highlighted that the risk register was reviewed and agreed. A new risk was asked to be created on the potential impacts of the current volatility with government priorities and policies. The Committee also tasked officers to provide a report on the impact inflation is having on schemes and how this affects Local Authorities.</p> <p>6.6 The Transport Forum review proposal was reviewed by The Committee. JD raised how the recommended proposal for the future of the Transport Forum was endorsed.</p> <p>6.7 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the discussions and actions arising at the meeting of the Audit and Governance Committee.</p>	
<p>7. Transport Forum review</p>	
<p>7.1 RC introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>7.2 RC outlined the operation review of the forum, since 2017 numbers of stakeholders had significantly increased. The membership had expanded, and it was a challenge to manage and make sure all views were taken into account. There were also a number of thematic groups that have been established to support technical workstreams.</p> <p>7.3 RC explained the three options that were considered. The forum had been taken through these through two engagement sessions and had opportunity for written feedback.</p> <p>7.4 RC outlined the proposal where the forum would meet twice a year, an advisory panel would be formed which pulls together Chairs from the thematic groups. The advisory panel provides a focus approach of advice into the board. The Chair of the advisory panel would feedback to the Board, have a seat on the Board and Chair the forum.</p>	

<p>7.5 The forum would have a broad membership. Meeting face to face twice a year. There will be digital engagement piece that would provide webinars and podcasts.</p> <p>7.6 RH wanted to recognise the work and value of the forum.</p> <p>7.7 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS:</i> <i>The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</i> <i>(1) Note the rationale for change and options that were discussed with Transport Forum members and the Audit and Governance Committee;</i> <i>(2) Note the feedback received from Transport Forum members; and</i> <i>(3) Consider and agree the revised operation of the Transport Forum as endorsed by the Audit & Governance Committee and the Transport Forum.</i></p>	
<p>8. Transport Forum update</p>	
<p>8.1 GF introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>8.2 GF highlighted the two recent meetings that took place of the Forum. The Forum had a discussion on the Regional Active Travel Strategy and queried when and how some groups would be engaged within the process. The Forum was also introduced to the State of the Region report.</p> <p>8.4 GF outlined the Transport Forum review proposal and the discussions that took place. The Forum had comments around practicalities of holding in person meetings. However, The Forum endorsed the recommended proposal.</p> <p>8.5 RH noted the interested involvement of Parish and Town Councils and wanted to acknowledge that this is something we could look into in the future. Noting their source of local knowledge and engaging early on.</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: (1) Note the recent meetings of the Transport Forum; and (2) Note and consider the comments from the Forum.</p>	
<p>9. SIP Policy Position</p>	
<p>9.1 Sarah Valentine (SV) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>9.2 SV explained how the seven statements have been prepared, all following the same format and drawing on our thematic plans.</p>	

<p>9.3 SV highlighted that the use of the phrase ‘road space reallocation’ in the highways statement is to be amended. This does not change the emphasis. In response to a query on the circumstances of removing the phrase SV explained we would not want a constituent authority to feel forced to do road space reallocation if that is not the right thing to do in their location.</p> <p>9.4 Tim Burr (TB) welcomed the decarbonisation statement but queried the importance of the environmental issue. Noting the other important environmental issues and how this would be reflected with growing priorities and developing policies.</p> <p>9.5 RC confirmed that the obligations for the other environmental issues would be best placed with local transport authorities, National Highways and Network Rail to protect landscapes. We can signpost in our strategy and strategic investment plan.</p> <p>9.6 Dan Taylor (DT) highlighted other STBs having similar priorities, not wanting to be articulated in statement but ensuring the synergies are there to make it stronger.</p> <p>9.7 TB highlighted the references to footpaths in well lit areas, and the existing SDNPA dark night skies policy.</p> <p>9.8 RC confirmed that the role of TfSE in relation to landscape is signposting as we are not the delivery body. It would be the local transport authority to have regard to.</p> <p>9.9 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to approve the seven policy position statements.</p>	
<h2>10. Financial Update</h2>	
<p>10.1 SV introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>10.2 SV outlined the update on the grant funding, the revised budget and local contribution proposal. SV noted the report has been taken through the Audit and Governance Committee who have agreed the recommendations for the Board.</p> <p>10.3 SV highlighted the grant funding was less than we had anticipated. We were awarded £1.725m, whilst we are grateful it is disappointing to not receive the amount indicated. Therefore, we are not able to fully deliver the agreed business plan.</p> <p>10.4 SV outlined the implications of the reduced grant funding. The reduction has been absorbed due to a delay in recruitment, the technical programme has been reprofiled with the delivery of the Centre of Excellence</p>	

<p>work slipping into next year and less support for the SIP schemes being only able to offer 4 schemes early stage support.</p> <p>10.5 SV shared the revised budget which has been endorsed by the Audit and Governance Committee.</p> <p>10.6 SV shared the position to the end of September against the revised budget and forecast to the end of the year.</p> <p>10.7 SV highlighted the proposal for the local contributions for 2024/25 to remain as they are given the current financial constraints. £58k for County and £30k for unitaries.</p> <p>10.8 SV raised that the business plan and financial budget for 24/25 will be brought to the January Board meeting.</p> <p>10.9 RH queried the reduced level of funding implications on the SIP and what this could mean.</p> <p>10.10 RC highlighted the importance of revenue funding to allow schemes to be developed and early grant settlement, having conversations with the Department now. Seeking out private funding for public infrastructure, there are a number of models we could potentially develop.</p> <p>10.11 DT highlighted that the grant funding this year was not due to a lack of confidence in TfSE. It was a decision applied to all STBs.</p> <p>10.12 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Note the update on grant funding from the Department for Transport; (2) Agree a revised budget for 2023/24 based on the reduced level of funding awarded; (3) Note the current financial position for 2023/24 to the end of September 2023; and (4) Agree the local contributions amount for 2024/25. 	
<p>11. Responses to consultations</p>	
<p>11.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>11.2 RC explained that the consultations do not always align timely with the Board meetings therefore an officer response is submitted subject to endorsement by the board.</p> <p>11.3 Vince Lucas (VL) queried the Govia Thameslink Railways – Proposals launched to improve customer service and reflect how customers now buy tickets. It was felt that the report did not evidence that the consultation response was addressed to Govia Thameslink Railways, South Eastern, Great Western Railway and South West Trains. RC confirmed the</p>	

consultation response was to all of the above. This has been noted by the secretariat team.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to agree the draft responses to the following consultations:

(1) Govia Thameslink Railways (GTR) –

Proposals launched to improve customer service and reflect how customers now buy tickets;

(2) National Highways –

Route Strategy Overview Reports;

(3) National Highways –

Connecting the Country;

(4) Transport Select Committee –

Call for evidence: Does the Government have a joined up plan for investing in transport?;

(5) Transport Select Committee –

Call for evidence: Future of transport data;

(6) Department for Transport (DfT) and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) –

Call for evidence: Freight and logistics and the planning system;

(7) Portsmouth City Council – Draft parking strategy consultation;

(8) Portsmouth City Council, Travel Portsmouth – Draft EV infrastructure strategy consultation; and

(9) London Gatwick - Registration as interested party: application for a Development Consent Order (DCO), repositioning the centre line of the Northern Runway to allow dual runway operations, aligning with international safety standards.

12. Lead Officer's Report

12.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.

12.2 RC highlighted the recent work of the Transport Forum review.

12.3 RC also highlighted the joint STB work building the relationship. The seven STBs meet frequently at joint technical steering group and chief officer group level.

12.4 RC also highlighted that Andrew Summers of Transport East is joining us today as an observer. All part of an STB family speaking with a single voice across our regions and to ministers.

12.5 The recommendation was **agreed** by the Partnership Board.

RECOMMENDATION:

The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the activities of Transport for the South East between July-September 2023.

13. Delivery of the Strategic Investment Plan	
<p>13.1 SV introduced this item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>13.2 SV highlighted that the delivery plan and story map are now live on our website. We would welcome any feedback.</p> <p>13.3 SV also highlighted that we have supported four schemes early stage development through the SIP.</p> <p>13.4 SV discussed the analytical framework work being completed with Transport for the North looking at rolling out analytical tools. Currently going through the barriers of data sharing.</p> <p>13.5 SV raised the recent success of recruiting the last vacant role of an analysis manager who will be starting middle of December.</p> <p>13.6 The recommendations were agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the progress of a range of workstreams that will support the delivery of the Strategic Investment Plan.</p>	
14. Technical Programme Update	
<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 the technical workstreams.</p> <p>14.3 KG highlighted the amount of work going on and thanked the technical team.</p> <p>14.4 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 progress with the development of TfSE's Centre of Excellence; (2) Note the progress with the work to refresh the transport strategy; (3) Note the progress with the work to implement the regional electric vehicle charging infrastructure strategy; (4) Note the progress with the delivery of TfSE's future mobility strategy; (5) Note the progress with the delivery of TfSE's freight logistics and gateways strategy; (6) Note the progress with the joint work on decarbonisation; and (7) Note the progress with the work to develop a regional active travel strategy. 	
15. Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Update	

<p>15.1 Duncan Barkes (DB) introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>15.2 DB highlighted the continued support to the technical programme set out within the communications and engagement plan. A refresh of the website has taken place with plans to revamp this in 2024.</p> <p>15.3 DB also highlighted the success of the Connecting the South East event on 19 September. A keynote speech was delivered by Minister Richard Holden.</p> <p>15.4 The TfSE Podcast has been launched in September with the first hearing from Councillor Glazier and Rupert on TfSE as an organisation, the second was launched in October focusing on EV and its challenges. The November podcast is being recorded and will look at the world of transport from a female perspective.</p> <p>15.5 DB outlined the MP engagement taking place across the South East.</p> <p>15.6 RH noted the useful MP engagement that is taking place however it would be useful to be made aware of any upcoming conversations.</p> <p>15.7 The recommendation was agreed by the Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION:</i> 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>	
<p>16. AOB</p>	
<p>16.1 KG thanked Lucy Dixon-Thompson who recently left the team for her work over the last few years.</p> <p>16.2 JD raised the circular 01/22 that was published in December and the greater emphasis on SRN and local roads placing greater alliance on local transport authorities. Asked the Board if we would consider writing to the DfT to seek out a greater share in order for us to plan effectively for greater mitigation.</p> <p>16.3 In response to the above Peter Duggan (PD) offered to facilitate a session with relevant officers and National Highways.</p> <p>16.4 Mark Breathwick (MB) noted the session would be welcomed.</p> <p>16.5 JD also raised the proposed rail timetable changes for the west Coastway.</p> <p>16.6 RC asked if JD could share the consultation or proposal for the proposed changes to the rail timetable for west Coastway with officers to review.</p>	

19. Date of Next Meeting	
19.1 The date for the next Partnership Board meeting will be Monday 29 January 2024 – 13:00-16:00, held virtually.	

DRAFT