

**TfSE Partnership Board
26 September 2022
Minutes**

Partnership Board Members		
Cllr Keith Glazier (Chair) Leader East Sussex County Council	Cllr Tony Page Deputy Leader Reading Borough Council (representing Berkshire Local Transport Body)	Ian Phillips Deputy Chair South Downs National Park Authority (Representative from Protected Landscapes)
Cllr David Monk Leader Folkestone & Hythe District Council (jointly representing District and Borough Councils)	Heather Preen, Head of Local Communities and Partnerships Transport for London	Cllr Elaine Hills Brighton & Hove City Council
Cllr Joy Dennis Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport West Sussex County Council	Cllr Dan Watkins Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport Kent County Council	Geoff French CBE Chair Transport Forum
Richard Leonard Head of Network Development, Strategy & Planning National Highways		

Apologies:

- John Halsall, Route Managing Director for South East, Network Rail
- Cllr Matt Furniss, Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure, Surrey County Council
- Cllr Amy Heley, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee, Brighton & Hove City Council
- Cllr Eamonn Keogh, Cabinet Member for Transport and District Regeneration, Southampton City Council
- Vince Lucas, South East LEP (jointly representing LEPs)

Guests:

Steven Bishop, Director, Steer
Kate Fairhall, Project Manager, Arup
Andrew Steele, Graduate Associate, Arup

Officers attending Virtually:

Rupert Clubb, Transport for the South East
Rachel Ford, Transport for the South East
Sarah Valentine, Transport for the South East
Emily Bailey, Transport for the South East
Hollie Farley, Transport for the South East
Mark Valleley, Transport for the South East
Lucy Dixon-Thompson, Transport for the South East

Matt Davey, West Sussex County Council
Nikki Nelson-Smith, Highways England
Joseph Ratcliffe, Kent County Council

James Hammond, Folkestone & Hythe District Council
 Pete Boustred, Southampton City Council
 Simon Duke, Surrey County Council
 Lyndon Mendes, Surrey County Council
 Felicity Tidbury, Portsmouth City Council
 Richard Kenny, Hampshire County Council
 James Hammond, Folkestone & Hythe District Council
 Andy Rhind, DfT
 Colin Rowland, Isle of Wight Council
 Anthony Middleton, C2C LEP
 Mark Prior, Brighton and Hove City Council
 Stuart Kistruck, Network Rail
 Ernest Amoako, Woking Borough 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 Cllr Elaine Hills who replaces Cllr Amy Heley as our Brighton and Hove Council representative.</p> <p>1.3 Cllr Glazier also welcomed Andy Rhind, who is attending today on behalf of the DfT.</p> <p>1.4 Cllr Glazier further introduced Stephen Bishop (SB), who will be presenting later on Decarbonisation and Kate Fairhall, who will be presenting on Local Capability outcomes.</p> <p>1.5 Cllr Glazier also offered apologies from the following Board members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ John Halsall, Route Managing Director for South East, Network Rail ○ Cllr Matt Furniss, Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure, Surrey County Council ○ Cllr Eamonn Keogh, Cabinet Member for Transport and District Regeneration, Southampton City Council ○ Cllr Phil Jordan, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport ○ Daniel Ruiz, Enterprise M3 LEP, jointly representing LEPs 	
2. Minutes from last meeting	
<p>2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.</p>	
3. Declarations of interest	
<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>	

4. Statements from the public	
<p>4.1 Cllr Glazier confirmed that no statements from the public have been submitted ahead of today's meeting.</p>	
5. Lead Officer's Report	
<p>5.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) took introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>5.2 RC informed the Board of the collaborative work that has been ongoing with the seven STBs across England. RC noted that the Lead Officers from each STB have been meeting regularly to ensure consistency across the board and used the example of the recent Great British Rail Transition Team (GBRTT) consultation response, which allowed for a consensus on a strategic approach and delivery.</p> <p>5.3 RC updated the Board on the progress of the technical programme to date, namely the joint collaborative work with England's Economic Heartland (EEH) and Transport East (TE) on both Bus Back Better and Decarbonisation. RC also noted the joint work with all seven STBs on a decarbonisation study.</p> <p>5.4 RC reminded the Board of the recent events that has been undertaken, highlighting the success of the 5 July event in Guildford which formally launched the Strategic Investment Plan (SIP), for which Baroness Vere was the keynote speaker.</p> <p>5.5 RC welcomed Sarah Valentine in her new appointment of Head of Analysis and Appraisal, and thanked Tiffany Lynch for her support in TfSE's technical programme, noting her departure.</p> <p>5.6 The members of the Partnership Board noted the activities of transport for the South East between July-September 2022.</p>	
6. SIP Consultation Progress Update	
<p>6.1 Lucy Dixon Thompson (LDT) presented this item and guided the Board through the paper. LDT noted at the time of the paper dispatch, the consultation was still live, and has subsequently closed. However, while the analysis is ongoing, will only be able to provide a high-level update on the emerging themes, and that a full report will be issued in advance of the November Board.</p> <p>6.2 LDT reminded the Board that the consultation was public, for residents, stakeholders and organisations alike, that ran for a 12-week period on a standalone platform, Engagement HQ.</p> <p>6.3 LDT informed the Board that the site received 429 engaged visitors who completed the survey or asked a question via the platform, just under 3000 active participants, who visited more than one page, and nearly</p>	

6000 unique visitors to the site. There were 131 responses that came in via a petition response, launched by Transport Action Network (TAN). In addition, 99 further consultation responses were received via email, which predominantly came from MPs, local authorities and organisations.

6.4 LDT thanked colleagues for their assistance in promoting the consultation, which proved to be fruitful as most traffic for the consultation came via the TfSE website, social media and local press coverage.

6.5 In addition to the digital consultation, TfSE held a number of events in parallel to the consultation, to encourage people to respond. This included the 5 July SIP launch event in Guildford, which had 166 attendees. There were also 2 virtual webinars, which largely welcomed town, parish, district and borough colleagues. There have also been several meetings with individual local authorities and other stakeholders who requested further information, and finally the event at Portcullis House, to present the SIP to MPs.

6.6 LDT noted that analysis thus far has ascertained that 80% of responses were from members of the public and 20% have come in via organisations, businesses, or political authorities. The demographic data also shows a split of 65% male and 25% female. When compared with similar consultations, these results are considered to be better than industry standards, and have been driven by a targeted media campaign to capture female responses. LDT noted that while the 16-24 demographic is not as high as we would have hoped, it was with the result of the consultation being run over the summer period.

6.7 LDT informed the Board that from the results of responses, most people rated decarbonisation and the environment as the highest priority for the SIP to deliver, but that overall, the global priorities were well balanced.

6.8 Overall, the consultation demonstrated that the majority of respondents felt that the SIP makes the best possible case for investment for transport infrastructure in the south east, with 46% agreeing, 32% disagreeing and 22% neither agreeing or disagreeing.

6.9 LDT informed the Board of key themes emerging from the free text questions as part of the qualitative analysis, noting that they will require further analysis. At present, the top comment is on requests for further investment and improvements to public transport, and prioritising active travel. These will be presented in more detail at the November Board.

6.10 LDT noted that while there were a number of free text responses regarding environmental impacts, the majority of responses do not provide comment on the integrated sustainability appraisal (ISA).

6.11 LDT reminded the Board that the offer of support for local authorities to take the SIP through their democratic processes still remains.

<p>6.12 LDT further reminded that the final SIP will be taken to the Board in March, following the opportunity for all local authorities to take the SIP through their own democratic processes.</p> <p>6.13 In response to Cllr Elaine Hill's (EH) query regarding approach to young people's involvement in future consultations, LDT informed the Board that TfSE would be looking at a refreshed communication approach and welcomes any feedback via email. LDT noted that for the SIP consultation, we targeted youth responses (16-24) via our connection with youth cabinets and universities. There were also targeted communications via Facebook.</p> <p>6.14 The recommendations were noted by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Note the approach taken to the public consultation on the SIP and; (2) Note the high level emerging outcomes from the consultation process. 	
7. Local Capability	
<p>7.1 Emily Bailey (EB) reminded the Board of the successful receipt of grant funding from the DfT in March 2022, after TfSE were invited to bid on 4 additional workstreams in October 2021. This funding was awarded to identify capability gaps across the region, and allocate funding to those local authorities that were able to put forward solutions that are able to be feasibly delivered by March 2023.</p> <p>7.2 EB noted that the intention of this item will be to inform the Board of recent 1:1s with local authorities, which have subsequently led to proposed allocations of funding.</p> <p>7.3 EB introduced Kate Fairhall (KF) and Andrew Steele (AS) from Arup, who guided the Board through the two options of funding. It was noted that in both proposals, BHCC and Wokingham would be receiving 100% of their funding request. Conversations with Solent Transport will determine the funding allocation for both Kent and Hampshire but pleased to note that both local authorities will be receiving funding irrespective of outcome.</p> <p>7.4 Should Solent Transport not be funded within this workstream, it was agreed that delegation would be offered to Lead Officer, in consultation with the Chair to adopt Option 2. Alternative ways to support Solent Transport's proposal would be considered in this instance.</p> <p>7.5 It was agreed that those proposals that have not been funded in this round will be offered feedback.</p> <p>7.6 The recommendations were all agreed by the Partnership Board members.</p>	

<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <p>(1) The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to: Note the outcome of the progress of the Local Capability workstream; and</p> <p>(2) Agree the funding allocation as set out in Option 1.</p> <p>(3) Agree to delegate authority to Lead Officer to undertake discussions with Solent Transport about their proposal and, in the event that the proposal cannot proceed as planned, delegate authority to the Lead Officer to implement Option 2.</p> <p>(4) Note the pipeline of proposals to be explored in more detail as part of the Centre of Excellence or in a future funding round.</p>	
<p>8. Centre of Excellence</p>	
<p>8.1 RC highlighted to the Board, that due to recent communications with the DfT on Centre of Excellence, the proposed recommendations have been updated.</p> <p>8.2 RC reminded the Board that a Centre of Excellence was included as part of our business plan, for which the Department offered provisional funding to, subject to the completion of a more detailed business case.</p> <p>8.3 Our business case was submitted to DfT on 9 September, and we have since been asked by the DfT to pause our proposal, while they consider how this could be rolled out more widely across all 7 STBs.</p> <p>8.4 While these discussions are ongoing, RC asked the Board to agree the recommendation that TfSE will be making the case to the DfT to draw down on some of the allocated funding, to support some background research in advance of the next financial year. We would like to release funding for the continuation of understanding what demand is, by working with local authorities and effectively co-designing a Centre of Excellence. This is notwithstanding the DfT's position in relation to the other six sub national transport bodies (STBs).</p> <p>8.5 RC introduced Andy Rhind (AR) from DfT, informed the Board that they are keen to present TfSE's proposal to new ministers on the role that STBs could play in delivering capability uplift via Centres of Excellence. This consideration will look at how the STBs work individually with their local authorities, as well as on a joint STB basis, to provide specialist support.</p> <p>8.6 Ian Phillips (IP) from South Downs National Park Association (SDNPA) supported the creation of this platform, and asked for it to include expert advice on protected landscapes as part of skills development.</p> <p>8.7 The recommendations were agreed by all Partnership Board members.</p>	

<p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <p>(1) Note the proposed approach to the Centre of Excellence, subject to ongoing discussions with the DfT; and</p> <p>(2) Agree that a case should be put to DfT to draw down funding to deliver phase 1a of the centre of excellence work in this financial year, with the remainder of the work programme to be delivered in 2023/24; and</p> <p>(3) Agree to delegate responsibility for the procurement of phase 1a to the Lead Officer.</p>	
<p>9. Decarbonisation</p>	
<p>9.1 Mark Valleley (MV) introduced this item and guided the Board through the paper.</p> <p>9.2 MV noted that this item seeks approval from the Board on the decarbonisation pathways report contained in Appendix 1 to the paper. The work was commissioned following the publication of the Government's Transport Decarbonisation Plan and in response to the governments mandatory target of achieving net zero by 2050, to identify the trajectory to net zero specifically for the TfSE area, and what the potential pathways to net zero would look like.</p> <p>9.3 MV introduced Steven Bishop (SB) from Steer, who presented on the detail contained within the report. SB noted that this presentation looks specifically at the emissions related to domestic and surface transport activity and does not consider embedded capital carbon, or international travel at this stage.</p> <p>9.4 SB presented the target-based trajectories , which have been developed by central government or other national organisations.</p> <p>9.5 A query was raised by Cllr Elaine Hills (EH), regarding livable cities and how they are being considered. SB confirmed that as part of TfSE's consideration to urban demand management, different interventions from car free city centres, area-based charges and low traffic neighbourhoods have been looked into and it is clear that it will require a combination of all these interventions to achieve maximum impact.</p> <p>9.6 Ian Phillips (IP) raised a query on the rationale behind the exclusion of a 2030 trajectory. SB noted that it was TfSE's professional view that looking at a regional level, a 2030 trajectory was not attainable given the scale of the challenge, but could be considered at a local authority level.</p> <p>9.7 A further query was raised with regard to rural improvements and their impact on decarbonisation. SB noted that the analysis did consider sustainable travel improvements within rural areas, as well as improved digital connectivity, but an isolated impact assessment has not been carried</p>	

<p>out to date. It is important to note that interventions were not only applied at an urban level, but on a regional approach.</p> <p>9.8 A final query was raised by IP regarding carbon capture potential, such as renaturing initiatives, when it comes to decarbonisation. SB noted that it is our view that for surface transport, the ambition is to aim for zero carbon as opposed to net zero, but to do so via renaturing would require huge areas of land to be able to offset these emissions, so can only be part of the solution.</p> <p>9.9 Andy Rhind (AR) answered a query from Cllr Tony Page (TP) regarding government guidance on decarbonisation. It was noted that embedded carbon will be a consideration and authorities will be encouraged to try and quantify the embedded carbon impacts of infrastructure on their local transport plans</p> <p>9.10 TP raised a query on the use of national demand management scheme as a mechanism for replacing the revenue from fuel duty that will be lost as we shift to electric vehicles. SB highlighted that there is certainly an opportunity to be provided by the national system to help fund investment in transport infrastructure including that identified in the SIP.</p> <p>9.11 MV further noted the progress on the collaborative decarbonisation work being done with England's Economic Heartland (EEH) and Transport East (TE) to identify the potential carbon reductions that can be achieved from local transport measures set out in local transport plans (LTPs). MV highlighted that the forthcoming guidance on Local Transport Plans will include specific guidance on quantifying the carbon emission reductions that will result from the measure included in Local Transport Plans. A further update on the progress of the joint decarbonisation work will be provided at the November Board.</p> <p>9.12 The recommendations were approved by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Approve the Transport Decarbonisation Pathways Report included in Appendix 1. 2) Note the progress with the development of a decarbonisation assessment tool that is being produced jointly with a number of other STBs. 	
<p>10. Technical Programme Update</p>	
<p>10.1 Mark Valleley introduced this item and guided the Board through the paper.</p> <p>10.2 MV informed the Board of the four additional workstreams that are supporting DfT's priorities:</p> <p><u>Bus Back Better</u></p>	

<p>MV outlined the procurement process and the award of contract to Mott MacDonald who are being supported by Arup, to identify and deliver the additional help that local authorities need to implement their Bus Service improvement Plans and Enhanced Partnerships. .</p> <p><u>EV charging infrastructure strategy</u> MV informed the Board the recent EV tender has been awarded to Arcadis, and TfSE will have been working alongside local authorities, to understand what charging infrastructure is required throughout the TfSE geography at the local level.</p> <p><u>Future Mobility</u> MV informed the Board that WSP are supporting TfSE on the implementation of the future mobility strategy, with recruitment being undertaken by TfSE internally to manage this work in the longer term. MV also updated the Board on the recent Future Mobility forum.</p> <p><u>Freight and Logistics</u> MV informed the Board that it is TfSE's aim to reinvigorate the Freight forum, which will commence in early 2023. MV further noted that TfSE have also been participating in a study with a number of other STBs to understand the need across the highway network for alternative fuelling stations for freight vehicles.</p> <p>10.3 The recommendations were noted by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the progress with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Ongoing work to assist local transport authorities with the implementation of their bus service improvement plans (BSIP) and enhanced Partnerships (EP); (2) Developing an electric vehicle charging infrastructure strategy for the TfSE Area; (3) Delivering TfSE's future mobility strategy; and (4) Delivering TfSE's freight logistics and gateways strategy. 	
<p>11. MRN Update</p>	
<p>11.1 Sarah Valentine (SV) introduced this item and guided the Board through the paper.</p> <p>11.2 SV updated the Board on the progress since the June meeting, and noted that two of the schemes have been given their final funding approval from DfT. The monies have been welcomed and received by our local authorities and can begin construction.</p> <p>11.3 SV reminded the Board that earlier this year, the DfT asked all STBs to review the schemes within the major road network (MRN) and large local major (LLM) programmes. To date, there has been no formal announcement from the DfT on the status of these schemes. SV noted that schemes that</p>	

<p>have been recommended for removal, are advised to consider this unless advised otherwise.</p> <p>11.4 SV noted that at senior officer group last week, some concerns were raised with regard to timescales. SV encouraged authorities to engage with DfT with any concerns, to obtain information that is required. SV offered that TfSE can assist with DfT discussions if that is helpful.</p> <p>11.5 Cllr Elaine Hills queried a Brighton and Hove specific MRN scheme and SV noted that she will raise this with DfT as an outstanding scheme.</p> <p>11.6 The recommendations were noted by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <p>The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Note that two schemes have been given final funding approval by DfT; 2) Note that the DfT's MRN Programme review is ongoing and no announcement on the outcome has yet been made 	
12. Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Update	
<p>12.1 Hollie Farley (HF) introduced this item and guided the Board through the paper.</p> <p>12.2 HF noted that a lot of recent engagement has been surrounding the SIP consultation. On the 20 June, which was the consultation launch date, we launched a communications campaign both on and off line.</p> <p>12.3 HF noted as part of the initial launch, TfSE issued a press release to local print and TV news outlets operating across the region. The story was picked up and promoted in a range of coverage and has been largely positive with more than 30 articles directing people to the consultation.</p> <p>12.4 The consultation itself generated seven media enquiries which ranged from local radio stations, newspapers, regional television and radio broadcasts. All interviews for said enquiries were held with either Rupert Clubb and/or Cllr Glazier and were well received.</p> <p>12.5 A bespoke newsletter was issued at the time of launch and was issued to over 2000 subscribers. The newsletter had a click-through rate of 13.4% and click to open rate of 38.6%, which measures the effectiveness of your email content, which demonstrates the reach it had.</p> <p>12.6 HF provided the Board with a detailed presentation on results from each social media platform, with Twitter being the most successful. It achieved more than 40,000 impressions over the duration of the consultation period, which is a success by industry standards.</p>	

12.7 The campaign was also ran on Facebook, with a combination of organic and paid posts. The organic posts on consultation was delivered to the feeds of over 10,000 people and achieved an engagement rate of 2.3%.

12.8 LinkedIn served the consultation to 6897 unique people with an engagement rate of 2.9%.

12.9 Throughout the consultation, responses were monitored to ensure all audiences were being reached. Noting that the younger demographic needed specific targeting, we ran a Facebook Messenger paid advert, which also went out on Instagram.

12.10 Midway through the consultation, it was noted that we had received a consistently lower response rate from women, and so to boost engagement to this group, we ran an advert targeting women linked to an article on gender bias in transport. The advert performed well, resulting in over 1200 link clicks.

12.11 HF reiterated the appreciation to local authorities for their support in sharing the consultation across their own channels and within their own networks, as the results clearly demonstrate the boost in engagement.

12.12 HF noted the events that have taken place in support of the SIP consultation, namely the MP event at Portcullis house that was unfortunately affected by the rail strikes. We were able to meet with five MPs, plus some aides, and supported by two Board members.

12.13 HF echoed the success of the 5 July launch event, which benefitted from a range of speakers and panelists including industry experts and government officials working within the transport sector. The feedback from that event was extremely positive.

12.14 HF informed the Board that the two virtual sessions hosted 77 attendees on 11 July, and 48 on 12 July. The presentations were well received and generated meaningful discussions. These have been published on our YouTube channel.

12.15 HF noted additional stakeholder engagement that is ongoing with our additional workstreams, via forums and workshops for our work on Bus Back Better, electric vehicle charging infrastructure and freight, logistics and gateway strategy.

12.16 HF noted that we will be hosting a meeting with the university working group on 4 October, and Board members are encouraged to attend.

12.17 HF informed the Board of the private sector meeting that took place on Friday 23 September, and noted that our private sector partners continue to be supportive of the work of TfSE.

12.18 HF noted that RC recently spoke at CECA Transport group event, and additionally noted that Sarah Valentine joined a panel on exploring the work and transport strategies of STBs at the NCE future of roads conference. SV

<p>also joined a panel on levelling up at the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transport's monthly webinar.</p> <p>12.19 At the start of November, we will be attending the National Highways event, where we will be having a number of panel discussions, which are to be confirmed at present.</p> <p>The recommendations were noted by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the activities of Transport for the South East between March-June 2022</p>	
<p>13. Financial Update</p>	
<p>13.1 Rachel Ford (RF) introduced this item and provided the Board with an update on budgets as of 1 September.</p> <p>13.2 RF informed the Board of the budget update to the end of August against the current forecast as set out in Appendix 1. RF noted that the main spend to date is on the technical program and on salaries, with a total spend to date of just under £1 million.</p> <p>13.3 RF explained that we are forecasting a slight underspend by the end of the financial year, which is reflected in the increase of reserves and would be carried forward for use next year.</p> <p>13.4 RF informed the Board of the recent discussions with the DfT. The letter from the DfT earlier this year confirmed the release of £1.175 million of our grant funding, and it highlighted that a further £250,000 for Centre of Excellence and £300,000 for the Analytical Framework would be released later on, pending approval.</p> <p>13.5 Following discussions with the DfT, we have developed plans for those workstreams and shared with DfT to ensure that there was no duplication. The work on both of these workstreams are advanced, and we are going to continue to work with the DfT to ensure they align with their work programme. As a result, we have asked the DfT to be able to draw down a small amount of funding from this budget allocation, for background research pieces against both the Centre of Excellence and the analytical framework. Subsequently, we would look to scale up both pieces of these works in the next financial year, with updated budget papers for the November Board meeting.</p> <p>13.6 RF informed the Board of the recent recruitment activity that TfSE have undertaken earlier this year, with the successful appointment of Sarah Valentine to Head of Analysis and Appraisal. RF noted that other positions have not been successful, and as a result we are currently undertaking an additional round of recruitment, with an agency supporting us. It is the intention that we will be able to inform the Board of appointments at the next meeting.</p>	

<p>13.7 We are also bringing in some temporary resource to help support the delivery of the technical programme, and RF welcomed Alan Jones (AJ) who joins the team today. AJ will focus predominantly on TfSE's future mobility, and freight strategies.</p> <p>13.8 The recommendations were noted by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Note the current financial position for 2022/23 to the end of August 2022; (2) Note the update on grant funding from the Department for Transport; and (3) Note the progress on the recruitment of additional staffing resource. 	
<p>14. Governance Update</p>	
<p>14.1 Cllr Tony Page (TP) introduced this item and guided the Board through the paper.</p> <p>14.2 TP noted that the group met on 9 September to discuss the key elements of the revised constitution.</p> <p>14.3 TP highlighted that the constitution retains the recognition of the ambition for statutory status. It also recognises that if the government do grant TfSE statutory status, it would still require the formal consent of our constituent authorities.</p> <p>14.4 TP additionally noted that the internal audit and governance committee will be established post publication of the SIP and this has been included formally within the constitution.</p> <p>14.5 It was noted that guidance from the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act defines local authorities as the ultimate decision makers, but in order to enhance the decision-making process, TfSE wished to coopt the local enterprise partnerships and protected landscapes due to the importance they offer to our work. As a result, it was determined appropriate they were given a vote. RF noted that within paragraph 9.2 of the constitution, the coopted voting members rights process is outlined. RC further noted that the intent is defined within the Act, and the constitution follows this.</p> <p>14.6 It was noted that an addendum be provided as part of the constitution, to provide more information on coopted members RC noted the legislation for STBs means that they must give regard to the social and environmental impacts in connection with the implementation of a transport strategy.</p> <p>14.7 Cllr Elaine Hills was welcomed to the governance group by the Board.</p>	

<p>14.8 The recommendations were noted and agreed by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Note the discussions at the recent meeting of the Governance sub-group; (2) Agree the proposed amendments to the constitution; and (3) Note the support from the accountable body's legal team. 	
<p>15. Transport Forum</p>	
<p>15.1 Geoff French (GF) informed the Board of the recent discussions with Forum, which was held on 6 September. The main item for this agenda was on the Disabled Passenger, as per forum member requests.</p> <p>15.2 GF noted the success of Brighton and Hove Buses in its approach to disabled passengers by giving due consideration to all impairments, to make transport as inclusive as possible.</p> <p>15.3 GF noted that the Forum suggested the need for disabled representation as part of its membership, to ensure TfSE are inclusive. RC noted that as scheme developments come forward, promoters will certainly be considering this representation to ensure accessibility is included as part of the equality impact assessments.</p> <p>15.4 RC noted the success of the Transport Forum, which allows those with genuine interests in TfSE a mechanism into the work that is being undertaken. The value in receiving feedback from those that attend the Forum gives TfSE a sense of pressures and challenges that our wide range of stakeholders are dealing with.</p> <p>15.5 RC further noted that TfSE works closely with Catherine Folca of Transport Focus to ensure that disabled representation and consideration is included as part of the Forum.</p> <p>15.6 The recommendations were noted by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Note the recent meeting of the Transport Forum; and (2) Note and consider the comments from the Forum. 	
<p>16. Responses to Consultations</p>	
<p>16.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) introduced this item and guided the Board through the paper. RC noted that there are five consultation responses within this period.</p>	

16.2 RC explained that the TfL consultation on the proposal for an ultra low emission zone (ULEZ) is broadly supported, with the caveat on impacts on the surrounding area, ie a new regime in the greater London area may have implications for our constituent authorities.

16.3 RC noted that the consultation on the primary legislative changes to reform railways is supported, provided that legislation follows the requirements of the Transport Act.

16.4 RC noted that the Gatwick Airport consultation has a few issues that remain and need bottoming out, and that further information is required before TfSE and its constituent authorities can form a view.

16.5 RC detailed that the consultation on updates to the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is about strengthening the environmental policies, dealing with issues such as lorry parking and freight. In summary, it is how National Highways will fulfill its role as a delivery partner.

16.6 RC informed the Board that the consultation response to the Great British Rail Transition Team (GBRTT) was a call for evidence to help them understand what realistic amount of freight can be transferred to rail.

16.7 Ian Phillips (IP) raised a query regarding the ULEZ consultation response as to whether or not there is feasibility for a pay as you go mobility. RC noted that there is work being undertaken in government, considering road user charging. RC further noted that future schemes need to continue to be complementary to local measures.

16.8 Andy Rhind (AR), DfT, reiterated that ministers are giving due consideration to replacing the current taxation arrangements, noting that it is for Treasury to lead on. AR assured that any successful national scheme will need to work in alignment with local tools that exist at that time.

16.9 The recommendations were **agreed** by all Partnership Board members.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- (1) Transport for London – Consultation on proposals to extend the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ);
- (2) Department for Transport – Consultation on primary legislative changes to reform our railways;
- (3) Gatwick Airport - Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project: Summer 2022 Consultation;
- (4) Department for Transport - Consultation to update the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and the delivery of sustainable development (circular 02/2013); and
- (5) Great British Railways Transition Team - Rail Freight Growth Target Call for Evidence

17. AOB	
17.1 No other business was raised.	
18. Date of Next Meeting	
18.1 It was noted that the date for the next Partnership Board meeting will be the 14 th November 2022, 13:00-16:00.	

DRAFT