

TRANSPORT FOR TEES VALLEY

**Castlegate Quay, Moat Street, Stockton on Tees at
2.00pm on Tuesday, 26th January 2010**

ATTENDEES

Councillor Charles Rooney	Middlesbrough BC	In the Chair
Councillor David Lyonette	Darlington BC	
Councillor David Budd	Middlesbrough BC	
David Marshall	Association of North East Councils	
Paul Campbell	Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council	
John Anderson	Darlington BC	
Robin Knight	Stagecoach North East	
Nigel Cay	Network Rail	
Richard McGuckin	Stockton BC	
Neal McCay	Durham County Council	
David Robinson	PD Ports	
Tom Bryant	North Yorkshire County Council	
Brian Glover	Middlesbrough BC	
Kyle Maylard	Highways Agency	
Andrew Johnson	Government Office North East	
Alastair Smith	Hartlepool BC	
Ross Smith	NECC	
Jonathan Spruce	Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit	
Simon Dove	One NorthEast	
Nigel Hart	Stockton BC	
Steve Pickard	JMP	
Martin Revill	JMP	
Mark Reynolds	GENECON	

APOLOGIES

Councillor Peter Jackson	Hartlepool BC
Councillor Bob Cook	Stockton on Tees BC
Richard Whitehouse	Durham Tees Valley Airport
Adrian Leigh	Department of Transport
Martyne Pellew	PD Ports
Adrian White	Durham County Council
Penny Marshall	Government Office North East

1 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None.

2 NOTES OF THE MEETING ON 21st JULY 2009

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st July 2009 were agreed as a true record.

3 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None.

4 MATTERS ARISING

Tees Valley Bus Network Improvements

The Board was advised that the scheme had been presented to the Department for Transport (DfT) on the 19th January 2010. The DfT had recommended it for full approval but had asked for it to be re-profiled due to budget constraints. The TVJSU and officers from partner authorities had since worked on its re-submission and an updated scheme had been despatched to the DfT earlier today.

The support of local M.P's was invited, and a request for support had also been put to the Regional Minister.

Tees Valley Metro

The Board was advised that approval of the 1st phase of the scheme had been included within the £30M RFA allocation and that the first tranche of improvements to the station network at Hartlepool, Thornaby etc was due to commence shortly, with an estimated Autumn completion.

5 ISSUES ARISING FROM THE BUSINESS CASE WORKSHOPS

Feedback was submitted from the Business Case Workshops held in October/November 2009, which had been well attended and raised the following critical issues that needed to be resolved in developing the business case further:

- a) The format and purpose of the strategy;
- b) The balance of the strategy between improving economic performance and tackling deprivation;
- c) The balance between the low carbon economy and

other key sectors;

- d) The need for an enhanced comprehensive start up/business development/incubation programme;
- e) Is there a need for a new approach to regeneration in the light of the credit crunch?;
- f) How do we resource housing and regeneration development in the future?;
- g) Changing the attitudes of the Tees Valley public towards public transport;
- h) How do we brand the Tees Valley?
- i) How do we better integrate arts/culture/tourism projects into regeneration?;
- j) How do we best influence national agencies in the provision of skills needs and demands in the Tees Valley?

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

6 FORMAT OF THE BUSINESS CASE

Further to the feedback arising from the Business Case Workshops, consideration was given to the following issues regarding the format of the Business Case:

- What does the strategy look like?
- There is general support for a Total Place approach to housing and regeneration – how do we take this concept forward?
- There is a need to prioritise our interventions thematically and in terms of geographical priorities for economic development, housing development and regeneration – how do we take this forward and build into the single conversation discussions?

It was noted that it was important for the City Region to spell out exactly what the Business Case is for, and that it truly reflect the existing TVU public-private partnership with more constructive use of the private sector. Therefore the document should be clear and concise in order to secure engagement.

Private sector board members had previously referred to the need for the City Region to be able to send a strong message that it was 'open for business' in the early part of an economic recovery and that there should be a reduction in the multiple strategies that exist in favour of a single message. It was also

necessary to make clear how the Business Case was relevant to the deprived communities across the Tees Valley and therefore an articulated single strategy that had links to the different communities and their priorities was preferred.

It was important also that the document was flexible and adaptable to the likely continuing changing circumstances post General Election with significant cuts in public spending expected. However, it also needed to positively emphasise the unique opportunities in the City Region and the strong partnerships in place, accompanied by a clear indication set out of the fact that we are aiming to deliver a thriving place with a more resilient and more diverse economy, as part of a managed transition.

Taking on board the above messages, it was proposed to adopt a different format for the document in favour of one over-arching, high level document, fed by a number of key assessments, and supported by a series of delivery plans. An illustrated diagram of the suggested format and linkages to other documents, was submitted, together with a proposed skeleton of the actual final document, which would extend to around 20-30 pages including extensive use of graphics and photographs.

It was hoped that in responding above to the key messages arising from the Business Case events, the following benefits could be realised:

- It would provide a high level document setting out what TVU's role is, and how it intends to use its resources, in a way that can be readily understood by TVU partners, central Government, the private sector and the general public;
- The strategic nature of the main document would allow an agreed, clear message to be articulated to a new Government whilst individual delivery plans are developed at their own appropriate pace;
- It would be an inclusive suite of documents that shows how many of the issues discussed at the Business Case events contribute to the Tees Valley as the place to which we all aspire;
- It would allow appropriate ownership of the different elements, reducing the possible strain on resources and increasing "buy in" from all sectors to the document;
- It would form the basis of the Tees Valley component of the Integrated Regional Strategy (or its successor document);

- It would be clear about the role of all partners in delivery, and what specific help may be needed from Government; and
- It would provide something that is balanced towards action rather than strategic thinking, which should appeal to any new Government.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

7 DELIVERING A SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT SYSTEM

Representatives from JMP and GENECON presented the results of their inception report as the first output of the study commissioned into connectivity and accessibility for the Tees Valley City Region.

As part of a delegation that meet with officials from the DfT yesterday, the representatives were able to report back on key messages obtained from the visit which were likely to influence the delivery; namely:-

- There was a need to extract the best value elements from the stage 1 programme, should the stage 2 programme be not delivered;
- There was a need to make the study outputs compelling so as to provide sufficient justification for taking stage 2 forward;
- It was unlikely that the DoT would press on with all studies, regardless of their outcomes.

It was noted that there was a need to prioritise our preferred options and it was suggested that the following 3 key challenges should be focused on:-

- i) deliver quantified reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;
- ii) improve connectivity and access to labour markets in key business centres;
- iii) improve journey experience of transport users of urban, regional and local networks, including at the interface with national networks.

Stakeholder consultation had also suggested that the benefits for all of the Tees Valley, including the most deprived areas, should be included, along with the aim to improve the quality and perception of public transport in the Tees Valley.

The Board's feedback was invited as follows to the following

critical questions arising from these challenges:-

1. Are the 3 challenges correct?

Reference was made to the need to look at the private sector transport contribution to improving the journey experience of transport users.

2. Are the challenges equally important?

It was suggested that a scoring mechanism may be necessary as the first challenge was covered by statute. Past experiences learnt regarding the difficulties of securing public transport connections to out of town retail centres should also be considered; as should the importance of land use allocation towards challenges 1 and 3. It was also suggested that there needed to be innovative thought given as to how best to utilise the existing transport network that we have.

3. What do we need to do to satisfy the high level objectives? What balance should there be between economic performance and tackling deprivation? And between economic performance and reducing carbon emissions?

It was noted that deprivation still remained a key Government priority, as fundamental as the aim to reduce carbon emissions. Whilst the business case would be made for the prosperity of the Tees Valley, the success would be felt much wider, making challenge 2 arguably more key than reducing carbon emissions. The importance of having the necessary infrastructure - road, rail, port and other transport networks - to facilitate inward investment was stressed, along with the importance of having available land and people with the necessary skills and transport means to be able to get to their place of work.

It was suggested that it would be beneficial to include an actual target to be aimed for in carbon reductions, and that the challenges include the need to have an economically sustainable strategy as the best transport systems were proven to be those that were profitable and consistently invested in. A strong, profitable daytime public transport system, was likely to see reinvestment/subsidy given to less well used evening routes.

4. What implications result for transport and spatial planning approaches from such a prioritisation?

It was noted that some local authorities already had 20 regeneration year plans in place, and it was essential that these matched the overall strategy. It was questioned whether land allocations would be based on large transport schemes in plans, and it was noted that planning considerations would

need to be considered alongside engineering and transport solutions. It was also necessary to consider the economic development activities that were critical to the Tees Valley and to have transport solutions that supported them.

5. Where are the principal labour markets located; where is economy likely to grow, and reduce? What balance should be struck between low carbon economy and other sectors? What transport policy implications result from this?

It was considered that the spatial priorities remained the 5 urban centres, the port, airport, logistics, advanced engineering, and hotspots such as Great Eston area, North South Tees.

6. What are the principal interfaces with national networks and international networks? Is there any priority? What transport policy implications result from such prioritisation? What evidence is there?

Key interfaces were regarded as Teesport, along with the Eaglescliffe, Hartlepool and Darlington rail links to the national network, and the major A1 and A19 road links, and east to west routes. The brief of the study was 'to connect the North East with the rest of the UK'.

7. Can the transport infrastructure improvements and policy responses needed to respond to these challenges be delivered? Are the resulting policy responses related to transport at all, or only partially? Is it better to reconsider spatial and regional strategies than fit transport strategies to existing plans?

JMP would address the challenges identified however it was considered that there would be a need to consider policy responses that met all of the Tees Valley priorities, and not just those confined to transport. It was considered important to retain proven strategies, but to be open to the opportunities provided by major developers and manufacturers wanting to return to areas of development. In recognition that some of the large ambitious projects may not be capable of being delivered, there was a need for a quantity of short term smaller projects to be worked up that would contribute to the overall aims of the strategy. This would require the invention of solutions to particular problems, and unlocking opportunities, rather than simply funding areas with the biggest problems.

In conclusion, JMP advised that they would take away the useful feedback provided and complete the stage 1 process of identifying initial options for completion by the end of March; and thereafter take forward stage 2 at some point beyond May 2010. A draft stage 1 report would therefore be submitted to

the April meeting of this Board, and in the meantime, one to one and steering group discussions would continue to be facilitated by JMP, and they themselves would continue to attend the next few meetings of this Board.

RESOLVED that:-

1. The information be noted.
2. JMP be requested to complete the stage 1 process of identifying initial options for completion by the end of March and submit a draft stage 1 report to the April meeting of this Board.

8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

9 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING(S)

Tuesday, 27th April 2010

Meetings to be held at 2pm – venue to be confirmed