

Scrutiny Committee -Minutes

Meeting: Scrutiny Committee
Date: 30 August 2018
Venue: Room A, Ground Floor, West Yorkshire Combined Authority,
Wellington House, 40-50 Wellington Street, Leeds LS1 2DE

Attendees:

Cllr Cathy Mitchell (Chair)	Warrington
Cllr Jim Shorrock	Blackburn with Darwen
Cllr Ian Stewart	Cumbria
Cllr Gordon Friel	Liverpool City Region
Cllr Bruce Pickard	North East
Cllr Sean Chaytor	Hull City Council
Cllr Andy Paraskos	North Yorkshire
Cllr Eric Firth	West Yorkshire
Cllr Ann Reid	York
Cllr David O'Hara*	Blackpool
Cllr John Davison*	North Lincolnshire Council

*Deputy in attendance

Officers:

Sasha Wayne	Head of Legal
Tim Wood	NPR Director
Iain Craven	Finance Director
Rosemary Lyon	Legal and Democratic Services Officer
Jonathan Spruce	Strategy Director
Robin Miller-Stott	Senior Policy and Strategy Officer
Jim Bamford	Head of Investment Planning
James Syson	Rail Strategy Liaison

Apologies:

Cllr Martin Mitchell	Blackpool
Cllr Don Stockton	Cheshire East
Cllr Philip Jackson	North East Lincolnshire
Cllr Roy Miller	Sheffield City Region
Cllr John Fenty	North East Lincolnshire
Cllr Denise Lelliott	Sheffield City Region

1.0 Welcome and Apologies

Action

- 1.1 In anticipation of further Members arriving, and it being noted that the quorum is established in the Constitution

rather than being a statutory requirement, the Chair moved and the Vice Chair seconded that the quorum was waived to permit the meeting to commence. The Committee agreed the proposed waiver. Members of the Committee were welcomed to the meeting.

- 1.2 There were no declarations of interest made.
- 1.3 Apologies for absence were noted.

2.0 Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising

- 2.1 The Committee gave consideration to the minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held on 14th June 2018.
- 2.2 Further to minute 4.19 of the meeting held on 14th June 2018, a query was raised about the plan to operate the rail infrastructure and whether there were any developments to report. The Chair confirmed the minute as presented was an accurate record of the discussion and any developments will be reported back to this Scrutiny Committee.

On arrival of Councillor Bruce Pickard (BP) at 11.30am, the meeting was declared quorate

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 14th June 2018 be approved as a true and accurate record.

3.0 Constitution Review

- 3.1 Sasha Wayne, TfN (SW) delivered the submitted report on the review of the TfN Constitution. SW, noting that the report stated a questionnaire would be sent to Members in the week commencing 20th August, confirmed that unfortunately, there has been a delay in circulating the questionnaire. It was hoped that the questionnaire, now in final form and waiting internal sign off, would be circulated early in the following week. SW noted that TfN will be seeking feedback from Committee Members and a further report which would detail the key revisions to the Constitution will be brought to the Committee on 22nd November.
- 3.2 Ian Stewart, Cumbria (IS) noted that TfN is a new entity and therefore still identifying how scrutiny will operate. SW advised that TfN was to work with Tim Gillings from the Centre of Public Scrutiny in order to develop the pre-scrutiny approach, further advising that she has been in touch with Tim Gillings looking to arrange a convenient time to meet to discuss scrutiny processes. IS requested

that the Chair and Vice Chairs are invited to attend the meeting with Tim Gillings. SW confirmed that she would extend the invitation. Gordon Friel, LCR (GF) re-affirmed that any discussions should focus on the pre-scrutiny approach

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and Members of the Committee will consider areas for review upon receipt of the questionnaire.

4.0 Northern Powerhouse Rail - first draft of Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC)

- 4.1 Tim Wood, TfN (TW) delivered an overview of Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) activities with a slide presentation for Committee members including an update on the current programme. The NPR Team has been meeting leaders in the north to discuss the SOBC. Leader engagement is on-going with a report going to TfN Members on 13th September in readiness for BICC. The final Business Case is to be submitted to the TfN Board for decision on 6th December 2018.
- 4.2 TW stressed that "all for one" and collective focus for all partners.
- 4.3 GF agreed that fundamental shift is needed in relation to rail in the North but noted his concerns as to how best to present the case for the North to Government. GF referred to the objective for the uplift in jobs and wealth creation with the problems of looking so far ahead with impacts of Brexit/network for freight and possible employment shifts resulting from, for example, A.I. advances. An important question was how TfN influenced Government, noting that change in UK economy from south to north was needed and how TfN might present that to Government? GF expressed his real concerns that TfN might over-state the benefits which might not be viable considering all variables. GF asked if the purported benefits have been tested in any way and whether the draft business case could be shared with Scrutiny.
- 4.4 TW stated the SOBC is about the key economic and strategic cases. As each piece of work or intervention on the rail network was completed we would be expected to see the benefits materialising. The rail strategy of trains and tracks is a 'system' and, for example, better connectivity for seaboard and freight would drive better jobs and better pay. It was noted that the National Infrastructure Commission mentioned NPR and stated that it should be fully funded by Government

- 4.5 IS stated he was delighted to hear the mention of freight. Doing more to address these issues will improve capacity and must not be lost. It was noted that there is some good rail infrastructure on the West Coast mainline but not got a full sense of what is proposed on integrating this sufficiently with what is already there – building on foundations and thought to be given on this. IS asked how integration of West Coast will be evidenced and noted speeding up Cumbria/Carlisle to Newcastle was important and should be considered. IS was pleased to hear that TfN is speaking to leaders. IS mentioned Jake Berry in his capacity as Under Secretary of State for the Northern Powerhouse and Local Growth and getting him absolutely on board. He therefore asked TW about engagement with him. IS confirmed that overall, good steps taken so far.
- 4.6 Cllr Sean Chaytor, Hull (SC) arrived at the meeting.
- 4.7 TW: Following IS comments, noted that freight is part of the NPR strategy and will be covered in the SOBC. With regard to the West Coast Mainline, as NPR gets built it will release capacity on other routes so it is about understanding holistically what is happening in the North. HS2 and Network Rail (NR) are TfN's delivery partners and there is a good understanding that all entities can work together to make collective recommendations to DfT. TW confirmed he would share information regarding the SOBC with Scrutiny Committee and come back to a future committee meeting with an update.
- 4.8 IS: stated that TfN need the Treasury on board with the NPR Programme and therefore need support from Jake Berry. Noted the challenges faced by DfT so need comfort that Treasury will be in favour. Therefore, a need to broaden the coalition so that it includes all players in the North was noted.
- 4.9 TW: Confirmed that the NPR Team has regular meetings with Treasury and he will be sure to meet to Jake Berry MP.
- 4.10 John Davidson, North Lincolnshire (JD)- raised the South Humber freight, commenting that there is no real mention of that line despite it being a valuable one for the UK. Reducing journey times is a priority for North Lincolnshire too. This is a real issue that needs to be considered as part of NPR review. JD explained that he has worked in the rail industry as a contractor for 40 years and biggest challenge now is the ability of NR to deliver the infrastructure and the diminishing contractor base. JD noted there is a risk that

projects will be delayed due to lack of resources and asked what is the answer to this?

- 4.11 TW: NPR is about connectivity of six major city regions which will release capacity. Also, working with NR and MIA on the TransPennine upgrade Routes (TRU) about which there was a separate report on the agenda for this meeting. TW noted the importance of being able to build the system holistically with NR and HS2, acknowledging that there is a massive draw on resources but it is all about pulling together for the "northern plan". At the same time, work needs to be done on the education and skill base of the local population. There was a need to work together with partners to ensure that everything can be delivered as there is a continuous pipeline of works over the next 20-25 years. TW welcomed the knowledge and experience of committee members, advising that he is open to contributions and asking members to contact him directly.
- 4.12 Jim Bamford TfN (JB) introduced himself and explained his lead role on existing rail investment. JB reassured members that the long-term rail strategy sets minimum standards across the whole of north, in particular, for faster journey times and a minimum of 2 trains per hour. This included the South Humberside line, Tame Valley line and Cheshire to Warrington by way of examples. He offered to attend a future scrutiny meeting to present in more detail
- 4.13 Jim Shorrocks, Blackburn with Darwen (JS) advised he agreed with IS about contact with Jake Berry, with the importance of improving journey times on the existing rail lines and with the strategic lines. Nice to know that future generations will benefit from today's discussions. Noted the importance of taking on board all considerations from all localities of the north and asked TW to note this when he next meets with Jake Berry. JS confirmed he will take his views to Jake Berry too by way of support.
- 4.14 SC: Touched on freight, noting that ABP think of the Humber ports as one port – so need connectivity for all of them. Failure to electrify Hull to Selby has had a negative impact. He talked about the proposed new site for Siemens to build trains for underground; that North Yorkshire had no connection to take it to Scarborough, the risk of substandard rolling stock as everything will be electrified or bi-mode. It took longer to get from Hull to Leeds by rail today than it did 50 years ago. He noted the housing capacity and missing out on the economic needs. SC expressed that the North needs railway lines that can be brought back into use and this needs to be done within

next 5 years and not 25 years. The road network cannot take the uplift in travel expected due to failing rail infrastructure. Change is needed sooner than later, particularly given uncertainty of Brexit

- 4.15 TW: Responded that the most important task for the NPR Programme is getting the business case over the line to give NPR sufficient standing. Hull to Selby electrification didn't happen originally but the work is still within SOBC as one of the options. The key thing for the SOBC is that Hull gets 2 trains per hour to improve capacity and speed. TfN is looking to build a world class railway in the North but there are requirements to be satisfied. The National Infrastructure Commission noted NPR in the top 3 projects. Next step is getting the approvals in place for SOBC.
- 4.16 SC: Specified that Hull wants 2 trains per hour to/from Manchester, with one going to Manchester Airport. TW confirmed this is an option set out in the SOBC

RESOLVED: That the presentation on the Northern Powerhouse Rail - first draft Outline Business Case be noted.

5.0 Strategic Transport Plan

- 5.1 Jonathon Spruce, TfN (JS) presented the submitted report that contained a proposed response to an independent report on the Draft Strategic Transport Plan consultation from Ipsos MORI. The proposed responses were presented for consideration and comment by the Committee to allow the Final Strategic Transport Plan to be developed and for TfN to publish a formal response to the consultation alongside it.
- 5.2 Rosemary Lyon, TfN (RL) reminded the Committee that TfN must be mindful of its duties under Part 5A of the Local Transport Act 2008 (as amended) and in regard of preparing or revising its transport strategy must (among other matters) have regard to—
- (a) the promotion of economic growth in its area,
 - (b) the social and environmental impacts in connection with the implementation of the proposals contained in the strategy,
 - (c) any current national policy relating to transport that has been published by or on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, and
 - (d) the results of the public consultation as required by the Act.
- 5.3 The Chair then led on discussion of the draft STP responses

- 5.4 Q1a, page 6 – Committee content with response by TfN.
- 5.5 Q1b, page 7 – GF: noted the potential friction that could result from timetable changes and SC noted the connectivity with other rail. SC reported that rail staff are unable to co-operate with operators. This is something that we need to tackle. GF nothing about timetables on the proposed response. Need a modernisation of the network to facilitate journeys. GF asked about the potential to look at timetable implications and how these can be better aligned to journeys.

Chair – TfN to look at timetabling matters.

JS: noted that the long-term rail strategy, which is a daughter document to the STP, looks at the whole of the rail network. It was noted that the national rail industry is fragmented, and while TfN's ability to impact at the national level is limited, it can look to make a change in the North. Integrated Smart Travel roll out is part of this integration.

GF: asked what responsibility TfN has to the tax payer.

JS: TfN has not given any tax payer money in support of the rail franchise and confirmed that these comments relate to long term rail strategy further on in the document.

- 5.6 Q1b, pages 8 and 9 -Committee content with the responses. Eric Firth West Yorkshire (EF)- Noted TP and the issues with the change of time table. Noted a lack of confidence in TP being able to deliver. Transforming economic performance, page 10. Chair welcomed that TfN has consulted on visitor economy and asked is there are any plans to make transit multi-modal. JS: looking at a set of design principles and adopt these. JS referred to the "How" section and requirements of the cities and local development plan to ensure that delivery partners are aware of these.

BP noted the Strategic Development Corridor (SDC) work and asked if there is an end date on when the corridor studies will be ready. JS: research will be concluded at the end of Oct and final studies will be ready by the end of the year to be published with the STP. JS clarified that what is presented to Committee today are suggested responses. The final STP will show how the Committee's observations have been translated into the plan. JS noted the final STP will be presented to the Committee in Nov before going to

TfN Board in Dec. Therefore, the Committee will have an opportunity to scrutinise the plan further. BP: noted comfort and thanked JS for clarifying the governance arrangements.

IS: welcomes the opportunity to have a second review of the STP in Nov. Noted that the current responses are such a high level and that it is not the right time for detail. JS: noted it comes down to the role of scrutiny first and requests of scrutiny for them to consider the responses before TfN commence on the detailed drafting of the final STP. Will be able to identify to the Committee how the directions from them today are translated into the final STP.

IS: in the interests of moving things on suggested that the Chair seeks comments from the Committee on a question by question basis rather than a page turn.
Chair – agreed and thanked IS for the feedback.

Promote and support the built and natural environment, page 13: Ann Reid York (AR) expressed her concern that reducing emissions will not necessarily ease congestion as people move to using electric cars. These are two separate issues that are interlinked. JS: Agreed this is an omission in the Strategic Transport Plan. The Plans needs to pick up on the relationship between strategic transport and local transport. In particular, JS noted that the first part of someone's journey will take place at a local level (e.g.: bus, walking, cycling to train) and that TfN has learnt from this. Transport at a local level is not within TfN's gift but funding for transport and for local transport is important to impact on local congestion. TfN can offer support for these initiatives but local transport will not be included in the Plan. EF noted that West Yorkshire is currently looking at intelligent traffic lights and perhaps this is something that can be included in the plan? JS: noted the reliability of the network is something that need to be emphasised in the Plan– need to make what we have work better. Not just about new things but looking at existing infrastructure too. Local funding is needed for local connections for strategic transport changes.

- 5.7 Q2a, page 17 – Committee content with this response.
- 5.8 Q2. b, page 19 GF: stated that it is good that TfN is working closely with Public Health England and asked for further information on this in the future. GF also noted the reference in the responses to improving travel for those with disabilities and queried the equality impact assessments. GF queried how TfN is recording the equality

impact assessments and requested that a review of the impact assessments are added to the agenda for a future meeting.

EF: noted that page 21 touches on waterways. He confirmed that waterways provide good source of transport via canal systems and this isn't used enough. JS: confirmed that in the corridor studies looking at the use of the Manchester Ship Canal and East towards Leeds as part of the investment programme.

GF: asked about the National Infrastructure Plan and how this takes local plans into account. JS confirmed the National Infrastructure Commission talks about a commitment to NPR for money to develop the scheme and touch points in HS2 but nowhere has set it out previously as budget for NPR as one of 3 projects. TfN welcomed this as a powerful statement from Government showing a true commitment. Developing the Strategic Development Corridors and obtaining agreement from DfT to the NPR SOBC will speed up the process for local developments.

GF: Noted the Amazon 360 degrees location hub and queried if this and like businesses are interested now in what might be developed several years later. JS: stated that TfN has looked at the business need as part of the STP.

SC: Referred to industries, such as Ikea which has a distribution centre in Doncaster and close to rail and motorway networks. Need to maximise train movements by reducing highways movements. He noted that Doncaster is located at the centre of a rail and motorway hub that fits with port hubs, so TfN needs to have strategy in place to work out where additional residential/new towns will be built. SC noted consideration should be given to all these matters as part of a wider strategy. Need to get this message back to Ministers because change is happening but how much do you want? JS: Agreed that Doncaster is a good case in point to show why transport is so important, essential for movement of goods and workers, so it needs reliable services. JS noted spatial planning is critical to transport needs for the future, this is a local issue though but some local members e.g.: Homes for the North – are looking at the link between transport and homes. The STP can only reflect this current point in time and will be refreshed over time. SC: Requested that the Committee makes a referral to TfN Board highlighting the bigger picture in the STP.

EF: Stated that the North East has not been included in the discussions today. GF: noted that this is something the TfN Board has already looked at. IS noted the focus of discussions by the Committee seems to be the widening and this is not valid for this agenda item – there is a place for the STP fitting into the bigger picture not sure it is for today. Refer it upwards rather than discussing any further today.

- 5.9 Q3a, page 21: BP noted TfN is at the early stages and needs to show a more inclusive position with a move away from Liverpool/Sheffield corridor. Northern route links needs to show support and should include Northumberland. BP requested that JS considers this when finalising the STP which must include the whole of the north. JS: referred to the Northern Rail map, noting that there is a temptation to think that connecting Liverpool/Sheffield and Leeds/Manchester better will be a fix, but this is not correct. The sequencing plan for NPR shows eastern part of the geography will benefit first – new bits towards the end of the programme. BP stated in the drafting perhaps think about the technical answers.

SC: stated that must have connectivity put in place and that the North of England needs to be dealt with as part of the integrated plan. Some of the biggest manufacturers are in the North East. Limited transport in North Yorkshire which has large land base so how does TfN take advantage about this? Need to think about tourism.

Q3a, page 23 – end of first para: JD asserted this is a woolly response and doesn't give confidence that the areas are being given proper consideration. JD thinks TfN need to readdress this wording. JS: suggested there has been a misinterpretation between NPR infrastructure and NPR services because these are different. No decision about the service patterns so cannot comment but noted there are operational benefits for running certain services. Services such as children services and health requirements for the population of the North are important. A set of minimal standards that must be delivered as part of the rail franchise requirements and the Committee will get visibility of this at the right time.

- 5.10 Q3c, page 29 –GF: noted traffic flow and that rail issues are causing gridlock on the roads. Does the report need to refer to last mile delivery? JS: confirmed that later section of Q3c picks up on the last mile.
- 5.11 Q3c2, page 33 – AR asked if the IST system will mirror the London underground tap in/out. JS: noted that since the

last meeting the full business case for the back office has been approved and the tender documents have been released. The back office will enable tap in/out across the North using various options such as card, phone and watch. GF: observed this is risky for the future, using the Oyster card by way of example. JS: noted that TfN is learning from problems now faced with the oyster cards. IST didn't specify the product – so it will be whatever the user wants to hold in front of the equipment that will enable them to travel, equipment is accommodating future needs and advances in technology.

- 5.12 Q3d, page 34 - SC: noted the scope of the question for the public. IS: agreed that it is a big question and scrutiny is being asked to look at the high-level responses at this stage. Reinforced the importance of local level and at what stage this is pushed forward. Balance to be met. For that reason, IS considers the current responses are sufficient.

SC: needs more detail going forward but in general content. SC suggested engaging with the Chambers of Commerce and LEPs for questions about the businesses as they are key and can feedback via local authorities and directly to TfN. JS: Confirmed that the LEPs have been consulted on the STP. A Code Frame is available to all partners including LEPS so have all the detail on local matters. Comments will be collated using feedback from businesses. Robin Miller-Stott TfN (RMS) confirmed that TfN Engagement Team is meeting with Chambers and a Chamber-wide meeting is scheduled in Manchester. SC: asked for invitations to Chamber meetings are extended to scrutiny committee members. JS: confirmed that he can extend invitations

- 5.13 Q4a – Committee is content with this response.
- 5.14 Q5a – Committee is content with this response but notes the business point above.
- 5.15 Q6b – JS: Confirmed that since the responses were obtained, TfN has met with Natural England to agree a programme of works. SC: asked about other statutory consultees. RSM explained that the TfN Regulations provide which statutory consultees need to be included in the STP consultation so these have been properly consulted and TfN continue to engage with them.
- 5.16 JS: There was a requirement to include a certain amount of technical information in the responses, but it was intended to prepare a detailed summary for the lay person, i.e. what does it mean for me. For instance, what does it mean for a

student, what does it mean for a local business – to bring it alive with examples. EF: noted about young people. JS: skills and innovation are covered – work with the LEPs ensure that the right educational opportunities are available. RMS: explained about the TfN workshops with young people – work with youth councils and other forums to input in our STP – EF Asked RSM to circulate to Scrutiny Committee

RESOLVED: The Scrutiny Committee considered and commented upon the proposed responses to the key issues raised in the Strategic Transport Plan consultation.

6 Draft Funding Framework

6.1 Iain Craven TfN (IC): Introduced his submitted report, noting that this reflected an on-going process of work since circa 2015. IC explained that the Funding Framework is required to allow TfN to complete the “How” section of the STP and at the same time enable TfN officers to further engage with government and stakeholders to work up proposals in greater detail. IC drew out the key points in the report: that the TfN’s plans are ambitious but achievable and the funding to deliver them is a reasonable ask of government; that locally raised funding should be spent locally; and that how money flows through the system is critical to TfN achieving its objectives. IC noted that further detail was available in the supporting report.

6.2 GF: Asked about TfN’s approach to capturing the value generated by its projects. IC: confirmed the revenue raising powers sit with TfN’s constituent authorities (or other local authorities in some cases) and the expectation is that any value generated would be collected and spent locally – TfN’s work to date indicated that most TfN projects that were likely to generate contributions would also generate material consequential costs for local partners – the example of new lines into Leeds station was given. In response to a further question from GF, IC confirmed that TfN’s approach was that where money is raised locally then it should be spent locally.

BP: Queried the recommendation about Option3, asking that an impact assessment on partner finances be performed before such a recommendation could be made. IC reiterated that the Framework expressly states that TfN cannot be funded at the expense of partners and agreed to perform this work once a more detailed set of proposals had been developed as part of the next steps.

6.3 IS: Referring to paragraph 1.6 to the submitted report, while recognising that further work is to be done and looking at the recommendation in the report to agree the four principals at this stage, noted the framework would move on and be developed. He was comfortable with the four principles and that the money won't all be used on Leeds and Manchester. A bigger concern was whether Whitehall will be willing to let people go so who do we need to engage with to support the vision collectively in the North – this should take place at Member level. Happy to endorse with a recommendation for approval to the Board. Seconded by SC.

RESOLVED That the Draft TfN Funding Framework be noted and, subject to further consideration of the proposed options once further work has been completed, the Framework be recommended to the TfN Board for approval.

7 Budget Review

7.1 IC: Presented the submitted report and noted there has been slippage in a number of areas in both operations and programmes. YTD underspends are largely driven by underspends in IST P1 caused by approval delays in 17/18 but we expect these to be caught up in-year. However, delays in achieving approvals for Phase 3 mean that a significant amount of activity originally forecast in the final quarter will slip into the following year.

7.2 GF: Agree in principle to the recommendations but ensure that the risk assessment is updated and duly recorded. IS: Noted progress, but when will the budget be back on track as this may impact on the credibility of TfN. IC: Noted the relevant delays cannot be recovered and the budget already takes into account acceleration. There is a risk that programmes such as IST can slip again. IS: urge that 12 months' time with the budget that this is considered and addressed by that time.

8 **RESOLVED** That

- (i) the year-to-date underspend of £4.89m be noted
- (ii) the proposed Revision 1 budget be noted;
- (iii) the potential need to seek budget variations later in the year to fund slipped activity from the previous financial year;

- (iv) The report be recommended to the TfN Board.

9 Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of report item 9 because it is likely that there will be disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A (as amended) of the Local Government Act 1972.

10 TransPennine Route Upgrade

10.1 JB: Noted that the presentation made to the Committee covered the TransPennine Route Upgrade but would happy to come back to a future committee meeting to present on the applying minimum standards across the whole of the North's rail network. JB presented his report using slides, clarifying the position regarding electrification which is not technically a requirement. There had been no change to that reported in June and the recommendations that will be taken to Board in September were highlighted. JB opened the paper to questions.

10.2 GF sought clarification on the freight upgrade as his understanding is that the government is restricting these. JB confirmed this is correct – current DfT preferred option (SDO6) does not include freight, but it is included in the option (SDO2a) for which TfN is pressing.

10.3 GF: Asked for information on option 2b as difficult to scrutinise something for which he doesn't have full details. He queried the slides showing freight because this doesn't translate into the written report. SDO1, £300m more than SDO 2 but this doesn't contain freight. JB: clarified that both SDO1 and SDO2 contain the same partial provision for freight requirements – both require electrification – because of that a lot of the bridge work will be done along with electrification.

GF: Queried what is the benefit for Government who is already investing a large sum of money on highways network for example Primrose Valley Road in Merseyside. Noting this investment in roads, the Government may have already made up its mind. JB: cannot comment on the road programmes but can confirm that Rail North/TfN has pushed very strongly for freight. Even if get approval, it will take years to implementation.

GF: from TfN's point of view it is an important issue – noted the carbon reduction. EF: asked if approved by 2019 when will works commence? JB; work would start 2020, with some works at Leeds due to commence this December

as an intermediate intervention was approved some time ago. JB confirmed that Morley Station will be replaced with a new station and there was close liaison with WYCA on this point. Noted a new car park was included and EF asked if TfN pays for the car park. JB confirmed that WYCA will cover the cost as the car park was a WYCA initiative.

RESOLVED That the presentation update be noted.

11 Any Other Business

- 11.1 Discussion of next meeting location: Committee agreed a North West location so the November meeting will be held in Warrington.

York was suggested as the location for the January meeting. York to be reserved for now with a final decision to be made in due course.

EF: Asked about confidential nature of the exempt report on TRU and whether he can report this back to the Leader and if the slides can be circulated. JB: will check with DfT.

IS: Raised his continuing concerns regarding reliability of Northern in the North West. Increasing noise that the compensation package is extended and TfN needs to provide a message about this. Level of confidence in the whole of the rail sector is diminishing. JB: noted that his colleagues are aware of this and he will relay IS comments. GF: asked about compensation through the franchise agreement and who is paying this. JB: directed to GF to Gary Bogan and David Hoggarth and we can put GF in touch.

The Chair drew the meeting to a close.

r = report; p = presentation; v = verbal