

# Transport for the North Board – Minutes

**Meeting:** Transport for the North Board  
**Date:** Thursday 13 September 2018  
**Venue:** Sheffield Town Hall

## **Chairman:**

John Cridland Chairman

## **Attendees:**

Jo Johnson MP (up to Item 4) Minister of State for Transport

## **Constituent Authority Attendees:**

Councillor Fred Jackson	Blackpool
Councillor Terry O'Neill	Warrington
Councillor Rachel Bailey	Cheshire East
Councillor Samantha Dixon	Cheshire West & Chester
Councillor Keith Little	Cumbria
Mayor Andy Burnham	Greater Manchester
Councillor Darren Hale	Hull
Mayor Steve Rotheram	Liverpool City Region
Councillor Carl Marshall	North East
Councillor Matthew Patrick	North East Lincolnshire
Councillor Rob Waltham	North Lincolnshire
Councillor Don Mackenzie	North Yorkshire
Mayor Dan Jarvis	Sheffield City Region
Mayor Ben Houchen	Tees Valley
Councillor Judith Blake	West Yorkshire
Councillor Ian Gillies	York

## **Rail North Authority Attendees:**

Councillor Trevor Ainsworth	Derbyshire
Councillor Chris Brewis	Lincolnshire
Councillor John Ogle	Nottinghamshire

## **LEP Attendees:**

Pete Waterman	Cheshire and Warrington LEP
Roger Marsh	Leeds City Region LEP
Matthew Lamb	North Yorkshire LEP
Jim Jackson	Cumbria LEP
Kishor Tailor	Humber LEP

**Delivery Partners:**

Ben Smith  
Paul Griffiths  
Sir Peter Hendy  
Jeremy Bloom

Department for Transport  
HS2  
Network Rail  
Highways England

**Invited Partners for Item 4:**

Anna-Jane Hunter  
Martin Frobisher  
David Brown  
Leo Goodwin

Network Rail  
Network Rail  
Northern  
TransPennine Express

**In attendance:**

Peter Kennan

Sheffield City Region LEP

**Transport for the North Officers in Attendance:**

Barry White  
Dawn Madin  
Alastair Richards  
Iain Craven  
Jim Bamford  
Sasha Wayne  
Tim Wood  
Adam Timewell

Chief Executive  
Director of Business Capabilities  
IST Programme Director  
Finance Director  
Head of Investment Planning  
Head of Legal  
NPR Director  
Rail North Partnership - Franchise  
Commercial Manager  
Rail Strategy Liaison Manager  
Solicitor  
Strategy Director  
Strategic Rail Director  
Major Roads Director  
Programme Director  
Legal and Democratic Services Officer  
Democratic Services Officer

James Syson  
Deborah Dimock  
Jonathan Spruce  
David Hoggarth  
Peter Molyneux  
Dave Abdy  
Rosemary Lyon  
Mark Hardman

**Apologies:**

Councillor Phil Riley  
Mike Blackburn  
Councillor Michael Green  
Edwin Booth  
Asif Hamid  
David Land  
Councillor Jon Collins  
Councillor Daniel Jellyman  
Paul Booth

Blackburn with Darwen  
Greater Manchester LEP  
Lancashire  
Lancashire LEP  
Liverpool City Region LEP  
North East LEP  
Nottingham  
Stoke-on-Trent  
Tees Valley LEP

## **1.0 Welcome and Apologies**

- 1.1 The Chairman welcomed Board members and other attendees to the meeting.
- 1.2 Apologies for absence were noted.

## **2.0 Declarations of Interest**

- 2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

## **3.0 Minutes**

- 3.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Transport for the North Board held on 28 June 2018 were considered.
- 3.2 Further to the consideration of rail performance given within Minute 10 and a discussion at the subsequent meeting of the Transport for the North Partnership Board held on 31 July 2018 at which the Chairman had been asked to write to the Secretary of State calling for a single person to oversee both infrastructure and train operations, the Transport Minister advised that Richard George, who had extensive rail industry experience had been appointed to the role to work closely alongside Transport for the North. Mr George would assume his role following agreement between Transport for the North and the Department for Transport (DfT) on the details of the appointment.
- 3.3 Pete Waterman (Cheshire and Warrington LEP) (PW) noted that the submitted minutes did not reflect his query concerning voting rights for Transport for the North LEP co-opted representatives.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the minutes of the meeting of the Transport for the North Board held on 28 June 2018 be approved as a correct record;  
(2) the reported appointment of Richard George to oversee both infrastructure and train operations be welcomed, and the Secretary of State be thanked for his response to the approaches of Transport for the North on this issue.

## **4.0 Rail Performance and Compensation Update**

- 4.1 David Hoggarth (Transport for the North) (DH) introduced a paper providing an update on rail

performance in respect of both Northern and TransPennine Express (TPE), with particular focus on the period from 20 May 2018 when the introduction of new timetables caused particular issues and problems. Updates were further provided in respect of enhancements to compensation schemes to be introduced in the coming weeks. The season ticket compensation scheme was being extended and in the coming weeks would also include those who were regular travellers (but not season ticket holders). The Delay Repay scheme would be extended to passengers who were delayed by more than 15 minutes, as opposed to the current 30 minutes.

- 4.2 The Chairman introduced industry representatives to report to, and to take questions from, the Transport for the North Board. Anna-Jane Hunter (Network Rail North West) (AJH) introduced a presentation on an industry action plan to address performance issues. It had been concluded that the issues of May 2018 arose through delay in completing the Manchester – Bolton - Preston electrification due to unforeseen poor ground conditions and the collapse of Carrillion, with the timetable for the North requiring re-writing in 16 weeks rather than the usual 40 weeks, while the team responsible were also processing changes elsewhere on the network. It had been concluded that the approach had been extremely ambitious, that too much had been attempted in one go, and that the size of the change for staff, infrastructure and customers had been underestimated. It was acknowledged that the industry had got it wrong and had worked hard over recent months to understand what went wrong and how to improve matters.
- 4.3 The presentation further considered performance data, what had been delivered to date in delivering rail transformation in the north and why the May 2018 timetable had not worked. The work within the Action Plan sought to understand and minimize disruption; to stabilize performance; to implement a stable base; and to ensure long term capability was reported. In addition, Network Rail and Northern had jointly commissioned a review of their processes for major timetable changes and areas of focus had been identified. A cross industry working group had been established to gather the collective knowledge of the railway in the north and to identify potential enhancements in several areas. It was acknowledged that risks remained around the autumn period, the May 2019 timetable and service enhancements proposed for

---

the December 2018 timetable that would need introduction to be carefully assessed and managed.

- 4.4 Councillor Darren Hale (Hull) (DHH) expressed concern that while the focus was on May 2018, there had been no improvement since before April 2018. He queried what would be the new stable base TPE would be working to and who would challenge this if no improvement was made by May 2019. Leo Goodwin (TPE) (LG) advised that TPE was confident of stable performance across the north of England, while acknowledging that there was more to do.
- 4.5 Councillor Chris Brewis (Lincolnshire) (CB) noted that due to poor rail performance, people were switching back to cars and were then lost to the railways. In response it was noted that the Great Northern Rail Project was undertaking upgrades, such as at Liverpool, delivering extra trains on the network and the completion of electrification at Bolton by Christmas.
- 4.6 Councillor Judith Blake (West Yorkshire) (JBL) highlighted the issue of short-forming that resulted in overcrowded trains and the implications for individuals in education and employment when left on stations, unable to board trains. David Brown (Northern) (DB) acknowledged there were issues of capacity and that a number of trains should be longer, but advised that electrification should resolve the problem by allowing rolling stock to be deployed. However, until the infrastructure was operational and additional trains on the network the issue would not be fully resolved.
- 4.7 Mayor Steve Rotheram (Liverpool City Region) (SR) advised that he had written to the Secretary of State asking that fares be frozen on trains in the north as a result of performance issues. The Secretary of State had responded that this was near impossible to do and would have consequences. SR asked whether the train operating companies would agree to a fares freeze until the mess was sorted out? A response was not made at the meeting.
- 4.8 Councillor Ian Gillies (York) (IG) queried the practice of turning trains back before reaching their destination, or running through scheduled stops, resulting in overcrowding on subsequent trains. DB acknowledged that part cancellations had been happening, particularly in the north-east area. Work to tackle this was ongoing, the December 2018 timetable changes were expected to address some of these issues and provide additional

recovery time for trains. AJH noted that the industry approach for recovery from service interruptions was to cancel or cut services short with the aim of reducing the number of customers impacted. The current sub-optimal service pattern impacted on system resilience, and December 2018 timetable changes looked to address this issue.

- 4.9 Mayor Andy Burnham (Greater Manchester) (AB) noted that the performance situation was too volatile, and that real problems still occurred on certain days. The current performance figures were 10% below the previous year's figure which was not good enough. Reference was made to Sunday service cancellations that were not announced until the day before. It was suggested that this could not all be blamed on May 2018 changes. LG noted that punctuality performance prior to timetable changes was around 86-87%; it was expected to achieve this figure in December. However, it was noted that franchise targets had been predicated by certain infrastructure schemes that had not yet been implemented; these schemes would provide greater resilience and improve performance
- 4.10 Councillor Fred Jackson (Blackpool) (FJ) referred to difficulties in travelling to/from Blackpool, noting recent lack of trains leading to crowded platforms at Rochdale North, and of driver shortages affecting Blackpool South. DB advised that there were issues on Sundays where drivers were not obliged to work when services were affected by engineering works, and that Northern had tried to give advance notice. It was acknowledged that the electrification works had caused issues, but that Blackpool would feel the benefit of this investment.
- 4.11 Mayor Ben Houchen (Tees Valley) (BH) questioned a proposal to be put to the Rail North Committee by TPE for the introduction in the autumn of a seven-week timetable that would have significant impacts for services to/from the north east. The proposal had been submitted very late and had not been raised by TPE in recent meetings with himself and Officers. He considered it unacceptable for such proposals to be brought at such short notice. Councillor Carl Marshall (North East) (CM) re-enforced BH's comments. LG advised that the proposals were intended to increase stability in advance of the December 2018 timetable, as had been the case in previous autumns, to give passengers a more predictable service. The Chairman noted the issue but indicated that consideration should be undertaken by the Rail North Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That: (1) the report be noted;  
(2) the extension of the compensation schemes be noted and welcomed;  
(3) the rail industry presentation and plans for rail improvement be noted.

## **5.0 Strategic Transport Plan and Consultation Update and Transport for the North Funding Framework**

- 5.1 The Board gave consideration to a submitted report presented by Jonathan Spruce (Transport for the North) (JS) further to the receipt of the independent report on the Draft Strategic Transport Plan (STP) consultation from Ipsos MORI in mid-June. The Board was advised of the review of the consultation feedback and to the consideration of the proposed response to the independent report and consultation responses. A series of proposed responses had been presented to the Transport for the North Scrutiny Committee on 30 August 2018 for consideration and comment. The submitted report outlined the key feedback from the Scrutiny Committee which would feed in to the Final STP and the formal response to the consultation. JS further presented a consideration of some high-level changes suggested for the Draft STP arising from the consultation as agreed by the Board, including a re-drafting of the Transport for the North Vision, the Pan-northern Transport objectives and introductory sections of the Final STP.
- 5.2 JS made further reference recent correspondence which had been circulated to the Board regarding how the STP would assess carbon emissions issues and advised that it was intended to present the environmental and social impacts as a whole within the Plan to be submitted to the Board in December 2018. This would be possible following the NPR business case and using the most recent work for the Strategic Development Corridors. It was further acknowledged that the Metro Mayors were under pressure to address air quality issues in their respective areas.
- 5.3 Iain Craven (Transport for the North) (IC) further advised that a key element of the Final STP would be how the infrastructure proposed by Transport for the North would be funded. A Funding Framework that will allow programmes to be delivered had, following a discussion at the Transport for the North Partnership Board, been developed and was presented in the submitted report. IC noted that further work would be

---

required to develop the detail of how the principles and proposals set out in the Framework might be implemented.

- 5.4 JBL noted reference in the submitted papers to spatial strategies and planning, querying the position of Transport for the North and noting the need to be aware of local sensitivities. JS noted that this issue fell into the 'How' section of the Plan and acknowledged that Transport for the North did not have all the answers but needed to be involved in such conversations as the 'North' matured. He noted that the 'How' section also considered active travel and the journey from home to the first point of contact with the transport mode, and that there needed to be an acknowledgement of it as part of the wider journey.
- 5.5 AB queried whether there was sufficient prominence and consideration of environmental issues in the Plan. Regarding the proposed Financial Framework, he suggested that that Transport for the North's focus was of the 'social' while the Treasury focus was on the 'economic' and queried whether Transport for the North's approaches would stand up to Treasury scrutiny and assessment. JS confirmed that environmental issues would be in the Plan submitted to Board in December, and that inputs had been sought particularly from West Yorkshire and Greater Manchester building on good work in those areas. With regard to funding, it was confirmed that the scheme appraisal approach would address such issues as might be required by the Treasury.

**RESOLVED:** That: (1) the key feedback from the Scrutiny Committee with regard to the proposed responses to the Draft STP consultation processes be noted;  
(2) the proposed revised introductory sections of the Final STP, including the Vision and Objectives be noted, and final comments be forwarded to Transport for the North by Friday 28 September 2018;  
(3) the key feedback from the Scrutiny Committee with regard to the Transport for the North Funding Framework be noted;  
(4) the Transport for the North Funding Framework be approved.

---

## 6.0 Budget Revision 1 and Year to Date Review

- 6.1 IC reported further to a submitted report, updating the Board on Transport for the North's financial position after the first four months of the 2018/19 financial year and presenting for adoption a revised budget ('Revision 1') taking account both of that position and of updated forecasts for the remainder of the financial year.
- 6.2 Over the first four months of the financial year Transport for the North had underspent against its base budget by £6.51m; this was principally driven by slippage on spend within the Integrated and Smart Ticketing (IST) Programme reflecting the impact of the delays to the conclusion of the Phase 1 contracting arrangements in the previous financial year prior to Transport for the North being able to enter contracts itself. It had also become apparent that the delays to the passage of Phase 3 of the IST Programme through the government approvals process would have a material impact on the profile of expenditure relating to the delivery of that activity in the remainder of the year
- 6.3 Adopting a revised budget at this stage affords Transport for the North the opportunity to work to a financial budget better aligned to the latest delivery timetables, the proposed Revision 1 budget presented standing at £56.52m; much of the £23.51m below the initial base budget related to adjustment and rephrasing of the IST programme expenditure profile into 2019/20. To continue to work to the opening base budget would reduce the value of financial monitoring and reporting as financial planning would be misaligned to delivery activity.
- 6.4 Councillor Rachel Bailey (Cheshire East) (RB) asked for the Board to receive an update on smart ticketing as this was fundamental to Transport for the North's activities and direction.

**RESOLVED:** That: (1) the 2018/19 year to date underspend of £6.51m be noted;  
(2) the proposed revision 1 budget, as presented within the submitted report, be approved;  
(3) the potential need to seek budget variations later in the year to fund slipped activity from the previous year, be noted.

---

## **7.0 Risk Management**

- 7.1 IC introduced a report providing the Board with an opportunity to review and discuss Transport for the North's corporate risks. The principal corporate risks faced by Transport for the North which might impact on the ability to deliver both the 2018/19 business plan objectives and priorities and the longer term objectives of Transport for the North were presented to the Board.
- 7.2 It was important the Transport for the North recognized, understood and managed the risks that could negatively impact on its abilities to deliver the objectives in the Business Plan and the Draft STP. Transport for the North had a Risk Management Strategy in place that provided the framework within which risks were identified and managed, and the Board was invited to consider and review Transport for the North's corporate risks periodically.

**RESOLVED:** That the information presented within the submitted report, including the assessment of the risks identified, be noted.

## **8.0 Transpennine Route Upgrade**

- 8.1 The Chairman introduced a consideration of the Transpennine Route Upgrade (TRU) connecting Manchester, Huddersfield, Leeds, York and Selby. As a high profile project for the North moving in advance of the Final STP, the Board needed to give a consideration of its advice to the Secretary of State in respect of the project. It was noted that the TRU was a scheme being promoted by the Department for Transport (DfT) and as such it was the role of Transport for the North to provide such advice.
- 8.2 The Chairman advised that a consideration of the project had been undertaken by the Transport for the North Partnership Board who were recommending the following advice to be provided to the Secretary of State for transport in respect of the DfT's TRU investment plans: -
- a) Transport for the North strongly supports this major, and long needed, transport investment scheme and the outputs established in the Client Development Remit as agreed by Rail North in 2016 given the major economic benefits and its role as a pre cursor to Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) development.

- b) Transport for the North recognises that the package of measures in the DfT's current leading option, "SDO6", delivers significant benefits to the rail network but does not deliver in full the key high level strategic outputs for journey time, capacity, capability, reliability and freight contained in the Client Development Remit.
- c) Transport for the North's preferred option, "SDO2a", should be designed in detail to identify the financial (including whole life costs), economic, environmental and deliverability implications prior to any final decision for delivery in 2019.
- d) Transport for the North supports the phased delivery of infrastructure and recognises the need to avoid the issues experienced in the May 2018 timetable when planning to release benefits early.
- e) Transport for the North notes that SDO2a design should enable early delivery of very significant benefits through SDO6 without reworking or duplication of effort. As designs are developed any released contingency should be allocated within the control period to secure more of the strategic outputs.
- f) Transport for the North supports the 'in-principle' approval for a set of Tranche 1 works at locations that would be done under any SDO which include:
- Manchester Victoria – Stalybridge journey time improvement works
  - Morley new station and journey time improvements
  - Church Fenton – York (Colton junction) journey time improvements.
- g) Transport for the North is clear there is a need for a very carefully planned service pattern during construction that will minimise passenger and business disruption and that this is likely to require procurement of additional rolling stock to maintain capacity during construction.
- h) Transport for the North notes the funding allocated in Control Period 6 and recognises the constraints to delivery and is happy to discuss appropriate phasing that draws on Control Period 7 funding yet to be allocated.
- i) Transport for the North supports the proposal to utilise HS2 east Leeds (Thorpe Park) – York, and the opportunity this presents for construction of HS2 phase 2b to start from the north as early as possible, so the benefits can be delivered at the same time as the TRU scheme is completed.

- 
- j) Transport for the North notes that TRU does not address the Manchester and Leeds congestion issues affecting the current timetable and that work on resolving these issues needs to carry on at pace in addition to the investment plans for TRU.
- 8.3 AB, noting the objectives of rail improvements over the next decade including the wider opportunities of NPR, considered that there was a need to pursue option SDO2a and that to accept option SDO6 would be to accept second best. Reference had been made to a letter talking about SDO6 that suggested blockades on the line for up to a year should SDO2a be chosen, and he queried whether such a result was inevitable as the route was part of the Transport for the North's wider ambition. BH noted that clarity was needed on the engineering and costing implications and that SDO2a could be delivered; when the scheme progressed a very clear communications plan would be required to make people very aware of the potential for disruption and that long term gain could cause short term pain. Jim Bamford (Transport for the North) (JBA) confirmed that the greater the work undertaken, the greater the disruption would be, but advised that through the Rail North Partnership there would be opportunities to address issues and identify mitigations. Issues of potential disruption and funding would be reported through to the Board.
- 8.4 AB, noting that the DfT is the sole client of the scheme and that Transport for the North a statutory consultee, asked for clarification as to what legal ability Transport for the North had to influence the decision maker. In response, Barry White (Transport for the North) (BW) confirmed that the DfT is the final decision maker. All partners are working with the DfT to achieve all objectives. AB supported this advice but noted that northern ambitions should not be held back.
- 8.5 The Chairman noted that Transport for the North support for SDO2a was a representation of the level of ambition of Transport for the North. However, TRU was a DfT scheme in which Transport for the North was a statutory consultee/partner: this was in comparison with the position regarding NPR where the DfT and Transport for the North were co-clients. In this regard, should the DfT opt for SDO6 as the option to pursue, Transport for the North would need to seek to ensure that this was undertaken such that SDO2a could still be done and NPR not unduly affected.

---

**RESOLVED:** That the formal advice to the Secretary of State for Transport on the DfT's TRU investment plans be as provided above.

1

DRAFT