

MINUTES

Hertfordshire Local Transport Body: 2nd Shadow Meeting

Tuesday 12th March 2013

Ashbourne Room, County Hall, Hertford

Attendees:

Attendee	Organisation
Cllr Stuart Pile	Hertfordshire County Council (<i>Chair</i>)
Cllr Teresa Heritage	Hertfordshire Infrastructure and Planning Partnership (<i>Full Member, substituting for Cllr Terry Douris</i>)
Rob Fairy	Network Rail (<i>Observer Member</i>)
David Gingell	Highways Agency (<i>Observer Member</i>)
Neil Hayes	Local Enterprise Partnership
Simon Warner	Hertfordshire Planning Group (<i>substituting for Jane Custance</i>)
Mike Younghusband	Hertfordshire County Council
Jon Tiley	Hertfordshire County Council
Morag Saunders	Hertfordshire County Council
Alissa Ede	Hertfordshire County Council
Andy Summers	Hertfordshire County Council
Susan Claris	Arup
Alistair Ryder	Hertfordshire County Council

Minutes:

1.	Welcome and Introductions	Actions
	<p>The Chair welcomed the group.</p> <p>Apologies were received from John Gourd (LEP), Alex Williams (Transport for London) and Cllr Terry Douris (HIPP).</p>	
2.	Minutes of Previous Meeting	
	<p>The minutes were agreed to be an accurate record of the previous meeting.</p>	
3.	Conflicts of Interest	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">JT confirmed that a full <i>conflicts of interest</i> guidance for LTB members had been requested from legal services and would be circulate to the members when completed.Councillor Douris had been advised that he had a conflict of interest in relation to the Item on the Prioritisation of Major Schemes, and had therefore arranged for a replacement Member from HIPP to attend the meeting - this was Councillor Heritage.	JT / AS
4.	The Major Scheme Process	
	<p>Mike Younghusband presented the major scheme process (see attached presentation). Key points arising were:</p>	

4.	The Major Scheme Process (continued)	Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to capture requirements in emerging County policy and strategy documents, and not for local plans to go straight to schemes. • Need to have governance in place for schemes at the start to avoid the scheme unravelling later on • There is a need to follow correct processes – these can be twin-tracked, but public sector cannot cut corners. • The LTB should start looking at 2019 onwards, as the lead-in time for schemes is generally a 7-year minimum process. • It was noted that the development of business cases for major schemes requires funding that is not currently provided through the LTB process • Government funding streams for major schemes often requires shovel-ready projects and LTB needs to be aware of the need for this. 	
5.	Priority List of Schemes	
	<p>Alissa Ede presented the five major schemes, alongside the initial prioritisation assessments (see attached presentation and meeting papers)</p> <p>Further points made with regard to the specific schemes included:</p> <p>A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Questions asked were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>TH - How easy is land acquisition? MY</i> – depends on the landowner, we would need to be prepared to follow a CPO process. • <i>TH - How would connections to routes on either side of the bypass work? Do they need to be single / dual? Does the case for the scheme still stack up? AE</i> – strategy would be to modernise the junctions either side to maximise capacity/throughput, keeping at single-carriageway, but reviewing any passive provisions for future dualling if needed at a later date. The northern bypass is the preferred route following consultation – if you changed the scheme then the deliverability within 2015-19 would be unlikely. • <i>TH – Do we have a feel for existing traffic and future impact of Stansted / 2000 new homes? SP</i> – one of the key bottlenecks on the network in Herts, MY- This scheme would have economic benefits across the wider network, compared to some of the other schemes where the benefits are more localised. AE - Is a designated freight route. <p>A602 Improvements (Stevenage to/from Ware)</p> <p>Key points discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a group of schemes that together address the congestion issues on this corridor, individually they would have less impact, therefore they need to be evaluated as a single entity to look at Value for Money. However they could be phased to fit a specific funding allocation if needed. 	

5.	Priority List of Schemes (Continued)	Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2 was almost funded a few years ago through CIF. • Many of the schemes would require land acquisition. 	
	<p>A1(M) Congestion Relief (Welwyn Garden City to/from Stevenage)</p> <p>Key points discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A series of improvements would be proposed between junctions 6-8. HA and HCC currently working together on a strategy to identify a solution. • DG (HA) outlined that HA are undertaking similar projects elsewhere, and the J6 northbound scheme is being taken forward by spring 2014. The scheme could be deliverable in the earlier part of the programme if within the HA boundary and did not require any land acquisition. • SP outlined that the value for money could be very large due to existing congestion. • The comments from the Advisory Group on this scheme (see meeting papers) were considered. • SP outlined that it is important that the solution is not compromised by the limitations of the DfT's 2015-2019 funding – the solution has to work for the long-term. <p>Watford Junction Interchange Redevelopment (Watford)</p> <p>Key points discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watford Junction is currently going through a new master-planning exercise. A number of landowners are involved, and the scheme promoter would need to ensure that all parties are on-board with the scheme proposals before it progressed. • The scheme currently scores low on deliverability for 2015-2019 but the value for money and achievement of LTP3 objectives would be high. • SP identified the need to avoid multiple schemes taking place in Watford at one time, thus disrupting the local network. MY identified that Croxley is due to be complete by 2016 Abbey Line delivery date is uncertain, but may be a similar time frame. • The need to continue to develop the scheme was identified and agreed, even if might not eventually be deliverable for 2015-19 funding, it could be a contender for further funding that may become available. • Key considerations would be links to Watford Health Campus and once HS2 is built, in 2033, this increases the potential for more stopping trains at Watford Junction, and thus more demand for usage of the station. <p>M1 Maylands Link NE Relief Road (Hemel Hempstead)</p> <p>Key points discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current proposal is based on the original scheme as identified in 1999. 	

5.	Priority List of Schemes (Continued)	Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next stage is to revisit this scheme, which would be a significant amount of further work. • It was identified that there is a Green Belt review taking place in the local area over the next 18 months which would provide context to the scheme. <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The LTB recommended to the accountable body that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further development work on all five of the schemes should progress between now and July 2013 (when a prioritised programme of schemes is required to be determined and forwarded to DfT). • The initial LTB Priority List – at this point in time - should retain all five schemes, with the following schemes currently scoring as the top three (as a result of their high scoring against deliverability and achievement of LTP goals): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) ii. A602 Improvements (Stevenage to/from Ware) iii. A1(M) Congestion Relief (Welwyn Garden City to/from Stevenage) • Watford Junction Interchange Redevelopment (Watford) and M1-Maylands Link NE Relief Road (Hemel Hempstead), whilst currently scoring lower against deliverability (based on our current understanding of these schemes), scored well against the LTP3 objectives – particularly the Watford Junction scheme - and should therefore be retained in the LTB process to July to allow further work to take place to determine the deliverability of these schemes in 2015-2019. • It should be noted that further work to take place on the schemes between now and July will focus on reviewing the schemes and developing the programme and funding profile and an initial assessment of value for money as well as reviewing the key risks and deliverability scores. These will be as robust as possible within the timescales provided by DfT. The assessments will be further refined as the full business cases are developed (after July). • It was also noted that planning and preparing transport projects to support economic growth needs to start very soon for schemes to be delivered in the following funding round (i.e beyond 2019). 	

6.	Communications	Actions
	<p>JT presented an initial Communications outline note produced by the Comms team. Comments made were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TH identified that there needs to be proper lines of communications between the planning teams at districts, the PR teams at districts and the LTB officers. • JT identified that HIPP is the route by which district members should be engaged in LTB business. • It was identified that those areas with no LTB schemes would still need to be engaged in the wider development of infrastructure • SP identified that communication with neighbouring LTBs would be important. • It was identified that districts should be communicating with the LTB and HCC to ensure any emerging schemes were included in County strategies – we need to work together to ensure schemes are developed properly. 	
7.	Next Steps	
	<p>JT identified that the LTB will need a strategy for how the LTB takes forward its long term work programme. This will need to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic priorities • Stakeholders beyond those identified in the Assurance Framework, • How LDFs interact with the LTB • How to engage businesses and economic development members <p>It was identified that a conference/summit could be useful for engaging with partners going forward.</p> <p>The role of the LEP was discussed. NH identified that the LEP sets out the framework for economic growth and requires partners to contribute. TH identified that the LTB / LEP needs a strong evidence base to develop future infrastructure strategy.</p> <p>It was agreed that the meeting on 30th September would discuss a long term work programme for the Local Transport Body.</p>	AS / JT
8.	Any Other Business	
	<p>The dates of the next meetings were clarified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friday 28th June, 14:00, Mimram Room, County Hall, Hertford • Monday 30th September*, 14:00 Ashbourne Room, County Hall, Hertford • Friday 29th November, 10:00 Ashbourne Room, County Hall, Hertford <p>* Note 30th: The original paper circulated with the meeting had an error.</p>	