

## **REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD MEETING**

**4 APRIL 2008: 10.00AM – 12.30PM (FOLLOWED BY LUNCH)**

**WHEELER HALL, ST ANNE'S STREET, LEEDS, LS2 8BE**

### **AGENDA**

1. Welcome, Introductions & Apologies
2. The Rt Hon Rosie Winterton MP – Minister of State for Transport and Regional Minister for Yorkshire and the Humber

#### **BUSINESS ITEMS**

**10.20 – 10.30**

3. Minutes of the Last Meeting – 1 February 2008 Attached
4. Matters Arising Attached

#### **DISCUSSION ITEM**

**10.30 – 10.50**

5. RSS Review – Project Plan and Transport Work Attached

#### **DECISION ITEM**

**10.50 – 12.30**

6. Interim Review of Regional Funding Allocations for Transport Attached
7. Any Other Business

#### **INFORMATION ITEM**

- Provisional Regional Transport Board Meeting Dates 2008/09 Attached

**Date of Next Meeting: TBC**

**MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 1 FEBRUARY 2008**

**For Decision**

Members are asked to note an amendment to the draft minutes of the Regional Transport Board Meeting that took place on 1 February 2008 and agree the revised minutes as an accurate record.

1. Following circulation of the draft minutes of the Regional Transport Board Meeting that took place on 1 February 2008, a request was received to amend the minutes as follows:

**Item 6 – Interim Review of Regional Funding Allocations for Transport**

The sixth bullet point originally stated *"Metro offered to provide views on priorities for the schemes put forward in West Yorkshire. This was welcomed by the Board."*

It is proposed this be amended to read *"Metro stated that the Leeds City Region planned to provide views on priorities for the City Region. This was welcomed by the Board"*.

2. Members are asked to agree the revised minutes, attached at **Annex A**, as an accurate record.

Nicola Baylis, Business Services Officer  
February 2008



**MINUTES OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD MEETING:  
1 FEBRUARY 2008**

**1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies**

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and the apologies were **noted**.

A full list of attendees and apologies is attached at **Annex A**.

**2. Minutes of the Last Meeting – 30 November 2007**

The minutes of the last meeting were **agreed** as an accurate record.

**3. Matters Arising**

The matters arising from the previous meeting were **noted**.

RSS Proposed Changes

Members were informed that Government Office had confirmed that the final Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), including the Regional Transport Strategy, would be published in May 2008.

Members requested clarification on whether any of the 'minor amendments' Assembly members made to the draft response to the RSS Proposed Changes related to the Board's comments on Transport. It was confirmed that no amendments were made to the Board's comments.

Achieving Low Carbon and Sustainable Transport Systems in Yorkshire and Humber

It was confirmed that the final report would be available at the end of February 2008, and a copy would be circulated to members when available.

Members were informed that the interim findings of this

**ACTION**

Nicola Baylis

report suggested that the scenarios identified would not reduce CO<sub>2</sub> to below current levels. It was proposed that a joint event with the Sustainable Development Board be arranged immediately after the April Board meeting to discuss the implications of these findings. Members **agreed** to hold a joint event on the afternoon of 4 April 2008.

#### Highways Agency Schemes

Members received a brief verbal update on the progress of the A63 Castle Street and A160/A180 schemes. It was confirmed that the A63 would reach option selection stage by April 2009 and work on the A160/A180 was progressing.

It was noted that the Highways Agency would shortly be presenting all schemes to DfT and that a further update would be provided at the next meeting.

Peter Godfrey

#### **4. Regional Monitoring Update – Highlights from Progress in the Region and the Annual Monitoring Report**

Members received a presentation (attached at **Annex B**) on the key trends – particularly relating to transport – emerging from the data analysed in Progress in the Region and the Annual Monitoring Report.

The presentation highlighted a number of important messages for the Board and provided a helpful analysis of the key trends. Members were then asked to consider how the Board could respond to these trends. In the discussion that followed, a number of key points were raised:

- It is important that this information is taken into account throughout the year when decisions are made and methodologies (i.e. RFA Review) are drawn up.
- Need to look again at how the Board's work links in with other agendas (e.g. housing, planning, sustainable development etc).
- Why is the Region's percentage of transport funding so much lower than the national average? Government Office stated that investment is long term, and that the infrastructure in the Region had needed much less investment for maintenance purposes than other regions. They also emphasised that investment in neighbouring regions had an impact on Yorkshire and Humber.
- Is there any data on congestion in the Region? It was

stated that there was very little data available at present on congestion – although WYPTE confirmed that they were currently monitoring congestion. It was felt that City/Sub Regions could look at this in more detail.

- Rail is key to reducing congestion – it would be helpful if the Board could look at rail in the future.
- The Northern Way is currently looking at motorway congestion in the North of England – it was **agreed** that a copy of the report would be circulated to members when available.
- As the region's economy grows, congestion and traffic growth will increase.
- Need to promote cultural change that encourages employers to allow people to work from home, thereby reducing congestion.
- Also need to change people's mindset about using public transport.
- Need to work more collaboratively to join up the data being collected in the Region.

John Jarvis

Members **noted** the next steps as set out in the report.

## 5. **Delivering the Regional Transport Priorities – Gap Analysis and Evidence Base**

Members received the report which analysed the findings of the work to identify 'gaps' in the planned delivery of transport priorities. They then considered the priority actions for 2008/09 set out in the report.

In the discussion that followed, a number of key points were raised:

- Who will pay for the evidence gathering? It was confirmed that both Yorkshire Forward and the Assembly were looking at providing funding for this work.
- Category B and C are also important and may also give us some 'quick wins' – we shouldn't focus purely on Category A.
- A summary of the schemes put forward to address each priority/category would be helpful.
- Need to acknowledge that public transport in Hull and Humber Ports City Region is also a priority as previously agreed by the Board.
- If these are our priorities, why are we considering other schemes?
- We need to focus on the Region's priorities, not what

- Government thinks are the Region's priorities.
- Need to continue to be pragmatic and get the flexibility to do what is best for the Region.
  - Demand management should be a key 'influencing' role for the Board.
  - Could the Board group smaller individual bids together into one larger bid if deemed appropriate?
  - The Board should welcome joint bids from two or more local authorities as these will have regional significance.
  - Need to encourage schemes that resolve some of the issues raised at Agenda Item 4.
  - Work is underway on the Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield City Region links – Annex B should be updated to reflect this.

Members **agreed** the priority actions for 2008/09 subject to the comments above. Overall it was **agreed** that the Board should take a proactive approach to encourage promoters of future transport schemes to bring schemes forward that address the key issues facing the Region, using the key findings from recent monitoring and research studies (discussed at Agenda Item 4) to do this.

## 6. Interim Review of Regional Funding Allocations for Transport

Members considered progress on an interim review of the Regional Funding Allocation and the implications of slippage in the existing programme.

It was confirmed that there was currently £92.7m of RFA funding not allocated – although there was still uncertainty around the cost increase of the Highways Agency schemes. The report recommended that the Board deliberately over-programme in order to avoid further underspending caused by scheme slippage.

In the discussion that followed, a number of key points were raised:

- A report (including case studies) would be helpful to explain why slippage occurs and how it can be prevented in future. Government Office **agreed** to undertake some work on this.
- Slippage of Highways Agency schemes is a major issue. It was noted that the Nichols's Review has taken place and had looked at this issue.

Margaret Jackson

- A risk assessment should run alongside the interim review, highlighting where slippage could occur and the implications.
- When bids are received, Officers should advise the Board on whether RFA is the most appropriate funding stream, or whether the bid could be better funded from elsewhere.
- One member expressed concern regarding the timing of the interim review, as the RSS was not yet finalised. It was confirmed that Regional Funding Allocations are set out in years, and cannot be rolled forward. It was also emphasised that the Regional Transport Strategy's priorities should not change significantly in the final version of the RSS.
- Metro stated that the Leeds City Region planned to provide views on priorities for the City Region. This was welcomed by the Board.
- It would be helpful if the criteria/methodology for the RFA review be recirculated. It was **agreed** that this information would be re-sent to members for information.

Nicola Baylis

Members **agreed** to 20% over-programming in 2009/10 and 2011 and thereby prioritise schemes up to the value of £129m through the interim review. However, Anthony Rae's strong objections to this decision were **noted**.

A supplementary bid on the City Regions/Rural Connectivity Programme was presented to the Board. Members **agreed** that this could be put forward if the details were submitted by 15 February 2008 deadline.

## 7. Regional Funding Allocations – Full Review of Programme 2008/09

Members were informed that DfT would be writing to regions in the summer to invite another round of advice regarding schemes to be resourced from the Regional Funding Allocation for Transport – with the scope of the exercise expected to be greater than in previous years.

It was emphasised that this work should be linked to the planned review of the RSS, as this will consider the increased housing numbers and the implications for transport.

Members then discussed the broad approach for carrying out the review. In the discussion that followed, a number of key

points were raised:

- The Board approach needs to also look at strategic fit.
- How much does the full review take into account decisions made during the interim review?
- Government Office stated that the second round of the RFA process will be covered in the SNR Consultation document.
- DfT is looking carefully at how rail can be brought into the next round.
- Local transport expenditure in the Integrated Transport Block may also be included in the process.
- DfT would like to take forward its discussions with the region on 'Towards a Sustainable Transport System'.

Members **agreed** the broad approach set out in the report for the full review of the programme for Regional Funding Allocations schemes, subject to the comments above. This should commence in summer 2008.

Members **agreed** that the Highways Agency should be encouraged to further develop its approach to modelling development sites. The Highways Agency asked that it be noted that other stakeholders were involved in the modelling work.

**Information Item:**

- **Progress on the Sub National Review**

The information item was **noted**.

**Date of Next Meeting: 4 April 2008**

Nicola Baylis, Business Services Officer  
6 February 2008



## REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD MEETING 1 FEBRUARY 2008

### Attendees

Nick Pontone	Business Sector (Deputy for Michael Oughtred)
Cllr Mark Kirk	Chair
George Peach	Confederation of Passenger Transport
Chris Glen	Deputy Chair
Anthony Rae	Environment Sector
John Hoare	Environment Sector
Margaret Jackson	Government Office
Peter Godfrey	Highways Agency
Cllr Andy Sloan	Hull and Humber Ports City Region Partnership
Cllr Martin Vickers	Humber Local Authority Partnership
Cllr Stephen Galloway	Leeds City Region Partnership (Deputy for Cllr Andrew Carter)
David Phillips	Network Rail (Deputy for Richard Thompson)
Cllr Clare Wood	North Yorkshire Local Authority Partnership
Cllr Symon Fraser	Rural Local Authorities
Cllr Jan Wilson	Sheffield City Region Partnership
Lyn Costelloe	Social Sector
Cllr Andrea Milner	South Yorkshire PTA
David Brown	South Yorkshire PTE
Cllr Allan Jones	Town and Parish Councils
Cllr Anne Hawkesworth	West Yorkshire Local Authority Partnership
Cllr Ryk Downes	West Yorkshire PTA
David Hoggarth	West Yorkshire PTE (Deputy for Kieran Preston)
John Jarvis	Yorkshire Forward (Deputy for Thea Stein)
Mike Padgett	YHA
Nicola Baylis	YHA
Richard Wood	YHA
Stuart Clewlow	YHA

### Visitors

John Blackburn	Bradford MDC
Adrian Withill	City of York Council
Ian Burnett	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Phil Jones	Government Office
Michael Ibbotson	Hull City Council

Amy Denton  
Elwyn Williams  
James Nutter  
Les Newby  
Andy Haigh  
Harriet Fisher

JMP Consultants  
North Yorkshire County Council  
Yorkshire Forward  
Yorkshire Futures  
YHA  
YHA

## **Apologies**

Andrew Palmer  
Michael Oughtred  
Cllr Andrew Carter  
Richard Thompson  
Mayor Martin Winter  
Kieran Preston  
Thea Stein  
Chris Martin

Business Sector  
Business Sector  
Leeds City Region Partnership  
Network Rail  
South Yorkshire Local Authority Partnership  
West Yorkshire PTE  
Yorkshire Forward  
YHA

DRAFT

**REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD MEETING:  
4 APRIL 2008**

**MATTERS ARISING FROM THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD MEETING  
HELD ON 1 FEBRUARY 2008 – FOR NOTING**

1. This note provides an update on those matters not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

**Item 3 – Matters Arising**

2. At the last meeting, it was confirmed that the final report of the Achieving Low Carbon and Sustainable Transport Systems in Yorkshire and Humber study would be circulated to members when available. Copies of this report will be made available at the meeting and the findings will be discussed at the workshop with the Sustainable Development Board following the meeting.

**Item 6 - Interim Review of Regional Funding Allocations for Transport**

3. At the last meeting, members felt that report (including case studies) would be helpful to explain why slippage occurs and how it can be prevented in future and Government Office agreed to undertake some work on this. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to undertake this in time for the current review but work will be needed on this for the full review later in the year.
4. As agreed at the meeting, the criteria/methodology for the RFA review was re-circulated to members for information on 12 February 2008.

Nicola Baylis, Business Services Officer  
March 2008

## RSS REVIEW – PROJECT PLAN AND TRANSPORT WORK

### For Discussion and Comment

Members are asked to provide comments to the Regional Planning Board as an input to the development of the Project Plan for the RSS Review.

### Introduction

1. An early review of the Regional Spatial Strategy (which includes the Regional Transport Strategy) is one of the Assembly's key work priorities for 2008/09. This Report seeks an input from Transport Board Members to the development of the Project Plan for the RSS Review. The Regional Planning Board will agree a draft Project Plan at its meeting on 8 April 2008.
2. The Government requires Assemblies to undertake a partial review of RSS by the end of 2010, focussed on housing growth. In December the Regional Planning Board agreed that the focus of the RSS review should be on three overall themes: levels of growth, locations for growth and infrastructure for growth. In agreeing this broad approach to the review, Board members stressed the need for the review to be seen as a 'continuous development' of the RSS, rather than a wholesale review. The Project Plan is being worked up within these parameters.
3. Evidence base review work has already begun. The RSS review work will need to be undertaken within the next year. It is proposed that work from April to September 2008 will focus on developing the evidence base. Work in the second half of the financial year would then concentrate on developing and analysing options, followed by policy development work. It is programmed that the Regional Planning Board will consider proposed revisions to the Yorkshire and Humber Plan at its April 2009 meeting. The Assembly would then consider a draft document in June 2009 for submission to Government.

### Regional Executive Board 'Steer' on the Project Plan

4. At its March meeting the Executive Board agreed that the testing of **Eco Town proposals** in the Region should also be incorporated into the RSS review. This would enable the bids already put to Government to be tested alongside other options for growth in the Region; including further evidence, analysis and proposals for managing growth developed and put forward by

City Regions; and other potential locations for Eco Towns as part of an overall spatial strategy for the Region.

5. The Board felt that alongside Eco Towns and Growth Point bids it was important that all possible options for growth are considered in the Review, including those put forward by local authorities, City Regions and the private sector. The Executive Board proposed that the RSS review process should include **'a call for evidence' on strategic proposals for accommodating future growth** in the Region. Such early input in the RSS review would offer a formal route to 'surface' these proposals up-front and enable this information to be used in the identification and testing of different development options for the Region.
6. Partnership working was a strong feature underpinning the development of the current Yorkshire and Humber Plan (the RSS) that is shortly to be issued by the Secretary of State. The partnership basis of the Assembly and its structure of Boards, Forums and Advisory Groups will continue to provide a strong foundation for joint working. The Executive Board proposed **that a strengthened approach to partnership working be adopted for the RSS review - drawing on collaborative evidence base and analysis work that is now taking place at the city/sub regional level.**
7. Collaborative work on the evidence base is already taking shape on this basis in the Region. For example, a complementary Regional and City/Sub Regional approach is being developed to look at infrastructure, and the work underpinning the current City Region 'transport visions' will be used as a key source of evidence/analysis in looking at transport constraints and opportunities. Work on Eco Towns and Growth Points at City Regions will also add to this. Such an approach can be used to facilitate the active involvement of City Region Boards and Panels in the RSS review process.

### **Regional Transport Forum Discussions on the Project Plan**

8. At the wider Regional Transport Forum on 5 March 2008 (at which all local authorities and a wider range of partners are represented) discussion focussed on engagement and involvement in the RSS Review, the critical transport issues for the Review and the current evidence base. Discussions on engagement highlighted the importance of existing networks/groups and the scope to make full use of Local Strategic Partnerships, the Rural Practitioners group, the Town and Parish Councils network and transport agencies. Involving the public will remain difficult. Given the review timescale electronic communication will be vital and focussing engagement at the sub area level (rather than region-wide) will be helpful.
9. In terms of critical issues and evidence base, Forum members were clear that decisions about future growth (not just housing) should not be taken in isolation to transport. The Review needs to look at capacity, key networks and services and planned transport schemes so that an overall long term look

is taken. Better integration between growth/development and transport will be necessary – getting transport improvements in first would be the ideal approach. The need to consider rural accessibility was stressed and smaller scale measures to promote alternative modes to the car must not be overlooked. The location of jobs would remain a critical factor for transport.

## **The Emerging Project Plan**

- 10.** The emerging draft Project Plan is grounded in an approach of collaborative evidence base/analysis working, particularly for key issues such as infrastructure, transport and locations for growth. The scope of the 2008 review will require the Assembly's three functional boards to work even more closely together. Furthermore the RSS review presents an opportunity to build on previous partnership working to take advantage of the development of city/sub regional structures that has taken place since the preparation of the current Yorkshire and Humber Plan (RSS) in 2004-05.
- 11.** The Project Plan being developed for the Review seeks to embody a more pro-active approach to transport, so that transport constraints and opportunities are considered early in identifying future locations for growth. More specific priorities will be identified at the RSS sub area level, tied to patterns of growth. An 'infrastructure' work stream is included.
- 12.** Evidence base review work on transport is already underway. This is examining how we can achieve a more pro-active approach and what evidence we have to support this approach. Identifying what we already have from City Region Transport Visions, Northern Way work, Local Transport Plans and Regional (Rail) Planning Assessments (amongst other sources of information) provides a good starting point. Identifying gaps and undertaking region wide analysis will be important next steps.

## **Conclusions**

- 13.** The housing-led review of RSS will be challenging and the number of national initiatives and announcements about growth and housing make it even more difficult. It should remain an important and fundamental principle that the Region shapes its own future growth pattern and RSS provides the means of doing this. The timescale for the review is relatively short.
- 14.** The RSS Review process will also help to establish clearer spatial priorities to inform the full review of schemes for Regional Funding Allocations for Transport, which will be led by the Regional Transport Board later in 2008. It is important that the two exercises are integrated. Feedback would be particularly helpful from the Board now on:
  - How as a Board, and as Board Members, can we keep you effectively engaged in the RSS Review given its tight timescales (for example the Regional Housing Board have requested a standing item), and

- What further evidence has become available (or is emerging), since the Plan was submitted to Government at the end of 2005.

Richard Wood, Head of Planning Strategy  
19 March 2008

## INTERIM REVIEW OF REGIONAL FUNDING ALLOCATIONS FOR TRANSPORT

### For Decision

Members are asked to:

- Approve the increase in costs to £19.5m for the Cudworth and West Green Bypass scheme (which is in the current Regional Funding Allocation programme);
- Agree the value of additional schemes to be supported in this review;
- Support the additional schemes set out in Groups 1 and 2 under paragraphs 15 and 16 for inclusion in the Regional Funding Allocation programme; and
- Consider whether any further (groups of) additional schemes should be supported.

### Introduction

1. At its meeting on 30 November 2007, the Board agreed to carry out an interim review of regional funding priorities early in 2008 to fill emerging gaps identified in the early to mid years of the Regional Funding Allocations (RFA) programme. Given concerns over the Region's relative share of transport funding it is important that we maximise the use of our current allocation. Under-utilising our funding allocation will not help the Region's case for additional funding in the future. However, notwithstanding the objective of making sure money is spent, it is also important that those schemes that are supported are high quality schemes and positively deliver the Region's spatial and transport priorities.
2. Later this year a full review of the Regional Funding Allocation for Transport will be taking place. This interim review is therefore not the only opportunity this year to bring schemes in to the programme. This situation needs to be taken into account in balancing the 'need to spend now' with the 'quality of fit' with policy objectives. This is an important context because there are a number of schemes that have come forward in the present interim review that have a good policy fit but need more development work. The fact that there will be a full review later in the year will allow time for scheme promoters to undertake that additional development work.
3. This report:
  - Provides information on the funding remaining available, to 2015/16 based

on the latest data.

- Provides information on the assessment process undertaken on scheme bids that have come forward for assessment.
- Sets out the results of the assessment and presents options for agreeing groups of additional schemes for funding.

## Funding Available

4. In February the Board considered slippage in the existing RFA programme to 2015/16. Not all the available funding had been spent or allocated. Given the scope for further slippage (i.e. schemes currently in the programme likely to be implemented later than planned) the Board agreed to over programme by 20% in 2009/11. This provided a potential 'pot' of £129m to draw on for this interim review.
5. Information about the current status and progress of schemes in the existing RFA programme has been further updated since the February meeting. The chart and spreadsheet in **Annex A** show the latest expenditure situation together with the details for individual schemes. There has been further slippage for some schemes and some changes in proposed expenditure. The latest data shows that £122.3m of the funding in the current programme (up to 2015/16) now remains to be allocated (an increase of almost £30m from the £92.7m reported in February)
6. This unallocated funding takes account of a cost increase for Cudworth and West Green Bypass scheme (Barnsley) that is already in the current programme. The cost increase is more than 10% of the original allocation and as such formal approval by the Board of the increase is now required again for the scheme to progress. The total scheme cost (previously £17.2m) is now £20.7m, of which Barnsley Council will fund £1.2m. The requirement from the RFA is therefore £19.5m. The scheme now represents even better value for money with the recalculated Benefit to Cost ratio (BCR) of 3.51 (previously 2.08). The scheme has not changed in any significant way, although the following minor changes have been incorporated, mainly as a result of negotiations and consultations during the statutory procedures:
  - An amended access has been provided to the glassworks site;
  - Minor modifications to two roundabouts following the public inquiry;
  - Removal of link to Three Nooks Lane following public consultation; and
  - Moving the roundabout at Fish Dam Lane, following public consultation.

Subject to receiving Full Approval from the DfT, it is programmed for construction work to start in September 2008.

**Recommendation 1. It is recommended that the increased cost of the Cudworth and West Green Bypass scheme is accepted, and the scheme re-endorsed for funding of £19.5m from the Regional Funding Allocation.**

7. In the light of the updated figures and taking into account the increased cost for the Cudworth and West Green Bypass (if approved by the Board in line with the recommendation) it is proposed that the Interim Review should now prioritise schemes up to the value of £159m. This takes into account the latest expenditure information and includes 20% over programming.
8. A significant level of further slippage has been identified over the past three months. Whilst over programming helps to manage this, further slippage may still occur. Balanced against this, however, are continuing uncertainties about cost increases on major schemes which could reduce the amount left unallocated. The full review later in the year provides the scope to consider updated costs and likely slippage in more detail.
9. Because of the current spending profile, the funding likely to be available and not yet committed remains unevenly spread over the years if we are to try to meet DfT's indicative profile. DfT have advised us that they would like to see a spending profile that roughly follows the indicative annual allocations, though this is not essential. The following table shows the approximate 'funding availability' profile that we ought to aim for in this review.

	2008/09 (£m)	2009/10 (£m)	2010/11 (£m)	2011/12 (£m)	2012/13 (£m)	2013/14 (£m)	Total (£m)
Funding availability including over programming	30	38	18	73	0	0	159

## The Assessment Process

10. The purpose of this interim review is to fill emerging gaps in the early to mid years of the RFA programme. A key driver is therefore to bring schemes in to the programme that can be delivered by 2013/2014 – relatively low cost major schemes are most likely to fit this requirement. This approach seeks to ensure that maximum use is made of the full regional allocation and to avoid any criticism that the region is not maximising its use of potentially available funding. Supporting good quality schemes that deliver regional policies remains a key overall objective.
11. Notice to all potential schemes sponsors was given on 14 December 2007 inviting proposals for additional RFA schemes in the range of £5m to £30m, (including 'exceptional' maintenance schemes), which could be completed before 2013/14. A total of 24 schemes were submitted by the deadline of 15 February 2008, with a combined value of £333.4m.
12. JMP Consultants were commissioned to undertake an independent assessment of submitted schemes. The proposals have been assessed using the methodology developed for the Government Office in autumn 2005 and updated by the Board in April 2007. This ensures that the assessment methodology is consistent with the methodology previously used to assess

schemes in the current programme. However, with the emphasis on deliverability in the interim review, the appraisal process has been strengthened with further information required from scheme sponsors on scheme deliverability (see **Annex B**). Deliverability has been assessed according to the risk of the schemes not being delivered within the time period set by the Board. This does not mean that schemes could not be delivered later.

- 13.** JMP has analysed all 24 schemes that were submitted to the Assembly by 15th February deadline. The analysis was supplemented by meetings with each scheme promoter which took place during the weeks commencing 3rd and 10th March. This approach has therefore been more rigorous than in the past and the deadlines have been important to ensure that schemes are properly assessed, in a fair and consistent manner to all scheme promoters. This analysis has provided an overview assessment of **policy, value for money** (usually Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)) and **deliverability** for each scheme. DfT policy is to generally fund most (if not all) projects with a high value for money; some (but not all) projects with a medium value for money; and very few projects with low value for money. The assessment categories are defined as follows:

Methodology element	Category	
Policy	Very Good	Contributes significantly to one or more policy area with a good overall policy fit
	Good	Good overall policy fit (but without contributing significantly to any of the policy areas)
	Fair	Supports one or more policy areas
Value for Money	High	BCR is over 2
	Medium	BCR is between 1.5 and 2
	Low	BCR is between 1 and 1.5
	Poor	BCR is less than 1
Deliverability	Red	High risk
	Amber	Medium risk
	Green	Low risk

## Assessment Results

- 14.** JMP's assessment summary sheets for all the 24 schemes are presented in **Annex C**. Based on an analysis of the results, discussions at the officers' Task Group meeting and to help the Board's consideration, the schemes have been set out below in five groups, based on the results of the assessment. This allows the schemes to be considered as groups rather than individually. This approach draws out how well the groups of schemes address policy, value for money and deliverability concerns.

15. The first group are schemes that score well against all the criteria and have a fairly low risk to their deliverability. These schemes score favourably against schemes in the existing programme.

**Recommendation 2. It is recommended that the schemes in Group 1 (set out below) are endorsed for funding from the Regional Funding Allocation.**

Assessment	Scheme	Cost to RFA (£m)
<b>GROUP 1</b> Very good policy fit High or medium value for money Green/Amber deliverability	Yorcard	28.000
	Leeds Station Southern Access	10.798
	White Rose Way, Doncaster	15.000
	A61 Penistone Road Quality Bus Corridor, Sheffield	9.959
	East Leeds Parkway, Micklefield, Leeds	19.400
	York Park and Ride - Askham Bar	5.241
	York Park and Ride - A59	10.401
	York Park and Ride - Clifton Moor	5.212
	Rotherham to Sheffield Bus Rapid Transit Northern Route	36.059
<b>Total</b>		<b>140.070</b>

16. The second group to consider are exceptional maintenance schemes, that have a good policy fit but, because of their nature, a BCR calculation is not required by DfT. However, a value for money case has been made. An additional benefit of these schemes is that they can be delivered by 2019/10.

**Recommendation 3. It is recommended that the schemes in Group 2 (set out below) are endorsed for funding from the Regional Funding Allocation.**

Assessment	Scheme	Cost to RFA (£m)
<b>GROUP 2</b> Good policy fit Value for money case but no BCR required Green/Amber deliverability *Deliver by 2009/10*	A636 Denby Dale Road Exceptional Maintenance Scheme, Wakefield	3.347
	A639 Colorado Way Exceptional Maintenance Scheme, Castleford	4.030
	A630 Centenary Way Exceptional Maintenance Scheme, Rotherham	4.783
<b>Total</b>		<b>12.160</b>

17. Taken together the schemes in Groups 1 and 2 would result in a total allocation of £152.3m

18. The third group can also be delivered by 2009/10. However, these schemes

have only a fair policy fit, so may be considered as less acceptable than schemes in previous groups. Nevertheless, including the schemes would help to make the maximum use of the RFA programme, particularly in its early years. This would result in a total allocation of £164.6m.

**Recommendation 4. Members are invited to consider whether or not to endorse the schemes in Group 3 (set out below) for funding from the Regional Funding Allocation.**

Assessment	Scheme	Cost to RFA (£m)
<b>GROUP 3</b> Fair policy fit High value for money Green/Amber deliverability *Deliver by 2009/10*	A64 Hopgrove Roundabout, York	8.880
	A628 Hoylandswaine Bypass Exceptional Maintenance Scheme, Barnsley (Value for money case but no BCR required)	3.400
<b>Total</b>		<b>12.280</b>

**19.** The fourth group schemes again have only a fair policy fit but the expenditure is over a longer time period. This would result in a total allocation of £191.2m.

**Recommendation 5. Members are invited to consider whether or not to endorse the schemes in Group 4 (set out below) for funding from the Regional Funding Allocation.**

Assessment	Scheme	Cost to RFA (£m)
<b>GROUP 4</b> Fair policy fit High value for money Green/Amber deliverability	Calderdale Burr Wall Maintenance scheme (Value for money case but no BCR required)	14.900
	A164 Humber Bridge to Beverley Route Improvement, East Riding	11.669
<b>Total</b>		<b>26.569</b>

**20.** The last group are schemes where the risk to deliverability has been assessed as red (high risk). It should be stressed that these schemes are not undeliverable as such but there is a high risk that they cannot be delivered within the time scale.

**Recommendation 6. It is recommended that the schemes in Group 5 (set out overleaf) are not endorsed for funding from the Regional Funding Allocation, as part of this review.**

Assessment	Scheme	Reason for 'red' deliverability assessment	Cost to RFA (£m)
<b>GROUP 5</b> Very good to Fair policy High to Medium value for money Red deliverability	Leeds City Region Rail Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The case for delivering what is a package of measures as a combined major scheme has not been agreed with DfT, though the synergy between the measures in this case does suggest a strong relationship and a logic to this being one scheme;</li> <li>The acceptability of including rail leasing costs within an LTP major scheme has not been tested with DfT, which could lead to delay in developing an acceptable business case;</li> <li>Legal powers such as planning consents and possible CPO for land purchase are required;</li> <li>Consultation has taken place with local communities on a number of elements, but further consultation is likely to be needed.</li> </ul>	23.700
	Leeds City Region Strategic Cycle Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The case for delivering what is a package of measures as a combined major scheme has not been agreed with DfT. There is little evidence to justify the additional benefits of undertaking the measures as a major scheme, other than affordability;</li> <li>Legal powers such as one key city centre TRO and some land purchase are required for some elements of the packages, though most of the land is at an advanced stage of negotiation;</li> <li>Consultation has taken place with local communities on some elements, but further consultation is likely to be needed for the entirety of the scheme.</li> </ul>	7.200
	A684 Bedale - Aiskew - Leeming Bar Bypass, North Yorkshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A decision on the A1 Dishforth to Barton upgrade is needed before this scheme can be delivered with certainty;</li> <li>Planning consents and other legal powers are still required.</li> </ul>	31.388
	Connecting Airedale, Bradford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The value for money case is unproven and does not include the public transport elements of the proposals;</li> <li>The case for delivering what is a package of measures as a combined major scheme has not been agreed with DfT. There is little evidence to justify the additional benefits of undertaking the measures as a major scheme, other than affordability;</li> <li>Both of the above could lead to significant delay in developing an acceptable business case for DfT;</li> <li>Legal powers such as planning consents and possible CPO for land purchase are</li> </ul>	26.389

Assessment	Scheme	Reason for 'red' deliverability assessment	Cost to RFA (£m)
		<p>required;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation has taken place with local communities on some elements, but further consultation is likely to be needed for the entirety of the scheme.</li> </ul>	
	Bradford Interchange	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The very early stage of engagement with the rail industry, with the proposal not even being at GRIP1 stage with Network Rail;</li> <li>• Planning consents are still required;</li> <li>• Agreement and approval from Network Rail required.</li> </ul>	16.548
	North Wakefield Gateway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No primary data collection or multi-modal modelling has yet been undertaken – this will be a DfT requirement if experience of other proposals is a guide;</li> <li>• No planning permission has yet been granted;</li> <li>• CPO may be required, though negotiations are advanced;</li> <li>• No public consultation has yet been undertaken.</li> </ul>	5.348
	Integr8, South Yorkshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The value for money case is unproven, the current appraisal does not include the park and ride sites;</li> <li>• The case for delivering what is a package of measures as a combined major scheme has not been agreed with DfT. There is little evidence to justify the additional benefits of undertaking the measures as a major scheme, other than affordability;</li> <li>• Both of the above could lead to significant delay in developing an acceptable business case for DfT;</li> <li>• Legal powers such as planning consents and possible CPO for land are required;</li> <li>• No public consultation has been undertaken.</li> </ul>	17.672
	Regional Information Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case for delivering what is a package of measures as a combined major scheme has not been agreed with DfT. The scheme promoter has not agreed the value for money approach with DfT.</li> <li>• The value for money case is unproven, as the current appraisal is predicated on identifying which measures from within the potential package are likely to deliver a BCR of more than 2 in each case, and then "working backwards" to collate together only those measures that individually provide value for money;</li> </ul>	14.049

Assessment	Scheme	Reason for 'red' deliverability assessment	Cost to RFA (£m)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little evidence to justify the additional benefits of undertaking the measures as a major scheme, other than affordability. Indeed, the approach of including only those measures which individually represent value for money explicitly ignores the potential benefits of combining these measures;</li> <li>All of the above could lead to significant delay in developing an acceptable business case for DfT.</li> </ul>	
<b>Total</b>			<b>142.294</b>

21. It is important to note that some of the schemes in Group 5 have a very good policy fit and value for money. In such cases, if the key risk element could be removed or reduced it is likely that these schemes could be recommended for approval in the full RFA review in the Autumn.

22. The summary table below shows the funding availability and the cumulative cost of approving each of the Groups of schemes in the order shown above. The table also shows the expenditure profiles for each group so the effect on the overall profile can be compared to the available allocation. We do not have to follow the profile and early expenditure would be beneficial to show that we can spend our allocation.

	2008/09 (£m)	2009/10 (£m)	2010/11 (£m)	2011/12 (£m)	2012/13 (£m)	2013/14 (£m)	Total (£m)
Available funding (including over programming)	<b>30</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>159</b>
Group 1	0.3	4.6	81.1	51.7	2.4		140.1
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>81.1</b>	<b>51.7</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>140.1</b>
Group 2		12.2					12.2
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>81.1</b>	<b>51.7</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>152.3</b>
Group 3	4.4	7.9					12.3
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>81.1</b>	<b>51.7</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>164.6</b>
Group 4 (£m)	1.3	8.5	11.2	5.6			26.6
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>32.2</b>	<b>92.3</b>	<b>57.3</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>186.6</b>
Group 5		7.5	28.1	60.8	30.4	15.4	142.3

## Other Issues

### Schemes with other Funding Sources

23. It is important that the RFA programme works alongside other funding sources for transport in the Region. One scheme – White Rose Way, Doncaster – does have the scope to be funded by the Local Authority. It scores well on policy fit and deliverability. With a 50% contribution from the Authority it represents good value for money (most schemes have a 10% contribution). As it is also not displacing other schemes with a very good policy fit, it is proposed to include the scheme in this interim review, and it is included as a Group 1 scheme.
24. The Board will need to consider the use of other funding sources in the Full RFA Review. When the Board agrees the detailed criteria and methodology for the review later in the year it may decide to ask scheme promoters to demonstrate a rigorous assessment of other funding options

### Leeds City Region Schemes

25. At the Board Meeting in February, Members accepted the offer from Leeds City Region to provide views on priorities for the City Region. This is presented in **Annex D**.
26. In addition we have received revised scheme proposals that they wish to be considered for the 'Connecting Airedale', Bradford (received from the City of Bradford Council on 19 March) and the Leeds City Region Rail Growth (received from Metro on 20 March). The information on these revised schemes was received after the assessment process on the submitted schemes had been completed. The information provided (excluding drawings) is included in **Annex D**.
27. It has not been possible in the time available to reassess the revised proposals, and we have not given other sponsors the opportunity to revise their proposals. However, the removal of the leasing element from the RFA funding does appear to remove one hurdle to the Rail Growth scheme's risk acceptability. There still appear to be significant uncertainties relating to the delivery of the 'Connecting Airedale' scheme.

### Reporting back to Scheme Promoters

28. There will be a report back to promoters on individual schemes. In addition, broader lessons learned from the Interim Review process will be identified and pro-actively shared with all potential scheme promoters.

### Scheme Withdrawal

29. North Yorkshire County Council gave notice on 25 March that they wish to

withdraw the A684 Bedale - Aiskew - Leeming Bar Bypass scheme (assessed as Group 5) from this review. They have not received notification from the Highways Agency that the A1 upgrade, that the scheme relied on, is going ahead so they are unable to deliver the bypass scheme in the time scale required.

## Conclusions

- 30.** The decision for the Board is to get an appropriate balance between the need for quality schemes and the need to make sure we spend our funding allocation. The emphasis for this review has to be on deliverability, given the emerging under-utilisation of our regional funds up to 2015/16. But this means that to approve schemes now with a high risk of non-delivery could potentially block other schemes and potentially result in further under spend (this is why the schemes in Group 5 are not recommended for endorsement at this stage).
- 31.** There is still an opportunity for scheme promoters with potential high quality, high value for money schemes to develop their schemes further and reduce the risk of non delivery and represent them in the full review later in the year. The interim review has served two key purposes: it will help to ensure that maximum use is made of the money that the Region has already been allocated and has helped to focus the Region and scheme promoters on what is required for the Full Review.

## Source Papers

- 32.** Past reports on this subject are available as follows:

Report	Location
<p>Regional Transport Board, 20 April 2007: Regional Funding Priorities for Transport, Considering new and emerging schemes in the short-term</p> <p>Regional Transport Board, 30 November 2007: Review of the Regional Funding Priorities for Transport</p> <p>Regional Transport Board Meeting, 1 February 2008: Interim Review of Regional Funding Allocations for Transport</p>	<p>Available from:</p> <p>Nicola Baylis Yorkshire and Humber Assembly 18 King Street Wakefield WF1 2SQ Tel: 01924 331560 E-mail: Nicola.Baylis@yhassembly.gov.uk</p>

Stuart Clewlow, Transport Policy Manager  
26 March 2008

**PROVISIONAL REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD MEETING DATES 2008/09**

1. Below are the provisional Regional Transport Board Meeting dates for the 2008/09 meeting year.
  - 25 July 2008
  - 10 October 2008
  - 23 January 2009
  - 24 April 2009
2. Regional Transport Board Meetings are scheduled to take place from 10.00am to 12.00noon. The venue for these meetings will be confirmed once the dates have been agreed.
3. These dates will be presented to the Assembly for formal approval at the Assembly AGM on 26 June 2008. Members will receive confirmation of the dates following that meeting.

Nicola Baylis, Business Services Officer  
February 2008