

Bath Package Programme Board Meeting
Wednesday 8th November 2006
Riverside, Keynsham

Notes of meeting

Attended by Richard Rawlinson
 Joy Jefferys
 Steve Froggatt Bath & North East Somerset Council
 Tony Bartlett
 Richard Long

 Peter Bartlett GOSW

 Bob Hewitt Bristol City Council
 Peter Davis West of England Partnership

 Stephen Walford North Somerset Council

		ACTION
1	Governance	
	<p>RR opened the meeting. Bath Package will have the same governance arrangements as the other major schemes, technical and budget issues will be dealt with at Board Level unless unresolved when they will be referred to Steering Group and beyond to Full Council to deal with any cross boundary issues.</p> <p>All of the respective Project Boards are now set up save for Bus Rapid Transit which Bath and NES are now responsible for.</p> <p>PB confirmed that DfT are paying increasing attention to Governance have a more hands on interest and are concerned with over runs both cost and time.</p> <p>RR Gateway Reviews recognised as useful to iron these issues out.</p>	RR
2	Terms of Reference	
	<p>The Terms of Reference follow the same format as the other major schemes but do reflect that this is the Bath Package. RR is the senior responsible officer, TB is the Section 151 Officer, JJ is the Project Manager. PB (GOSW) will be observer and board member. PD who will be working in West of England Partnership as of Monday the 13th is welcome to attend.</p>	

	<p>RR asked if there were T of R for West of England Partnership, PB none available but will be prepared in due course. It was confirmed that the West of England Partnership have no devolved powers from the four UA's i.e. no legal status but that it has a strategic co-ordination role to play.</p> <p>Prime legislation would be required to devolve any powers of UA's. BH considered that the new white paper is hinting at more joint working arrangements.</p>	PB
3	PID	
	<p>RR pointed to papers handed out at the meeting. An Executive summary of the Bath Package was included to give some background information on the scheme together with an up date report prepared for the Programme Steering Group which met on the 3rd November.</p> <p>RR confirmed that negotiations have been continuing with Crest Nicholson and that the £2.0m contribution referred to in the business case has been agreed. Crest Nicholson will be asked to dedicate land for the BRT but Bath and North East Somerset will progress the Package in any event.</p> <p>RR aiming now to move towards Programme Entry, and progress from conditional consent to full consent. Whilst there are barriers to overcome development work has commenced. A presentation was made to the RDA recently, we have secured the support of Baroness Ford who has written to the minister, Colin Skellett of the RDA is also adding support.</p> <p>PB confirmed that any delay in a response from the DfT should not be seen as negative, it simply takes time for the volume of schemes to be considered, he confirmed that Bath Package has been prioritised by the Region.</p> <p>PB there will be close scrutiny of the scheme on a technical basis to ensure that the business case is sound in order to avoid later problems, in the later stages a lighter touch is likely to be applied unless any major changes are made to the project. A green light in this process is considered to send a very much stronger message than previously.</p> <p>RR expects that DfT will appoint consultants to look at</p>	

	<p>our work and that we will be expected to meet with them to run through any assumptions made.</p> <p>RR Gateway review will be carried out by the 4P's other HoS on lines of a peer review.</p> <p>RR some of the elements of the Bath Package are individual schemes we will wish to pursue anyway for e.g. Lambridge Park and Ride. RR gave an explanation of how he intends to progress this to sign off conditions from the planning approval which will involve planning applications made by third parties.</p> <p>RR likewise the work required to kick start the BRT i.e. land acquisition is important because of linkages to Bath Western Riverside and we will be pressing ahead with this.</p> <p>RR extensions to other Bath Park and Rides will also be progressed (anticipating a settlement from DfT) A question which naturally arises is why not use JLTP money to provide the Bath Package but this process would take too long and a step change is required.</p> <p>RR The PID attached to the papers is a B&NES PID, it is in addition to the PID in the business case. Our own PID is subject to an internal robust review which is scheduled for early Dec.</p>	RR/JJ
4	Delivery Plan	
	<p>RR flow chart of work programme attached to paperwork, this shows aiming for programme entry by end of this year. We will aim for these dates but will be delayed depending on when DfT give approval to the Finance. We propose to follow along the same procedural lines as GBBN.</p> <p>JJ confirmed that work packages have been subject of an initial meeting and sub-divided amongst the team members. We will be pulling in expertise from other areas of the council, some of which will be subject to Service Level Agreements.</p> <p>PB confirmed that he agreed it was correct for us to progress since timescales were challenging particularly when you take into account TRO's and CPO's RR confirmed that TRO's are however within the gift of the Council.</p>	

	<p>RR Bath and North East Somerset leading on Bus Rapid Transit, good synergy with Bath Package since it has BRT. Bus Rapid Transit has various links one being Bath to Cribbs Causeway, arguments re viability will need to be considered, Steer Davies Gleeve have prepared a report.</p> <p>TB asked if a formal diary of meetings was available, RR initially not meeting monthly but recognised that regular meetings will need to be programmed shortly and this will be sorted out in next couple of weeks.</p>	RR/JJ
5	Gateway Review	
	<p>RR Board will focus on gateway review. RR will be on the panel.</p> <p>PB will tease out issues and the outcome of the review which is for the Programme Board.</p> <p>RR in his view biggest issue will be procurement, will have impacts for TB, all UA's have different standing orders to comply with and also differing arrangements for tending i.e. term contractors etc. The larger elements of Bath Package will not be so easy to deal with as GBBN for e.g..</p> <p>TB/RR suggested meeting of all four UA's finance officers to gain greater understanding of these issues.</p> <p>RR/PB legal agreement is required to deliver FIRST's contribution i.e. the £2.0m must be guaranteed.</p> <p>TB need forward plan for Lambridge, CPO/BWR recognised need for interdependencies to be identified. I.e. what do the Board need to do to progress programme.</p>	<p>TB</p> <p>JJ</p>
6	AOB DONM	
	<p>RR requested notes be sent to FIRST, Amanda Brooks (Bath and North East Somerset Legal) Peter Blake</p> <p>RR it was agreed that time will be set aside to update on other programmes at the end of each meeting.</p> <p>RR asked PB if appropriate to push DfT for decision, yes ok but within reason.</p> <p>RR Motts gave assistance with the business case, SF</p>	<p>JJ</p> <p>JJ</p>

	<p>attended to bring him up to date on the project re Design etc, Motts will need to be brought in on modelling issues as required.</p> <p>RR Regional Traffic model being updated BATS3, GBBN and Bath Package will not be remodelled using this model the business cases have be based on earlier modelling work which will not be revisited. To judge against a new one could result in 12months delay and will incur unnecessary costs i.e. £200-300K. The sub-region must get behind not using new model for GBBN or Bath Package.</p> <p>PB Don't want TIF to have a new model unless the layers above Bath and North East Somerset/TIF is clear within the sub region that we will not be using the model retrospectively. Clearly one model is a good idea but clarity on this is crucial, for e.g. Somerset use Atkins, Bath use Motts.</p> <p>RR/PB if scheme delayed 4-5 yrs this may be a different scenario.</p> <p>TB of the view the Risk Register needs to be broken down into 2 parts, elements of Risk related to Gateway Review need to be identified separately in time for the next meeting.</p> <p>TB, as scheme funded over life of scheme what scope for slippage/growth?</p> <p>PB the more the scheme departs from the business case either money or time the more likely deferral to the region would be. Unacceptable to have other schemes dropped, you are time and cash limited.</p> <p>RR even if cost rose and Council decided to prop up scheme DfT may not find an acceptable approach because affects value for money assumptions made.</p> <p>BH pointed out discrepancies he thought were present in PID. (£750,000K short)</p> <p>RR thanked BH for pointing these out but explained that the PID is the most up to date document, the £1½m design fees will be split 50% B&NES 50%DfT reclaimable, so £750,000 cut in half which accounts for the anomaly.</p>	<p>RR/JJ</p>
--	---	--------------

<p>RR info on land acquisition costs being prepared.</p> <p>TB have the figures in the business case had inflation added?</p> <p>JJ can confirm that they have been included and assumption shown on part two core information.</p> <p>PB of the view and RR agreed that the Unitary Authorities need to more actively promote networking.</p> <p>PB/RR RATOSG representation from Unitary Authorities not as strong as should be.</p> <p>RR will meet with TB on financial matters date to be confirmed.</p> <p>RR Progress report to the Steering Groups on all 6 projects reported, it is crucial that the Steering Group are kept informed. This has already happened on GBBN it is mandatory to produce up dates, West of England Partnership to co-ordinate.</p> <p>RR It was agreed that minutes from Steering Group need to be included with papers for Programme Board Meetings in future.</p> <p>RR It was recognised that specialists from the UA's such as legal will need to be party to separate meetings</p> <p>PD will circulate circulars/advice notes on Web tag advice.</p> <p>BH will keep in close contact re UTMC and RTI</p> <p>BH Recorded that Gloucestershire not keen on bendy buses, there was some discussion about the trip to York. Surprise expressed at how little bus priority installed.</p>	<p>RR/JMJ</p> <p>PD</p> <p>JJ</p> <p>PD</p> <p>BH</p>
DONM Wednesday 13th 2.00pm Riverside Keynsham	