

BATH PACKAGE PROJECT BOARD

19TH JANUARY 2007

NOTES

Present: Peter Blake (S. Glos)
Pete Davis (Bristol)
Bob Hewett (Bristol)
Stephen Walford (N. Somerset)
Simon Cursio (First)
Peter Bartlett (GOSW)
Tony Bartlett (B&NES)
Amanda Brookes (B&NES)
Richard Rawlinson (B&NES)
Joy Jefferys (B&NES)
Steve Froggatt (B&NES)

1.0	<u>Minutes of last Meeting:</u>	
1.1	DfT Letters & Responses: copies circulated at last meeting. Further 50 questions received. Meeting with Motts to bottom out before Gateway Review.	
2.0	BWR planning application went to committee Wed. 17 th . Members were minded to approve by 5:4. The application has now been referred to GOSW to see if a call in is necessary. Important for Bath Package because Crest making £2m contribution. Summary for Steering Group circulated to PD together with an A4 copy of the programme.	PD
3.0	<u>DfT:</u> dealing with a couple of departments. Latest set of questions to do with modelling, validation, etc. Shows DfT are looking at bid seriously. Motts are dealing with 50 questions responses and have been given deadline of 31 st January to respond. Will go through answers with P.Bartlett before send back. Questions can be shared with other UA's. RR asked if BP would be tied to GBBN, i.e. if GBBN slows down will this affect BP. PB said would not, seen as a separate scheme. <u>BRT:</u> element of bid critical – implementation by 2011. Very tight timescale which depends on programme entry in April 07. PBl. Potential to fast track some elements of the two programmes, e.g. Governance/Assurance and Bath Package will piggyback on elements of the work which are complimentary. Timing is important. PBa. Wise to hope for decision on Programme entry by April otherwise will be a hiatus caused by local elections, new PM, possible cabinet reshuffle, etc which could push it back to June/July.	

	Therefore important to get response to 50 questions back by end of January/early February to allow time to consider.	
4.0	<p><u>Gateway Review:</u> Stan Coates from 4P's presenting on 31st January. Just an assessment meeting. Assuming will start at GR 0. PBI asked if needed Gateway Review before Programme entry. PBa no indication DfT would require it prior to programme entry. PBI suggested setting a provisional date in June based on programme entry in April and talk to DfT to confirm this.</p>	
5.0	<p><u>Delivery Plan – Gantt Chart:</u> Shows critical path of BRT by 2011 together with different elements of the scheme. Early parts mainly concerned with administration. Have identified the need for detailed drawings to be prepared. Some were only done for the summary element. It is essential the BRT route is protected and need detailed drawings to be able to answer detailed questions generated from developments planned along the route and to progress statutory appeals. SF is talking to Gary Peacock about the different work package requirements. RR stressed that need to start this financial year. SF said had resources to deal with the work. Additional staff were required and this was being dealt with plus had Motts as partners.</p> <p>There are also a number of supplementary studies that need to be done such as environmental, P&R etc. JJ There are a number of baseline studies carried out by the Major Projects team for BWR and we have the documents. There might be some that could be used for BP thus avoiding duplication/reducing cost.</p> <p>Legal agreements with First important part of critical path. SC said most could be lifted from GBBN draft agreement – detail would be different.</p> <p>Lambridge P&R: pushing ahead. Planning application for Mill Lane going in for end of February. Trying to get approved this side of local elections.</p> <p>JJ meeting 29th January with Planning to go through statutory requirements, e.g. signing off negative conditions on adjacent site which is causing difficulties. A strategy is needed to deal with this, hence meeting with planners on this and other statutory requirements.</p> <p>Bus Lanes/stops: as part of the value management exercise for GBBN have been relooking at bus lanes, bus stops. Want to do a similar exercise for BP. Set this up and include First before detailed drawings commissioned.</p> <p>Land: CPO – reserve position. Ascertain land ownership and solve by negotiations before CPO if possible. Need active engagement to</p>	

	<p>progress. TB commented that cash flow would be biggest problem, especially if served with blight notices.</p> <p>RR stressed that Programme Entry was very important to B&NES.</p>	
6.0	<p><u>Risk Register</u>: basic register produced – needs updating. Based on B&NES corporate risk register. Proposed to hold a workshop – internal in the first instance although was suggested PD should attend in the interests of continuity. PD agreed would be helpful and papers from SBRR could inform workshop.</p>	
7.0	<p><u>Linkages with GBBN</u>:</p> <p>PBl. Number of key lessons re Gateway Review, Assurance documents, trying to bridge programme entry to final submission gap. These are the main areas.</p> <p>RR asked what progress on legal agreements was. AB responded she was still waiting for comments from the other UA's and from Paul Fox. RR. difficult because new area. Document from First really well written but need to protect council's interest. Document looks ok technically but how do judge legal side? Risk register should help with this. PBl. Agreement only a draft and final documents will not be submitted with the Business Case. The agreement will only apply once the infrastructure is in place. AB. There are also indications that the legal side could change, maybe in 2008.</p> <p>RR asked about including other bus operators. PBl. There will be consultation prior to final Business Case submission so can be dealt with after programme entry. BP can use the experience gained by GBBN and almost copy the approach although BP will be different from GBBN because of BRT.</p> <p>Consultation: RR commented that need to advise Members and considering a workshop for this. PBl. The main focus at the moment should be programme entry. If there is additional capacity then can move forward some other elements at the same time. Some of the documentation, such as legal agreements, is not yet in the public domain and Members need to understand this. TB. Need to be aware with forthcoming elections of possible political ramifications. Would be better to put back consultation for a couple of months.</p> <p>PBl. Consultation plan, governance, legal must all come through the Project Board so could hide behind the process for 3 months.</p> <p>RR. the planning application associated with Lambridge will raise</p>	

	<p>public awareness again prior to the elections and this is one of the risks.</p> <p>TB. Need a risk workshop to pick through these risks, eg. Political, etc.</p> <p>RR. there is no flexibility in the timeframe unless programme entry is delayed until after April.</p> <p>PBI. The key issue is programme entry and a green light from the DfT.</p> <p>RR. members may not understand the stages to be gone through to get to programme entry.</p> <p>JJ. members now more focussed on BP because of BWR consent.</p>	
8.0	<p><u>Next Meeting:</u></p> <p>This has been scheduled for 21st February but it was agreed this was too early.</p> <p>New date 27th March at 9.30.</p>	