

Date: 22/06/2023

Venue: Microsoft Teams

Present: David Taylor, Independent Consultant (Chair) (DT)
Lee Quincey, Leicestershire County Council (LQ)
Clare Waldron, ITP (CW)
Louise Twining, ITP (LT)
Toby France, Arriva (TF)
David Brooks, Centrebus (DB)
Nicola Tidy, Nottingham City Transport (NT)
Patrick Stringer, Stagecoach Midlands (PS)
Liz Hopwell, Charnwood DC (LH)

Purpose: Leicestershire Enhanced Partnership Board Meeting Minutes

Minutes take by: Louise Twining (ITP)

Minutes of Meeting

		ACTION
1.	<p><u>Welcome and introductions (DT)</u> Apologies were received from Adam Hemingway (Vectare), David Atkinson (Harborough DC) and Andrew Gibbons (Leicester City Council) When reviewing the minutes, TF provide a progress update on Arriva and Stagecoach's proposed Qualifying Agreement (QA) for the Nuneaton to Leicester Corridor. Both operators have provided a white paper and draft timetables to LCC and are awaiting assistance from the Council to clarify next steps.</p> <p>ACTION- LQ to arrange a call with operators to progress the QA</p>	LQ
2.	<p><u>BSIP+ funding and review update (LQ)</u> LQ informed the meeting that Leicestershire has received £1.79 million of BSIP+ funding from DfT. The funding has been allocated with the clear objective of the council maintaining support for services and prioritising access to employment. LQ emphasised the short-term</p>	

	<p>nature of the funding and the need to be mindful of the Council's significant budget pressures that still remain.</p> <p>The intention is to pause the Passenger Transport Policy and Strategy review of supported services and review the policy approach to align better with the Government's aspirations. The funding will help to maintain the status quo on supported services, while this work is undertaken. It is also intended to use some of the funding on studies and other work identified by the Council and/or through the EP.</p> <p>LQ also reported that DfT is expected to make a further £80 million of BSIP+ funding available for the 2024/2025 financial year and Leicestershire will be aiming to secure a share of that funding. To put Leicestershire in the best position to secure the funding, the current BSIP+ money needs to be spent appropriately and the intention is to incorporate the intentions and aspirations in the annual refresh of the BSIP for Leicestershire.</p>	
3.	<p><u>EP Manager role(s) update (LQ)</u></p> <p>LQ reported that the EP Manager role was readvertised following a limited response to the first advert. Three applications have been received. Two of these were deemed suitable for shortlisting - one candidate has been interviewed but deemed not suitable and the other is being interviewed during week commencing 26th June.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Future projects for inclusion in EP Scheme document (LQ)</u></p> <p>LQ indicated those elements of the current EP Scheme which remain live. The audit of bus stop infrastructure on Narborough Road South (the B414 corridor) is complete and using some of the BSIP+ funding towards upgrading some of the infrastructure on that corridor could be explored, subject to the BSIP+ T&Cs. The requirement for services on the corridor to meet Euro 6 vehicle standards by 2024 remains a live element of the Scheme.</p> <p>LQ also put forward a list of potential new projects which could be incorporated into a revised EP Scheme which some of the BSIP+ funding could finance (again subject to the T&Cs):-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. DRT feasibility study – Future FoxConnect zones; improved DRT offer/options across Leicestershire ii. Feasibility study into bus electrification across Leicestershire iii. Feasibility and options appraisal on standardisation of youth fares iv. Bus/rail interchange improvements – RTI, wayfinding, advertising at key stations across Leicestershire v. Branding – Creating a Leicestershire Buses branding that is complementary with the Leicester Buses branding 	

	<p>vi. Review the list of pinchpoint locations and assess order of priority based on deliverability, cost, services catered for, operator offer (increased frequency, improved fares, etc.), wider benefits, etc.</p> <p>vii. Implement totems and RTI within Flexi zone</p> <p>viii. Start to implement mobility hub concept at agreed locations e.g., Narborough Station, but also open to considering other locations</p> <p>ACTION- Circulate the list for operators to feedback on the ones they consider should be prioritised</p> <p>DB suggested that the funding should not be spread too widely and focus on one or two projects. TF agreed with DB and suggested that if the highest ranked priority required too much funding the second or third ranking option should be considered.</p> <p>DT confirmed that a RAG rating based on cost and deliverability would be used in prioritising projects.</p> <p>LQ also welcomed further suggestions from operators for consideration/prioritisation.</p> <p>ACTION- Operators to feed in any other suggested schemes for consideration and prioritisation.</p>	<p>LQ/CW</p> <p>Operators</p>
5.	<p><u>Inclusion of Leicester City Council as non-voting EP Board member – vote (DT)</u></p> <p>DT explained that Andy Gibbons has requested that Leicester City Council be added to the Leicestershire EP Board as a non-voting member and invited comments from those present.</p> <p>TF suggested that if one neighbouring authority was invited then all the neighbouring authorities should also be invited.</p> <p>There were discussions around the purpose of having them as a member of the board but non-voting, when they are already able to attend meetings as an observer.</p> <p>A vote from the EP board couldn't be conducted as there was no small operator representative in attendance. It was agreed that voting will take place via email.</p> <p>DB asked for clarification on what the question would be that the Board would be voting on. LQ suggested that the exact wording would be considered but would be along the lines of "Should all neighbouring authorities be invited to join the EP Board on a non-voting basis?"</p> <p>ACTION- vote to take place by email</p>	<p>LQ/CW / All voting board members</p>
6.	<p><u>Loughborough bus access – stakeholder engagement (CW)</u></p> <p>CW explained that bus access in and around Loughborough town centre had been raised numerous times at recent EP meetings. As the issue is of concern to operators, it was proposed that a brief</p>	

	<p>questionnaire is prepared to enable operators to formalise their views. CW asked LH about her insights on what is possible in terms of improving bus access in Loughborough.</p> <p>LH explained that previous administrations were keen to retain pedestrianisation but wasn't sure of the new administration's views. LH also explained that Chris Grace (Head of Economic Development and Regeneration) is working on the masterplan and town deal so would have some views to consider.</p>	
	ACTION- CW to draft questions for operators and share with LH for review and approval	CW, LH
	ACTION- operators (and others) to respond to questionnaire by email	Operators
	ACTION – CW to collate and analyse questionnaire responses	CW
	ACTION- LH to share operator responses with Charnwood lead member	LH
7.	<p><u>Passenger Charter (CW)</u></p> <p>CW reported that the passenger charter had been shared with the bus user group (BUG). As no comments had been received, the charter should now be made available online. CW highlighted that further comments around wording of the 'passenger behaviour' section had been received, but the wording will be kept neutral and refer passengers to operator's terms and conditions of carriage.</p> <p>Discussions took place surrounding whether Leicestershire EP needed a dedicated website, separate to the Leicestershire County Council website. Those present agreed that it could remain on the County Council website, but it needed sprucing up to make it easier to find and contain key information and links.</p> <p>NT asked when the operators would be expected to provide links from their websites to the passenger charter.</p>	
	ACTION – LQ to advise operators when the webpage is ready and provide a link to the passenger charter	LQ
8.	<p><u>AOB – questions / discussion (DT)</u></p> <p>NT explained that Nottingham and Nottinghamshire had decided to help operators by supporting the marginal commercial routes and asked if LCC were planning to do something similar. LQ explained that the main focus would be on the current supported services and other potential projects discussed during the meeting.</p>	
9.	<p><u>DoNMs (DT)</u></p> <p>The next EP Board meeting is in November with the other EP meeting dates as below. It was advised that an extraordinary general meeting might be needed to agree the revised EP Scheme but no date was set for this.</p>	

Meeting	Date	Time		
BUG	07/09/2023	1800-1930		
FORUM	21/09/2023	1330-1500		
BOARD	02/11/2023	1000-1130		