



## Notice of a public meeting of

### Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee (Calling In)

- To:** Councillors Galvin (Chair), Fraser, Horton, Jeffries, King, McIlveen, Potter, Runciman (Vice-Chair) and Steward
- Date:** Monday, 3 June 2013
- Time:** 5.00 pm
- Venue:** Craven Room (GO48), West Offices, Station Rise, York YO1 6GA

## AGENDA

### 1. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point, Members are asked to declare:

- any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests
- any prejudicial interests or
- any disclosable pecuniary interests

which they may have in respect of business on this agenda.

### 2. **Public Participation**

It is at this point in the meeting that members of the public who have registered to speak can do so. The deadline for registering is **5.00pm on Friday 31 May 2013**. Members of the public can speak on agenda items or matters within the remit of the committee.

To register to speak please contact the Democracy Officer for the meeting, on the details at the foot of the agenda.

**3. Minutes** (Pages 3 - 6)  
To approve and sign the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 15 April 2013.

**4. Called In Item: West Yorkshire Plus York Transport Fund (WYTF+)** (Pages 7 - 52)  
To consider the decisions made by Cabinet on 7 May 2013 in relation to the above item, which has been called in by Cllrs Healey, Gillies and Richardson in accordance with the Council's Constitution. A cover report is attached setting out the reasons for the call-in and the remit and powers of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee (Calling-In) in relation to the call-in, together with the original report and the decisions of the Cabinet.

**5. Urgent Business**  
Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.

Democracy Officer:

Name : Jill Pickering

Contact Details:

- Telephone : 01904 552061
- E-mail : [jill.pickering@york.gov.uk](mailto:jill.pickering@york.gov.uk)

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting.

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above.

## About City of York Council Meetings

### Would you like to speak at this meeting?

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

**A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088**

### Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

### Access Arrangements

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an

interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 551550 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন ভাষাতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরনের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোভাষী সরবরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 551 550।

*Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin terümesini hazırlatmak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel: (01904) 551 550*

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話 (01904) 551 550。

اگر مناسب وقت سے اطلاع دی جاتی ہے تو ہم معلومات کا ترجمہ میا کرنے کی پوری کوشش کریں گے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 551 550

*Informacja może być dostępna w tłumaczeniu, jeśli dostaniemy zapotrzebowanie z wystarczającym wyprzedzeniem. Tel: (01904) 551 550*

### **Holding the Cabinet to Account**

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Cabinet (39 out of 47). Any 3 non-Cabinet councillors can 'call-in' an item of business following a Cabinet meeting or publication of a Cabinet Member decision. A specially convened Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee (CSMC) will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Cabinet meeting, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

### **Scrutiny Committees**

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

### **Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?**

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- York Explore Library and the Press receive copies of **all** public agenda/reports;
- All public agenda/reports can also be accessed online at other public libraries using this link

<http://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?bcr=1>

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

---

MEETING	CORPORATE AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (CALLING IN)
DATE	15 APRIL 2013
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS WISEMAN (CHAIR), BARNES, HORTON, KING, MCILVEEN, POTTER, RUNCIMAN (VICE-CHAIR), STEWARD AND WARTERS
IN ATTENDANC	COUNCILLORS REID AND HEALEY

---

## 20. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare, at this point in the meeting, any personal interests, not included on the Register of Interests, or any prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests they may have in respect of business on the agenda. No further interests were declared.

## 21. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there had been one registration to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Sue Galloway, spoke as Vice Chair of the Foxwood Residents Association, referring to the reporting of faults on a number of street lights in the Foxwood Area over a number of weeks. It was noted that the faults had not been rectified or the reports acknowledged until they had been escalated to Stage 2 of the complaints procedure. Concerns were also raised at the absence of any costings, or a timetable for the proposed work and to the use of residents to report future faults. Reassurances were sought that the proposed service would be no worse than that currently in operation and at no greater cost. Contingency arrangements were also requested until the new system was up and running. The Cabinet Member was asked to confirm that Residents Associations and Parish Councils would be informed of the new arrangements and that the city centre would not receive preferential treatment under the new arrangements at the expense of the rural areas.

**22. MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 17 December 2012 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the following:

- i) The addition of Cllr Ayre as in attendance at the meeting.
- ii) The addition of '*That Officers examine the current practice of marking Members as absent from meetings when they have to appoint a substitute through their having a prejudicial interest in matters on the agenda*'.

**23. CALLED IN ITEM: STREET LIGHTING MAINTENANCE PROCUREMENT**

Members received a report which asked them to consider the decisions made by the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services on 21 March 2013, in relation to the procurement of a new street lighting maintenance contract. The report to the meeting outlined the options available for the procurement of a new contract, following the expiration of the existing street lighting term maintenance contract which expired on 31 March 2013.

Details of the Cabinet Members decision was attached at Annex A to the report, with the original report to the Cabinet Member attached at Annex B. The decision had been called in by Cllrs Reid, Runciman and Orrell on the following grounds:

- i) It is a serious concern that the Council will stop routine checking (scouting) for faulty street lighting.
- ii) The report does not refer to the experience the City had 15 years ago when it stopped scouting and found that, while some neighbourhoods were very good at reporting faults, in other areas lights were often not reported and therefore not working for weeks or months.

- iii) A lack of public consultation to determine whether the capacity exists for resident reporting to work this time.
- iv) No proper analysis of the quality of the service provided by the existing contractor or the service levels expected to be achieved by the Council.
- v) No business case for bringing the service in-house or examination of the capacity and expertise the Council has.
- vi) No apparent measures in place in the event skilled staff can not be TUPE'd across and the Council needs to recruit and train staff.

Members were asked whether to confirm the decision (Option a) or to refer it back to the Cabinet Member for re-consideration (Option b) as set out in the report.

Councillor Reid addressed the meeting on behalf of the Calling-In members expressing concern at the proposal to cease routine scouting for faulty street lights and the effect of this on local communities. Particularly in relation to fear of crime and the need for a consistent approach across the city. If the decision should be upheld they requested a strengthening of the feed back system. Reference was made to the lack of detail in the report in respect of analysis of the options, staffing levels and hire/purchase arrangements for the necessary equipment. Expansion of the business area had been mentioned, in the report, however no information had been provided to support this. Members were asked to reinstate night scouting as there did not appear to be an adequate business case to support the proposal.

The Cabinet Member for Environmental Services responded to the points raised, pointing out that the decisions he had taken were completely independent of each other. A number of authorities had stopped night scouting with no resulting increase in crime levels. The high level of mobile phone ownership and usage would assist in the reporting of issues through the use of mobile devices. He confirmed that he would follow up the references made, earlier in the meeting, to response times and feedback mechanisms.

Members went on to discuss the points raised and other issues in some detail. It was questioned how the new reporting arrangements would be advertised, details of monthly costings and health and safety issues

In response to questions, Officers confirmed that reportings had never been split between public reporting and scouting. The new arrangements would give the authority more control over lighting maintenance work and ensure quicker response times. Existing performance indicators would be retained and it was noted that every street light would have a notice displayed with details of the new reporting arrangements.

Reference was made to the business case underlying the options put forward which the Cabinet Member had considered when making his decision. This had contained financial commercially sensitive information relating to employees pay and details of plant, labour, leasing, fuel and materials.

The Cabinet Member confirmed that he would ask Officers to examine the use of Your Voice and the website to publicise the new arrangements and confirm the details with Parish Council's and Residents Associations.

Following further discussion Officers confirmed that, following reporting of an issue, no feedback would be given to the reporter unless a problem arose and the light could not be fixed within the usual 2 day period. Members reiterated the need to continue to make savings and efficiencies in all these areas.

RESOLVED: That Option (a) identified in the report be approved and that the decision of the Cabinet be confirmed.

REASON: In accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution.

Cllr S Wiseman, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.30 pm and finished at 6.20 pm].



---

**Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee  
(Calling – In)**

**3 June 2013**

Report of the Assistant Director, Governance and ICT

Called-in Item: West Yorkshire Plus York Transport Fund

**Summary**

1. This report sets out the reasons for the call-in of the decisions made by Cabinet on 7 May 2013 in relation to the West Yorkshire Plus York Transport Fund (WYTF+). The report to the meeting provided an update on the development of the Fund, proposed details of the package of schemes, sought in principle support as to indicative levels of financial contributions and detailed governance proposals.

This cover report sets out the powers and role of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee in relation to dealing with the call-in.

**Background**

2. The Decision Sheet issued after the Cabinet decision is attached as Annex A to this report. This sets out the decisions taken by Cabinet on the called-in item. The original report to Cabinet on the called-in item is attached as Annex B to this report.
3. The Cabinet Members decision has been called in by Cllrs Healey, Gillies and Richardson for review by the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee (CSMC) (Calling-In), in accordance with the constitutional requirements for call-in. The following are the reasons given for the call-in:
  1. *No comparison, detailed or otherwise, of the advantages and disadvantages of joining with the Leeds Economic Partnership as compared with the North Yorkshire and East Riding Economic Partnership have been put forward;*

2. *The 'York Package of Schemes' as put forward has only demonstrable value to North Yorkshire and York whilst demonstrating none for Leeds and West Yorkshire;*
3. *There has been a complete lack of debate and consideration of any precept which might need to be levied in order to progress the 'York Package of Schemes.'*”

### **Consultation**

4. In accordance with the requirements of the Constitution, the calling-in Members have been invited to attend and/or speak at the Call-In meeting, as appropriate.

### **Options**

5. The following options are available to CSMC (Calling-In) Members in relation to dealing with this call-in, in accordance with the constitutional and legal requirements under the Local Government Act 2000:
  - a. To decide that there are no grounds to make specific recommendations to the Cabinet in respect of the report. If this option is chosen, the original decisions taken on the item by Cabinet on 7 May 2013 will be confirmed and will take effect from the date of the CSMC (Calling-In) meeting; or
  - b. To make specific recommendations to Cabinet on the report, in light of the reasons given for the call-in. If this option is chosen, the matter will be reconsidered by Cabinet at a meeting of Cabinet (Calling-In) to be held on 4 June 2013.

### **Analysis**

6. Members need to consider the reasons for call-in and the report to Cabinet and form a view on whether there is a basis to make specific recommendations to Cabinet in respect of the report.

### **Council Plan**

7. There are no direct implications for this call-in in relation to the delivery of the Council Plan and its priorities for 2011-15.

## Implications

8. There are no known Financial, HR, Legal, Property, Equalities, or Crime and Disorder implications in relation to the following in terms of dealing with the specific matter before Members; namely, to determine and handle the call-in.

## Risk Management

9. There are no risk management implications associated with the call in of this matter.

## Recommendations:

10. Members are asked to consider the call-in and reasons for it and decide whether they wish to confirm the decisions made by Cabinet or refer the matter back for reconsideration and make specific recommendations on the report to Cabinet.

**Reason:** To enable the called-in matter to be dealt with efficiently and in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution.

## Contact details:

**Author:**

Dawn Steel  
Head of Civic &  
Democratic Services  
01904 551030

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Andrew Docherty  
Assistant Director, Governance and ICT

**Report  
Approved**



**Date** 21 May 2013

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)** None

**Wards Affected:**

**All**



**For further information please contact the author of the report**

## Annexes

Annex A – Copy of the Decision Sheet produced following the Cabinet decision on the called-in item.

Annex B – Report of the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning and Sustainability to Cabinet on 7 May 2013.

**Background Papers**

None

**CABINET****TUESDAY, 7 MAY 2013*****Extract from the DECISIONS***

Set out below is a summary of the decisions taken at the Cabinet meeting held on Tuesday, 7 May 2013. The wording used does not necessarily reflect the actual wording that will appear in the minutes.

Members are reminded that, should they wish to call in a decision, notice must be given to Democracy Support Group no later than 4pm on the second working day after this meeting.

If you have any queries about any matters referred to in this decision sheet please contact Jill Pickering.

**6A WEST YORKSHIRE PLUS YORK TRANSPORT FUND (WYTF+)**

RESOLVED: That Cabinet agree to:

- i) Support the principle of establishing a £1 billion 'West Yorkshire Plus' Transport Fund and the associated, indicative levels of financial commitments as set out in the report, subject to resolutions ii) and iii) below.
- ii) Satisfactory progress in on-going City Deal negotiations, specifically including securing clarity and agreement on an acceptable level of Earn Back funding from future additional business rates in West Yorkshire and York; and
- iii) An in-principle agreement being made by all West Yorkshire District Authorities.

- iv) Submit the proposal to Full Council once negotiations have been progressed, an acceptable level of Earn Back funding has been agreed and receipt of in-principle agreement by all West Yorkshire District Authorities.
- v) Approve the draft Memorandum of Understanding, as set out Annex C of the report.
- vi) Approve the initial development of business cases for the Outer Ring Road schemes and early development work on the bus interchange at York railway station in 2013/14.

## REASON:

- i) - iv) To enable major transport schemes to be brought forward which will deliver the council's objectives.
- v) To enable CYC and West Yorkshire Authorities to work together to deliver the WYTF+.
- vi) To allow delivery of schemes early in the WYTF+ programme.



---

**Cabinet****7 May 2013**

Report of the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning and Sustainability

**WEST YORKSHIRE PLUS YORK TRANSPORT FUND (WYTF+)****Summary**

1. This report is presented in order to:
  - Provide an update on the development of the West Yorkshire Plus York Transport Fund (WYTF+);
  - Provide details of the proposed York package of schemes;
  - Seek support in principle to the indicative level of financial contributions that York would need to make to the fund;
  - Provide an update on emerging governance proposals and indicative timeline of key WYTF+ milestones.
  - Approve the governance Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) covering the interim period to April 2014.
  - Approve the preliminary development of the projects within the proposed York package in 2013/14.
  
2. Owing to the proposed future financial and governance commitments identified in this report the final decision will need to be taken by Full Council in due course. A final report will be presented at Full Council in advance of any formal transfer of authority, prior to making any long term revenue commitments and following the resolution of any outstanding City Deal items such as the Earn Back arrangements.

## Background

### ***Context – The Need for WYTF+***

3. Although York is weathering the current economic slowdown relatively well in comparison to some other UK towns and cities<sup>1</sup>, it is acknowledged that the major UK cities and regions must compete on an international basis. Even against a backdrop of a global recession many other cities are investing heavily and seeing their economic output grow.
4. Therefore, the challenge for the local authorities of York and the West Yorkshire region is to find the best way to use the scarce public sector funds available to stimulate the economy so that the recovery is strong and sustained.
5. There are several ways in which investment can lead to this form of economic strengthening. Investment in infrastructure that leads to business growth and efficiency gains is one of them. Transport connectivity – how long journeys take as well as their reliability - is a critical factor for most businesses across the North, and it is therefore an absolutely vital area for investment.
6. Work done by the Northern Way established an evidence base that highlighted the potential in the North to provide a strong boost to national economic recovery, but we don't yet have the quality transport networks that are needed. It also suggested that the growth potential for the north is substantial and called for a re-balancing of transport expenditure away from the south of England.
7. Calculations carried out by Transport for Greater Manchester in a Single Appraisal Framework (SAF) reveal that transport infrastructure investment offers excellent value for money relative to other local authority policy and intervention areas, in terms of increasing economic potential.
8. Major transport schemes are also needed to underpin the emerging York Local Plan. Opportunities to link the phasing of some of the proposed York package to key local development sites such as York Central are important and will be investigated fully. Significant growth would be accommodated through the following outcomes:

---

<sup>1</sup> Centre for Cities, Cities Outlook report 2012

- Widening the accessible labour pool to attract new employees from a wider catchment area.
  - Improving access to York by upgrading the northern section of the outer ring road with specific benefits for all road users.
  - A significant enhancement in bus commuting into the city centre and to sustainable nodes, assisted by the relocation of non-essential traffic out of the city centre onto the ring road.
  - Entering into a partnership with Network Rail to transform the existing station to create an improved gateway with the capacity and quality to attract significant numbers of new users thus delivering growth.
  - Connecting the increased workforce expected as a result of housing growth with new and existing employment opportunities.
  - Improving access to new jobs and areas of existing employment for people who live in deprived communities.
9. Locally in York there is strong support from the general population for transport investment to support the economy, reducing congestion and improving connectivity and transport.<sup>2</sup> This is reinforced through comments and views received through ongoing dialogue with our key transport stakeholders, some of whom are very concerned at current inadequacies affecting their businesses in terms of delivery times and reliability.

### ***Context – The Development of WYTF+***

10. The origins of the WYTF+ date back to the announcement of the Leeds City Deal with Government in July 2012. As well as a proposal to change transport governance arrangements (a Combined Authority) and initiate rail devolution, the Leeds City Deal also included a commitment to create a £1 billion+ fund to invest in transport over the next decade.
11. Alongside the City Deals the UK Government has also changed the way in which local transport major scheme funding will be

---

<sup>2</sup> City of York Council Local Transport Plan for 2011 to 2031

organised from 2015/16 onwards. Local authorities were invited to become members of Local Transport Bodies (LTB). By devolving power and funding for transport major schemes from the DfT the LTB becomes the organisation through which scheme prioritisation and funding decisions are made.

12. The Cabinet approved (9 October 2012) the proposal for York to join a West Yorkshire and York LTB subject to detailed Governance arrangements being agreed. The DfT confirmed the indicative Major Scheme allocation for the West Yorkshire and York LTB in January 2013. The WYTF+ includes the West Yorkshire + York LTB major scheme funding.
13. City of York Council is also a non-voting member of the neighbouring North Yorkshire LTB. Initial discussions with the NYLTB have identified that the York Outer Ring Road scheme is of mutual benefit to both West Yorkshire Plus York and North Yorkshire LTB.
14. A report describing the development of the WYTF+ is attached as Annex A. The key objectives are:
  - The fund is targeted specifically at increasing employment and productivity growth.
  - The fund will address decades of under-investment in the City Region transport network.
  - The overall impact of the fund will be carbon neutral or better
15. Evidence shows that the fund has potential to achieve the following outcomes:
  - Generate significant additional economic investment
  - Enhance connectivity to, from and within the area.
  - Unlock key development sites
  - Substantially reduce dependence on central funding
  - Provide surety over a 10 year programme of major schemes
  - Create a further income stream (the Earnback deal)
  - Develop transformational schemes

***The York Package***

16. The proposed York package of schemes shares the same objectives as the (core) West Yorkshire package - namely the delivery of the maximum net increases in Gross Value Added (GVA) – a measure of economic output - and improving access to employment.
17. By adopting the same strategic objective as that used in the core package York's overall funding contribution and its per capita allocation of major scheme funding will be spent either on schemes with a mutual benefit to West Yorkshire and York (and potentially other LTBs) or on schemes of benefit to York and its hinterland.
18. The initial long list of potential major schemes and a précis of the analysis and modelling carried out to prioritise the schemes is detailed in Annex B. The five highest performing York schemes were prioritised as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 – York Package of Schemes

Initial Sift Order	Scheme	Cost (incl optimism bias) £m	Scheme Description
1	York Central Access	27.0	York Central Access, new access road via A59, pedestrian access from station area, sustainable access routes, Queen Street bridge demolished and bus interchange within wider station redevelopment
2	A19 Bus Lane and access to Designer Outlet P&R Improvements	1.9	A19 Bus Lane and Improved access to and egress from existing Designer Outlet P&R
3	Clifton Moor Park & Ride and corridor improvements	9.8	New Clifton Moor Park & Ride site and bus priority and general corridor improvements
4	PT Improvements 2 – City Centre Infrastructure	7.2	PT Improvements 2 – City Centre bus priority infrastructure and traffic management measures including: City centre bridge access priorities City centre bus priority measures Changes to city centre traffic management Roll out of hybrid/electric bus fleet conversion York ongoing Better Bus Area Status
5	Northern Outer Ring Road Improvements - Low Intervention	37.6	Northern Outer Ring Road Improvements - Low Intervention (r/b upgrades, minor widening improvements to approaches and exits and some NMU facility upgrades)
<b>York Package</b>		<b>83.5</b>	<b>c.£129m total York GVA</b>

19. The prioritised package of schemes in York follows a similar balanced approach as in West Yorkshire by offering additional highway capacity around York, while enabling sustainable growth (by bus, rail, walk and cycle) for access to new employment opportunities in the city centre, main urban areas and at sustainable nodes.

20. The package will deliver the following:

- Increased capacity on the northern sections of the outer ring road

- Provide new access and bus interchange within the York Central development
- Full Park & Ride coverage of the city and service improvements
- Support priorities for bus, cycle and walking access within and to the city centre.

21. These five schemes naturally form a coherent package that would support additional employment and GVA growth, compared to the baseline situation without the package, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 – Economic and Employment Impact

<b>YORK</b>	Year	2024	2030	2036
Additional employment		1,200	1,800	2,000
Additional GVA (per year)		£70m	£110m	£130m
Additional York residents in employment		750	900	1,200

22. Overall the Fund would support significant levels of employment growth with only a minimal increase in the volume of car commuting traffic. The increase in employment within York would be met by increased employment opportunities for York residents and an increase in inward commuting from North Yorkshire.

23. Along with 1,200 additional York residents in employment by 2024, there would be benefit for residents of neighbouring Authorities. The additional number of residents in employment would also increase (by 2036) above the baseline, as follows:

- West Yorkshire            110
- Selby                         240
- North Yorkshire         110
- East Riding                130

24. The York package of schemes performs very well in terms of GVA 'bought' per £1.00 invested. The calculations suggest the package would buy £1.61 of GVA per £1.00 invested, compared to £1.23 in West Yorkshire (and £0.90 in Greater Manchester). The conventional Transport Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) for the York package is calculated as 2.2 as a minimum, which excludes a detailed analysis of decongestion benefits (which are likely to be significant).

25. Addressing existing points of congestion and delay on the highway and public transport networks will benefit all transport users. Quicker and more reliable journey times are provided for strategic (through) traffic enhancing strategic connectivity to the A1(M). These will be complemented by city centre measures that will result in quicker, more reliable public transport into the heart of the historic city areas.
26. The overall impact on carbon emissions is expected to be neutral or slightly positive. The carbon impacts of decongestion cannot be tested in detail at this stage, but once adequately calculated the scale of reduction is expected to lead to a net decrease in city wide emissions. The detailed impact on carbon will be assessed at the detailed design and business case stage
27. A similar approach to further carbon reductions as suggested for West Yorkshire could be pursued. It will be possible to set more ambitious targets for carbon as part of the design specification, or as enhancements to scheme designs which could attract additional funding or third party contributions which could facilitate the following types of intervention:
  - Further improvements in bus technology such as an increased rate of conversion to hybrid or preferably electric vehicles
  - Inclusion of electric charging points as part of rail station/bus park and ride schemes
  - Cycle and walk schemes being incorporated within key corridor and town centre improvement designs

### ***“Earn-Back”***

28. Discussions are taking place with central government over the terms of the ‘earn back’ commitment set out in the City Deal. It is anticipated that delivery of the early measures in the fund will generate additional economic activity and revenue for government (primarily through business rates). A key element of the City Deal is the ability to ‘earn back’ a proportion of this revenue and use it to support further investment through the fund locally. This is particularly important for some of the more ambitious, longer term measures that are proposed to be implemented after the first 10 years.

29. As the Fund develops, and as Earn Back starts to create a 'new' funding stream in the future, the York and West Yorkshire partners will develop an approach to jointly developing, delivering and funding mutually beneficial schemes.

### ***Transformational Schemes***

30. A number of larger mutually beneficial schemes have been identified as medium term interventions with potential to deliver transformational change. It is recognised that most of these will take longer than the initial 10 year period of the fund to develop, design and deliver and will require funding over and above the initial £1bn (for example through the 'earn back' deal with government). It is proposed that the fund will be used to undertake the preparatory work required for future delivery.
31. Also of relevance to York are the committed improvements to the Trans-Pennine train services (electrification) that will improve connectivity between York, Leeds and beyond and provide a key building block to achieve further rail improvements.
32. Also of significant local interest are further rail network improvements (potentially funded through Earn Back). Most notably improvements to the Harrogate line will be developed in partnership with Network Rail. Other rail projects will be developed to address connectivity between York and Castleford/Wakefield, and Bradford and Halifax via the Caldervale line.
33. Business links will be further enhanced through the future provision of heavy rail or tram train connections between Leeds and Bradford City Centres and Leeds Bradford International Airport.

### ***Governance***

34. Following detailed consideration by the West Yorkshire District Councils, West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority and City of York Council it is proposed to establish the West Yorkshire and York Local Transport Body in accordance with the requirements of the DfT. Proposals for the governance arrangements to be adopted are currently being finalised by each partner with a view to submitting the governance plan to DfT by July 2013 for approval.

35. The governance proposals have been shaped by the intention of the West Yorkshire authorities to form a Combined Authority (CA) in April 2014. At the point the Combined Authority is established, the LTB functions will be assumed by the arrangements to be put in place for the Combined Authority. Before then, arrangements need to be made for the 'Interim Period'.
36. A draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) has been prepared to set out the common will of the WYTF+ partners to cover governance issues during the interim period. This is attached as Annex C, and the key features are:
- The LTB functions will be administered by the Executive Committee of the West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (WYITA).
  - During the Interim Period an elected Councillor nominated by the Leader of City of York Council may attend all meetings of the LTB or any committee of the WYITA at which LTB business appears on the Agenda. Under the standing orders of WYITA the Chair will permit the York Councillor to address the meeting and take part in discussions but not vote.
  - Subject to agreement from WYITA and CYC, a Joint Advisory Committee of the WYITA and City of York Council may be established pursuant to s101 of the Local Government Act 1972 to advise and make recommendations to the LTB.
  - The Parties agree that York's overall funding contribution to the Fund including the devolved major scheme funding will only be directed to: schemes with a mutual benefit to West Yorkshire and York (and potentially other LTB's); or schemes of benefit to York and its hinterland.
  - In its capacity as the LTB, WYITA will only allocate resources committed to the Transport Fund and prioritise schemes in accordance with the agreed prioritisation criteria and in agreement with both parties – effectively 'Ring-Fencing' the York package to the schemes as outlined.

37. As York is unlikely to be a founder member of the CA (due to non contiguous boundaries) a further MoU is likely to be needed between the CA and CYC.

### ***Preparatory Work***

38. Following approval from each individual district to set up the WYTF+, it is proposed to develop a number of schemes that can be brought forward in the early years of the fund.
39. Work to develop West Yorkshire based schemes will be funded by a ring-fenced allocation in the 2013/14 WYITA budget allocated from the WY transport levy. This funding is not available to develop York schemes.
40. Therefore, if York is to keep pace with the other members of the WYTF the council will need to assign sufficient budget from its own funds to develop York scheme(s) for early delivery.
41. Given the existing congestion problems and LTP and DfT funded scheme investment programme, it is the Officer view that the York Outer Ring Road scheme should be prioritised for early delivery in the WYTF+. Development of this scheme at an early stage also maximises the opportunity for a contribution from the North Yorkshire Local Transport Body (NYLTB) which is working to a 2015-2019 funding window. Initial discussions regarding a joint funding proposal to the NYLTB have been positive.
42. Early development of the station bus interchange plans will also be a priority to enable early engagement with potential East Coast Mainline franchise bidders and working with Network Rail to ensure implementation takes place within the next franchise period.
43. Current transport capital programme funding is fully allocated in 2013/14 to support the delivery of the Access York Phase 1 project and Better Bus Area Fund and Local Sustainable Transport Fund schemes. Subject to confirmation of the financial arrangements it is proposed to fund the preliminary development work for the schemes within the WYTF+ by bringing forward a proportion of the 14/15 contribution to the fund once the fund has been approved. In the interim initial development of the schemes will continue using the existing Delivery and Innovation Fund allocation (£70k) for Access York Phase 2 development.

44. Depending on the delivery programme it is anticipated that up to £200k will be required in 13/14 to progress the development of the business case and early stage design for the Outer Ring Road Schemes.

### ***Shared Delivery***

45. Looking further ahead there are key opportunities to share delivery expertise between York and West Yorkshire authorities and efficiencies to be gained through a partnership approach to feasibility studies, business case development, project management and delivery.

### **Consultation**

46. Citywide consultation was carried out in 2009 when the City of York Council Local Transport Plan for 2011-2031 was developed. Consultation has also taken place with business interests and the York Quality Bus Partnership. This showed strong support for transport investment to support the economy.
47. Internal consultation concerning WYTF+ has been carried out with: Leader; Chief Executive; Cabinet Member for Transport; Director; Finance Director and Assistant Director through a regular programme of Officer Steering, Leaders and Portfolio holders' meetings.
48. Detailed consultation will be undertaken on the individual schemes as they are progressed.

### **Options**

49. This section presents the main options available for Members to consider as follows:

Option 1 – Support in principle the establishment of the West Yorkshire Plus Transport Fund and the indicative financial commitment.

Option 2 - Reject the proposal

### **Analysis**

50. This section presents an appraisal of the advantages and disadvantages of each option.

**Option 1 – Support in principle the establishment of the West Yorkshire Plus Transport Fund and the indicative financial commitment.**

51. Supporting the principle of the fund and the indicative financial contributions to the WYTF+ will set in motion the process of establishing the fund. The York package of measures will bring about significant GVA and job creation benefits alongside substantial improvements to the York transport network including:
  - a. Extension and improvement of the Park & Ride network and relieving the main urban area road network
  - b. Upgrading the northern parts of the York Outer Ring Road
  - c. Improving public transport and sustainable access into the city centre
  - d. Unlocking access into key brownfield development sites
  - e. Improving public transport connectivity at the railway station
52. In the longer term the WYTF+ core schemes will form the building blocks for future transformational schemes such as Harrogate Line upgrades. The scheme has potential to earn back future revenue streams into the transport fund.
53. There are a number of action points to finalise if the proposed support in principle recommended in this report is approved to enable the Transport Fund to progress, these are:
  - a) Confirmation of the availability of funding to meet the local contributions. As part of the annual budget setting process a budget report will be prepared for approval at Cabinet which will be then be forwarded to Full Council for final approval.
  - b) Further consideration of the impact of the proposed revisions to the LTP settlement.
  - c) Satisfactory progress made in on-going City Deal negotiations, specifically including securing clarity and agreement on an acceptable level of Earn Back funding from future additional business rates in West Yorkshire and York..
  - d) An in-principle agreement to the setting up of the fund being made by all West Yorkshire District Authorities

54. Members should be aware of the proposed ongoing long term financial commitment to contribute towards the fund as set out in the financial section below.
55. As part of this option it is proposed that the draft Memorandum of Understanding is approved to cover the Interim Period until the proposed Combined Authority is established.

### **Option 2 – Reject the WYTF+ financial contribution**

56. Rejecting the indicative financial contributions to the WYTF+ will mean that York has no access to city region deal elements of the WYTF+ local transport major scheme funds. This represents the bulk of the fund. This will also remove potential to access earn-back and may prevent transformational schemes being achieved in York.
57. It may be possible for membership of the LTB to continue but York may only be able to access the devolved DfT funding element (£5.0m for 2015 – 2019), and this would be subject to agreement from the other partners.
58. Choosing this course of action will result in reduced impact on achieving the Council priorities of “Get York Moving” and “Grow the Economy”.

### **Council Plan**

59. The York package of major transport schemes will enable the achievement of the Council priorities as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3 – York Package Fit to Council Priorities**

<b>Get York Moving</b>	<b>Grow the Economy</b>	<b>Protect Environment</b>	<b>Protect Vulnerable</b>	<b>Build Strong Communities</b>
Reduced congestion Quicker ORR journey times Further expands and improves	Removes barriers to job creation Stimulates GVA Focus on city centre and northern ORR Reduces congestions costs and	More PT and P&R trips Improved City Centre Air Quality and cityscape Reduced carbon emissions by	Focus on public transport Improves accessibility to transport, jobs and healthcare	Helps open the York Central site up and underpins the city’s continued growth

P&R	business/delivery unreliability	switching to electric (hybrid) buses
-----	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

## Implications

### *Financial*

60. The cost of the York package, including optimism bias is circa £80m. Without optimism bias this figure reduces to circa £60 million.
61. During the detailed development and phasing work, the spend profile and the funding requirement may need to be adjusted to balance. This report presents an indicative approach to this income and expenditure balance, which is considered appropriate at this stage.
62. The WYTF Finance Working Group (made up of Strategic Finance Managers from the five West Yorkshire Districts, York and Metro) have identified three main sources of direct contributions into the Fund, and the 'buying power' attributable to each element:
- District Contributions (£749 million)
  - LTP top slice at a level of 40% from LTP into the Fund (£101 million)
  - DfT local major scheme funding (£150 million)\*
  - TOTAL (£1 billion)
- \* The DfT funding element may be increased once the implications of the recent announcement on devolved major scheme funding has been assessed - WY and York have been informed they will receive an indicative £182m over 10 years)
63. To build up the £749 million capital element of the Fund, District revenue contributions would start in 2014/15 and increase year on year up to a maximum in 2022/23. That additional contribution would then need to be maintained for a period of 30 years.
64. It is also proposed to top slice 40% of the LTP to add an additional £101 million. The availability of funding is dependent on future LTP settlements. This will move transport funding away

from small schemes towards the larger schemes with city region wide impact.

65. The table below sets out the District contributions that would be required in future years and the actual contributions which are proposed for 2013/14. Contributions are based on June 2011 population figures.

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18		2022/23
Leeds	656	1,061	3,433	5,148	6,866	and ramping up year on year to	15,448
Bradford	461	735	2,392	3,589	4,785		10,766
Wakefield	299	447	1,493	2,239	2,986		6,718
Calderdale	176	291	934	1,401	1,867		4,202
Kirklees	359	967	1,934	2,902	3,869		8,705
<b>York</b>		<b>452</b>	<b>905</b>	<b>1,357</b>	<b>1,809</b>		<b>4,070</b>
Total	1,951	3,953	11,091	16,636	22,182		49,909
Per head of population YORK	£0.00	£2.28	£4.57	£6.85	£9.13		£20.55
Per week per head YORK	0p	5p	9p	14p	18p	40p	

*District contributions are in £000's*

66. It should be stressed that this level is indicative and not presented as definitive figures. The profile of contributions will adjust to the delivery profile. The table does however demonstrate the scale of contributions which would be required over a 40 year period if the objective of a £1bn Transport Fund is to be achieved.
67. It should be noted that the districts contributions may need to be amended subject to options for a medium term review and will always be subject to existing DCLG guidance and overall Local Government Powers for raising finance locally.
68. There is currently no revenue budget provision for the York contribution to a Transport Fund. The funding requirement ramps up from £452k in 14/15 to £4.070m per year by 2022/23 and would need to be maintained for the following 30 years. The costs shown in the table would add to the Council's budget gap and need to be considered in the context of the budget savings which the Council is already having to identify.
69. A one off contribution from the Economic Infrastructure Fund could be allocated to cover the 2014/15 district contribution to the

fund. However future funding would need to be identified from the revenue budget.

70. The proposed 40% LTP top-slice will have a significant impact on the ability to deliver smaller scale local schemes in York. The base LTP budget allocated for 2013/14 is £1.63m and £2.32m in 2014/15. A 40% top-slice is therefore likely to amount to around £930k per annum. Depending on future settlements the funding available for smaller local transport schemes could be in the region of £1.4m. This reduction will mean that fewer schemes will be delivered impacting particularly on the smaller scale cycling and pedestrian schemes. In addition it will limit the ability to match fund bids for specific projects from the LTP budget as has been the case for the LSTF and Access York projects.

### ***Human Resources (HR)***

71. The York aspects of the West Yorkshire Transport Fund will need to be managed locally with staff taken on as necessary. Reduced LTP funding will result in a lower staffing requirement for the development of smaller scale schemes in York. Opportunities may exist for staff to be seconded to the central WYTF+ delivery team. As York's LTP has a high level of match funding commitments over the next two years (BBAF and LSTF) a more gradual or tapered top-slice contribution will need to be considered.

### ***Equalities***

72. No adverse impact on specialist groups expected. A full SDI analysis likely to be carried out as part of the appraisal for a major transport scheme.

### ***Legal***

73. We are currently progressing the governance aspects of the interim arrangements on the basis of the MoU. Legal issues related to the possible progression of the Combined Authority will be the subject of a separate report.

### ***Crime and Disorder***

74. No significant impact

**Information Technology (IT)**

75. No significant impact

**Property**

76. No significant impact

**Other**

77. None

**Risk Management**

78. The first key risk is the ability of the Council to make the necessary budget adjustments to fund the proposed district contribution. If the necessary budget is not available it may not be possible to progress the fund in the format proposed.

79. The second key risk is that a lack of support for and progress of the Fund will undermine the basis of the City Deal with Government, resulting in the devolved powers not being secured. This is being managed through ongoing engagement with all partners, and the process for creating the Combined Authority.

**Recommendations**

80. Members are recommended to:

- 1) Support the principle of establishing a £1 billion 'West Yorkshire Plus' Transport Fund and the associated, indicative levels of financial commitments as set out in this report, subject to:
  - i) Satisfactory progress in on-going City Deal negotiations, specifically including securing clarity and agreement on an acceptable level of Earn Back funding from future additional business rates in West Yorkshire and York; and
  - ii) An in-principle agreement being made by all West Yorkshire District Authorities

Reason: To enable major transport schemes to be brought forward which will deliver the council's objectives

- 2) Submit the proposal to Full Council once the issues in recommendation 1 have been resolved.

Reason: To enable major transport schemes to be brought forward which will deliver the council's objectives

- 3) Approve the draft Memorandum of Understanding

Reason: To enable CYC and West Yorkshire Authorities to work together to deliver the WYTF+

- 4) Approve the initial development of business cases for the Outer Ring Road schemes and early development work on bus interchange at railway station in 2013/14.

Reason: To allow delivery of schemes early in the WYTF+ programme.

### Contact Details

**Author:**

*Tony Clarke  
City & Environmental Services  
01904 551641*

*Matthew Rudman  
City & Environmental Services  
01904 551624*

**Cabinet Member Responsible for the report:**

*Cllr. David Merrett  
Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning  
and Sustainability*

**Report  
Approved**



**Date** *23-April-  
2013*

**Specialist Implications Officer**

*Financial  
Patrick Looker  
CES Finance Director  
01904 551633*

**Wards Affected:** *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

**All**

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

**Annexes**

***Annex A – West Yorkshire Plus York Technical Summary Report***

***Annex B – Prioritisation Analysis and Modelling Report***

***Annex C – WYTF+ Draft Memorandum of Understanding***

## ANNEX A

WEST YORKSHIRE PLUS TRANSPORT FUND – TECHNICAL SUMMARY  
REPORT

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>
1.1	<p>This report sets out the progress that has been made in developing the approach to, and scope of a West Yorkshire Plus Transport Fund. It covers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rationale behind and need for establishing the Fund</li> <li>• The scope, cost and impacts of a prioritised package of investments in West Yorkshire (the Core Package)</li> <li>• The implications for establishing a Fund, with sufficient buying power to deliver the prioritised packages, on the budgets of the West Yorkshire and York and the commitments each District would need to make</li> <li>• A summary of on-going negotiations around the City Deal and the Combined Authority</li> <li>• How the Fund could be delivered in partnership with York</li> </ul>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Background</b>
2.1	<p>Transport connectivity is acknowledged as being critically important in unlocking and stimulating economic growth, closing the ‘wealth’ gap between our City Region and others, and improving the overall quality of living, working and doing business in West Yorkshire. The spatial inter-relationships affecting the economic geography of West Yorkshire result in an inter-dependency between the Districts and there is a significant level of cross boundary commuting. Investment in one District can be seen to deliver benefits to other neighbouring Districts. The evidence assembled to underpin the development of the Fund has clearly shown this cross boundary effect at play in West Yorkshire.</p>
2.2	<p>The development of a West Yorkshire Transport Fund (WYTF) has the potential to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generate significant additional economic investment that would deliver jobs in the short and longer term;</li> <li>• Enhance connectivity to, from and within West Yorkshire;</li> <li>• Establish a fully integrated transport system for West Yorkshire; and</li> <li>• Substantially reduce dependence on central funding, giving local communities and businesses surety over a 10 year programme of major transport schemes</li> </ul>
2.3	<p>Previous reports to Districts have made the case for transport investment as a</p>

	highly effective means of supporting growth in GVA and employment, and increasing the productivity of businesses. The methodology and appraisal used in this work forecasts a scale of impacts on GVA and employment comparable with the forecasts produced when a Transport Fund was developed for Greater Manchester. A previous report to the Districts has set out progress with the analysis being undertaken to develop the Fund and the schemes it would deliver.
2.4	<p>There is clear evidence that without significant and well-targeted investment in the transport network in West Yorkshire the opportunities for economic growth will be constrained. This will be a result of increasing levels of congestion, rising costs of motoring and public transport and the ability to recruit a workforce, interact with other businesses or transport goods and services to people and business that need them. Significant investment in transport is therefore needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To enable existing, and new, businesses to become more productive (through reducing lost time caused by congestion);</li> <li>• To expand the size of the workforce that could both support the growth of existing businesses and the creation of new employment, particularly in major growth locations (such as Aire Valley);</li> <li>• To expand the numbers and types of employment opportunities that can be reached from existing communities, and new housing sites, to improve the opportunities available to the existing and the future workforce.</li> </ul>
2.5	The Core Package of schemes in the Fund will work together to deliver a combined impact across the transport network which will be greater than the sum of the individual impacts. Together, and with the addition of other committed improvements, they will help close the economic gap between our city region and others. These investments will help ensure that the Leeds City Region becomes a leading city region in the UK and Europe. The combined package of improvements to be delivered will enhance connectivity with West Yorkshire, across the north and the rest of Yorkshire and the UK.
2.6	The WYITA, on behalf of the partners, has allocated £700,000 to develop and utilise the analytical tools to enable an evidence based approach to developing the Fund. York has committed around £70,000. The analytical tools were developed from previous work undertaken by Metro and Leeds using DfT specified appraisal guidance. The methodology used to develop the Fund followed the approach successfully used to establish the Greater Manchester fund. To put that allocation in context, it is understood Greater Manchester spent in excess of £2million to get to a similar position.
2.7	A Portfolio Holders Steering Group (made up of lead members from each Districts and the Chair of the ITA) has provided the scrutiny, direction and overview to ensure the Fund would be capable of delivering on the pre-defined objectives, supporting District LDF aspirations and identifying a mechanism to deliver local

	control over the identification, development and delivery of long term investments in the transport network of West Yorkshire and York. On-going consultation and engagement with Leaders, Chief Executives and Directors of Development has informed the process.
2.8	<p>Those objectives were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The primary objective is to maximise an increase in <b>employment and productivity growth</b> by the completion of transport schemes across West Yorkshire, irrespective of boundaries</li> <li>• Against this background, two employment accessibility minima are proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A better than average improvement in employment accessibility for residents in the most deprived 25% of WY communities and</li> <li>○ Every WY district to gain an average improvement in employment accessibility no less than half the average across WY</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The overall impact of the Fund's interventions would be carbon neutral at the package level</li> </ul>
2.9	An improvement in people's ability to access jobs, with a particular focus on those living in the most deprived communities, will be an important complementary measure of the Programme of schemes.
2.10	<b>Appendix B</b> lists the schemes that have been identified within the West Yorkshire Core Package.
2.11	The detailed definition of all schemes in the West Yorkshire Core Package would be refined during detailed business case development, including appropriate value engineering, consultation, optioneering, fit with LTP objectives and appraisal. This would be done to ensure all schemes offer best value for money.
2.12	It should be noted that the Core Package is one that would be deliverable within 10 years and that comprises the schemes that are most effective in supporting short term growth in GVA and employment. In turn these will have the most impact on generating 'Earn Back', which would be used to extend expenditure into longer term transformational schemes.
<b>3.0</b>	<b>West Yorkshire Schemes</b>
3.1	A number of high profile transformational and gateway schemes are already committed for delivery in West Yorkshire and York by 2020. These are from external budgets outside the Fund. They include the following schemes with capital works costing in the region of £550 million:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electrification of York-Leeds-Manchester and Selby-Leeds</li> <li>• Associated capacity improvements (such as at Huddersfield station)</li> <li>• NGT lines 1 and 2 in Leeds</li> <li>• Leeds station southern entrance</li> <li>• Leeds station Masterplan</li> <li>• HLOS rail capacity expansion ( an average 20% increase in rail capacity)</li> <li>• Smartcards</li> <li>• Bus Quality Contracts or Partnership approach (currently being developed)</li> </ul>
3.2	<p>The government has announced its intention to proceed with a longer term delivery (circa 2032) of high speed rail between Leeds and South Yorkshire, East Midlands, West Midlands and London, including a new city centre HS2 rail station in Leeds. HS2 would be funded centrally from sources outside the Fund, but it is important that relevant schemes delivered through the Fund will be designed to maximise the positive impacts and benefits of HS2 for the whole of West Yorkshire, York and the Leeds City region.</p>
3.3	<p>The Fund would also include work to support the production of robust evidence, lobbying material, development and detailed design associated with longer term and more complex transformational schemes which will need to be developed and delivered in partnership, and may involve re-shaping longer term land use reallocation to generate sufficient demand to establish a Financial case. The schemes which will be progressed would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full electrification of the Caldervale rail line linking Leeds, Bradford, Halifax and Manchester</li> <li>• Full electrification of the Leeds-Harrogate-York rail line</li> <li>• Fixed link connections (such as tram-train) between Bradford, LBIA and Leeds</li> <li>• Expansion of the NGT network, e.g. west to Bradford</li> <li>• Delivery of essential improvements identified in the Yorkshire Rail Network Study</li> </ul>
3.4	<p>The West Yorkshire Core Package addresses network wide and specific locations and corridor based needs where transport constraints will inhibit economic growth. The Package will help to extend the benefits of committed investments across the whole of West Yorkshire, in a way that transform transport connectivity within and between the main urban centres, and ensure that regional employment locations (such as the Aire Valley Leeds) are well connected to residents and businesses in all West Yorkshire Districts.</p>
3.5	<p>The Core Package would provide a step change in connectivity across West Yorkshire through the delivery of the following projects, which would have a transformational set of impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speed and frequency increases on the Caldervale rail line</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New and improved motorway junctions, including junction 24a on the M62</li> <li>• Major end to end corridor works such as Bradford to Leeds, Halifax to Huddersfield and Dewsbury to Leeds</li> <li>• Significant works in Leeds and Halifax centre to reduce car impacts, open up development land and improve connectivity and sustainable access</li> <li>• Significant expansion of park and ride at rail stations and through new bus or NGT based services</li> <li>• A comprehensive package of highway improvements (on around 500km of WY roads) to reduce congestion, improve traffic speeds and reliability and increase flows, and address local air quality, safety and frontage activity</li> <li>• Major highway improvements to unlock critically congested junctions and provide access to new development sites such as Cooper Bridge</li> <li>• A package of bus measures to increase frequency, reduce delays and unreliability, introduce 'greener' more efficient hybrid buses and provide a framework for reduced bus fares (circa 10% in real terms) to be delivered via Quality Contracts or Bus Partnerships</li> <li>• Expansion of the NGT network into Leeds Aire Valley</li> </ul>																
3.6	<p>The schemes in the Core Package will have a significant transport impact at a local level, but when delivered as a package they will deliver greater benefits at a network wide level. This will facilitate faster, more reliable highway connectivity between the national motorway system, strategic destinations such as Aire Valley, East Wakefield, Canal Road and the airport, and across the City Region. In parallel the significant enhancements to public transport will facilitate sustainable, low carbon, economic growth in our urban centres by improving connectivity into, and between the key centres of Leeds, Bradford, Wakefield, Huddersfield and Halifax, as well as beyond to York, Manchester and Sheffield.</p>																
3.7	<p>The combined effect of this core package would support <b>additional</b> employment and GVA growth in West Yorkshire at the following scale, above the situation without the package. The difference between 'additional employment' and 'additional West Yorkshire residents in employment' is made up by an increase in-commuting from outside West Yorkshire and an increase in out-commuting, to Manchester for example.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 1570 1445 1727"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2024</th> <th>2030</th> <th>2036</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Additional employment</td> <td>12,500</td> <td>15,800</td> <td>18,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Additional GVA (per year)</td> <td>£810m</td> <td>£1,100m</td> <td>£1,230m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Additional WY residents in employment</td> <td>10,700</td> <td>13,000</td> <td>14,700</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2024	2030	2036	Additional employment	12,500	15,800	18,200	Additional GVA (per year)	£810m	£1,100m	£1,230m	Additional WY residents in employment	10,700	13,000	14,700
	2024	2030	2036														
Additional employment	12,500	15,800	18,200														
Additional GVA (per year)	£810m	£1,100m	£1,230m														
Additional WY residents in employment	10,700	13,000	14,700														
3.8	<p>The WY package of schemes performs well in terms of GVA 'bought' per £ invested. The Greater Manchester Fund (circa £1.5billion) was calculated to buy £0.90 of GVA per £1.00 invested. The circa £1billion WY package is calculated to buy £1.23 of GVA per £1.00 invested.</p>																

3.9	The employment forecasts (for permanent jobs) would be additional to temporary employment in the construction industry as a result of this level of infrastructure investment. This is estimated to be around 7,500 job years (e.g. for example, 750 jobs lasting 10 years).
3.10	<p>The Core Package would also deliver the against the secondary criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved accessibility to employment from 'deprived wards' greater than the West Yorkshire average (by a factor of +7%)</li> <li>• Equitable distribution of improved accessibility geographically, with all Districts seeing an improvement greater than half the West Yorkshire average</li> </ul>
3.11	<p>The analysis to date forecasts that because of the prioritised Core Package, there would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an 8% increase in employment (and hence commuting levels)</li> <li>• an increase in average commuting distances</li> <li>• an increase in business to business and business to market trips</li> </ul>
3.12	This increased level of commuting is forecast to be accommodated through a reduction in the absolute levels of car commuting and an increase in the absolute levels of bus and rail use. By 2024, with the Core Package in place, the forecast predicts a reduction of 2% in car commuting, a 20% increase in bus commuting and a 13% increase in rail commuting at the West Yorkshire level.
3.13	An objective of Fund is to ensure it Core Package 'carbon neutral'. That is to say, that compared to a future year baseline, the Fund would not lead to an increase in carbon emissions from transport. Achieving sustainable (zero carbon) economic growth is actually a very tough objective, particularly given the polycentric nature of West Yorkshire, the dispersed nature of cross boundary commuting, the role of the M62/M1 corridors and the location of growth sites, which are often away from the major centres of housing.
3.14	<p>Because of the strategic nature of the modelling it is not yet possible to accurately predict the impact on carbon. The initial estimate is for an increase of 1-2%, but this analysis excludes significant benefits of decongestion, which could result in a net decrease. A better understanding of the impact on carbon will be obtained at the detailed design and business case stage. It will be possible to set more ambitious targets for carbon as part of the design specification, or as add-on's to scheme designs which could attract additional funding or third party contributions which could facilitate the following types of intervention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further improvements in bus technology such as an increased rate of conversion to hybrid vehicles</li> </ul>



3.19	The conventional BCR (Benefit to Cost ratio) for the Core Package is calculated as between 3.5 and 5.0, depending on the scale of decongestion benefits achieved. As defined by DfT, a strong BCR would be 2.0 or above.																		
3.20	A provisional £50m has been identified to promote and accelerate the co-funding and delivery of rail station gateway schemes, such as Leeds and Bradford city centre stations. This would be used to accelerate Network Rail investments through co-funding and enabling works. This was the approach adopted in Greater Manchester.																		
3.21	<p>The estimated cost of the West Yorkshire Core Package is between £780 and £1,100 million (depending on the scale of optimism bias applied). The following table summarises the costs associated with the West Yorkshire investment package.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 824 1430 1346"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="320 824 762 898"></th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="762 824 1430 898">Allocated Funds (£ million)</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="320 898 762 972"></th> <th data-bbox="762 898 1102 972">Minimum (zero optimism bias)</th> <th data-bbox="1102 898 1430 972">Maximum (full optimism bias)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 972 762 1084">Enabling schemes (from Core Package)</td> <td data-bbox="762 972 1102 1084">430</td> <td data-bbox="1102 972 1430 1084">620</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1084 762 1196">Transformational schemes (from Core Package)</td> <td data-bbox="762 1084 1102 1196">300</td> <td data-bbox="1102 1084 1430 1196">430</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1196 762 1270">Gateways works</td> <td data-bbox="762 1196 1102 1270">50</td> <td data-bbox="1102 1196 1430 1270">50</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1270 762 1346"><b>WY TOTAL</b></td> <td data-bbox="762 1270 1102 1346"><b>780</b></td> <td data-bbox="1102 1270 1430 1346"><b>1100</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Allocated Funds (£ million)			Minimum (zero optimism bias)	Maximum (full optimism bias)	Enabling schemes (from Core Package)	430	620	Transformational schemes (from Core Package)	300	430	Gateways works	50	50	<b>WY TOTAL</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>1100</b>
	Allocated Funds (£ million)																		
	Minimum (zero optimism bias)	Maximum (full optimism bias)																	
Enabling schemes (from Core Package)	430	620																	
Transformational schemes (from Core Package)	300	430																	
Gateways works	50	50																	
<b>WY TOTAL</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>1100</b>																	
3.22	Similar work has been undertaken to identify a Package of investments in York. The opportunity would be explored to manage a Fund jointly, while maintaining separate and equitable funding pots to deploy in West Yorkshire and York. The analysis has shown that while cross-boundary effects are very significant in West Yorkshire, they are not significantly apparent between West Yorkshire and York so there is no basis in using West Yorkshire funds in York and vice versa.																		
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Funding Package</b>																		
4.1	In order to enable expenditure of between £780 million and £1,100 million in West Yorkshire (and between £60 million and £80 million in York), analysis has been undertaken to consider the options of establishing a Fund with £1 billion buying power.																		

4.2	In time, and during detailed development and phasing work, the size of the Fund and the scale of the expenditure will need to be iterated to match each other. This report presents an indicative approach to this income and expenditure balance, which is considered appropriate at this stage. On this basis the mechanism for creating £1 billion of spending power is set out.
4.3	<p>The three sources of direct contributions into the Fund, and the ‘buying power’ attributable to each element are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Contributions (£749 million)</li> <li>• LTP top slice at a level of 40% from LTP into the Fund (£101 million)</li> <li>• DfT local major scheme funding (£150 million)*</li> <li>• TOTAL (£1 billion)</li> </ul> <p><i>* this may be increased once the implications of the recent announcement on devolved major scheme funding has been assessed (WY and York will receive £182m over 10 years)</i></p>
4.4	Top slicing the LTP budget by 40% would need careful management to ensure the remainder was targeted to the types of schemes not specifically addressed by the Fund, for example road safety, cycling or travel planning. The Fund would result in significant and extensive investment in schemes aimed at economic growth, which would reduce the call on the LTP, hence the need to consider rebalancing the LTP allocations to other spend areas.
4.5	The City Deal negotiations are seeking certainty on the LTP and local major contributions from DfT, and this report is seeking agreement from the West Yorkshire and York Leaders that they can commit to the scale of the District Contributions proposed in order to establish a £1 billion Fund. These are summarised in <b>the table</b> below

4.6	<p>To build up the £749 million element of the Fund, District contributions are illustrated to start in 2014/15 and increase (through extra levy) year on year to up to a maximum in 2022/23. That additional contribution would be maintained for a period of 30 years. The table below sets out the District Contributions that would be required, in the first three and last years. Contributions are based on June 2011 population figures. The first year (2013/14) assumes zero contributions from the Districts and would be met from a ring fenced ITA allocation.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 488 1433 808"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2013/14</th> <th>2014/15</th> <th>2015/16</th> <th>2016/17</th> <th>2017/18</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Leeds</td> <td>656</td> <td>1,061</td> <td>3,433</td> <td>5,148</td> <td>6,866</td> <td>and</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Bradford</b></td> <td><b>461</b></td> <td><b>735</b></td> <td><b>2,392</b></td> <td><b>3,589</b></td> <td>4,785</td> <td>ramping</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wakefield</td> <td>299</td> <td>447</td> <td>1,493</td> <td>2,239</td> <td>2,986</td> <td>up</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Calderdale</td> <td>176</td> <td>291</td> <td>934</td> <td>1,401</td> <td>1,867</td> <td>year</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kirklees</td> <td>359</td> <td>967</td> <td>1,934</td> <td>2,902</td> <td>3,869</td> <td>on</td> </tr> <tr> <td>York</td> <td></td> <td>452</td> <td>905</td> <td>1,357</td> <td>1,809</td> <td>year</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>1,951</td> <td>3,953</td> <td>11,091</td> <td>16,636</td> <td>22,182</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Per head of population</td> <td>£0.80</td> <td>£1.63</td> <td>£4.57</td> <td>£6.86</td> <td>£9.15</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Per week per head (pence)</td> <td>1.5p</td> <td>3.1p</td> <td>8.8p</td> <td>13.2p</td> <td>17.6p</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>District contributions are in £000's</i></p>		2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18		Leeds	656	1,061	3,433	5,148	6,866	and	<b>Bradford</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>2,392</b>	<b>3,589</b>	4,785	ramping	Wakefield	299	447	1,493	2,239	2,986	up	Calderdale	176	291	934	1,401	1,867	year	Kirklees	359	967	1,934	2,902	3,869	on	York		452	905	1,357	1,809	year	Total	1,951	3,953	11,091	16,636	22,182		Per head of population	£0.80	£1.63	£4.57	£6.86	£9.15		Per week per head (pence)	1.5p	3.1p	8.8p	13.2p	17.6p	
	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18																																																																		
Leeds	656	1,061	3,433	5,148	6,866	and																																																																	
<b>Bradford</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>2,392</b>	<b>3,589</b>	4,785	ramping																																																																	
Wakefield	299	447	1,493	2,239	2,986	up																																																																	
Calderdale	176	291	934	1,401	1,867	year																																																																	
Kirklees	359	967	1,934	2,902	3,869	on																																																																	
York		452	905	1,357	1,809	year																																																																	
Total	1,951	3,953	11,091	16,636	22,182																																																																		
Per head of population	£0.80	£1.63	£4.57	£6.86	£9.15																																																																		
Per week per head (pence)	1.5p	3.1p	8.8p	13.2p	17.6p																																																																		
4.7	<p>The West Yorkshire Districts would need to commit to this scale of additional contribution, ramping up from 2014/15 to 2022/23, and then remaining in place for 30 years.</p>																																																																						
4.8	<p>While direct comparisons are difficult it is worth noting that the Greater Manchester Transport Fund includes a levy increase rising to circa £80 million after 10 years compared to circa £50 million in the West Yorkshire Plus Fund.</p>																																																																						
4.9	<p>It is recognised that these are challenging levels of contribution given the current position on local government funding. There is an opportunity to effectively spread the first year cost by making an initial contribution through an increased levy in 2013/14. This would again be ring-fenced by the ITA and should a decision be made not to proceed with the Fund then this sum could be rebated back through the 2014/15 levy discussions.</p>																																																																						
4.10	<p>During detailed development, design and phasing work the Funding Model would be used to optimise the phasing of the expenditure and borrowing requirements. The District commitments are therefore likely to change to some small degree, but the figures shown represent a realistic scale and profile of commitments required to establish a Fund of circa £1 billion.</p>																																																																						

4.11	<p>The Fund would be used to address decades of under investment in West Yorkshire. In that context it is helpful to understand the level of contributions paid across other Metropolitan Authorities. The table below shows levy and population comparisons in the ITAs in 2011/12 (excluding the additional Fund levy in Greater Manchester). West Yorkshire clearly had the lowest levy per head of population by a significant margin (£43 per head).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 450 1437 786"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Levy £ 000s</th> <th>Population 000s</th> <th>Levy / head £</th> <th>Levy / head % of highest</th> <th>Levy / head % of GMITA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Integrated Transport Authority</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>West Yorkshire (Metro)</td> <td>97,600</td> <td>2,250</td> <td>43</td> <td>49%</td> <td>68%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>West Midlands (Centro)</td> <td>140,718</td> <td>2,655</td> <td>53</td> <td>60%</td> <td>83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater Manchester</td> <td>168,900</td> <td>2,629</td> <td>64</td> <td>73%</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tyne &amp; Wear</td> <td>71,706</td> <td>1,120</td> <td>64</td> <td>73%</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South Yorkshire</td> <td>93,000</td> <td>1,328</td> <td>70</td> <td>80%</td> <td>109%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Merseyside</td> <td>119,076</td> <td>1,353</td> <td>88</td> <td>100%</td> <td>137%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Levy £ 000s	Population 000s	Levy / head £	Levy / head % of highest	Levy / head % of GMITA	<i>Integrated Transport Authority</i>						West Yorkshire (Metro)	97,600	2,250	43	49%	68%	West Midlands (Centro)	140,718	2,655	53	60%	83%	Greater Manchester	168,900	2,629	64	73%	100%	Tyne & Wear	71,706	1,120	64	73%	100%	South Yorkshire	93,000	1,328	70	80%	109%	Merseyside	119,076	1,353	88	100%	137%
	Levy £ 000s	Population 000s	Levy / head £	Levy / head % of highest	Levy / head % of GMITA																																												
<i>Integrated Transport Authority</i>																																																	
West Yorkshire (Metro)	97,600	2,250	43	49%	68%																																												
West Midlands (Centro)	140,718	2,655	53	60%	83%																																												
Greater Manchester	168,900	2,629	64	73%	100%																																												
Tyne & Wear	71,706	1,120	64	73%	100%																																												
South Yorkshire	93,000	1,328	70	80%	109%																																												
Merseyside	119,076	1,353	88	100%	137%																																												
4.12	<p>With the Fund in place the West Yorkshire figure of levy/head of population would rise to around nearly £64 after 10 years.</p>																																																
<b>5.0</b>	<b>City Deal</b>																																																
5.1	<p>Discussions on the City Deal are still on-going. A key element to be agreed is the scale of the Earn Back formula, and the agreed level of additional business rates that would be paid to the West Yorkshire and York Authorities going forward. Specifically the Authorities need clarity on an acceptable level of 'new' funding that would be a future income stream to the West Yorkshire and York Authorities.</p>																																																
5.2	<p>A number of further areas are still under discussion, and it is the view that agreement is being aimed for by Autumn 2013, allowing an implementation of the Fund in April 2014.</p>																																																
5.3	<p>The areas still under discussion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The geography of the Local Transport Board and Combined Authority</li> <li>• Securing long term commitments to funding from DfT</li> <li>• Early release of block funding at the start of DfT spending periods</li> <li>• Securing rail devolution</li> <li>• Agreement on DfT role in developing and delivering improvements identified in the Yorkshire Rail Network Study (such as electrification of the Caldervale and Harrogate lines)</li> </ul>																																																
5.4	<p>The availability of Earn Back as a future revenue stream has not been taken into account when building up the Financial Model, and profiling borrowing powers.</p>																																																

	<p>This approach is prudent, and creates the potential for future flexibility around a number of future choices around how this future revenue is used, which could include some or all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery of longer term transformational transport schemes, for example a fixed-link to the Airport</li> <li>• Global or targeted subsidy of different transport costs, such as for example reduced bus fares for young people or people/families with low income</li> <li>• Transport investment with an added emphasis on regeneration or urban realm schemes (such as town centre pedestrianisation/urban quality schemes)</li> </ul>
5.5	<p>It should also be noted that additional revenue income associated with increased public transport usage has not been assumed as a revenue stream to service the debts of the Fund. The current work suggests the level of this additional income revenue would be significant, and within a Quality Contract framework (or an acceptable Bus Partnership arrangement) or devolved rail framework it would be an important revenue future steam. This revenue could present the same opportunities as described in the previous paragraph.</p>
5.6	<p>The scale of Earn Back is still being negotiated, but has been estimated (from the Greater Manchester experience) as generating of an income of £20m per year, which could generate £300m plus of spending power. This could become available 5 years after the start of the Fund.</p>
5.7	<p>The scale of additional public transport revenue would also be significant. Access to it will be influenced by the arrangements for Rail Devolution and whether a Quality Contract or Bus Partnership Framework is in place. With the Core package in place, the analysis forecasts a growth of circa 20 million public transport passengers (bus, rail and NGT) per year by 2024 This suggests a significant level of net 'new' funding in the tens of millions per year, if some or all of this can be captured by the public sector.</p>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Relationship with York</b>
6.1	<p>At the outset it was considered possible that expenditure in West Yorkshire could have direct and significant impacts in York and vice versa. Subsequent analysis has shown that two largely discrete and independent Core Packages have been identified for priority delivery within 10 years.</p>
6.2	<p>The option of a joint Fund for West Yorkshire and York is therefore not mutually dependent. However there is benefit in considering the establishment and management of a Fund jointly, even if the decisions on the scale of allocations between the two areas, is clearly dictated by the scale of input from each area.</p>

6.2	As longer term projects are developed there is scope to consider the concept of joint funding and the equitable allocation of funding from each area. This could apply to the work on electrification of the Leeds-Harrogate -York rail line for example.
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>
7.1	Each District Council needs to consider the scale of year on year contributions they would need to commit to establish a combined spending power of circa £1 billion. Similarly they need to endorse the Core Package of priority investments that the Fund would deliver.
7.2	If agreed then a delivery phasing programme would be established, and detailed work carried out to refine and optimise schemes development to get the most effective, value for money designs. This would involve consultation with members, public, businesses and partners
7.3	The full agreement to commit to District expenditure to the Fund should be conditional on on-going City Deal negotiations. A key benefit of establishing a West Yorkshire Plus Transport Fund would be to enable access to additional funding that would be earned through the Earn Back process. The scale of that earn back would determine the scale of further investment that could be delivered in WY, beyond the Core Package.

This page is intentionally left blank

## ANNEX B – Scheme Prioritisation and Modelling

1. Schemes located outside the City of York but with particular potential to offer benefits to both West Yorkshire and York were investigated but were recognized as being schemes that will take longer than the initial 10 year period of the fund to develop, design and deliver or will require funding over and above that which is allocated from the initial £1bn. A contribution ‘top-sliced’ from the fund provides a commitment to the detailed development and business cases required for schemes - such as Harrogate line improvements.
2. Projects based within York were considered but the numbers (of potential schemes) were strictly limited by analysis cost and available budgets. An initial long list of ten potential major projects was identified in discussion with the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport. These are listed in Table A.

Table A – Initial Long List of Schemes

Initial Sift Rank Order	Scheme Description
1	York Central Access, new access road via A59, pedestrian access from station area, sustainable access routes, Queen Street bridge demolished and bus interchange within wider station frontage redevelopment
2	A19 Bus Lane and Improved access to and egress from Designer Outlet P&R
3	Clifton Moor Park & Ride and corridor improvements
4	PT Improvements 2 – City Centre bus priority infrastructure and traffic management
5	Northern Outer Ring Road Improvements - Low Intervention (r/b upgrades)
6	Northern Outer Ring Road Improvements - High Intervention (Dualling and grade separated selected junctions)
7	Northern Outer Ring Road Improvements - Medium Intervention (r/b upgrades, and dualling across the river and ECML bridge sections)
8	PT IMPROVEMENTS 1: Enhanced Bus Network (PT2 measures+fare interventions+hybrid buses)
9	PT IMPROVEMENTS 3: Bus/Rail Interchange and York Station approach area improvements. Transformational transport hub - no link to York Central assumed
10	Haxby station

3. WYTF+ prioritisation methods were used to prioritise and select the schemes that make up the York package focusing on the delivery of the maximum net increases in GVA and jobs within the York context.
4. A summary of the modelling process is as follows.

- Schemes run through the York Transport Model (CUBE/SATURN). Summary modelling statistics and changes in generalised cost skims output.
- Output fed into the SDG UDM model (Land Use Planning and Transport Interaction)
- Outputs provided in terms of GVA and Jobs created.

5. The performance of the ten schemes is as shown below

Scheme name	Adjusted capital cost (2012 prices, inc OB) - contribution from fund (£m)	Whole life cost to the fund (£m NPV)	Net York employment change in 2026 compared to the baseline	Net York direct GVA change in 2026 compared to the baseline (£m in 2009 prices)	GVA/per £ of whole life cost	Ranking	Cumulative capital cost (£m)	Cumulative jobs impact (will include some double counting between schemes)	Beneficiaries (Districts)	Scheme Type
York Central Access Road	13.7	5.1	1,303	92	18.0	1	14	1,303	York	Highway
A19 Bus Lane and access to Designer Outlet P&R Improvements	1.9	0.3	49	3	11.9	2	16	1,352	York	Multi-modal corridor
Clifton Moor Park & Ride and corridor improvements	9.8	2.8	56	3	1.1	3	25	1,408	York	Multi-modal corridor
PT Improvements 2 – City Centre Infrastructure	7.2	2.7	24	1	0.5	4	33	1,433	York	Multi-modal improvements
Northern Outer Ring Road Improvements - Low Intervention	37.6	14.6	100	6	0.4	5	70	1,533	York	Highway
Northern Outer Ring Road Improvements - High Intervention	212.6	74.1	516	28	0.4	6	283	2,049	York	Highway
Northern Outer Ring Road Improvements - Medium Intervention	91.4	36.0	229	11	0.3	7	374	2,278	York	Highway
PT IMPROVEMENTS 1: Enhanced Bus Network	20.5	24.9	76	4	0.2	8	395	2,354	York	Multi-modal improvements
PT IMPROVEMENTS 3: Bus/Rail Interchange and York Station approach area improvements	28.7	8.8	-6	0	0.0	9	423	2,348	York	Multi-modal improvements
Haxby station	7.7	7.9	-76	-5	-0.6	10	431	2,272	York/Leeds	Rail

6. The top five schemes were taken forward to form the York package.

## ANNEX C

## DRAFT

**West Yorkshire and York Local Transport Board**  
**Memorandum of Understanding**  
**Between**  
**West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority and**  
**City of York Council**  
**March 2013**

**Introduction**

1. The Department for Transport (DfT) plans to abolish the current competitive process where scheme promoters compete for funding from the 'national Major Scheme funding pot'. From the 2014 Spending Review period, the DfT will devolve and distribute funding based on population to voluntary local partnerships and with decisions on this funding being taken by accountable local partners. This new local partnership is to be known as a 'Local Transport Body' (LTB).
2. The DfT have advised that a share of the national Major Transport Scheme funding pot will initially be allocated based on the proportion of the national population in West Yorkshire and York. Indicative allocations are as shown below:

<b>Indicative Funding Allocations from Major Scheme Funding Devolution</b>			
<b>Funding Period</b>	<b>West Yorkshire</b>	<b>City of York</b>	<b>Total</b>
2015 - 19	£55.0m	£5.0m	£60.0m
2019 - 25	£112.6m	£10.2m	£122.8m
<b>Totals</b>	<b>£167.6m</b>	<b>£15.2m</b>	<b>£182.8m</b>

3. As a part of the City Deal, the West Yorkshire local authorities are working collaboratively to create the West Yorkshire and York Transport Fund by April 2013 and a Combined Authority potentially by April 2014. The new Fund will include devolved major transport scheme funding as well as other sources of funding.
4. Following detailed consideration by the West Yorkshire District Councils, West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority and City of York Council it is proposed to establish the West Yorkshire and York Local Transport Body in accordance with the requirements of the DfT.

## Agreement

5. For the period before the proposed Combined Authority is established (“the Interim Period”), it is proposed that the LTB functions be administered by the West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (WYITA). This MoU covers ‘the Interim Period’ and how WYITA and CYC intend to work together to produce a common line of action during this time.
6. At the point the Combined Authority is established, the LTB functions will be assumed by the arrangements to be put in place for the Combined Authority. At this stage the parties acknowledge that the future arrangements for the LTB and the Combined Authority have yet to be approved as part of the Statutory Review under the Local Democracy Economic Development and construction Act.
7. During the Interim Period, the LTB will comprise the Executive Committee of the WYITA until the establishment of the Combined Authority arrangements.
8. The LTB will agree a prioritised list of programmes and projects to be funded from the resources within the proposed Transport Fund. During the Interim Period an elected Councillor nominated by the Leader of City of York Council may attend all meetings of the LTB or any committee of the WYITA at which LTB business appears on the Agenda. Under the standing orders of WYITA the Chair will permit the York Councillor to address the meeting and participate in discussion but not vote.
9. If the Parties both agree that it would be expedient, a Joint Advisory Committee of the WYITA and City of York Council may be established pursuant to s101 of the Local Government Act 1972 to advise and make recommendations to the LTB. Any such Joint Committee would be subject to the Standing Orders of the WYITA then in force.
10. The LTB will seek endorsement to the prioritised list from the Leaders and Portfolio Holders of the District Councils of West Yorkshire and City of York Council. It is anticipated that the approved list will be submitted to DfT during July 2013.
11. The Parties agree that the prioritisation criteria for the Transport Fund shall be:
  - Primary objective – to maximise the increase in employment and productivity growth across West Yorkshire and York via the delivery of transport schemes.
  - Secondary objective - to improve the ability of people in every West Yorkshire district and York to access jobs, with a particular focus on those living in the most deprived communities, and to achieve a carbon neutral impact at the package level.

12. Whilst accepting that the primary objective of the Fund is to maximise employment and productivity, the Parties agree that York's overall funding contribution to the Fund including the devolved major scheme funding will only be directed to:

- Schemes with a mutual benefit to West Yorkshire and York (and potentially other LTB's); or
- Schemes of benefit to York and its hinterland.

Which in either case are acceptable to both parties, acting reasonably

13. In its capacity as the LTB, WYITA will only allocate resources committed to the Transport Fund and prioritise schemes in accordance with the above prioritisation criteria.

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank