

**CROSSRAIL 2 PROGRAMME BOARD**

**1 November 2018**

**TfL Offices, 55 Broadway, London SW1H 0BD**

**Minutes**

**Attendance:  
Members**

[REDACTED]	Independent Board Member (CHAIR)
[REDACTED]	Independent Board Member
[REDACTED]	Managing Director, Crossrail 2, TfL
[REDACTED]	Director, Major Rail Project Development
[REDACTED]	Director of Corporate Finance (interim)
[REDACTED]	Crossrail 2, Interim Deputy Director, Rail Major Projects, DfT
[REDACTED]	Director, Housing & Land, GLA
[REDACTED]	Executive Director, Development, Enterprise and Environ ,GLA
[REDACTED]	Director General, Decentralisation & Growth, DCLG
[REDACTED]	Head of Infrastructure Delivery, IPA
[REDACTED]	Head of Crossrail 2, Network Rail (for Sir Peter Hendy)
[REDACTED]	Deputy Chief Executive, Homes England

**CR2 Project Teams**

[REDACTED]	Head of Commercial and Controls, Crossrail 2, TfL
[REDACTED])	Head of Funding & Case making, Crossrail 2
[REDACTED])	Transport Planning Manager, Crossrail 2, TfL
[REDACTED])	Crossrail 2, Rail Major Projects, DfT
[REDACTED]	Business Operations Manager, Crossrail 2, TfL ( <i>Secretariat</i> )
[REDACTED]	Crossrail 2, Rail Major Projects, DfT ( <i>Secretariat</i> )

**Apologies:**

[REDACTED]	Director General, High Speed & Major Rail Projects, DfT
[REDACTED]	Chief Finance Officer, TfL
[REDACTED]	Chair, Network Rail

Ref	Item	Decision	Action/Notes	To Action
1.	Introductions/ apologies		Apologies were noted as above	
2.	Minutes & matters arising from previous meeting		<p>The circulated minutes of the 28 June Programme Board were agreed as presented. MD noted that some actions no longer applied as the project had moved on significantly since June.</p> <p>DT raised the issue of the current FOI request for the release of minutes of the Board between October 2017 and February 2018. MD informed attendees that a request had been made and that - legal advice was that the minutes will need to be released -but that certain information can be redacted. The release may prompt requests for further release of minutes and documentation.</p> <p>The Programme Board is an advisory board not one that takes key decisions. It was not equivalent to the Crossrail Ltd Board.</p> <p>MD said that- it was important to have a good record of the meetings in order to understand how and why the project had progressed.</p> <p>A response to the FOI will -be made asap.</p>	
3.	Post Independent Affordability Review (IAR) update	Noted	<p>MD introduced the report saying that it summarised the work the IPT has been focussed on post the IAR responding to questions raised by the DfT. MD said that there are a number of critical decisions that need to be made, including agreeing the scope of [REDACTED] and agreeing what "[REDACTED]" should be used as a planning assumption (including whether to plan for an end state frequency of [REDACTED]. Concern about safeguarding is partly driving the need for a decision on the route and the approach to the SOBC.</p> <p>MD referred to the responses to the IAR's recommendations that are contained in the report and also the decision tree to be used in helping identify areas of agreement between DfT and TfL that would narrow down the set of issues to be put to politicians in reaching a decision [REDACTED]</p>	

			<p>TBP talked through the decision tree starting with the Core Scheme (Wimbledon – Euston) and a discussion ensued regarding [REDACTED]. Clear points of discussion were [REDACTED] and housing v transport benefits in these locations. CE made the point that the marginal BCR of [REDACTED] was low and raised questions about their inclusion in the scheme. Further work was needed to understand whether the Level 1 incremental BCR represented a complete picture.</p> <p>MD made the point that if [REDACTED] are removed from the scheme for reasons of affordability, then London business/developers may be less willing to contribute to the cost of the scheme because they would see fewer London benefits. She also reminded the group that given the pros and cons of whether or not [REDACTED] is in the scheme should be -a political decision.</p> <p>SD made the point that given the circumstances that Crossrail finds itself in, it would be prudent to start work on cost assurance and bring that back to the Programme Board. SA said that this work had already started.</p> <p><b>Action - Update the Programme Board on the cost assurance work.</b></p> <p>RJ concluded that the route decision -was mostly a question for DfT and TfL.</p> <p><b>The Board noted the paper.</b></p>	SA
4	Housing & Growth	Noted	<p>MD introduced the item saying that a growth &amp; development sub panel had met on a number of occasions to discuss housing and hybrid bill powers and the papers presented are outputs from previous sub panel meetings.</p> <p>MD said that she wanted to ensure that those responsible for delivering housing had bought in to the way forward and as many of the homes unlocked were outside London it was important to have Homes England and MHCLG on board. MD wanted to ensure that there was support for the -respective teams to take this work forward.</p>	

			<p>CE said that he hoped to discuss the delivery plans as well as the technical work that had been done. MD said that the Housing Delivery Report covered the options for delivery but these and -the appropriate powers required hadn't been agreed. SD said that a discussion had taken place previously and that in his view the real point was what degree of certainty was wanted on the delivery of the 200,000 homes as that would then determine the powers that would be required. It was important to agree jointly how interventionist the Board wanted to be.</p> <p>TW said that Homes England had recently published a 5 year plan and that work/thinking needed to be brought into the CR2 housing work. RJ made the point that HMT is interested in both transport and productivity benefits and that the bar had been set higher now as a result of Crossrail.</p> <p>DL said that there were 3 clear areas of focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Where are the homes located?</li> <li>ii) What policy/powers/plans were needed?</li> <li>iii) Current delivery mechanisms or new ones?</li> </ul> <p>TW added the following to the above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv) Money</li> <li>v) Resource</li> <li>vi) Leadership</li> </ul> <p>MD said that much of this work had been done and offered to share the analysis and/or to provide a briefing to anyone that wanted one.</p> <p>SD agreed that it had been done but said that there was a lack of connection between spending £Xbn on a railway and getting Y,000 homes built as a result.</p> <p>CE said that there had been robust analysis of the transport side of the scheme and the same level of analysis was needed on the assessment of delivery of the housing. If the hope is to deliver a railway, housing and OSD then it is important to go to HMT with full confidence in the analysis.</p> <p>MD said that the assessment on the number of homes by location had been made and reviewed by the Growth</p>	
--	--	--	--	--



			<p>Commission. It was important to work with the right people to deliver these. DL suggested that he and LO/TW take the challenge of how to build 200,000 homes away and come back with options. MD reminded all that a number of -homes in London were embedded in the London Plan but those outside of London were not necessarily embedded in local plans.</p> <p>MD said that a map of where housing could happen already existed along with estimates of OSD + had been made but -it was worth considering in more detail and bring that back to the Board.</p> <p>TW talked about the Oxford-Cambridge corridor and lessons from that in terms of housing delivery.</p> <p>The discussion concluded with agreement that GLA/Homes England/MHCLG colleagues meet as soon as possible to review options for delivering the housing.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – GLA/Homes England/MHCLG meet to review options for housing delivery.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – Feedback from this meeting be brought back to Programme Board before the New Year.</p> <p>The offer of any analysis/input from the IPT was reiterated.</p>	<p>CM</p> <p>LO</p> <p>LO</p>
8	Regular programme update	Noted	<p>SA introduced the item saying that the IPT was working on a 12 month programme in readiness for the CSR. He raised the issue of the timing of consultation as one that the IPT is keen to get agreement on soon. SD said that the IPA was pushing HMT for an assessment of deliverability against any CSR ask.</p> <p>SA referred to the top identified risks in particular safeguarding. CC said that a previously flagged risk at Broxbourne has now been realised – land that was hoped to be safeguarded has been lost to a developer. The IPT is working with the DfT on how to manage this situation generally. The risk around development funding was also highlighted by SA, as well as the tunnelling strategy, which has yet to be shared with the public – underlining that the lack of consultation is fast becoming a bigger issue.</p>	

9	AOB		CE said the meeting had been very productive and thanked the Chair.	
Dates of future meetings		18 December 2018		

DRAFT