

**CROSSRAIL 2 PROGRAMME BOARD**

**28 June 2018**

**BDB Offices, 50 Broadway, London SW1H 0BL**

**Minutes**

**Attendance:  
Members**

[REDACTED]	Independent Board Member (CHAIR)
[REDACTED]	Independent Board Member
[REDACTED]	Managing Director, Crossrail 2, TfL
[REDACTED]	Director General, High Speed & Major Rail Projects, DfT
[REDACTED]	Chief Finance Officer, TfL
[REDACTED]	Crossrail 2, Rail Major Projects, DfT
[REDACTED]	Director, Major Rail Project Development
[REDACTED]	Senior Policy Advisor, Major Projects, HMT ( <i>for Tristan Pedlty</i> )
[REDACTED]	Senior Housing Lead, GLA ( <i>for David Lunts</i> )
[REDACTED]	Head of Performance, IPA ( <i>for Stephen Dance</i> )
[REDACTED]	Head of Crossrail 2, Network Rail (Project Team)
[REDACTED]	Deputy Director, Local Gov. Finance, MHCLG ( <i>for Simon Ridley</i> )

**In attendance**

[REDACTED]	Chair, Independent Affordability Review (IAR) <i>Items 1- 3 only</i>
------------	--

**CR2 Project Teams**

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

**Apologies:**

[REDACTED]	Director, Housing & Land, GLA
[REDACTED]	Chair, Network Rail
[REDACTED]	Deputy Director, Transport funding, HMT
[REDACTED]	Director General, Decentralisation & Growth, DCLG
[REDACTED]	Head of Infrastructure Delivery, IPA

Ref	Item	Decision	Action/Notes	To Action
1	Introductions/ apologies		Apologies were noted as above	
2	Minutes & matters arising from previous meeting		The circulated minutes were agreed as presented.	
3	Independent Affordability Review (IAR)	Noted	<p>MG said that good progress had been made since the last update he had provided in April and since the smaller briefing with programme Board members on 11 June. There is now a Direction of Travel (DoT) slide pack that has been shared most importantly with both the Mayor and SoS. Both are strongly supportive of the DoT and there is a good deal of alignment over how the options should be narrowed down.</p> <p>The review has filtered down to ■■■■■, ■■■■■ the reference case, ■■■■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■■</p> <p>MG then turned to the issue of funding. ■■■■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■■ More work will be done to differentiate between the funding options.</p> <p>MG said that ■■■■■ a particular problem – ■■■■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■■ this is a challenge ■■■■■ that is generic to other infrastructure projects there may be a generic solution.</p> <p>MG talked about the relationship between transport and housing benefits – this is being explored, especially when considering whether ■■■■■ Feedback has been received form MHCLG and will be incorporated in the review .</p>	

			<p>MG said that the IAR panel had been meeting almost twice every week. There are two more full panel meetings scheduled; 3 July when the executive summary will be reviewed and then 25 July where the full report will be considered. MG said that he had received great support from MD and the team, all was on track and that the draft executive summary would be circulated on 29 June.</p> <p>A discussion followed MG's update, the key points for noting from it are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The final review report will not include an implementation plan [REDACTED] unless the SRO's provide a different steer</li> <li>• There is a critical path to actually realising the funding streams and this needs to be articulated</li> <li>• The Panel has worked closely with NR and has sought to reduce ON works (and costs) as far as possible.</li> </ul> <p>MG left the meeting, with the thanks of the Programme Board.</p>	
4	Local Engagement update	Noted	<p>AN said that the paper is an update to the one brought to the Board in January. The activity that the paper wanted to bring to the Board's attention was the 5 engagement events that have been organised regarding level crossings on the ON section of the route. In 2015, NR levels of design were not so advanced as those of the COS but are now. An approach to local engagement was agreed with the DfT and the first of these events took place on 26 June at Raynes Park to discuss the Motspur Park and West Barnes Lane level crossing. The event was invite only and was well received.</p> <p>AN said that the project has good relationships with all local authorities along the route, with high level support from outside London as well as Surrey. He said that the biggest issue was safeguarding – getting clarity on that quickly was important to the project.</p> <p><b>The Board noted the paper.</b></p>	
5	Housing	Noted	CB presented a two part update. The first was on the	

	development and Hybrid bill update		<p>refresh of the housing model. The model was last run in 2015 but since then there have been significant changes to the policy environment, including a draft London Plan and, the availability of sites has changed. The result of the housing model refresh, with revised assumptions, is an increase of [REDACTED]. These updated figures are higher than those previously assumed and will be used in an y SOBC update.</p> <p>CM said that whilst the recent model refresh strengthened the business case slightly it was important to recognise that the numbers are contingent on a number of things happening. The project needed to be clear what they are and to be explicit about the assumptions being made. CM asked that DfT continue to be included in this exercise.</p> <p>The second update related to hybrid bill powers; CB referred to a meeting of the Growth Sub panel that was held in January 2018 to discuss what powers a hybrid bill might need to seek in order to gain approval for the scheme. It also requested that existing and alternative powers were considered in parallel, as they might be better than using a hybrid bill.</p> <p>MD suggested that it was worth reconvening the group and refreshing the Housing Report.</p> <p>MD said that the meeting would be a discussion and was not scheme specific and therefore not tied to IAR timings.</p> <p><b>The Board agreed that the Growth sub panel be re-convened and that the Board receive the output from that meeting.</b></p>	MD
6	Safeguarding	Noted	<p>MD said that <i>not</i> safeguarding land is causing issues, Merton Hall was a case in point (discussed at April Board). [REDACTED] has been suggested as the first potential hotspot to safeguard as the scheme [REDACTED]</p> <p><b>MD and DT agreed to discuss [REDACTED] off line to agree if this was still the case.</b></p> <p>There was discussion about whether the SoS had the powers to safeguard without a public consultation. Public</p>	MD/DT



			<p>consultation is not a necessary requirement. [REDACTED]</p> <p><b>MD said that an update on safeguarding would be brought to the July Board.</b></p>	MD
7	Lesson learned update	Noted	<p>SA introduced the paper as an update to one that was considered by the Board in April. Over 300 lessons have been logged in a register. A prioritisation process is being formulated.</p> <p>A meeting has taken place with DfT colleagues to integrate their lessons learned into one register. HMT colleagues will also be approached for their lessons.</p> <p>RJ said that he was carrying out a refresh of his Economies of Experience report and intended to capture lessons that are gleaned from informal conversations – often the most valuable.</p> <p>RJ mentioned further lessons not captured in his original report to cover:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Review of technical standards</li> <li>2) A serial approach to construction</li> <li>3) Using standard design throughout</li> <li>4) Delivery of ON works</li> </ol> <p>Once a prioritisation process has been agreed, actions/mitigations will be formulated and implemented.</p> <p>SA said that the project is talking to IPA colleagues regularly and has discussed how the work may be shared with others. It is likely to be published on the IPA's Knowledge Hub.</p> <p><b>The Board noted the paper.</b></p>	
8	Regular programme update	Noted	<p>MD said that whilst the IAR was on track there was an urgent need to agree the work programme post the IAR.</p> <p>MD highlighted the issue of the budget saying that the original [REDACTED] had assumed a Hybrid Bill deposition in 2019 but this was no longer the case. If deposition was going to be in 2021 or 2022 then further funding was required [REDACTED] respectively.</p> <p>MD said that costs had been assumed on the basis of</p>	

			<p>DfT/TfL/NR rates and that as the project gets to establishing a SPV, it will need to consider how to manage expectations regarding salaries in particular.</p> <p><b>This is a discussion that the SROs will need to have in relation to the Spring 2019 CSR.</b></p> <p><b>The Board noted the paper.</b></p>	CM/SK
9	AOB		Nothing was raised.	
<b>Dates of future meetings</b>			<b>Venue</b>	
18 July 2018			BDB Offices	