

**Peninsula Transport
Sub-National Transport Body
Board Meeting
Part I**

Thursday 27th November 2025 (10:00-13:00)
MS Teams

Attendees

Cllr John Stephens, Plymouth City Council (CJS) [Chair]
Cllr Dan Rogerson, Cornwall Council (CDR)
Cllr Jacqi Hodgson, Devon County Council (CJH)
Cllr Richard Wilkins, Somerset Council (CRW)
Cllr Adam Billings, Torbay Council (CAB)
Hannah Shrimpton, Peninsula Transport STB (HS)
Ewan Wilson, Peninsula Transport STB (EW)
Nigel Blackler, Peninsula Transport STB (NB)
Kim Hawes, Peninsula Transport STB (KH)
Ross Pascoe, Peninsula Transport STB (RP)
Harriet James, Peninsula Transport STB (HJ)
Lauren Hutton, Peninsula Transport STB (LH)
Rebecca Riley, Cornwall Council (RR)
Jamie Hlland, Devon County Council (JH)
Philip Heseltine, Plymouth City Council (PH)
Matthew Prince, Somerset Council (MP)
Adam Luscombe, Torbay Council (AL)
Emma Creasey, Coast Communications (EC)
Ben Kempner, Department for Transport (BK)
Heather Cowling, National Highways (HC)
Hannah Fountain, Western Gateway (HF)
Jo Riley, WSP (JR)
Ian Harrison, Member of the Public (IH)
Reuben Bowles, Member of the Public (RB)

Apologies

Hannah Clark, Devon County Council (HC)
Sally Farley, Plymouth City Council (SF)
Paul Barnard, Plymouth City Council (SF)
Sunita Mills, Somerset Council (SM)

Part I – Open Committee

1.	<p>Welcome and Apologies</p> <p>CJS welcomes everyone to the meeting. Pt financial proposal for 26/27 will be one item not conducted in the public forum and will take place in Part 2.</p>
2.	<p>Minutes of previous meeting</p> <p>CJS asks if minutes reflect what was discussed. Minutes accepted as correct</p> <p>PROPOSED by Cllr Stephens and ALL IN FAVOUR that the minutes of the meeting held on the 31st July be approved as true to record.</p>
3.	<p>Items Requiring Urgent Attention</p> <p>CJS notes final board meeting for IH. CJS thanks IH for his contribution and on behalf of whole board.</p> <p>IH – thanks the chairman.</p>
4.	<p>Public Participation</p> <p>CJS - Two items submitted – one from Safer Plusha Action Group who have provided STB with an update. HS – SPAG have submitted a statement but can't attend. The paper is included in the reports. CJS – The note is good and it's positive they feel they have some clarity moving forward.</p> <p>RB is from Cornwall Youth Council and has an issue to share about Hayle train station</p> <p>RB – Submitted a questions related to the limited number of trains stopping at Hayle Station. RB commutes daily from Hayle for school and the frequency of trains is low and therefore inconvenient. The station sits on the mainline, yet not all trains serve the station. This makes the station less useful for the 9,043 local residents. 5 minutes faster to not stop at Hayle. Doesn't make sense particularly in AM and PM peaks. New housing developments are planned in the area and an increase in stopping services would be a quick solution to future developments. Question – what are the limitations of stopping more trains at Hayle.</p> <p>CJS – thanks RB and thanks for the paper which summarises what he's said.</p> <p>CJH – question – how much would it cost us to stop at Hayle. If not adding much time on, why not</p>

	<p>CDR – RB has raised a good point. Pressure on main roundabout at Hayle on to A30 is huge so encouraging PT would be helpful for the wider transport situation.</p> <p>CJS – has the youth council discussed with CC already?</p> <p>RB – transport team at CC are more focussed on bus services so this meeting might be more useful.</p> <p>RR – Head of transport at CC. This is question for GWR and we can pick that up via PRTF, as a LA out of hands, but will have the convos with GWR.</p> <p>JH – deputy director at DCC. Offered RB a job! Highlights it’s good to have younger generation getting involved.</p> <p>CJS – There are a number of youth councils across the SW – we should alert ourselves to the voices of younger people.</p> <p>CJH – we will raise it – RR will raise with GWR and STB will feedback to RB.</p> <p>NB – thanks RB for bringing it to attention. We have a specialist rail subgroup called PRTF that meets to raise issues affecting the network in the region. We will raise. The railways revise their timetable twice a year – December and May with a long lead in time. So, can’t promise any immediate changes but if we start to raise the case, and with particular reference to housing increases increasing demand, where we have improved frequency of stopping services, this always translates to more people using the railway. Paper highlights very little disbenefit in terms over the longer distance.</p> <p>RB – was worried it goes against strategic plan due to increase in JTs</p>
	<p>Items for Decision</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Rural Mobility - Pilots</p> <p>HJ leads on this paper. Introduces herself, before PT was at WG. Back in 2022, WG and PT worked together to release SW rural mobility strategy – once action to launch various pilots. Bodmin community bus scheme is going well. Hope to release M&E report next year. Within this report there will be lessons learned not just positive news stories. This round of funding 26 applications in total. PT decided we want to split the £50k between 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Gateway project in Torpoint – testing of a bus link between Torpoint and St Germans railway station. This type of transport hub could be replicated across other coastal communities 3) One Ilfracombe Project – getting locals into jobs in partnership with DCC and local business

	<p>3) Devon Communities together - Intergeneration volunteering pilot – volunteer recruitment, encouraging younger people to get involved in volunteer driving for DRT and Community Transport.</p> <p>Hoping all 3 pilots will offer lessons learned. Paper seeks Board approval to grant the funding requested for these three projects.</p> <p>CJS – how does 26 submissions compare to last time</p> <p>HJ – 12 last year, 26 this year</p> <p>CJS – impressed with how Torpoint have shown interest as Torpoint is a drive through town.</p> <p>EC – have included some new media coverage on highways news</p> <p>CDR proposes, CJH seconds. Board approved.</p> <p>CJS – what’s the process now for informing bidders</p> <p>HJ – financial checks and formal approval from PCC and then can get up and running in the next couple of months</p> <p>ALL IN FAVOUR proposed by CDR and second by CJH that the funding is approved.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Railways Bill</p> <p>HS – paper in relation to railways bill, starting route through House of Commons on 5th Nov. The Bill allows creation of GBR, bringing track and train together and bring TOCs into public ownership. Recommendations welcome publications of Railways Bill and also to ask for approval of chair of PRTF to raise with rail minister that there is no separate mechanism for non-mayoral areas to influence GBR decisions and service provisions.</p> <p>HS - Regulation was consulted upon in Jan this year, we said wording and policy focuses entirely on MCAs and MSAs devolved governments, which not all areas have. Our response to consultation was to seek reassurance that other authorities could still be consulted. Still no reference and we are concerned about that. Where there are local stakeholders like PRTF, does that mean our regional voice will be lost in terms of how rail services are developed and changed.</p> <p>CJS – two tier system implies that they are not being considered without MCAs/MSAs. Is CDR in conversations with rail minister?</p>

	<p>CDR – Didn't really receive an answer. Message was until recently that everywhere would have a mayoral authority. Some departments have not caught up with this change yet. PRTF can take this up again. There are opportunities to change this, House of Lords could change it.</p> <p>BK – this issue has not cropped up in other forums. We can take this away and will be a challenge going forward.</p> <p>NB – following on from CDR and recent visit of Rail Minister in Cornwall. Showed him some of the work we've been doing in the area to improve rail network. We've gained a reputation in London for the proactive approach authorities have taken in the region. Took the opportunity to raise that the publications don't take account of lack of mayoral authorities in all areas. There is some change coming through government, but this hasn't filtered into other departments yet. We as a region need to continue to make the case that the region will need a way to represent our rail needs with GBR still. Wouldn't want to lose PRTF or equivalent with GBR coming in.</p> <p>CJH – become a big issue, with conversations around LGR as well. No mayoral authority before 2031 at least in this area. Unreasonable that government would ignore a region this big. Wi-Fi on trains so successful and we need to get the wider rail benefits despite not having a mayor. We have good operators that need to be equally supported, no matter where they are in the country. Means we won't have a good network across the country – happy to join any group that wants to meet with the minister.</p> <p>CJS – need to make sure we don't get the scraps of any benefits</p> <p>Recommendations are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Board notes and welcomes the publication of the Railways Bill, which will fundamentally reform Britain's railway network through the creation of Great British Railways, a single point of leadership across passenger train services and infrastructure management 2. The Board gives approval for the Chair of the PRTF to raise with the Rail Minister the need to create an appropriate mechanism to maintain regional input into the provision and improvement of rail services in the peninsula. <p>The recommendations are Proposed by CJH and seconded by CRW ALL IN FAVOUR recommendation as suggested.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Roads Investment Strategy 3</p>

EW – recommendation for board to approve for chair to write a letter regarding publication of draft RIS regarding what the region seeks funding for

Draft RIS was published in the summer, full implementation plans due to be published in March. Met with network developer for NH, RIS3 is focussed on renewals and maintenance of existing network – looks thin in the SW, most of major schemes in midlands and the north. Much of road network is around 60 years old in this region. No major improvements planned in this region. Some small schemes in the region to improve safety and resilience but with massive housing growth planned, lack of major schemes is a concern – letter suggested focusing on 3 key themes. Number of areas with a poor safety and resilience record, and number of growth clusters where we anticipate an increase in demand.

Recommend that board approves a letter being drafted to secretary of state.

CDR – focus on safety is welcome within the RIS. Priorities in Cornwall would be continued work on A38, and work on crossing/barrier gaps. Proposals coming forward are to just close them but in terms of accessibility / economic activity etc, this is an issue. Aspirations towards grade separated junctions being implemented would be better – if they were built now, they would be grade separated junctions –e.g. Plusha etc. Newer sections all have graded junctions, so having to make business case for updating to grade separated junctions doesn't seem fair. I'd like this to be in the letter. Development around the A30 will increase pressure on inadequate crossing points

EW – we have explicitly mentioned that location in our discussions. We've met with Cornwall officers and NH. We will make that case in the draft letter.

CRW – not happy with direction of this. In the peninsula we have two strategic routes into region, we need to be clear about strategic nature of our roads – M5 and A303. M5 can be flaky and so we need improvements on the A303 corridor, and we should be putting pressure on Government to improve the whole A303 network from Stonehenge to the A30 and into Cornwall. We should look at it from a strategic level, let's look past our own borders, from an economic point of view we need improvements on the routes into the region

EW – critical connector aspect of draft response will consider connection between A303, M5 and A358. Stonehenge and A358 scheme have been cancelled, and we will make these points within the letter.

CJH – noise is always around Devonport being expanded and Torbay trying to expand, arterial routes through e.g. Totnes are becoming dangerous. E.g. Torbay to Plymouth aren't adequately dealt with. Should be looking at getting

freight onto rail or will be more difficult to keep these routes safe with freight demands increasing. Good to be protesting this.

EW – support these comments.

JH – building on points about resilience. Exeter gateway is a real risk, all strategic routes funnel to location around Exeter on M5. 4 closures brought SW to standstill recently – queues to Okehampton and Newton Abbott. Concerns around M5 viaduct bridge engineering – if that's closed, there is no connectivity. Reinforcing messages in report with real examples. Viaduct is beginning to snap and won't be cheap to replace.

CRW – need to focus on that and not get preoccupied with small schemes. These two routes are our only feed into the SW. doesn't just affect us, but also the neighbouring STBs so need a joined-up message on this. Need to be clear about the flakiness of the routes which aren't up to standard.

CAB – strong message that the comms is about strategic connectivity into and out of SW but also across the SW. not sure this has been picked up in the draft so far. We won't be able to keep the level of investment etc throughout, safety concerns don't seem to land as strongly as connectivity concerns. Suggests using examples from CJH and CRW to show that holistically this is a problem, not just in our own areas.

IH – about the second strategic route issue, we've been here before in 2007 with previous SH tunnel scheme cancelled. A303 as strategic route dropped off gov agenda. Brought back onto their agenda by a similar forum to this one, which resulted in new scheme being in national programme. Back to square one now. Context different now in terms of balance of modes. STBs plural, need to take a view to what might be appropriate, having twice had Stonehenge tunnel schemes approved then cancelled due to cost. At least PT and WG should talk about what might be an appropriate concept for A303 corridor. This RIS goes to 2031 so talking about what might be appropriate in mid 2030s – should be thinking about what sort of proposals we want included in a future RIS programme

HS – asking BK a question. Discussed with WG before, was going to be a working group set up with STBs and local highway authorities by DfT after tunnel scheme was cancelled.

BK – on the horizon. Lots of conversations with NH etc, and plan is still to set up a group to talk through the issues and longer-term options as RIS draft is just renewals etc, but longer term is very important still. Working with TEAM Plymouth around Devonport, and looking at wider network, not just Plymouth.

CJS – is it less money or political coincidence that funding is diverted to midlands and north – schemes are costlier?

BK – I can't answer that, don't know. Can take away. SH situation does reflect tight fiscal situation currently.

CAB – more info needed on average journey speeds at different parts of the route. Around Stonehenge, scheme is v expensive that would help the congestion there but not the only bit of congestion on that route or the only single carriageway section. The monument makes it more expensive. Pleased with dualling on a different section of the A303. A map of the route with average speed in different sections would be useful.

IH – comprehensive work was done in 2012 identifying each of the locations. After that the gov adopted the strategy to improve all single carriageway sections and putting them into the RIS of the time. They didn't cover all the sections but yes there is some albeit outdated information. Perhaps this needs revisiting.

CAB – can we share this as an action?

PH – need to make the case in RIS3 about having a commitment to fund corridor studies along all the strategic routes. Lots of major developments in proximity of these major routes. Work initiated by homes England in terms of houses on the M5 (Birmingham to SW corridor and A303 corridor), we need a commitment to be ready for a strong evidence base to go into RIS4. We need commitment from NH for undertaking these corridor studies.

CRW – RIS3 does look at M5 but it'll create a lot of pressure on A303 corridor in the medium term. This corridor wont cope. Seems to be a disconnect about how we move transport into the SW while constriction is taking place. Not getting through to government. SW home to huge population and we're allowing our infrastructure to be unable to bear the weight. When you look at road and rail together, we are not being heard.

EW – responding to question around budget by CJS when we spoke to NH budget is 25 billion which is similar as previous RIS periods, so inflation means this doesn't go as far as it used to so some schemes have had to be cancelled. This is a renewals RIS, and the focus is to maintain resilience.

CJS – amount is the same but not increased with inflation then this is effectively a cut. Issues with resilience in the SW regionally and locally, common theme with railway and road. if there's a blockage/crash etc, there's not many places to divert. Seasonal impact in the SW to be considered too. If something happens on one highway in the SW, we all suffer across the

	<p>region. Power of this board is that we all commit together. Can put off businesses/ people moving to SW if the maintenance and infrastructure improvements don't happen. Does recommendation stay as it is or should something be changes</p> <p>EW – we can make explicit the need to highlight strategic connectivity into/out of region and across. We could request delegated authority to agree contents of letter to ensure themes discussed today are include in the letter.</p> <p>CJS – me and CRW as vice chair could represent the other members to approve.</p> <p>NB – to build on point, perhaps we should make specific reference to second strategic route even though there's no money available to make enhancements on the network it won't always be that way. We should position ourselves now to get proposals into RIS4. Would look in RIS3 for resources to be allocated to look at proposals for RIS4, where more money available for enhancements over maintenance.</p> <p>CJS – agree should outline as early as possible. Happy for recommendations with caveat that CJS and CRW are contacted to review?</p> <p>CAB proposes, CJH seconds. all approve.</p>
	<p>Matters for Information</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Peninsula Transport Update</p> <p>EW – shares slides. All of these updates are in detailed papers. Ongoing workstreams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail update- One of actions within the SIP is to improve station accessibility at stations in the area. NR have a methodology for prioritising improvements, and we think we have an opportunity to focus on this with them. NR working on resilience studies in response to challenges around climate change. Also met with Somerset council recently about updating existing business cases. Infographic around the potential benefits and opportunities of a Plymouth metro system. Going to commission an economic impact study. • Bus and coach – continuing to develop bus proposal to get region ready for project coral. PT will be co-chairing SW coach forum, quarterly from next year. • RIS- high level map of area with some of the schemes we will be mentioning in draft response. See slide for map.

- **Infographic for A38** – a renewed case for action. Worked with partners to update this and officers have commented on, supports case for requesting investment in region
- **Freight and EV** – continuing to deliver forums. Most recent forum had over 40 attendees. Freight industry survey produced asking LAs how the STB can help. Looking at feasibility for bringing more freight into the region, starting with Midlands to Exeter then into Plymouth and Tavistock.
- **Capacity & Capability** – Project management services – managing commission, LTP and strategy development support, regional engagement with Network Rail, National Highways and Homes England.

Gantt chart showing number of workstreams progressing.

CJH – on slide 7 there was mention of terminal sites being developed. What's the timescales and what's being proposed. Is anyone thinking about how we do freight and whether Eurotunnel and putting vehicles onto train is an option

EW – strategy identified number of rail freight sites, feasibility work at Avonmouth, potential service between midlands and SW, and interest in bringing freight into port at Falmouth. Timescales depend on viability of rail freight service, not happening overnight. Happy to provide briefing offline if helpful.

CAB – caution the amount we can move the needle on freight. In my business, I bring arctics down. Ability for us in this group is limited. Biggest frustration on my side is arctics coming full into the area are leaving empty. We could improve our manufacturing on the region so that they could leave full. Speed of delivery from initial order to getting it to customer is predicated on road distribution system rather than railway.

EW – accept that freight is 99.9% private sector and so scope we have is limited but trying to engage with private sector as best we can

IH- freight is private operation. The most straight forward form of terminals is a large concrete pad where a stacker can take containers off rail wagons and onto lorries. 3 likely markets for freight – about a trains worth of containers coming into SW along M5 every day from Southampton. Southampton ports are offering incentives to get freight off road and onto rail. Second is supermarket traffic where we lag the rest of country in SW. Midlands distribution centres go most places on rail. Bulk aggregates as a third are

	<p>dependent on extraction. Agree with CAB that scope is limited but the absence of any terminals means we're not in the market.</p> <p>CJH – important that we should not feel silenced about what seems impossible.</p> <p>JH – lots of activity going on. future financial uncertainty, should we review what we want to prioritise with the constraints. What's most important to us as a region.</p> <p>CJS – where we are now, this applies, and we will have to adapt with any future funding constraints.</p> <p>HF – have put in chat the outputs of rail freight feasibility report just completed at Avonmouth. Summarises economically viable window would be 3-6 trains a day coming into that terminal. As network of rail freight terminal hubs builds up across the country, the report might be of interest. Challenges found at Avonmouth, size of rail freight cars that need to pass underneath bits of infra on network etc. precedent in area as energy to waste terminal – 50% of waste comes in by rail. Option to see one in action on a slightly smaller scale. Could help to arrange a trip to site if anyone is interested.</p> <p>EW – useful comments that we will consider. Paper was for board to note progress. And no matter for decision.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Peninsula Rail Update</p> <p>Note the change from agenda (Trail)</p> <p>NB – paper gives an update on Peninsula Rail. Covers Plymouth Metro, rail mobile connectivity, visit by Rail Minister to Cornwall which was important as he opened the lift bridge at St Erth station, also provided opportunity to talk to him about other rail projects in the region such as Mid Cornwall Metro project, will offer increase in connectivity for e.g. Newquay, difficulty in funding lift bridge at Par station to give accessible access between mainline and branch line. Gap in funding needs to be closed to get full benefits.</p> <p>CDR as chair of PRTF was able to have discussion with Rail Minister to that effect as well. Now working with rail industry on accessibility initiatives, developing a pipeline of projects for the industry, not just expensive lift bridges. Report also gives summary of PRTF meeting chaired by CDR in October. One paper presented by GBR – was good to understand where we are in that process.</p> <p>Rail mobile connectivity – looking at impact at OOC and construction works for new HS2 tunnel and impact on intercity services in and out of Paddington over construction period of 7 years. Looking at mitigation in place for</p>

increased JTs, e.g. need for mobile connectivity to improve the time on the journey rather than the JT. In Jan, we met with rail minister to run a pilot on one GWR train. Brought a paper to board in March this year for resources to fully fund that project to trial the system. Improved coverage and capacity of the system and speed of system – challenges overcome. Working with stakeholders. Installation on one train was challenging as fleet is in regular use, installation went ahead and last Monday, launched at Paddington station – hosted by CDR, attended by rail minister, MPs etc. event went well, and on Tuesday we were back at Paddington with operators from e.g. America, Germany Italy Norway who are in the process of getting same equipment. On weds, we went to Wi-Fi on trains conference. Technical choice we've made was conformed to be a good one and equipment is state of the art. How do you maximise the benefits of the greatly enhanced capacity – good proposals put forward to help both the passenger and the operator. Benefits the system and can reduce the cost of running the railway. Picked up further requests from DfT, department for industry and trade etc to ride on the railway and experience it themselves.

NB thanks the Board for giving the opportunity to do this pilot – big ask in March. Trial itself is a 60-day trial starting next week. We will be monitoring the performance / coverage for the whole intercity network between Paddington / Penzance / SW Wales, and upload/download speeds, cost of data, what its being used for e.g. Streaming/teams calls etc. this will go into business case for installing the system across the fleet. This pilot would give GWR first mover advantage. Funding is set aside in Government (£57million) to improve Wi-Fi connectivity nationally – PT aim to be first in there so that our passengers get it first. GWR go to public ownership autumn next year and we want to have equipment installed by then. Graphic shared on the screen highlighted where this scheme sits in the National Programme.

Only region in the country doing this work which should give us first mover advantage and so GWR fleet should get it first.

CJS – after the false start in Sep, v successful launch. softener for the OOC issue. What's the start date for that?

NB – it's under construction now, but large project, all the work so far, is taking place north of the mainline into Paddington. Mainline needs to be moved. more significant periods of closure, lower line speeds through construction area. Major disruption has been put back, Rail Minister accepted that mitigation needs to be in place, and so disruption has been put back a few years. Hopefully enough time for mobile connectivity will be improved. Appropriate mitigation given we don't benefit directly from HS2. We should get some benefit given it's taking a lot of the rail investment.

	<p>CJS – attended the devon rail meeting chaired by CJH. Mentioned the significant number of passengers using railway, which now exceeds pre covid levels. People needing support accessibility in station has increased, which fits in with our plans.</p> <p>CJS notes the recommendations.</p>
10.	<p>National Highways Update</p> <p>The Board heard a verbal update from National Highways about strategic road schemes. Special inward investment scheme which sets outside of the rail investment strategy which is funded by the DfT.</p> <p>HC – made a note of discussions had earlier in the meeting and will report those back. Status of RIS3, still finalising plans and ORR doing efficiency review and will be sent to sec of state for transport. Aiming to publish next year in summer.</p> <p>M5 at Bridgewater Jn22A sits outside RIS. Funding for scheme is from DfT. Hitting some key milestones. Prelim design is nearing completion and so is environmental appraisal. Engineering surveys completed and traffic modelling ongoing. Stakeholder engagement plan being produced and they will be reached out to at key points.</p> <p>A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross – end of 2025, all underpasses opened, NMU crossings completed by end of year. Landscaping etc to be completed by end of year. Work should have started this month on planting on bridge.</p> <p>Sparkford to Ilchester – final stages, last elements of landscaping to be finished by Christmas.</p> <p>Saltash tunnel – gantries in place and electrical works installed. Elsewhere business on site with electrical works – soon will receive specialist equipment. Emergency phones will be out of service whilst work is going on but there will be signs should people need help. Tunnel control system should be back in the new year. Works to be expected until the summer.</p> <p>CJS – don't seem to have had much noise in Plymouth about delays by constriction.</p> <p>CDR – agree. Lots going on A30 currently, so a few grumbles about when the road will settle down i.e speed limits changing etc. but not a huge problem for users.</p> <p>CJS – when will the tunnel works be completed</p>

	<p>HC – due to delay in electrical works, spring/summer 2026.</p> <p>CRW – map on HC’s screen showed the lack of routes in the SW. Can HC send to every board member.</p> <p>HC – available on the website but will put it in the chat</p> <p>NB – on Carland Chiverton, accommodation works still ongoing as priority given to opening the mainline in time for the summer period. Permanent Signage is still not complete, noticeable locally. Temp signage since scheme opened.</p> <p>HC – will raise with the project team and see what the current timescales are.</p> <p>RR – written to HC. Chiverton and Carland, western off slips are querying back onto A30 in the mornings. Not safe.</p> <p>HC – aware of this and safety is main priority so closely monitoring. There are options for things to do with the slip road once the traffic settles.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>Department for Transport Update</p> <p>BK – during the summer, we extended e-scooter programmes to May 2028. New trials programme allows new areas to have the trial. Looking at e scooter safety and how it can help gov emissions targets.</p> <p>Invalid carriage regulations don’t account for devices people need to use.gov reviewing the law around mobility aids.</p> <p>Bus bill became law at the end of Oct. most used form of PT but millions fewer miles in 2024 than 2010 – route cuts. Bill looks to stop routes being cut at short notice and focusses on people in rural areas, gov will empower LAs to find routes that are socially necessary. Allows them to run their own services. Gov will back bus services with further funding from LAs.</p> <p>EVs- electric car owners in position where easier and cheaper to charge vehicles at home without a private driveway. Removing planning permission for cross pavement charging gulleys.</p> <p>10m of gov funding for EV charging devices to operate without LOST HIM. private operators can apply for funding to enable existing energy supplies to go further.</p> <p>Rail – freeze on rail fares for first time in 30 years as per Chancellor’s budget</p>

	<p>New think campaign launched for drug driving work – reminds people that one poor decision can impact safety on the road. particularly targets young men, supporting evidence.</p> <p>CJS – rail fare freeze welcome – is this generally intercity? So branch lines might not be affected?</p> <p>BK – will take away as an action and get back.</p> <p>CJS – only England and not Scotland. So, Plymouth to Glasgow wouldn't work?</p> <p>BK – take that away too.</p> <p>CDR – road pricing and low emissions vehicles and tax situation. Does need to differentiate between rural and urban – if were pushing people to shift modes of transport, they need to have the opportunity to do that. Higher charges for rural residents.</p> <p>CJS – not for 2.5 years but lots of work to be done before. Consultations may be necessary. Electric cars will have impact on road surfaces as any car but needs to be a level of fairness.</p> <p>RR - electric vehicles have £195 a year where was free previously. Did you give any clarity around BSIP announcements and meaning of socially necessary services.</p> <p>BK – can paste some text into chat as another authority asked this question. Funding announcement for BSIPs will be over the next days.</p> <p>CJH – silver at bus awards for bus enhancement with stagecoach. Partnership working was recognised.</p> <p>PH – heard stagecoach are getting a ministerial visit at Plymouth depot Active travel funding – any indication of a settlement letter?</p> <p>BK – next couple of weeks, but slightly later than bus funding. Will find out about Plymouth visit.</p>
	<p>Standing Items</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p>Finance Update The Board received a verbal update from the Programme Director on the financial position of the STB.</p> <p>HS – paper wasn't shared with the rest of the papers.</p>

	Recommendation PAPER TO BE SHARED.
13.	<p>Communications and Engagement Update</p> <p>EC – comms and media coverage for all projects, not just rail Wi-Fi.</p> <p>Event management – coast organised the Wi-Fi trains event. Created a strategy event matrix, master task list, QR codes, FAQs, briefing notes etc, press release. Over 85 guests attended, from MPs to GWR advisory board, rail minister.</p> <p>Coast created unique stakeholder guestlist across the route of the trainlines. Spokespersons were fantastic CDR included – Eden project, motion applied, GWR, PRTF.</p> <p>PR and media relations – created bespoke media list. Post event press release was released after the event</p> <p>Public affairs – MPs were selected based on regional interest. Over 10 MPs attended the event. Each of these took part in individual photography by the pilot train.</p> <p>Videography was on a rolling loop at the event.</p> <p>Now finished a master video which HS will share. Created shorter social media clips.</p> <p>High media coverage, reaching BBC news, and many newspapers etc. media coverage still being generated now, but included everything we have to date in report.</p> <p>Metrics – equivalent cost for this is advertising was >£1m. on top of this is the broadcasting – BBC news and radio and expected to total over 50k. final figure is expected to be well in excess of 1m£ media coverage. Some PR professionals believe you should multiply this by e.g. 2 as earned media is more impactful than advertising.</p> <p>LinkedIn impressions day after event shot up by 830%. The website, visitors increased by 55%. Evaluation – hold sound bites from MPs etc from the day. Planning a phase 2, lots of MPs/journalists/stakeholders want 1-1s and a trip on the train.</p> <p>HS shared the film from the day.</p> <p>EC – follow up comms on linked in</p>

	<p>CDR – big thankyou to the team and everyone at coast. Good awareness exercise for what can be achieved when we work together.</p> <p>CJH- interested in watching the other passengers. Event was done very well.</p> <p>CJS – no way of knowing which train it'll be when you book.</p>
14.	<p>Dates of Future Meetings</p> <p>The next Board meeting will be held in Jan bit might be determined by when DfT funding comes.</p>

Membership

Declaration of Interests

Members are reminded that they must declare any interest they may have in any item to be considered at this meeting, prior to any discussion taking place on that item.

Access to Information

Any person wishing to inspect any minutes, reports or lists of background papers relating to any item on this agenda should contact Lauren Hutton on Lauren.Hutton@peninsulatransport.org.uk

Agenda and minutes of the Board are published on the Council's website.

Webcasting, Recording or Reporting of Meetings and Proceedings

Anyone wishing to film part or all of the proceedings may do so unless the press and public are excluded for that part of the meeting or there is good reason not to do so, as directed by the Chairman. Any filming must be done as unobtrusively as possible from a single fixed position without the use of any additional lighting; focusing only on those actively participating in the meeting and having regard also to the wishes of any member of the public present who may not wish to be filmed. As a matter of courtesy, anyone wishing to film proceedings is asked to advise the Chair or the Democratic Services Officer in attendance so that all those present may be made aware that is happening.

Public Participation

Any member of the public resident in the administrative area of the Peninsula Transport authorities may submit a formal written question to the Board which relates to the functions of the Board. Questions must be delivered to the Chief Executive by 12 noon 4 working days before the meeting takes place. The name of the person asking the question will be recorded in the minutes.

Alternatively, any member of the public who lives in the area served by the Peninsula Transport authorities may make oral representations on any matter relating to the function of

OFFICIAL

the board. Such representations will be limited to 3 minutes, within the overall time allowed of 30 minutes. If you wish to make such a representation, you should, via email or letter, submit a brief outline of the points or issues you wish to raise before 12 noon 4 working days before the meeting takes place. The name of the person making the representation will be recorded in the minutes.

For further details please contact Hannah.Shrimpton@peninsulatrtransport.gov.uk

Emergencies

In the event of the fire alarm sounding leave the building immediately by the nearest available exit, following the fire exit signs. If doors fail to unlock press the Green break glass next to the door. Do not stop to collect personal belongings, do not use the lifts, do not re-enter the building until told to do so.

Mobile Phones

Please switch off all mobile phones before entering the Committee Room or Council Chamber.

If you need a copy of this agenda and/or a report in another report (eg large print, audio tape, Braille or other languages), please contact lauren.hutton@peninsulatrtransport.org.uk or 01752307618.