

**WEST OF ENGLAND COMBINED AUTHORITY:
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
25 July 2018**

MINUTES

Committee Members:

Cllr Stephen Clarke, Bristol City Council (Chair)
Cllr Steve Pearce, Bristol City Council (Vice-Chair)

Cllr Tim Ball, Bath & North-East Somerset Council
Cllr Liz Richardson, Bath & North-East Somerset Council
Cllr Carole Johnson, Bristol City Council
Cllr Margaret Hickman, Bristol City Council
Cllr Claire Hiscott, Bristol City Council (On behalf of Cllr Mark Weston)
Cllr Geoff Gollop, Bristol City Council
Cllr Brian Allinson, South Gloucestershire Council
Cllr Katherine Morris, South Gloucestershire Council
Cllr Mike Drew, South Gloucestershire Council (On behalf of Pat Hockey)

Copies to:

Cllr Chris Blades, North Somerset Council
Cllr Charles Cave, North Somerset Council
Cllr Donald Davies, North Somerset Council

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 | <p>WELCOME AND EVACUATION PROCEDURE</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and advice was given on the fire evacuation procedure.</p> |
| 2 | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies were noted from Cllr Charles Cave, Cllr Pat Hockey & Cllr Mark Weston</p> <p>Cllr Mike Drew was substituting for Cllr Pat Hockey & Cllr Claire Hiscott was substituting for Cllr Mark Weston</p> |
| 3 | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest</p> |
| 4 | <p>MINUTES</p> <p>The minutes from 23 May 2018 and 6 June were agreed.</p> |
| 5 | <p>ANY MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>Cllr Don Davies raised concerns that no answers regarding the MetroBus figures were given in the last meeting, but were then given to a local media outlet directly after the meeting. Cllr Tim Ball, Cllr Stephen Clarke, Cllr Steve Pearce and Cllr Geoff Gollop all agreed it was disappointing not to be given all the information at the time by officers of Bristol City Council. Cllr Mike Drew suggested making a complaint in writing. All agreed for Cllr Stephen Clarke to draft a letter to the relevant party.</p> |
| 6 | <p>ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC</p> <p>One statement was received from David Redgewell, and one from Christina Biggs. The Chair invited the attendees to speak in the order their statements were received.</p> <p>Statement attached in Appendix 1</p> <p>Eight questions were submitted by Adam Reynolds, and three questions were submitted by Thomas Gravatt. Copies of questions and answers were made available to the committee and to members of the public.</p> |
| 7 | <p>PETITIONS FROM MEMBERSHIPS</p> <p>There were no petitions</p> |
| 8 | <p>Invest in Bristol and Bath (Joint Committee business)</p> <p>Neil Gregory (NG), Interim Head of Business and Skills, presented the paper on Invest Bristol and Bath (IBB), providing an update on continuing activities of the unit, together with an outline of the process for the upcoming review. NG confirmed WECA has received good input from the UAs and has fed this into the process.</p> <p>He presented the report and drew attention to the delay noted in point 2.5. However, he said this had been helpful by allowing time for full engagement with Leaders, Mayor and CEOs.</p> <p>Scrutiny members thanked NG for his update and some members fed back that generally they thought IBB was delivering well.</p> <p>Cllr Katherine Morris (KM) said she believed IBB have done a good job considering the economic and financial context over the last few years.</p> |

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| | <p>Wider issues affecting the region were then discussed. Cllr Tim Ball (TB) raised concerns over the fact firms are leaving Bath due to lack of land for expansion. This is leading to the loss of industrial clusters and associated semi-skilled jobs.</p> <p>The discussion moved on to the importance of housing and transport infrastructure to enable economic growth and to attract companies to locate to the West of England. NG agreed that housing, transport and infrastructure need to be considered together.</p> <p>The Chair noted that much of the growth in the media industry had taken place without incentives, partly due to the existence of 12 business hubs with flexible desk space.</p> <p>NG was asked what provisions are being made to mitigate the risk of significant employers leaving the region. The committee were told WECA continues to work with key employers and sectors to ensure that the region remains an attractive place to invest.</p> <p>Members also asked what was being done to address the hollowing-out of the high street and low-skilled jobs through emergent and imposed industrial change. It as also asked how to achieve inclusive growth and balance support to both the highly skilled and lower skilled members of the workforce.</p> <p>The Chair expressed the need to support microbusinesses, to increase skills, GVA and diversity of the supplier base.</p> <p>Cllr Geoff Gollop (GG) said he saw SMEs as a key area of strength for the region. He wanted confirmation that they were not being forgotten by IBB and reassurance that resources are being focused in the right areas. He then highlighted the need to provide local workshops and other facilities to support SMEs in the area.</p> <p>The committee emphasised the importance of independent challenge in the IBB review process. The suggestion was made that once the report has been to the review panel it should then be brought back to Scrutiny, before the final version is signed off. NG suggested the draft review be brought to Scrutiny in November. This was agreed.</p> <p>Many members stressed the importance of a series of performance targets to enable the Committee and others to measure the ongoing success of the service.</p> <p>NG responded by informing Scrutiny members that currently the performance of IBB is measured against other investment bodies in the UK. However one role of the review is to decide appropriate KPIs going forward. He suggested the choice of KPIs was an area where Scrutiny could provide useful input.</p> |
| <p>9</p> | <p>PROGRESS UPDATE: LOCAL GROWTH FUND, REVOLVING INFRASTRUCTURE FUND, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND (Joint Committee business)</p> <p>Pete Davis, Investment performance Manager, WECA (PD) provided the committee with an update on progress since March and an update on funds.</p> <p>This included what has been achieved so far in terms of outputs and outcomes and when new jobs are likely to materialise.</p> <p>He drew members' attention to the business cases that have come forward (p82 of the report) and completed projects (Appendix 2). He noted the difference in timescales between being able to report on outcomes compared to outputs. Outputs can be reported at the completion of the project, then evaluation takes place to identify outcomes. Outputs measured include the number of jobs created over the period of the Local Growth Fund (LGF).</p> <p>TB asked how monies paid back from the revolving infrastructure fund is being spent. PD confirmed any monies received had been reinvested. This reinvestment is overseen by the West of England Joint Committee and the unitary authorities have undertaken to repay the money.</p> <p>Cllr Donald Davis (DD) said North Somerset needs a skilled workforce to attract business from elsewhere. They had seen the Enterprise and Technology College built, but the OFSTED report</p> |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| | <p>said the school requires improvements in all areas, which suggests it is not delivering effectively against the objective of improving skills in the region. He asked what WECA's/the Scrutiny and Overview Committee's role is in ensuring the legacy of investments and achievement of project outcomes. For example what processes are in place to ensure the Unitary Authorities derive the desired benefits from their investment.</p> <p>PD responded that WECA does not have responsibility for the educational outputs of the school within the scope of this project. OFSTED is the organisation responsible for assessing and benchmarking educational standards. Gill Sinclair, Deputy Monitoring Officer (GS) confirmed education is not part of WECA's remit or in the Terms of Reference of the Committee.</p> <p>Cllr Donald Davies (DD) followed up by asking what criteria were used for monitoring the legacy aspect of projects over the next 10-20 years and what powers WECA/the Scrutiny and Overview Committee have in relation to that. PD responded that the Unitary Authorities hold responsibility for that element.</p> <p>Cllr Chris Blades (CB) asked what the purpose is of the Year 3 project evaluation reports.</p> <p>PD explained that they were to evaluate the value and effectiveness of the assumptions in the original business case and inform future project planning, decision-making and allocation of funding regarding the skills agenda.</p> <p>PD was asked how issues are managed and what happens if a project breaks down. PD said it depends on the nature of the outputs, but it would be possible to withhold business grants.</p> <p>The Chair asked PD to highlight in Figure 2 which projects are currently items at high risk or with issues emerging or emerged. He suggested it would be helpful to identify these in the next report to assist members in monitoring emerging or emerged issues. He requested officers to include notices of change and level of change in future reports. PD confirmed they would be included in the next report.</p> <p>The Chair then requested the WECA Committee report be circulated to members of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee for information. This was agreed.</p> |
| | <p>Pause: North Somerset Councillors are invited to leave the table</p> |
| <p>10</p> | <p>FUTURE BRIGHT (WECA business)</p> <p>Sue Dobson, Project Manager of Future Bright, WECA, (SD) presented a progress update on Future Bright, as previously requested by the Committee. She told members that work has progressed and the programme has now moved into full delivery stage.</p> <p>SD said Future Bright works with a specific target group of people of 19 years old or older in paid work and in receipt of eligible benefits. This is in line with the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) funding criteria. Generally individuals are supported for 3-6 months and all support is tailored to their individual needs.</p> <p>LR asked if there are any figures regarding how many people have benefited from the programme so far. SD told committee members that so far there have been approximately 200 people participating in the scheme.</p> <p>A next step will be developing case studies on participants and gathering quotes from them about what difference it has made to their life. The case studies will then be used to help promote Future Bright to potential participants.</p> <p>External evaluators have been appointed and a database has been set up to support the monitoring and evaluation process. The interim evaluation is due to take place in January 2019.</p> <p>TB asked if there had been any issues with Universal Credit, and the potential loss of housing benefit if participants' income increases as a result of working with Future Bright. SD confirmed that all involvement in the programme is voluntary and that Future Bright is currently excluded from working with people on Universal Credit, due to the funding criteria. She then explained that participants in the Future Bright programme are at potential risk of reduced benefits if their income</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>increases, even if they are not in receipt of Universal Credit. However there is an expectation that, over time, benefit income of participants will reduce. And in fact that is one of the drivers behind DWP funding the programme. Future Bright acts as a stepping stone towards the long-term goal of financial independence. It aims to increase the income participants receive through employment, while reducing the income provided via benefits. Therefore any short-term short-fall in income should be outweighed by their long-term employment opportunities.</p> <p>GG asked for quarterly reports for WECA to go to Scrutiny and Overview Committee, from August 2018 onwards.</p> <p>He then asked whether local colleges have been involved. SD informed him that they were kept informed by the Western Training Providers Network.</p> <p>GG went on to ask whether the Future Bright programme can be worked up with constituent authorities to work with care leavers. SD said she would feed that back.</p> <p>Cllr Brian Allinson (BA) raised the issue of a typo in the way a telephone contact number for Bristol was written that might cause confusion. It was agreed to correct this.</p> <p>The Chair asked whether any further groups have been identified that Future Bright is not currently involved with.</p> <p>SD said they are keen to expand the programme. For example, people on a low income and in work and are in receipt of other benefits. This will be explored if it looks likely that the programme won't hit its targets. She agreed with the suggestion from members that a recommendation supporting this could be made to the Mayor by the Scrutiny and Overview Committee.</p> <p>SD was asked how individuals are being engaged. SD explained the team does not have the ability to target individuals directly as Future Bright doesn't have access to personal data (such as names and addresses). Concern was expressed about how effective the programme is going to be in identifying and directly targeting benefit recipients. SD said target groups are being recruited via a network of referral agencies and a marketing campaign.</p> <p>SD was asked what happens to participants if they cease to be in work. For example, if they are working a 'zero hours' contract. SD explained that participants need to be able to produce evidence of some income through employment over the previous 4-week period.</p> <p>The Chair asked for further clarification on the Individual Engagement Model and the role of the Career Progression Coaches. SD replied that there are 18 coaches, with the target of supporting 3,000 residents over two years. All participants first receive an assessment, before progressing to triage. All support is tailored to the needs of the individual. There are two levels of support available: light touch and full service. The full service typically lasts between 3-6 months.</p> <p>The Chair then asked if two case studies could be included in the next report, as well as an indication of what was going well and any areas where the programme was struggling. SD said this should be possible. There was then a general offer of support from members, who said they would be happy to engage more closely if helpful.</p> <p>Cllr Claire Hiscott (CH) said she would raise through Bristol's Assertive Contact and Engagement Service (ACE).</p> |
| 11 | <p>ANY OTHER ITEM THE CHAIR DECIDES IS URGENT</p> <p>The Committee asked for an update on progress with moving towards the use of ModernGov software to support the meetings. HE confirmed the software had been purchased with the aim of launching by September, following an initial staff training programme. HE will pick up any training needs of members of the Scrutiny Committee with their Council</p> |

Public Forum

Questions Received

| | |
|----------|--|
| 1 | Adam Reynolds, Cycle Bath Chair Congestion |
| 2 | Thomas Gravett MetroWest |

**West of England Combined Authority Overview & Scrutiny Committee
25th July 2018**

Response to questions from Adam Reynolds

Please note, that not all of the specific data requested is available, so we have attempted to respond using the most appropriate similar information, making clear the sources in our responses.

- 1) There has been analysis that congestion is costing Bristol businesses £43.7m annually (<https://www.bristolpost.co.uk/news/business/congestion-costing-bristol-businesses-437million-1318>) . How much is congestion costing Businesses in the West of England?**

The West of England Joint Transport Study states that the cost of congestion is forecast to rise to over £500 million per annum in 2026 and £800 million per annum in 2036 if there is no further investment in strategic transport improvements to improve travel conditions. This figure applies to the whole of the West of England and includes all journeys, not just business journeys.

- 2) Analysis has also been published showing that congestion costs commuters to Bristol over £800 per year and £1500 in Bath <https://www.bristolpost.co.uk/news/bristol-news/traffic-jams-bristol-cost-you-996>. How much does congestion cost a West of England commuter per year? What is the total?**

The above article relates specifically to the cost of petrol used whilst sitting in traffic jams, which is different to the cost of commuting. Please refer to Question 1.

- 3) What are the costs to the NHS in terms of Air Pollution and transport related obesity caused by this congestion to the West of England?**

National figures state that 40,000 deaths in the UK per year are caused by air pollution, costing £20bn (<https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/every-breath-we-take-lifelong-impact-air-pollution>), which averages a cost of £500,000 per death. In Bristol (rather than the West of England) it is estimated that 300 deaths per year are due to poor air quality (<https://www.bristol.gov.uk/documents/20182/32675/Health+Impacts+of+Air+Pollution+in+Bristol+February+2017/4df2fce5-e2fc-4c22-b5c7-5e7a5ae56701>), which at a cost of £500,000 per death equates to £15m for Bristol.

In the UK, the direct financial cost of physical activity to the NHS was estimated to be greater than £900m in 2009/10 and contributes to almost one in ten premature deaths and one in six deaths from any cause.

<https://www.bhf.org.uk/informationsupport/publications/statistics/physical-activity-statistics-2015>. We do not have any comparable data for the West of England.

3a) How many yearly deaths are attributed to Air Pollution? How many to transport related obesity?

See answers above to question 3.

4) Given the British Medical Journal's analysis that cycling, and, to a lesser extent, walking had a direct impact on health and wellbeing <https://www.bmj.com/content/357/bmj.j1456>, will WECA now recognise cycling as THE key strategic form of transport and commit to delivering a comprehensive regional cycling network suitable for age 12+?

WECA, working with Bath & North-East Somerset, Bristol City, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire Councils, is currently producing a new Joint Local Transport Plan (JLTP). The JLTP takes a balanced, multi modal connectivity based approach to transport recognising that each mode has a role to play. Cycling and walking are key to local and neighbourhood connectivity with cycling also having a role to play for beyond just local journeys and this will be fully recognised in the JLTP.

5) Will WECA commit the majority of the £80M of Transforming Cities Fund money to delivery of a comprehensive age 12+ cycle network connecting communities to schools and places of employment?

A programme of schemes for Transforming Cities funding is currently being worked on.

6) How many car commuters live within a 20 minute walk of work (2km)? How many live within a 20 minute cycle of work (5km)? How many live within a 20 minute eBike ride of work (9km)?

2011 Census data (DC7701EW1a - Method of travel to work (2001 specification, 2011 data) by distance travelled to work) shows that of 531,925 people travelling to work in the region, 102,125 travel less than 2km, 114,150 travel 2 to 5km, and 92,746 travel 5 to 10km.

Of the 102,125 travelling less than 2km, 38,245 (37%) drive a car or van and 4,383 (4%) are a passenger in a car or van

Of the 114,150 travelling between 2 and 5km, 65,262 (57%) drive a car or van and 7,460 (7%) are a passenger in a car or van

Of the 92,746 travelling between 5 and 10km, 66,170 (71%) drive a car or van and 5286 (6%) are a passenger in a car or van

7) Given that the Joint Local Transport Plan is still being drafted, is WECA aware that other metro mayors are going ahead with building cycling and walking networks with their JLTP in a similar state? Using Transport for London's Strategic Cycling Analysis process we could begin delivery of a congestion busting network this year. <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/strategic-cycling-analysis.pdf>

See the answer to question 5.

**West of England Combined Authority Overview & Scrutiny Committee
25th July 2018**

Response to Thomas Gravett

What will WECA do to assist with finding the funding for the Portishead railway?

The West of England Combined Authority has through the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Local Growth Fund funded the majority of the £10m development costs for MetroWest Phase 1 (includes Portishead) and £44.5m towards delivery. An additional £6m from the West of England Investment Fund was approved by the West of England Combined Authority Committee in December 2017 to present a compelling case for Large Majors funding by the Department for Transport but subject to a successful Large Majors bid.

The West of England Combined Authority will continue to work with North Somerset Council on securing full funding for MetroWest Phase 1.

Will WECA communicate with Chris Grayling and others to remind them of the importance of the Portishead railway project and to request funding from central government?

The West of England Combined Authority is in constant communication with the Department for Transport on the MetroWest programme and wider aspirations for suburban rail in Bristol.

What will WECA do to ensure that funding is found by September in time for the submission of a development consent order for the project?

The West of England Combined Authority and the Local Enterprise Partnership will continue its work with North Somerset Council on MetroWest Phase 1.

Public Forum

Statements Received

| | |
|----------|---|
| 1 | David Redgewell, Bus Users UK Transport |
| 2 | Christina Biggs, Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways Secretary Transport |

Statement from David Redgewell on behalf of Bus Users UK and South West Transport Network.

1. Cross Country Rail Franchise – Consultation

We wish to urge the Authority to make a full and detailed response to the current DfT consultation on the future of the Cross Country Rail Franchise. In particular we urge the response to clearly show the requirement for through services to continue linking northern cities and Scotland with the South West as per the current services and not allow services to be reduced or cut short. We also strongly support enhanced security on trains through measures such as CCTV. We must ensure that catering services on the long-distance trains are retained as they are very important to customers making those journeys. There also needs to be a priority given to all aspects of Disability Access both on trains and at the stations.

2. Support for Partnership Working in Transport.

We wish to see the Local Authorities taking advantage of Partnership working with First and other operators in enhancing and developing the public transport offer in Bristol City plus South Gloucestershire, BANES and North Somerset. The bus companies are willing to commit to investment in return for infrastructure commitments from the local authorities. I urge the local authorities to work together through WECA and linking in with North Somerset to take advantage of the offers to invest which will lead to a speedy delivery for the benefit of local residents. Bristol must work closely with WECA and the WECA Board to develop coordinated plans for fast delivery.

3. Rail Projects

We fully support the Metro West Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects and urge the Authorities to progress these schemes. These schemes need to be developed and fully integrate with the bus network to provide seamless integrated public transport. We note that for Phase 2 of Metro West there is no support in the rail industry for trains to turnback short at Bathampton or Yate and we wish to see trains serving the full journeys to Gloucester/ Cheltenham and Westbury.

4. Bristol Congestion Task Group

We welcome the work undertaken especially on bus priority and bus infrastructure and the potential Quick Wins on the A38 corridor. The Group worked on getting progress on Temple Meads station works which are now receiving funding. We believe that through Partnership working with First Bus division, First Rail division and Network Rail we are getting funding released and are making real progress.

5. Wessex Bus

Following the demise of Wessex Bus – Part of Rotala, we wish to see urgent action from WECA as the responsible transport authority, to work with the relevant local authorities to ensure that services continue for the travelling public. We understand that several services and the staff have been transferred to Stagecoach and First, however we are concerned that Service 12 in Bath and Service 10 in Bristol have not been mentioned and it is vital that this service is covered with continued public subsidy as it provides crucial links for the public within the Region. We also want to see the Service 12 in Bath covered and want to ensure that the areas covered by the current service 51 still have a bus service.

With regard to Service 10 Mike Garland will be attending the meeting to make the point of how important this service is to local residents.

We want to ensure that the authorities make integrated ticketing a priority too as different companies may be picking up the services and their replacements.

Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways (FOSBR)



Statement to WECA Scrutiny Weds 25 July, WECA Committee and WoE Joint Committee Friday 27 July 2018, on FOSBR Rail Plan 2018 proposals for the Joint Local Transport Plan consultation draft

1. MetroWest Phase 1 - FOSBR suggests that N Somerset Council considers seeking third party private and corporate investment for the £48 million shortfall for the Portishead Line, and urges that the MetroWest Phase 1A signalling works at Avonmouth and some turnback strategy for Bath (such as turning back at Chippenham or Westbury) be completed soon so as to expedite the delivery of the long-awaited half-hour service from Avonmouth to Bath, hourly to Severn Beach.

2. Severn Beach Line – FOSBR has been engaging with GWR and Network Rail on the continuing delays and cancellations on the Severn Beach Line, and urges that WECA contribute financially to provide sustainable solutions – such as extra rolling stock, 40-minute buses between Avonmouth and Severn Beach, and that WECA engages with Network Rail on the outstanding issues with the BASRE resignalling, namely the 10 mph limit still in force at Temple Meads, and the long waiting times for Severn Beach Line trains at Narroways Junction due to the Automatic Route Setting software.

3. Infrastructure – FOSBR welcomes the WECA funding of £2m for the Temple Meads Masterplan and urges that Station Street and a bus exchange on the Friary should be delivered soon as a first stage. FOSBR welcomes the ongoing Filton Bank works and urges that WECA continue to lobby government to fund Bristol East Junction. We would also ask WECA to consider working up proposals for selective double-tracking of the Severn Beach Line as the single-track sections are highly sensitive to any delays. We also note Parish Council support for a station at Coalpit Heath.

4. Henbury Loop – In the light of the recent announcement of the proposed Brabazon Hanger location for the Arena, we urge that WECA reconsider the proposals for the Henbury Loop, especially those not in the original 2015 plans, such as running from North Filton through the Filton Rail Diamond to Bristol Parkway (as the nearest station on the electrified Paddington line), decoupling the St Andrew's Gate, West Town Rd and Avonmouth Station level crossings to reduce barrier down time, and improving the road access to Holesmouth Bridge. Please also consider Chittening Station.

5. Bristol Airport – FOSBR notes the Airport's wish to expand, and would ask for comprehensive public transport provision, including restoring a rail-bus link to Nailsea and Backwell station, perhaps with an electric minibus that could run through residential streets in Backwell to bypass the crossroads. This station already has a half-hour train service and regional GWR connectivity to Cardiff, Gloucester and Taunton as well as a mere 11-minute road transit time to Bristol Airport. We urge that WECA work with GWR to complete the ramp access to Nailsea and Backwell and consider creating space for a minibus stop in the car park. This would obviously be a supplement to the existing Bristol and Weston Flyers but would suit executive short-stay business travellers due to the much reduced journey time to the airport. An exploratory postcode study should be initiated soon.

6. Pilning - FOSBR would wish to point out that if a temporary Pilning footbridge is delivered (for £2 million) in 2018, a commuter service could be delivered in the May 2019 timetable as one of WECA's contributions to the current Clean Air proposals and illustrative of the potential for rail as the only long-term solution to both the regional congestion and regional air quality concerns. We have already attended a DfT CrossCountry Franchise consultation event and urge WECA to join us in requesting a trial daily commuter stop at 07:30 at Pilning on the 07:00 Cardiff to Manchester stopping service as this is the optimum time of day for commuters both to and from Pilning, Severnside and Thornbury.

7. Thornbury – FOSBR urges that WECA investigates imaginative uses of the existing Tytherington Line, such as a bolt-on powered carriage for a MetroWest Phase 2 Gloucester train, and using the Westerleigh Freight Line to provide better cross-over connectivity at Westerleigh Junction.

Christina Biggs (FOSBR Secretary)

FOSBR Rail Plan 2018 – car-free travel from your door



A reliable half-hour train service:

- WECA to have rail powers and operational oversight;
- **Longer** trains with more seats and **room for cycles**;
- Rail-bus interchanges at Filton Abbey Wood for Southmead Hospital and Nailsea & Backwell for Bristol Airport, accurate real-time bus information at stations;
- Multi-modal **smart ticketing**, with guards on all trains;
- Delivery of MetroWest Phase 1A **half-hour train service between Avonmouth and Bath**, hourly to Severn Beach;
- 30 min service for Patchway, Parson St and Bedminster;
- Future 15 or 20 minute frequency.

Robust infrastructure to unlock capacity:

- Completion of Filton Bank four-tracking;
- Bristol East and Westerleigh Junction remodelling;
- Replace footbridge at Piling for Severnside commuters;
- Emission-free trains: electrification to Bristol Temple Meads and battery or hydrogen-fuelled local trains;
- Extra platforms and bus hub at Temple Meads;
- Selective double-tracking of Severn Beach Line.

Reopening stations across the network:

- Deliver Portishead line with an initial hourly service with planning for half-hour service;
- Henbury Spur extension to Henbury Loop;
- Welcoming WECA's proposals for Horfield (at Constable Rd), St Anne's, Salford, Ashton Gate & Charfield;
- Consideration of further stations at Coalpit Heath, Chittening, Uphill/Locking, Corsham & Long Ashton;
- Exploring an extension of Tytherington line to Thornbury.