This summary has been drawn together by the Sustainable Transport Sub-Group based on the responses of Local Transport Authorities and Local Enterprises to the recent DfT consultation.

The purpose of this summary is twofold:

i) To inform Portfolio-Holders about common points (and differences) made in the responses; and,

ii) To highlight consistent requests for further information or action by Government. These may also provide opportunities for Local Transport Authorities to come together to make their own proposals based on what would work best for them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Key points in responses</th>
<th>Issues for DfT action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Role, Membership and LEP involvement | • Working across functional LEP geographies means areas can align local majors transport funding with wider economic goals but some Councils favoured simpler devolution directly to Local Transport Authorities;  
• LEPs can play a key role in seeking views from businesses and partners about local transport and infrastructure issues.  
• Local democratic accountability is key; local Members should have the decision-making role.  
• As well as the crucial democratic legitimacy, Local Transport Authorities also have the experience, expertise and resources to undertake the role and serve as the formal accountable body.  
• Widespread view that precise membership should be left to each Local Transport Body. | • The very different nature of English places and their infrastructure / governance means it’s very likely that Local Transport Bodies will do different things, with different people.  
• Is DfT happy for Local Transport Authorities / Bodies to come forward with proposals for a tailored decentralisation model for each area? |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Strategic Investment Decisions | • LEPs and local authorities are well-placed to coordinate funding for infrastructure priorities – including with Growing Places Fund, Enterprise Zone receipts or other business rate and European funding.  
• Needs to be a way for larger schemes to be progressed across wider geographies. There is a strong track record of Local Transport Authorities coming together around shared issues (Felixstowe-Nuneaton rail link). | • How will DfT underpin the devolution of local majors funding with other funding streams so Local Transport Authorities can decide how best to strengthen their local infrastructure using a single, merged resource? |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Funding Formula              | • Funds should be allocated on a transport authority basis, which can be aggregated to LEP geographies where necessary.  
• Where local bodies decide to aggregate funds at LEP level, there will be a need to a means of dealing with areas in more than one LEP – this might be best left to local partners to address. | • The formula must be simple and fair. There is a bigger picture than just local majors funding, so these allocations must also reflect the HA investment programme, for example.  
• Payment needs to be made promptly in |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
A funding formula based purely on population is shown to neglect rural areas (lower density and not reflective of transport need) and areas earmarked for significant future growth.

The formula should also take account of economic contribution. Local economies across the East of England have traditionally been a net contributor to UK plc and offer the most promising prospects for growth.

DfT can also explain how Local Transport Bodies will fund their decision-making work; a small top-slice (such as with Growing Places Fund) may be most effective.

**Role of the Department and General Issues**

- Greater devolution would help Local Transport Bodies overcome local infrastructure constraints and support local growth.
- Some of the administrative savings made by the Department from the devolution need to be passed to local bodies so they are effective.
- Local Transport Authorities are ambitious in developing their infrastructure to support growth. Government needs to be quicker in devolving through, for example, extending ‘city deals’ to none-city areas.
- Whilst DfT may wish to take decisions over genuinely nationally-significant projects, it is important to retain some local input. Involving a very small number of Members (even if under strict confidential terms) would improve transparency and be appreciated locally.

**Assurance and Appraisal Systems**

- There is no need to impose central supervisory requirements on local majors funding if it were to be channelled through Local Transport Authorities.
- A robust business case is needed for all successful schemes – this may be based around established processes like WEBTAG, but may also include the strategic fit with local priorities – including economic, health or environmental impacts.
- Assurance processes (from DfT, other government departments and Europe) should be complimentary to minimise additional costs.
- Is DfT able to develop a proportionate assurance system, building on the best bits of WebTAG, which meets the requirements of other bodies (such as other Departments and European funds)?

**Timetable for Implementation**

- If Local Transport Bodies / Authorities are to be in a position to lead on local majors
- The timetable is very challenging – particularly if all parties wish to pursue tailored devolution for their area. We have deduced the timescales below:
  - Sept 2012 - Outline funding allocations
  - Dec 2012 – Publish proposals to test value
  - Apr 2013 - Agreed the programme for post-2015
- Will other work be scheduled to assist more holistic devolution over local infrastructure (i.e. local majors; HA investment; reform of bus subsidy and concessionary fares; influence over rail franchising).
- Does DfT recognise that by April 2013 it will only be possible for local areas to indicate general levels of funding that is expected to be leveraged?