

BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL

**PUBLIC SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF
THE RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMISSION HELD ON FRIDAY 21ST JUNE
2013 AT 9.00 A.M.**

- P Councillor Mark Brain
- P Councillor Sean Emmett
- P Councillor Gary Hopkins (in the Chair)
- A Councillor Mahmudur Khan
- P Councillor Dr Doug Naysmith
- P Councillor Alastair Watson
- A Councillor Mark Weston
- P Councillor Dr Mark Wright

RSC

1.6/13

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

RESOLVED - that it be noted that Councillor Hopkins was appointed Chair of the Resources Scrutiny Commission for the 2013/14 Municipal Year by Overview and Scrutiny Management Board at its Meeting on 6th June 2013.

RSC

2.6/13

ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR

RESOLVED - that Councillor Brain be elected Vice-Chair of the Resources Scrutiny Commission for the 2013/14 Municipal Year.

RSC

3.6/13

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

RESOLVED - that membership of the Resources Scrutiny Commission for the 2013/14 municipal year be as follows:-

**Councillor Brain
Councillor Emmett
Councillor Hopkins
Councillor Khan
Councillor Dr Naysmith
Councillor Watson
Councillor Weston
Councillor Dr Wright**

**RSC
4.6/13**

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCES, SUBSTITUTIONS AND INTRODUCTIONS

Apologies were received from Councillors Khan and Weston.

**RSC
5.6/13**

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

**RSC
6.6/13**

WHIPPING

None was declared.

**RSC
7.6/13**

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED - that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business (ie Bristol Workplace Programme) on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

**RSC
8.6/13**

BRISTOL WORKPLACE PROGRAMME
(Exempt under paragraph 3)

The Head of the Executive Office introduced the report and

summarised its content.

Members asked various questions in relation to the report and after discussion it was:

RESOLVED - (1) that the report be noted; and
(2) that the Commission receive an update on the Programme at its next meeting.

The press and public were re-admitted to the meeting at this point.

RSC
9.6/13

BRISTOL REGION CITY DEAL

The Commission considered a report of the Service Director, Finance (Agenda Item No. 9) setting out details of the Bristol Region City Deal

The Head of the Executive Office summarised the background to the Deal.

The Service Director, Finance summarised the report and confirmed that a report would be presented to Council. He also gave a presentation.

During discussion of the report the following points were highlighted:

- The Council would be allowed to keep to all of the growth in business rates in the 6 Enterprise Zone/Areas identified over a 25 year period;
- The current local government finance system nationally was based upon a re-localisation of 50% of business rate, however any additional benefit from this was largely subsumed by cuts in grant funding elsewhere in the system. Therefore, the City Deal created a powerful incentive mechanism, outside the current local government funding system, to deliver growth;
- The national local government finance system also had periodic 'resets' built into it, in 2020, 2030 and 2040, allowing for income growth to be reallocated across the country. This Growth

Incentive Deal did not have these reset points for the next 25 years, which gave officers an enhanced level of confidence about the business rate income from the Enterprise Zone/Areas against a long term strategy for investment could be planned;

- Long term projections suggested significant additional income would be generated over the 25 years. There was a shorter term risk that business rate income levels could go down. The economy was not yet in full recovery however there were very high levels of certainty that over the full 25 year lifespan of the Deal, significant economic growth would mitigate the risk;
- The Deal allowed for investment in a range of areas, depending on what was needed to make the Enterprise Zone/Areas thrive and grow. Some investment would go towards infrastructure development; other investment may be needed in skills or business support. The underlying purpose of the Deal was to provide a flexible resource for investing in economic growth. Complementary to this was the transport element of the City Deal, which provided a 10 year allocation of funding to deliver the Greater Bristol Metro, a major piece of infrastructure that would help link the Zone/Areas and support their economic development;
- Details of indicative plans for spending would be provided to members of the Commission.

RESOLVED - that the report be noted.

RSC

10.6/13

UPDATE ON 2014/15 BUDGET SCRUTINY PROCESS

The Commission received a presentation by the Service Director, Finance (Agenda Item No. 10) giving an update on the 2014/15 budget scrutiny process.

The Service Director, Finance explained the process that was being undertaken - savings of £90m had made in recent years; all services were being looked at; there were fixed costs that had to be met; the statutory minimum standards for each service were being considered; and the remaining budgets were being ranked against the Corporate Policies.

During discussion of the report the following points were

highlighted:

- There was a need to look at the process stage by stage with early information provided for members;
- There was concern about providing services against a reducing budget; statutory services were being looked at for efficiencies;
- A progress report would be provided at each meeting of the Resources Commission , and
- Work was being done on a revised Corporate Strategy and Priorities

RESOLVED - (i) that the report be noted; and

(ii) that a progress report be provided at each meeting of the Resources Commission.

RSC

11.6/13

ANNUAL BUSINESS 2013/14

The Commission considered a report of the Service Director, Legal Services (Agenda Item No. 11) setting out the Annual Business Report.

- RESOLVED -**
- (1) that the commission's terms of reference, as set out in paragraph 1 of the report be noted;**
 - (2) that the meeting dates and times for the commission in 2013/14, as set out in paragraph 2 of the report, be agreed;**
 - (3) that the arrangements for the establishment of select committees, working groups and inquiry days be noted;**
 - (4) that the arrangements for co-options to the commission for the 2013/14 municipal year (on the understanding that individuals may only legally assume co-opted status once they have**

completed an entry in the members' interests register and signed up to the Members' Code of Conduct) be noted; and

(5) that the Call In process be noted.

RSC

12.6/13

WORK PROGRAMME SETTING FOR 2013/14

The Commission considered a report of the Service Manager, Democratic Services (Agenda Item No. 12) setting out the Work Programme for 2013/14.

RESOLVED - that the Work Programme for 2013/14 be agreed including items for in-depth scrutiny and the vehicle for undertaking those reviews (e.g. Working Group, Inquiry Day).

RSC

13.6/13

PUBLIC FORUM

Nothing was received.

RSC

14.6/13

RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME – FINANCIAL MODEL

The Commission considered a report of the Service Director, Transport (Agenda Item No. 14) setting out the residents' parking scheme financial model.

The representative of the Service Director, Transport introduced the report and summarised its content.

During discussion of the report the following points were highlighted:

- Engagement has not been started in outer areas;
- The changes made by the Mayor were welcomed;
- It was noted that there was an emerging black market for resident visitor parking permits;

- The review of scheme would cost £50,000;
- Car ownership was higher in some areas than in others and the take up of permits would therefore vary from area to area;
- Enforcement would be concentrated in problem areas and more enforcement staff may be employed;
- There may be higher charges for permits in more affluent areas; it was recognised that the costs of permits added to the costs of running a car and members expressed concerns about the implications of this for lower income households;
- Each scheme would cost £450,000 (including TRO's) to implement;
- Members questioned whether or not the vote at Council on 18th June 2013 would result in changes to the scheme;
- Members expressed concerns about the lack of detailed financial information and evidence supporting the introduction of the scheme in many areas of the city;
- Members considered that the risk assessment was biased and that it should be the subject of an independent review;
- Members agreed the Commission should receive update reports at its next and subsequent meetings, and
- Members agreed that they would put forward a statement to Cabinet at its Meeting on 27th June 2013. This would be based on the views of the members of the Commission as expressed at the meeting. The Chair would agree the statement on behalf of the Commission.

RESOLVED - (1) that the report be noted;

(2) that the Commission should receive update reports at its next and subsequent meetings; and

(3) that the Commission submit a statement to Cabinet at its meeting on 27th June 2013 based on the views of the members of the

Commission expressed during the meeting.

(The wording of the subsequently agreed statement is attached to these minutes at Appendix 1.)

**RSC
15.6/13**

BUS RAPID TRANSIT- FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF CHANGES

The Commission considered a report of the Service Director, Major Projects (Agenda Item No. 15) setting out the options for changes to the Ashton Vale to Temple Meads (AVTM) MetroBus scheme previously approved by Cabinet on 21st July 2011.

The Service Director, Major Projects introduced the report and summarised it's content. He reported that the report had been considered by the Sustainable Development and Transport Scrutiny Commission the previous day and that the Commission had supported the Option 2 proposal.

During discussion of the report the following points were highlighted:

- A further update on the public inquiry was expected at the end of July although it was not clear if this would be a final report;
- there was a potential risk that should Option 2 be chosen, the public inquiry could be re-opened; Option 1 had a lower risk than Option 2 which involved changing the route. That scheme was high profile with a lot of public interest and a possibility of legal challenge;
- There may be a small delay in the Scheme if Option 2 was adopted as additional planning powers would be required; site work was due to start in early 2014;
- The adoption of Option 2 would result in fewer passengers being carried and fewer buses being required;
- £27m of funding still had to be identified and may be borrowed; this funding was not required until the end of 2016;
- The scheme had to be built within DfT Guidelines and attempts

would be made to ensure that the scheme could be extended at a future time;

- Any congestion charge scheme had not been taken into account when modelling this scheme and it could only be modelled on present conditions.

At this point the Chair proposed that the meeting move into exempt session in order that the Commission could discuss the information in the exempt appendices to the report. On being moved and seconded, it was;

RESOLVED - that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

The Commission then considered an exempt appendix to the report which detailed the legal implications relating to Options 1 and 2.

The Service Director, Legal and Democratic Services introduced and summarised the legal issues in relation to Option 1 and then Option 2 as set out in the report.

Members considered and discussed the legal advice which they had been given.

At the conclusion of the discussion, it was:

RESOLVED - (1) that the report be noted; and

(2) that the Commission submit a statement in response to the information contained in the exempt appendices, to the Cabinet at its meeting on 27th June 2013 based on the views of the members of the Commission expressed during the meeting.

The press and public were re-admitted to the meeting at this point.

RSC

16.6/13

**MINUTES – RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 12TH
APRIL 2013**

**RESOLVED - that the minutes of the meeting of the
Resources Scrutiny Commission held on 12th
April 2013 be confirmed as a correct record
and signed by the Chair.**

RSC

17.6/13

CHAIR'S BUSINESS

There was none.

RSC

18.6/13

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

**RESOLVED - that the next meeting of the Resources
Scrutiny Commission be held on 19th July
2013 at 9.30 a.m.**

(The meeting ended at 1.00 pm.)

CHAIR

RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME – FINANCIAL MODEL

Resources Commission's submission to Cabinet on 27th June 2013

The following is the wording of the Statement prepared by the Chair based on the views of the Members of the Commission expressed at the Meeting and subsequently agreed by the Members of the Commission prior to its submission to Cabinet.

“Firstly, can we say that it was most regrettable that the Mayor did not attend Friday’s meeting. Attendance had been confirmed and the Commission adjusted the agenda to fit with the Mayor’s availability. We, of course, were in a similar position to SD&T with regard to late publication of the report; but, if anything, matters were even more confused because there were different understandings of the latest policy adjustments, which might have been cleared up if the Mayor had been present.

We feel strongly that it is unsafe to proceed with the report as supplied but would wish to encourage completion of the inner-city schemes where there is a clear demand and need. We understand from officers that there has been work done and, if these complete, they will do so at the current charging rate with guarantees rather than the proposed higher charging rate.

Some of our concerns:

1. The risk register is clearly inadequate and needs to be independently assessed.
2. There has been no assessment of need and, indeed, in the outer zones the only evidence available shows a total lack of commuter parking.
3. There is no evidence supplied of new future problems in the outer zones and no analysis of likely effects or even of existing scheme effects.
4. Despite officers failing to answer some of the questions supplied weeks in advance, it is clear that the current scheme in Kingsdown is more than covering costs. We have little confidence

in the financial projections and will be screening these at our next meeting.

5. We note that the financial projections take into account the 'cost' of operating enforcement but not the revenue derived. This was over £48k in Kingsdown in one year.
6. We note that there is no examination of the effect of the possible cordon charging scheme and would suggest that this is a very relevant factor. Clarity is needed in this area.
7. The suggestion that schemes will be designed up to and including TRO, but may not be implemented is more than questionable. The cost would be many hundreds of thousands of pounds which cannot be wasted.
8. Officers have no idea how many businesses are in the area proposed, let alone how they may be affected.
9. Disabled parking is mentioned in passing but no reference to costs and officers were unable to answer what charges would be.
10. Concerns regarding costs have been dismissed as the permit represents a 1% - 2% of the average running costs of a car. Whilst this may be true for the many motorists who have modern cars that depreciate, it is certainly not true of some lower income households who keep their cars going on a hand-to-mouth, make -do-and-mend basis.
11. There was concern expressed about the capacity of the department to deliver and, in particular, that other planned and budgeted-for schemes may suffer in the attempt.

We intend to be examining the scheme again next month, with clear expectations that it will either have been radically amended by the Mayor or blocked by call-in prior to changes.

We sincerely hope that by then officers are in a better position to answer relevant questions and apply themselves to so doing."