



**Growth and Regeneration Scrutiny Commission Action Tracker 2018/2019**

Agenda Item	Title of Report/ Description	Action and Deadline	Responsible Officer / Member	Action taken and date completed
<b>Action Sheet - 26<sup>th</sup> July 2018</b>				
6	<b>Public Forum Statement</b>	<b>ACTION:</b> Cllr Threlfall to raise concerns at the 27 July 2018 / West of England Joint Committee on behalf of the Scrutiny Commission over the issue of bus services halting and the effects of this on some communities.	Cabinet Member and Scrutiny Advisor	The Chair of the Scrutiny Commission has requested an all member briefing to help clarify for Members where responsibilities for transport including bus services now lie between WECA and BCC.
<b>Action Sheet – 29th November 2018</b>				
9	<b>Local Highways Delivery Scheme</b>	Members asked if it was possible to look into whether Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money could be used to pay for the drawing up of schemes in future Action: Officers to look in to this and report back.	Ed Plowden, Jim Cliffe Jo Holmes	Officers have confirmed that the current situation is as follows. However, please note we are trying to ascertain whether there is any possibility of the situation changing in future:  <u>We cannot spend CIL on upfront feasibility studies</u> , as the point of CIL is to provide infrastructure.  If the result of a feasibility study is that an infrastructure scheme <u>is delivered</u> – then <u>the feasibility study could be retrospectively funded from CIL along with the infrastructure scheme.</u>  However if the feasibility study results in <u>nothing</u>

Agenda Item	Title of Report/ Description	Action and Deadline	Responsible Officer / Member	Action taken and date completed
		<p>Officers to provide an up-date in January 2019 on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the recruitment was progressing</li> <li>• How web design process was progressing</li> <li>• How the processes for Area Committees are progressing and whether they are on schedule</li> </ul>		<p><u>being done because it is not feasible to do so – the CIL cannot be applied to it – because no infrastructure is provided.</u></p> <p>Officers have reported: “the 2019 Area Committee process has been defined and agreed and the adapted timeline is now published. Councillors and communities have a time table and we will deliver to that published timetable”.</p> <p>Further to this, Members were sent a comprehensive email up-date on 08/02/19.</p>
10	<b>Bristol Harbour Review</b>	<p>Officers to provide Members with further information about how and what costs savings could be achieved via increased licence fees.</p> <p>Forthcoming Harbour Consultation: It was agreed that Members would be kept informed with the consultation process and said they would send the draft consultation to them when it was ready.</p> <p>It was agreed that this item would come back to the Commission again before it went to Cabinet in May or June 2019. An agreement to be made when in 2019 is</p>	Gemma Dando / Penny Fell	<p>Work is in hand to interrogate this both as part of the overall planned Harbour Review and a full review of the relevant budget heads to achieve a sharpened commercial focus.</p> <p>The Director: Commercialisation and Citizens is undertaking a programme of meetings with key Harbour stakeholders and to that end is attending the Harbour Forum on 13 February 2019 – a phased consultation with all relevant parties will be undertaken thereafter and members will be kept informed of meeting and event dates and attendees accordingly.</p> <p>Members and officers to discuss and agree when the Harbour Review will be re-scheduled to return to a scrutiny commission meeting.</p>

Agenda Item	Title of Report/ Description	Action and Deadline	Responsible Officer / Member	Action taken and date completed
		most appropriate.		
11	<b>Quarterly Performance Progress Report (Quarter 2)</b>	<p>Increasing the number of affordable homes delivered in Bristol: A Member asked if the figure for this year was likely to be lower than last year instead of more. Officers said that BCC are still projecting to exceed the Affordable Housing target of 240 units. The Chair asked that Members were provided with further information on this.</p> <p>Members were pleased to see that figures show an increase in the number of passenger journeys on buses. However, one Member said it would be useful to compare bus usage figures with the available 'capacity' figures and asked if the data was available on this? <b>ACTION:</b> Officers to look into this and see if the data is available and report back.</p>	<p>Kate Cole / Mark Wakefield (to forward on where necessary)</p> <p>Transport Officers</p>	<p>To give Members confidence that the overall AH target will be met this year please note the following schemes will deliver in Q3 and Q4:</p> <p>Schemes in Q3 Bowmead Extra Care Housing (ECH) 60 Affordable Rent (AR), Cold Harbour ECH 40 AR, Guildford Road 5 Social Rent (SR), Monsdale Rd 14 AH, White Hart public house 14 AR, Marksbury Rd 3 SR, Malago Rd 6 SR, St Matthias Campus 11 SR.</p> <p>Then followed by these schemes in Q4: Filwood Park 26 Shared Ownership, Marksbury Rd 17 SR, Malago Rise 4 SR, St Matthias 4 SR.</p> <p>Affordable rent is where rent is below the Local Housing Allowance (LHA) inclusive of service charge.”</p> <p>This information was emailed to Members on 20/11/2018</p> <p>Officer response: It is possible to provide this information however it would take a lot of work and officer time as officers would need to work out how many journeys there are on each service each day, how many seats there are on the bus (we have a number of different vehicle sizes) and then try and calculate this figure. If there is a specific question the councillor would like answer to we can try and provide some information on this.</p>

Agenda Item	Title of Report/ Description	Action and Deadline	Responsible Officer / Member	Action taken and date completed
	<b>Quarterly Performance Progress Report (Quarter 2)</b>	(DGR120) Members queried why the number of people 'seriously injured' and the number of people 'killed' were both grouped under the same indicator. They asked if it was possible to look at this particular data set going back about 10 years or so, so that comparisons could be made. Officers to look into separating the two indicators and also to see if comparable data is available.	Kate Cole / Mark Wakefield (to forward on where necessary)	Please see the information appended to the end of this Action Sheet which contains a reply and up-date from officers.
13	<b>City Leap Project</b>	<p>The Chair asked if it was possible for Members to have the slides they were being shown. Officers to double check with Legal about sending the slides to Members.</p> <p>Officers agreed to bring this item back to scrutiny before it goes to Cabinet in March 2019. To be confirmed when this will come back to scrutiny (Feb 2019 TBC).</p>	Gemma Dando / David White	<p>The presentation slides were sent to Commission Members on the 20<sup>th</sup> December 2018.</p> <p>This item is returning to the 21<sup>st</sup> February 2019 Scrutiny Commission meeting</p>

**Growth and Regeneration Scrutiny 29<sup>th</sup> November - follow-up to members' queries on the Quarter 2 Performance Report**

(DGR120) A Member asked why the number of people 'seriously injured' and the number of people 'killed' were both grouped under the same indicator when they were very different outcomes. He said the figures were a 'good news story' (as less people had actually been killed) but doesn't really appear so

when just looking at the figures as they are and asked if it was possible to separate the data so it very clear. Officers said the data was provided by the police but they would look into separating the data. Another Member asked if it was possible to look at this data going back about 10 years or so, so that comparisons could be made. **ACTION: Officers to look into separating the two indicators and also to see if comparable data is available.**

**Feedback from officers.**

The reporting of Killed and Seriously Injured road casualties is a long-standing national metric. The data is provided to us by Avon and Somerset police and is reported quarterly, but in arrears i.e. at BCC Q1 reporting period (April to June) the calendar months January to March are reported. Data is also subject to an annual review to give validation to any amendments made during the year.

The table below shows the last 10 calendar-years annual total which has now been separated out by the two elements of the measure, “killed” and “seriously injured”. In addition, the percentage change year on year has been shown, so the overall reduction of -11.1% between 2008 and 2009 is a positive one so shown in **green**, whereas the number of fatalities between the same two years increased by 55.6% so is noted in **red** as it is negative.

With relatively small numbers it can therefore be seen that minor changes (both positive and negative) can produce some dramatic % changes when comparisons are made. There is not always any strong evidence as to why numbers change so substantially between some years.

Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) data - 10 year trend						
Year	Total KSI	% change year on year	Killed	% change year on year	Seriously injured	% change year on year
2008-2009	126		9		117	
2009-2010	112	-11.1%	14	55.6%	98	-16.2%
2010-2011	132	17.9%	4	-71.4%	128	30.6%
2011-2012	158	19.7%	11	175.0%	147	14.8%
2012-2013	147	-7.0%	7	-36.4%	140	-4.8%
2013-2014	107	-27.2%	12	71.4%	95	-32.1%
2014-2015	122	14.0%	8	-33.3%	114	20.0%
2015-2016	130	6.6%	8	0.0%	122	7.0%
2016-2017	107	-17.7%	5	-37.5%	102	-16.4%
2017-2018	79	-26.2%	12	140.0%	67	-34.3%

In terms on ongoing reporting it is recommended that the measure remains as it has been reported so far (i.e. killed and seriously injured as one number), but the managers commentary is makes clearer separation between the two categories. Other narrative can also be included e.g. particular road safety campaigns.

The Joint Local Transport Plan for 2010 -2026 (JLTP3) has a midway target of 30% reduction in killed and seriously injured (KSI) casualties based on the 2005-09 average (156) by 2020. However, as a result of a number of interventions such as new infrastructure and reduced speed limits there has been better than forecast progress since this was set, so a revised stretch target was agreed in Bristol's ten year road safety plan "Safe Systems Approach to Road Safety (2015 to 2024)". This is now **50%** reduction in KSI casualties by 2020, when compared with the average for 2005-09. The 2010-14 average was 133 KSI which has already delivered a 15% reduction over the 2005-09 average. The ultimate long term target, of course, is to eliminate fatal and life changing injuries altogether.

The long-term trend for Bristol is a good news story as there has been an overall reduction in KSI over the last ten years. However this still remains an area of concern which is still being given attention as can be seen in the new draft Joint Local Transport Plan 4 (2019-2036) published last month.

<https://westofengland-ca.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s702/13b%20-%20Draft%20West%20of%20England%20Joint%20Local%20Transport%20Plan%20Nov%202018.pdf>

For wider context, the most recent annual report (2017) on road casualties from the Department for Transport can be found at this link.

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/744077/reported-road-casualties-annual-report-2017.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/744077/reported-road-casualties-annual-report-2017.pdf)

Kate Cole  
Strategic Performance & Intelligence Advisor (Growth and Regeneration)  
12.2.19