



**Place Scrutiny Commission Action Sheet 2016/2017**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Title of Report/ Description</b>	<b>Action and Deadline</b>	<b>Responsible officer</b>	<b>Action taken and date completed</b>
<b>Action Sheet – 20<sup>th</sup> September 2016</b>				
7	Public Forum	Concern was raised about the siting of the bus stop for Megabus. Officers had been working to resolve the issue and discussions would continue. An update was required for the next meeting		<p>This information will be provided to Members as soon as it is available and will remain on the action sheet until this time.</p> <p>Officers are presently investigating maintaining the Megabus, Falcon and other scheduled coach services on Bond Street. However, this would require altering the existing Metrobus stop proposed at this location. This is still a work in progress – we would however welcome feedback from Scrutiny as to the suitability of this proposal.</p>
8.	Work Programme	Increased cost of Prince Street Bridge project to	Johanna Holmes	The BC&R scrutiny commission

		be considered by relevant Scrutiny Commission or Audit Committee. Policy Officer Scrutiny to confirm relevant path		discussed scrutiny of the Prince St Bridge repairs but were advised by the BC&R Strategic Director that the project and any scrutiny sit within 'Place'.  'Prince St Bridge' has been added to the Commissions January 17 meeting agenda. Complete
8.	Work Programme	Councillor Pearce to confirm the date the Arena would be discussed by the WOE Joint Scrutiny	Councillor Pearce	'Bristol Arena – Economic, Transport and Housing Implications for the WoE Joint Scrutiny' – item is scheduled on 6 <sup>th</sup> March 17 Committee Meeting. Complete
8.	Work Programme	Impact of possible Metro Mayor elections would be considered over work programme. DSO to confirm legal advice re pre-election period	Samantha Mahony	Officers to report back on this as soon as possible.
10.	Residents Parking Schemes Review	Comments to be formed into recommendations and discussed further by the party leads before submission to the consultation.	Johanna Holmes and Party Leads	Final comments are currently being agreed by Lead Members and will be sent on as agreed as soon as possible.  Comments were agreed and sent on to the Cabinet Member for Transport, relevant Officers and requested to be included as part of the consultation process.

				Complete
10	Residents Parking Schemes Review	To be added to the agenda for the next meeting including invitation to the Cabinet Member. To confirm to Councillors how they should lead the review, the next stage of consultation, and how communities who wished to have a RPS can request one	Johanna Holmes and Transport Officers	<p>The Cabinet Member for Transport is unable to attend the October Scrutiny Commission meeting due to a prior engagement.</p> <p>Officers are enquiring if the Cabinet Member can attend the November meeting instead.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Transport will attend the next meeting for a 30 minute Q&amp;A session with Members of the Commission.</p> <p>Complete</p>
11	Quarter 1 Place Directorate Performance Report	With reference to BCP092 [Increase the number of affordable homes delivered in Bristol] Officers were asked to confirm when the target for this measure was likely to be set.		<p>This information will be provided to Members as soon as is available.</p> <p>Action carried over.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Annual AH target for 2016/17 remains at 250 AH. After receipt of the Q2 returns we are back on trajectory and are above the Q2 cumulative target of 100 AH.</li> <li>- However the AH delivery targets for 2017/18,</li> </ul>

				2018/19 2019/20 and 2020/21 are currently being reviewed following the work of the Housing Delivery Hot House and will not be available until they have been reviewed with the Cabinet Member for Homes in late October/early November. Complete
11	Quarter 1 Place Directorate Performance Report	Members requested the financial figures for the revenue budget against each of the Place directorate areas, performance against revenue budget (year to date). The Commission requested that this information be presented as part of the next report.		This information will be included as part of the Q2 Performance Monitoring Report in December. Action to be carried over until then.
<b>Action Sheet – 17th October 2016</b>				
4	Minutes of the previous meeting and Action Sheet	it was confirmed that the Prince Street Bridge project management and cost was within the remit of Place Scrutiny Commission. The item would be added to the January work programme subject to officer availability.	Johanna Holmes	Item added to the scrutiny commissions January 2017 Meeting agenda
4	Minutes of the previous meeting and Action Sheet	Regarding concern raised about the siting of the bus stop for Megabus, officers continued to explore all of the options and had confirmed that Bond Street stop would continue to be utilised until Christmas at the least.		See above action from September Meeting.
6	Chair's Business	Report regarding the Long Ashton Park and Ride management to be provided when legally	Peter Mann	This has been added to the 'items to be scheduled' section

		appropriate.		of the scrutiny work programme. It will be added to a meeting agenda as soon as the legal process allows.
7	Public Forum	It was confirmed that Real Time Information had patchy mobile signal in Avonmouth as suggested. A further response would be sent to Councillor Alexander following the meeting.	Peter Mann	Provided via email to Councillor Don Alexander - Complete
9	Draft Corporate Strategy 2017-22, Business Plan 2017-18 and Medium Term Financial Plan 2017-18 - 2021-22	Various questions for response	Barra Mac Ruairi (for delegation)	Please see information below

#### **Our Transport Business Plan – Questions**

<b>Charge for advisory disabled bays and Keep Clear markings</b>	Q. Can they be means tested as this seems to be “one size fits all”?
A one-off charge would cover the necessary costs of design and contractor works. Where other local authorities charge there is no evidence of means testing, which would require access to information currently not available and an assessment process which would largely negate the budget saving.	
<b>Remove funding for local traffic schemes currently devolved to Neighbourhood Partnerships</b>	Q. How would NPs lobby for local traffic schemes?
The views of local communities are essential to identifying local highway issues and developing appropriate solutions. Under this proposal a new approach would need to be designed to enable local issues to be registered and taken into account as work programmes are developed. The intention would be to expand the well-regarded Traffic Choices website to provide the sort of information provided by Highways officers. The role of ward councillors as the conduit for local views will be even more important. Local priorities would need to be assessed objectively against the asset management plan and road casualty information.	
<b>Withdraw reimbursements to Community Transport operators for concessionary travel</b>	Q. Have any conversations been had with CT providers around the impact on their business?
Not as yet, but previous years have seen budget proposals that might have affected CT grant funding so the impact on each of the current providers is largely understood. Some providers would be able to absorb some of the loss and the opportunity might be considered to start charging fares for travelling in order to cover costs.	
<b>Reduction of subsidies for bus routes with low numbers of passengers</b>	Q. How will the level of reduction be chosen and what other options might there be? Would officers report back on the consultation before making any final decision?

Officers will report to the November Place Scrutiny meeting on the process to be followed, which entails inviting tenders for a wide range of service options to provide the best information to make decisions on which services to support financially from September 2017.

**Stop funding the Freight Consolidation Centre which is not profitable**

Q. How much effort has been put in to making the FCC commercial? (eg. vigorous marketing with businesses/relationship managers etc, use by BCC and BaNES?) Are we sure we are not overpaying on the contract and can this be renegotiated? Why can't FCC vehicles use bus lanes? – OLEV money should do this. What powers would the Metro Mayor have in relation to charging vehicles that aren't low emission?

- Numerous steps have been taken to promote take up of the FCC since 2011 in order to increase the prospects of it becoming commercial:
- DHL meet with city centre businesses in both Bristol and Bath on a regular basis to try to encourage them to join the freight consolidation operation.
  - The LSTF Roadshow visited all businesses in both Bristol and Bath city centres in 2013/14 to explain the benefits of freight consolidation.
  - The LSTF marketing team ran a campaign to promote freight consolidation in 2103/14, this included a leaflet drop to businesses and advertising on the consolidation vehicles.
  - Council officers and DHL have regularly promoted freight consolidation at Chamber of Commerce meetings in Bristol and Bath
  - Six months free membership has been offered to new businesses joining freight consolidation.

Transport officers in both Bristol and Bath have encouraged both Councils to use freight consolidation, but with little success to date.

A competitive tendering exercise was undertaken jointly with BaNES for a new contract to run for 3 years in 2014. Only one bid was submitted, by the existing operator DHL. The cost of the current contract is similar to the previous contract which commenced in 2011, three logistics organisations bid at this time. A new procurement exercise is unlikely to result in any significant cost savings.

The OLEV project includes a proposal to open the Portway bus lane, used by freight consolidation vehicles travelling between the consolidation centre in Avonmouth and Bristol and Bath to electric vehicles.

**Reorganise how school crossings are patrolled**

Q. Which schools would be affected? What alternative methods might there be (capital schemes/volunteering?). Have risk assessments been carried out? Is there a legal liability on the Council if a child is injured where a SCP is withdrawn?

There are 56 schools which currently have one or more SCPs. The sites can be found on the Council's Pinpoint software <http://maps.bristol.gov.uk/pinpoint/> - click Transport and Streets, tick School Crossing Patrol (map). Options to continue to provide SCPs are for schools to pay either directly or through sponsorship or fundraising. Volunteering is clearly a possibility but this would require training and supervision by BCC which could result in not delivering the full savings. Another option would be to develop and promote "walking buses" which would be a less onerous ask for volunteers but give parents the confidence that their children are safe. Reassessment of crossing sites against set criteria, which are risk based, may result in fewer SCPs required. Alternatively engineering solutions, such as zebra or signalled crossings, may lead to a reduced need but will require capital investment. There is no legal liability on the Council if a child is injured where a SCP is withdrawn.

<b>General considerations</b>	Q. It was highlighted that the savings listed did not necessarily add up to the totals outlined. Officers confirmed that there were other savings outside of those listed within the document such as the reconsideration and consolidation of lease arrangements. Councillors therefore requested clarification of what those figures were. )
Officers have reviewed all of the information including current Savings Tracker, the draft Corporate Strategy (under public consultation) and the Scrutiny Commission’s Savings Tracker under the heading “Increasing Business Efficiency”, and we can confirm that the items listed in the table below are “the other savings outside of those listed within the documents” under point 7. The majority of these savings initiatives will not result in recurrent revenue savings, as these are primarily one off Capital receipts or revenue.	

## Place - Miscellaneous

### Other Management Actions

Initiatives	Lead Officer	Savings Description	FTE Saving	Net saving 2016/17	Net saving 2017/18	Full year recurring	Additional notes
			£0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Holding Company Asset Transfer options</b>	Bill Edrich	Transfer of Council Assets to Holding Company			-17,000		CAUTION: Options to be explored as part of the Business Plan work. Cabinet decision required in early 2017.
<b>Lease Re-Gearing</b>	Robert Orrett	Capitalisation of re-gearred lease - one off Capital saving			-4,000		CAUTION: This has already been counted towards future years Capital Receipt target. This is a one off Capital saving.
<b>Temple Street, Parkview</b>	Robert Orrett	Rent income and cost avoidance - productive use of existing estate			-1,800		CAUTION: This is still under investigation and may not be a recurrent Revenue saving.

<b>Energy Capital Project Funding Revision</b>	Bill Edrich	Financial mechanisms - reviewing Capital Programme funding structure, redirect the use of Grant funding from Capital to Revenue (one off in 2016/17).						NB: This is being picked up as part of the Corporate Capital Programme Review.
<b>Holding Company Funding Options</b>	Bill Edrich	Various Financial mechanisms						Preference share Capital investment rather than using earmarked reserves. Already actioned in 2016/17. 17/18 Business case being explored
<b>Council Conferencing Company/Vehicle</b>	TBA	Rationalisation and commercialisation of BCC venues						CAUTION: Significant opportunity that needs to be explored. Currently on the SLT forward plan.

<b>Review Museum Opening Hours</b>	Q. Members requested further analysis of proposals for museums as closures or changes in opening hours needed to be considered alongside loss of revenue. (ACTION: Question for response)
<p>Bristol City Council provides approximately 40% of the funding for Museums – the remainder is raised through grant funding from Arts Council (25%) and Earned income (35%).</p> <p>From a review of our current retail, events and exhibition and café income a closure of Tuesday and Wednesday in term time and Monday to Wednesday in school holidays would result in a loss of £500,000 of earned income. It would also significantly reduce the numbers of school children who can visit our sites which would impact on our offer to schools and our income.</p> <p>This proposal in terms of closing the museums 3 days a week would also breach our current 2015-18 agreement with a strong possibility of losing our 2017-18 grant of approx. £1.5M from Arts Council. The recent change to close Bristol Museum &amp; Art Gallery on Monday's during term time was only agreed with Arts Council after careful negotiation and reassurance that this would have relatively minor impact upon service delivery. Arts Council have flagged us as a 'reputational' risk on their system for the duration of the restructure.</p> <p>In addition it would add significant risk of us being unsuccessful at the next round of major grants funding from Arts Council for 2018-22 worth approx. £1.5M</p>	



per annum as Arts Council have been clear they expect a continued level of investment from Bristol City Council. The loss of Arts Council funding from 2017-18 would result in the loss of at least 24 FTE across the service and a subsequent major reduction in delivery of public service impacting exhibitions, schools, earned income, care of a Council asset and could lead to our accreditation status being revoked which would prevent us from being able to apply for national grant aid and lottery funds.

All of the above will impact our public offer, which includes 1 Million in-person visits which will have major impact locally and nationally.

**The draft Capital Programme 2017-2022**

**T104 – Affordable Housing Enabling Budget (Get Bristol Building)**

Changes had been proposed for the capital programme and further information would be forthcoming.

*Response to follow - officers need further clarification*

**T121 – Planning and Sustainable Development**

With reference to Legible City Funding, officers were asked if there any plans to include parks within wayfinding.

I can confirm that we do have plans to provide parks way finding. We hope to map out the city’s green spaces and provide better wayfinding to the city’s green and blue assets. We have however not identified funding for installing BLC units in parks though. Legible City is also involved in a bid to ESRC about identifying and managing green and blue assets for public health and well-being where we bring the added value with mapping.