



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

4.00PM, THURSDAY, 14 JUNE 2012

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM	Page
5. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	1 - 4
(a) Petitions: Combined e-petition and paper petition relating to the No.52 Bus Service to be presented by Councillor Mitchell on behalf of Mr. N. Redfern and Ms. G. Alexander.	
(b) Written Questions: To receive questions from: (i) Mr. Hinton (ii) Ms. Paynter (iii) Ms. Walker	
7. TARGETED BUDGET MANAGEMENT (TBM) PROVISIONAL OUT-TURN 2011/12	5 - 6
Amendment from the Labour & Co-operative Group (copy attached).	
13. SUPPORTED BUS SERVICE NETWORK	7 – 10
(i) Amendment from the Conservative Group (copy attached).	
(ii) Amendment from the Labour & Co-operative Group (copy attached).	

Subject: Public Involvement - Petitions
Date of Meeting: 14 June 2012
Report of: Strategic Director, Resources
Contact Officer: Name: Mark Wall Tel: 29-1006
E-mail: mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk
Key Decision: No
Wards Affected: Various

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 To receive any petitions presented at Council, any petitions submitted directly to Democratic Services or any e-Petition submitted via the council's website.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.2 That the Committee considers the petition(s) listed in paragraph 3 of the report and determines whether to:

- (i) note the petition;
- (ii) write to the petition organiser setting out the Council's views; or
- (iii) where it is considered more appropriate, call for an officer report on the matter which may give consideration to a range of options, including the following:
 - taking the action requested in the petition
 - considering the petition at a council meeting
 - holding an inquiry into the matter
 - undertaking research into the matter
 - holding a public meeting
 - holding a consultation
 - holding a meeting with petitioners
 - referring the petition for consideration by the council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee
 - calling a referendum

3. PETITIONS

3. (i) Save the 52 Bus Service

To receive the following e-Petition submitted by Mr Redfern and signed by x people, together with a paper petition to be submitted on the day of the meeting:

“We the undersigned petition the council to reconsider its proposals to cut the direct 52 bus service link to the city centre and the station. (This also applies to Woodingdean.) We further request the council to re-examine current passenger numbers on this route as, especially (but not exclusively) since the establishment of the Ovingdean Hall International College and Study Centre, whose students use the service extensively, the current subsidy level may no longer be appropriate.

The council proposes to cut back the very well-used 52 bus service which links Woodingdean and Ovingdean directly to the city centre and the train station.

Passengers would instead be forced to change buses, either at the A259 coast road or the Marina. This would severely disadvantage elderly, vulnerable and disabled residents of both areas, increasing social isolation. The service also provides a direct link for students attending Cardinal Newman Catholic College. And a large number of students at Ovingdean Hall College International School would also be hugely disadvantaged.

The number 52 service appears to have been singled out: such proposals would mean this would become the city's only outlying area without a direct link to the city centre. It would also mean a financial disadvantage for those without concessionary passes, as a single fare would no longer be applicable. Woodingdean residents, already subject to a frequency cutback of the number 22 service, also regularly use this service as for them, too, it provides a direct link to the city centre using an alternative route.

Those who do have alternative transport means will simply be forced to use their cars, bringing more congestion to the city at a time when the council has an aspiration to be the UK's "greenest".

We appreciate that this is a council-subsidised service (this needs to be reassessed), and are glad to hear the council is in urgent discussions with Brighton Buswatch (brightonbuswatch@gmail.com).

However, we request that the policy and resources committee on 14 June, which is due to discuss this issue, takes this petition and comments into consideration in its deliberations.”

Neil Redfern

Subject: Public Involvement – Written Questions
Date of Meeting: 14 June 2012
Report of: Strategic Director, Resources
Contact Officer: Name: Mark Wall Tel: 29-1006
E-mail: mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk
Key Decision: No
Wards Affected: Various

For General Release

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed for questions submitted by a member of the public who either lives or works in the area of the authority at each ordinary meeting of the Committee.

Every question shall be put and answered without discussion, but the person to whom a question has been put may decline to answer. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion.

The following three written questions have been received from members of the public.

(a) Mr Hinton

“The proposal to lend £14 million to the i360 company is based on two key figures, a forecast that 800,000 people will ride on the i360 each year (that’s over 2,000 a day on average) and a forecast that 440 new jobs will be created indirectly by the i360.

“Will the Council publish the evidence and reasoning on which these two forecasts are based so that when the final decision is made, councillors and their constituents will have a clearer idea of what level of risk the Council will be taking with public money?”

(b) Ms Paynter

“What is council policy towards use of the ground floor public seating area by the elderly and disabled who feel unable to manage access and use of the upper gallery within Hove Town Hall's Council Chamber?”

(c) Ms Walker

“Changes to school admissions in 2008 meant Withdean and Westdene children had to go to Hove Park or Blatchington Mill Schools. As it is too far to walk the council helped by subsidising a bus service. No.96 is a double-decker which is nearly full everyday and most children have bus passes costing £240 a year. If this service is cut we would have to get two buses via the centre of Brighton, adding 2 hours extra travel daily. There is no alternative service travelling east to west in the north of the city. How can the council justify this cut?”

LABOUR & CO-OPERATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

**TARGETED BUDGET MANAGEMENT (TBM)
PROVISIONAL OUT-TURN 2011/12**

In having regard to the use of unallocated reserves as detailed in the TBM report the following points should be considered and changes made to the recommendations:

- (i) Appendix 2, Unallocated reserves - to transfer the sum of £226,000 identified for One Planet Living new projects to instead support the council subsidised bus transport budget thus keeping those routes open that are currently threatened with closure or a reduced service for a further year to allow for a complete review of the patronage for the routes planned to be cut or reduced and allow for continuing negotiations with the bus companies with a view to their investing in the services.
- (ii) That the balance of the £250,000 could then be used to support the continued provision of a mobile library service.

To add an additional two recommendations 2.3 and 2.4 as shown in bold italics and re-number the remaining recommendations 2.5 to 2.9 as shown below:

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Committee note the provisional outturn position for the General Fund, which is an underspend of £4.370m. This includes £3.831m for the council controlled budgets (compared to £3.187m assumed at budget setting time) and £0.539m on the NHS managed S75 budgets.
- 2.2 That the Committee note the provisional outturn for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for 2011/12;
- 2.3 ***That the sum of £226,000 identified in Appendix 2, unallocated reserves for One Planet Living new projects be transferred to support the council subsidised bus transport budget;***
- 2.4 ***That the remaining £24k from the unallocated reserves identified for One Planet Living new projects be transferred to the Mobile Library to help achieve a sustainable solution for the service;***
- 2.5 That the Committee approve the carry forward requests totalling £5.602m as detailed in Appendix 2 ***(as amended by 2.3 and 2.4 above);***

- 2.6 That the Committee approve the changes to provisions and reserves set out under Corporate Budgets in Appendix 1;
- 2.7 That the Committee agree to fund initiatives totalling £0.662m from unallocated reserves in 2012/13 as detailed in Appendix 2 (**as amended by 2.3 and 2.4 above**);
- 2.8 That the Committee note the provisional outturn position on the capital programme;
- 2.9 That the Committee approve the following changes to the capital programme
- (i) The budget re-profiling as set out in Appendix 1;
 - (ii) The carry forward of slippage into the 2012/13 capital programme, to meet on-going commitments on these schemes as set out in Appendix 1.

Proposed by Cllr Gill Mitchell

Seconded by Cllr Les Hamilton

CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

SUPPORTED BUS SERVICE NETWORK

To amend recommendation 2.2 with the addition of the wording “with the exception of routes 27, 22, 52 and 81” and an additional two recommendations 2.3 and 2.4 as shown in bold italics:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Policy & Resources Committee award contracts for the supported bus routes as set out in Appendix 1 in Agenda Item 14 which is a Part Two Report.
- 2.2 That contracts for the additional services, shown in paragraph 3.14, are not awarded on the grounds of insufficient budget, ***with the exception of routes 27, 22, 52 and 81.***
- 2.3 ***That a report be brought back to the Policy & Resources Committee on 12th July identifying funding for the routes 27, 22, 52 and 81.***
- 2.4 ***That officers urgently re-examine the evidence given for terminating the 96 school bus route and that no changes are implemented until September 2013 at the earliest.***

Proposed by Cllr Geoffrey Theobald

Seconded by Cllr Garry Peltzer Dunn

Supported Bus Routes – Conservative Amendment

Comments of the Chief Finance Officer

The funding required to maintain the supported bus routes 22, 27, 52 and 81 is £127,000 per annum. The amendment sets out that the proposed source of funding would be brought back to this committee on 12th July. Over a four year contract period this would be a commitment of £508,000. This would then need to be referred for final decision to Full Council on 19th July. This is because, taking into account both the scale and length of the financial commitment and the explicit decision made by Budget Council on 23rd February 2012 in relation to the available budget for supported bus routes, this is outside the agreed budget framework and therefore is a matter for Council to determine, not Policy & Resources Committee.

The continuation for one year of the supported bus 96 of the Part 1 report would cost a minimum of £38,000. The procurement process undertaken to award this contract

was for a period of 4 years. A one year contract on this route would be a material departure from that advertised. Therefore a further EU compliant procurement process would be required which would take an estimated 3-4 months. A short term contract would therefore need to be let in the interim with the existing operator for this route because the current contract cannot be further extended. It is likely that the short term contract with the existing operator and the new contract for potentially 6-9 months (after taking into account the procurement timetable and any necessary notification period to the transport commissioner) would have higher costs than that quoted for a 4 year period.

LABOUR & CO-OPERATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

SUPPORTED BUS SERVICE NETWORK

To delete recommendation 2.2 and replace with a new 2.2 and to insert two additional recommendations 2.3 and 2.4 as shown in bold italics:

~~2.2 That contracts for the additional services, shown in paragraph 3.14, are not awarded on the grounds of insufficient budget.~~

RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1 That the Policy & Resources Committee award contracts for the supported bus routes as set out in Appendix 1 in agenda item 14 which is a Part Two Report;

2.2 ***That Policy & Resources Committee agrees, in principle, to the award of the contracts and continuation of the services listed in paragraph 3.14 of the report for one year.***

2.3 ***That the Strategic Director: Place (in consultation with the Leaders of the three political groups), be authorised to take all steps necessary to the continuation of the services and award of the contracts as detailed in paragraph 3.14 of the report for year, including compliance the necessary procurement and Transport Act processes,***

2.4 ***That P&R notes the financial implications as set out in the note from the Director of Finance.***

Proposed by Cllr Gill Mitchell

Seconded by Cllr Les Hamilton

Supported Bus Routes – Labour Amendment

Comments of the Chief Finance Officer

The continuation for one year of the supported bus routes identified in para 3.14 of the Part 1 report would cost a minimum of £229,000. The procurement process undertaken to award these contracts was for a period of 4 years. A one year contract on these routes would be a material departure from that advertised. Therefore a further EU compliant procurement process would be required which would take an estimated 3-4 months. A short term contract would therefore need to be let in the interim with the existing operator for these routes because the current contract cannot be further extended. It is likely that the short term contract with the existing operator and the new contract for potentially 6-9 months (after taking into account the procurement timetable and any necessary notification period to the transport commissioner) would have higher costs than those quoted for a 4 year period.

Note that if the Labour amendment in relation to item 7 is not carried, a further report would need to be brought to this committee to identify the funding source.

