

Review Title: <b>Passenger Transport Review</b>
Overview & Scrutiny Panel: <b>Joint Panel (passenger transport)</b>
Panel Chairman: <b>Cllr. Andy Furse</b>
Overview & Scrutiny Project Manager: <b>David Langman</b>
Supporting Service Officer: <b>Fiona Venton Harvey, Corporate Performance Unit Manager</b>

### **Process for Tracking O&S Recommendations - Guidance note for Executive Members**

The enclosed table lists all the recommendations arising from the above Overview & Scrutiny Review. Individual recommendations are referred to the relevant named Executive Members (or whole Executive in the case of a whole Executive referral) as listed in the '**Exec Member**' column of the table. In order to provide the O&S Panel with an Executive response on each recommendation, the named Executive member (or whole Executive) is asked to complete the last 3 columns of the table as follows:

#### **Decision Response**

The Executive has the following options:

- **Accept** the Panel's recommendation
- **Reject** the Panel's recommendation
- **Defer** a decision on the recommendation because a response cannot be given at this time. This could be because the recommendation needs to be considered in light of a future Executive decision, imminent legislation, relevant strategy development or budget considerations, etc.

#### **Implementation Date**

- For 'Accept' decision responses, give the date that the recommendation will be implemented.
- For 'Defer' decision responses, give the date that the recommendation will be reconsidered.
- For 'Reject' decisions this is not applicable so write n/a

#### **Rationale**

Use this space to explain the rationale for your decision response and implementation date. For accepted recommendations, please give details of how they will be implemented.

## Passenger Transport Review: Recommendations

Recommendation	Exec Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
<b>4.1 Models of Service Planning and Delivery</b>				
<p><b>Recommendation 4.1.1</b> The Executive should develop and bring together a Vision and a Strategy for integrated passenger transport services in Bath &amp; North East Somerset, along the lines of the South Gloucestershire model, taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children and young people</li> <li>• Poverty &amp; Social Exclusion</li> <li>• A safe, clean, sustainable environment</li> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• The local economy</li> <li>• Accessibility</li> <li>• Integration</li> </ul> <p>In addition, planning of services should note the emphasis being placed by the Government via the preparation of the 2006 –2011 sub regional Transport LTP on four key criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access</li> <li>• Congestion</li> <li>• Highway Safety</li> <li>• Air Quality</li> </ul>	Full Executive	Accept	From June 2005	<p>Officers propose to set up an Integrated Passenger Transport (IPT) Board comprising relevant Members, Peter Rowntree (Director with responsibility for transport), and relevant Officers. This body would be responsible for identifying current spend and addressing the recommendations proposed in the O&amp;S report.</p> <p>Could be achieved Within Existing Resources (WER)</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 4.1.2</b> Economies of scale in delivery of passenger transport services may be possible through close working relationships with neighbouring local authorities. Opportunities should be investigated.</p>	Full Executive	Accept	From June 2005	<p>Some initiatives are already in place but we will investigate further through joint Local Transport Plan and other Cross Boundary working</p> <p>WER</p>

<b>4.2 Transport Route Planning</b>				
<b>Recommendation 4.2.1</b> A study should be undertaken to clearly identify core transport corridors, e.g. to and from the Royal United Hospital (RUH), universities, colleges, schools, social services centres, etc. In light of the results of the study, it may be possible to re-think the network of transport hubs, and hence transport services, across Bath & North East Somerset.	Sir Elgar Jenkins	Accept the need for a study to look at concept, priorities and feasibility	From 2005	In the short term, this could only be done for transport over which we have direct control – i.e. council provided transport, which accounts for only 15% of the bus network. This, and the longer term recommendation, would also be a task for the Integrated Passenger Transport Board (see above) to inform route planning and need  WER
<b>4.3 Innovative Services</b>				
<b>Recommendation 4.3.1</b> Introduce the fare car concept to Bath & North East Somerset, possibly as an improved 'demand responsive' alternative (or replacement) to existing supported bus routes.	Sir Elgar Jenkins	Accept	From 2005	Plans to introduce a fare car type service (a shared taxi) are currently underway. The villages and hamlets in the rural area immediately to the North of Bath are currently served by the 780 Lansdown - Bath, and the 781 Swainswick - Bath bus services. These bus services will be replaced on the 4th May 2005 by the Langridge & Northend Area Fare Car. Fare Car will serve all destinations currently served by the 780 and 781 bus services., (subject to approval) (ref Report E738 'Annual Review of Supported Bus Services'). It is anticipated that the service will commence in May this year.  Following evaluation of the scheme later this year, it may be possible to convert other supported bus services to fare car. However, it should be noted that the maximum vehicle seating capacity allowed with these schemes is 8 seats (under section 11 of the Transport Act 1985). This

				capacity limitation effectively means that only around 10% of the Council's supported bus services would be suitable for conversion to fare car.
<b>Recommendation 4.3.2</b> Seek to maximise the use of our commercial fleet through partnership working with the NHS ambulance service.	Full Executive	Accept	Discussions already underway	Cross reference recommendation: 4.8.3 below – decisions awaited  Continue to explore wider opportunities for our vehicle fleet and extend discussions to include Social Services and other NHS organisations. IPT Board to coordinate. WER
<b>4.4 Supported Bus Services</b>				
<b>Recommendation 4.4.1</b> Cease high cost supported bus contracts and evaluate alternatives that can provide improved services to customers, increase ridership and deliver better value to the council.	Sir Elgar Jenkins	Defer	October 2005	We will continue to review services and opportunities for alternative provision that will offer better value for money for the Council.  Officers have recently developed a socio-economic model to rank all supported bus services. The model uses 2001 census indices on a parish and ward level together with cost per passenger journey data. It compares each bus contract and provides an overall value ranking. The Census data shows how well each bus contract is targeted in terms of identifying areas where the social need for public transport is greatest. Low cost, highly socially targeted bus contracts are ranked the highest.  The model provides strategic direction to the management of bus contracts, as it also highlights contracts that provide relatively lower overall value. Where appropriate actions can be taken such as amending, reducing, merging, discontinuing or

				<p>converting these bus contracts to fare car.</p> <p>These lower value contracts will be fed into the next Annual Review of Supported Bus Services, which is due to commence in October 2005.</p> <p>The Executive will receive a report from officers on the risks associated with increases in tendering costs caused by escalating fuel and other costs.</p>
<b>4.5 Support for Elderly</b>				
<p><b>Recommendation 4.5.1</b></p> <p>The series of points made by Action for Pensioners need investigation and methods for improvement planned and implemented, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• driver training in working with elderly people;</li> <li>• safety at bus stops especially at night;</li> <li>• route information weaknesses;</li> <li>• more generous interpretation of bus pass usage;</li> <li>• hours of operation, and;</li> <li>• improved access</li> </ul>	Sir Elgar Jenkins	Accept	From June 2005	<p>We believe these proposals are aimed more at all bus operators rather than in house Council transport. We shall therefore take these points up directly with bus operators and report progress to Action for Pensioners. In house procedures may also need to be reviewed to ensure that they meet required standards</p> <p>Since August 2004, bus passes issued in B&amp;NES can now be used across ex Avon Councils and we will need to consider the impact of the proposals in the latest Government budget decisions to offer free transport for the over 60's and disabled people from April 2006 when the details are available.</p> <p>We produce and distribute a Public Transport Map annually. This shows all the bus services operating in the authority area together with a host of related public transport information. The Council provides and maintains information at 200 bus stops,</p>

				and other operators provide and maintain information at over 500 other bus stops.  WER
<b>4.6 Dial a Ride / Voluntary Community Transport</b>				
<b>Recommendation 4.6.1</b> Note seriously the suggestion for a supplementary vehicle for the Keynsham dial-a-ride to extend services to Saltford and surrounding villages. Investment in an additional vehicle should be considered.	Sir Elgar Jenkins	Defer	Later in 2005	More “social needs” mapping will be carried out to establish the need and value for money for Dial a Ride services B&NES-wide (to include Bath), before we commit to a particular scheme.
<b>Recommendation 4.6.2</b> The feasibility of a new Dial-a-ride service in Chew Valley area should be explored. This could provide valuable rural service for the elderly.	Sir Elgar Jenkins	Defer	Later in 2005	More “social needs” mapping will be carried out to establish the need and value for money for Dial a Ride services B&NES-wide (to include Bath), before we commit to a particular scheme.
<b>Recommendation 4.6.3</b> Work with the Community Transport Liaison Group to improve Council support for volunteers, particularly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>tailoring support to suit the needs of individual organisations (reduction in paperwork &amp; form filling, more consultative style of support on basis of needs)</li> <li>investigate and advise on the tax liability issue reported by Keynsham Dial-a-Ride organisers.</li> </ul>	Sir Elgar Jenkins	Accept	From Sept 2005	<p>We shall investigate opportunities for removing unnecessary bureaucracy by discussing with volunteers their specific needs</p> <p>The Group meets every quarter and is well attended by representatives of transport schemes. In the last 6 months officers have presented various topics including Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) Checks (People Services officer), Health &amp; Safety law, Driver Training and Vehicle checks, Rural Transport Partnership.</p> <p>Changes to the criteria for funding have been made, after consultation, including a requirement to undertake CRB checks and to adopt a Health &amp; Safety policy, within 12 months. The vast majority of the representatives from the transport schemes</p>

				<p>have accepted this and are happy with the arrangements. A small minority have indicated dissatisfaction. These changes will protect both the schemes and the Council in terms of risk management. Also because many of these schemes would not exist without the Council's funding, the Council must ensure that issues regarding corporate responsibility are dealt with appropriately.</p> <p>WER</p>
<b>4.7 Concessionary Travel Schemes (Bus Passes &amp; Travel Tokens)</b>				
<p><b>Recommendation 4.7.1</b> Reform the Travel Tokens scheme by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Considering the possibility of means testing the allocation of travel tokens.</li> <li>(b) Any development of the scheme should include an appraisal of the administrative costs of means testing to ensure viability within existing resources.</li> <li>(c) Investigate offering a senior citizens rail card as an alternative option to tokens.</li> </ul>	Full Executive	Defer	From 2005/6	<p>The government budget of March 2005 has announced free transport to the over 60's from 2006. This recommendation will be deferred until there are further details on government proposals.</p> <p>Senior citizens rail cards, which offer substantial discounts, are already available through rail providers, however, we propose to promote these more prominently in our leaflets on travel concessions.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 4.7.2</b> Review the administration costs for the issuing of bus passes, currently running at £17,000 per annum, possibly by issuing a long-term pass at age 60, valid for life, rather than the current annual replacement process.</p>	Full Executive	Defer	From April 2006	<p>The government budget of March 2005 has announced free transport for the over 60's from 2006. This recommendation will be deferred until there are further details on government proposals</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 4.7.3</b> Investigate further the advice from Transport 2000</p>	Full	Defer	2005/6	<p>Bus passes issued by Bath &amp; North East Somerset can be used across the ex Avon</p>

( D Redgewell) and the Joint Planning, Technical & Environment Unit about bus pass eligibility throughout the Greater Bristol area, connections to hospitals and other similar public bodies and ascertain the current position.	Executive			area.  The Executive will seek further clarity from the panel on the Transport 2000 advice about bus pass eligibility before they can respond.
<b>Recommendation 4.7.4</b> Any savings made in the administration of these schemes should be re-allocated corporately to enhance community transport schemes, as per our recommendations in section 4.6.	Malcolm Hanney / Full Executive	Defer	Subject to review by Executive and Council when considering the Corporate & Financial Plan	Executive Members will determine resource allocation priorities according to Council's Corporate Plan principles.
<b>4.8 Social Services Transport</b>				
<b>Recommendation 4.8.1</b> The moves towards nominal charging and promoting greater independence and reliance on public transport are bold and demonstrate the direction the council needs to take. There was a minority view from the panel to uphold the request; that any monies saved/generated on Social Services transport should stay in Social Services. A majority of the Panel members expressed an alternative view that savings should be recouped corporately to spend on other passenger transport priorities. The Executive must consider these issues and make the decision based on the full corporate picture.	Francine Habeline / Full Executive	Reject		A single member decision was taken 15 Feb 2005 to charge £2 per day for people using Council transport to day care services. Charges for day centres will cease as from July 2005. Consultation was carried out with clients on the basis that any income achieved through charging would be reinvested in community care for their benefit. The loss of income from charging would necessitate a review of policy as loss of day centre and transport income would need to be funded.  Social Services Officers recommend that income from charging is used to offset loss of income from day care charges and that any surplus will be used to offset any deficit in community care budgets  Current cost is £498k. Charging will produce a net income of £150k, after taking into account the loss of day care income of



				£20K. This is included in the Social Services Service and Financial Plan.
<b>Recommendation 4.8.2</b> In line with our earlier recommendations on integrated transport (4.1), we would like to see Social Services transport assets utilised more effectively. For example, the same vehicles and drivers could operate at different times of day for Social Services and Education (home to school) and then in the evenings and at weekends for other community transport services.	Full Executive	Accept	From 2005	The IPT Board will explore better utilisation of assets  WER
<b>Recommendation 4.8.3</b> Opportunities for joint ventures with the NHS (Avon Ambulance Trust) should be explored.	Malcolm Hanney	Accept	2005	We have held a number of constructive and positive discussions with Avon Ambulance Trust and expect a decision shortly  WER
<b>4.9 School Transport</b>				
<b>Recommendation 4.9.1</b> Remove or radically reform the current discretionary policy of free transport for pupils attending denominational schools.  In its place, we would like to see a school transport policy that provides free transport to those in most need (use means testing to assess eligibility) and introduces charging (using the new Charging Powers, on a cost recovery basis) for anybody else who wishes to use a bus to get to school.  The aim of a new policy should be to target current expenditure more equitably, taking account of all aspects of school choice and travel needs, to provide low cost transport to a much wider group of users than current policies allow. The overall objective should be to provide more bus services, increase ridership and reduce 'school run'	Full Executive	Defer	Programme dates being established for consultation	We propose to review current discretionary policy of free transport for pupils attending denominational schools and to consider charging for this discretionary service including options for partial contribution and full cost recovery.  If charging is introduced, the option to allow free transport for those pupils entitled to free school meals could be considered to ensure that those in greatest financial need are protected.  We will ensure that Schools, Governors, Diocesan representatives and Schools Budget Forum are fully consulted and involved in the review. O&S panel members' involvement will be welcomed.

congestion.				
<b>Recommendation 4.9.2</b> Set up a partnership between the Council, schools and bus operators for dialogue with a view to establishing more useful and cost effective bus routes to all schools (including independent) whose travel needs may not be currently met.	Full Executive	Defer	Programme dates being established for consultation	Linked with 4.9.4 – we shall investigate the possibility of additional bus routes to schools
<b>Recommendation 4.9.3</b> Use any financial savings created by adoption of other listed recommendations to invest in capital projects that will reduce the need for transport over designated hazardous routes, e.g. create safe routes to school, cycle routes, e.g. across Lansdown Road and also in rural areas where transport costs are high.	Full Executive	Defer	Programme dates being established for consultation	Executive Members will determine resource allocation priorities according to Corporate Plan principles.
<b>Recommendation 4.9.4</b> In reforming school bus services, take account of the great possibilities for tackling congestion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School transport must be provided so as not to force more cars on roads.</li> <li>• Create more bus lanes to be used by greater number of vehicles, e.g. school buses, Social Services vehicles, community transport, etc.</li> <li>• Implement staggered starting times for schools.</li> <li>• The potential of travel plans to reduce unnecessary bus/car use and promote more safe cycling and walking routes.</li> <li>• Investigate the principles that underpin the ‘yellow buses concept’ and look at how these have been developed by other Local Authorities.</li> </ul>	Full Executive	Defer	<i>Programme dates being established for consultation</i>	<p>The Local Authority has a statutory responsibility to provide transport for pupils meeting the statutory distance criteria, attending their nearest appropriate school.</p> <p>Development beyond this statutory responsibilities and integration with other services should be promoted to reduce individual car journeys and therefore reduce congestion</p> <p>We shall investigate all possible methods of reducing congestion and increasing bus service use such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encouraging governing bodies to use staggered start times.</li> <li>• Promoting safe routes to school (walking and cycling routes)</li> <li>• Encouraging schools to develop travel plans</li> <li>• Investigating the possibility of providing more bus routes for schools</li> <li>• Integration of school transport with other</li> </ul>

Passenger Transport Review (Joint O&S Panel): Executive Response Table  
 Appendix 2

				transport provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigating the ‘yellow bus concept’ developed in other authorities.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--