Review Title: **Home to School Transport Review 2012**
Overview & Scrutiny Panel: **Early Years, Children and Youth Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel**
Panel Chairman: **Councillor Sally Davis**
Policy Development & Scrutiny Officer: **Lauren Rushen/Donna Vercoe**
Supporting Service Officer: **Kevin Amos**

Process for Tracking PD&S Recommendations - <u>Guidance note for Cabinet Members</u>
The enclosed table lists all the recommendations arising from the above Policy Development & Scrutiny Review. Individual recommendations are referred to the relevant named Cabinet Members (or whole Cabinet in the case of a whole Cabinet referral) as listed in the '**Cabinet Member'** column of the table. In order to provide the PD&S Panel with a Cabinet response on each recommendation, the named Cabinet member (or whole Cabinet) is asked to complete the last 3 columns of the table as follows:

Decision Response
The Cabinet 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 Cabinet 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.

Recommendations from the Early Years, Children and Youth Panel

Recommendation	Lead Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
Recommendation 1: The Council should continue to seek to encourage more sustainable methods of home to school transport; the Panel would particularly like to see an increase in cycling. We understand that as part of the medium term service and resource plan for 2012/14, £500,000 has been allocated to improve cycling provision and we recommend that these, or future funds, are spent across B&NES and not just the city centre. We would particularly encourage the Cabinet to consider where routes could be used to create safer cycling routes to schools.	Cllr Roger Symonds Cllr Dine Romero			
Recommendation 2: Given the questionnaire evidence, we recommended that the Cabinet encourage the promotion of safe cycling routes to school as an alternative to using the car where there is a safe route to do so. Evidence from our questionnaire also suggested that there was some level of demand for two cycle paths and we	Cllr Roger Symonds Cllr Dine Romero			

Recommendation	Lead Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
recommend that the Cabinet investigate the feasibility of establishing the following two routes: a) Between Bishop Sutton and Chew Valley School b) Compton Dando to Marksbury				
Recommendation 3: We recognise that the existing home to school transport system needs to become more efficient in the current financial climate and that 'doing nothing' is not an option. We therefore recommend that the Cabinet considers exploring and implementing from September 2014 one of the following four options in order to reduce the overall spend on home to school transport. a) Raising the level of financial contribution currently paid by parents/carers using home to school transport from the Council i.e. those who do not qualify for free home to school transport. This could take the form of raising the fare currently paid for the 1st child from £50 per term to a level that would ensure that the service operated on a cost neutral basis (this amount would need to be identified by the Cabinet and Service Officers); b) Removing the 50% reduction for 2nd and	Cllr Dine Romero			

Recommendation	Lead Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
3rd children and/or removing the subsidised transport for families with more than three children requiring home to school transport (unless they qualified as a low income family). c) A combination of option A and option B. A financial briefing for providing a cost neutral option will be prepared by service officers if either option a, b or c are accepted by the Cabinet. A phased withdrawal of subsided home to school transport services for new starters attending denominational schools from September 2014 who would not qualify under other home to school policy subsets e.g. as a low income family. This option would not affect students who currently attend the school, only new pupils joining in September 2014. The anticipated savings from this withdrawal would be seen over a number of years can be found at the end of this document in *Table 1* The above savings are calculated on the basis that the money is allocated to denominational schools to arrange transport which is suitable to them. If the Council continues to arrange transport on behalf of the schools the savings in the first few years may not be as great. This is because we may have to continue to use the same size vehicle until numbers drop sufficiently to reduce the size of the transport. Based on current numbers the Council will				

Recommendation	Lead Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
continue to spend £15,000 per year as our statutory duty under the extended rights to free travel scheme. This will be for children from low income families who live between 2 and 15 miles from their nearest denominational school. e. This withdrawal could either be administered by the Council or; f. Following a similar example to Wiltshire Council, a set sum of money could be allocated per year to the affected schools to arrange transport that is suitable for them.				
Recommendation 4: That the budget to provide home to school transport for children in care (circa £70,000) is maintained for the foreseeable future.	Cllr Dine Romero			
Recommendation 5 a) Passenger Transport Services should review home to school transport routes on a termly basis to ensure best value for money and that home to school transport bus routes are as efficient and effective as possible. b) This should also include liaising with parents/carers of students who have Special Educational Needs to consider whether it is appropriate for them to receive independent	Cllr Dine Romero			

Recommendation	Lead Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
travel training and a personalised transport budget to arrange their own transport which may be more suitable for their needs, similar to the system used at Coventry City Council.				

Table 1 Detailing the Anticipating Savings for Recommendation 3:

	Year 1 (2014-15)	Year 2 (2015-16)	Year 3 (2016-17)	Year 4 (2017-18)	Year 5 (2018-19)	Year 6 (2019-20)	Year 7 (2020-21)
Spend on denominational transport	£217,500	£170,500	£123,500	£76,500	£29,500	£19,500	£15,000
Anticipated saving	£27,500	£74,500	£121,500	£169,000	£215,500	£225,500	£230,000