

Public Document Pack

Cabinet Monday, 3 December 2018 Supplementary Information Pack

Agenda Item No.	Supplementary Information	Page Number
5	Bus Subsidy Review and Savings – Supplementary Report to MTFS	3
5	Joint Scrutiny of the Budget 28 November 2018 – Draft Minutes	9

This page has been left intentionally blank.

CABINET	AGENDA ITEM No. 5
3 DECEMBER 2018	SUPPLEMENTARY PUBLIC REPORT

Report of:	Peter Carpenter – Interim Director of Corporate Resources Annette Joyce – Service Director - Environment and Economy	
Cabinet Member(s) responsible:	Cllr Peter Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development & Environment Capital	
Contact Officer(s):	Annette Joyce, Service Director – Environment and Economy	Tel. 452280

BUS SUBSIDY REVIEW AND SAVINGS – SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT TO MTFS

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATION	
FROM: Annette Joyce	Deadline date: N/A
It is recommended that Cabinet approve the proposed methodology for reviewing the Bus Subsidy in order to achieve savings of £150,000 as put forward in the Council’s tranche II savings proposals.	

1. ORIGIN OF REPORT

This is a **SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT** to the MTFS report and comes to the Cabinet to help underpin the Council’s formal budget process as per the legislative requirements to set a balanced and sustainable budget for 2019/20 – 2021/22.

2. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT

2.1 To describe and seek approval to progressing a review of Bus Subsidy in order to achieve funding reductions.

2.2 This report comes to Cabinet as part of the council’s formal budget setting process following consideration by the Joint Meeting of the Scrutiny Committees on 28 November 2018.

2.3 *How does this report link to the Corporate Priorities?*
As per the legislative requirements to set a balanced and sustainable budget for 2019/20 – 2021/22.

3. TIMESCALES

Is this a Major Policy Item/Statutory Plan?	NO	If yes, date for Cabinet meeting	N/A
---	-----------	----------------------------------	------------

4. BACKGROUND AND KEY ISSUES

4.1 Background

The current Peterborough City Council Transport (Bus Subsidy) budgets are £3,715,000. Most of this (£3,000,000) is statutory reimbursement of concessionary fares with the balance funding 60s Services, Evening Citi Services and on demand services (Call Connect and Community Link).

As part of tranche two of the Council's 2019/20 budget setting process an option to reduce this budget by £150,000 was put forward for consultation. Specifically, Cabinet have asked officers to identify options for achieving this reduction, in consultation with Group representatives, without impacting 'demand responsive' services (i.e. Call Connect and Community Link). Instead to consider the £520,000 budget for the 60s services and the evening services that the Council supports on Stagecoach's Citi network.

In particular it was noted that £104,000 of additional investment into the 60s services made in 2017 did not result in a significant increase in user numbers (7077 additional journeys from the average between 2014-2016 – equivalent to 10 return journeys per day). These additional journeys were therefore costing £14.69 per additional journey which Cabinet did not believe represented value for money. It was therefore the 60s services where most of the proposed savings were to be sought with the balance to be found from the 60s service or a timetable redesign of lower used Citi Evening Services.

The majority of the city's Passenger Transport Services are provided on a commercial basis by bus operators. This means that they operate without financial support and have the commercial freedom to decide their own routes, vehicles and infrastructure, timetables and fare structures. To put this into context, Stagecoach reported to the Department for Transport that 8.8m bus journeys were undertaken in 2017/18, which when grossed up to take account of other smaller operators equates to approximately 10.1m commercial bus journeys. As approximately 300,000 journeys are supported by bus subsidy, this means that approximately 3% of journeys operate with subsidy from the Council.

In line with delegated powers passed to the Council, currently extending to the 31st of March 2019 from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, the Council support some passenger transport services, informed by a Cross Party working Group in 2013. The Combined Authority have commissioned a 'Strategic Bus Review' which the Council is supporting in terms of data provision etc. the output of which is expected by the end of 2018.

Summary of services:

Stagecoach 60s services - These services replaced some of the old 'Local Link' services in 2013 and were specifically designed to provide a bus service to those people who, due to location, are not served by a commercial bus service. In spring 2015 a working group was established to consider options to enhance bus provision in the city. The group subsequently agreed to invest an extra £100,000 annually to enhance the services already in place.

The number of passengers using this service for single trips over the last four years is broken down as follows:

Year	No. of trips	Yearly cost	Subsidy per trip*
2014/15	85,666	£216,742	£2.53
2015/16	83,497	£216,475	£2.59
2016/17**	83,265	£271,568	£3.26
2017/18	91,659	£320,549	£3.50

*It should be noted that the Council is responsible for reimbursing the operator for Concessionary Fare passes used on this route which is in addition to the price included in the table.

**The yearly cost for this service increased in 2016/17 following implementation of the working group recommendations part way through the year.

Passenger numbers provided by Stagecoach show that the 48% additional investment has resulted in just a 9.8% increase in the number of trips when comparing the original services (2015/16) to the revised services (2017/18).

Officers have undertaken initial discussions with Stagecoach to explore potential options to reduce the overall subsidy required for these services whilst ensuring that all residents receive at least some level of service provision, albeit potentially on a less frequent basis. As such Stagecoach have presented options which suggest that it would be possible to make amendments to the current services which would result in an annual budget reduction of £162,651. In order to understand the potential impact of these changes a copy of the existing timetable (appendix B) and the proposed changes (appendix C) are included. In summary the changes include:

- Route 60 provides links between the Ortons and Stanground to Hampton Tesco. The proposal is to withdraw service on Saturdays; provide an extra journey at 1539 on Mondays – Fridays.
- Route 61 provides links between the city centre, Eastern Industry and Showcase cinema. It is proposed to: withdraw the service on Saturdays; Withdraw the journey at 05:34; Retain current services between 06:02 and 18:39; Withdraw services after the 18:39 departure.
- Route 62 provides a link between Maxey, Newborough and Peterborough. It also provides a local link in the Paston and Dogsthorpe areas. It is proposed: To withdraw the journey at 05:09; Retain current services between 07:10 and 18:52; Withdraw journeys at 19:55 and 23:15.
- Route 63 links Peterborough city centre, Newark and Parnwell Quays. It is proposed to: Withdraw the service on Saturday; Retain existing journeys on Mondays to Fridays.

Stagecoach Evening and Weekend Services (previously known as the Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA)) - This agreement enables Stagecoach to offer an hourly evening and weekend bus service on their Citi network (the Citi network provides approximately 85% of Peterborough’s bus services). Without this support these services would not be commercially viable for Stagecoach to operate. Specifically, the Council supports bus services on routes Citi 1 to Citi 6 after 20:30 on Mondays to Saturdays, and after 17:30 on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

The number of passengers using this service for single trips over the last four years is broken down as follows:

Year	No. of trips	Yearly cost	Subsidy per trip*
2014/15	195,009	£200,000	£1.03
2015/16	172,746	£200,000	£1.16
2016/17	188,127	£200,000	£1.06
2017/18	198,569	**£200,000	£0.99

*It should be noted that the Council is responsible for reimbursing the operator for Concessionary Fare passes used on this route which is in addition to the price included in the table.

** Officers renegotiated this agreement for 2018/19 and have achieved a moderate saving of approximately £14k to £186k annually.

Officers have undertaken initial discussions with Stagecoach to explore potential options to reduce the overall subsidy for these services. At this stage this involves requesting and analysing data from Stagecoach to ascertain, for example, whether any of the routes could now be

considered commercially viable, stopped at an earlier time in the evening, delivered differently to reduce the operating cost. Stagecoach have so far proposed a revised timetable for the Citi 5 Service to provide some savings.

The Council currently supports a number of different demand responsive services. These are:

Demand responsive

Call Connect: Call Connect is a demand responsive service that operates in the rural areas of Peterborough where there is no provision of a regular commercial bus service. This service is operated on our behalf by Lincolnshire County Council and the cost is partly funded by BSOG, so any reduction in service or full withdrawal is only likely to achieve partial savings.

Cabinet decided not to look at this service to achieve Tranche II savings.

Accessible Transport

Community Link: Community link is a demand responsive service which is designed for residents from the urban area who are not able to access commercial services. To access the service individual users need to register as a member and book services as and when required.

Cabinet decided not to look at this service to achieve Tranche II savings.

Rural Dial-a-Ride: The annual cost of this service is currently unknown but a budget of approximately £35k is in place. This is basically the same as the Community Link service but operates across the rural area of the city. The cost of this service is partly covered by our Bus Service Operator Grant (BSOG).

Cabinet decided not to look at this service to achieve Tranche II savings.

Community Car Scheme: This service is operated by Royal Voluntary Service (RVS) from the Senior Stop on Cattle Market Road and uses volunteers to allow residents with accessibility issues to book a 'taxi' style service for appointments etc. Without a small subsidy from the Council it is likely that RVS would withdraw this service.

Cabinet decided not to look at this service to achieve Tranche II savings.

In Summary

With £150,000 of savings sought, Stagecoach have so far proposed revised timetables for the 6Os services that will save in excess of this (it would provide a £162,651 saving if agreed to amend timetable as per their proposal). The cost of operating the Citi Services has already been negotiated down by £14,000 without the need to reduce services.

Cross Party Consultation Group

In order to inform decision making it is necessary to gather more information about who may be affected by any proposed changes. In order to achieve this we propose to:

- Undertake an analysis of the ticket type purchased. This will provide an indication of the likely reason that somebody is travelling i.e. if a 'megarider' is used than it is a reasonable assumption that the passenger needs to undertake a number of trips during the week for work purposes or other commitments.
- Carry out surveys with passengers travelling on timetabled routes where changes are proposed. This will involve officers travelling on these particular services and asking a predetermined set of questions to passengers. It is unlikely that this will result in a large sample size but will add to our understanding of the impact of any changes.

- Work with Stagecoach to obtain and validate a robust data set to ensure all proposals are well informed and therefore the impacts of any changes understood. This will involve data requests to Stagecoach and meetings between them and officers, utilising specialist support as required, in order to validate data. The data requested will include the number of passengers on each timetabled journey,
- Explore other existing contracts to see if there is the opportunity to achieve additional savings without affecting service provision. For example, officers have negotiated a reduction for the current year of £14k from the Stagecoach Evening and Weekend Services. The Council have also been delivering the rural dial-a-ride service in house from the beginning of the 2018/19 year and current expenditure suggests that there may be an overall reduction in the budget required to deliver this service.
- Seek suggestions for other services, routes that could be considered and analysed further to ascertain the potential for change.
- Consider the Review methodology as proposed above
- Provide further information on bus subsidy
- Seek opinions on the service revisions so far proposed by Stagecoach
- Determine what further work is required

A further review meeting will be arranged once survey results and data analysis have been completed to agree the final details of delivering the savings required.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 There is no requirement for formal consultation in relation to this matter.

6. ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES OR IMPACT

6.1 It is anticipated that this report will provide the committee with an overview of the proposed methodology for reviewing the Bus Subsidy.

7. REASON FOR THE RECOMMENDATION

7.1 It is recommended that Cabinet approve the proposed methodology for reviewing the Bus Subsidy in order to achieve savings of £150,000 as put forward in the Council's tranche Two savings proposals.

8. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

8.1 None

9. IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications

9.1 If approved the proposed methodology for reviewing the Bus Subsidy will help achieve savings of £150,000 as put forward in the Council's tranche II savings proposals.

Legal Implications

9.2 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Equalities Implications

9.3 There are no equalities implications arising from this report.

Rural Implications

9.4 There are no rural implications arising from this report.

10. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

10.1 Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22 – Tranche Two

11. APPENDICES

11.1 None

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEES MEETING
HELD AT 6.00PM ON
28 NOVEMBER 2018
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Councillors N Simons (Chairman), K Aitken, A Ali, S Bashir, R Brown, G Casey, A Ellis, M Farooq, J A Fox, J R Fox, C Harper, S Hemraj, C Hogg, A Iqbal, M Jamil, D Jones, S Lane, S Martin, E Murphy, D Over, B Rush, B Saltmarsh, N Sandford, L Serluca, J Stokes, S Warren

Also Present: Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
Councillor Fitzgerald, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care and Health
Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education Skills and University
Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development
Councillor Lamb, Cabinet Member for Public Health
Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources
Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services
Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities
Councillor Allen, Cabinet Advisor to the Leader
Councillor Fuller, Cabinet Advisor for Commercial Strategy and Investments

Officers Present: Gillian Beasley, Chief Executive
Peter Carpenter, Acting Corporate Director, Resources
Adrian Chapman, Service Director, Communities and Safety
Fiona McMillan, Interim Director of Law and Governance
Annette Joyce, Interim Corporate Director, Growth and Regeneration
Wendi Ogle-Welbourn, Executive Director, People and Communities, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Councils
Will Patten, Service Director Commissioning
Dr Liz Robin, Director of Public Health
Lou Williams, Service Director, Children & Safeguarding
Jonathan Lewis, Service Director, Education
Paulina Ford, Senior Democratic Services Officer

9. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

The Senior Democratic Services Officer opened the meeting and advised the Committee that in accordance with *Part 4, Section 8 – Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules, section 13, Joint*

Meetings of Scrutiny Committees a Chairman would be required to be appointed from among the Chairmen of the Committees who were holding the meeting. Nominations were sought from those Chairmen present at the meeting which were Councillor Simons, Chairman of Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Stokes, Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Committee and Councillor Harper, Chairman of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Simons was nominated by Councillor Harper and seconded by Councillor Stokes. There being no further nominations Councillor Simons was therefore appointed Chairman.

The Chairman welcomed everyone present and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for all members of each Scrutiny Committee to scrutinise the Medium Term Financial Strategy, Budget 2019/20 to 2021/22 Tranche Two proposals document as part of the formal consultation process before being presented to Cabinet on 3 December 2018 for approval and recommendation to Full Council on 12 December 2018.

6. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Bisby, Councillor Barkham, Councillor Shaheed, Councillor Goodwin, Councillor Dowson and Councillor Joseph. Councillor Murphy was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Dowson. Councillor A Iqbal was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Joseph and Councillor Hogg was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Shaheed.

Councillor M Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene also submitted his apologies.

The following co-opted members also sent apologies: Education Co-opted members Peter Cantley and Flavio Vettese. Independent Co-opted Members Dr Watson, Alistair Kingsley, Rizwan Rahemtulla and Parish Councillor Co-opted Member Henry Clark and Barry Warne substitute for Henry Clark.

7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING DECLARATIONS

There were no declarations of interest or whipping declarations.

8. Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2019/20 - 2021/22 – Tranche Two Proposals

The Cabinet Member for Resources gave a short introduction to the Budget 2019/20 – 2021/22 Tranche Two proposals document accompanied by the Interim Corporate Director of Resources and went through a short PowerPoint presentation a copy of which can be found attached at Appendix 1 of the minutes.

Each section of the budget proposals document was then taken in order according to how it was presented in the Budget Book. The relevant Cabinet Member or Corporate Director were given the opportunity to introduce their section of the budget before taking questions from the Committee.

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
<p>5. Presentation and Introduction of the Medium Term Financial Strategy Tranche Two Proposals Document</p> <p>Cabinet report dated 15 October 2018 (pages 1 to 37) of the MTFS 2019/20 to 2021/22 Tranche Two Proposals Document</p>	<p>Members sought clarification as to how much budget had been allocated to the ICT change in strategic direction.</p>	<p>The paper that went through Cabinet in July stated a total investment of £1.2m but this would vary year on year.</p>
	<p>Councillor Sandford commented that he had requested information on the cost of the transition between the Microsoft platform and google and the reverse from google to Microsoft on 1 October at the Budget Working Group and on several occasions since but had yet to receive the information.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Resources apologised for the late response to Councillor Sandford's request for detailed information regarding the ICT transition between the Microsoft and google platforms. An email providing a response had been sent out to members of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee of which Councillor Sandford was a member earlier in the day on 28 November.</p>
	<p>Councillor Sandford queried why the detail of the proposed public transport cuts had not been published in full as he had requested. The supplementary report on the Bus Subsidy Review and Savings published on 27 November had not contained full details. Concern was also raised that the proposed Cross Party Working Group had only been asked to meet on 27 November and not sooner.</p> <p>Concern was raised that the proposed savings would be pushed through at the next Council meeting on 12 December without proper consultation.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Resources advised that there was still a lot of consultation work to be undertaken which included engaging with groups such as the Youth Council, Pensioners Association and the Cross Party Working Group. It was an ongoing process including negotiating with Stagecoach to achieve the £150K savings. Stagecoach had already indicated that they could identify where those savings might come from.</p>
	<p>Members sought clarification as to how the budget control and if there had been an improvement or if the</p>	<p>A budget control report was presented to every Cabinet meeting to provide a continuous update throughout the year and</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>situation was worsening. Had there been any unexpected budget pressures which had previously not been taken into account.</p> <p>Had the Chancellor given any further detail on how the council may benefit from the increase in funding to public services?</p>	<p>the report indicated that the budget position was improving.</p> <p>The budget position at a high had shown an overspend of £6.4m in August, £5m of which was due to increases in Children's Services. Approximately £3.9m had been built into the budget to go towards Children's Services.</p> <p>The budget overspend as of last month had come down to £4.9m and further processes were being put in place to reduce this further.</p> <p>The major areas for funding to come out of the Chancellors speech was the additional funding for Winter Pressures and Adult Social Care. There was also additional funding of £1.5m for pot holding which would need to be spent before the end of the financial year.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>6. Appendix A Page 39 to 42 2019/2020 – 2021/22 MTFS Detailed Budget Position and Appendix B Page 43 Local Government Finance Event Timeline</p>	<p>What is the MRP Re – Provision listed under Table 2 Non repeatable One off Savings on page 3 of the report?</p>	<p>This item comes under Capital Financing Costs and is monies that can be offset against the Capital Financing Costs. Money that is set aside for debt.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>7. Appendix C Page 45 to 48</p> <p>Performance Data</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
<p>8. Appendix – D Page 49 to 51</p> <p>Capital Programme 2018/19-2021/22</p>	<p>It was noted that the Community Leadership Fund listed at £860K was underspent last year and the question was posed as to whether it should be reduced, remain the same or be disposed of.</p> <p>Some Members advised that it was used fully in their wards and they would not want it to be taken away.</p> <p>After a short discussion Councillor Over seconded by Councillor John Fox recommended that the Community Leadership Fund remain at £1000 per councillor and that any Community Leadership funding not spent by February of the current financial year should be pooled and redistributed to Councillors who had already spent their allocation and could use it for further projects within their area.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy recommended that the Community Leadership Fund be reviewed.</p> <p>Some Members felt that the rules on how the money could be spent were quite restrictive.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Resources advised that there was a Capital Programme Board in place which challenged the Capital Programme thoroughly to reduce the overall amount.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council commented that it was sometimes difficult to spend the total amount allocated within one year and it would be more helpful if the funding could be rolled over to the next financial year. This might then provide funding for more meaningful projects.</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>Members sought clarification on whether the figure of £860K was accurate and if it had been listed in the correct area of the budget.</p> <p>Councillor Jamil, seconded by Councillor Hogg provided an alternative recommendation to Councillor Over's recommendation recommending that if the Community Leadership Fund was not used within the financial year then it is rolled over to the next year so that it remained within the same ward rather than being redistributed, providing this was allowed within the rules of the Community Leadership Fund.</p> <p>Councillor Over agreed to Councillor Jamil's recommendation and it was therefore put to the vote.</p> <p>(17 in favour, 7 against, 2 abstentions) The recommendation was therefore agreed.</p>	<p>The Acting Corporate Director, Resources advised that he would have to confirm the figure after the meeting and would look at the figure as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Communities requested that when considering the rules of the Community Leadership Fund consideration could also be given to how the fund is allocated within the ward if a Councillor should resign. Currently if a councillor resigned their portion of the Community Leadership Fund was lost.</p>
	<p>Members were concerned that putting £18m this year and £10m next year into the Housing Joint Venture was putting 'all our eggs in one basket'. Members requested that Cabinet look at other funding streams and review the current housing situation.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy seconded by Councillor Jamil recommended that Cabinet</p>	<p>The Leader responded that the government rules currently stipulate that the Combined Authority could not fund the housing associations however this was currently being looked at. Current funding was coming from the Department of Homes and Communities. The council were open to and bidding via every avenue possible to build and obtain housing.</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>review the current housing financial situation and consider other funders and not put the £28m in to one vehicle for provision of homes.</p> <p>The recommendation was put to the vote. (17 in favour, 0 against, 3 abstentions)</p> <p>The recommendation was therefore agreed.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget and made the following recommendation.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Joint Scrutiny Committee RESOLVED to recommend that Cabinet review the current housing financial situation and consider other funders and not put the £28m into one vehicle for provision of homes. 2. The Joint Scrutiny Committee RESOLVED to recommend to Cabinet that if the Community Leadership Fund was not used within the financial year then it is rolled over to the next year so that it remains within the same ward rather than being redistributed, providing this was allowed within the rules of the Community Leadership Fund. <p>AGREED ACTIONS</p> <p>The Joint Scrutiny Committee requested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Acting Corporate Director, Resources confirm if the figure of £860K listed against the Community Leadership Fund in Appendix D of the budget book is correct. 2. The Director of Law and Governance to review the rules around the Community Leadership Fund following the recommendation made. 		
<p>9. Appendix E Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 Tranche Two Budget Proposals Document starting on page 53</p> <p>Introduction, Budget Process, Priorities, Funding and Council Service Expenditure, Overall Budget Position,</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
and Budget Consultation Pages 55 to 63		
The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.		
10. Governance Budget Proposals Page 64	Members noted the proposals regarding HR – supplies and services and salary cost savings through reduction of hours and sought clarification as to which staff would be affected. Members also asked if the provision of service would be affected.	It was only HR staff who would be affected and they did not provide any HR services to other authorities.
The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.		
11. Growth and Regeneration Budget Proposals Pages 65 to 67 Including the supplementary report published yesterday on Bus Subsidy Review and Savings separately numbered pages 1 to 6	Members commented on the proposals to reduce the council's subsidisation of local bus routes and felt that the proposals targeted the evening and Sunday services on the core routes 1 to 6. The supplementary report mentioned that the detailed revised timetables were attached in appendix B and C however the appendices was not included with the report. Members therefore sought clarification as to what the savings entailed. <i>7.04pm Councillor Ali left the meeting.</i> Members were concerned that approval of the £150K savings might go through without any detailed analysis or public consultation. Some Members suggested that the savings be found elsewhere as there was concern that a cut in services	Stagecoach had provided the council with details of savings of approximately £164K relating to the 60's service. The Cross Party Working Group had therefore been formed to consult on all of the subsidised journeys. The recommendation in the report was to approve the methodology for reviewing the Bus Subsidy in order to achieve the savings put forward in the Tranche Two savings proposal. Stagecoach had responded to say that they had managed to find some savings across the 60's service however more detailed analysis would be required from Stagecoach. Members were informed that Stagecoach had provided initial proposals and timetables. The Cross Party Group would look at the full detail of the proposals before a decision was made. The council were working with partners to rationalise the subsidised routes to make the

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>would affect lifelines to rural communities.</p> <p>Confirmation was sought from the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development that full details of the cost saving proposals would be revealed before the next council meeting in December.</p> <p>It was noted that the Combined Authority was now responsible for transport and that they might decide in the future to reinstate the bus services and charge the council for the services. It was suggested that the council and the Combined Authority should work together on the Bus Subsidy review.</p> <p>Members suggested that the council should look at providing its own bus transport.</p> <p>It was suggested that the Cross Party Working Group should meet in public.</p> <p>Councillor Hogg seconded by Councillor Sandford recommended that the decision on the Bus Subsidy review and savings be deferred to Tranche Three to allow the Cross Party Working Group to come back with detailed proposals.</p> <p>The recommendation was put to the vote (9 in favour, 13 against, 0 abstentions)</p>	<p>savings.</p> <p>A consultant had already been engaged and a route and branch review was already being undertaken to look at the bus routes around the city which were being under used.</p> <p>Members were reminded that the council had lost over £55m of revenue support grant. The council had to make decisions on what services could be provided. Bus subsidy was one area of scrutiny. The details of the passenger numbers were known and the detail that had already been provided supported the proposed savings of £150k.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development advised that some of the information provided by the bus companies may be commercially sensitive.</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>The recommendation was defeated.</p> <p>Councillor Sandford seconded by Councillor Hogg recommended that in order to ensure transparency going forward that the Cross Party Working Group hold their meetings in public so that all details were made publically available subject to them not being commercially sensitive.</p> <p>The recommendation was put to the vote (9 in favour, 14 against, 0 abstentions) The recommendation was defeated.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>12. People and Communities Budget Proposals Pages 68 to 75</p>	<p>Clarification was sought with regard to self-funders and elderly residents in nursing homes who may have dementia being moved from one home to another that would potentially be cheaper. Members were concerned that this could potentially put elderly residents at risk.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care and Health gave a short introduction to areas within the budget which was covered by his portfolio.</p> <p>Self-funders. There was enormous pressure in the nursing market. Sometimes self-funders were misinformed with regard to the care home fees. When people ran out of funds it was the responsibility of the council to step in and provide suitable care. The Cabinet member advised that when this happened and the council had to provide assistance in funding care arrangements. This did not necessarily mean that the resident would have to move to alternative accommodation but if this was the case the council would ensure that the accommodation provided was equal to what was already being</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>Members were pleased to note the development of Care Suites across the city and wanted to know where they would be located.</p>	<p>provided. The same type of accommodation would be provided at an affordable price. The council would not want to see people moved unnecessarily. Cheaper accommodation did not mean worse accommodation, often it would be the same accommodation that they were already in but at a cheaper rate.</p> <p>The location of the Care Suites were known but because of commercial sensitivity they could not be named. However they would be located in Peterborough.</p>
	<p>Home to School Transport – Catchment Areas. Members sought clarification regarding the proposed reduction in home to school transport costs by reviewing the catchment areas of primary and secondary schools.</p> <p>Will the children who are currently using the home school transport still be able to continue using it?</p> <p>Members commented that anything that could be done to encourage cycling and walking would assist the reduction in home to school transport costs. Adequate school places within the catchment areas would also assist this.</p>	<p>The Director for Education responded that the catchment areas within Peterborough were very old and over the years the schools had changed. Some schools no longer existed and there were many new schools the catchment areas therefore needed to be rebalanced to reduce home school transport costs.</p> <p>This proposal was about planning for the future and therefore those currently using home school transport would not be affected.</p> <p>Cycles were already in the scheme and the LEA already promoted cycling to school and where appropriate promoted parents providing transport to school as this could often be cheaper and more cost effective.</p>
	<p>National Living Wage. It was noted that next year there was nothing in the budget and a -£300 saving for the following two years which</p>	<p>At the time the decision was taken the legislation was not quite clear and therefore there was an over provision in the budget as it was uncertain as to the exact costs</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>was based on intelligence from reviewing the latest information and legislation coming from central government. Why was nothing entered for next year?</p>	<p>associated with the National Living Wage. Due to the over provision it is correct that there would be no savings next year and savings of - £300 over the next two years. The money saved would go back into reinvestment into the service.</p>
	<p>Housing Needs. It was noted that the report stated that the council had made significant gains by increasing the number of temporary accommodation units to meet homelessness demands. How many properties had been acquired and tenancies created or dwellings for homeless people so far? Members suggested that the figure of £223K savings needed to be revised as it was believed that the figures would not be achieved.</p>	<p>The budget figures were accurate and reviewed on a weekly basis. Offers had been accepted on 23 houses and by Christmas 35 will have been secured and were on target to have achieved 55 by March 2019. 8 properties had been acquired on Cromwell Road which had been empty for some considerable length of time and were being converted into general needs accommodation. Medesham Homes, Midland Road properties will be listed in the coming weeks. 22 properties had also been secured at Tysedale in Bretton and were currently being converted into general needs stock. Additionally the council had secured and signed up 32 lease properties from the private sector.</p>
	<p>Term time only working. Have staff been consulted with regarding staff moving to term time only contracts resulting in a lower salary.</p>	<p>This related to Education Staff only and individuals affected were being consulted with. The number of people affected related to one or two people only.</p>
	<p>Virtual School. Members were concerned about the savings identified with regard to the Virtual School as this affected children in care.</p>	<p>The Virtual School provision for looked after children's education was very important. The process and systems in place for the Virtual School has improved over the years and therefore some efficiency savings could now be made. There was also an additional grant from government which would cover the shortfall.</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	Delivery improved performance by the Adult Social Care Team. Would there be any staff redundancies incurred through the £200k savings?	This was about improving productivity and working smarter and more efficiently. There would not be any staff redundancies.
	Community Capacity - Community Asset Transfer (CAT) Programme. If any group did not have the capacity to take on the asset could the council assist the group?	Officers have taken extreme care and sensitivity in the handling and transfer of assets and in particular cases which have been particularly difficult to resolve. The time, care and effort that had been put into the process had been excellent and would continue.
	PES / Community Safety Operating Model. Will the remodelling of the PES service have an effect on other service areas?	The PES continued to grow and extend delivery to all communities across the city and was made up of a range of different interventions. Some of these interventions were about raising revenue through an increase in enforcement activity. There was also the new HMO licensing regulations. Revenue raised would be used to offset the staffing costs. A large amount of the £350K savings was linked to the fact that the CCTV service was now shared with Fenland District Council which would mean sharing the staff and costs.
The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.		
13. Public Health Budget Proposals Pages 76 to 77	Members were concerned with some of the proposed savings and in particular Public Health Staffing savings in respect of three vacant posts (Mental Health Promotion Officer, Senior Public Health Analyst and Drug and Alcohol Misuse Health Improvement Specialist. How long had the posts been vacant and how	The savings for Public Health staff all related to posts in Cambridgeshire County Council. The Mental Health Promotion Officer post had been vacant for less than a year, the Public Health Analyst post had been vacant since December 2017 and the Health Improvement Specialist post went out to advert twice but it was not possible to appoint.

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>would the services provided by these posts be fulfilled.</p> <p>It was also noted that there would be a cut in sexual health and contraceptive services but recent public health indicators were concerning with regard to teenage pregnancies and sexual health. How can the cuts therefore be justified.</p>	<p>In terms of cover for the posts the Mental Health Promotion Officer spent a lot of time working on the Keep Your Head mental health web site which consisted of an adult and children's section. The site has now passed to voluntary sector organisations.</p> <p>An agreement has been made with the NHS to appoint a full time person to the Analyst role which was a post that was originally only being funded for a part time role.</p> <p>The Health Improvement Specialist role was being covered by other areas of the team.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that there were some challenges in Peterborough with regard to teenage pregnancies and late diagnosis of HIV. In Tranche One of the budget the council invested heavily in the iCash service because the demand was so high. The council had now negotiated with the provider to mitigate some of that initial cost. Overall there was an investment in year. Consultation was underway with regard to making the savings and making a minimum impact to the service user.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>14. Resources Budget Proposals Pages 78 to 79</p>		<p>The Cabinet Advisor for Commercial Strategy and Investments gave a brief introduction with regard to the councils Commercial Strategy.</p>
	<p>ICT (Change of Strategy Direction). A request was made for a detailed breakdown of the budget</p>	<p>In 2013 / 2014 the direction of travel was to develop ICT solutions working with other partners. This had not quite</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>pressure of £1,024m including costs relating to the transition to google from Microsoft and the reverse of this decision. Did the £1,024m include licences, training, equipment etc?</p> <p>Members requested information on what had been spent on contracts with Serco and Arcus over the past few years.</p>	<p>developed as expected. The direction of travel had now changed to using solutions that were already on the market rather than developing our own. Part of the costs were for changing the strategy to deliver the new direction of travel and removing some of the targets that had been put in the original ICT strategy.</p> <p>The Acting Director of Resources advised that he would provide the information after the meeting.</p>
	<p>Increased Council Tax Collection. How did the council propose to raise the additional amount of money?</p>	<p>Peterborough had been moving up the league tables in terms of council tax collection and had been cited as the most improved Unitary authority. Peterborough were now in the top end of the league table with regard to the collection of council tax. More money was collected more efficiently at an increased rate of half a percent.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p> <p>ACTIONS</p> <p>The Joint Scrutiny Committee requested that the Acting Director of Resources provide information on how much money had been spent on contracts with Serco and Arcus over the past few years.</p>		
<p>15. Staffing Implications Page 80</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	<p>.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget</p>		
<p>16. Appendix F Pages 81 - 154 Equality Impact Assessments</p>	<p>Subsidised Transport Equality Impact Assessment (EIA). Members noted that the EIA stated that “It is not possible</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development advised that an equalities impact assessment could only be carried out when it</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>to identify which, if any individuals or groups will be affected until a review of the various supported services has taken place. A full assessment will be taken at that stage". It also states that any positive or negative effects were unknown at this stage. Members had been advised that a comprehensive review would be undertaken and detailed information on the services would be submitted to the full council meeting on 12 December which left little time to carry out a detailed review and full equality impact assessment. Members sought assurance that a full equalities impact assessment would be carried out.</p>	<p>was known which bus routes would be affected. When the routes have been identified an impact equality assessment would be carried out.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget</p>		
<p>17. General Comments, any overall recommendations and Conclusion:</p>		
<p>There were no further comments, questions or recommendations made.</p>		

CHAIRMAN

The meeting began at 6.00pm and ended at 8.17 pm