

North Yorkshire County Council
Transport, Economy and Environment
Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held at County Hall, Northallerton on 19 December 2013 at 10.00 am.

Present:

County Councillor Bob Packham in the Chair

County Councillors Margaret Atkinson, Robert Baker, Andrew Goss, Bryn Griffiths, Michael Heseltine, Robert Heseltine, Peter Horton, Penny Marsden, Chris Pearson (substitute for David Chance), Richard Welch and Robert Windass

Members invited to attend:

County Councillors Arthur Barker and Chris Metcalfe

Members of North Yorkshire County Council's Young People's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (County Councillors Val Arnold, Derek Bastiman, Anne Jones, John Ritchie, Janet Sanderson, Elizabeth Shields and Tim Swales were present. Jon Carling and Chris Head were also present)

Also in attendance:

County Councillors John Clark, Bill Hoult, Carl Les, Shelagh Marshall and John Savage

Officers:

Richard Owens, Assistant Director: Integrated Passenger Transport (BES), Jonathan Spencer, Corporate Development Officer (Central Services), Andrew Terry, Assistant Director: Access and Inclusion (CYPS)

There were approximately 11 members of the public present for the item on the proposed reductions in Bus Subsidy

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

18. Minutes

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 30 October 2013, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

19. Public Questions or Statements

It was noted that there were no general public questions or statements, as all the speakers who were present wished to speak on items 3 and 4 on the agenda.

20. Chairman's Introduction

The Chairman County Councillor Robert Packham, who was chairing the meeting in the absence of County Councillor David Jeffels, explained the order of business, the purpose of the meeting and the Committee's remit. He went on to note that the consultation feedback from members of the public during the consultation, and comments from those present at today's meeting, would be taken into account in determining the Committee's recommendations to the Executive. He emphasised that whilst it was inevitable that those present at the meeting would wish to illustrate local examples in advancing their arguments, they should be put in the context of county-wide issues. This was in order to make it fair to the diverse range of communities across North Yorkshire, and to allow the Committee to produce a set of recommendations that had county-wide significance.

The Chairman went on to report that additional information had been circulated at the meeting relating to the proposed reductions in Bus Subsidy. This included an extract from the draft minutes of the November meeting of the County Area Committee for the Harrogate district concerning the Ripon local town bus service petition, and a flyer relating to Richmondshire Bus Services circulated by Mr Tony Pelton, a local resident.

21. Proposed reductions in Bus Subsidy

Considered –

The report of the Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services, to invite members of the Committee to comment on the Council's proposals to reduce bus subsidies by £1.1m.

The Chairman invited Richard Owens to present his report.

Richard Owens explained about the level of corporate savings that the County Council was required to make from 2011/12 to 2014/15. Part of this included reducing the amount of subsidy for bus services by £1.1m. He went on to provide an outline of how the bus network in the county was currently made up; the remit of commercial services; the Council's role in securing the provision of public passenger transport services and school services; the Council's Bus Strategy and its role in buying services; how the Council's bus subsidy was spent; bus stops served by commercial services in North Yorkshire; bus contracts over £100k; the consultation exercise for reducing the bus subsidy, including the consultation process and feedback; school services; the proposed changes to the original consultation proposals, as detailed in Appendix A of the report; and next steps. He went on to note that as a result of these changes, and through having re-procured a large part of the network of services for fare paying children, the total budget saving would now be in the region of £2m. There would be no service reductions before 1 April 2014 and where the Council was proposing to withdraw services it would not happen before 1 September 2014.

Moving on to public questions the Chairman took each notified question or statement in turn, starting with that forwarded by Scarborough Borough Councillor Steve Siddons representing the Ramshill ward.

Steve Siddons spoke regarding the Number 4 Service in Scarborough, setting out the reasons why he felt that the proposal to withdraw the subsidy from this service should be reconsidered. He made reference to the high proportion of elderly residents living

in his ward and was concerned that there did not appear to be commercial services that were available in close proximity. Residents living in this ward would face a one mile walk up a steep hill to reach Scarborough town. The proposed alternative of a Dial A Ride service would not be to service the existing 1000 bus passengers each week. He went on to state that the Number 4 service represented good value and called for the County Council to think again and only cut the subsidy for town services where commercial services existed.

Sue Cowan (Pickering Town Mayor) spoke regarding the town service in Pickering. She said that the proposed Dial A Ride service would not be able to cater for the large number of people who currently used the service on a regular basis. Public meetings had been held to campaign against the withdrawal of the existing service and petitions had also been signed to urge the County Council to retain the town service. She went on to note that many concessionary pass holders who used the town service would be prepared to make a contribution.

Ruth Annison spoke. Her written statement below was circulated to the Committee and is shown below:

"I note that the officer's report to the Scrutiny Committee states that "the consultation identified that many people rely on bus services." (Section 12.8). This finding accords with an earlier report which states: "All policies that aim to improve local economies, tackle unemployment and ensure equal access to educational opportunities depend on buses."

I wish to draw the attention of councillors to some aspects of the proposed cuts in bus services in the seven districts (Craven, Hambleton, Harrogate, Richmondshire, Ryedale, Scarborough, Selby) and, in particular, to the following:

(a) The key question about NYCC's proposed timetables for all bus users is: "Will I be able to get there and back, with enough time at the destination to complete the purpose of my journey?" ALSO:

(b) Implications of the proposed cuts on the lives and livelihoods of residents (voters!) and visitors to the county; potential effects on employment and the local economy (including tourism); restricted access to work, shops, recreation, hospital, the transport network.

(c) Comments referred to in the officer's report to the Scrutiny Committee (8.4) but regrettably not explored further: "a number of comments [in the consultation] being relevant to the timing of our proposals relative to the Tour de France in July 2014."

My question relates to a proposal that cuts should be postponed until autumn 2014, to cover the busy tourist season, including the Yorkshire Grand Depart; take more account of responses and practical suggestions received from the public; to allow for informed assessment of the consequences of the proposed cuts; to offer a positive opportunity to review and improve the proposed timetables. (For example, why cut out the scheduled bus that reaches the doctors' surgery in Hawes before it closes? For elderly, less mobile people, this is a serious threat to independent living!)"

Ruth Annison said that for the last six months she had not been able to drive due to an injury. Elderly people depended on the bus service for essential items and social interaction. She noted that the report made a useful comment that people relied on bus services. This was something that everyone could agree on but the problem was in terms of the proposals as they currently stood. Tourism was indisputably part of the local economy but the report did not reflect the representations made to postpone the cuts until after next year's tourist season in particular until after the Tour de France Grand Depart Yorkshire. She said that the Committee should instruct officers

to go back to the drawing board to seek to design a better system of bus service provision and cost out the financial implications of delaying the cuts. More thought should also be given to combining school transport and public transport wherever possible. She also said that a reliance on minibuses in place of public buses was not the answer for elderly people as they were more difficult to alight and embark from and had restricted space inside.

Tony Pelton spoke regarding bus services in Richmondshire. He said that he had attended a number of bus passenger meetings in Richmondshire and had recommended to County Council officers that the Council should be looking for ways to increase passenger numbers. One way of doing this was to introduce more bus services with shorter gaps in the timetables. The proposal was to amalgamate the current 26, 27, 28 and 34 services operating in Richmondshire to provide a circular service for the area and for the provision of bus stop services outside of the new Richmondshire District Council Offices. This would increase passenger numbers and consequently the viability of the local bus services.

The Chairman read out a statement from County Councillor David Jeffels who was not able to be present at the meeting. The statement is shown below:

“I should be grateful if Members could give consideration to the following comments:

1. That holders of Concessionary Fare Tickets be encouraged to make voluntary contributions when using the subsidised bus services. Many have indicated that they would be prepared to do so to keep services, especially in the remote rural areas of the county, operating. While it is not possible to charge the Concessionary fare Ticket Holders because it would need a change in Government legislation to do so, there appears to be quite considerable support from the older generation to make contributions.

2. The whole issue of rural bus services be taken on board as a subject for a Task group Review bearing in mind that further cuts to the services could follow in future years which would have a detrimental effect on the older generation, leading to isolation, and to younger families and young people needing to access work opportunities. Such a review could explore alternative ways of running bus services especially in the remote rural areas where there must be a real threat in the future to no services being provided.”

The Chairman invited Richard Owens and the Portfolio Holder County Councillor Chris Metcalfe to respond to the questions and statements raised above.

In response to the points raised by Steve Siddons and Sue Cowan, Richard Owens responded by saying that the Council's strategy was to retain town services on a commercial basis. If there was not a commercial solution the fall-back position was to provide a Dial A Ride service to provide transport for the most vulnerable. People would need to register for the service. Dial A Ride services worked well in other areas of the county. With regards to seeking voluntary contributions from concessionary pass holders the Council had undertaken a pilot in Whitby. The pilot had shown that voluntary contributions would be very unlikely to provide a reliable income stream particularly as those people who were prepared to make a voluntary contribution were not prepared to contribute the equivalent amount that it would cost for the full fare.

In response to the points raised by Ruth Annison, Richard Owens said that reference to the comments raised about the timing of the Council's proposals relative to the Grand Depart Yorkshire had been made in paragraph 8.4 of the report. However the

issue had not been a major recurring theme in the consultation feedback. It would be possible to calculate the budgetary impact of delaying the proposed changes. The Council did try to co-ordinate public bus services with school bus services however it was reliant upon commercial providers.

The Chairman invited Members on the Transport, Economy & Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee to speak.

Members of the Committee made the following key comments:

- A Member added to the comments raised by Steve Siddons about the Number 4 Scarborough service, noting the large population of older people living in Weapონness and the lifeline that the bus service provided for many residents there to access essential services. For older people the area was not in reasonable walking distance of the town. Consequently 1000 passengers a week relied on the service. She acknowledged the requirement for the County Council to save money but mentioned that there was a need to have an integrated passenger transport system in Scarborough, with public transport providing a key element. She went on to offer to work with the County Council to produce a solution.
- Referring to section 4 of the report a Member asked for an update on the Ripon town bus service. Richard Owens replied that commercial provision had been confirmed but the Council was awaiting final details.
- A Member spoke about the concessionary fares scheme noting that although pass-holders were willing to pay the cost of their fare, the current legislation did not permit this to happen. The County Council should write to the government to ask for the legislation to be changed. County Councillor Chris Metcalfe said that the consultation had shown that pass-holders valued the retention of bus services more than the fact that they were free. He and Richard Owens had attended a meeting last week with Julian Smith MP to explain about this in great detail. The reality was however that none of the major political priorities so close to the next General Election would be prepared to champion a reduction in the discount for the concessionary fares scheme. Julian Smith MP had suggested that the County Council's Chief Executive and all MPs representing North Yorkshire should meet to discuss how together they could influence a future government to make changes to the concessionary fares scheme. Councillor Metcalfe said that he supported this proposal and had communicated this to the Chief Executive.
- Referring to paragraph 9.7 of the report, a Member commented that the Equalities Impact Assessment had shown that low income and rural isolation, in combination with other factors, could adversely affect those residents. Referring to section 8 of the report he also noted the economic impacts that reducing the bus subsidy across the county would have on employment. He asked what measures were being put in place to shore up those bus services that would no longer be receiving a subsidy. Richard Owens replied that the Council wanted to maintain bus services to as many people as possible and so very few areas would lose their services entirely under the proposals. Those services that were withdrawn would be due to performance i.e. very low passenger numbers. In all cases there would be fewer journey opportunities but communities would not be left un-served. The Member went on to suggest that there was a tipping point whereby reducing the frequency of services would create a vicious cycle whereby people would no longer use the bus. Richard Owens acknowledged that if he had been tasked with

putting forward a strategy to increase bus use-age then a different set of proposals would have been developed.

- A Member commented on the proposal to reduce the frequency of the Stokesley to Northallerton service and the knock-on effects that this would have upon people using connecting services, including to rail services. Richard Owens replied that when the proposals had been drawn up to reduce the frequency of the Stokesley to Northallerton service the train timetables had been taken into account. He noted that one of the priorities in the County Council's bus strategy was to retain those services that were used the most. Surveys had shown that the majority of people who used the bus service from Northallerton train station did so for short trips. The bus service from Stokesley to Northallerton in the early morning had low passenger numbers and was not well-used after 4pm.
- A Member said that there was a clear need to increase the age at which a person was eligible to apply to the concessionary fares scheme. She also went on to underline the importance of people in rural areas being able to continue to access essential services including health services. She highlighted Masham as an example with its distance from Northallerton and Harrogate hospitals. Richard Owens confirmed that eligibility for the concessionary fares scheme would be linked to the acceleration in the retirement age.
- A Member commented that subsidised services meant unprofitable services. Voluntary contributions were fine in principle but in reality would not provide a regular income flow. Conflict could also arise between those people who made a contribution and those that did not. A better solution to guarantee income would be to encourage people to purchase season tickets. Richard Owens replied that the Council had given thought to how a voluntary contributions scheme could work, having piloted this in Whitby. The Department for Transport had however been critical of the County Council for piloting this scheme. Cornwall County Council had tried to introduce a flat rate charge for concessionary travel but had subsequently not been allowed to do so by the government.

The Chairman invited Members not on the Committee to speak.

- Referring to paragraph 4.2 of the report, a Member said that she felt that the Malton Town Service should have included Norton in view of the bus depot being located there. She noted that the report stated that commercial provision had been confirmed about this service and further details were awaited. She went on to ask if these details had now been finalised. She also proposed that County Councillors and County Council employees should be asked to make a financial contribution to help fund bus services in the county. Richard Owens said that the Malton Town Service proposal was subject to the commercial operator confirming the pattern of journeys on commercial basis. There would be no subsidy provided for the service.
- Referring to paragraph 4.2 of the report, a Member noted that with reference to the Whitby Town service the County Council was currently reviewing what action it should take in view of the commercial services to Stainsacre and Castle Park due to being withdrawn since the consultation was issued. He said that services should be retained where they brought economic benefits in helping to secure employment; the Whitby Town service was one such example. Richard Owens said that he had no information at present as the

commercial provider was not duty bound to inform the County Council until eight weeks before the change was made.

- A Member queried what approach the County Council took towards subsidising those bus services that travelled outside of the county's boundaries. Richard Owens confirmed that the County Council was in regular dialogue with neighbouring authorities and shared the costs of the contract but only where it fitted with the County Council's criteria.
- A Member commented on the proposed reduced frequency of the 770 (Follifoot-Rudding Park Area) and the 412 (York to Wetherby) bus services from an hourly to a two hourly bus service. He called for both services to remain as currently timetabled. In respect of the 770 service he noted that the staff employed at Rudding Holiday Park relied heavily on the bus service and when at full capacity 1000 people used the Park. The bus service was used by holiday makers to travel in and out of Harrogate. Harrogate Rugby Club had also recently relocated nearby with between 300 and 400 people travelling there for matches. People living in the village of Follifoot village needed access to essential health services. With regards to the 412 service he made particular reference to the village of Bilton-in-Ainsty and noted that a public meeting had been held to campaign against the withdrawal of the existing service, which had been very well attended and a petition had been handed to Julian Sturdy MP and Nigel Adams MP. Older residents in the village without their own transport could be left with no means of access to essential services. Richard Owens said that he was hopeful that the commercial provider would retain an hourly service for Follifoot without public subsidy.
- Referring to the Equality Impact Assessment a Member queried how the County Council would be aiming to expand the provision and availability of volunteer car schemes in light of funding pressures faced by the voluntary sector. He also asked what analysis the County Council had undertaken on the ability of voluntary car schemes to mitigate the proposed reductions in the frequency and availability of bus services. Richard Owens said that he recognised that voluntary car schemes would become more important and was keen to continue working with the Clinical Commissioning Groups to maintain and develop existing joint approaches to such schemes with the health sector. He went on to note that the County Council had looked into ways to make car schemes more sustainable in the long term.
- A Member added to the comments raised by Sue Cowan about the Pickering town service. He said that Pickering clearly valued its bus service with the consultation response having shown that 23% of responses to town services related to the Pickering town service. He said that he accepted that the Council had to make savings due to the government's policies but he hoped that the Council could act as a facilitator to help communities retain their bus services. A person who lived one mile from the shops could be just as isolated as someone who lived 15 miles away. Consequently shops in Pickering would lose out to home delivery services from the large supermarkets if the bus service was lost. There was a need therefore to look at commercial sponsorship to contribute in part towards running the bus service, and for discussions to take place with Pickering Town Council to raise its precept to help support the bus service. He went on to add that he was not advocating the full subsidy to be paid to retain the Pickering town service but was sure that there was a way to negotiate through. Councillor Chris Metcalfe replied that it was in the interests of the commercial provider to have a dialogue with the County Council. He was confident that a solution could be

found for the Pickering town service. Longer term there was a need to engage with communities in-depth about how people were using bus services and how they met their needs. Exploring other funding opportunities would need to be part of this and different arrangements would need to be negotiated, envisaged and designed.

- Referring to paragraph 5.3 of the report a Member commented on the County Council's proposals to ensure safe walking routes to schools where it was intending to withdraw transport for fare paying children. She noted the recent increase in accidents and fatalities in the county involving children, and feared that this would increase further with more children walking to school. There were a number of fast roads in the county which were clearly not suitable to walk alongside.

The Chairman opened up the meeting for a full Committee discussion of the Members on the Transport, Economy & Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee and also invited the Committee to make and confirm its recommendations to be submitted to the Executive. He advised that the recommendations should be based upon the broad principles and themes highlighted in the public consultation and at today's meeting. He suggested that the more specific issues and queries raised at the meeting in relation to individual bus services should be looked at by Richard Owens.

Members of the Transport, Economy & Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee made the following key concluding comments:

- A Member commented that the latest financial settlement for local government announced yesterday had done the County Council no favours, although the Council did have positive plans to respond to this extremely challenging situation. The bus subsidy reduction proposals that had been put forward were realistic and the related consultation had been carried out in a professional manner. As long as the Council followed the principles set out in the consultation it would allow North Yorkshire to build services back up when times improved, particularly as in most cases services would not be withdrawn in their entirety.
- A task group should be set up along the lines suggested by County Councillor David Jeffels in his written statement. However the review should incorporate both rural and urban areas. County Councillor Chris Metcalfe said that he was supportive of Cllr Jeffels's suggestion for the Committee to work with the Integrated Passenger Transport Unit to carry out a task group review. However clarity was needed to establish whether the review would focus on the current round of proposals or the proposals to be developed in respect of the 2015/16 to 2018/19 budget savings. A review that went back to the 'drawing board' in terms of looking at what bus services the County Council provided and what people required to access services was a bigger piece of work than the current round of proposals would allow. He said that he saw the value of a longer term review as the County Council would no longer be able to fund all the services that people required; local ownership of solutions would be necessary. The Chairman noted that it would be unrealistic for the review to focus on the current set of proposals due to the timescales involved and suggested that the task and finish group should feed into the development of longer-term policy development.
- The County Council should lobby central government to make changes to the concessionary fares scheme.

- The Chairman noted the comments made during the consultation and at today's meeting about the need to retain the subsidy for Town services where there were no alternative services.
- Referring to Paragraph 4.1, a Member proposed that where the subsidy per passenger journey cost less than £6 it should be retained but where it cost more than £6 local communities should be encouraged to seek alternative forms of funding including from parish councils.
- The indicative savings required was £1.1m but the current savings proposals amounted to roughly £2m. There was plenty of scope therefore to look again at some of the proposals by taking into account the potential impact that the reduction or withdrawal of a bus service would have upon jobs in a given area and access to services for vulnerable people.

Resolved –

- a) That the County Council continues to engage with central government about concessionary fares issues, in particular the financial pressures the current scheme is placing upon upper tier local authorities and the fact that the county-wide consultation exercise has shown that a significant number of pass-holders would be prepared to make a voluntary financial contribution.
- b) That where local bus services are not provided commercially, alternative funding from commercial sponsorship and parish councils etc. be investigated.
- c) That the Transport, Economy & Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee conducts an in-depth review of local bus services in rural and urban areas of the county (post-implementation of the current proposals) to establish how local bus services could be put on a more sustainable footing, including investigating alternative ways of running bus services suited to local needs.
- d) That the Executive considers retaining the subsidy for Town services where there are no alternative services in the area, with a report to be presented back to the Transport, Economy & Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- e) That given that the indicative savings proposals exceed the required saving of £1.1m the Executive be requested to look again at the overall budget to see if it can further reduce the impact on local economies and, with reference to the Equalities Impact Assessment, minimise the adverse impacts on particular communities.

22. Post-16 Home to School College and Transport

Considered –

The report of the Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service, to consider responses to consultation on proposals to increase the charge for post-16

Home to School and College Transport; and to seek the views of the Committee for inclusion in the report to the meeting of the Executive on 7 January 2014.

The Chairman invited Andrew Terry, Assistant Director: Access and Inclusion (CYPS), to present his report.

Andrew Terry explained that the Medium Term Financial Strategy for CYPS included a target to achieve a £400k reduction in the subsidy to post-16 home to school and college transport. Executive Members had consequently approved consultation on proposals to achieve £200k of the target saving. The consultation exercise had run from 10 September to 6 December. He went on to refer to paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4 of the report outlining the numbers of students in post-16 education at school or college who currently received transport assistance from the County Council; the current annual charge of £360 and the proposal to increase the charge to £480 per annum. Included in the consultation were proposals for free transport for certain vulnerable groups and a reduced charge for those on a low income. The consultation had also mentioned that there could be a further increase in the annual charge in September 2015. The intention was to discuss with schools and colleges use of delegated 16-19 bursary funds and the remaining local authority subsidy to develop local post-16 transport arrangements and thus avoid the need for the further increase. Andrew Terry went on to refer to section 4 of the report and Appendices 4 to 6 detailing the consultation responses.

Members made the following key comments:

- Young people sometimes did not have any choice but to travel to access their chosen course. Nidderdale High School was given as an example of a secondary school that did not have a sixth form, which meant that post 16 students had to travel to Harrogate and beyond to access their chosen course. What account had been taken in the proposals of pupils who did not have a choice to travel? Andrew Terry confirmed that the Council provided transport to 16-19 students to access their nearest available course. Where there was not a Sixth Form available locally it was inevitable that there would be a cost to the student.
- With reference to paragraph 7.2 in Appendix 1, a Member asked what the number would be for those entitled to the proposed 50% remission of charge and what this would represent as a percentage of the total number of post-16 students receiving transport assistance from the County Council. Andrew Terry referred to Appendix 3 (Equalities Impact Assessment) noting that it was difficult to estimate the exact number of families per annum that would benefit from the proposal. However an approximate figure was 24. The Member said that there was a strong case for a 100% remission of charge in view of the small numbers involved and because the eligibility criteria would be the same as those used for the free school meals entitlement. A 100% remission of charge would help to ensure that those from low income households would still be able to fully engage in society. Andrew Terry replied that the 50% remission of charge would represent a reduction on current costs for low income families and some schools could provide additional support through their bursary funds. Portfolio Holder County Councillor Arthur Barker said that it was difficult to quantify the numbers involved but in putting forward the 50% remission of charge the County Council had tried to be as even-handed as possible.
- With reference to the mileage allowance (paragraph 7.3 of the report), a Member queried what would happen if families living in particularly rural areas where the transport infrastructure was limited did not have access to a car.

Andrew Terry confirmed that the mileage allowance did not relate solely to car travel and could be used by students and their parents as they saw fit.

The Chairman invited non Committee Members to speak and noted there were no members of public remaining at the meeting.

- The increase in the annual charge by a third was a lot for families to be able to budget for in light of other rising living costs. Did the County Council have a sense of how many young people would be discouraged from pursuing post 16 education because of the increase in the charge? Andrew Terry reiterated that the increase would only apply to new starters commencing a post 16 course from September 2014. It was not possible at this stage to measure the impact in terms of the take-up of courses. His gut feeling was that it might well have an impact and in the consultation 45% of respondents felt that it would. He went on to note though that many schools were providing transport at their own cost and there was scope for this to be extended. He noted that the Equality Impact Assessment mentioned that take-up rates would be monitored.
- A Member commented that the County Council had been put in a very difficult budgetary position by central government. Charging for transport to enable post-16 year old students to access education though was in effect a tax on education. The biggest problem that the economy faced was unemployment amongst young people. The employability of young people would not improve if they were discouraged from continuing in education because of transport costs. It was very important that the County Council worked with schools and colleges to ensure that there was not a further increase in the annual charge. He went on to acknowledge that the Council was not required to consult more widely on increases in the cost of post-16 home to school and college transport. However he said that he felt that as per the current consultation, the County Council should conduct a formal public consultation exercise on any further increase. This was in order to take into account the public's views when shaping policy.

The Chairman opened up the meeting for a full Committee discussion of the Members on the Transport, Economy & Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee and also invited the Committee to make and confirm its recommendations to be submitted to the Executive.

Motion

County Councillor Bryn Griffiths moved and County Councillor Andrew Goss seconded the following motion:

“That there should be a 100% remission of charge for the students whose families are on low income and students who are young parents on low income, as defined in Appendix 1, paragraph 7.2 of the report.”

A vote was taken by a show of hands. The Committee was divided with six for the motion and six against the motion. The Chairman exercised his casting vote and the motion was carried.

Resolved –

- a) That the report be noted.
- b) That there should be a 100% remission of charge for the students whose families are on low income and students who are young parents on low income, as defined in Appendix 1, paragraph 7.2 of the report.

The meeting concluded at 12.50pm
JS