

Thurrock - An ambitious and collaborative community which is proud of its heritage and excited by its diverse opportunities and future

Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The meeting will be held at **7.00 pm** on **11 September 2018**

Committee Room 1, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL

Membership:

Councillors Martin Kerin (Chair), Peter Smith (Vice-Chair), Alex Anderson, James Baker, Terry Piccolo and Jane Potheary

Substitutes:

Councillors Qaisar Abbas, Mike Fletcher, Graham Hamilton, Andrew Jefferies and Sue MacPherson

Agenda Open to Public and Press

	Page
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Declaration of Interests	
3. Minutes	5 - 10
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 4 July 2018.	
4. Items of Urgent Business	
To receive additional items that the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency, in accordance with Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
5. C2C Rail Presentation	
6. Integrated Medical Centres: Delivering High Quality Health Provision for Thurrock	11 - 22
7. Bus Shelter Procurement	23 – 28

- | | | |
|-----------|--|----------------|
| 8. | Procurement of Local Bus Services | 29 - 32 |
| 9. | Work Programme | 33 - 36 |

Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:

Please contact Kallum Davies, Democratic Services Officer by sending an email to

Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Agenda published on: **3 September 2018**

Information for members of the public and councillors

Access to Information and Meetings

Members of the public can attend all meetings of the council and its committees and have the right to see the agenda, which will be published no later than 5 working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published.

Recording of meetings

This meeting may be recorded for transmission and publication on the Council's website. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be recorded.

Members of the public not wishing any speech or address to be recorded for publication to the Internet should contact Democratic Services to discuss any concerns.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Guidelines on filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings

The council welcomes the filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings as a means of reporting on its proceedings because it helps to make the council more transparent and accountable to its local communities.

If you wish to film or photograph the proceedings of a meeting and have any special requirements or are intending to bring in large equipment please contact the Communications Team at CommunicationsTeam@thurrock.gov.uk before the meeting. The Chair of the meeting will then be consulted and their agreement sought to any specific request made.

Where members of the public use a laptop, tablet device, smart phone or similar devices to use social media, make recordings or take photographs these devices must be set to 'silent' mode to avoid interrupting proceedings of the council or committee.

The use of flash photography or additional lighting may be allowed provided it has been discussed prior to the meeting and agreement reached to ensure that it will not disrupt proceedings.

The Chair of the meeting may terminate or suspend filming, photography, recording and use of social media if any of these activities, in their opinion, are disrupting proceedings at the meeting.

Thurrock Council Wi-Fi

Wi-Fi is available throughout the Civic Offices. You can access Wi-Fi on your device by simply turning on the Wi-Fi on your laptop, Smartphone or tablet.

- You should connect to TBC-CIVIC
- Enter the password **Thurrock** to connect to/join the Wi-Fi network.
- A Terms & Conditions page should appear and you have to accept these before you can begin using Wi-Fi. Some devices require you to access your browser to bring up the Terms & Conditions page, which you must accept.

The ICT department can offer support for council owned devices only.

Evacuation Procedures

In the case of an emergency, you should evacuate the building using the nearest available exit and congregate at the assembly point at Kings Walk.

How to view this agenda on a tablet device



You can view the agenda on your [iPad](#), [Android Device](#) or [Blackberry Playbook](#) with the free modern.gov app.

Members of the Council should ensure that their device is sufficiently charged, although a limited number of charging points will be available in Members Services.

To view any “exempt” information that may be included on the agenda for this meeting, Councillors should:

- Access the modern.gov app
- Enter your username and password

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

Breaching those parts identified as a pecuniary interest is potentially a criminal offence

Helpful Reminders for Members

- *Is your register of interests up to date?*
- *In particular have you declared to the Monitoring Officer all disclosable pecuniary interests?*
- *Have you checked the register to ensure that they have been recorded correctly?*

When should you declare an interest *at a meeting*?

- **What matters are being discussed at the meeting?** (including Council, Cabinet, Committees, Subs, Joint Committees and Joint Subs); or
- If you are a Cabinet Member making decisions other than in Cabinet **what matter is before you for single member decision?**



Does the business to be transacted at the meeting

- relate to; or
- likely to affect

any of your registered interests and in particular any of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interests?

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests shall include your interests or those of:

- your spouse or civil partner's
- a person you are living with as husband/ wife
- a person you are living with as if you were civil partners

where you are aware that this other person has the interest.

A detailed description of a disclosable pecuniary interest is included in the Members Code of Conduct at Chapter 7 of the Constitution. **Please seek advice from the Monitoring Officer about disclosable pecuniary interests.**

What is a Non-Pecuniary interest? – this is an interest which is not pecuniary (as defined) but is nonetheless so significant that a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably regard to be so significant that it would materially impact upon your judgement of the public interest.

Pecuniary

If the interest is not already in the register you must (unless the interest has been agreed by the Monitoring Officer to be sensitive) disclose the existence and nature of the interest to the meeting

If the Interest is not entered in the register and is not the subject of a pending notification you must within 28 days notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest for inclusion in the register

Unless you have received dispensation upon previous application from the Monitoring Officer, you must:

- **Not participate or participate further in any discussion of the matter at a meeting;**
- **Not participate in any vote or further vote taken at the meeting; and**
- **leave the room while the item is being considered/voted upon**

If you are a Cabinet Member you may make arrangements for the matter to be dealt with by a third person but take no further steps

Non- pecuniary

Declare the nature and extent of your interest including enough detail to allow a member of the public to understand its nature



You may participate and vote in the usual way but you should seek advice on Predetermination and Bias from the Monitoring Officer.

Our Vision and Priorities for Thurrock

An ambitious and collaborative community which is proud of its heritage and excited by its diverse opportunities and future.

1. **People** – a borough where people of all ages are proud to work and play, live and stay
 - High quality, consistent and accessible public services which are right first time
 - Build on our partnerships with statutory, community, voluntary and faith groups to work together to improve health and wellbeing
 - Communities are empowered to make choices and be safer and stronger together

2. **Place** – a heritage-rich borough which is ambitious for its future
 - Roads, houses and public spaces that connect people and places
 - Clean environments that everyone has reason to take pride in
 - Fewer public buildings with better services

3. **Prosperity** – a borough which enables everyone to achieve their aspirations
 - Attractive opportunities for businesses and investors to enhance the local economy
 - Vocational and academic education, skills and job opportunities for all
 - Commercial, entrepreneurial and connected public services

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 4 July 2018 at 7.00 pm

Present: Councillors Martin Kerin (Chair), Peter Smith (Vice-Chair), Alex Anderson, Terry Piccolo and Jane Potheary

In attendance: Steve Cox, Corporate Director Place
Andrew Millard, Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection
Kirsty Paul, Principle Planning Officer
Kallum Davies, Democratic Services Officer

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting may be filmed and was being recorded, with the audio recording to be made available on the Council's website.

1. Items of Urgent Business

There were no Items of Urgent Business

2. Declaration of Interests

There were no Declarations of Interest

3. Development Plan Update

The Chair began the meeting by reading aloud the two recommendations of the report (1.1,1.2) to the committee before inviting Andrew Millard, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection, to present the report.

Andrew Millard introduced the report and explained that recommendation 1.2 referred to the proposed report to Cabinet which had been scheduled for the following week. The officer further explained the need to review and update the Local Plan was because the current plan was out of date in terms of timescales, but also because it needed to have references to the South Essex Joint Strategic Plan added.

The officer introduced a PowerPoint presentation which aimed to highlight key matters and facilitate debate. He further emphasised that this was not a consultation on the plan itself, but was a consultation on a step towards the creation of a Local Plan. This step set out a series of questions that sought responses which would be used to shape the Local Plan going forward. Lastly the officer explained that this stage of the plan was not about agreeing on specific locations or numbers of homes, rather it was agreeing an approach to, and the teasing out of views on options that were available. These views were to be used in the future when decisions were to be made.

The Chair invited Members to pose questions. Councillor Potheary asked if the choices referred to in the presentation were the choices that residents were asked to express a preference on and, in terms of the guide figure of 32,000 new homes, if any one of the options presented would realistically provide that number of properties. The Councillor further asked if that was not the case, did the consultation in its then form fail to manage the expectations of residents by inviting them to express a preference but ultimately it might be necessary to use all the options.

The officer stated that it was highly unlikely that any single option would meet the required provision, and that a blend would be required. The Officer clarified the presented options were to highlight the pro's and con's of each approach and further pointed out that some of the options would, by their nature, not be appropriate for some locations.

The officer added that the report referred to developments which the development industry had expressed interest in, in order to gain an understanding of how it envisions future growth in Thurrock. This was because one of the tests for a local plan was if the plan was deliverable. If calls for sites did not yield any interest within the industry for bringing sites forward, the plan was not deliverable. The spatial categories gave an understanding of what land owners and developers were looking to provide in the borough and opened the debate about each option.

Councillor Potheary sought clarity, asking if it would be a combination of the options regardless of the consultation. The Officer confirmed this was correct.

Councillor Potheary asked whether the approach would leave the Council at the mercy of developers who may be serving their own business interests. The Councillor asked if the Council should be more proactive in undertaking developments itself.

Steve Cox, Corporate Director for Place, responded saying it was essential to ensure deliverability of plans and that this would not have been the case if developers were not interested. The Officer stated that if sites were brought forward it allowed the Council to challenge developers and landowners to deliver schemes that were wanted in Thurrock.

Councillor Potheary asked if relying on a broken market was the most sensible approach. Steve Cox responded stating that the majority of houses that would be built in the borough would be built by the market and that it was a question of how the Council made sure they were getting the type of development that they wanted.

The Officer expanded stating that the consultation would arm the Council with the evidence to demonstrate what people in the borough wanted.

Councillor Potheary stated that the quoted figure of 32,000 included people who had been living with their parents in Thurrock.

The Councillor did not believe that allowing developers to build houses and sell them for maximum profit would allow those people to move out of their parent's house. The Councillor expressed a concern that this was not solving Thurrock housing crisis, rather it was solving London's housing crisis.

Andrew Millard stated the difficulty in the market was down to a lack of choice, because all the significant spaces had already been developed. The Officer explained that this consultation allowed the Council to shape at a very early stage what would be developed going forward.

The Chair interjected and invited Councillor Smith to pose a question. Councillor Smith asked Andrew Millard if there had been any evidence of Land Banking in Thurrock, specifically in any areas where the borough had an ambition to develop and which might be holding the Council back.

Andrew Millard stated there may have been patches of it but he was not aware of any major issue with Land Banking in Thurrock. The Officer stated that in previous years when the market had been weaker, developers would sit on consents, however this had diminished massively. Kirsty Paul, Principal Planner added that their monitoring had revealed that starts and completions of approved planning applications had both increased in recent years, and very few developments had been considered to be stalled which suggested there was not an issue with Land Banking.

Councillor Piccolo stated that the figure of 32,000 had already been eroded and that by his calculation the number would be roughly below 30,000 because of the houses that had already been built since the number was issued, and would continue to be eroded by developments that had been taking place. Andrew Millard confirmed this interpretation to be correct.

Councillor Smith raised a concern about the significant workload on Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee which was only set to increase. Steve Cox commented that this was a valid concern and that Members are invited to help in shaping the Work Programme for the Committee.

Councillor Potheary questioned who the report had been written for as it had been quite long and included planning jargon and asked for reassurance that there would be a more user friendly approach for residents.

Andrew Millard stated that this had been a high level strategy document and whilst there were statutory requirements for what must be included, and that the consultations themselves would be varied and tailored to the community.

Councillor Smith commented that he had attended two of the roadshows for "Your Place, Your Voice" and stated that they had been brilliant. Councillor Smith further asked that Cabinet consider redoubling their efforts with regard to public engagement in this regard, and go further to become the national leader in this approach.

Councillor Piccolo stated that in his role working for Thurrock CVS he received a call asking if CVS office would be willing to have a set of documentation for the consultation and some hard copy response forms. The Councillor added that the caller had openly invited suggestions from CVS on any other ways that the Council could reach residents and that he had been pleased to witness this proactive outreach which evidenced the Council's efforts.

Councillor Anderson asked if failings by our neighbouring local authorities in their Local Plan could affect the development of Thurrock, and if so how. Andrew Millard responded stating that there was a government requirement to create a Statement of Common Ground with neighbouring authorities and pointed out that such authorities were able to approach Thurrock through the consultation process. The Officer added that no local authorities had requested we take any of their housing numbers, but in the event that they did, Thurrock would be duty bound to consider this.

The Chair thanked Officers for the report and asked that the Committee have sight of more details around affordable homes for Thurrock as he felt affordability to people moving to the borough from London was significantly higher than it was to current residents. The Chair further stated that he could not find any specific commitment in the report to providing housing to alleviate the 9,000 person waiting list for Council properties. Councillor Smith stated that at Full Council there had been a motion for Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider investigating if 8,000 new homes could be built in Thurrock for this purpose. Councillor Smith further requested this be added to the Work Programme.

The Chair, referring to Councillor Anderson's question, asked how was the Council assuring that Thurrock was leading in the process and not "being done to" by the partnership.

Andrew Millard, referring to the previous affordable housing question, stated that the definition of "Affordable Housing" for the purposes of the report meant social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing that was provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. The Officer stated that Joint Strategic Plan had representatives from all neighbouring local authorities and that he was Chair of the board, adding that the approach that had been taken was of collaboration to ensure no borough had been "done to".

The Chair stated that he felt there had been a need for a task force to work solely on the Local Plan and invited other members to comment on his idea.

Councillor Piccolo stated he supported the idea of a task force but that it should look at individual components of the plan rather than as a whole and further requested that the committee see the responses so far from the consultations in September.

Councillor Smith stated he also supported both the idea of a task force, highlighting the success of the Lower Thames Task Force, and Councillor Piccolo's proposed approach. Councillor Smith added that the Terms of Reference for any such task force "must have teeth". Councillor Pothecary supported the suggestion of a task force and stated that this had been the time for members to become more involved. Councillor Anderson supported the proposition and agreed with Councillor Piccolo's suggested approach.

The Chair and Councillor Smith asked Officers to advise on and draft a Terms of Reference for a suitable body, to be approved at the Committee's next meeting. Councillor Piccolo requested that the proposal be provided as soon as possible before the meeting in order for discussions to take place with group leaders.

RESOLVED:

- 1.1 The Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee commented on the Issues and Options document and the Local Plan Engagement Strategy.**
- 1.2 The Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee commented on the South Essex Statement of Common Ground, Revised Local Development Scheme and Draft Statement of Community Involvement.**
- 1.3 The Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee further resolved that a suitable body be established to review in detail all aspects of the Local Development Plan.**

Work Programme

The Chair raised that Full Council had, in Motion 4 of its 27 June 2018 meeting, moved that the Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider adding to its Work Programme;

"research into the feasibility of building 8,000 council, housing association and low-cost homes within the next five years without such buildings threatening the character of any existing settlements within the borough and to seek to explore the extent to which Thurrock Regeneration Limited could input into such a target."

Members of the Committee agreed this Motion be added to the Work Programme.

The Chair requested that an update be provided on the Grays Underpass Development as this was a matter that affected his Ward. The Vice-Chair seconded this request.

Councillor Potheary stated that the Committee needed to receive an update on schemes that had been in progress, specifically Grays Town Centre Traffic Flow and the Stanford Transport Hub.

The Vice Chair requested that Purfleet Regeneration Company attend before Christmas to do a presentation and give the Committee a workflow as to current progress and when key milestones would be met.

Councillor Potheary asked that C2C and Network Rail be called to attend, for questioning about their contingency planning and communication in relation to delays and service issues within the last few months.

The Chair thanked the Members for their engagement, the officers for their hard work and the members of the public for their attendance.

The meeting finished at 8.16pm

Approved as a true and correct record

CHAIR

DATE

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk**

11 September 2018	ITEM: 6
Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee	
Integrated Medical Centres: Delivering High Quality Health Provision for Thurrock	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Key
Report of: Roger Harris – Corporate Director Adults, Housing and Health / Steve Cox Corporate Director Place	
Accountable Assistant Director: Detlev Munster, Assistant Director Property, Regeneration and Development / Les Billingham Assistant Director Adult Social Care and Communities	
Accountable Director: Steve Cox, Corporate Director, Place. Roger Harris, Corporate Director Adults, Housing and Health	
This report is Public	

Executive Summary

It is well evidenced that some areas of Thurrock have poor access to quality health care provision. The Council and partners in the health sector have been working together to develop a new model of care that will see services delivered via an integrated model and delivered from modern, high quality premises able to attract the best staff. Four brand new Integrated Medical Centres (IMCs) are proposed with the intention of locating services in the heart of the communities that they serve and bringing more health care services under one roof to improve and simplify pathways for patients.

The decision taken by the July meeting of the Joint Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) Committee to close Orsett Hospital and re-locate services into the community further supports the need to develop IMCs in a timely manner. This report updates Members on progress of all four IMCs and gives particular detail on the delivery of the Tilbury and Chadwell IMC which the Council is leading on.

1. Recommendation(s)

The Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee are asked to:

- 1.1. Comment on the current development with the delivery of the 4 Integrated Medical Centres across Thurrock.**

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1. Members will be aware that the quality of health provision in several areas of the Borough falls below the standards that the Council and NHS partners would like to see delivered. The Council, with its NHS partners, have an exciting opportunity to address this and improve the health and well-being of the population of Thurrock by moving from outdated facilities and fragmented services, improving the capacity and capability of primary, community and mental health care and delivering an integrated health, social care and community/third sector care model with Thurrock's residents at its heart.
- 2.2. To this end the Council has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (May 2017) with Basildon and Thurrock Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (BTUH), Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust (EPUT), North East London NHS Foundation Trust (NELFT), and Thurrock Clinical Commissioning Group (the CCG) for the creation of four new Integrated Medical Centres (IMCs) in Thurrock.
- 2.3. The IMCs will serve local populations and will be located in:
 - Tilbury - to primarily serve Tilbury and Chadwell;
 - Corringham – to primarily serve Stanford and Corringham;
 - Grays – to primarily serve Grays but also to act as a Central Hub for the whole of Thurrock; and
 - Purfleet – to primarily serve Purfleet, Aveley and South Ockendon.
- 2.4. The Council has been working with the CCG and service providers to develop the concept of Integrated Medical Centres (IMCs) which will provide an integrated model of care, in high quality premises located in the communities that they serve. The IMCs, will be crucial to the introduction of the New Model of Care as presented by the Director of Public Health, including the new Primary Care offer, Well-Being Teams and Technology Enabled Care.
- 2.5. In July 2018, following the public consultation, the Joint Committee of the 5 Clinical Commissioning Groups in mid and south Essex gave approval to implement proposals for moving services currently provided at Orsett Hospital, including out-patients, tests and scans, to the four new IMCs in Thurrock. The work to develop the IMC concept undertaken to date is capable of being adapted to ensure that capacity is available to support this additional requirement at the four IMCs already proposed. It is however clear that the successful delivery of the IMCs is now even more critical.
- 2.6. The IMC programme is being developed through a Collaborative Programme Board meeting monthly and attended by the NHS colleagues, service providers and Council representatives including the Corporate Director Adults, Housing and Health, Regeneration and Legal and Finance as required.
- 2.7. In July 2017 Cabinet gave approval for the Council to lead on the delivery of the Tilbury and Chadwell IMC, to procure a design team and to receive a

future report on the Purfleet IMC. This report provides an update on the Tilbury and Chadwell IMC and requests approvals that will enable the project to continue to progress. It also highlights the current status of the three other IMCs.

- 2.8. Further discussions have been taking place with health partners over the future provision of community mental health services to improve their accessibility. The recent Mental Health Peer Review was clear that, where possible, mental health provision should be integrated into the proposed IMCs and officers are now planning to see how this can be implemented.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

3.1 IMC Decision Making Timeline:

Due to the number of partners included in the IMC programme there is a number of decision making gateways to be navigated. The CCG Joint Committee at its meeting on 6 July agreed a range of proposals in relation to acute hospital re-configuration including the closure of Orsett Hospital. The table below shows the proposed timetable for decision making and when the IMCs can then progress to construction.

Gateway	Reason	Date
CCG Joint Committee	Approved closure of Orsett hospital but only when IMCs are open and no clinical services will move outside of Thurrock that currently service Thurrock residents.	6 th July 2018
Thurrock Council Cabinet	To approve the ongoing role of the Council in delivering the Tilbury and Chadwell IMC	Sept 2018
Outline Business Case to BTUH Boards	To secure approval for the location of services, BTUH's role and financial business plan	Oct 2018
OBC to CCG	To secure approval for location of services commissioned by the CCG and the role of the CCG in ongoing risk share	Oct 2018
Primary Care OBC to NHS England Capital Investment Oversight Group	To secure NHS approval of the change to service provision required to locate primary care services in the IMCs	Oct 2018
FBC to all above Boards/Groups	To secure final approval for the location of services and any cost implications associated with the change	Spring 2019

OBC = Outline Business Case
FBC = Full Business Case

Delivery of the IMC Programme

3.2 Introduction and proposed People's Panel

There has been extensive planning and consultation over the delivery and the content of the proposed Integrated Medical Centres and we are now very much in delivery mode and the individual descriptions below reflect that. A People's Panel is being established to oversee the detailed delivery programme and this is being established with the help of Thurrock Healthwatch. This will also look at what services are best delivered from which IMC.

Tilbury and Chadwell IMC

3.3 The aspiration to deliver four IMCs in 2020/21 remains challenging, however, since the Council took the decision to lead on the delivery of the Tilbury and Chadwell IMC on the site of the Community Resource Centre in Tilbury (site plan attached at Appendix 1) work has progressed significantly.

3.4 The Council, CCG and service providers have worked collaboratively to develop a schedule of accommodation that can be provided at Tilbury and Chadwell IMC. This accommodation schedule fully subscribes to the integrated vision and includes provision for:

- 3.4.1 Multi-functional consult exam rooms;
- 3.4.2 therapy rooms;
- 3.4.3 treatment rooms;
- 3.4.4 interview rooms;
- 3.4.5 group rooms;
- 3.4.6 phlebotomy bay;
- 3.4.7 mobile imaging docking bay;
- 3.4.8 shared workspace;
- 3.4.9 library;
- 3.4.10 community hub; and
- 3.4.11 public access meeting rooms.

3.5 The suite of flexible clinical rooms enables multiple services to make use of the space meaning patients can access multiple services in a single Centre. The community elements such as the library and community hub have a key role to play in addressing the wider determinants of health. This is supported by shared workspace which will allow staff from council departments and other services to be based at the centre on a flexible basis bringing the delivery of public services into the community and creating better opportunities for joined up working across professions.

3.6 Following a competitive tender process Pick Everard were appointed as designers in October 2017. Design work has reached RIBA Stage 2 with the designers having produced an outline design and cost plan. More detailed design work has recently commenced with a view to developing and consulting on a full planning application in autumn of this year.

- 3.7 A CABE design workshop to review the outline plans was held in May 2018. The report from this session has provided some useful feedback, in particular how the ethos of the building can be translated into the external space around it to continue the theme of healthy living. The panel recognised the clear potential for the building to have a positive impact on the urban fabric of Tilbury and the vitality of the Town Centre with the report suggesting that the scheme had the potential to be award winning and encouraging the Council and design team to set high aspirations to create a lasting benefit to the area.
- 3.8 Whilst the design team is currently directly appointed by the Council it is envisaged that the contract for the capital development will be procured on a design and build basis and the design team will ultimately be novated to the contractor. This will keep consistency within the professional team whilst providing price certainty on the capital works and ensuring that risk is transferred to the contractor wherever possible.
- 3.9 The design and build contract will be procured via the NHS Procure22 framework and let on a phased basis with contractors initially being asked to do a discrete package of work to develop cost certainty (culminating in a guaranteed maximum price for the scheme). This information is a prerequisite to the Outline Business Case for the NHS. Phasing the contractor commission ensures that this information can be provided in a timely manner whilst limiting the financial exposure to the Council should the required approval not ultimately be secured.
- 3.10 Alongside the design work a number of surveys have taken place on site to assess the ground conditions, ecology, acoustics etc and inform the development of the initial cost plan. Early survey work has established the particular ground conditions on the site and allowed early pricing of abnormalities which are a key risk to development in Tilbury.
- 3.11 The next stage of work will further refine the design of the IMC and cost plan and prepare the planning application.
- 3.12 The previous Cabinet report highlighted the intention for the Council to use prudential borrowing to fund the capital cost of the Tilbury IMC and to secure the borrowing against the income stream generated from the building's lease to a third party. The Council is committed to supporting the IMCs and the principles of the borrowing would therefore be set to provide the maximum level of affordability for the Centre. It is proposed that no interest would be levied against the capital amount beyond that which the Council itself would be charged to access the borrowing and that the borrowing would be repaid over a period of 30 years. The IMC is not intended to provide a financial return to the Council but that lease and rental income should cover the borrowing costs.
- 3.13 The new model of service provision intended to be delivered from the IMCs is focussed on integration of services across provider boundaries. With the

exception of the primary care area (which has a distinct funding mechanism), providers will not have dedicated rooms that may stand empty outside of set clinic hours, rather rooms will be multifunctional and therefore interchangeable across services. Maximising the use of the space and limiting void time will support the affordability of the Centre for providers and reinforce the integration of services but it will also require a move away from a typical head lease/sub lease arrangement as services taking the sub leases will not have defined square metre areas on which to base sub lease valuations. Whilst the Council in its role as landlord will have the protection of a standard head lease the Council will also be an occupier of the centre and so has an interest in how the sub lease arrangements will also work.

- 3.14 Providers are currently working together to establish a set of finance principles which seek to share the risk and rewards created as a result of actual occupancy levels when the IMCs are operational and reflecting this principle of shared space. The shared approach to risk incentivises all partners to maintain utilisation of the Centres and provides reassurance to the Council (as landlord and the organisation contributing the full capital funding to the Tilbury and Chadwell IMC) that the risk of non-repayment of the borrowing is mitigated as far as possible.
- 3.15 These broad principles are accepted by all partners in the emerging Thurrock Integrated Care Alliance (TICA). TICA is the overall umbrella group established by all NHS partners and the Council locally to take forward our integrated health and care agenda. An agreement to define these principles is currently being drafted and once agreed in final form will be the basis of the financial structure across all four IMC's.
- 3.16 Basildon and Thurrock University Hospital (BTUH) have stated that they would like to become the head leaseholder for his facility. Now that the cost plan has been produced and a proposed head leaseholder has been identified the Council and BTUH can assess affordability and start to develop Heads of Terms on an Agreement to Lease. An Agreement to Lease will be required before the main building contract is awarded to minimise the financial risk to the Council.
- 3.17 As highlighted in the previous report to Cabinet and supported by the CABA design review there is a clear regeneration benefit to bringing increased footfall to the centre of Tilbury, revitalising the Civic Square and acting as a benchmark for design quality. To this end the brief to the design team has been to ensure the building works in terms of the functionality of the centre but also makes a positive contribution to the urban fabric of the area. This high quality design ambition will come at a cost premium which is over and above what service providers need to operate a functional centre. The current cost plan includes this premium but it is noted that pursuing this strategy of quality design could make the IMC unaffordable to providers taking on the head or sub leases if the requirement is for the rental stream to pay off the full capital cost.

The Council will be asked to consider making a financial investment into the scheme (rather than looking to value engineer the building or extend the loan term) to ensure that the regeneration objectives are delivered as well as the health objectives. The level of this potential investment will be determined via the detailed discussions with BTUH in their role as proposed head leaseholder and will be confirmed before the main building contract is awarded.

Stanford and Corringham IMC

- 3.18 The delivery of the Stanford and Corringham IMC, on the site of 105 The Sorrells, Stanford Le Hope, is being led and funded by NELFT. Planning consent for the IMC was secured in 2016 and amended in 2018 to extend the proposed opening hours.
- 3.19 A decision on the Business Case for the development is expected to be taken by the NELFT Board in autumn 2018. With an estimated build period of 15 months, it is anticipated that the IMC could be operational from late 2020.

Purfleet and South Ockendon IMC

- 3.20 It is intended that the Purfleet and South Ockendon IMC will be delivered as part of the wider Purfleet Centre regeneration scheme. An outline planning application which includes medical facilities was submitted in December 2017 and is expected to go to planning committee in the autumn of this year. The Purfleet IMC is part of the wider Phase 1 development proposal submitted by PCRL and reflects how key this is to the whole project.
- 3.21 Purfleet Centre Regeneration Ltd (PCRL), the appointed developer for the scheme is committed to assisting with the delivery of the IMC as part of the development. The schedule of accommodation is being finalised with partners and detailed design work will then commence (commissioned by PCRL). The funding strategy for this IMC is still to be finalised. Delivery of this IMC is expected to be in 2021.

Grays IMC

- 3.22 Thurrock Community Hospital has been designated as the new IMC for Grays and is the only IMC which will be predominantly a refurbishment of an existing healthcare facility rather than a new-build development. The site is owned by EPUT which leases part of the site to NELFT and third sector providers. The site has 19 separate buildings with over half of the buildings vacant or underutilised which means the estate is inefficient in use and offers an opportunity to reconfigure and redesign to improve delivery.
- 3.23 The Council is committed to support EPUT with some Master Planning for the site, and has recently agreed a specification with EPUT and partners for this Master Planning exercise. Quotes are being obtained from suitable agencies to undertake this work. As the only site already built, Thurrock Community Hospital offers the opportunity to renovate and redesign facilities to

accommodate services, with the potential to bring services on line in a shorter time frame.

- 3.24 The CCG is also in consultation with relevant primary care providers to try and ensure that there is a significant primary care service on site because until recently it was going to be the only IMC without GP services at its core. These discussions are ongoing but health colleagues are confident of a positive outcome.

Integrated Medical Centres (Phase 2)

- 3.25 The Council is currently procuring the Design Team for the 21st Century Residential Facility on the White Acre/Dilkes Wood site on Daiglen Drive in South Ockendon. This is not an IMC but is a related project which will improve the health provision in Thurrock.
- 3.26 As reported to Cabinet in December 2017, the South Ockendon Health Centre on an adjacent site on Darenth Lane is currently occupied by a single handed GP Practice, a branch surgery of an Aveley Practice, and a range of other clinical services including Health Visitors and Dentists. Health partners have confirmed the building is no longer fit for purpose, and they see potential benefits in redeveloping the site to create a new health centre which could bring together other surgeries from the local area, and to equip it with a fuller range of primary care facilities. A further report, with detailed funding and development proposals for the construction of the new Residential Facility, together with the initial proposals for a new health centre, will be brought to Cabinet for approval in December 2018.
- 3.27 Officers and the Chair of the HWB Board have been in discussions with officers from BTUH and the CCG to agree the next stages of this programme and ensure that we see this as a long term development leading to stronger primary and community services and more services moving out of an acute hospital setting where appropriate. Collins House will continue to be part of this – we already have step down beds and interim beds at Collins House to support hospital discharge and we see Collins House and the new residential development at Whiteacres as being key alternatives to unnecessary stays in a hospital bed.
- 3.28 As stated above we are reviewing current mental health services with our main provider EPUT and CCG commissioners. We are very keen that mental health services are also part of the IMC programme and this will be assessed as part of the ongoing discussions about the exact content and core delivery from each IMC.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 Delivery of the IMC programme is essential to securing high quality health outcomes for Thurrock residents.

The Council has agreed to take the lead on the delivery of the Tilbury and Chadwell IMC and has already committed funding to the initial design phase. Further approvals are now required to allow this project to progress to the next stage.

- 4.2 The tender for the capital works will be in excess of the £750,000 threshold that can be approved by Directors and therefore requires a Cabinet decision. This tender is expected to be issued later this year.
- 4.3 Approval to delegate the award of the construction contract is requested to ensure that the delivery programme of the IMC is maintained and new premises delivered as soon as possible.

5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

- 5.1 This report will be presented to Planning Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 11 September and Health Overview and Scrutiny on the 6 September and a verbal update on comments will be provided to Cabinet at the meeting.
- 5.2 The Tilbury IMC has undergone a pre-application consultation with the Local Planning Authority and a CABE design workshop.
- 5.3 Further public consultation on the specifics of the IMCs will be undertaken as part of the planning process. For Tilbury and Chadwell IMC this is programmed for autumn 2018.
- 5.4 It is understood that Health Watch will be organising a People's Panel to gain public input into the development of all four IMCs.

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 6.1 The IMC programme supports all three subsections of the 'People' element of the Council's corporate vision and priorities.
- 6.2 The programme also supports the four principles stated in the Thurrock Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2016-2021 and has a specific reference under 'Goal 4 Quality care, centred around the person' of the same strategy.
- 6.3 The Council is committed to an MoU with partners to secure the delivery of four IMCs in Thurrock. The approvals recommended in this report will assist the Council in meeting its obligations under this MoU.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Sean Clark**

Director of Finance and IT

There are clear financial implications to the content of this report with the intention to use prudential borrowing to fund the capital cost of the Tilbury and Chadwell IMC. Income from leases and rentals should cover the council's cost of capital making the scheme cost neutral. The risk sharing approach to the operation of the centre reduces the risk to the Council and the necessary due diligence would be undertaken on the financial standing of the proposed head leaseholder prior to entering into the lease. Should the leaseholder default on the loan repayments the Council would retain the freehold of the asset which could be used for another purpose.

It is noted that an element of financial support may be required to ensure that a high quality building is developed. Should this be required provision will need to be made in the Capital Programme.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Benita Edwards**
Interim Deputy Head of Law

It is proposed that the contractor be procured using the NHS Procure 22 framework. That procedure shall ensure that the tender process is carried out in a fair and transparent way and that it complies with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 as well as with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules. Accordingly, in approving this report, the Council shall be acting lawfully.

The report notes that an agreement to lease and head lease will be required to deliver the Tilbury and Chadwell IMC. A report or reports seeking approval for entry into an agreement for lease and authority to grant one or more leases shall be tabled in due course. The Council's internal legal and assets teams will provide support on ensuring that the required agreements adequately protect the Council's position.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Natalie Warren**
Community and Equalities Manager

The IMC programme is crucial in addressing the health inequalities currently experienced in some areas of the Borough. All buildings developed as part of the programme will need to comply with equalities legislation and pay attention to the particular needs of the visitors to the centre a high proportion of whom are likely to be vulnerable.

7.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

The development of the Tilbury IMC will allow staff from several Council departments to work in the community that they serve improving public access to vital services.

There is a clear health benefit to pursuing this programme of work.

8. Background papers used in preparing the report (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

- Cabinet Report: 12 July 2017, Integrated Medical Centre Delivery Plan - Phase 1.
<https://democracy.thurrock.gov.uk/documents/s12467/Integrated%20Medical%20Centre%20Delivery%20Plan%20Phase%201%20Decision%201104436.pdf>

9. Appendices to the report

Appendix 1 - Tilbury IMC Site Plan

Report Author:

Rebecca Ellsmore
Programmes and Projects Manager
Place

This page is intentionally left blank

SITE PLAN

With the preferred option agreed amongst the Client Team, the east half of the Civic Square was chosen to be our proposed site. This will result in the existing health and fitness centre being demolished to allow the new IMC to be constructed within a single phase.

The majority of the massing on the east side of the site is 2 storey with 2 single storey. Out-building and a 3-4 storey framed tower formally used for fire and rescue exercises.



This page is intentionally left blank

11 September 2018	ITEM: 7
Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny	
Bus Shelter Procurement	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Key
Report of: Andrew Austin, Commercial Services Manager	
Accountable Assistant Director: Julie Nelder, Assistant Director Highways, Fleet and Logistics	
Accountable Director: Julie Rogers, Director of Environment & Highways	
This report is public	

Executive Summary

The Councils current agreement for Bus Shelters is reaching end of life. The existing contract was originally for a term of 15 years, with the option to extend for up to 5 years; of which 2+2 years of extension have been agreed bringing the contract expiration to the 30th June 2019.

As such, the council needs to undertake a procurement exercise to source a new provider of Bus Shelter units including maintenance and cleaning; as the majority of the existing Bus Shelter units are owned by the current provider and in principal would be removed post contract expiration.

Funding for this procurement has already been agreed under the capital budgets approved at February Council 2018.

1 Recommendation(s)

- 1.1 The Planning, Transport and Regeneration - Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes the procurement of a new Bus Shelter contract**
- 1.2 That Planning, Transport and Regeneration - Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes delegated authority to award contract will be sought from Cabinet.**

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 The current agreement for Bus Shelters and associated advertising is reaching end of life. This contract was originally signed for a 15 year term. With the option for up to 5 years extension, of which 2 years plus 2 years have been agreed bringing the contract expiration to 30th June 2019.
- 2.2 Under this agreement the existing provider owns 147 of the 170 shelters, and performs all cleaning and maintenance works on all 170 shelters; in return they also manage all advertising and retain all income from advertising.
- 2.3 Soft-market testing with main industry players and bus shelter manufacturers' in 2017 highlighted a lack of industry appetite for providing capital funding as part of a commercial agreement. Therefore, capital funding was applied for and agreed by Full Council February 2018 for replacement of the existing Bus Shelters.
- 2.4 As such, in working with Communications and Passenger Transport services, the approach taken has been to split this into 2 procurement streams:
 - Bus Shelters including maintenance and cleaning
 - Advertising
- 2.5 It should be noted that the Passenger Transport Team has no revenue funding for the maintenance of bus shelters; and that income from advertising would be used to fund this activity.
- 2.6 Of these shelters, 50 have operational Real Time Information (RTI) displays for bus arrivals, of which 9 are the newer TFT display type and 41 are the traditional 3 line dot-matrix style. These are normally on locations which also support advertising; with these shelters being owned by the existing provider.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

3.1 Option 1 – Purchase existing shelters

- 3.1.1. Under the existing agreement, the Council could seek to acquire the existing shelter assets from the existing provider; but that in principal the incumbent could remove them for use on other contracts or for spare parts.
- 3.1.2 Under the existing agreement, the incumbent would be responsible for all removal costs and making good the areas when they remove their shelters. It should be noted that the current contract requires the incumbent to agree a removal plan with the Council upon contract termination over a period up to 24 months.
- 3.1.3 The acquisition option was discussed with the incumbent in Q1/17 who indicated an asset valuation of circa £3k per location to transfer the existing assets to council ownership. This does not correctly reflect the assets ages, conditions, depreciated values or costs for incumbent to remove and make

good the locations. This would mean that the council would require circa £440k just retaining the existing legacy assets.

- 3.1.4 Purchasing existing shelters would still require the council to procure a new maintenance and cleaning agreement. And whilst having the maintenance and cleaning done by environment services may be feasible, it would not be recommended due to the specialist knowledge and access to parts required.
- 3.1.5 Further, a marketing contract will still need to be procured, as marketing income would be required to cover the costs of maintenance, cleaning and repairs. However, due to the fact that the incumbent is not required to share any commercial information on income levels they are achieving; this point will only be able to be ascertained in full once Communications have decided how they want the marketing activities run in the future.

3.2 Option 2- Purchase new shelters.

- 3.2.1 New bus shelters would be procured, which would allow the council to purchase modern high grade units, with long warranties periods (ideally 10 years) and life expectancy periods (25 year lifecycle). This would shift as much cost as possible into capital funding, and minimise revenue budget impacts.
- 3.2.2 Replacement units would also be able to take advantage of new technologies to improve the environmental impact they have for lighting, and light pollution. Through the use of modern LED lighting units, which can be motion triggered; along with the use of solar power units which could remove the need for utility connections and reduce operational revenue budget running costs.
- 3.2.3 Replacing existing units initially on a like-for-like basis would also allow the Council to profile the number of units, type and locations they are deployed at; to better meet the needs of the community.
- 3.2.4 Replacing the existing units would also allow marketing income opportunities to be reassessed; and units deployed with correct number of marketing panels to improve income streams, including consideration for more advanced electronic media formats.
- 3.2.5 This would also allow the legacy Real Time Information (RTI) panels to be assessed and consideration for upgrading these to LCD units, which would allow marketing messages and local council messages to be displayed along with bus information. The current RTI provider is also working with the council to develop a marketing indicative income model, but initial indications point to the income potential meeting the cost of ongoing servicing and maintenance.
- 3.2.6 It is important to update these bus shelter units to a modern solution which will also support and integrate with emerging technologies; and can be upgraded to support items such as atmospheric measuring, CCTV, motion tracking, contactless device charging, solar lighting, solar energy production, digital advertising displays and interactive information panels.

3.2.7 Based on the above requirement the outline costs for the assets are:

- Bus Shelter acquisition, including the survey, preparation, installation (including utilities), commission and handover - £5k per bus shelter (maximum) for 170 locations
- Support for up to 10 additional locations to meet future expansion needs of the council
- Real Time Information Displays, relocation of existing units from existing shelters and installation into new units - £3,000 per RTI Display (estimated) for 50 locations
- Risk Contingency – as the Council does not have any true financial baseline for running this business area, a high risk margin of 20% is recommended for the capital project.

3.2.8 Total Budget Requirement

Budget for the procurement of assets has already been approved by cabinet in February 2018.

Item	Description	Unit Cost	Unit No.	Totals Costs
1	Bus Shelter units	£5,000	170	£850,000
2	Bus Shelter units	£5,000	10 Future needs support	£50,000
3	RTI Displays – Relocations	£3,000 Estimated	50	£150,000
Sub Total Capital Budget Requirement				£1,050,000
5	Risk Contingency	20%	All items	£210,000
Total Capital Budget Requirement				£1,260,000

Notes

- Bus Shelter unit cost indicative maximum required for 15yr guaranteed, hi-grade and modular design bus shelters. And is based on the discussions held with bus shelter manufacturers. This cost excludes advanced option for solar energy lighting.

3.2.9 Further, a marketing contract will still need to be procured, as marketing income would be required to cover the costs of maintenance, cleaning and repairs. However, the Bus Shelter contract would ideally be procured including cleaning and maintenance costs within the bus shelter unit price for the first 3 years; this will allow Communications to decide on how and where marketing activity will be undertaken, and minimise any potential revenue cost implications to the council.

4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 The Council has two main options available, either to purchase the existing shelters requiring circa £440k funding or acquire new shelters which would also allow for evaluation of site locations, marketing income potential and use of newer energy efficient solutions.
- 4.2 In both cases, the council will need to establish a separate new marketing agreement, to generate marketing income from these locations. This is being

addressed by Communications and would form a separate procurement activity.

- 4.3 The recommendation therefore, is to progress with the purchase of a new Bus Shelter provider contract for the following key reasons:
- a) Existing bus shelters are of varying age, condition and appearance; therefore purchasing them may still mean a proportion need replacing in the short term (under 5 years)
 - b) Existing bus shelters will require circa £440k capital funding for purchase from the incumbent (assuming incumbent would sell them, and not decide to remove them for use elsewhere); and would require the council to procure a separate maintenance and servicing agreement.
 - c) Purchasing new bus shelters would allow the Council to consider the use of more modern energy efficient solutions, such as solar lighting
 - d) Purchasing new bus shelters would allow the Council to re-evaluate shelter locations and positioning to optimise the support for user needs.
 - e) Purchasing new bus shelter would also allow evaluation of their marketing income potential, including the use of updated LCD RTI boards; to allow improved income generation from advertising.
 - f) Purchasing new shelters would allow for capitalisation of costs, and minimise revenue pressures associated to maintenance and cleaning.
- 4.4 Delegated Authority for Director of Environment and Highways to contract award is sought, to minimise any delays in contract implementation post successful procurement exercise completion.

5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

- 5.1 Not applicable, this project relates to the renewal of existing street furniture assets and will not change the services or support provided by the Council to the residents and businesses.

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 6.1 The renewal of the bus shelters will continue to support residents and business users' use of local public transport services; by providing a safe, clean, maintained and well lit refuge area for users against environmental conditions.

This will also continue to enable service information to be provided to local public transport users, whilst also allowing the passenger transport service to assess the needs of each location.

In addition, this will also allow the potential for commercial marketing income generation to be assessed at each location; including the use of the specific locations for Council information and messages to be displayed.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Mark Terry**
Senior Financial Officer

The replacement of the assets in covered under capital funding already in place; in terms of the revenue funding necessary to support the ongoing serving and maintenance this would form part of a separate procurement for Advertising on Council assets.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Afamefune Ajoh**
Legal Counsel

The Council are required to provide a suitable and safe environment for users of the public transport services. Updating the existing bus shelter assets should ensure that the council is meeting its legal responsibilities to provide a safe environment for users of public transport.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Rebecca Price**
Community Development Officer

Bus shelters are necessary to support the equality needs of the Councils public transport users, by providing a safe, clean and well lit area of refuge from environmental conditions; which is especially relevant for those with mobility, sight and other health issues.

7.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

None

8. Background papers used in preparing the report (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

- None

9. Appendices to the report

- None

Report Author:

Andrew Austin
Commercial Manager, Commercial Services

11 September 2018	ITEM: 8
Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee	
Procurement of Local Bus Services	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Key Decision
Report of: Julie Nelder Assistant Director for Environment and Highways	
Accountable Assistant Director: Julie Nelder Assistant Director for Environment and Highways	
Accountable Director: Julie Rogers Director for Environment and Highways	
This report is Public	

Executive Summary

This report sets out the proposals for the procurement of bus services 11, 374 and 265 which terminate on 31st March 2019. This report is to seek approval for the tendering of these services for a period of 3 years, with a further option to extend for a period of up to 24 months. The new contractual arrangement will commence on 1st April 2019. The reason it is proposed to offer a contract of 3 years with extensions is in order to encourage more operators to bid for the contract which may reduce costs to the Council.

1. Recommendation(s)

1.1 That the Committee note the details of the report

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 Local bus services are provided on a commercial basis by bus operators. Where these services do not meet the needs of local people, local authorities have a responsibility to consider the needs not met and provide additional services and / or journeys in those areas concerned. (**Transport Act 1985:**

“To secure the provision of such public passenger transport services as the council consider it appropriate to secure to meet any public transport requirements within their area which would not in their view be met apart from any action taken by them for that purpose.”)

This is the situation for routes 11, 374 and 265, which cover Bulphan, West Tilbury, East Tilbury, Linford, Horndon-on-the-Hill and Fobbing.

- 2.2 The annual cost to the Council of the current number 11 bus service is £243,927 and £196,968 for service 374. The cost for service 265 is £22,800. The total cost to the Council for these bus routes over a 12 month period is £463,635. Fares are collected by the bus operator and retained by them. The revenue risk remains with the bus operator ensuring that the budget cost to operate the services is fixed. This form of contract encourages the operator to maximise patronage, with revenue protection being the operator's responsibility and may reduce the impact on commercial service revenue between common stops. (The operator collects and keeps all fares whether from out tendered services or their commercial routes) This has been the case with existing contracts.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

- 3.1 The tender documentation will include options for a range of frequencies for service 11 and 374 to be costed for consideration within the budget envelope. The current frequency on service 374 is every 90 minutes and for the 11 it is 105 minutes. We will tender for both the 11 and 374 on the current route and frequency and include options to increase the frequency.

In view of the opening of Integrated Medical Centres in Long Lane and Corringham, options will be sought to reroute service 11 to serve these facilities. This will also have the benefit of service 11 not operating along the A13 which may be prone to delays due to roadworks. This will increase the frequency of service for communities between Stanford-le-Hope and Basildon but reduce the overall frequency and will offer at least a 120 minute frequency service.

Ticket information from the operator has been analysed and the results show that passenger distribution throughout route 11 is fairly consistent in the communities it serves and avoids duplication of commercial services in all but one section (Wood View to Chadwell Cross Keys).

- 3.2 Service 265 provides a service linking Bulphan with Orsett and Grays 3 days per week with a morning and afternoon journey.
- 3.3 The awarding of the contract will consider maximum frequencies within the budget allocation. Prior to the award, ward members and bus user group members will be consulted on the new service levels through the website press release, printed timetables and roadside information. Social media will also be used to inform residents of impending changes.
- 3.4 Continuous monitoring of the services will be undertaken to assess their effectiveness and to ensure any changes to demand are identified and implemented

4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 The recommendation to tender these services will allow the Council to provide local residents with continued access to travel where no commercial services operate in those specific areas or where no direct links for these communities exist.

5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

- 5.1 This report is being shared with PT and R Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- 5.2 This report covers a standard tender of existing bus services.
- 5.3 The Council will invite tenders for a range of frequency options for services 11 and 374 (60, 90, 120 and 180 minute) including the route change to service 11 enabling an increase the number of destinations for its users.
- 5.4 The Council will also invite tenders for service 265 on the current frequency.
- 5.5 Operators will be given the opportunity to offer alternative timetables for consideration.

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 6.1 Procurement of these services will enable the Council to support local bus services and provide access to employment, education, healthcare, shopping and other facilities.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Carl Tomlinson**
Finance Manager

The budget for Local Bus Services is. £510,203 on budget codes ET011 2608 and ET011 4118.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Kevin Molloy**
Contracts Solicitor

The proposal is that provision of bus services shall be procured as required by the Transport Act 1985, to provide a service for 6 communities who would otherwise be without otherwise service. When tendering for bus service contracts.

The Council must ensure that the process is conducted in a fair and transparent way that complies with the requirements of the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Council's Contract Procedure Rules. Legal support can be provided so as to ensure the procurement is carried out in a lawful manner and that the Council's interests are protected.

7.3 **Diversity and Equality**

Implications verified by: **Roxanne Scanlon**
Community Engagement & Project Monitoring Officer

These bus services enable direct links for all members of the community in the areas concerned in order to carry out essential functions of daily life. Direct services offer greater convenience for all members of the community.

7.4 **Other implications** (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

- N/A

8. **Background papers used in preparing the report** (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

- N/A

9. **Appendices to the report**

- N/A

Report Author:

Michael Boon
Information and Monitoring Assistant
Passenger Transport Unit

Work Programme

Committee: Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Year: 2018/2019

Dates of Meetings: 4 July 2018, 11 September 2018, 6 November 2018, 8 January 2019, 12 March 2019

Topic	Lead Officer	Requested by Officer/Member
4 July 2018		
Local Plan Update		Members
11 September 2018		
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Standard Item
Integrated Medical Centres Report	Rebecca Ellsmore	Officer
Bus Shelter Procurement	Andrew Austin	Officer
C2C Rail Presentation	C2C	Members
Procurement of Local Bus Services	Michael Boon	Officers
Extraordinary October Meeting (TBC)		
Local Plan Issues and Options 2 Consultation Document	Andy Millard	Officers
Motion 4 of Full Council. Research into 8,000 affordable homes within 5 years	Andy Millard	Members
Approval of proposed Task and Finish ToR	Andy Millard	Members

Work Programme

6 November 2018		
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Standard Item
Highways, Maintenance, Efficiency Programme (HMEP) and Asset Management	Julie Rogers	Officer
Purfleet Regeneration Update	Rebecca Ellsmore	Members
Freight and Logistics	Andrew Millard	Officer
PTR Fees and Charges Report	Andrew Austin	Officer
Grays Underpass Development Update		
Update on Schemes; Grays Town Centre Traffic Flow Stanford Transport Hub		
8 January 2019		
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Standard Item
Local plan update		
12 March 2019		
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Standard Item