

**Imperial College Union
Finance, Audit & Risk Committee / 2 November 2022**

Review of Union Minibus Service

- Author(s): Dylan Hughes (Deputy President Clubs & Societies)
Tom Newman (Managing Director)
Connor Walford (Activities & Development Manager)
Robert Fenner (Senior Activities Coordinator (Operations))
- Purpose: To outline the current minibus service operations and financial position.
To provide options on the potential future provision of a minibus service.
- Decision(s): For the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee to decide on which future options should be investigated and presented for implementation at the March Board Meeting.

1. Summary

The Union runs a minibus hire service that includes a fleet of minibuses and other vehicles that are available for Clubs, Societies, Projects, College Departments, Staff and Halls Wardens to book out for getting to and from activities.

Since 2021/22, the Union has been delivering the *Back to Basics* strategy. The minibus service has not yet been reviewed appropriately in line with the strategy. In that time, the Activities Team have received consistent negative feedback regarding the service from students. The Union in this period has also lacked the necessary expertise and staff resources which has led to deterioration of the fleet. Since 2018/19 the service has made a loss each year of operation, with a total collective loss of almost **£100,000**.

This paper outlines the usage of the service by its users and the flaws that the current model poses to the Union. Following the analysis, we have drawn together a range of possible models for the Finance and Risk Committee to consider and recommend for further investigation. The model aims to address the issues surrounding safety, risk, resource allocation, and experience measures against the Union strategy. The Activities Team have recommended which models are most appropriate for further investigation.

A recommended timeline of model exploration has been outlined below that we would like to use to investigate any models that could potentially work better for the Union. The aim is to present a more detailed version of the chosen operating models for the Board to choose for implementation from Summer 2023.

2. Assessment and understanding of current service offer

2.1 Fleet of Vehicles

The Union currently owns:

- 2 Ford Transit Minibus purchased between 2007-2010 with installed roof racks.
- 8 Peugeot Boxer 15 Seat Minibuses purchased between 2014-2017.
- 1 Volkswagen Amarok Pick-Up Truck purchased in 2018 with a 6ft trailer
- 4 Vintage Vehicles (*The vintage vehicles are outside of the scope of this paper, but should the Board want more detail a summary paper can be provided in March 2023*)

The fleet is currently stationed across multiple campuses and sites. There are currently 9 vehicles at South Kensington, 1 at Charing Cross Hospital, 1 at Silwood Park Campus and the trailer for the pickup truck is stored at Harlington Sports Grounds.

There are currently only **three vehicles** within our fleet that do not have considerable damage or faults. You can find in *Appendix One*, a table of known damages and faults for each of our vehicles in the fleet including whether they are safe to drive. Where a vehicle is marked as safe to drive but with an amber rating this is because whilst they have been signed off, there is an increased risk because of the known faults with the vehicle.

Currently, 6 of the minibuses have a mileage reading of over 100,000 miles, with 3 of them exceeding 140,000 miles. It has been noted by our partnered garage that there is now an increased risk of these minibuses facing more serious faults and failures in the coming years.

2.2 Financial Position

Year	Closing Position
2018/19	(18,722)
2019/20	(20,717)
2020/21	(25,879)
2021/22	(4,530) **

**** In 2021/22 the minibus accounts final position is misleading due to year end accounting adjustments. The comparable figure taking this into account is a £27,795 deficit.**

In the academic year 2019/20 it is important to clarify that approximately £8,000 of this loss could be assigned to the reduction in service due to COVID-19, but by March 2020 the service was already £12,752 behind budget in terms of hire income. Between October 2019 – February 2020 before the pandemic started, there were 148 unfulfilled CSP (Clubs, Society and Project) booking requests due to the minibuses not being safe or fit for purpose. This resulted in a total £14,554 loss of revenue.

In the academic year 2021/22, the service continued the trend of making a loss. Whilst the end of year performance resulted in a deficit of £4,530, without the end of year credit from the College for insurance costs the end of year position would have been approximately a deficit of £27,795. This would have been an increased budget deficit in comparison to 2020/21. This increased loss can be attributed to the fact that the fleet was not operational for the whole of term 1 in the academic year 2021/22 because the Union Section 19 permit was not awarded until term 2. This meant minibuses could not be hired by student groups until term 2 of 2021/22.

The new Imperial Athletes model is showing to have a significant impact on the hire of our minibuses. There has been an average reduction of 80% in sports clubs' bookings for our minibuses since the new model was introduced in 2020/21. Transport is administered by the College sports department for sports club training at Harlington and sports fixtures on a Wednesday. Their preferred method is to book coaches through a private provider, Commonwealth Coaches, which is the College's main transport partner. For comparison, in October 2019 there were 139 sports bookings totalling almost £14,000 whereas for October 2022 we have had 19 bookings for clubs totalling £2000.

To operate our fleet, we need the right license. Usually, organisations would need a public service vehicle operator's license, however, to prevent us from needing one of these we operate under a

Section 19 permit as our service is not for profit. It also enables our drivers to not have the need to acquire a passenger carrying vehicle entitlement on their license. We would need to investigate further whether a profit can be generated and held in restricted funds with an aim of reinvesting into the fleet to either replace depreciated assets or manage the continuing increase of maintenance costs as they begin to deteriorate further. Without this in place, all risk associated to the breakdown and increased maintenance needs of the fleet falls to an increase pressure to staff on promoting the hire of buses to CSPs (Clubs, Societies and Projects) or the Union budgets where this does not work.

The current budget does not have any directly budgeted costs for career staffing although below outlines the impact on the Student Activities and Development staffing resource. We hire student casual staff to support the delivery of the minibus training tests due to the high time resource it costs to deliver these. The Union has a policy of offering no less than a 4-hour shift to casual staff, which means when delivering tests for students we must put this cost back on to students at approximately £30 per test. To aim to reduce a loss on the cost of delivering tests we make students wait until it is possible to deliver tests for 3 students, which affects students' experience of the service.

3 Staff Resource

3.1 Full Time Staff

Before a restructure of roles in August 2019, the Activities Team had a full-time member of staff who managed only minibuses (Activities Coordinator – Minibuses). This cost approximately £35,000 in staffing cost. Their only responsibility was managing the minibus service and ensuring it ran properly throughout term. Since then, the responsibility of managing the service has been split across multiple roles as demonstrated below with approximate hours and the cost for the relevant member of staff:

Role	Responsibilities	Approx. Hours Per Week	Cost Per Hour*
Student Activities & Development Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing policies & legislation associated to the fleet • Overseeing health and safety documentation regarding the fleet • Overseeing the budget • Supporting the team regarding the service outputs and complex issues • Out of hours contact for serious issues relating to the service 	5	[X]
Senior Student Activities Coordinator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing and training the Transport Assistant • Supporting the Silwood Minister for Transport Volunteer • Managing the test credit sales & the test process for new drivers • Managing the maintenance of the vehicles • Processing fines & charges • Ensuring compliance expectations are met and record keeping • Managing the relationship with the college car parking team 	10	[X]

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing and delivering the processes and procedure related to the fleet and service Administering the budget Answering enquiries in the inbox Delivering the communications about the minibus service Reviewing service limits in relation to specialised bookings and requests 		
Activities Operations Assistant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewing and approving driver applications Processing Minibus requests and cancellations Supporting the maintenance of the vehicles Administrating the check system with drivers Answering enquiries in the inbox 	10	[X]
Helpdesk Coordinator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-ordinating key collection and drop off for bookings Triaging any issues regarding minibus collections 	5	[X]
4 Members of Staff		30	

**Individual staff members' salaries redacted for web. The middle spine cost for the grade of the roles was used to reflect the average cost of the member of staff's role per hour over time.*

Across the current service, you can see that we weekly we still spend approximately 40 hours per week on the delivery of the service which costs £513.90. Across 52 weeks, that cost equates to £26,722,90 which is close to the cost we were spending before the restructure.

There is an operational impact on the ability of delivering a minibus service effectively when not hiring a specialist individual. Currently, the manager role and the senior coordinator role have multiple other focuses within the role, specifically student experience, activity delivery and volunteer management. Due to the breadth of legislative knowledge and operational experience needed to deliver a transportation service, it is unfeasible to expect the current staffing model and resource to meet the necessary minimum to run the service within compliance and student expectations whilst breaking even.

3.2 Casual Staff Support – Transport Assistant

Role	Responsibilities	Approx. Hours Per Week	Cost Per Hour*
Transport Assistant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arranging regular test slots in E-Activities Sending out communications to test credit holders to let them know slots available Coordinate and deliver driving tests Assist with maintenance works on fleet Where necessary support with administration 	4	£15.52

Total Annual Cost	£3228.16
--------------------------	-----------------

On average we spend between £3000-£4000 per annum on our transport assistant to support with the above responsibilities.

Whilst there is an opportunity to offer casual staff roles to support maintenance of the fleet whilst earning money, our minibuses have not been able to be fully maintained through this process in the past three years due to a continued lack of knowledge. This leads to a lack of expertise to deliver sometimes the simplest of maintenance such as oil changes, meaning the minibuses always having to go to garage for repairs a higher cost. Furthermore, there are questions around the recruitment process for these positions, as we currently do not have an internal specialist who is able to verify whether candidates are suitable.

4 Systems Team & eActivities

The Systems team currently do not supply a weekly support service to the Activities Team in relation to the use of eActivities to deliver the minibus service. However, we do rely on them time to time to support the administration processes that are delivered through the system as it is custom built. I would estimate we approximately take up an 1-2 hours per month of their time supporting the service.

The current system function within eActivities that was custom built for delivering our minibus service is now out of date and not easily fixed without at least a minimum 3 weeks' worth of work from the Systems' Team and the Activities Team. The systems team does not have a review of the minibuses function with eActivities on their Annual Operating Plan and therefore will not have the ability to support on development of improving the system to therefore improve the operations of the service.

5 Suitability of Fleet

Earlier data from 2017-2019 shows that the minibus fleet did not meet the full demands of the sports clubs needs for matches on a Wednesday or training on Mondays and Tuesdays, which led to the college delivering a coach-based service for clubs. Approximately 2 bookings per day, Monday – Wednesday, could not be approved. This impact meant that students were using their own vehicles, missing morning lectures to take slower and more expensive routes of public transport.

The 9-seater minibus is used primarily by Recreation Sector CSPs for trips and tours, both nationally and abroad (the 15 seaters are not allowed abroad). These activities require a large amount of cargo space in addition to moving people as well as roof racks. Because of the lack of 9-seaters in the fleet and the number of seats that must be removed to accommodate the large amount of cargo it severely limits the number of individuals that can take part and therefore makes the cost of hiring this for trips and tours higher per person. The types of vehicles within our fleet should be reconsidered to ensure that the types of vehicles we have meet the needs of the groups who wish to use them.

Currently there is only 1 minibus within the fleet that is suitable to support a student with wheelchair needs, however the overall accessibility of the fleet that has been considered in the purchasing previously has been little to none. There are two minibuses with support steps, 1 of which is faulty. However, we have only ever had 1 request for a minibus with wheelchair adaptability.

Ford Transit CTO and Ford Transit KYW are no longer compliant with London Emissions regulations and therefore is charged ULEZ (Ultra Low Emission Zone) charges every time it leaves the imperial campus.

6 CSP Usage Reports

We have data from 2002 – 2022 on the usage of the minibus fleet and below summaries a range of data insights that will help contextualise the use of the service in comparison to the bigger picture of the service provided to CSPs through the Student Activities and Development Team. In this time, the team have approved 21,614 minibus bookings (not including cancellations or request rejections). On average the Union has had 335 CSPs.

6.1 The number of CSPs who use the service

Each year, only 12% -15% (40-50) of all CSP's have used the minibus service. Since 2002 only 42% (141) of CSPs have used the service, dropping down to 25% for those who have had a booking more than 10 times over the 20-year period and down to only 5% who have used it each year consistently.

8 sports clubs alone are responsible for 42% of all bookings received. The next 8 groups are recreation groups who are responsible for 13% of all overall bookings. Since 2019, those top 8 sports groups have dropped among the bottom of the list of users.

6.2 Lengths of Hire

Length of Hire	% Of Bookings
Under 1 day	82%
1 full day	3%
Full weekend hire	10%
3 or more days	5%

80% of bookings are made for under 1 day, and these are made by sports clubs and 92% of the bookings made for a full weekend or longer were made by recreation groups.

6.3 Periods of Need

Period	% Of Bookings
Term 1	42%
Term 2	41%
April - September	17%

Across all years the average times in which bookings were made are displayed above. Between April – September, 95% of the bookings made across all years were made by recreation groups.

6.4 Location of Minibuses

Location	% Of Bookings
South Kensington	90%
Hammersmith (Charing Cross Hospital)	10%

This usage report shows that we currently have the correct distribution of minibuses on campuses. We only have 1 stationed at Hammersmith with the rest being at South Kensington.

6.5 Vehicle Types

Vehicle Type	% Of Bookings
15-Seater	60%
9-Seater	39%

Our current distribution of vehicle types across our fleet does not match the clear needs of the groups who primarily use the minibus service. Currently 1 of 10 of our bookable vehicles is a 9-seater, this highlights the reason that our current 9-seater has significantly more mileage and wear and tear in comparison to the other vehicles. It was also noted that a lot of the time when the 9-seater is booked, seats are taken out to make space for more cargo or a transit van is hired to support with moving of equipment.

6.6 Use of Enhancements

Enhancement Type	% Of bookings that requested use
Roof Rack	1%
Tow Bar	<0.1%
Wheelchair Access	0%

All requests for the use of any enhancements were made by the top 8 recreation clubs who book the minibuses.

7 **Volunteer Experience**

7.1 Student Drivers

Through the training and test programme, we have approved 2348 student drivers and currently have 321 active drivers on the system. We surveyed our active drivers at the end of the academic year 21-22 with a focus on the experience they have had being a driver and their thoughts on the overall service. The statements below reflect the opinion of 31% of our drivers.

- 81% of volunteer drivers report that they have a reduced care for the fleet as they get no remuneration for a significant amount of time
- 86% of volunteer drivers believe that the current condition of the fleet is not to an acceptable standard
- 72% of volunteer drivers agree that the process for become an approved driver is unclear and unsupportive
- 83% of volunteer drivers agree that the test process does not make them feel safer driving our minibuses
- 92% of volunteer drivers feel communications regarding the minibus service, including vehicle checks and vehicle issues is poor.

7.2 CSP Committee Members

We survey our student committee leaders on our service outputs at the end of each academic year. Since 2019 the common themes have been raised about the minibus service:

- Supplying the minibus service for recreational groups is more cost effective than using external providers
- Minibuses offer flexibility that public transport does not
- Student leaders prefer to use Union minibuses instead of personal vehicles
- A barrier to using the service is finding student volunteers who want to dedicate a significant amount of time to driving for free and going through the process of becoming a driver
- Only a small number of respondents cared about the enhancements of minibuses including roof racks and towbars
- Several the groups used the minibuses to move substantial amounts of equipment not just passengers.
- Student Leaders raised concerns about the safety of the fleet vehicles due to the number of breakdowns they were aware of the significant amount of body damage the buses had.

8 Silwood Park Campus Minibus

Since 2018, we have had a minibus permanently stationed at Silwood Park Campus for the use of the Constituent Union (CU) Committee and the committee of the CSPs that runs out of that location.

The CU committee uses the minibus every week to do shuttle trips to a local supermarket for all the students that are located on the remote campus. The small number of CSPs that run there book the use of the bus with the CU committee.

We do not run this minibus through the normal minibus booking system, unique usage for students and the small number of CSPs there the usage of the minibus is delegated to role on the CU committee called 'minister of transport.' They administer the tests and bookings of the bus and there is no charge for the use of the bus. Therefore, the rest of the service must generate enough income to cover the maintenance and compliance of this bus.

9 Summary of Assessment

From the assessment of the current service, the Union is not meeting a level of basic function within the minibus service, and we should not continue with the model as it is. The main reasons for moving to an alternative model are:

- The service on average is only used by 12-15% of CSPs per annum
- There is a lack of trust in the service from committee members and drivers
- The experience of student drivers is poor
- We lack the resource and ability within the staff team to manage the service to a minimum standard
- Due to new operating models for sport and the small engagement across CSP's it is going to prove difficult to generate significant income to cover the cost of the compliance and maintenance of the fleet
- We do not have the correct vehicles in our fleet to meet the needs of CSPs who do mainly use the service
- To get our current fleet up to a roadworthy and safe we would need to invest significantly both time and funds
- To improve the overall experience with the service a review of the systems that support the service would need a full review

10 Benefits of Change

Conducting a full review of the service model and implementing a new model ready for the academic year starting August 2023 would ensure that we are fulfilling our obligation of taking the activities teams service through the back-to-basics approach that our current strategy has outlined.

Ensuring that we deliver a sustainable model will reduce our financial risk as the service has previously lost almost £100,000 over the past 4 years.

Reviewing our fleet to ensure the service we deliver is within our resources will ensure that our legal obligations of health and safety are more easily satisfied with is one of the core issues that led to our organisational restructuring. It will also ensure that our staff are more focused on the right objectives that are a higher priority.

It will reduce the amount of staff resources used across the Union that are needed to deliver the service, which will free up time for us to focus on higher priority issues that can have more impact.

11 Options Appraisal

These options have not been investigated at a deep operational or financial level, but we have looked at 10 other Students' Unions and how they deliver transport to student groups as well as some external charities who need transport and what they do. From this, we have decided on the models below that could be investigated for delivery in the future.

11.1 Option 1 – All New Fleet

The Trustees feel that the service we offer is core and therefore wish to continue to deliver a service provision at the level we currently offer. To get to a standard that is of a back-to-basics nature we would like to replace the reduced fleet size with a phased approach with the idea of buying the right vehicles to meet the needs outlined by student groups. This would require an additional full-time role within the Student Activities Team that focuses solely on the delivery of the minibus service. We would also need a sprint project by July 2023 with the systems team to update the system to meet the needs of the service.

i. Risk associated with Option 1:

- Our data already shows that the need from our CSPs within the current models of operation, may not lead to increased hire of a new fleet and therefore risk further loss of income.
- The service is currently expected by the board to run as a break-even service, adding in the cost of a member of staff to run the service in a compliant way means the board would have to consider changing this perspective
- Fully scoping a new fleet and purchasing will take a significant amount of time. The current market wait on a new minibus can be up to 2 years. Leasing is not an option because the mileage used by the groups would exceed the customary practice leasing agreement and would skyrocket the price.

11.2 Option 2 – Reduce Fleet with the plan to replace vehicles

The Trustees feel that the service we offer is of a core nature and therefore wish to continue to deliver a service provision at a slightly lower level than what we currently offer. To get to a standard that is of a back-to-basics nature we would like to replace the whole fleet with a phased approach with the idea of buying the right vehicles to meet the needs outlined by student groups. This would also require an additional part-time role with the Student Activities Team that focuses solely on the delivery of the minibus service. We would also need a sprint project by July 2023 with the systems team to update the system to meet the needs of the service. There is also the possibility of this option having a focus on specific groups such as the recreation groups and only offering a service for them.

i. Risks associated with Option 2:

- Our data already shows that the need from our CSPs within the current models of operation, may not lead to increased hire of a new fleet and therefore risk further loss of income.
- The service is currently expected by the board to run as a break-even service, adding in the cost of a member of staff to run the service in a compliant way means the board would have to consider changing this perspective.
- Fully scoping a new fleet and purchasing will take a significant amount of time. The current market wait on a new minibus can be up to 2 years. Leasing is not an option because the mileage used by the groups would exceed the customary practice leasing agreement and would skyrocket the price.
- There may be displays of dissatisfaction from CSP leaders as although the data shows a reduction in hiring, there is a perception that the minibus service is a lifeline to a lot more groups and that more minibuses are needed. We can deliver a communications piece about the decisions and the service if this choice is taken to reduce the student dissatisfaction.

11.3 **Option 3 – Reduced the fleet with the plan of phasing out the service**

The Trustees feel that the service we offer is not of a core nature and therefore over the next 2 years will aim to phase out the service. As part of this process, we will develop guidance for CSP's regarding alternative options.

i. Risks associated with Option 3:

- There may be displays of dissatisfaction from CSP leaders as although the data shows a reduction in hiring, there is a perception that the minibus service is a lifeline to a lot more groups and that more minibuses are needed. We can deliver a communications piece about the decisions and the service if this choice is taken to reduce the student dissatisfaction.
- Alternatives may be more costly to a CSP, and this may have a budgetary impact on the CSPs. As such a small number of CSP's will be affected by this, it will be possible for us to support the groups through the budgeting process to clarify their needs better and appropriately raise this membership costs.

11.4 **Option 4 – Third Party Partnership**

The board feel that the service we offer is not of a core nature but understand that transport is core to student activities and there for would like a phasing out of the service we currently offer and want us to scope out creating a partnership with another organisation to supply hiring vehicles to our members.

i. Risks associated with Option 4:

- This model was born out of the commercial and charitable organisations that we investigated when looking into alternative models. A lot of these organisations have a higher demand for hire, more funding for higher costs and less niche hiring needs and therefore it may be difficult to source a partner who could sufficiently meet our needs.
- Depending on the partnership agreement with a partner, there may be financial risk involved related to the expected number of bookings or service use with a partner that we cannot promise to meet. This would be mitigated by only agreeing to a partnership where there is either no financial risk or if there is risk that it is within the Unions risk appetite.

- There is a risk of still having an administrative burden related to this option. When investigating this model, other organisations who have this still face high volumes of claims, accidents, charges from the partnership which would be administrated via the team.

11.5 Option 5 – No Service Provision at All

The board feel that there are adequate options outside of the Students' Union for CSP's to be able to organise and pay for themselves without the Union have having to be a middle provider. As part of this option, we will develop guidance for CSP's regarding alternative options.

i. Risk associated with Option 5:

- There may be displays of dissatisfaction from CSP leaders as although the data shows a reduction in hiring, there is a perception that the minibus service is a lifeline to a lot more groups and that more minibuses are needed. We can deliver a communications piece about the decisions and the service if this choice is taken to reduce the student dissatisfaction.

12 Recommendation

The Activities Team recommend the Finance and Risk Committee to approve the scoping of **Option 3 and Option 5 with the aim of the Union no longer delivering a minibus service**. Our reasons for this are:

- Without significant and continued financial investment agreed by the board, delivering this service to a compliance and acceptable level with our current resourcing is not possible.
- The service review shows that this service is accessed by a small percentage of our CSP's yet takes a considerable amount of staff resource already to deliver for insignificant impact.
- These options of not delivering a minibus service is a model that several other students' unions across the country operate and several of them have actively moved to this model for similar reasons.

If the board was more inclined to change the service from being a self-funded core service to a block grant funded core service that has a cost and risk, we would recommend **Option 2**.

- Our model of sports administration is likely to change which could positively affect the amount of minibus hire but this is likely to take another 18 months.
- But it would include the need for adequate staffing for the service.

Appendix One – Record of Fleet Issues

	Reg	Make & Model	Seats	Location	Current Known Faults	Safe For Use
1	LJ66 DW	Peugeot Boxer	15	Silwood Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage/ dents /scratches to both sides of the exterior bodywork of the minibus • Large damage and dent in the roof of the bus 	Yes
2	LN64 AAK	Peugeot Boxer	15	Charing Cross Hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light Damage/ dents /scratches to both sides of the exterior bodywork of the minibus 	Yes
3	LP14 JNJ	Peugeot Boxer	15	South Kensington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage/ dents /scratches to both sides of the exterior bodywork of the minibus • Broken wing mirror • Internal Ceiling collapsed exposing electrical wiring • Internal body panels damaged and some missing • Internal Wall Damage • Internal Seals Broken and replaced with tape • Missing Fire Extinguisher Holder • Significant Roof Damage • Growing Moss in a few places due to damp. 	No
4	LJ17 AEU	Peugeot Boxer	15	South Kensington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant damage/ dents /scratches to both sides of the exterior bodywork of the minibus • Internal bodywork panels damaged/missing • Growing Moss and plants from cracks and windows due to age 	Yes
5	LN64 AAV	Peugeot Boxer	15	South Kensington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant damage/ dents /scratches to both sides of the exterior bodywork of the minibus • Large dent to the front bumper • Missing a few internal panels • Wing mirror damage • Missing fire extinguisher holder 	Yes
6	LJ17 AEP	Peugeot Boxer	15	South Kensington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant damage/ dents /scratches to both sides of the exterior bodywork of the minibus • Missing internal panels • Steering alignment off – drives to the left 	Yes
7	LJ66 DXA	Peugeot Boxer	15	South Kensington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light damage/ dents /scratches to both sides of the exterior bodywork of the minibus • Fire extinguisher holder broken 	Yes

8	LJ66 DXB	Peugeot Boxer	15	South Kensington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light damage/ dents /scratches to both sides of the exterior bodywork of the minibus • The back bumper is rusted, and damaged posing a risk of use and is currently taped on to reduce poor visuals. • Rusting in places across the bus • Hole on the backdoor of the bus that is taped up • Faulty accessibility mechanisms • No fire extinguisher holder • Broken wing mirror 	No
9	LM5 9 KYW	Ford Transit	15	South Kensington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant damage/ dents /scratches to both sides of the exterior bodywork of the minibus • Many parts of the minibus as rusting beyond repair also making the visuals of the bus look worse. • The back bumper is rusted, and damaged posing a risk of use and is currently taped on to reduce poor visuals. • Seals around the side door are faulty and currently stuck on with tape. 	Yes
1 0	FV60 CTO	Ford Transit	9	South Kensington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant damage/ dents /scratches to both sides of the exterior bodywork of the minibus with some parts of the bodywork fully missing. • Broken door handle for the main side door • Many parts of the minibus as rusting beyond repair also making the visuals of the bus look worse. • The back bumper is rusted, and damaged posing a risk of use and is currently taped on to reduce poor visuals. 	Yes
1 1	RE6 9 VOP	Volkswa gen Amarok	5	South Kensington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently no known faults but due its first MOT on 3rd January. 	Yes
1 2	RE6 9 VOP	Trailer	0	Harlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rollers and Breaks broken due to poor storage conditions. 	No