

Agenda Item No. 8(j)

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

22 November 2016

Report of the Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Communities

**RESPONSE TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON POTENTIAL CHANGES
TO LOCAL BUS AND COMMUNITY TRANSPORT SERVICES (HIGHWAYS,
TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)**

(1) **Purpose of Report** To consider the County Council's response to public consultation on proposed changes to funding for conventional bus and Community Transport services and agree a way forward.

(2) **Information and Analysis**

Background

At its meeting on 26 January 2016, Cabinet agreed to consult on proposals to cease all funding for supported bus services and Community Transport Dial-a-Bus services with effect from 1 October 2017 (Minute Nos 18/16 and 19/16 refer). Views were also sought on proposals to mitigate the impact of these cuts by providing a pre-bookable Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) service and a 'Door-to-Door Plus' service for people with particular needs who may be unable to use the DRT service.

These proposals were put forward in the light of the severe pressures on the County Council's budget and, if implemented would have resulted in a very substantial and rapid reduction in funding for public transport.

The consultation therefore made it clear that the proposals involved not only a change in the type of service that could be provided, but also a significant reduction in the level of service that could be offered. Indeed, the report to Cabinet explained that a DRT service was likely to provide for less than 5% of the 4.2 million journeys a year made by passengers using supported bus services.

Consultation Process

An extensive public consultation exercise was undertaken that aimed to target those who would be most directly affected by the proposed changes.

Consultation took place over an 8 week period ending on 24 April 2016. An explanation of the changes and survey forms were available on the County

Council's website and paper copies were distributed primarily through libraries and Community Transport schemes, but also through district/borough council offices. The Call Centre was briefed to deal with any enquiries, three press releases were issued and posters were distributed to schools, parish councils, children's centres, GP surgeries, district/borough council offices, adult education centres and visitor centres.

Awareness of the consultation was also raised through social media, a feature story on the homepage of the County Council's website and by articles on the website's public transport and Community Transport pages. Bus and Community Transport users were also targeted through posters on vehicles and at bus stops and specific interest groups were contacted, such as the Derbyshire Older Peoples' Advisory Group (DOPAG), Learning in Derbyshire (LID) and the student website, derbyshireyouthinc.com.

Officers have considerable experience of consulting transport users and they are confident that the arrangements made for this consultation were sufficient to enable people to have an effective input to the process.

Consultation Findings

There was a very good level of response to the survey. Over 4,200 completed questionnaires were received. The survey forms allowed people to comment on particular aspects of the proposals and this resulted in nearly 25,000 individual comments. These comments have been helpful in providing a greater insight into respondent's views than is possible from simple 'tick box' responses. A summary of the responses is included in Appendix 1 (it should be noted that the percentage figures included in the body of the report have been rounded up to the nearest whole number). A fuller and more detailed version of this is available on the County Council's website.

Of those who responded, 91% were Derbyshire residents. The consultation was also effective in targeting people who might be affected by the proposed changes with 87% of respondents reporting that they used either subsidised bus services or Community Transport Dial-a-Bus services. More women (63%) than men (37%) responded to the survey. Older people were also more likely to respond with nearly 60% saying that they were over 65. Just under a quarter of respondents said that they considered themselves to be disabled.

The high proportion of older people responding of the questionnaire was reflected in the types of journey being made with the most journeys being made for shopping, leisure or travelling to GP or hospital appointments. Among younger people aged 17-34, travelling to work or getting to college was more likely to be a reason for using public transport. Most respondents used supported bus services during the daytime, with smaller numbers using evening and Sunday services.

The survey asked for views on the County Council's proposals and some 92% said that they disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to withdraw County Council funding for subsidised bus services, with 4% saying that they agreed with the idea. Respondents gave a range of reasons for being opposed to the withdrawal of these services, including difficulties in getting to essential services, inability to access employment and education opportunities, social isolation and loss of independence. There was, however, some recognition of the need to make the best use of limited resources and various suggestions were made to enable at least a minimum level of service to be provided, including proposals for reducing the frequency of services and combining routes.

When asked about the loss of Community Transport Dial-a-Bus services, 61% of respondents said that they disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to withdraw the service and 8% said that they agreed or strongly agreed with the idea. The main concern of those who disagreed with the proposal was that they would find it more difficult or impossible to get out and about, and that they would be unable to get to a supermarket or town centre.

The survey showed that the idea of introducing DRT services was not popular. Some 51% of respondents said that they disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal and 17% said that they agreed or strongly agreed with the idea. The main concerns of those who disagreed with the proposal were the infrequency of the service (29%), the need for pre-booking (27%) and the loss of conventional 'turn up and go' services (23%). The survey asked if people would be likely to use DRT services and 24% of respondents said that they would be fairly likely or very likely to do so.

There was some support for the proposal to introduce a Door-to-Door Plus service for people who would be unable to use the proposed DRT service. Of those who responded to the survey, 43% said that they agreed or strongly agreed with the idea and 15% said that they disagreed or strongly disagreed.

In addition to the survey forms, around 200 letters, emails and telephone calls were received during the consultation period. The contents of these varied but they included, amongst other things, concerns about the loss of particular services, enquiries about the local impact of the changes, requests for more survey forms and various suggestions about how the County Council should proceed.

Officers have also held a series of meetings with bus operators in order to get a better understanding of the potential impact on their operations and to invite comment and suggestions from the industry. In general, operators are not in a position to make any firm commitments until a clearer picture has emerged about the way forward. It is reasonable to assume, however, that if

implemented, the withdrawal of supported services would have some knock-on implications for the network of commercial services.

In some cases, it is possible that operators will choose to take on services commercially that are currently subsidised by the County Council, possibly on a lower cost or reduced frequency basis. In other cases, however, the loss of funding for a subsidised service may undermine the viability of a commercial service and, in a limited number of cases, operators could have to close their business.

Equality Analysis (EA)

A detailed EA was undertaken to assess the impact of the proposal on the protected characteristic groups and this is attached as Appendix 2. The EA includes an assessment of the impact of the proposals, together with a number of recommendations for potential mitigation. The scope of the EA was agreed by a steering group with further advice being given from the County Council's Equalities and Public Health teams.

The EA indicated the proposals would adversely impact on three of the protected groups: age, disability, and gender; as well as non-statutory groups including poor and disadvantaged communities and rural communities. The EA also highlighted the impact of the proposed changes on a number of non-protected groups, including the friends and relatives of current bus service users, health and care providers, educational and training suppliers, employers and other road users.

The likely impacts of the proposed changes identified in the EA are as follows:

- The current proposed changes would particularly impact on disadvantaged groups who make more use of the services, specifically younger and older people, women, disabled and poorer members of the community.
- These people would find it significantly more difficult to access employment, educational opportunities, health services and other key facilities, such as food shopping, as they would be unable to afford or access other forms of transport.
- Some areas of Derbyshire, particularly the more rural areas in the west of the County, would also experience particular difficulties because alternative transport options are not available.
- Without these services, many current passengers would be unable to continue to live independently, which could result in other Council Departments having to provide additional support.
- Experience from elsewhere in the country, where DRT type services have been introduced, has shown that overall usage of the new service is significantly less than the supported bus routes they replaced.

- The withdrawal of the supported services may adversely affect the viability of the remaining commercial bus network. This could jeopardise the long term continuity of some services that are currently provided on a commercial basis, thereby increasing the number of people affected.

Consultation Conclusion

It is clear that the vast majority of those responding to the survey disagreed with the proposal to withdraw funding for supported bus services, with a smaller majority disagreeing with the proposal to withdraw Community Transport Dial-a-Bus services. The concept of introducing DRT on a countywide basis was also rejected by the majority of respondents. People generally preferred the convenience of a 'turn up and go' service without the need for pre-booking. The survey also showed there was concern about the needs of people who would find it difficult to use conventional public transport and this was reflected in the support for the proposed 'Door-to-Door Plus' service.

It is difficult to reconcile these results with the proposals outlined to Cabinet at the meeting on 26 January 2016. It is evident from the survey that the real value of local bus services is not the bus services themselves but more the access they provide to essential services - work, education, food shopping doctor's appointments etc. There are, of course, some people who have a choice and can make other arrangements, but for many the loss of a bus service will have far-reaching implications, for example, some people may be unable to continue in with their present job whilst others may need to move house. The EA explained that the proposed cuts particularly affect women, older people and younger people who are generally more reliant on public transport than the population as a whole.

The financial pressures on the Authority have not diminished, but officers are of the view that the consultation proposals would have an unacceptable impact on people who depend on these services. The introduction of DRT-type services would have helped some people, but evidence from elsewhere in the country, where it has been introduced, suggests that only a relatively small proportion of the current 4.2 million journeys a year could be met in this way. An alternative proposal of retaining some conventional bus services would cater for more passengers. However, the level of funding proposed in the consultation would mean that the number of services that could be operated would be very limited, even if major reductions in frequency and hours of operation were introduced. This approach would also leave a number of areas of the County without any buses at all.

Way Forward

The County Council is therefore in a very difficult position. The pressure on Council budgets is unprecedented, yet it is clear from the strong response to

the consultation, that going ahead with the cuts would have a significant impact on the day-to-day life of many Derbyshire residents. Some people, for example, explained that they would have difficulty getting to work or accessing essential services such as food shopping.

The County Council has recently agreed to undertake a pilot DRT service in an area north of Ashbourne. This should provide some valuable lessons in understanding the scope for this type of service to meet transport needs in rural areas. In the County as whole, however, DRT or provision of a limited number of conventional services is unlikely to meet the transport needs of Derbyshire residents. It is therefore suggested that the original consultation proposals for withdrawing support for local bus services and introducing countywide DRT services should not be proceeded with and that the Authority should, instead, develop an approach that meets people's needs for accessibility whilst moving towards a more stable and financially sustainable future.

This will require a new approach with an emphasis on developing partnerships with commercial bus operators; actively managing the supported bus network to make the best use of the budget; and exploring opportunities for integrating services more effectively. This, of course, will have significant financial implications and will inevitably increase the pressure on the County Council's very limited resources.

Since 2009, spending on local bus services has reduced by around 38% from £6.791m to £4.200m in 2016-17 (*Note: the 2008-09 figure includes an adjustment for Bus Services Operators Grant (BSOG) at that time paid by the DfT direct to bus operators*). This has been achieved by relatively modest adjustments to the network of supported services, such as the withdrawal of very lightly used evening and Sunday services, efficiencies in contract specifications and a competitive market that has reduced tender prices.

In more recent years, uncertainty over funding has meant that the supported network has not been adjusted to any significant extent to reflect the changing pattern of demand. As a consequence, the County Council is in the position of supporting some services that are poorly used, whilst in other areas there is potential to introduce new or improved services to better meet the current demand.

Officers consider that there is potential to make savings in spending on these services whilst maintaining existing levels of accessibility for the vast majority of current users. Reviewing and adjusting services on an area basis, for example encouraging operators to take over services commercially, rationalising networks to reduce the level of resources required, and removing lightly used journeys or reducing the number of operating days where passenger use is limited, could produce annual savings estimated to be

£1.5m by 2020-21. This would free up resources that could be invested in other areas, such as kick start funding of services that offer the prospect of becoming commercially viable, supporting services that give access to employment opportunities in areas such as Markham Vale, providing real-time information, as well as providing some basic services, such as cleaning and maintaining bus stop infrastructure. In essence, it is thought that there is scope to make more effective use of the available resources which would be of direct benefit to passengers, as well as ensuring the most effective use of public funds.

A key element of this approach is to work more closely with bus operators to support and extend the network of commercial services. These already account for around 85% of all passenger journeys in Derbyshire and discussions with bus companies suggest that there are a number of supported services that could have the potential to become commercially viable. The full implications of proposals in the current Buses Bill are yet to be understood, however there is a clear intention to support partnership working with operators by introducing more flexible quality and enhanced partnerships. Under these arrangements the County Council would undertake schemes and measures to help bus operators and their passengers (e.g. better roadside infrastructure, electronic information and schemes to reduce delays), whilst for their part the operators would offer improved services (e.g. new routes, better vehicles, more frequent services and better co-ordinated networks).

Partnership working can only be effective if resources are available to pursue improvements and initiatives in conjunction with bus operators. Capital spending can contribute to this but some revenue spending may also be needed. It is therefore proposed that a Growth and Improvement Fund should be established using savings realised from more effective management of the supported bus network.

Cabinet has previously agreed that services designed to meet individual needs, which are currently provided by the Community Transport organisations, should be subject to a competitive tendering process and that the existing grant funding arrangements will end September 2017 (Minute No 19/16 refers). The consultation confirmed the importance that is attached to these services and officers are currently developing proposals for tendering a 'Derbyshire Connect' service designed to meet these needs. This will incorporate elements of the consultation proposals including the concept of a door-to-door service and the potential for DRT-type services in areas with very low levels of demand and will be the subject of a further report to Cabinet in due course.

Proposals for the 'Derbyshire Connect' service will be developed in conjunction with the aCTive travel service (access to healthcare) for which funding has been agreed until March 2020 (Minute No.19/16 refers). Cabinet

also agreed, subject to consultation, funding for a door-to-door service. The proposals for a countywide DRT service, if implemented, may have gone some way towards meeting the needs of people unable to use conventional transport but, in the absence of this, funding in the order of £0.350m a year will be needed to ensure an adequate service for the 600 or so regular passenger who currently benefit from a weekly trip to the local supermarket or town centre. This level of support, however, would be considerably below the level of funding formerly provided under the grant funding arrangement for Community Transport organisations. In the longer term, the service could also seek to integrate local bus, Dial-a-Bus, school and health service transport as envisaged in the Total Transport project. In this way it may help to address the needs of areas that are hard to serve by conventional transport.

Summary of proposed response to public consultation

For clarity, the original proposals and the recommended responses following consultation are summarised below.

Original proposal: To withdraw funding for subsidised local bus services from October 2017.

Proposed response:

- The Council should not proceed with the proposal and instead a revised budget should be introduced from October 2017 which would seek to maintain accessibility for communities whilst moving to a more sustainable level of expenditure in the longer term. The proposed budget would be £3.80m in 2017-18 reducing to £2.70m by 2020-21.
- Actively engage with bus operators to introduce partnership agreements to support their existing commercial networks through capital investment, working with them to develop new services or making existing supported services commercially viable.
- A new Growth and Improvement Fund should be established to facilitate partnership working with bus operators, to support economic growth and improve operating conditions for bus operators and their passengers. This could include using some of the funds to clean and maintain roadside infrastructure.
- The supported bus network should be reviewed on an area by area basis to ensure the services meet the needs of passengers. As part of this review, priority will be given to services which allow access to essential facilities and opportunities, such as work, shopping, health facilities or further education and training opportunities.
- Monitor and actively manage the new network to ensure any supported bus services continue to provide best value for the Council and that adjustments are made to meet changing needs.
- Consider the potential for more integrated 'Total Transport' solutions, particularly in areas with low levels of demand.

- Produce a bus strategy in partnership with key stakeholders setting out a long term vision for bus services for the next 10 years.

Original proposal: To withdraw funding for Community Transport Dial-a-Bus services from October 2017.

Proposed response:

- To implement the proposals to withdraw support for the existing grant funded Dial-a-Bus service from October 2017.
- To mitigate the loss of Community Transport services by providing a new “Derbyshire Connect” service, which would be of particular benefit for current users of Community Transport, using funding previously earmarked for ‘Door to Door Plus’ (previously referred to as ‘aCTive travel Plus’). This would continue to provide all areas of the County with a weekly shopping service. To provide a level of service comparable to that currently provided, top-up funding of approximately £0.25m will be needed from savings in spending on supported services to provide a total of £0.350m a year.
- To integrate the “Derbyshire Connect” and “aCTive travel” services into single contracts.
- To consider developing “Derbyshire Connect” services into DRT services that could meet the needs of all users in areas where there is low demand for conventional bus services.
- Procure the new service through a competitive tendering process. (Further details will be the subject of a further report to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Infrastructure).
- Investigate the potential for more integrated ‘Total Transport’ solutions where this could provide more efficient and effective solutions, for example, by integrating ‘shopping services’ with services provided for Adult Care passengers.

Original proposal: To introduce Demand Responsive Travel (DRT) to help mitigate the loss of supported conventional and Community Transport Services

Proposed response:

- In the light of the results of public consultation, to reject the concept of DRT as a countywide universal solution to meeting accessibility needs.
- Investigate the potential for DRT-type solutions in areas of low demand where there may be scope to use a single vehicle to meet a variety of transport needs e.g. local transport, school transport, adult care and health transport. Proposals for a pilot scheme in the Ashbourne Area are to be considered by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure at the meeting on 25 October 2016 and this should provide valuable experience that could have application in other parts of Derbyshire.

Original proposal: To introduce a new ‘Door to Door Plus’ service for people unable to use the proposed DRT services.

Proposed response:

- Not to proceed with a ‘Door to Door Plus’ service
- Use the funding earmarked for this service to provide a new “Derbyshire Connect” service. Whilst it is no longer proposed to introduce DRT services on a countywide basis (see above), there will remain a need to help those people who would find it difficult to use conventional bus services.
- The new “Derbyshire Connect” service would be procured through a competitive tendering process based on an understanding of the underlying need to provide transport to essential services. As independent charities, the existing Community Transport organisations would remain free to provide ‘top up’ services in response to local needs.

(3) **Financial Considerations** The indicative future expenditure programme is summarised in the table below. It shows that overall spending would reduce from £5.044m in 2016-17 to £3.9m in 2020-21.

Commitment to a programme of support for services over an extended period will help to ensure stability for passengers and enable the Authority to get the best possible value for money. Contracts for short periods of time do not usually offer good value for money due to the high set up costs for operators, including procuring vehicles and recruiting and training drivers.

Indicative spending on public transport 2017-18 to 2020-2021
(figures for 2016-17, in italics, shown for comparison purposes)

	<i>2016-17</i> £m	2017-18 £m	2018-19 £m	2019-20 £m	2020-21 £m
Supported Bus Services (net spend excluding contributions local authorities and Children’s Services)	<i>4.20</i>	3.80	3.40	3.10	2.70
Community Transport grant including support for flat fare scheme	<i>0.65</i>	0.25	0	0	0
‘aCTive’ travel grant	<i>0.10</i>	0.05	0	0	0
aCTive travel tendered (previously agreed)	<i>0.05</i>	0.10	0.15	0.15	0.15

"Derbyshire Connect"	0	0.20	0.35	0.35	0.35
Growth and Improvement Fund	0	0.10	0.40	0.60	0.70
Total	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.20	3.90

At its meeting on 26 January 2016, Cabinet agreed funding for the aCTive travel scheme and the Wheels to Work scheme and made provisional allocations for a door-to-door service and a countywide DRT service (Minute Nos 18/16 and 19/16 refer).

The programme outlined in the table provides support for conventional bus services and continues the previously agreed support for the aCTive travel and Wheels to Work schemes. It supersedes the programme agreed in January 2016 and now makes provision for a "Derbyshire Connect" service and a Growth and Improvement Fund to support partnership working with operators and related activities.

It should be noted that the costs of providing the supported local bus service, the aCTive travel service and the proposed "Derbyshire Connect" service are estimates based on Officer's knowledge and experience. The actual cost will not be known until after contracts have been awarded.

In 2017-18, the overall cost of this programme can be met from the budgets available from the Economy, Transport and Communities Department, Public Health Funding and funding from the General Reserve that has previously been made available. Whilst the overall cost of the programme would continue to reduce, there would be shortfalls in funding estimated to be £2.6m in 2018-19, £3.1m in 2019-20 and £2.8m in 2020-21, putting further pressure on the County Council's very limited resources. Officers will therefore need to look at all available funding streams to secure the revenue contribution needed to meet the desired level of service provision and a further report will be submitted in due course. If alternative funding streams cannot be found, or reductions made elsewhere within the Council, it is possible that further cuts in public transport provision will be considered again in later years.

(4) **Legal Considerations** In considering any potential changes to subsidised local bus services following consultation, Cabinet would need to be satisfied that the changes would continue to permit the Council to meet its statutory obligations. Section 63(1) of the Transport Act 1985 places a duty on the Authority to secure the provision of such public passenger transport services as the Council considers appropriate to secure to meet any public transport requirements within the County which would not, in its view, be met apart from any action taken by them for that purpose.

Under Section 63(8) of the Act, the Council also has a duty to have regard to the transport needs of members of the public who are elderly or disabled when exercising the Section 63(1) duty referred to above.

The Equality Act 2010 provides that the Council should give 'due regard' to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations in the exercising of its functions. This need for 'due regard' specifically applies to all nine protected characteristics set out in the Act, including age and disability.

(5) **Human Resources Considerations** The consultation process and subsequent analysis involved a considerable amount of Officer time. This was managed using existing staff resources.

(6) **Equality and Diversity and Health Considerations** The proposals that formed the basis of the public consultation have potentially far-reaching implications for people who use these services. The potential impact of these changes on different groups is outlined in the Appendix that accompanies this report.

(7) **Social Value Considerations** County Council funding for local bus and Community Transport services helps to support local businesses and provide employment opportunities for Derbyshire residents. The bus services that are supported by the Council enable people to get access to jobs, shopping and leisure activities, thereby contributing to their own well-being as well as supporting the local economy.

Proposals for future provision of Public Transport provision will need to ensure that these impacts are mitigated insofar as it is possible given the resources available.

In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: prevention of crime and disorder, environmental, property and transport considerations.

(8) **Key Decision** Yes.

(9) **Call-In** Is it required that call-in be waived in respect of the decisions proposed in the report? No.

(10) **Background Papers** Held on file within the Economy, Transport and Communities Department. Officer contact details – Steve Cannon, extension 38148.

(11) OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATIONS That Cabinet:

- 11.1 Notes the outcome of public consultation on proposed changes to Local Bus and Community Transport Services as outlined in this report.
- 11.2 Rejects the proposals to withdraw funding for local bus services that formed the basis of consultation and agrees to pursue an approach to public transport as outlined in the report.
- 11.3 Confirms the proposals to withdraw grant funding for Community Transport as proposed.
- 11.4 Agrees in principle the introduction of a new "Derbyshire Connect" service from October 2017 to help meet travel demands not met through conventional bus services.
- 11.5 Agrees to receive a further report on detailed proposals for the "Derbyshire Connect" service.
- 11.6 Agrees to receive a further report on proposals for developing a Derbyshire Bus Strategy in conjunction with bus operators and representatives of bus passengers.
- 11.7 Notes the profile of indicative spending for the period 2017-18 to 2020-21 as outlined in the report and the impact this will have if alternative funding streams cannot be identified.

Mike Ashworth
Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Communities

Appendix 1

Summary of consultation results

Note: Figures have been rounded and may not total 100%

Are you answering this questionnaire as...(tick all that apply)

A Derbyshire resident	91%
A user of subsidised bus services	79%
A Derbyshire resident who does not use subsidised buses	6%
A user of community transport Dial a Bus shopping services	8%
A Derbyshire resident who does not use Dial a Bus shopping services	26%
Someone who works for a bus company providing subsidised buses	0%
Someone who works or volunteers for a community transport scheme	1%
Someone who works for Derbyshire County Council	3%
Other	5%

How strongly do you, or a member of your household, agree or disagree with the proposal to withdraw council funding for subsidised buses?

Strongly agree	2.2%
Agree	2.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	2.6%
Disagree	14.2%
Strongly Disagree	78.1%
Don't know	0.9%

How often do you, or a member of your household, use a local bus service subsidised by the council?

	Daytime	Evening	Sunday
Almost every day	74%	19%	7%
At least once a week	66%	22%	11%
About once a week	50%	22%	28%
Within the last 6 months	41%	27%	31%
Within the last year	42%	26%	31%
More than a year ago	43%	28%	28%
Never use	27%	35%	39%

Please tell us why you, or a member of your household, are making these journeys and when you use these services?

	Daytime	Evening	Sunday
Education/training	73%	24%	3%
Employment	59%	31%	10%
Healthcare	88%	8%	4%
Leisure/social	56%	24%	19%
Supermarket	83%	9%	8%
Town/local centre	75%	14%	11%

How strongly do you, or a member of your household, agree or disagree with the proposal to withdraw council funding for Dial a Bus shopping buses?

Strongly agree	3.3%
Agree	4.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	21.9%
Disagree	18.7%
Strongly Disagree	42.0%
Don't know	9.2%

How often do you or a member of your household, use the Dial a Bus shopping buses paid for by the Council?

Once a week	11.4%
Once a fortnight	1.7%
Once a month	0.5%
Occasionally	5.5%
Never	81.0%

How strongly do you, or a member of your household agree or disagree with the proposal to put on a Demand Responsive Transport service in place of subsidised bus services and Dial a Bus shopping buses?

Strongly agree	6.1%
Agree	10.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	20.1%
Disagree	16.9%
Strongly Disagree	34.0%
Don't know	11.9%

How likely or unlikely would you or a member of your household, be to use a Demand Responsive Transport service?

Very likely	12.1%
Fairly likely	12.1%
Neither likely nor unlikely	12.0%
Fairly unlikely	14.6%
Very unlikely	28.5%
Don't know	20.8%

How strongly do you, or a member of your household, agree or disagree with the proposal to put on a Door-to-Door Plus service for people who would be unable to use the proposed Demand Responsive Transport service?

Strongly agree	17.5%
Agree	25.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	26.2%
Disagree	6.1%
Strongly Disagree	8.6%
Don't know	16.0%

Are you ...

Female	62.8%
Male	37.2%

Age group

Over 65	59.9%
Under 65	40.1%

Derbyshire County Council

Equality Analysis



Department	Economy, Transport and Communities
Service Area	Public Transport
Changes or proposals	<p>Proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To withdraw funding for all Council supported local bus services at the end of September 2017. • To end grant funding for Community Transport Schemes to operate the Dial a Bus (DAB) and aCTive travel service at the end of September 2017. • To introduce a Demand Response Transport (DRT) service from the start of October 2017 to provide a limited alternative option to the withdrawn supported local bus and DAB services until at least March 2020. This service would be procured via an open tender process. • To introduce a limited “Door to Door Plus” service for users of the current DAB service who would struggle to use the proposed DRT service for mobility reasons from the start of October 2017 until at least March 2020. This service would be procured via an open tender process. • To maintain the current level of funding for the aCTive Travel service until March 2020 with the service being procured via an open tender process
Chair of Analysis Team	Chris Hegarty
Date of Analysis	7 th June 2016
Version	3

1 Prioritising what is being analysed

A Description of current service arrangements

Whilst the vast majority of bus services in Derbyshire are operated on a commercial basis, with no direct financial support from the County Council, the Council does play an important role supporting this network. It does this by subsidising public transport services in less populated areas and at times and days when services are not financially viable, as well as by paying for specialist transport for people who struggle to use conventional bus services. The Council currently spends approximately £5.7m, gross, a year from its reserves to fund the provision of -

- Local bus services in rural areas of the County which cannot support a conventional commercial service.
- Additional evening and Sunday trips on local bus services which are commercially operated during the day Monday to Saturday but would not be viable outside these times.
- Dial A Bus and aCTive travel to provide a door to door service for people who would struggle to use conventional buses because of mobility difficulties.

The supported bus services are operated by local commercial bus companies using routes, timetables and fares structures set by the County Council. Operators are chosen to provide these services following a competitive tender process. Dial A Bus (DAB) and aCTive Travel services are provided by the six Community Transport schemes, (CTs) across Derbyshire to a specification provided by the Council. The CTs are registered charities and companies limited by guarantee and they operate with a mix of paid and voluntary staff, including a voluntary Board of Trustees/Company Directors. The Council currently pays the CTS an annual grant to operate these services, however, it is proposed that this arrangement will end in September 2017.

The supported bus network, DAB and aCTive travel service provide a vital transport link for local people across Derbyshire allowing them to access employment, educational, health facilities, food shopping and leisure opportunities across the County. Between them, these services carry approximately 4.1m passengers a year.

B Details of proposals or changes

The proposed changes from October 2017 would involve –

- Withdrawing all Council funding for supported local bus services. Currently the Council directly financially supports 137 bus services. Of these, 84 are completely paid for by the Council with a further 53, which are commercially viable during some part of the day, having additional early morning, late evening or weekend journeys paid for by the Council.
- Withdrawing all Council grant aid funding for CTs to operate DAB and aCTive travel services. Currently the six CTs operators use this grant to provide people who struggle to use conventional bus services with a weekly DAB trip from every community to their nearest town centre or supermarket and an aCTive travel service allowing people to access health and other community services.
- To introduce a Demand Response Transport (DRT) service to provide a limited alternative option to the withdrawn supported local bus and DAB services until at least March 2020. Whilst the precise format of this service would take has yet to be completely agreed, it seems probable that passengers would need to book the journey they want to take in advance with no guarantee that it would be available exactly when people wanted to travel. Only a limited number of DRT vehicles would be available across the County and it has been proposed they would operate from 7am to 7pm Monday to Friday. It has still not yet been decided if the DRT would run on a fixed route to and from one specific destination from a fixed location in local communities or offer a more bespoke service from and to wherever passengers wanted to go. The service would be procured following an open tender process.
- To introduce, until at least March 2020, a limited “Door to Door Plus” service for current users of the DAB who would not be able to use DRT because of their disabilities or mobility difficulties. The level of service provided by “Door to Door Plus” would be significantly reduced from the current DAB provision. The service would be procured following an open tender process.
- To maintain the current level of funding for the aCTive travel service until March 2020 with the service procured following an open tender process.

C Rationale for proposed changes

Whilst the Council funded bus network is important to many residents the services are non -statutory and therefore there is no obligation for the Council to provide them or support their provision. At a time when the Council is struggling to afford to pay for the services which it has a statutory obligation to provide, due to budgetary pressures, it is important that we review the provision and cost of these discretionary areas of spending.

The level of funding provided by the Council towards bus services has reduced since 2011. As a result some local supported bus services have either been withdrawn or had the frequency cut. The number of different journeys provided by DAB has also been reduced. However, despite these changes, the Council is still spending £6.5m on a service which it has no statutory obligation to provide. With the level of Central Government Revenue Support Grant to the Council dropping from £98.05m in 2015-16 to an estimated £13m in 2019-20, it has now reached the point where it is simply unaffordable to continue to provide the current level of financial support to bus and Community Transport services.

Information from previous consultations on changes to supported bus, DAB and aCTive travel services over the last few years has shown that these are highly valued by users and many in the wider community. The number of people using the current services would also indicate that there is a large demand for some sort of supported bus services across the County to fill the gaps in the commercially provided network, thus allowing people in these areas to access employment, educational, health and other essential facilities which otherwise they would not be able to reach. Whilst some of the existing supported network may be replaced by operators on a commercial basis if the Council was to withdraw its funding, it is unlikely that they would fill many of the gaps created by the ending of all local authority support. This is particularly true in the more rural and deprived areas of the County where there is insufficient demand to make a replacement service commercially viable.

Simply cutting all Council support for bus services was therefore not seen as a practical option so instead, an alternative proposal was developed to introduce a limited DRT and “Door to Door Plus” service to meet at least some of the existing demands. It was with this proposal that the Council went out to public consultation on in February 2016.

2 The team carrying out the analysis

<i>Name</i>	<i>Area of expertise/ role</i>
<i>Chris Hegarty</i>	<i>Accessibility and Transport</i>
<i>Steve Cannon</i>	<i>Accessibility and Transport</i>
<i>Deborah Oddy</i>	<i>Community Transport/School Transport</i>
<i>Elaine Wachlarz</i>	<i>Community Transport</i>
<i>Anthony Crompton</i>	<i>Local Bus Services</i>
<i>Neil Bennett</i>	<i>Surveys and Data Analysis</i>

3. Existing information and consultation based feedback

Sources of data and reason for using

<i>Source</i>	<i>Reason for using</i>
Results of the February - April 2016 public consultation on proposals to remove Council funding from local buses and CTs, and to introduce a limited DRT and Door to Door Plus service.	To get the views of current passengers and the wider community on the proposed removal of most of the Council's subsidy for local bus and DAB services and the introduction of DRT and Door to Door Plus as a limited replacement. As part of the consultation we also sought to gain a better understanding of what types of journeys are currently being made on the existing supported transport services. During the consultation, 4204 completed questionnaires were returned along with a number of letters and emails in response to the proposals.

Results of July - September 2015 public consultation on proposals for changes to Council funding of CTS, DAB and aCTive travel.	To understand the views of existing users and the wider community on the earlier proposal to end Council funding of the CTs and the aCTive travel service, and to reduce the level of DAB service provided.
Result of February - March 2015 public consultation on proposals for changes to the Council funding of the B_line young person's concessionary travel scheme.	To understand the views of young people on public transport, what journeys they make on it and the impact of reducing the level of fares concessions available to them on these services from the B_line scheme.
Results of November 2010 - January 2011 public consultation on proposals to reduce Council spending on local bus services, CTs, school bus services, B-line and Gold Card .	To understand the views previously expressed the last time major reductions to local bus services across the County were proposed.
Rural ageing Research Summary Report of Findings – Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs 2013 http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0ahUKEwjN0vPL5afNAhVIFMAKHf2mAJ4QFggcMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Frandd.defra.gov.uk%2FDocument.aspx%3FDocument%3D11690_DEFRARuralAgeingReport.pdf&usg=AFQjCNG-ct6bQACWfWMTDq3-Q5m-l3MKkQ	To gain a better understanding of the barriers older people in rural areas experience accessing a variety of different services, including transport, and the potential means of overcoming them.
Value for money of tendered bus services – Department for Transport 2016 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/500158/Value_for_Money_of_Tendered_Bus_Services.pdf	To understand the wider monetised benefits of tendered bus services, including benefits to passengers who are able to travel on the services and access work, leisure, education, etc., the effect on road congestion from reduced car journeys, and the net effect of greenhouse gas emissions from reduced car journeys. The report estimated that for every £1 of local authority spend in rural areas on bus services it generated wider benefits of £2.10.

<p>The English Indices of Deprivation, 2015, (ID 2015) Summary Analysis for Derbyshire October 2015, version 1.0</p>	<p>These indices use Lower-layer Super Output Areas (LSOA) as there geographical levels. Of the 32,844 across England, there are 491 such areas in Derbyshire. Of these, 60 fall within the 20% most deprived in England, a third of these lie in Chesterfield, 12 in Erewash, 10 in Bolsover and 8 in Amber Valley districts. 18 LSOA's also fall within the 10% most deprived in England, Chesterfield contains 6, Erewash contains 4, Bolsover, High Peak and Amber Valley contain 2 each, and North East Derbyshire and Derbyshire Dales contain 1 each. In these 18 LSOAs, there are approximately 26,700 residents which represent about 3.5% of Derbyshire's total population. Findings relating to the protected characteristic groups can be used to show any correlations with responses from the Council consultation. In particular, the connection between income deprivation and the physical and financial barriers to accessing key local services.</p>
<p>The Future of Transport in an Ageing Society (2015) Age UK http://www.ilcuk.org.uk/index.php/publications/publication_details/the_future_of_transport_in_an_ageing_society</p>	<p>This study provides a national overview of issues relating to projected population increases in people over the age of 65, 80 and 90, and the current perceived failure of public transport to address the needs of elderly people.</p>
<p>No entry – Transport barriers facing young people (2013) Intergenerational foundation http://www.bettertransport.org.uk/sites/default/files/research-files/No_Entry_final_report_definitive_0.pdf</p>	<p>This study provides information on transport issues facing young people and the important role public transport plays in their life.</p>
<p>Monitoring Poverty and Social Exclusion 2015 – Joseph Rowntree Foundation https://www.jrf.org.uk/mpse-2015/commentary</p>	<p>This study provides information on poverty and its consequences.</p>

Barriers to Education, Employment and Training for Young People in Rural Areas (2012) Commission for Rural Communities http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/15199/1/Barriers-to-education-employment-and-training-for-young-people-in-rural-areas.pdf	This study provides information on the barriers young people experience accessing education and work in rural areas, including the impact of public transport cuts on their ability to access these opportunities.
Buses Matter (2011) Campaign for Better Transport report	This study provides background information about the importance of bus services to the economy in general and particularly to people from disadvantaged groups, such as the young, the old, those on low incomes and disabled people.
Transport and poverty – a review of the evidence UCL 2014 https://www.ucl.ac.uk/transport-institute/pdfs/transport-poverty	The study provides information on the link between poverty and transport, and how improvements in transport can create wider benefits to people in poorer communities.
DRT, a Transport Focus report on users views of services June 2016 http://www.transportfocus.org.uk/research-publications/publications/demand-responsive-transport-users-views-pre-booked-community-buses-shared-taxis/	To gain an understanding of users views of a number of different DRT type services which have been introduced elsewhere in the country in the last few years, to replace conventional supported bus services, and what lessons can be learnt for any potential service in Derbyshire.

4 Known impacts on different protected characteristic groups and any mitigation

Statutory

<i>Protected Group</i>	a) From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?
Age including children and families, older people	<p>Older people and the young are more likely to use bus services than the general population. Nationally, on average, people over 70 make 11% of their journey by bus while those between 17 and 20 make 15% of their trips in the same way. This compares to just 4% of trips made by bus for people aged 40-49. As a result, the distance young and older people travel by bus is also greater than the annual national average for the population as a whole of 371 miles for women and 279 miles for men. Women aged from 17-20 travel on average 905 miles a year by bus and men 507 miles, whilst the figures for people over 70 were 492 miles for women and 359 miles for men. Nationally, therefore, public transport is a key enabler for both the young and old allowing them to access social activities as well as educational and employment opportunities.</p> <p>Older and younger people are also disproportionately represented in the lower income brackets. As a result, they would be less likely to be able to afford to either buy their own private transport such as a car, or use other forms of public transport, such as taxi, to replace any of the journeys they currently take by bus services.</p> <p>Research undertaken with young people has shown those with a positive experience of bus travel are more likely to continue to use them later in their life. However, a recent study of other DRT schemes introduced elsewhere in England, to replace supported local bus services, has shown that they have failed to attract young people to use them, primarily because they were not viewed as conventional bus services but something purely for the elderly or disabled.</p>

	<p>The number of older people likely to be dependent on this type of service is anticipated to increase significantly in the next 15 years with the population over 65 in Derbyshire forecast to increase by 45,000 to 105,000 by 2032.</p> <p>Overall, therefore, it would appear that the old and the young are likely to be heavily affected by the proposed changes which will have consequential impact on their independence, finances and general wellbeing.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any specific age group that would benefit from the proposed changes.</p>
	<p>b) From existing customer and other feedback including consultation feedback—who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?</p> <p>As with most consultation processes, the people who take part are self-selecting. It is therefore difficult to say if the 4204 people who completed the questionnaire in the recent consultation are truly representative of supported bus service users in general. Whilst the age range of the people who responded to the questionnaire stretched from the teens to the early 90s a significant majority were aged over 65. This would seem to show that this age group will be more heavily affected by the proposals as they have taken the time to participate in the process. Further examination of where people are traveling to on the bus services shows the potential impact which withdrawing them would have with -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16% (670) using the services to access education or training 28.4% (1194) using the service to go to work. 51.7% (2176) using the services to access healthcare. 61.6% (2592) using the services to access food shopping. <p>A common comment received was that without the Council supported service, people would find it very difficult, if not impossible, to make these journeys. As a result they would not be able to go to school, college, work etc.</p>

	<p>The consultation carried out in 2015 about earlier proposals to reduce the frequency of DAB services and end support for aCTive travel recorded similar concerns about the impact of the suggested changes on older people. Key issues raised included -</p> <p>15% of those that replied thought the proposals will have a social impact on them as they would miss meeting friends etc. Any reduced service would therefore increase social isolation for these users and the impact would be felt to the greatest extent by older people.</p> <p>18% stated the proposals would affect their independence and safety.</p> <p>15% thought the proposals will particularly affect them because of their limited mobility and they needed to travel in an accessible vehicle.</p> <p>6% stated that they thought the proposals would affect them because of rural isolation.</p> <p>2.5% thought the proposals would have an adverse impact on their health.</p> <p>Earlier consultation carried out in 2015 about proposals to reduce the discount young people received from the B_line concessionary scheme highlighted the importance of bus services to young people. Of the 1034 questionnaires completed, 40% of respondents stated they used bus services to reach school or college and 41% using to access leisure and entertainment. Whilst no attempt was made to distinguish between commercial and Council supported services, it is likely that a significant number of these journeys were made on routes which are likely to stop operating.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any specific age group that would benefit from the proposed changes.</p>
	<p>c) Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impacts, what are those actions, and how will they assist</p> <p>The introduction of the proposed new DRT and Door to Door Plus services from October 2017 will provide a limited replacement for some of the journeys currently taken by supported local bus and DAB services. However, because of the limited resources that will be available to fund these new services, they will not be able to offer the number and variety of</p>

	<p>opportunities to travel or the capacity to deal with peak demands which the current services provide. Also because the DRT service will need to be booked in advance, there will be no guarantee that it will be available to make the journeys people going to work or education need to make on a regular basis.</p> <p>In areas where commercial bus routes will also operate, in addition to the proposed DRT and Door to Door Plus services, it may be possible for the Council to encourage greater use of them as a way to access alternative employment, educational, healthcare or shopping opportunities. Potential measures could include improved information provision, better quality roadside infrastructure, joint ticketing schemes or bus punctuality schemes. These types of measures would also require additional Council funding to complete.</p>
--	--

<p><i>Protected Group</i></p> <p>Disabled people including mobility, sensory, learning, mental health, HIV, and also include carers and relatives</p>	<p>a) From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?</p> <p>Nationally, disabled people travel around a third less than the population as a whole, however, they use busses around 20% more frequently on average than non-disabled people. A lot of this difference is probably because 60% of disabled people do not have access to a car in their household.</p> <p>Findings from a 2009 poll commissioned by the Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee showed that 48% of disabled people cited transport or the lack of it as one of the main problems in their area compared to just 39% of non-disabled people. Increasing frequency and accessibility to public transport was seen as the most important improvement that could be made to any local services such as health or education.</p> <p>Nationally disabled people are more likely to have low incomes or be in poorly paid jobs. As a</p>
---	--

	<p>result they tend to be more reliant on the free bus travel concessions offered by the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme. They are therefore less likely to be able to afford their own private transport or other forms of transport such as taxis, to replace the journeys they currently take on bus services.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any specific group of disabled people who would benefit from the proposed changes.</p>
	<p>b) From existing customer and other feedback including consultation feedback– who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?</p> <p>Of the 4204 people who returned questionnaires to the recent consultation, 30.6% considered they had a disability. Of these -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 660 had a disability affecting mobility 226 had a disability affecting hearing 163 had a disability affecting vision 62 had a learning disability <p>Consultation carried out in 2015 about earlier proposals to reduce the frequency of DAB services and end support for aCTive travel recorded a similar high level of responses from disabled people with 57% of people who completed the questionnaire considering they had a disability. Of these –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 466 had mobility problems 163 had a disability affecting hearing 133 had a disability affecting vision 16 had a learning disability <p>Earlier consultation carried out in 2015 about proposals to reduce the discount young people received from the B_line concessionary scheme also highlighted the importance of bus services to young disabled people with 10% of the questionnaires being completed by people</p>

	<p>who considered they had a disability.</p> <p>The 2011 consultation about local bus service reductions also received a considerable response from disabled users with 38% of completed questionnaires coming from people who stated they had a disability.</p> <p>From the responses to these consultations about bus services over a number of years, it would appear that the supported bus service network is well used by people with disabilities, so any changes to these services is likely to impact on them more severely than the population as a whole.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any specific group of people with disabilities that would benefit from the proposed changes.</p>
	<p>c) Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impact, what are those actions, and how will they assist</p> <p>The proposed Door to Door Plus service will offer disabled people a limited opportunity to access key facilities such as shopping or health. However, the level of service proposed will be significantly less than the current DAB provision so it will not be able to meet the needs of all the current users. The current level of funding for aCTive travel will also be maintained until 2020. Some disabled people will also be able to use the proposed DRT services, however, it is unlikely that these will offer the same level of “door to door” provision or extra passenger assistance which the current DAB provides. Other services, such as volunteer car schemes, may also be able to provide disabled people with some alternative transport options.</p>
<p>Protected Group</p> <p>Gender (Sex)</p> <p>including men and</p>	<p>a) From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?</p> <p>Nationally, women are more likely to use bus services than men. On average women travel</p>

<p>women, boys and girls</p>	<p>371miles per year by bus compared to 279miles for men. Young women aged 17-20 travel further by bus than any other group with annual average journeys totalling 905 miles. There are a number of potential reasons for these differences which could include the 14.4% average pay gap between sexes, which means that women are less likely than men to be able to afford private transport. Also, the number of male car drivers still outnumbers women drivers, with 82% of men holding a valid license compared to 60% of women.</p> <p>The Office for National Statistics has found that, while both men and women make roughly the same number of journeys each year, there are significant differences in the reason for travel. For men, commuting is the most common reason for travel, while for women it is shopping. Women are more likely than men to take on caring responsibilities. This means they are significantly more likely to travel for escorting reasons, that is, where the main purpose is to accompany someone else, such as a child to school. Women are more likely than men to work part-time, particularly if they have dependent children. Nearly 40% of women with dependent children work part-time, compared with just 4% of men with dependent children. Similarly, 23% of women without dependent children work part-time, compared with 9% of men without dependent children. This means that women are much more likely than men to need bus services that run at different times of the day and night, rather than just during traditional commuting hours. It therefore seems likely that the proposed services changes will have more of an impact on women than men.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any gender group that would specifically benefit or gain from the proposed changes.</p>
	<p>b) From existing customer and other feedback including consultation feedback– who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?</p> <p>Of the 4204 people who completed the recent consultation questionnaires 62.8% were women. Consultation carried out in 2015 about earlier proposals to reduce the frequency of DAB services and end support for aCTive travel recorded a similar high level of response from women with 79% of respondents who completed the questionnaire being female.</p>

	<p>Earlier consultation carried out in 2015, about proposals to reduce the discount young people received from the B_line concessionary scheme, also highlighted the importance of bus services to young women with 56.6% of questionnaires being completed by females.</p> <p>The 2011 consultation about local bus services reductions also received more response from women with 61% of completed questionnaires coming from them compared to 39% for men.</p> <p>By comparison, it is estimated that 50.8% of the total population of Derbyshire are female.</p> <p>From the responses to the consultations about bus services which have taken place over a number of years it would therefore appear that they are more heavily used by women than men. As a result, the proposed changes are more likely to affect females.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any gender group that would specifically benefit or gain from the proposed changes.</p>
	<p>c) Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impact, what are those actions, and how will they assist</p> <p>The introduction of the proposed new DRT and Door to Door Plus services from October 2017 will provide a limited replacement for some of the journeys currently taken by supported local bus and DAB services. However, because of the limited resources that will be available to fund these new services, they will not be able to offer the number of opportunities to travel or the capacity to deal with peak demands which the current services provide. Also, because the DRT service will need to be booked in advance, there will be no guarantee that it will be available to make the regular journeys people need to make, such as to work or education.</p> <p>In areas where commercial bus routes will also operate, in addition to the proposed DRT and Door to Door Plus services, it may be possible to for the Council to encourage greater use of</p>

	<p>them as a way to access alternative employment, educational, healthcare or shopping opportunities. Potential measures could include improved information provision, better quality roadside infrastructure, joint ticketing schemes or bus punctuality schemes. However, these types of measures would also require additional Council funding to complete.</p>
<p>Protected Group</p> <p>Gender reassignment – including impact, if any, on transgender people</p>	<p>a) From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?</p> <p>The Gender Identity Research and Education Society (GIRES) estimate that nationally 1% of the population experience some degree of gender non-conformity, with approximately 1 in 4000 being transgender. This would equate in Derbyshire to approximately 200 people.</p> <p>Those who are transitioning are more likely to be accessing healthcare services for a number of years so the loss of bus services, especially those running close to hospitals, GP surgeries and other health services, may have a negative impact on this group. Transgender people may also need to travel further to socialise and to find support groups.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any specifically benefit or gain from the proposed changes for transgender people.</p>
	<p>b) From existing customer and other feedback including consultation feedback– who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?</p> <p>From the consultation responses it is not thought that the proposed changes will pose a specifically disproportionately adverse impact on people because of gender reassignment.</p>
	<p>c) Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impact, what are those actions, and how will they assist</p> <p>Transgender people could access the proposed DRT and Door to Door Plus services in the</p>

	same way as other members of the wider community.
Protected Group Race – including all racial groups, including impact, if any, on Gypsies and Travellers	<p>a) From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?</p> <p>Approximately 4.2% of the population of Derbyshire consider themselves to be from an ethnic minority background compared to the national figure of 19.5%. Predominately, most of this community lives in Erewash, Chesterfield and South Derbyshire. Nationally, ethnic groups often live in poorer urban communities with higher levels of deprivation and disproportionately on lower incomes. However, in some areas close to nearby cities such as Stenson Fields adjacent to Derby, there are more affluent and professional ethnic communities. It is not apparent that any particular racial group would gain or benefit from the proposals</p>
	<p>b) From existing customer and other feedback including consultation feedback– who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?</p> <p>Of the people who responded to the recent consultation, 98% considered themselves as white. It therefore not thought that the proposals will pose a specific disproportionately adverse impact on people because of their race.</p>
	<p>c) Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impact, what are those actions, and how will they assist</p> <p>People from different racial origins could access the proposed DRT and Door to Door Plus services in the same way as other members of the wider community.</p>
Protected Group Religion and belief including non-belief, including religious	<p>a) From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?</p> <p>Census data shows 63.6% of people in Derbyshire describe themselves as Christian, while a further 28% indicated they had no religion or belief. The next largest religious groups were</p>

minority communities, Humanists	Muslim and Sikh with 0.3% of the population. It is not apparent that any particular religious or belief group would gain or benefit from the proposals.
	<p>b) From existing customer and other feedback including consultation feedback– who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?</p> <p>Whilst the reduction in Sunday buses could impact on Christians attending Church, it is not thought that the proposals will pose a disproportionately adverse impact on people because of religion and belief. It is not apparent that any particular religious or belief groups would gain or benefit from the proposals.</p>
	<p>c) Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impact, what are those actions, and how will they assist</p> <p>Members of religious and belief groups could access the proposed DRT and Door to Door Plus services in the same way as other members of the wider community.</p>
<p>Protected Group</p> <p>Sexual orientation – including the impact, if any, on any lesbian, gay and bisexual people</p>	<p>a) From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?</p> <p>Whilst there is limited data for the number of lesbian, gay or bisexual people there are the Government estimates it is somewhere between 5-7%. Stonewall the national lesbian and gay organisation, feels this is a reasonable estimate. In Derbyshire, this would equate to between 38,484 – 53,878 people.</p> <p>It is not apparent that any particular group would benefit from these proposals.</p>
	<p>b) From existing customer and other feedback including consultation feedback– who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?</p> <p>Whilst there is some anecdotal evidence that lesbian, gay and bisexual people may travel</p>

	<p>further to nearby cities in order to socialise and to find group support from the consultation responses, it is not thought that the proposals will pose a disproportionately adverse impact on people because of their sexual orientation.</p>
	<p>c) Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impact, what are those actions, and how will they assist</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Protected Group</p> <p>Pregnancy and maternity – including new mothers/ parents</p>	<p>a) From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?</p> <p>Nationally, women are less likely than men to have access to a car or to have a driving license. As a result, they are more likely to be dependent on public transport to reach key health services, such as pre-natal and anti-natal care. It is not apparent that any one from this group would specifically gain or benefit from the proposals.</p>
	<p>b) From existing customer and other feedback including consultation feedback– who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?</p> <p>As previously discussed in the section about gender from the results of the consultation it seems likely that women will overall be more adversely affected by the proposals as they depend more on public transport to access services.</p>
	<p>c) Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impact, what are those actions, and how will they assist</p> <p>This group could access the proposed DRT service in the same way as the wider community.</p>

<p>Protected Group</p> <p>Marriage and civil partnership – also include impacts on lone parents and unmarried couples</p>	<p>a) From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?</p> <p>Nationally, women make up 90% of lone parents. Whilst over 60% of single parent households work, the average income of single parent households is 25% less than the national average for couple households. This means they are less likely to be able to afford a car and thus more reliant on public transport to travel to key services, employment and educational opportunities.</p>
	<p>b) From existing customer and other feedback including consultation feedback– who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?</p> <p>In Derbyshire, approximately 6.2% of the total population are lone parents. Whilst these people may experience some adverse impacts from the proposed changes, overall, it is not felt that the proposal will pose a disproportionately adverse impact on people because of their marital or partnership status.</p>
	<p>c) Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impact, what are those actions, and how will they assist</p> <p>The introduction of the proposed new DRT and Door to Door Plus services from October 2017 will provide a limited replacement for some of the journeys currently taken by supported local bus and DAB services.</p>

Non statutory

<p>Poorer and disadvantaged communities and groups, including</p>	<p>a) From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?</p> <p>Travel offers the means to reach essential opportunities, such as jobs, education, shops and</p>
--	--

people who experience financial exclusion	<p>friends. A lack of mobility is often linked to social disadvantage and exclusion. Income is strongly related to travel behaviour. People with low incomes travel much less than those with high incomes. The 2012 Department for Transport National Travel Survey showed those households in the lowest income bracket made on average 819 trips a year travelling 6382km compared to 1052 trips and 16,622km for those in the highest income households. Despite this, people from poorer and more disadvantaged communities tend to make more use of bus services than those from wealthier backgrounds with those in the lowest income bracket making 3 times more journeys by bus than those in the highest income bracket. This is because half of households in the bottom income bracket do not own a car compared to a national average of 25%.</p> <p>The figures are even higher for individuals on benefits where nearly two thirds of people claiming income support or job seekers allowance do not have access to a car or a license to drive it. Statistics published by the former Social Exclusion Unit showed how poor public transport is a significant barrier for people trying to find work such as :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Almost 40% of jobseekers saying that their job search has been limited because of the costs involved.• 13% of people saying they had not applied for a particular job in the last year because of transport problems. This figure rose to 18% for people living in low income areas. <p>The same research also showed that new jobs are increasingly being created in locations which are inaccessible without a car such as out of town or suburban locations. Also, many of these new jobs require evening and weekend work when public transport services are poorer.</p> <p>Another study by the Citizens Advice Bureaux and the Campaign for Better Transport highlighted similar links between poor bus services and unemployment. It reported that, for a third of jobseekers, the biggest obstacle is not willingness to work or the financial rewards of doing so instead it was difficulty of actually getting to and from work. The research also highlighted that for people in low paid work, high fares and cuts in bus services can force them out of work with the expense making the difference between being better off on benefits</p>
--	---

	<p>or better off continuing to work.</p> <p>It would therefore appear that people from poorer and disadvantaged communities could suffer disproportionately from the proposed changes. There does not appear to be any specific benefit or gain from the proposed changes for these people.</p>
	<p>b) From existing customer and other feedback including consultation feedback– who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?</p> <p>The recent questionnaire, issued as part of the consultation on the proposed changes, did not include any questions about the income of those completing it so it is hard to say with any certainty that these included people from poorer or disadvantaged communities. However, from comments made as part of the consultation, it is clear that the cost of transport is a key issue for some people.</p> <p>Earlier consultation carried out in 2011 on the potential for changes to supported bus services did ask people, who completed the questionnaire about their household income. At the time, the national median household income was £23,200 and 60.8% of those who answered the question had a household income of less than £19,999.</p> <p>What the responses to the recent consultation did highlight was the importance of the supported local bus routes to access key services which have are particularly important to poor and disadvantaged groups. Of the 4204 questionnaires completed-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16% (670) reported using the services to access education or training • 28.4%(1194) reported using the services to go to work <p>From the additional comments made it is clear that the loss of these services could result in significant hardship with some people potentially having to give up work or college because they would not be able to travel there any other way.</p> <p>The questionnaire also reported high levels of bus usage to access other key facilities with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 51.7% using the services to access healthcare • 61.6% using the services to access food shopping.

	<p>c) Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impact, what are those actions, and how will they assist</p> <p>The proposed DRT and Door to Door Plus services will be available for people from poorer or disadvantage communities to use in the same as any other potential passengers in the County. At the moment, it is unclear what kind of fares will be charged on these new services and if various ticketing products, such as weekly or monthly passes currently available on some local supported services, will be available. If not it may result in some passengers having to pay higher fares than now. Also, as passengers will need to phone to book the service, this will result in some additional costs.</p>
<p>Rural communities</p>	<p>a) From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?</p> <p>Derbyshire has a significant proportion of rurality with 27.3% of wards in the County classified as rural (Derbyshire Observatory 2011). The County is more urban in the east with areas such as Chesterfield and Erewash, but more rural in the west and north.</p> <p>People in rural areas tend to have to travel further to get to employment, education and health facilities, and other key services such as food shopping compared to those in urban centres. As a result, walking is often not an option particularly as there may not be footpaths on certain roads to allow people to walk between villages safely. This means that the cost of travel for people in rural areas is higher. Research by the Centre for Social justice showed that people who live in rural areas can spend between 20% and 30% more on transport than those in urban areas with people from poorer backgrounds in rural areas more likely to own a car than their counterparts in towns.</p> <p>Those residents in rural areas without access to a private car are therefore more likely to be dependent on public transport to get around and to access key services. However, because</p>

	<p>of the small numbers of people involved, many rural bus services do not generate sufficient income to make them financially viable. As a result the number of commercially operated services is small and tends to be limited to the main corridors between the market towns and urban centres with the other bus routes limited to whatever service the local authority is able to fund. Therefore, should the Council withdraw funding for all its local bus services it is likely to have a more profound impact on residents in rural areas than those in urban areas as there will be no other commercially operated services available for people to use. There does not appear to be any specifically benefit or gain from the proposed changes for rural communities.</p>
	<p>b) From existing customer and other feedback including consultation feedback– who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?</p> <p>In the recent consultation, questionnaires were returned from a large number of different rural communities from Linton in the south to Padfield in the north. From the comments received, it was clear that the local bus and DAB services were seen as very important particularly as so many other local village facilities, such as shops and post offices have closed in recent time meaning people now need to travel further to access them. The importance of bus services for accessing employment and educational opportunities outside of the immediate rural area were also made clear in a number of responses.</p>
	<p>c) Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impact, what are those actions, and how will they assist</p> <p>The proposed DRT and Door to Door Plus services will be available in rural, as well as urban areas. However, because of the distances between potential passengers and their destinations, there is a potential that rural users of the service will experience longer journey times and considerably less service opportunities than those in urban areas.</p>

5. Are there any *other* groups of people who may experience an adverse impact because of the proposals?

The relatives, friends and neighbours of existing local bus and DAB services passengers could be adversely affected as they may be called upon to help transport those people now unable to use the supported services.

Health and Adult Care services may experience an increase in the number of people requiring assistance at an earlier stage placing an additional strain on their resources. It is evident that people use the supported local bus and DAB services to access not only shops, but also health related appointments, and any reductions in the availability may require health professionals to intervene earlier or more often, or require home visits. Overall, this may have a negative impact on people's perceived or actual levels of independence. Likewise, if people's ability to travel independently is reduced, there may be an impact on the demand for the NHS Non-Emergency Patients Transport Service (NEPTS).

The withdrawal of supported services may result in education and training providers, and some employers experiencing problems recruiting students and staff as the limited capacity of the proposed DRT services will make it difficult for people to rely on it to make regular peak period journeys to access these educational and work opportunities. This may result in these organisations having to provide their own transport services which add additional costs to their operations.

Bus companies and CTs staff are likely to be adversely effected by the proposed changes. Whilst the proposed introduction of DRT and Door to Door Plus services will generate some opportunities for bus companies and CTs who currently operate local bus and DAB services to find new work, the funding available to provide them will be significantly less than that currently spent by the Council. As a result it is inevitable that the number of people working for these companies and CTs will reduce, which may result in increased unemployment in certain areas. The volunteers who work at the CTs helping to operate the DAB services and other projects as social car schemes, could also be affected by the proposed changes. Studies carried out by the University of Wales have shown that volunteering can decrease mortality, as well as improving mental health and life satisfaction in general.

Where companies and CTs are particularly dependent on Council local bus and DAB contracts to generate income, there is a potential that some organisations may even be forced out of business as a result of these changes. Should this happen, it could have a negative impact on the Councils ability to procure other services such as school and special educational needs transport, as the number of organisations which will be able to tender for this type of contract would be reduced.

The withdrawal of supported bus services may also impact on the existing commercial network as some customers change between the different services to make their onward journeys. Removing the current supported services would mean that these follow on journeys were not made thus reducing the fares income operators generate on them. As a result services, which currently operate without financial support, could become vulnerable and potentially be withdrawn, thus increasing the number of communities and people affected by the proposed change.

Road users in general may experience more delays to their journeys due to additional traffic on the highway network as current local bus and DAB users switch to other forms of transport. This could cause particular issues around key locations, such as schools and colleges, employment sites, health facilities and shopping areas, which currently attract significant numbers of bus users.

Because of the size of the proposed changes, virtually all the areas in the County will lose some services. The table below lists, by electoral division, all the supported services to be withdrawn during weekday daytimes services and also the additional evening and weekend services funded by the Council. Also the withdrawal of DAB services and introduction of a Door to Door Plus as a limited replacement will affect all areas of the County. The table list below lists all the current supported local bus services that would be lost by electoral ward.

Electoral division	Daytime weekday services lost	Evening and weekend services lost
Alfreton and Somercotes	140 Alfreton, Crich, Matlock 148 Alfreton, Pentrich, Ripley, Codnor 149 Alfreton, Higham, Tibshelf, Sutton	R1 Alfreton, Somercotes, Eastwood, Nottingham 40 Alfreton, Crich, Matlock 140 Alfreton, Crich, Matlock 148 Alfreton, Pentrich, Ripley,

	150 Matlock, Wessington, Alfreton, Clay Cross 151 Alfreton, Outseats Estate, Peasehill Estates 152 Alfreton, Sommercotes, Lower Birchwood 153 Alfreton – Meadow Lane 231 Alfreton, South Normaton, Pinxton	Codnor 149 Alfreton, Higham, Tibshelf, Sutton 150 Matlock, Wessington, Alfreton, Clay Cross 151 Alfreton, Outseats Estate, Peasehill Estates 152 Alfreton, Sommercotes, Lower Birchwood 153 Alfreton – Meadow Lane 231 Alfreton, South Normaton, Pinxton
Alport and Derwent	113 Belper, Ashbourne 140 Alfreton, Crich, Matlock 141 Matlock, Crich, Alfreton 142 Nether Heage, Belper, Crich, Alfreton 143 Ripley, Ambergate, Belper 144 Ripley, Ambergate, Crich	Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby 140 Alfreton, Crich, Matlock 141 Matlock, Crich, Alfreton 142 Nether Heage, Belper, Crich, Alfreton 143 Ripley, Ambergate, Belper 144 Ripley, Ambergate, Crich
Ashbourne	108 Ashbourne, Leek 110 Matlock, Kniveton, Ashbourne 111 Matlock, Hognaston, Ashbourne 113 Belper, Ashbourne 114 Derby, Ashbourne 442 Buxton, Hartington, Ashbourne	1 – Uttoxeter, Tutbury, Burton Swift – Derby, Brailsford, Ashbourne, Mayfield 110 Matlock, Kniveton, Ashbourne 442 Buxton, Hartington, Ashbourne
Aston	70 Barrow on Trent, Derby	2 Swadlincote, Melbourne, Derby
Bakewell	171 Bakewell, Youlgreave, Middleton	171 Bakewell, Youlgreave, Middleton

	172 Bakewell, Stanton, Winster, Matlock 173 Bakewell, Litton, Tideswell, Castleton 177 Bakewell, Monyash, Chelmorton, Buxton 215 Bakewell, Grindleford, Sheffield 275 Bakewell, Eyam, Bamford, Sheffield	172 Bakewell, Stanton, Winster, Matlock 173 Bakewell, Litton, Tideswell, Castleton 177 Bakewell, Monyash, Chelmorton, Buxton Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby
Barlborough and Clowne	49 Clay Cross, Holmewood, Bolsover Clowne 73/74 Clowne, Renishaw, Killamarsh/Eckington, Crystal Peaks 75 Clowne Local Service	53A Mansfield, Bolsolver, Clowne, Eckington, Sheffield 73/74 Clowne, Renishaw, Killamarsh/Eckington, Crystal Peaks
Belper	113 Belper, Ashbourne 138 Belper, Heanor, Langley 142 Nether Heage, Belper, Crich, Alfreton 143 Ripley, Ambergate, Belper	113 Belper, Ashbourne 138 Belper, Heanor, Langley 142 Nether Heage, Belper, Crich, Alfreton 143 Ripley, Ambergate, Belper Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby
Birdholme	16/16A Broomfield, Chesterfield, Barlow, Dronfield 48 Brampton, Chesterfield, Sutton Scarsdale, Holmewood, Clay Cross	16A Broomfield, Chesterfield, Barlow, Dronfield 80A Wingererworth, Chesterfield, Royal Hospital, Brimington 97A Chesterfield, Pilsley, Morton, Alfreton

Bolsover North	49 Clay Cross, Holmewood, Bolsover Clowne	53A Mansfield, Bolsover,Clown, Eckington, Sheffield Eckington, Sheffield 82/83 Chesterfield, Bolsolver, Shirebrook, Langwith
Bolsover South	49 Clay Cross, Holmewood, Bolsover Clowne 122 Langwith, Shirebrook, Leen Valley	53A Mansfield, Bolsover,Clown, Eckington, Sheffield Eckington, Sheffield 82/83 Chesterfield, Bolsolver, Shirebrook, Langwith
Boythorpe and Brampton South	63/64 Chesterfield/Matlock, Ashover, Clay Cross	16/16A Broomfield, Chesterfield, Barlow, Dronfield 80 Walton, Chesterfield 84 Holymoorside, Chesterfield, Royal Hospital 90A Yew Tree, Chesterfield 170 Chesterfield, Baslow, Bakewell X17 Sheffield, Chesterfield, Matlock
Breadsall and West Hallam	59 Derby, Stanley Common, Ilkeston, Shipley View	11 Heanor, Ilkeston, Stanley, Derby 59 Derby, Stanley Common, Ilkeston, Shipley View
Breaston	9/9A Derby, Spondon, Ockbrook, Borrowash	9/9A Derby, Spondon, Ockbrook, Borrowash
Brimington	78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington	78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington
Buxton North and East	68 Buxton, Tideswell, Castleton 190 Buxton, Upper End, Chapel, Chinley, Whaley Bridge 442 Buxton, Hartington, Ashbourne	68 Buxton, Tideswell, Castleton 190 Buxton, Upper End, Chapel, Chinley, Whaley Bridge 442 Buxton, Hartington, Ashbourne

		Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby
Buxton West	58 Buxton, Macclesfield 76 Buxton, Brownedge	58 Buxton, Macclesfield 61 Glossop, New Mills, Buxton 76 Buxton, Brownedge Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby X15 Buxton, Leek, Hanley
Chapel and Hope Valley	190 Buxton, Upper End, Chapel, Chinley, Whaley Bridge	190 Buxton, Upper End, Chapel, Chinley, Whaley Bridge 272 Sheffield, Hathersage, Bradwell, Castleton, 273,274,275 Bakewell/Castleton, Eyam, Bamford, Sheffield. Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby
Clay Cross North	48 Brampton, Chesterfield, Sutton Scarsdale, Heath Clay Cross 49 Clay Cross, Holmewood, Bolsover, Clowne 61 Clay Cross, Hepthorne Lane, Wingerworth 63/64 Chesterfield/Matlock Ashover Clay Cross	48 Brampton, Chesterfield, Sutton Scarsdale, Heath Clay Cross 61 Clay Cross, Hepthorne Lane, Wingerworth 63/64 Chesterfield/Matlock Ashover Clay Cross 97A Chesterfield, Pilsley, Morton, Alfreton
Clay Cross South	48 Brampton, Chesterfield, Sutton Scarsdale, Heath Clay Cross 49 Clay Cross, Holmewood, Bolsover, Clowne 61 Clay Cross, Hepthorne Lane, Wingerworth	48 Brampton, Chesterfield, Sutton Scarsdale, Heath Clay Cross 63/64 Chesterfield/Matlock Ashover Clay Cross 97A Alfreton, Morton, Pilsley, Chesterfield

	63/64 Chesterfield/Matlock Ashover Clay Cross 149 Alferton, Higham, Tibshelf, Hilcote, Sutton 150 Clay Cross, Alferton, Wessington, Tansley, Matlock	149 Alferton, Higham, Tibshelf, Hilcote, Sutton 150 Clay Cross, Alferton, Wessington, Tansley, Matlock
Derwent Valley	66 Buxton, Tideswell, Chesterfield 172 Bakewell, Stanton, Winster, Matlock 217 Matlock, Rowsley, Chatsworth 275 Sheffield, Bamford, Eyam, Bakewell	65 Buxton, Tideswell, Sheffield 66 Buxton, Tideswell, Chesterfield 172 Bakewell, Stanton, Winster, Matlock 217 Matlock, Rowsley, Chatsworth 218 Sheffield, Baslow, Chatsworth, Bakewell 275 Sheffield, Bamford, Eyam, Bakewell Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby
Dovedale	102 Ashbourne, Parwich, Kirk Ireton, Wirksworth 110/111 Matlock, Wirksworth, Carsington, Ashbourne 113 Ashbourne, Hulland Ward, Turnditch, Belper 114 Ashbourne, Hulland Ward, Kedleston, Derby 171 Bakewell, Youlgreave, Middleton 172 Bakewell, Stanton Winster, Matlock 177 Bakewell, Monyash, Chelmorton, Buxton	102 Ashbourne, Parwich, Kirk Ireton, Wirksworth 110/111 Matlock, Wirksworth, Carsington, Ashbourne 113 Ashbourne, Hulland Ward, Turnditch, Belper 114 Ashbourne, Hulland Ward, Kedleston, Derby 171 Bakewell, Youlgreave, Middleton 172 Bakewell, Stanton Winster, Matlock 177 Bakewell, Monyash, Chelmorton, Buxton

	178 Bakewell,Over Haddon, Monyash 193 Tideswell, Taddington, Buxton 441/442 Buxton, Hartington, Ashbourne 449 Ilam, Parwich, Bakewell	178 Bakewell,Over Haddon, Monyash 442 Buxton, Hartington, Ashbourne Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby
Dronfield East	14/15 Holmesfield, Dronfield, Appleknowle, Marsh Lane, Chesterfield	14/15/15A Holmesfield, Dronfield, Appleknowle, Marsh Lane, Chesterfield 44 Sheffield, Coal Aston, Dronfield, Chesterfield 50 Sheffield, Eckington, New Whittington, Chesterfield
Dronfield West and Walton	16/16A Broomfield, Chesterfield, Barlow, Dronfield 66 Buxton, Tideswell, Chesterfield	16/16A Broomfield, Chesterfield, Barlow, Dronfield 66 Buxton, Tideswell, Chesterfield 84 Holymoorside, Chesterfield,Royal Hospital 170 Chesterfield, Baslow, Bakewell 218 Bakewell, Chatsworth, Barlow, Sheffield X17 Sheffield, Chesterfield, Matlock
Duffield and Belper South	17 Derby, Duffield 114 Derby, Ashbourne 138 Belper, Heanor, Langley	114 Derby, Ashbourne 138 Belper, Heanor, Langley Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby
Eckington and Killamarsh	14/15 Holmesfield, Dronfield, Apperknowle, Marsh Lane/ Chesterfield 73/74 Clowne, Renishaw,	14/15 Holmesfield, Dronfield, Apperknowle, Marsh Lane/ Chesterfield 50/50A Sheffield, Eckington, New

	Killamarsh/Eckington, Crystal Peaks 252 Crystal Peaks, Eckington, Marsh Lane, Sheffield	Whittington, Chesterfield 53/53A Mansfield, Bolsover, Clowne, Eckington, Sheffield 70A/71A Sheffield, Killamarsh/Eckington, Staveley, Chesterfield 73/74 Clowne, Renishaw, Killamarsh/Eckington, Crystal Peaks 252 Crystal Peaks, Eckington, Marsh Lane, Sheffield
Etherow	341 Glossop, Gamesley, Hattersley, Hyde 393 Glossop, Shirebrook Park, Padfield 394 Glossop, Gamesley, Marple, Stepping Hill Hospital	237 Ashton, Hadfield, Glossop, 341 Glossop, Gamesley, Hattersley, Hyde 393 Glossop, Shirebrook Park, Padfield
Etwell and Repton	Villager 2 Derby, Hilton, Egginton, Burton	Villager 1 Derby, Hilton, Tutbury, Burton Villager 3 Derby, Willington, Repton, Burton
Glossop and Charlesworth	341 Glossop, Gamesley, Hattersley, Hyde 390 Shire Hill Hospital, Glossop, Whitfield, 393 Glossop, Shirebrook Park, Padfield 394 Glossop, Gamesley, Marple, Stepping Hill Hospital	237 Ashton, Hadfield, Glossop 341 Glossop, Gamesley, Hattersley, Hyde 390 Shire Hill Hospital, Glossop, Whitfield 393 Glossop, Shirebrook Park, Padfield
Greater Heanor	59 Derby, Stanley Common, Ilkeston, Shipley View 138 Belper, Heanor, Langley	20 Heanor, Ilkeston, Kirk Hallam, Beeston, Nottingham 59 Derby, Stanley Common, Ilkeston,

		Shipley View 138 Belper, Heanor, Langley Amberline Derby, Kilburn, Heanor
Heanor Central	138 Belper, Heanor, Langley	138 Belper, Heanor, Langley Amberline Derby, Kilburn, Heanor
Hilton	DRT Roston to Derby	1 Uttoxeter, Hatton, Tutbury, Burton Villager 1 Derby, Hilton, Tutbury, Burton
Horsley	59 Derby, Stanley Common, Ilkeston, Shipley View 138 Belper, Heanor, Langley 174 Street Lane, Marehay, Ripley	59 Derby, Stanley Common, Ilkeston, Shipley View 138 Belper, Heanor, Langley Amberline Derby, Kilburn, Heanor
Ilkeston East	14 Ilkeston, Stanton by Dale, Sandiacre 59 Derby, Stanley Common, Ilkeston, Shipley View	11 Heanor, Ilkeston, Stanley, Derby 14 Ilkeston, Stanton by Dale, Sandiacre 20 Heanor, Ilkeston, Kirk Hallam, Beeston, Nottingham 59 Derby, Stanley Common, Ilkeston, Shipley View
Ilkeston South	14 Ilkeston, Stanton by Dale, Sandiacre	14 Ilkeston, Stanton by Dale, Sandiacre MY 15 Ilkeston Sandiacre, Long Eaton Sawley
Ilkeston West	59 Derby, Stanley Common, Ilkeston, Shipley View	11 Heanor, Ilkeston, Stanley, Derby MY 15 Ilkeston Sandiacre, Long Eaton Sawley 20 Heanor, Ilkeston, Kirk Hallam, Beeston, Nottingham

Linton	22 Swadlincote, Coton, Rosliston, Walton, Burton	21E Overseal, Swadlincote, Burton 22 Swalincote, Coton, Rosliston, Walton, Burton
Long Eaton	29 Long Eaton, New Sawley, Sandiacre	MY 15 Ilkeston Sandiacre, Long Eaton Sawley 29 Long Eaton, New Sawley, Sandiacre
Loundsley Green and Newbold	16/16A Broomfield, Chesterfield, Barlow, Dronfield	16/16A Broomfield, Chesterfield, Barlow, Dronfield 39 Holme Hall, Chesterfield, Grangewood Farm 170 Chesterfield, Baslow, Bakewell
Matlock	110 Matlock, Kniveton, Ashbourne 111 Matlock, Hognaston, Ashbourne 140 Alfreton, Crich, Matlock 141 Matlock, Crich, Alfreton 150 Matlock, Wessington, Alfreton, Clay Cross 172 Bakewell, Stanton, Winster, Matlock 216 Matlock, Starkholmes, Cromford, Bonsall 217 Matlock, Rowsley, Chatsworth M1 Matlock, Asker Lane, Cavendish Park	110 Matlock, Kniveton, Ashbourne 111 Matlock, Hognaston, Ashbourne 140 Alfreton, Crich, Matlock 141 Matlock, Crich, Alfreton 150 Matlock, Wessington, Alfreton, Clay Cross 172 Bakewell, Stanton, Winster, Matlock 216 Matlock, Starkholmes, Cromford, Bonsall 217 Matlock, Rowsley, Chatsworth M1 Matlock, Asker Lane, Cavendish Park M3 Matlock, Hackney M4 Matlock, Hurst Farm Estate Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby X17 Sheffield, Chesterfield, Matlock

Melbourne	24 Swadlincote, Lower Midway	2 Derby, Chellaston, Melbourne, Swadlincote 24 Swadlincote, Lower Midway Villager 3 Derby, Willington, Repton, Burton
New Mills	62 Hayfield, Thornsett, New Mills, Marple 389 New Mills Town service	61 Buxton, New Mills, Glossop 62 Hayfield, Thornsett, New Mills, Marple 358 Hayfield, New Mills, Marple, Stockport 389 New Mills Town service
Petersham	29 Long Eaton, New Sawley, Sandiacre	MY 15 Ilkeston Sandiacre, Long Eaton Sawley 29 Long Eaton, New Sawley, Sandiacre
Ripley East and Codnor	141 Matlock, Crich, Ripley 143 Ripley, Ambergate, Belper 144 Ripley, Ambergate, Crich 148 Alfreton, Pentrich, Ripley, Codnor	141 Matlock, Crich, Ripley 143 Ripley, Ambergate, Belper 144 Ripley, Ambergate, Crich 148 Alfreton, Pentrich, Ripley, Codnor
Ripley West and Heage	140 Matlock, Crich, Alfreton 141 Matlock, Crich, Ripley 142 Nether Heage, Belper, Crich, Alfreton 143 Ripley, Ambergate, Belper 144 Ripley, Ambergate, Crich 147 Street Lane, Marehay, Ripley 148 Alfreton, Pentrich, Ripley, Codnor	140 Matlock, Crich, Alfreton 141 Matlock, Crich, Ripley 142 Nether Heage, Belper, Crich, Alfreton 143 Ripley, Ambergate, Belper 144 Ripley, Ambergate, Crich 147 Street Lane, Marehay, Ripley 148 Alfreton, Pentrich, Ripley, Codnor

	150 Matlock, Wessington, Alfreton, Clay Cross	150 Matlock, Wessington, Alfreton, Clay Cross Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby
Sandiacre	9/9a Derby, Borrowash, Ockbrook 14 Ilkeston, Stanton by Dale, Sandiacre 29 Long Eaton, New Sawley, Sandiacre	9/9a Derby, Borrowash, Ockbrook 14 Ilkeston, Stanton by Dale, Sandiacre MY 15 Ilkeston Sandiacre, Long Eaton Sawley 29 Long Eaton, New Sawley, Sandiacre
Sawley	29 Long Eaton, New Sawley, Sandiacre	29 Long Eaton, New Sawley, Sandiacre
Shirebrook and Pleasley	122 Langwith, Shirebrook, Leen Valley	23 Langwith, Shirebrook, Pleasley, Mansfield 82 Chesterfield, Bolsover, Shirebrook, Langwith 122 Langwith, Shirebrook, Leen Valley
South Normanton, Pinxton	231 Alfreton, South Normanton, Pinxton	9.3 Alfreton, Pinxton, South Normanton 90 Ripley Pinxton, Sutton 231 Alfreton, South Normanton, Pinxton
Spire	14/15 Holmesfield, Dronfield, Apperknowle, Marsh Lane/ Chesterfield 16/16A Broomfield, Chesterfield, Barlow, Dronfield 48 Brampton, Chesterfield, Sutton	14/15/15A Holmesfield, Dronfield, Apperknowle, Marsh Lane/ Chesterfield 16/16A Broomfield, Chesterfield, Barlow, Dronfield 39 Holme Hall, Chesterfield,

	<p>Scarsdale, Heath Clay Cross 63 Matlock Ashover Clay Cross, Chesterfield 66 Buxton, Tideswell, Chesterfield 78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington</p>	<p>Grangewood Farm 48 Brampton, Chesterfield, Sutton Scarsdale, Heath Clay Cross 50 Sheffield, Eckington, New Whittington, Chesterfield 53A Mansfield, Bolsover, Clown, Eckington, Sheffield Eckington, Sheffield 63 Matlock Ashover Clay Cross, Chesterfield 66 Buxton, Tideswell, Chesterfield 70A/71A Sheffield, Killamarsh/ Eckington, Staveley, Chesterfield 78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington 80/80a Wingererworth, Chesterfield, Royal Hospital, Brimington 82/83 Chesterfield, Bolsover, Shirebrook, Langwith 84 Holymoorside, Chesterfield, Royal Hospital 90A Yew Tree, Chesterfield 97A Alfretton, Morton, Pilsley, Chesterfield 170 Chesterfield, Baslow, Bakewell X17 Sheffield, Chesterfield, Matlock</p>
St Marys	<p>14/15 Holmesfield, Dronfield, Apperknowle, Marsh Lane/ Chesterfield 16/16A Broomfield, Chesterfield,</p>	<p>16/16A Broomfield, Chesterfield, Barlow, Dronfield 50 Sheffield, Eckington, New Whittington, Chesterfield</p>

	Barlow, Dronfield 78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington	78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington 90A Yew Tree, Chesterfield X17 Sheffield, Chesterfield, Matlock
Staveley North and Whittington	78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington 81 Bolsover, Staveley, Markham Vale	50 Sheffield, Eckington, New Whittington, Chesterfield 70A Killamarsh/ Eckington, Staveley, Chesterfield 78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington 81 Bolsover, Staveley, Markham Vale
Staveley	78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington 81 Bolsover, Staveley, Markham Vale	70A Killamarsh/ Eckington, Staveley, Chesterfield 78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington 81 Bolsover, Staveley, Markham Vale 82/83 Chesterfield, Bolsover, Shirebrook, Langwith
Sutton	48 Brampton, Chesterfield, Sutton Scarsdale, Heath Clay Cross 49 Clay Cross, Holmewood, Bolsover, Clowne 78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington	48 Brampton, Chesterfield, Sutton Scarsdale, Heath Clay Cross 78 Hartington, Staveley, Royal Hospital, Chesterfield, Brimington 82/83 Chesterfield, Bolsover, Shirebrook, Langwith
Swadlincote Central	22 Swadlincote, Coton, Burton 24 Swadlincote, Lower Midway	2 Swadlincote, Melbourne, Derby 22 Swadlincote, Coton, Burton 24 Swadlincote, Lower Midway

Swadlincote North	22 Swadlincote, Coton, Burton	21E Overseal Swadlincote, Burton 22 Swadlincote, Coton, Burton
Swadlincote South	22 Swadlincote, Coton, Burton	21E Overseal Swadlincote, Burton 22 Swadlincote, Coton, Burton
Tibshelf	49 Clay Cross, Holmewood, Bolsover, Clowne 149 Alfreton, Higham, Tibshelf, Sutton	1 Alfreton, Tibshelf, Sutton, Mansfield 49 Clay Cross, Holmewood, Bolsover, Clowne 149 Alfreton, Higham, Tibshelf, Sutton
Walton and West	48 Brampton, Chesterfield, Sutton Scarsdale, Heath Clay Cross 63 Matlock Ashover Clay Cross, Chesterfield 66 Buxton, Tideswell, Chesterfield	48 Brampton, Chesterfield, Sutton Scarsdale, Heath Clay Cross 63 Matlock Ashover Clay Cross, Chesterfield 66 Buxton, Tideswell, Chesterfield 84 Holymoorside, Chesterfield, 90A Yew Tree, Chesterfield 170 Chesterfield, Baslow, Bakewell X17 Matlock, Chesterfield, Sheffield
Whaley Bridge	60/64 Glossop/Disley, New Mills, Macclesfield 63 Whalley Bridge, Stoneheads 190 Buxton, Chapel, Chinley, Whaley Bridge	60/64 Glossop/Disley, New Mills, Macclesfield 61 Glossop, New Mills, Buxton 63 Whalley Bridge, Stoneheads 190 Buxton, Chapel, Chinley, Whaley Bridge 199 Buxton, Chapel, Whaley Bridge, Stockport, Manchester Airport
Wingerworth and Shirland	61 Clay Cross, Hephthorne Lane, Wingerworth 63 Matlock Ashover Clay Cross, Chesterfield	1 Alfreton, Tibshelf, Sutton, Mansfield 61 Clay Cross, Hephthorne Lane, Wingerworth 63 Matlock Ashover Clay Cross,

	149 Alfreton, Higham, Tibshelf, Sutton 150 Matlock, Wessington, Alfreton, Clay Cross	Chesterfield 97A Alfreton, Morton, Pilsley, Chesterfield 149 Alfreton, Higham, Tibshelf, Sutton 150 Matlock, Wessington, Alfreton, Clay Cross X17 Matlock, Chesterfield, Sheffield
Wirksworth	102 Ashbourne, Parwich, Wirksworth 110/111 Matlock, Wirksworth, Carsington, Ashbourne 113 Ashbourne, Hulland Ward, Turnditch, Belper 114 Ashbourne, Hulland Ward, Derby 140 Alfreton, Crich, Matlock 141 Ripley, Nether Heage, Crich, Matlock 216 Bonsall, Cromford, Matlock 449 Ilam, Parwich, Bakewell	102 Ashbourne, Parwich, Wirksworth 110 Matlock, Wirksworth, Carsington, Ashbourne 113 Ashbourne, Hulland Ward, Turnditch, Belper 114 Ashbourne, Hulland Ward, Derby 140 Alfreton, Crich, Matlock 141 Ripley, Nether Heage, Crich, Matlock 216 Bonsall, Cromford, Matlock Transpeak Manchester, Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock, Derby

6. Impact on employees of Derbyshire County Council or prospective employees

The proposed changes, particularly to the supported local bus services, will impact on current and prospective employees of the Council making it more difficult for them to get to and from work and to travel to other locations across Derbyshire as part of their day to day duties using buses. This will be a particular problem in those parts of Derbyshire where the current commercial network is very limited, such as Derbyshire Dales. Staff who work outside “normal” 9-5 Monday- Friday office will also experience particular difficulties as the number of evening and weekend commercially operated bus services are also extremely limited outside of the main urban centres

of the county.

Whilst the proposed DRT service will provide some opportunities for employees to travel to and from work, because of the limited resources that will be available to fund these new services they will not be able to offer the number of opportunities to travel or the capacity to deal with peak demands which the current service provides. Also, because the DRT service will need to be booked in advance, there will be no guarantee that it will be available to make the journey to work on a regular basis.

Some staff currently employed within the public transport unit are also likely to be directly affected. The volume of work required particularly in the supported bus services and community transport teams, are likely to reduce considerably following these changes. This may result in job losses or redeployment.

7. Gaps in data

What are your main gaps in information and understanding of the impact of your policy and services? Please indicate whether you have identified ways of filling these gaps.

Gaps in data	Action to deal with this(if any)
Impact on local bus companies and CTs operators of withdrawing subsidy	Because of commercial sensitivities it has proved difficult to fully understand the impact the loss of subsidy will have should the proposals be implemented. Further discussions with bus and CTs operators will take place to get a better understanding of the potential impact.
Impact on other Council services.	Public Transport Team to investigate this as per the recommendations regarding further development work.

8 Main Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

- The current County Council supported local bus network and DAB services are well used with over 4 million journeys being taken on them on every year. So, regardless of what actions are taken to try and mitigate the impact of the proposed changes significant numbers of people will be affected.
- The public consultation undertaken this year on the proposed changes and that done in earlier years on specific changes to DAB, aCTive travel, B line concessions, etc has shown that they are highly valued by users and the community in general.
- The current proposed changes will particularly impact on disadvantaged groups who make more use of the services, specifically the young, the old, disabled and poorer members of the community. These groups would find it significantly more difficult to access employment, educational opportunities, health services and other key facilities making it harder for them to live independently.
- Certain areas of Derbyshire, particularly in the more rural western side of the County, would also experience particular difficulties because of the very limited commercial bus network available.
- Experience from elsewhere in the country, where DRT type services have been introduced has shown that whilst people are happy, some sort of transport continues to be provided, overall, usage of the new service is significantly less than the supported bus routes they replaced. As a result, the level of Council subsidy per user increases considerably. The number of young and working age people using the service was particularly affected with DRT being perceived as something only used by elderly or disabled rather than the population as a whole.
- The withdrawal of the supported services may also affect the viability of the commercial bus network putting in jeopardy the long term future of more bus services across the County.

Recommendations (if any)

- Due to the potential impact of this proposal on protected groups it is recommended that Derbyshire County Council commences a period of development work to fully understand the implications of any changes on other departments in the Council.

- Alternative modals to DRT for providing some sort of supported bus services on the busy and more urban areas of the County should be examined in detail to see if partnership or De Minimis arrangements with operators would offer better value for money.
- Detailed discussions about the potential of adding elements of some of the supported services onto existing commercial network need to be explored with bus operators.
- DRT should be introduced in the more rural and remote areas of the County, potentially as part of a trial or as part of a wider Total Transport solution.
- Where DRT is introduced that publicity and vehicle branding is designed to encourage take up, particularly amongst younger and middle aged people, and those going to work, to tackle the assumption that this service is only for the elderly and disabled.
- To combine the budget available for Door to Door Plus and aCTive travel to fund 1 joint service to support users who would be unable to use conventional and DRT service due to their disabilities.
- Because of the limited time when funding is guaranteed for these services, it is proposed that these arrangements are introduced on an experimental or pilot basis, rather than under strict tendering and contracting basis to allow changes to be made quickly dependent on experience of how well the new services meet customer requirements.

9. Action planning in response to the completed analysis

<i>Objective</i>	<i>Planned action</i>	<i>Who</i>	<i>When</i>	<i>How will this be monitored?</i>
<i>What you want to achieve</i>	<i>What you intend to do</i>	<i>Responsible person or department</i>	<i>Timing of action</i>	<i>Monitoring and review arrangements</i>
Reduce the impact of the proposed changes on affected groups	To work with local bus and CTs operators to examine if alternative partnership or De Minimis arrangements could offer potential better value for	Steve Cannon, Anthony Crompton, Chris Hegarty, Elaine Wachlarz	October 2016	Economy, Transport and Communities, Department Management Team

	<p>funding available.</p> <p>To work with local operators to see what potential there is for the commercialisation of certain elements of the existing supported services network</p> <p>To pilot the introduction of a DRT type service in a rural area as part of a wider Total Transport solution.</p> <p>Ensure publicity about the changes is spread across the County and work with Communications to provide media coverage.</p>	<p>Steve Cannon, Anthony Crompton, Chris Hegarty with potentially some external consultancy support</p> <p>Phil Smith, Elaine Wachlarz, Chris Hegarty</p> <p>Caroline Carey</p>	<p>October 2016</p> <p>Early 2017</p> <p>Spring 2017</p>	<p>Economy, Transport and Communities, Department Management Team</p> <p>Economy, Transport and Communities, Department Management Team</p> <p>Economy, Transport and Communities, Department Management Team</p>
Access the impact of proposed change on other Council departments	To work with other departments to access the impact of proposed changes on other Council departments and identify potential mitigation measures.	Steve Cannon, Chris Hegarty, Deborah Oddy	Late 2016	Economy, Transport and Communities, Department Management Team
Monitor impact of proposed changes once in operation	Data will be collected which will provide information on the use of the new services.	Anthony Crompton, Chris Hegarty	October 2017 onward	Economy, Transport and Communities, Department Management Team

10 Monitoring and review arrangements

Please outline what steps will be taken to monitor and review the implementation of proposals if they are agreed here:

The operators of any revised services will be checked to make sure they are operating legally and correctly, and the services are correctly registered with the Traffic Commission if necessary. They will be subject to monitoring and review to take account of any requirement to change the service.