



*Meeting:* **Scrutiny Commission**

*Date/Time:* **Friday, 5 July 2013 at 2.00 pm**

*Location:* **Sparkenhoe Committee Room, County Hall, Glenfield**

*Contact:* **Mr. S. J. Weston (Tel: 0116 305 6226)**

*Email:* **sam.weston@leics.gov.uk**

### Membership

Mr. S. J. Galton CC (Chairman)

Mrs. R. Camamile CC	Mr. A. M. Kershaw CC
Dr. R. K. A. Feltham CC	Mr. P. G. Lewis CC
Mr. S. J. Hampson CC	Mr. K. W. P. Lynch CC
Dr. S. Hill CC	Mr. R. J. Shepherd CC
Mr. Max Hunt CC	Mr. L. Spence CC

### ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTARY REPORTS TO THE CABINET WHICH INCLUDE UPDATES TO THE RESPONSES TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION (PERTAINING TO AGENDA ITEMS 8 AND 9 OF THE MAIN AGENDA)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Report by</u>	
1. Consultation on Home to School Transport Policies on: 16+ Transport to Educational Provision, Transport to Denominational Schools and Transport for Pupils in Moving to a New Address in their Final Year(s) of Each Phase of their Compulsory Education.	Director of Environment and Transport	(Pages 3 to 9)
The Cabinet Lead Member for Transportation, Mr. P. C. Osborne CC, has been invited for this item.		
2. Proposed Withdrawal of Discretionary Elements of the Concessionary Travel Scheme - Outcome of Consultation.	Director of Environment and Transport	(Pages 11 to 18)

The Cabinet Lead Member for Transportation, Mr. P. C. Osborne CC, has been invited for this item.







**CABINET – 9<sup>th</sup> JULY 2013**

**RESULTS OF CONSULTATION ON THE HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT  
POLICY AND PROPOSED CHANGES TO POLICY AND CHARGING**

**SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF THE  
DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT**

**Purpose of Supplementary Report**

1. Further to the report of the Director of Environment and Transport marked item '5' on the main agenda, this supplementary report advises the Cabinet of the final results of the public consultation on proposals to change the Mainstream Home to School Transport Policy, attached as updated Appendices B and C. The Cabinet is invited to consider its response to the consultation process set out in the main report and this supplementary report.

**Recommendations**

2. The Cabinet is recommended to note and consider the final responses to the consultation on proposals to change the Mainstream Home to School Transport Policy and charging (attached as updated Appendices B and C).

**Reasons for Recommendations**

3. To enable the Cabinet to take into account the final results of the consultation before making a decision on the proposals to change the Mainstream Home to School Transport Policy following the ending of the consultation on 30 June 2013.

**Results of the Consultation on Concessionary Travel**

4. There are currently:
  - 3,500 16+ students
  - 900 denominational pupils
  - 400 farepayers
5. There were 659 responses to this consultation.
6. For age 16 + transport to colleges and sixth forms:
  - 90% of respondents disagreed with the proposal to remove the subsidy from post-16 transport
  - 72% agreed that the transport service should remain available for those who wish to cover the full cost

- 87% agreed that the Council should continue to provide transport to those in the second year of 16 plus if the subsidy is withdrawn

7. For transport Voluntary Aided (Denominational) Schools

- 68% disagreed with the proposal to remove the subsidy from denominational support
- 67% agreed that the transport service should remain available for those who wish to cover the full cost

8. For eligibility when a pupil changes address

- 61% disagreed with the proposal that the Council should remove free or subsidised transport from the new address if a student changes address

### **Officers to Contact**

Ian Drummond      Assistant Director, Transportation, Environment and Transport  
Department

Email: [ian.drummond@leics.gov.uk](mailto:ian.drummond@leics.gov.uk)      Tel: 0116 305 5990

Tony Kirk              Sustainable Travel Group Manager, Environment and Transport  
Department

Email: [tony.kirk@leics.gov.uk](mailto:tony.kirk@leics.gov.uk)      Tel: 0116 305 6270

### **Appendices**

Updated Appendix B - details of consultation responses on concessionary travel

Updated Appendix C - summary of written responses

## **Appendix B - UPDATED**

### **Details of consultation responses on home to school transport policy and proposed changes to policy and charging**

- Findings as of end of 02/07/13

#### **School Transport user numbers**

- 3,500 16+ students
- 900 denominational pupils
- 400 farepayers

#### **Consultation Process**

Consultation started on 20<sup>th</sup> May and ran to 30<sup>th</sup> June. The consultation was e-mailed directly to our database of school contacts and again through the Education Information System and direct to the Diocesan Council at Derby.

A press release covered the consultation process and a Members' News in Brief was circulated to all County Councillors.

The consultation was also shown as a banner on the front page of the County Council website.

**Count of responses to 02 July 2013: 659**

### **Headlines**

#### **Age 16+ transport to colleges and sixth forms**

- **90% of respondents disagreed** with the proposal to remove the subsidy from post-16 transport (81% 'Strongly Disagreed')
- **72% agreed**, with 46% 'Strongly Agreeing', that the transport service should remain available for those who wish to cover the full cost
- **87% agreed** that the Council should continue to provide transport to those in the second year of 16 plus if the subsidy is withdrawn (68% 'Strongly Agreed')

#### **Transport to Voluntary Aided (Denominational) Schools**

- **68% disagreed** with the proposal to remove the subsidy from denominational support (61% 'Strongly Disagreed')

- **67% agreed** (38% 'Strongly Agreeing') that the transport service should remain available for those who wish to cover the full cost

### **Eligibility when a pupil changes address**

- **61% disagreed** with the proposal that the Council should remove free or subsidised transport from the new address if a student changes address (44% 'Strongly Disagreed' with this)

## **Findings by statistical significance**

### **Age 16+ transport to colleges and sixth forms**

*Question 1: Do you agree or disagree with the Council's proposal to remove the subsidy from post-16 transport to colleges and sixth forms? (644 responses)*

#### **Agreement**

- Non-parents or carers were more likely than expected to 'Strongly Agree' (11%)
- Those who do not have children who use the home to school transport were more likely than expected to 'Agree' (6%)
- Those stating 'No religion' were more likely than expected to 'Strongly Agree' (9%) and 'Agree' (9%)

#### **Disagreement**

- No significance found.

*Question 2: Do you agree or disagree that if the subsidy is removed the transport service should remain available for those who wish to cover the full cost of the transport (approximately £425 per student per year)? (638 responses)*

#### **Agreement**

- No significance found.

#### **Disagreement**

- No significance found.

*Question 3: Do you agree or disagree that, if the subsidy is withdrawn, we should continue to provide transport to those who are already receiving it to allow them to complete their second year of 16+ in the 2014/2015 academic year? (640 responses)*

#### **Agreement**

- No significance found.

**Disagreement**

- No significance found.

**Transport to Voluntary Aided (Denominational) Schools**

*Question 5: Do you agree or disagree with the Council's proposal to remove the subsidy from denominational transport? (615 responses)*

**Agreement**

- Those who do not have children who use the home to school transport to denominational schools were **very likely** (more than expected) to 'Strongly Agree' (24%) and more likely than expected to 'Agree' (13%)
- Males were more likely than expected to 'Strongly Agree' (22%)
- Those stating 'No religion' were **very likely** (more than expected) to 'Strongly Agree' (42%) and more than expected to 'Agree' (14%)

**Disagreement**

- Those who have children who use voluntary aided transport were **very likely** (more than expected) to 'Strongly Disagree' (93%)
- Those stating 'Roman Catholic' were **very likely** (more than expected) to 'Strongly Disagree' (93%)

*Question 6: Do you agree or disagree that if the subsidy is removed the transport service should remain available for those who wish to cover the full cost of the transport (approximately £640)? (609 responses)*

**Agreement**

- No significance found

**Disagreement**

- No significance found

**Change of address and eligibility**

*Question 8: Do you agree or disagree with the proposal that we remove free or subsidised transport from the new address if a student changes address? (374 responses<sup>1</sup>)*

**Agreement**


---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that due to an error the first 268 respondents to the survey were not presented with an opportunity to complete this question. The base number for this question is 391 (representing the number of those who did have a chance to complete it) whereas it is 659 for all other questions.

- No significance found

**Disagreement**

- No significance found

**Note on representation**

The demographic profile of respondents shows that there is an over-representation of responses (using comparable 2011 Census data) from county residents who are:

- Female
- Aged 45-59
- And those who have two or more cars or vans in their household

There is an under-representation from county residents who are:

- Male
- Less than 45 years old and those aged over 60
- Asian or Asian British
- And those who have no cars or vans in their household



## **Appendix C - UPDATED**

### **Summary of written responses to the consultation on home to school transport policy and proposed changes to policy and charging**

#### **General summary of comments**

This summary includes comments made on the consultation response form, and in separate correspondence received in response to the consultation. It omits comments about matters which the County Council cannot influence, e.g. suggested changes to statutory guidance or relevant legislation.

#### **Home to school transport: 16 plus comments:**

- a) Numerous comments that students should remain entitled to free travel until they reach the new statutory age limits for remaining in education or training.
- b) Increased travel costs will make it more difficult for students to travel to their favoured course.
- c) General car traffic could increase, including increased congestion and road safety issues at the school gate.
- d) The proposals hit hardest at less well off families and those living in rural communities.
- e) The difference in the proposed charges for 16 plus travel to faith schools and to other schools is unfair.
- f) One or two comments that 16 plus transport should not be subsidised whilst education post 16 remains optional, or not subsidised just for SEN students.
- g) It would be better to keep the transport facility at higher cost than to discontinue the school bus service altogether.

#### **Home to school transport: transport to denominational (faith) schools comments:**

- a) Some comments that those attending faith schools through parental choice should not receive subsidy.
- b) Other comments putting forward the opposite view: attendance at a faith school is advantageous to children being brought up in that faith and should not be discouraged.
- c) Faith schools are often some distance from home, making it more difficult for parents to provide alternative transport.
- d) Parents could be forced to change their children's school, which would penalise the children.
- e) Families where more than one child travels to a faith school will be particularly affected.

This page is intentionally left blank



## CABINET – 9<sup>th</sup> JULY 2013

### RESULTS OF CONSULTATION ON WITHDRAWAL OF DISCRETIONARY ELEMENTS OF THE CONCESSIONARY TRAVEL SCHEME

#### SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT

##### Purpose of Supplementary Report

1. Further to the report of the Director of Environment and Transport marked item '4' on the main agenda, this supplementary report advises the Cabinet of the final results of the public consultation into proposals for the withdrawal of discretionary elements of the Concessionary Travel Scheme, attached as updated Appendices A and B. The Cabinet is invited to consider its response to the consultation process set out in the main report and this supplementary report.

##### Recommendations

2. The Cabinet is recommended to note and consider the final responses to the consultation on the removal of the discretionary elements of concessionary travel (attached as updated Appendices A and B).

##### Reasons for Recommendations

3. To enable the Cabinet to take into account the final results of the consultation before making a decision on the provision of discretionary concessionary travel arrangements offered in Leicestershire following the ending of the consultation on 30 June 2013.

##### Results of the Consultation on Concessionary Travel

4. There are currently:
  - 120,000 older person pass holders
  - 8,500 disabled person pass holders
  - 3,600 vouchers holders
5. There were 668 responses to this consultation, of those respondents:
  - 86% did not agreed with the removal of half fare on Community Transport
  - 84% did not agree with the removal of £33 of vouchers
  - 72% did not agree with the removal of free travel for disabled pass holders before 9.30am Monday to Friday
  - 56% did not agree with the removal of free travel after 11.00pm Monday to Friday

6. 88% of the 668 respondents had some form of concession. Of these concession holders 85% had an older person's pass, 13% had a disabled person's pass and 2% received vouchers

### **Officers to Contact**

Ian Drummond      Assistant Director, Transportation, Environment and Transport  
Department  
Email: [ian.drummond@leics.gov.uk](mailto:ian.drummond@leics.gov.uk)      Tel: 0116 305 5990

Tony Kirk              Sustainable Travel Group Manager, Environment and Transport  
Department  
Email: [tony.kirk@leics.gov.uk](mailto:tony.kirk@leics.gov.uk)      Tel: 0116 305 6270

### **Appendices**

Updated Appendix A - details of consultation responses on concessionary travel

Updated Appendix B - summary of written responses

## Appendix A - UPDATED

### **Details of consultation responses on proposed changes to concessionary travel**

- Findings as end of 02/07/13

#### **Concessionary Travel user numbers**

- 120,000 older person pass holders
- 8,500 disabled person pass holders
- 3,600 vouchers holders

#### **Consultation Process**

The consultation ran from 20<sup>th</sup> May to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2013. The consultation was sent to disabled and elderly representative organisations and voluntary sector transport providers.

A press release covered the consultation process and a Members' News in Brief was circulated to all County Councillors.

The consultation was also promoted via a scrolling news item on the front page of the County Council website.

**Count of responses to 02 July 2013:** 668

#### **Headlines**

##### **Withdrawal of half fare on community transport**

- **86% disagreed** that it should be withdrawn (69% 'Strongly Disagreed')
- 7% agreed it should be withdrawn

##### **Withdrawal of taxi vouchers for disabled people who cannot use conventional bus services and for older people who live over 800 metres from an hourly bus**

- **84% disagreed** that it should be withdrawn (63% 'Strongly Disagreed')
- 6% agreed it should be withdrawn

##### **Withdrawal of free bus travel for disabled people before 9.30am, Mondays to Fridays**

- **72% disagreed** that it should be withdrawn (54% 'Strongly Disagreed')

- 19% agreed it should be withdrawn

### **Withdrawal of free bus travel for older people and for disabled people after 11pm, Mondays to Fridays**

- **56% disagreed** that it should be withdrawn (43% 'Strongly Disagreed')
- 30% agreed it should be withdrawn

### **Concessionary type**

88% currently use some form of concessionary travel, of which:

- 85% use bus passes for older people
- 13% use bus passes for disabled people
- 2% use taxi vouchers

### **Findings by statistical significance**

#### **Withdrawal of half fare on community transport** (637 responses)

##### **Agreement**

- Non-users of concessionary bus or taxi vouchers were more likely than expected to 'Strongly Agree' (8%)
- Users of bus passes for disabled people were more likely than expected to 'Agree' (9%)
- Males were more likely than expected to 'Strongly Agree' (6%)

##### **Disagreement**

- No significance found

#### **Withdrawal of taxi vouchers for disabled people who cannot use conventional bus services and for older people who live over 800 metres from an hourly bus** (587 responses)

##### **Agreement**

- No significance found

##### **Disagreement**

- No significance found

**Withdrawal of free bus travel for disabled people before 9.30am, Mondays to Fridays** (589 responses)

**Agreement**

**Disagreement**

- Owners of one car or van were more likely than expected to 'Disagree' (24%)

**Withdrawal of free bus travel for older people and for disabled people after 11pm, Mondays to Fridays** (586 responses)

**Agreement**

- No significance found

**Disagreement**

- No significance found

**Note on representation**

The demographic profile of respondents shows that there is an over-representation of responses (using comparable 2011 Census data) from county residents who are:

- Female
- White
- Over 60 years old
- And those who have no cars or vans in their household

There is a under-representation from county residents who are:

- Male
- Under 60 years old
- Asian or Asian British
- And those who have two or more cars or vans in their household

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Appendix B - UPDATED**

### **Summary of written responses to the consultation on the withdrawal of the discretionary elements of the concessionary travel scheme.**

#### **General summary of comments received**

This summary includes comments made on the consultation response form, and in separate correspondence received in response to the consultation. It omits comments about matters which the County Council cannot influence, e.g. suggested changes to the statutory national concessionary travel scheme.

#### **Specific Comments**

**Community Transport** attracted a good number of comments about the facility; some transport providers actively encouraged their users to respond.

Common themes were:

- a) Increasing the cost of community transport to users increased the disparity between the frail elderly reliant on community transport and the younger pensioner group able to access free bus travel.
- b) Increasing the cost would lead to greater social isolation and loss of independence among current scheme users.
- c) Increasing the cost to users could reduce scheme usage to the extent that schemes were no longer viable, therefore impacting on those willing to pay full fare and potentially on other activities of the transport provider. Alternative income streams may already be fully exploited.
- d) The schemes sometimes provide the only affordable or practical means to reach shops or medical appointments.
- e) Schemes may serve rural areas where alternative public transport is in any case scarce.
- f) One or two comments that users would be prepared to pay the full fare as they find the service so useful.
- g) A number of comments about how good a service is provided by voluntary sector transport organisations.

**Pre 9.30 am free bus travel for disabled people** comments included:

- a) Having to pay for am travel could mean those disabled people in low paid jobs would be better off not working.

- b) The saving of £20,000 per annum is relatively modest but will cause particular difficulty for disabled people, for example those unable to handle money due to their disability.
- c) Early journeys are sometimes necessary for medical appointments.

**Withdrawal of taxi vouchers** received relatively few comments: most concerned increasing loss of independence for frail elderly and disabled people.

**Free bus travel after 11pm** only comment was that people could be unexpectedly stranded, if a bus scheduled to depart before 11 pm runs late and the driver refuses free travel.