

Appendix C – Comments from Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultees

As part of the Enhanced Partnership Plan (The Plan) and Enhanced Partnership Scheme (The Scheme) consultation, notification of the consultation was sent out to statutory and non-statutory consultees. Statutory consultees included County Councillors, MPs, Competition & Markets Authority, Leicestershire Chief Officer of Police, Traffic Commissioner, district/borough/parish councils, neighbouring authorities, bus operators and other organisations that represent local passengers. Below tables consist of detailed comments relevant to The Plan and The Scheme and other non-relevant general comments. Both tables are broken down by statutory and non-statutory consultee comments.

Comments Relevant to The Plan and The Scheme	
Statutory Consultees	Welcome and the introduction of the Euro VI emissions.
	This partnership ought to be working between all levels and tiers of local government across boundary and City (including County, district/borough, City, parish and town councils below or at the same level as the Public Transport County Authority) and with the national Government as well as other key transport related agencies such as: Transport for the East Midlands, Midlands Connect, East Midlands Councils, National Highways, Network Rail and the Train Operating Companies (the latter to ensure better integration between bus and rail services and to facilitate benefits like through, seamless ticketing etc.).
	Objectives of The Plan and The Scheme need to enable/facilitate integrated travel between travel modes, e.g., between local and sub-national and national inter-city bus and coach services, demand responsive bus transport, rail services, walking, cycling, taxi and car use. This should be for seamless ticketing, integrated access for all sectors of community to use with equal ease and confidence.
	There should be an integration between City and County services to form one accessible network that is local government boundary blind and is clean, reliable which includes taxis, Demand Responsive Transport (DRTs) and buses.
	There is a need to deliver a regular frequency service and regular patterns across 24 hour each day (e.g., 10 mins at peak time, 30 mins for rest of day, 45 mins after 6pm and weekends) which would make buses easier to access, reliable and develop passenger loyalty and confidence.
	Need to secure an investment in bus waiting environment and passengers must be under care of a bus service from when they get to a bus stop and not when they get on a bus. Must have high quality lighting, signage, totems, shelter, travel information and bus stop furniture, of a countywide consistent style and typeface, and it should be provided across the entire Leicestershire Bus network.
	Buses must be equally accessible for both able-bodied and less able-bodied and should be same at waiting environments and quality of environment at destination.

	<p>Travel information should be equally accessible to able and less able-bodied people (travellers with a hearing or sight impediment, physical disabilities including those in a wheelchair in terms of the height travel information is displayed and the like). Information should also be routinely available in audio and in braille.</p>
	<p>Failure to deliver a reliable bus service, including buses running to time (both in terms of running ahead of advertised time or behind it) should be met with suitably punitive financial or other suitable and appropriate penalties. In order to facilitate this, clear and timetabled designated waiting points should be placed on each bus route to allow buses to wait to return to their advertised time path when they are ahead of time and also a comprehensive suite of bus priority measures should be investigated on the road network that are coordinated with strategic timing points to allow buses to accelerate past known traffic congestion hot-spot points should they be behind their advertised times.</p>
	<p>Bus passenger numbers used in National Bus Strategy (NBS) engagement were during Covid-19 lockdown times (2020 and 2021) and may be skewed.</p>
	<p>Scheme is subject to Government funding which isn't guaranteed.</p>
	<p>Enhanced Partnership board will consist of six operators (one vote each) and two Council officers (three votes each). There should be representation from all district/borough councils to reflect differing needs for urban and rural areas.</p>
	<p>Bus user group appears to have little influence on decision making.</p>
	<p>Tie up of train and bus service in Leicester/Leicestershire will be advantageous as it is a long walk (especially with luggage) between London Road train station and Haymarket and St Margaret's bus stations.</p>
	<p>There should be more emphasis on circular routes in the County, especially within villages alongside A47 and Oadby/Wigston areas.</p>
	<p>Houghton Parish Council was involved in previous discussions to save 747 service by heading forums and campaign groups and has expertise and would like a place on bus user group.</p>
	<p>The Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) refers to many measures that passengers want improving, however, there is work to do to convert high-level aspirations to real change.</p>
	<p>The initial proposed scheme is limited to creating service stability and improving facilities on B4114 corridor which is recognised as simple/low cost first step.</p>
	<p>Early resident and visitor consultation is welcomed, and it is anticipated to see that an open approach to consultation will continue throughout Partnership.</p>
	<p>Compared draft The Plan and The Scheme to Transport Focus "What passengers want from BSIPs document" which reflects national research into passenger priorities for improvement with robust methodology and samples and would expect The Plan and The Scheme to reflect these passenger priorities as well as those identified in the Council's local engagement and research.</p>
	<p>The Council's survey carried out for BSIP provides useful data</p>

	about local priorities and bus use, but it is not always clear how these have informed development of The Plan and The Scheme.
	Surprised not to see explicit links between The Plan and BSIP.
	Pleased to see in BSIP a number of passenger satisfaction measures chosen as performance indicators and agree this cover some of highest priority areas.
	Also outlined ambitious targets of passenger growth, journey time and reliability, however, not always clear how schemes in BSIP would enable targets to be met.
	Noted that performance will be reported against targets every six months and suggest that reports include explanations about targets, constraints in meeting them and published figures.
	Noted and welcome Council's intention to develop a Passenger Charter in line with a Transport Focus Guidance.
	Understand that bus industry faces challenges in competing with car as it seeks to recover from reduced patronage due to the Covid-19 pandemic and uncertainty over Government funding make it difficult to make firm commitments.
	It's clear that bus patronage must increase, and passenger satisfaction must improve, so proposals must be up to the task which Transport Focus will judge.
	Passengers want buses running more often and it is noted that BSIP proposes number of reviews, although it is unclear if reviews are subject to funding or implementation of findings.
	Review to determine how network is reshaped and pilot scheme of increased service frequencies is positive but only covers supported network and may not be wide-ranging.
	Extending DRT to evening services would benefit the poorly served communities.
	Coordination of bus timetables with rail timetables and creation of mobility hub could improve connection with other transport forms.
	Passengers want buses to go to more places.
	BSIP suggests further DRT services in new area could offer new and extended routes but will be subject to assessment of Narborough routes performance.
	Scheme commits to only making timetable changes on agreed change dates which is positive commitment for stable network as long as number of dates are kept low.
	Would like reassurance that passengers will be consulted and communicated with on significant changes.
	Passengers want more buses on time and faster journey times.
	Plans to understand "pinchpoints" leading to delays and potential interventions are welcome.
	As delay interventions are subject to feasibility studies and funding, it is difficult to judge how it will help Local Authority meet reliability targets.
	Note intended review of app-based information provision but want to see more commitment to keeping on-board passengers informed of delays/disruptions (could be included in the Bus

Passenger Charter).
Passengers want better value for money.
BSIP mentions ambition to introduce consistent age under which young people can access discounted fares which is welcomed but unclear if this is firm commitment or subject to funding.
Pleased to see that cash payment option will be retained.
Long-term aim to develop multi-operator capped fare is welcome but commitment appears high-level.
Would like to know more on how passengers can access fare and ticket type information.
Need clarification on what simpler flat/flexible fares are being considered.
Passengers want more effort to tackle anti-social behaviour.
Noted that part of audit of B4114 stops is to review safety issues, but disappointed not to see any measures to tackle anti-social behaviour.
Would like to see CCTV, improved lighting and stops and enforcement/inclusion of safety in design guidelines for buses and stops.
Planned audit of stops could address some anti-social behaviour issues and would encourage to involve users when determining features to audit and setting new standards.
Passengers want better quality of information at bus stops.
Would encourage to involve users in audit plans for setting new standards in relation to information at stops.
Would like to see up-to-date timetable at every stop, fare information at major stops and consider route/network connection maps at major stops.
Plans to improve information availability and be informed by customer research is positive.
Plans to improve real time information and develop countywide app covering all operators is positive but still subject to reviews and funding.
Passengers want more accessible buses.
Didn't see any detail about how buses will be made more accessible which would be useful to give confidence about Council's ambitions.
Know from Transport Focus own research and highlighted in Council engagement, that bus accessibility could encourage greater bus use. E.g., providing audio-visual next stop information.
Council Passenger Charter could include commitment to provide alternative transport for wheelchair space and to customer service training.
Passengers want cleaner buses.
Intention to agree/implement minimum service standards for cleanliness is welcome but need more detail on what these standards will be and if this can be delivered without funding.
Research following the Covid-19 pandemic shows importance of on-board cleaning for passengers.

	Would like to see commitment to enhanced bus cleaning regimes and regular graffiti removal.
	Not convinced that Enhanced Partnership Forum carrying out consultations from time to time constitutes a Plan and meets statutory requirement to consult users on how well the Enhanced Partnership is working (as set out in S.138A (8) of Transport Act 2000).
	Would like more detail about user representation on Enhanced Partnership Forum and reassurance their views will be properly heard.
	Recommend involving groups representing people with protected characteristics to the Enhanced Partnership Forum and use passenger research to hear from representative demographic across the County with types of research question set out in brief.
	Would like to understand more about measuring delivery of improved customer experience and how it will be reported and scrutinised.
	BSIP contains some detail on how performance will be reported but unclear how this will link to role of the board.
	Concerned that less onerous bespoke mechanism (which should only be used for minor modifications) to vary scheme will be used as alternative to making additional schemes which would require consultation (as per S.138k OF Transport Act).
	Transport Focus can help the Partnership to improve services by carrying out passenger satisfaction/passenger research, and various policy and process development activity.
	Overall, proposals are welcomed by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC).
	With system of privatised bus operators outside of London, difficult to envisage Enhanced Partnership proposal having significant impact.
	A split between City and County into separate partnerships will make integration difficult as many services span both areas.
	Local authorities ought to have voting rights on proposed board.
	Thought should be given to possible sanctions for operators who don't participate on board/forum.
	The initial proposed scheme is welcome but needs extending.
	Should be investigated if B4114 corridor initiative can be extended to other areas with buses that fail emission standards including HBBC.
	BSIP ignores needs of Bottesford with main focus on B4114 corridor rather than remote but fast-growing communities.
	BSIP notes that bus patronage is dramatically down which it will be if there is no service that meets residents' needs.
	Introduce circular route (e.g., Ratby, Groby, Kirby Muxloe, Leicester Forest East, City) which can be an adopted system throughout the County using less vehicles, creating greener environment, more economic and less wear and tear on highway.

Non-Statutory Consultees	This is a great scheme going forward.
	Plan is informative and encouraging
	Wholeheartedly support ideas contained in draft The Plan of joint ticketing, measures to lower emissions, improve air quality and identify amendments to routes which make more rural areas accessible by public transport, coordinate timetables and provide better links with active travel infrastructure.

Comments Not Relevant to The Plan and The Scheme	
Statutory Consultees	Feel that NBS public engagement survey open for too short period (15 June – 30 Jul 2021), during school holidays, not well publicised, received insufficient responses and included responses from Councillors and organisations which meant replies not only from public. Also, responses/recommendations were obvious.
	Concerns about future of 747 services as it is part subsidies by Rutland County Council who are not part of partnership plan.
	Residents within Sileby Parish are currently besieged with issues including, traffic congestion, flooding, diversions due to building works, frequently cancelled Kinchbus service 2, no RTIs and poor bus communication.
	Would like to see reporting and key performance indicators at level of detail that parish councils can analyse and challenge on behalf of residents. Whether it be by operator, route or parish.
	There is no public transport directly from Blaby to Fosse Park or Enderby Leisure Centre.
	Would like to highlight importance of Centrebus service 58 which runs through South Kilworth, on the route from Market Harborough to Lutterworth.
	Centrebus service 58 vital to community of South Kilworth in providing access to the two main towns either side of the village and is used by all groups of people including carers, children, elderly and teenagers giving them connection to varied amenities and services available.
	Sutton Cheney Parish Councillor would like a dial a bus service from Sutton Cheney to Nuneaton Railway Station.
	Bottesford is growing village hub at northern extreme of Leicestershire and Parish Council and community feel they are ignored with regards to public transport provision.
	As satellite village, many Bottesford residents have to commute to work in Nottingham, Newark, Grantham, London (via Grantham), Bingham Melton and Leicester using cars due to lack of regular/reliable public transport.
	Bottesford residents want to go to Nottingham, Melton, Grantham or Leicester for entertainment, socialising and leisure but aspirations are curtailed due to lack of public transport and must use cars or taxis.
	No public transport between Bottesford and Melton (and on to Leicester) after 5pm and on Sunday, with Centrebus service 23 having last journey from Melton to Bottesford on weekday and

	<p>Saturday at 6pm.</p> <p>Anyone in Bottesford wanting to go for evening meal in Nottingham or Grantham is unable to get train back after 8pm.</p> <p>Bottesford residents wanting to take bus back from Nottingham after 5.40pm (weekdays) or 4.45pm (Saturdays) can only travel as far as Bingham (Vectare 93) with no connection onwards to Bottesford.</p> <p>Last bus from Bottesford to Grantham is at 5.45pm (weekdays) and 5pm (Saturdays) on Vectare 93, and at 4pm (Weekdays) and 3pm (Saturdays) on Centrebus 6 which is no good for anyone working until 5pm or 5.30pm on Saturdays.</p> <p>What is needed from BSIP is seamless connectivity between Bottesford and local town/cities (including Vale of Belvoir) including integrated services and cross-boundary partnership working with Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire and practical timetable timings allowing Bottesford residents use of buses for employment, education, hospital visits, socialising, leisure and entertainment.</p>
Non-Statutory Consultees	<p>No bus service in Heather and closest service is 1.25 miles away which only goes to Hinckley and Coalville where you would have to catch another bus to get to Leicester.</p> <p>Recently applied for bus pass but hoping that Sileby will still have a bus service to use pass on.</p> <p>Many elderly people in Sileby who rely on bus services.</p> <p>Buses, in comparison to car travel are poor for passenger comfort being bumpy with hard suspension and hard plastic seating, drafty, noisy. They have rattling plastic panels, windows, frames and luggage racks. Electric buses will hopefully solve these issues but in meantime can passenger comfort be addressed on current plastic buses.</p> <p>Disappointed that gross inequality promoted by the Council has not been addressed as it discriminates based on age with providing free travel persons over certain age. Studies suggest that free bus pass increases travel substantially by age groups affected while those discriminated have possibly reduced bus usage.</p> <p>Resident has had to use car since Centrebus service 128 (which use to serve Frisby-on-the-Wreake) has stopped.</p> <p>Older people in Frisby-on-the-Wreake cannot get to Leicester or Melton.</p> <p>The Council are happy with climate emergency and doesn't wish to encourage use of Public Transport.</p> <p>The National Forest Company is currently managing a £3.9m Landscape Partnership Scheme (LPS) in Charnwood Forest, largely funded by National Lottery Heritage Fund, to enable people to explore, understand and help care for the forest area which is being delivered by partnership of 18 organisations including relevant LA's and National Forest Company. One of challenges identified during development of LPS is prevalence of car use and paucity of public transport in some areas of forest. There are</p>

	<p>number of projects as part of LPS which focus on encouraging public transport use with various members of Environment and Sustainable Travel Team at the Council working with National Forest to incentivise and support active travel. There is a small amount of funding to carry out a feasibility study to support this. As part of LPS, Charnwood Regional Park Board to pursue application from UNESCO Global Geopark status for park area on grounds of its internationally significant geological heritage with process likely to take seven years and no guaranteed success. UNESCO have 17 development goals which need considering for application, some of which relate to climate action, sustainable communities and infrastructure.</p>
--	---