Consultation Report
The Proposed Withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services in Worcestershire - Appendices A-M

Find out more online:
www.worcestershire.gov.uk/busservicereview
Appendix A
Consultation Plan
CONSULTATION PROJECT PLAN

TITLE OF THIS EXERCISE: Bus Service Review 2013
PROJECT PLAN PREPARED BY: MC Jones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>ACTION / EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 1 – WHY ARE YOU CONSULTING?</td>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What specifically is the policy / decision / issue that you are seeking views on?</td>
<td>To undertake a public consultation on the planned withdrawal of subsidised local bus services across the County in September 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please set out your budget estimates for this consultation exercise</td>
<td>20k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date entered on the Consultation Portal</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a strategic / contentious consultation exercise?</td>
<td>Yes – Being submitted to WCC Cabinet November 7th, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you entered this into the Cabinet Forward Plan?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does this exercise need to be completed?</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAGE 2 – WHAT ARE YOU CONSULTING ABOUT

<p>| Background | The Better Outcomes Leaner Delivery (BOLD) Programme was launched by Worcestershire County Council at the end of 2009, as an initiative aimed at achieving better results against the Council’s corporate objectives over the medium term 2011-14. The programme was developed to address reducing resources from Central Government. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>ACTION / EVIDENCE</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The BOLD programme was subjected to several rounds of public consultation in which residents were asked to prioritise the services currently being delivered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The public indicted that bus services were ranked amongst the low priority services for the residents of Worcestershire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcestershire County Council currently supports the provision of these buses across the County, both in fulfilment of statutory functions (home to school transport) and to enable access to facilities and services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Council supports the provision of local bus services to enable access to facilities and services by financially subsidising routes that are not provided on a commercial basis by private operators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To reflect the outcomes of the public consultation on BOLD budget prioritisation, a consultation was undertaken, specifically related to reducing subsidised bus services in 2010.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The consultation was initially centred around a set of proposed criterion designed to prioritise local bus services, followed by a secondary consultation offering options on a preferred service list.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A reduction of £2.5 million in the subsidised local bus budget was achieved following this consultation, meeting the targeted BOLD savings. (50% of these savings will be realised in 2011/12 and 100% thereafter).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional funding reductions for 2013 to 2017, as indicated in the Government Comprehensive Spending Review in June 2013, suggests that the scope and reach of the BOLD programme will now have to be extended further.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This will subsequently have an impact on bus services, with a further reduction of £3 million in the subsidised local bus budget. It is planned that 50% of these savings will be realised in 2014/15 and 100% thereafter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TASK** | **ACTION / EVIDENCE OUTCOME**
--- | ---
Do we need to consult? | Current subsidised provision is as follows:
- Worcestershire County Council Bus expenditure - £3 million per annum
- Number of Services Supported – 97
- Number of Passengers Journeys – 3 million per annum

Significant work has been undertaken to date to deliver financial savings to subsidised bus services through efficiency and operational reviews and savings cuts including:
- Route optimisation, and
- Procurement reviews, including the application of e-tendering and e-auctions.
- £2.5 million budget reduction in 2011

A proportion of savings would need to be reinvested if we still require a local bus to transport entitled scholars to school. Alternatively additional dedicated school transport contracts would have to be provided to meet the need for these scholars.

Worcestershire County Council has a duty to consult as part of its Best Value duty pursuant to the Local Government Act 1999 but would consider it appropriate regardless to consult on bus service reductions. As part of the consultation process the Council will seek to identify and develop some “big society”, self-help or community and voluntary sector solutions that could constructively support areas where reductions are proposed to be made.

The proposed reduction of subsidised bus services to meet the required financial saving targets as outlined by the BOLD programme.

What specifically are we consulting upon? | Although the exact questions for the consultation are still being defined, these should provide a number of outcomes as listed below:
- To confirm the proposed reduction of £3m in relation to other service areas

What specific outcomes are we ultimately trying to achieve?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>ACTION / EVIDENCE</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • To identify passenger travel information (what services, frequency, purpose etc) to determine what the passenger transport requirements for the county are;  
• To identify the impacts of service reductions of customers  
• To ascertain if bus fares should increase (and by how much) to help reduce the subsidies required  
• Receive further comments                                                                 | With a current expenditure of £3m, targeted savings of £3m, the financial flexibility to deliver statutory (home to school) services is extremely limited.  
All views are welcome and information will be used to reflect sound judgement in decision making. |
| What are the constraints?  
What is open to change and what is not?  
This needs to be clearly set out in your consultation material            |                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                              |
| How have you explained your objectives to all staff involved?         | Yes                                                                                                                                                           | Regular project meetings including HUB meetings, Library briefs, County Officer meetings (R&I/Comms etc), Future Lives team.                                    |
| Do staff have the necessary skills to carry out this consultation?    | Employees with the appropriate skills to carry out most of the elements of the Consultation Plan are available to work on the project; however the appropriate time resource and 'buy in' will need to be established. Some technical support will be required from cross directorate staff, specifically R & I, Equality & Diversity Officer and Central Communications. |
| Consider how you will set out your objectives to consultees           | The following MUST be included in any material:  
Clear statement of objectives  
Information on the issue that is being consulted about, any constraints and a clear explanation of context, choices/opportunities for influence  
How views will be taken account by whom and by when  
A contact point  
[Data Protection Act statement]  
• The consultation timescales, |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>ACTION / EVIDENCE OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Date responses needed by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How feedback will be provided,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where to find further information,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunities for people to evaluate your consultation, comment / complaint on process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAGE 3 – DECIDING WHO TO CONSULT**

Who are the stakeholders?

- County wide Stakeholder list plus all other relevant contact lists via other Directorates (Adults/Commissioning etc.)
- Local Members and other Directorates
- Local stakeholders, including bus and taxi operators, Parish Councils plus County’s schools
- Equality and Diversity Groups (Liaise with the Equality & Diversity Officer). This includes groups who traditionally have had difficulty accessing or responding to standard consultation documentation. E.g. Those with learning difficulties.
- User Groups (Older People’s Forum, BUUK etc.)
- Bus users
- Worcestershire Residents

How will you inform the local councillor(s) of this consultation?

- Local Councillors will be invited to a briefing session 14th November, 2013

Can you use existing groups and forums for your consultation?

- Yes, it is the intention to combine with Future Lives who have a full programme of meetings planned for their own consultation (which runs concurrently to the bus service proposal)
- The district area Highway & Transportation Forums.
- Equality and Diversity Groups – to be advised by ED Officer
- Hub Team leaders Meeting (23 October)

Suggest that no other groups are included at this stage, although others may be identified during process delivery.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>ACTION / EVIDENCE OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAGE 4 – WHEN TO CONSULT</strong></td>
<td><strong>NOTE CHECKLIST 4.A – Preparing your timetable will help you with this section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was this consultation identified in your Directorate Performance Plan?</td>
<td>This is a FutureFit initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When do the results of your consultation need to be available in order to inform a decision?</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Financial</strong> - refer back to your budget, are the financial resources in place to successfully implement the chosen method?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human.</strong> Are the people available to deliver this consultation?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Resource</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you need to build in time to “pilot” your consultation?</td>
<td>No – although a number of sessions have been/will be held with County Councillors and advisory staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long before your exercise starts do you plan to publicise your consultation?</td>
<td>After the Member briefing (November)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How long will you give consultees to respond to your consultation? – | 10 weeks  
8 Nov 13 to 17 January, 2014 |
| Does the consultation period coincide with any events that are likely to influence the outcome? | Christmas 2013 – although the period of consultation has been extended into the New year to mitigate any risk of the Christmas period having an impact. |
| **Outline Programme** | • Cabinet Decision – November 2013  
• Pre-consultation with Councillors – 14 Nov 2013  
• Publicise consultation. Press releases/ posters etc.  
• **Consultation period** – 8 Nov 2013 to 17 January 2014  
• Analyse results and prepare the necessary reports (full, summary etc) – January 2014  
• Allow your results to be considered by others – January 2014 |
## TASK ACTION / EVIDENCE OUTCOME

- Submit back to Cabinet – 6 February 2014
- Provide feedback – and prepare any material necessary – February 2014
- Evaluate Consultation Results further
- Submit back to Cabinet - April 2014
- Post consultation evaluation (lessons learned) – April 2014

### STAGE FIVE – HOW TO CARRY OUT YOUR CONSULTATION

Are you using external consultants to carry out this consultation? Yes

**Methods**

**Local Members Briefing Session**

The aim of the Members presentation is to convey information on the proposed consultation, its context and methodology in advance of the consultation process going live.

All WCC Local Members will be invited with the aim of raising their awareness and giving them the opportunity to comment and to discuss the proposals.

The cost of implementing this approaches - both financially and in terms of time is effective. Internal resources will be used wherever possible and refreshments limited to tea/coffee where appropriate.

Resources to be confirmed

**WHERE/WHEN**

Lakeview Room, 14th November

**District member and WCC member updates via the local Highways and Transportation Forums.**

Similar briefings will also take place at the local Highways Forums – resources and dates/venues to be confirmed

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>ACTION / EVIDENCE OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member updates via the Intranet Members page, Member Support Unit and directly from Transport Officers.</td>
<td>As appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hub</td>
<td>23rd October/25th October/19th &amp; 20th November - Brief the Worcestershire Hub so that customer enquiries can be effectively handled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hub staff should refer customers to the consultation documents and information on the website (Consultation portal and <a href="http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/busservicereview">www.worcestershire.gov.uk/busservicereview</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customers can fill the electronic survey out on-line or print out a version and send it in Freepost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For those unable to access the website a small amount of printed leaflets will be available at Hubs/Libraries etc from 22nd November. Brief Hub to print and post any surveys on request and assist in completion for those who need help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>Press releases should be distributed in advance of the start of the consultation and then at appropriate intervals as the process continues. The public and media will have access to the Cabinet Papers once they are released therefore the purpose of the press release would be to pre-empt this to generate a ‘more positive’ news story on the consultation exercise than it otherwise might be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Your Say Road shows</td>
<td>An extensive programme of public facing corporate road shows have been planned which coincide with this consultation. Therefore, it is intended to ‘piggy back’ on these road shows in order to disseminate information on the bus service proposals. Please see schedule below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>ACTION / EVIDENCE OUTCOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyre Forest (no Gazebo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redditch (no Gazebo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bromsgrove (Take Gazebo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester (No Gazebo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern Hills (Take Gazebo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveyor Distribution of Leaflets on buses

Utilise our existing resources to distribute the leaflets and web signposting cards to bus users directly onto the buses where the services are most affected. **When: November 2013**

Future Lives Events

Join up with the Future Lives consultation programme

Public Meetings/Exhibitions/Events

As the consultation is delivered, it is expected that 'hot spots' and issues are likely to come forward and that meetings etc. may be attended at the request of the local WCC Member.

Website and Survey

All information (content see section 2) and the opportunity to respond will be available on the County’s website

Survey to be developed in conjunction with Project Manager, Research and Intelligence, Central Comms
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>ACTION / EVIDENCE</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder letter and Pro-former Survey</td>
<td>Ensure that the consultation is listed on the Corporate Consultation Portal and</td>
<td>That front page flags are reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When: To go 'live' at the start of consultation period</td>
<td>Letters will be posted directly to key stakeholders or emailed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The postal pro-forma will consist of a paper based survey to respondents who then complete and return it by a specified date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys are ideal as the Stakeholders are widely dispersed across the County. The survey questions need to yet be defined but are likely to consist of tick-box responses. There should also be an opportunity for an open-ended response. Recipients will be directed to the Web site for more information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider email for most Stakeholder Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: That the letters should include the list of proposed service cuts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When: Distribute at the start of consultation period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A publicity poster will be required directing members of the public to the website. This will be enclosed with the stakeholder letters where appropriate and circulated to libraries and hubs etc. via this usual distribution mechanism (see Directorate Comms) 900posters will also be placed at the county's bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be distributed at the start of the Consultation period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This will be the main method for members of the public. It will be promoted by members of staff, the Stakeholder letters, posters, press releases etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As well as containing information on the consultation (including the methodology and proposals) it will also include the survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ACTION / EVIDENCE OUTCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP’s, County Councillors and District Councillors 1 each</td>
<td>452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted stakeholders</td>
<td>1 each</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUBs</td>
<td>50 each</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the buses</td>
<td>1000 per district</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish clerks to post around their villages</td>
<td>20 each</td>
<td>3240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spares</td>
<td>608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>12k</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Entry & Analysing results

Data Protection – We will need to make it clear to customers how information will be used and obtain their consent.

It is proposed to employ a temporary member of staff for data entry due to the numbers of responses expected. Coding and consistency checks to be agreed within the first week of responses being received. Summary reports to be produced fortnightly during the consultation period. Analysing results and reporting will be undertaken by the BEC Consultation Team.

**SEND THIS PLAN TO YOUR MANAGER / CONSULTATION COMMISSIONER FOR APPROVAL – ONCE APPROVED SEND THE DETAILS OF THIS CONSULTATION TO THE PUBLIC SITE OF THE ASK ME CONSULTATION PLANNER AND FINDER**

Prepared by: Michele C Jones
Date: October 2013
CONSULTATION DETAILS SENT TO PUBLIC SITE ON CONSULTATION PORTAL BY (Name) .... ON (Date) ...... TO BE COMPLETED BY MANAGER / CONSULTATION COMMISSIONER

Manager/ Consultation Commissioner to state here any actions identified to be completed before the consultation is signed off:

In particular consider if:
You agree the plan as set out, and you are comfortable that the relevant issues have been considered
Sufficient budget / resources are available
That the spend / level of activity on this consultation is proportionate to the issue being consulted about
Duties under Equality and Data Protection Legislation have been met
Staff have sufficient training / expertise to carry out the consultation

Note any actions to be completed before consultation is signed off here:

PLAN SIGNED OFF BY MANAGER / CONSULTATION COMMISSIONER (Name)
(Date):

RETURN THIS FORM TO THE PERSON WHO PRODUCED THE PROJECT PLAN. IT SHOULD BE RETAINED FOR AUDIT PURPOSES. CONSULTATION DETAILS SHOULD NOW BE SENT TO PUBLIC SITE ON CONSULTATION PORTAL.
Appendix B
Questionnaire
Consultation:
The Proposed Withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services in Worcestershire
Background

You will probably have read in newspapers, heard on the radio or watched on television that councils and all public services are facing a severe reduction in funding as Central Government deals with the national debt. Every year Worcestershire County Council faces tough decisions about where it spends your money and is currently needing to save £30 million per year.

Worcestershire County Council has adopted a proactive approach so that a considered plan can be drawn up of how to address this challenge.

The proposal

Worcestershire County Council is proposing to save £3 million from the £3 million that is currently spent towards subsidising bus journeys in Worcestershire. This reduction in spending is likely to lead to the withdrawal of subsidised bus services.

Worcestershire County Council currently supports the provision of buses across the County. This is in the fulfilment of legal functions (e.g. home to school transport) and to enable residents to travel on services that are not provided by commercial bus operators. These bus services are in urban and rural areas and are used for journeys to work, to school, essential shopping trips, to reach medical services and for leisure/sporting activities.

Currently approximately 80% of bus passenger journeys are provided commercially by the private sector and others, approximately 20% are subsidised by Worcestershire County Council.

Consultation to date

Spring 2010

Residents were asked to prioritise all services provided by Worcestershire County Council over several rounds of public consultation. Results showed that subsidising bus services ranked as less of a priority behind such services as adult social care, children’s social care and highways maintenance.

Autumn 2010 / Spring 2011

A further consultation was then undertaken, specifically related to reducing subsidised bus services.

This showed that residents preferred to see a reduction in the level of service rather than a complete withdrawal of specific routes.

Changes to services were implemented in 2011 and a saving of £2.5 million of tax payers money was made.

Current Situation

Due to the ongoing financial challenges faced by Worcestershire County Council we now need to explore how a further £3 million saving can be achieved.

Key facts

- Worcestershire County Council Bus expenditure is £3 million per annum
- Number of Services Supported is 97
- Number of Passengers Journeys on supported services is 3 million per annum
- The current minimum subsidy is £0.10 per passenger Journey
- The current maximum subsidy is £8.24 per passenger Journey
- The current overall average subsidy is £1.04 per passenger journey
This Consultation

Understanding your views, opinions and preferences is key to our decision making process. Please read each question carefully and tick a box which most closely matches your personal opinion.

The closing date to return your questionnaire is **Friday 17th January 2014.**

All the opinions you express and any information you give will be treated confidentially.

**Section 1: Current Subsidised Bus Services**

The following section asks you questions about bus routes that are currently subsidised by the Council. Please only answer these questions if you have used one of these routes.

**Q1** Please list ALL the subsidised bus service numbers from those listed at the back of the leaflet that you currently use. Please note if the services you use are NOT on this list then they are operated commercially and may not be affected.

- None of the services listed (please go to Section 3 of the survey)

**Q1a** Please state the Worcestershire County Council subsidised bus service number you use most frequently.

**Q2** Thinking about the subsidised service you use most frequently, how often do you use this service? Please tick one box only.

- Three or more times a week
- Once or twice a week
- Once or twice a month
- Once or twice a year

**Q3** What are the main reasons that you use this service? Please select one main reason, and then highlight any other reasons why you make use of the bus service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main reason (please tick one)</th>
<th>Other reasons (please tick all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to/from a school/college/university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to/from work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending hospital/doctor/dentist/health appointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting friends/relatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to/from shops to do essential shopping (For example, food shopping)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to/from shops to do non-essential shopping (For example, clothes shopping)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting leisure/recreational facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting community/day centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q4** If this bus service were no longer available, how significant would the impact be on you? Please tick all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>High impact</th>
<th>Some impact</th>
<th>Low impact</th>
<th>No impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to/from a school/college/university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to/from work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending hospital/doctor/dentist appointments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting friends/relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to/from shops to do essential shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to/from shops to do non-essential shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting leisure/recreational facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting community/day centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q5** What alternative means of travel would you use, if any, if the bus service you most frequently use was withdrawn? Please tick all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Means of Travel</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Quite likely</th>
<th>Not very likely</th>
<th>Not at all likely</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle/Moped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifts with friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car sharing scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use community transport schemes (e.g. dial-a-ride)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or don't know or no alternative (please state)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q6** All of the bus services shown at the back of this leaflet are at risk. Please select THREE types of service from the list below that you think are most important to you. Please rank your selection 1 to 3, with 1 being the most important to you.

- Town services
- Rural services (to/from villages)
- Services used by workers
- Services used for essential shopping trips
- Services to hospitals and medical centres
- Services mainly used by people who are elderly or with disabilities
- Services to reach leisure or sporting activities
- Park and Ride
- Evening services
- Sunday services
Section 2: Other Ways to Cost Save

Q7 One of the ways that we can reduce the amount of subsidy required is to increase bus fares. This may LIMIT service reductions. The current AVERAGE bus fare paid for each journey is £1.60. Do you feel that bus fares should be increased and if so, by how much? Please tick

Yes □
No □

If yes, by how much should fares be increased? Please tick one box only.
- Less than 25p per journey □
- 25p to 50p per journey □
- 51p to 74p per journey □
- 75p to £1 □
- More than £1 □

Q8 Do you have any other suggestions that may off-set the subsidies required to pay for bus services?

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Q9 Worcestershire County Council could have opportunities to bid for government money to support commercial operators to grow local bus services. If this is the case, which initiatives do you think we should bid for (Please rank your top three, 1 being the highest):

- Promotion and publicity (such as timetables) □
- Real time information displays at bus stops □
- Bus stop enhancements (such as new bus shelters) □
- Priority and traffic lights for buses □
- Ticketing incentives □
- Driver Training □

Section 3: Further comments

Q10 Please tell us anything further which would help us understand:

- The impact on you of the withdrawal of these services
- Any further suggestions on saving money
- Anything which would tell us more about the answers you have given above

This could include information about you which helps us to understand the importance of bus services for you, or any further information on the impact the withdrawal/s may have.

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
Section 4: About You

The following section asks you about yourself. This is especially important when identifying which groups of people will be most affected by potential service changes.

All information provided by you remains completely confidential, and will not be used for any other purpose beyond this analysis.

Q11 Are you male or female?
Male ☐ Female ☐

Q12 What is your age?
Under 16 ☐ 16 to 24 ☐ 25 to 44 ☐ 45 to 64 ☐ 65-80 ☐ 85+ ☐

Q13 Please provide your postcode. This is essential because it will enable us to identify which locations have the greatest need for services. It will not be used for any other purpose.

Q14 Which of the following best describes your current work status?
Employee in full-time job (30 hours or more per week) ☐
Employee in part-time job (less than 30 hours per week) ☐
Self-employed – full or part time ☐
Unemployed and available for work ☐
Retired ☐
Full-time education at school, college or university ☐
Not required to work due to a disability or illness ☐
Other (please specify) ________________________________

Q15 Do you own and/or have access to a car?
Yes ☐ No ☐

Q16 Do you have a disability or long term illness?
Yes, but this does not limit my ability to get out and about ☐
Yes, and this does limit my ability to get out and about ☐
No ☐

Q17 Do you make use of the concessionary bus pass scheme?
Yes, I hold an older persons’ bus pass ☐
Yes, I hold a disabled persons’ bus pass ☐
No ☐
Q18 To which ethnicity group do you consider you belong?

- White: British
- White: Irish
- White: Any other White background
- Mixed: White and Black Caribbean
- Mixed: White and Black African
- Mixed: White and Asian
- Mixed: Any other Mixed background
- Asian or Asian British: Indian
- Asian or Asian British: Pakistani
- Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi
- Asian or Asian British: Any other Asian background
- Asian or Asian British: Caribbean
- Black or Black British: Caribbean
- Black or Black British: African
- Black or Black British: Any other Black background
- Chinese
- Gipsy or Traveller
- Prefer not to say
- Other (please state)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Please send the completed questionnaire by Friday 17th January 2014 to:

The Transport Programme & Commissioning Team  
Worcestershire County Council  
FREEPOST RSGG-HSZK-HSGL  
H1 County Hall  
WORCESTER  
WR5 2NP

Additional copies of this document can be downloaded from our website and the questionnaire can also be filled out on-line.

www.worcestershire.gov.uk/busservicereview

Consultation closes Friday 17th January 2014

Data Protection

Your personal information will be held and used in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The Council will not disclose such information to any unauthorised person or body but where appropriate will use such information when carrying out its various functions and services.

What happens next?

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this consultation. All the consultation responses will be assessed and the findings included in a report for Worcestershire County Councillors to consider. The information will then be used to make informed decisions, including an Equality Impact Assessment on any service changes.

We will not be responding directly to your feedback, but we will be producing a summary at the end of the process. This will be available on our website from February 2014.

Please note that any proposals will not be implemented until September 2014.
## Local Bus Services Funded by Worcestershire County Council: At Risk

### Bromsgrove District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Service Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Days / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Buses</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>The Oakhalls - Bromsgrove - Halesowen via Catshill, Romsley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Bromsgrove - Droitwich via Wychbold, The Stokes</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Redditch - Bromsgrove - Longbridge via Barnt Green</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Blackwell - Redditch (St. Bedes) via Lickey, Finstall, Webheath</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Lickey - Redditch via Cotton Hackett, Barnt Green, Alvechurch, Rowney Green</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Bromsgrove - Redditch via Elm Grove, Barnt Green, Alvechurch, Rowney Green</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Stourport - Kidderminster - Halesowen via Burlish, Hagley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Wolverley School - Halesowen via Kidderminster, Hagley</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Hagley - Kidderminster via Belbroughton, Blakedown</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansons</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>Bromsgrove Rail Stn - Stourbridge via Bromsgrove, Sidemoor, Catshill, Belbroughton, Hagley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday, Off-peak journeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Wythall - Hockley Heath via Whitlocks End, Tidbury Green, Dickens Heath, Solihull, Knowle, Dorridge</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus / Dudley's Coaches</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>Foxhylate Inn - Ridgeway Middle School via Webheath</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Malvern Hills District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Service Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Days / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Upton-upon-Severn - Great Malvern via Welland, Malvern Wells</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Upton-upon-Severn - Malvern Link via Welland, Hanley Swan, Great Malvern, Malvern Hospital</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>42F</td>
<td>Upton-upon-Severn - Malvern Link via Welland, Hanley Swan, Fruitlands, Great Malvern, Malvern Hospital</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>42G</td>
<td>Upton-upon-Severn - Malvern Link via The Graftons, Welland, Hanley Swan, Great Malvern, Malvern Hospital</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Upton-upon-Severn - Malvern Link via Welland, Malvern Wells, Poolbrook, Great Malvern</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>43F</td>
<td>Upton-upon-Severn - Malvern Link via Welland, Malvern Wells, Fruitlands, Poolbrook, Great Malvern</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coniston Coaches</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Stourport - Astley Burf [Circular]</td>
<td>Fridays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;B Travel</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells - Kidderminster via Mamilbe, Bewdley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Worcester via Foley Park, Burlish, Stourport, Holt Heath</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Worcester via Comberton Hill, Wilden, Stourport, Holt Heath</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Worcester - Clifton upon Teme via Rushwick, Broadheath, Grimley, Martley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>Worcester [6th Form College] - Hanley Broadheath via Broadheath, Martley, Clifton-upon-Teme</td>
<td>College Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Worcester - Clifton-upon-Teme via Broadheath, Martley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>Gloucester - Tewkesbury via Corse Lawn</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>Holt Heath - Droitwich via Ombersley</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>Holt Heath - Redditch via Ombersley, Droitwich, Hanbury, Feckenham</td>
<td>Tuesday and Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>Tewkesbury - Upton-upon-Severn (Tunnel Hill) via Ryall</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>Worcester - Upton-upon-Severn via St. Peter's, Kempsey, Kinnersley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>Worcester - Upton-upon-Severn via Callow End, Hanley Swan</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>Worcester - Upton-upon-Severn via St. Peter's, Kempsey</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>Pershore - Tewkesbury via Baughton, Ripple</td>
<td>Wednesdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>Malvern Link - Cheltenham via Great Malvern, Malvern Wells, Hanley Castle, Welland, Pendock, Gloucester</td>
<td>Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>Worcester - Pershore via Norton, Littleworth, Defford, Eckington</td>
<td>Friday and Saturdays Evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>Worcester - Ledbury via Bishops Frome, Cradley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Worcester - Bransford - Alfrick - Suckley - Alfrick - Bransford - Worcester</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>Worcester - Bransford - Alfrick - Suckley - Great Malvern</td>
<td>Fridays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;B Travel</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>Tenbury - Hereford via Leysters, Middleton, Kimbolton, Stoke Prior</td>
<td>3rd Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugg Valley Primrose Travel</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Burford - Leominster via Tenbury, Kimbolton</td>
<td>Fridays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>Ledbury - Great Malvern via Wellington Heath, Colwall, West Malvern</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Local Bus Services Funded by Worcestershire County Council: At Risk

### Redditch District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Service Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Days / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Redditch - Batchley (Salters Lane) via Cedar Road, Woodlands</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Redditch - Matchborough West via Abbeyleague, Morrisons</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Sainsbury’s - Abbey Stadium - Redditch - Matchborough East via North Moons Moat</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Redditch - Plymouth Road (Circular) via Bentley Close</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Redditch - Woodrow North via Lodge Park, Greenlands</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Redditch - Bromsgrove - Longbridge via Barnt Green</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Blackwell - Redditch (St. Bedes) via Lickey, Finnall, Webheath</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Lickey - Redditch via Cotford Hackett, Barnt Green, Alvechurch, Rowney Green</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Bromsgrove - Redditch via Elm Grove, Barnt Green, Alvechurch, Rowney Green</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Redditch - Worcester via Alexandra Hospital, Astwood Bank, Inkerrow, Upton Snodsbury, Worcestershire Royal Hospital</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>Holt Heath - Redditch via Ombersley, Droitwich, Hanbury, Feckenham</td>
<td>Tuesday and Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>Washford Mill - St. Augustine's RC High School via Redditch</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus / Dudley's Coaches</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>Foxlydiate Inn - Ridgeway Middle School via Webheath</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>New End - Kingsley College via Astwood Bank</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>Webheath - Kingsley College</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>Webheath - Kingsley College</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Worcester City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Service Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Days / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Worcester - Winchester Avenue - Worcester</td>
<td>Monday to Thursday and Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Worcester - Broadway Grove - Solitaire Avenue - Worcester</td>
<td>Monday to Thursday and Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Worcester - Blanquettes Avenue - Longfellow Road - Worcester</td>
<td>Monday to Thursday and Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Worcester - Kilbury Drive (Circular) via Prestwich Avenue</td>
<td>Monday to Thursday and Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>26/27</td>
<td>Worcester - Diglis - Battenhall - Worcester</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Worcester - Dines Green (Circular)</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>31A/31C</td>
<td>Worcester - Worcestershire Royal Hospital - Warndon - Worcester</td>
<td>Daily, Daytime and Evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Northwick (New Inn) - Worcester via Ombersley Road</td>
<td>Friday and Saturday Evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>33A/34A</td>
<td>Worcester - Tolladine - Warndon - Lyppard Centre - Tunnel Hill - Worcester</td>
<td>Friday and Saturday Evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Worcester - Blackpole (Circular) via Brickfields, Warndon</td>
<td>Friday and Saturday Evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Worcester - Stratford via Evesham, Bidford-on-Avon</td>
<td>Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Worcester via Foley Park, Bursill, Stourport, Holt Heath</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Worcester via Comberton Hill, Wilden, Stourport, Holt Heath</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Worcester - Clifton upon Teme via Rushwick, Broadheath, Grimley, Martley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>Worcester (6th Form College) - Hanley Broadheath via Broadheath, Martley, Clifton-upon-Tême</td>
<td>College Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Worcester - Clifton-upon-Teme via Broadheath, Martley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Redditch - Worcester via Alexandra Hospital, Astwood Bank, Inkerrow, Upton Snodsbury, Worcestershire Royal Hospital</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>Droitwich - Worcester via Chawson, Fernhill Heath, Commeadows</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>Worcester - Grafton Flyford via Tibberton, Crowle</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>Worcester - Droitwich via Tibberton, Crowle, Himbleton</td>
<td>Monday, Wednesday and Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>Worcester - Droitwich via Crowle, Tibberton, Shennal Green</td>
<td>Tuesday, Thursday and Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>Worcester - Upton-upon-Severn via St. Peter's, Kempsey, Kinnersley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>Worcester - Upton-upon-Severn via Callow End, Hanley Swan</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued overleaf*
### Worcester Bus Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Service Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Days / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>Worcester - Upton-upon-Severn via St. Peter's, Kempsey</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>Worcester - Pershore via Norton, Littleworth, Defford, Eckington</td>
<td>Friday and Saturday Evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>Worcester - Ledbury via Bishops Frome, Cradley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Worcester - Bransford - Alfrick - Suckley - Alfrick - Bransford - Worcester</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>Worcester - Bransford - Alfrick - Suckley - Great Malvern</td>
<td>Fridays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>Worcester - Evesham via Drakes Broughton, Pershore, Fladbury</td>
<td>Friday and Saturday Evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Droitwich - Blessed Edward Oldcorne School</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Primsland - Blessed Edward Oldcorne School via Fernhill Heath</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Blackpole - Blessed Edward Oldcorne School via Warndon, Warndon Villages</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Warndon Villages - Blessed Edward Oldcorne School</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Blackpole - Blessed Edward Oldcorne School via Warndon Villages</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>S27</td>
<td>Worcester - Battenhall (Blessed Edward School)</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>Worcester - Worcester North Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>W3</td>
<td>Sixways - Worcestershire Royal Hospital</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wychavon District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Service Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Days / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Droitwich - Cockshute Hill (Circular)</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Droitwich - New Chawson (Chalverton Court)</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>19A/19C</td>
<td>Droitwich - Chawson - The Ridings - Meadows Estate - Droitwich</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Droitwich - Westlands - (Hampton Lovett) (Circular)</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson's</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Stratford - Pembworth (Circular) via Welford, Long Marston</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>31A/31C</td>
<td>Worcester - Worcestershire Royal Hospital - Warndon - Sixways - Worcester</td>
<td>Sixways served Monday to Friday daytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Droitwich via Chaddesley Corbett, Cutsall Green</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Bromsgrove - Droitwich via Wychbold, The Stokes</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Worcester - Stratford via Evesham, Bidford-on-Avon</td>
<td>Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Redditch - Worcester via Alexandra Hospital, Astwood Bank, Inkberrow, Upton Snodsbury, Worcestershire Royal Hospital</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>Holt Heath - Droitwich via Ombersley</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>Holt Heath - Redditch via Ombersley, Droitwich, Hanbury, Feckenham</td>
<td>Tuesday and Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>Droitwich - Worcester via Chawson, Fernhill Heath, Commeadows</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>Worcester - Grafton Flyford via Tibberton, Crowle</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>Worcester - Droitwich via Tibberton, Crowle, Himbleton</td>
<td>Monday, Wednesday and Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>Worcester - Droitwich via Crowle, Tibberton, Shernall Green</td>
<td>Tuesday, Thursday and Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>Pershore - Tewkesbury via Baughton, Ripple</td>
<td>Wednesdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>Worcester - Pershore via Norton, Littleworth, Defford, Eckington</td>
<td>Friday and Saturday Evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astons Coaches</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>Evesham - Cheltenham via Beckford, Broadclyst, Tewkesbury</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>Worcester - Evesham via Drakes Broughton, Pershore, Fladbury</td>
<td>Friday and Saturday Evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henshaws</td>
<td>552/553</td>
<td>Evesham - South Littleton - Pembworth - Honeybourne - Badsey - Evesham, East Vale Hopper</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>564/565</td>
<td>Pershore - Inkberrow - Evesham - Elmley Castle - Pershore, Wychavon Hopper</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>Peopleton - Pershore Estates via Pinvin, Pershore, Pershore PlumLine</td>
<td>Monday, Wednesday and Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Travel</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>Upton Snodsbury - Pershore Estates via Pinvin, Pershore, Pershore PlumLine</td>
<td>Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN Cresswell</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>Evesham - Hampton - Evesham</td>
<td>Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN Cresswell</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>Evesham - Fairfield - Evesham</td>
<td>Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN Cresswell</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Willersey - Broadway - Evesham</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday, early morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Droitwich - Blessed Edward Oldcorne School</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Primsland - Blessed Edward Oldcorne School via Fernhill Heath</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>S15</td>
<td>Droitwich Road - Stourport - Bewdley via Wilden Top</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>S70</td>
<td>New End - Kingsley College via Astwood Bank</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>W3</td>
<td>Sixways - Worcestershire Royal Hospital</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>Service Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Days / Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>4A/4A</td>
<td>Fairfield - Kidderminster via Puxton Drive, Franche, Ferndale</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Puxton Drive - Kidderminster</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday, afternoon journeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Fairfield via Greenhill, Sion Hill</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Offmore Road</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Stourport - Bewdley via Wilden</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Droitwich via Chaddesley Corbett, Cutnall Green</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Stourport - Kidderminster - Halesowen via Burlish, Hagley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Wolverley School - Halesowen via Kidderminster, Hagley</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Hagley - Kidderminster via Bellbroughton, Blakenor</td>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coniston Coaches</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Stourport - Astley Buf (Circular)</td>
<td>Fridays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;B Travel</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells - Kidderminster via Mable, Bewdley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Kidderminster (Rail Stn) - Ludlow via Bewdley, Hales Park, Cleobury Mortimer</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday, Off-peak journeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Worcester via Foley Park, Burlish, Stourport, Holt Heath</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Worcester via Comberton Hill, Wilden, Stourport, Holt Heath</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arriva</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Bridgnorth via Arley, Alveley</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Kinver via Sion Hill, Fairfield</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus / Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>Caunsall - Wolverley School via Cookley</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus / Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>Kidderminster - Wolverley School via Wilton Avenue, Habblerley</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bus</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>Chaddesley Corbett - Wolverley School via Kidderminster</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>Sion Hill - Wolverley School</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>Marlpool Lane - Wolverley School via Willowfield Drive</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittle Coach and Bus</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>Droitwich Road - Stourport - Bewdley via Wilden Top</td>
<td>Schooldays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You can contact us in the following ways:

By post:
Worcestershire County Council, County Hall, Spetchley Road, Worcester WR5 2NP

By email:
busservicereview@worcestershire.gov.uk

Online:
www.worcestershire.gov.uk/busservicereview

This document can be made available in other formats (large print, audio tape, computer disk and Braille) on request.

To the best of our knowledge all information was correct at the time of printing November 2013

Find out more online:
www.worcestershire.gov.uk/busservicereview
Appendix C
Pocket Card
have your say...
...on the proposed withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services In Worcestershire

Closing date: 17th January 2014

Questionnaires available:
On line www.worcestershire.gov.uk/busservicereview
This does not affect commercially run services
Appendix D
‘Have Your Say’ Poster
have your say...

...on the proposed withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services In Worcestershire

Closing date: 17th January 2014

Questionnaires available:
On line www.worcestershire.gov.uk/busservicereview

This does not affect commercially run services
Appendix E
Press Release
Press Release: County Council Cabinet approves bus subsidy withdrawal consultation starting tomorrow (November 8)

Worcestershire County Council's Cabinet has agreed to a 10-week consultation, which will start tomorrow (November 8), on a proposed withdrawal of the £3million bus subsidy spend.

Plans have been put forward to remove the taxpayers' money spent on bus subsidies to help meet the financial challenge the authority faces due to reduced levels of Central Government funding. Over the next 12 months a total of £30million of savings need to be made across the council.

The vast majority (around 80 per cent) of bus services in Worcestershire are provided by commercial operators with no involvement from the council. These proposals are not looking into these services.

Currently £3million of taxpayers' money is spent to plug gaps in the commercial network – usually the less popular or less well used services. The average spend on such subsidised services is around £1 per passenger journey (highest subsidy spend being £8.24 per journey).

People in Worcestershire are being urged to take the opportunity to share their views on these proposals over the next 10 weeks.

Hard-copy consultation questionnaires can be obtained from Libraires or Hubs.

Questionnaires can also be downloaded online from the County Council's website www.worcestershire.gov.uk/bservicerereview. The dedicated web section also includes a full list of bus services currently subsidised by the County Council and further background information.

The closing date for responses is Friday, January 17, 2014.

Any changes to the bus subsidy spend will not be implemented until September 2014.

Cllr John Smith OBE, County Council Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, said: "The financial challenge the authority is currently faced with means tough decisions have to be made on how taxpayers' money is best spent.

"The vast majority of bus services in Worcestershire are run commercially and won't be affected.

"These proposals look to withdraw all funding for subsidised services but we need to hear what people think about the plans before a final decision is made in February, 2014. I'd encourage anyone with a view to take part in the consultation and have their say."

Financial savings of around £2.5 million have already been made in public transport over the last few years through efficiency and operational reviews. These have been made by:

• Working with operators to ensure a better route optimisation;
• Procurement reviews – including e-tendering and e-auctions
• A previous subsidy budget reduction of £2.5million following an extensive public consultation in 2011.
Appendix F

Bus Advertisement
Worcestershire County Council

The Proposed Withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Service funding in Worcestershire

Worcestershire County Council is proposing to withdraw the £3 million it currently uses to fund bus subsidies.

Have your say -
If you have a view please share them via www.worcestershire.gov.uk/busservicereview which contains background information and an online survey.

Anyone wishing to have their say can do so until the consultation ends on January 17, 2014.

Hard copy questionnaires are also available in Libraries across the County.

Find out more online:
www.worcestershire.gov.uk/busservicereview
Appendix G

Face-to-Face Schedule
## Face-Face Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graham T</th>
<th>Sue H</th>
<th>Kevin</th>
<th>Sue L</th>
<th>Dawn</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Margaret</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 20th</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td>Stourport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th 21st</td>
<td>Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Stourport</td>
<td>Droitwich</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 22nd</td>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td>Kidderminster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 23rd</td>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td>Bewdley</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Droitwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 25th</td>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td>Stourport</td>
<td>Upton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Droitwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 26th</td>
<td>Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Kidderminster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 27th</td>
<td>Evesham</td>
<td>Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Bewdley</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th 28th</td>
<td>Wythall</td>
<td>Kidderminster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 29th</td>
<td>Stourport</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evesham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 30th</td>
<td>Evesham</td>
<td>Vic Fayre</td>
<td>Vic Fayre</td>
<td>Upton</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bromsgrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 2nd</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Kidderminster</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pershore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 3rd</td>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pershore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 4th</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>Wythall</td>
<td>Kidderminster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th 5th</td>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td>Bewdley</td>
<td>Evesham</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 6th</td>
<td>Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Droitwich</td>
<td>Tenbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 7th</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td>Kidderminster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 10th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 13th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pershore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H
‘Have Your Say’ Roadshows
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wyre Forest (no Gazebo)</td>
<td>Rowland Hill Centre</td>
<td>Sat 7th Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redditch (no Gazebo)</td>
<td>Kingfisher Centre, Redditch Evesham Square opp. Primark</td>
<td>Sat 9th Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromsgrove (Take Gazebo)</td>
<td>Farmers Market, nr Barclays Bank</td>
<td>Sat 16th Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester (No Gazebo)</td>
<td>Crown Gate Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Wednesday 4th Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Hills (Take Gazebo)</td>
<td>Outside Connells, Malvern High Street</td>
<td>Sat 23rd Nov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I
Future Lives Schedule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is it for</th>
<th>Where is the event</th>
<th>Date and time</th>
<th>Hosted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Bromsgrove Methodist Church, 19 Stratford Road, Bromsgrove B60 1AS</td>
<td>10.1.2014, 10.30am – 12.30pm</td>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>The Cube, Albert Road, North Malvern, WR14 2YF</td>
<td>13.1.2014, 2pm - 4pm</td>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Wallace House, Evesham, Oat Street, WR11 4PJ</td>
<td>16.1.2014, 6pm - 8pm</td>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Community House, 103, Easemore Road, Redditch B98 8EY</td>
<td>6.1.2014, 6.30pm – 8pm</td>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Kidderminster Library, Market Street, Kidderminster, DY10 1AB</td>
<td>14.1.2014, 2.30pm – 4.30pm</td>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>Horizon Centre Midlands Road, Worcester WR5 1DS</td>
<td>13.1.2014, 10.30am – 12.30pm</td>
<td>Speak Easy N.O.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Informal Carers</td>
<td>Perdiswell Young People’s Leisure Club, Droitwich Road, Worcester, WR3 7SN</td>
<td>7.1.2014, 10.30am – 12.30pm</td>
<td>Worcestershire Association of Carers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Informal Carers</td>
<td>Offices of Worcestershire Association of Carers, Polysec House, Blackpole Rd, Worcester WR3 8TJ</td>
<td>7.1.2014, 6.30pm – 8.30pm</td>
<td>Worcestershire Association of Carers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older People</td>
<td>Evesham Town Hall, Market Square, Evesham WR11 4RW</td>
<td>15.1.2014, 2pm – 4pm</td>
<td>Age UK Hereford and Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older People</td>
<td>Malvern Hills District Council Offices, Avenue Road, Malvern WR14 3AF</td>
<td>14.1.2014, 10am -12 noon</td>
<td>Age UK Hereford and Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disabilities and Sensory Impairment</td>
<td>County Hall, Worcester, Sprehley Road, WR5 2NP</td>
<td>7.1.14, 2pm – 4pm</td>
<td>Worcestershire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disabilities Consultative Group</td>
<td>County Hall</td>
<td>06.1.2014</td>
<td>10-12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event - General Public</td>
<td>Community House, Redditch</td>
<td>6.1.2014</td>
<td>6.30 pm - 8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event - Carers - Family and Informal</td>
<td>Perdiswell YPLC</td>
<td>7.1.2014</td>
<td>10.30 am - 12.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event - Carers - Family and Informal</td>
<td>WAC offices</td>
<td>7.1.2014</td>
<td>6.30 pm - 8.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event - Joint PDSI FL event</td>
<td>Council Chamber</td>
<td>7.1.2014</td>
<td>2 pm - 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dementia Care Planning Group</td>
<td>Gt Malvern Room</td>
<td>8.1.2014</td>
<td>2pm - 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire OP Partnership</td>
<td>Perdiswell YPLC</td>
<td>8.1.2014</td>
<td>10am - 12.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers Consultative Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1.2014</td>
<td>10am - 1.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>Worcester Community Housing, Bilford Road, off Southdown Road, Astwood Farm, Worcester, Worcestershire WR3 8QA</td>
<td>08.01.2014</td>
<td>10 am - 11.30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>Worcester Community Housing Chelmsford Court Chelmsford Dr, Worcester, WR5 1RD</td>
<td>08.01.2014</td>
<td>12 pm - 1.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>Worcester Community Housing, Himbleton House, Himbleton Road, St Johns, Worcester, Worcestershire WR2 6HS</td>
<td>08.01.2014</td>
<td>2.30pm - 4.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Location Details</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people event - Single Homeless</td>
<td>Worcester YMCA</td>
<td>8th Jan 14</td>
<td>17.30 - 19.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>Yates Court, 95/97 High Street, Evesham WR11 4DN</td>
<td>09.01.2014</td>
<td>10 am - 11.30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>Ferry View, Merstow Green, Evesham WR11 4BT</td>
<td>09.01.2014</td>
<td>1 pm - 2.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>Ferry View, Merstow Green, Evesham WR11 4BT</td>
<td>09.01.2014</td>
<td>3 pm - 4.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people event - Mental Health</td>
<td>Kidderminster Town Hall, Corn Exchange</td>
<td>9th Jan 14</td>
<td>10:00 -11:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event - General Public</td>
<td>Hive</td>
<td>9.1.2014</td>
<td>10.30 am - 12.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People Provider Forum</td>
<td>County Hall Kidderminster room</td>
<td>9.1.2014</td>
<td>10am - 12pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people event - DA</td>
<td>Guildhall, Worcester</td>
<td>9th Jan 14</td>
<td>11.00 - 13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people event - Mental Health</td>
<td>Bromsgrove BDC Council House, Spadesbourne suite, Burcot Lane Bromsgrove B60 1AA</td>
<td>9th Jan 14</td>
<td>12.30 - 14:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people event - Young People</td>
<td>South Worcester YMCA</td>
<td>9th, Jan 2014</td>
<td>17.30-19.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people event - HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>ASHA Womens Centre. Worcester</td>
<td>10th Jan 13</td>
<td>13.30 - 15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event - General Public</td>
<td>Methodist Church, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>10.1.2014</td>
<td>10.30 am - 12.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People - Learning disability</td>
<td>Kidderminster library, Market st, Kidderminster DY10 1AB</td>
<td>10.1.2014</td>
<td>12pm - 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Housing Substance Misuse</td>
<td>The Hive</td>
<td>10th January</td>
<td>10.00 - 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse ETEV</td>
<td>Guildhall, Worcester</td>
<td>13th January</td>
<td>1.30 - 3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people event - Mental Health</td>
<td>Worcester CCP, Pierpoint Street Worcecster WR1 1TA</td>
<td>13th Jan 14</td>
<td>10.00 - 11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event - General Public</td>
<td>Cube, Malvern</td>
<td>13.1.2014</td>
<td>2 pm - 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event - People with Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>Horizon Centre Midland Road Worcecster WR5 1DS</td>
<td>13.1.2014</td>
<td>10.30 am - 12.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>Committee Room - 3, Redditch BC - Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH</td>
<td>13.01.2014</td>
<td>10 am - 11.30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>Committee Room - 3, Redditch BC - Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH</td>
<td>13.01.2014</td>
<td>12 pm - 1.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>Committee Room - 3, Redditch BC - Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH</td>
<td>13.01.2014</td>
<td>2 pm - 3.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people event - Young People</td>
<td>North Redditch Ecumenical Centre</td>
<td>13th Jan</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>Storer Court – Festival Housing, 3 Geraldine Road, Malvern, WR14 3NT</td>
<td>14.01.2014</td>
<td>9.30 am - 11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>Thomas Morris House, William Tennant Way, Upton-upon-Severn, WR8 0LP</td>
<td>14.01.2014</td>
<td>11.30 am - 1 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event - General Public</td>
<td>Kidderminster library, Market st, Kidderminster DY10 1AB</td>
<td>14.1.2014</td>
<td>2.30pm - 4.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event - Older People</td>
<td>Malvern Hills District Council Offices, Avenue Road, Malvern</td>
<td>14.1.2014</td>
<td>10 am - 12 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Carers</td>
<td>Perdiswell YPLC</td>
<td>14.1.2014</td>
<td>7-9pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people event - Mental Health</td>
<td>Ecumenical Centre Redditch</td>
<td>15th Jan 14</td>
<td>14:00 - 16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Hills LSP</td>
<td>The Council House, Malvern</td>
<td>15.01.2014</td>
<td>9.30 - 12 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCS Future Lives Reference Group</td>
<td>County Hall, Gt Malvern Room</td>
<td>15.1.14</td>
<td>2.30 - 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event - Older People incl. Well Check, BME, forums</td>
<td>Evesham Town Hall</td>
<td>15.1.2014</td>
<td>2 pm - 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People, Older People</td>
<td>The Heriotts, Worcester Road, Droitwich, WR9 8AA</td>
<td>15.01.2014</td>
<td>2 pm - 3.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>The Hive, Studio</td>
<td>15.1.2014</td>
<td>10-12pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people event - Mental Health</td>
<td>Evesham Wallace House Community Centre Oat street Evesham WR11 4PJ</td>
<td>16th Jan 14</td>
<td>12:00 - 14:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting People, Older People</strong></td>
<td>Cornwall Gardens, Tenbury Wells, WR15 8E</td>
<td>16.01.2014</td>
<td>2 pm - 3.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting People, Older People</strong></td>
<td>Crabtree community room, Parkwood rd, Sidemoor, Bromsgrove B61 8UA</td>
<td>16.01.2014</td>
<td>10.30 - 12pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting People, Older People</strong></td>
<td>Buckleys Green Community room, The buckleys, Alvechurch, B48 7NG</td>
<td>16.01.2014</td>
<td>1.00 - 2.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting People, Older People</strong></td>
<td>Shawhurst Lane community room, Forest Way, Wythall, B47 5JS</td>
<td>16.01.2014</td>
<td>3.00 - 4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting people - Homeless families</strong></td>
<td>Redditch Town Hall</td>
<td>16.1.2014</td>
<td>11am to 1pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Event - general Public</strong></td>
<td>Wallace House, Oak Street,Evesham, WR11 4PJ</td>
<td>16.1.2014</td>
<td>6 pm - 8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting People - Learning Disability</strong></td>
<td>Wallace House, Oak Street,Evesham, WR11 4PJ</td>
<td>16.1.2014</td>
<td>10am - 12pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting people event -Off</strong></td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>6th Jan 14</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Harriet Baldwin MP
The Transport Programme and Commissioning Team
Worcestershire County Council
FREEPOST RSGG-HSZK-HSGL
H1 County Hall
WORCESTER
WR5 2NP

13 January 2014

I am writing as MP for West Worcestershire with a summary of the views of my constituents on the current consultation on ending subsidised bus services.

West Worcestershire is the most rural part of the county and is perhaps disproportionately affected by these proposed changes.

Some residents have indicated they would be prepared to pay (if currently on a concession) or pay more to retain services.

Less Regulation

The County may also want to consider making it easier to set up new bus transport routes with smaller vehicles, less regulated prices, simpler operator licence regimes for smaller buses, simpler tests for mini-bus licences, modular mandatory training for drivers and less complexity and expense when making minor service changes. After all, when you travel in the third world, there is usually an ample supply of bus transport in all shapes and sizes. Could the County do a form of de minimis tendering?

Home to School Transport

There are three schools in West Worcestershire – The Chantry at Martley and Tenbury High School and Bredon Hill Middle School - without Sixth Forms where many students will go on to do their 16-18 education at Worcester City Sixth Form College or 14-18 at Evesham or Pershore. Most will be travelling over 3 miles to attend college. In addition, one of the 11-18 schools in West Worcestershire – Hanley Castle High School – is more than 3 miles from most of its pupils' homes. Routes 42, 309 and 540 may require subsidy, but they must also run at times that
allow students to reach school and it may be cheaper for the council to subsidise these routes than to provide other transportation to students at these schools.

Cutting off Upton-upon-Severn

Routes 41, 42, 361, 362, 363, 364 all serve Upton-upon-Severn. In fact, as far as I can tell all routes to Upton-upon-Severn will be ended if all these services are ended. A town of over 3,000 needs some form of public transport link to Worcester and Malvern. Could a shuttle bus be arranged between Upton-upon-Severn and the nearest commercial routes?

West Malvern and Malvern Wells

As Malvern is so spread out, there needs to be some way to get from the outskirts to connect with a railway station and the main commercial bus route. Could a circular shuttle work?

Pershore High School

As above, in terms of access to school for students from villages over 3 miles away.

I enclose a fully completed consultation form and also the letters I have received from constituents about specific routes. Below is a list for your convenience.

Malvern Hills District

41: Upton –upon-Severn – Great Malvern via Welland, Malvern Wells

42: Upton –upon-Severn – Great Malvern via Welland, Hanley Swan, Great Malvern, Malvern Hospital

43: Upton-upon-Severn – Malvern link via Welland, Malvern Wells, Poolbrook, Great Malvern

291: Tenbury Wells – Kidderminster via Mamble, Bewdley

308: Worcester – Clifton-upon-Teme via Rushwick, Broadheath, Grimley, Martley

309: Worcester Sixth Form College to Hanley Broadheath via Broadheath, Martley, Clifton.
310: Worcester – Clifton-upon-Teme via Broadheath, Martley
361: Tewkesbury – Upton-upon-Severn (Tunnel Hill) via Ryall – Upton GP
362: Worcester – Upton-upon-Severn via St. Peter’s, Kempsey, Kinnersley
363: Worcester – Upton-upon-Severn Via Callow Wnd, Hanley Swan
364: Worcester – Upton-upon-Severn via St. Peter’s, Kempsey
675. Ledbury to Great Malvern via West Malvern.

**Wychavon District**

375: Pershore – Tewkesbury via Baughton, Ripple
566: Peopleton – Pershore Estates via Pinvin, Pershore, Pershore Plumline
(Monday, Wednesday and Friday)

566: Upton Snodsbury- Pershore Estates via Pinvin, Pershore, Pershore Plumline
(Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday)

I hope that the County Council will do all that they can to ensure my constituents and other bus users in the county are made fully aware of the changes that will be made to current services and when they will be enforced. It is a diverse group including commuters, shoppers and students who will be affected when travelling between rural towns.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Harriett Baldwin MP

Member of Parliament for West Worcestershire
Appendix K
District Responses
Dear Councillor Hardman

FUTURE OF BUS SERVICES IN BROMSGROVE

Following discussion at our full Council meeting, we are writing to express our grave concerns about your Council’s current proposals for the future of bus services and subsidies in Bromsgrove. Our concerns are outlined under the following headings:

Impact on Residents

We believe that for Bromsgrove District to prosper and grow it needs a strong and robust public transport system. Bromsgrove District is a geographically wide reaching area with multiple rural communities. We are concerned that without the lifeline of a public transport network our rural communities will suffer.

Currently Bromsgrove residents benefit from the community transport service provided by the RVS (‘BURT’). If the proposals are implemented it is likely there will be an increase in demand for the BURT, which may not be able to be met. Residents rely heavily on BURT for medical appointments and assisted travel. BURT also helps to maintain independence for those with poor mobility and disabilities. If the increased demand cannot be met, this is likely to have an adverse impact on residents’ health and wellbeing.

Rural Isolation

91% of the area of Bromsgrove District is green belt. The myriad of small villages and settlements rely on public transport to access even the most basic services (shops, GP surgeries, post offices). Reducing the frequency of services adversely affects residents, as it limits their ability to spend time in a town or with a service; removing the bus service means they have to rely on car transport or do not make the journey at all, leading to social isolation.

In such cases, numbers using the service can be misleading as there isn’t the mass of demand that might exist in an urban area. So removing a service that 5 people use regularly can affect 5 lives disproportionately. Generally, the removal of bus
subsidies could lead to some residents being cut off from getting to work, attending College or staying connected with family and friends.

Planning and development

The proposals do not appear to acknowledge the existence of a public transport system which been paramount in the agenda for planning decisions for some time now. The County Transport Plan is predicated on the existence of bus routes and of buses themselves in the delivery of sustainability across our District.

In addition, the County Council has been working with Bromsgrove to breathe life into the Town Centre through the delivery of the Area Action Plan and the Town Centre regeneration scheme. Much of the work to date has been underpinned by the expectation that the town will ultimately be better resourced and attract more people to work and shop here.

Our current road networks are woefully inadequate and the County Highways approach has been to develop a plan that is heavily reliant on a form of public transport that you are now proposing to undermine by cuts. For example, a requirement in S106 agreements for the provision of gold standard bus stops in areas where there might no longer be a bus. In addition to this there has been considerable concern identified in planning terms about the climate change issues that CO2 emissions are contributing to. Indeed planning decisions have hung in the balance as a result of County Highways advice in this regard.

It would therefore seem to us that, far from removing the subsidy, the work to be done is to understand the method by which reinvestment might encourage greater use and eventual self financing of this vital community lifeline.

Economic Impact

The County has also been working with the District to improve and relocate the Town’s Train Station. The station is situated some considerable way outside of the Town Centre and access to the station from the Town is dependent on bus routes. Both services 141 and 318, which are proposed for cuts, include the station.

In addition there are services that will gain access and egress to a development and improvement Zone in the Stoke area of the town. Currently this area is accessed by the 141 bus route and if this service for any reason ceases to exist it undermines to the basis of the regeneration project in this area.

Consultation process

Finally we would like to comment on the consultation process itself.

We recognise that the County Council is under time pressure to reduce its budget for 2014-15. However, the timescales are very tight for enabling residents to respond in an informed way to the consultation. We understand that consultation forms were late arriving in some local libraries or did not arrive at all.

The criteria for bus subsidies are unclear so we are not certain how the final decision can be transparent or be explained and justified.
The questionnaire appears to be aimed at those who currently use buses. We consider this excludes many who could make a valuable contribution to the consultation – those who have recently retired for example.

In conclusion, the Council resolved that a clear and unequivocal message be sent from the Chamber to Worcestershire County Council that the residents of Bromsgrove and District value and want to keep their bus services.

In response to the consultation currently taking place, as leader of the County Council we urge you to take account of our views and ask you to ensure that the current and important local bus services for Bromsgrove residents are retained.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Roger Hollingworth  
**Leader of the Council**

Cllr Luke Mallett  
**Leader of the Labour Group**

Cllr Sue Baxter  
**Leader of Wythall Residents Association**
Dear Sir/Madam

I write on behalf of Malvern Hills District Council in respect of your consultation on subsidised bus service withdrawals.

Malvern Hills District Council understands the tough decisions that the County Council face to meet future funding reductions but it is concerned about the impact that this will have on the health and well being of local communities and individuals who rely on these buses to access key services such as schools, health agencies, shops and other public services which require personal contact and for which for many vulnerable residents there simply is no alternative to access these services. These services are also vital to avoid the social isolation that comes with living in rural areas in this County.

If removed completely these subsidies will have a devastating effect on our residents and their towns, villages, businesses and schools and a particularly negative impact upon the Upton On Severn area of the District.

The Council would ask if it is possible for you to explore alternative ways of achieving some of the required savings without totally removing subsidies to this vital service.

Finally and depending on the County Council’s decision, this Council undertakes to work with both the County Council and local communities to seek to minimise the adverse impact the proposed reductions are likely to have on the residents of this District

Regards

John R Williams
Head of Policy and Governance
+Malvern Hills District Council
The Council House
Avenue Road
Malvern
WR14 3AF
01684 862227
07940372212
john.williams@malvernhills.gov.uk
The Transport Programme & Commissioning Team
Worcestershire County Council
FREEPOST RSGG-HSZK-HSGL
H1 County Hall
WORCESTER
WR5 2NP

17th January 2014

Dear Sir

BUS SUBSIDIES

The County Council's proposals include the remove bus subsidies for 16 bus routes in Redditch. This will impact on residents being able to get to work, attend college or access other essential services that enable them to live an independent life. In particular I note that this includes the 61 bus route which goes to the Abbey Stadium Leisure Centre. Loss of this service will restrict residents in being able to access a wide range of sporting activities thereby having an adverse impact on residents' health and well being.

The loss of vital public transport is likely to affect our more vulnerable and elderly residents the most. Restricting residents' ability to travel across the Borough will have a knock on effect on both their physical and mental well being, and consequently will drive in increased demand and cost for other public services, such as mental health and social care services.

I would therefore request that WCC be asked to reconsider its proposals to remove bus subsidies.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Greg Chance
Planning, Regeneration, Economic Development and Transport Portfolio Holder
Redditch Borough Council
15 January 2014

The Transport Programme & Commissioning Team
Worcestershire County Council
FREEPOST
County Hall
WORCESTER
WR5 2NP

Dear Transport Programme & Commissioning Team

Consultation: The Proposed Withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services in Worcestershire

In light of the current consultation on subsidised bus service withdrawals, on behalf of the Pershore Market Town Partnership, I wish to register our concerns regarding the likely impact on the town. Therefore, we would respectfully request that the decisions regarding the town’s service are carefully considered bearing in mind the potential significant impact on the town’s prosperity which could develop following severe cuts.

The Pershore Market Town Partnership involves key stakeholders in the town with representatives from the public, private, voluntary and community sector working together to address local needs. Through the multiple representatives on the board, this consultation on routes at risk presented serious concerns and is deemed extremely urgent.

A strong message from the local economy is to keep trade local and Pershore puts considerable effort into encouraging town and nearby residents to support the businesses and services available. With Pershore’s demographics showing a high percentage of residents in the 65+ age range (27.2%, notably higher than Wychavon 21.6% and Worcestershire 19.5% as a whole), local public transport is paramount to not only the businesses, but also to the residents.

The two main routes – the Wychavon Hopper and the Pershore Plum Line – are considered extremely important in local transportation. It would be seen as a considerable blow should these routes be affected with fears that Pershore would become isolated from the surrounding area. We fully respect the difficult period you are in and the tough decisions that will follow, but urge you to consider the repercussions of affecting Pershore’s main services when finalising your verdict.

Kindest Regards

Steve

Steve Knight BA
Pershore Market Town Partnership Manager
Direct Dial (01386) 565519 Fax (01386) 561634
steve.knight@wychavon.gov.uk
I’m one of the lead officers who produce an evidence based document known as the Village Facilities and Rural Transport Survey, which is prepared jointly with Malvern Hills District Council to inform the development strategy and the sustainability of villages for the South Worcestershire Development Strategy (SWDP). As part of the methodology used in determining the sustainability of villages, we use Worcestershire bus timetables to assess the availability and frequency of bus services in Wychavon and Malvern villages. Therefore any reduction or loss of bus services could have the potential to have an impact on where we are directing future housing.

I have a copy of the local bus services that could be at risk. I appreciate that the consultation has just started but wondered, at this stage, if you are able to advise me if there are any services that are certain to be cut?

Any information you may have would be much appreciated.

Kind Regards

Sarah

Sarah Matthews
Planning Officer

Wychavon District Council
The Civic Centre, Queen Elizabeth Drive, Pershore, Worcestershire, WR10 1PT
Tel: 01386 565453
www.wychavon.gov.uk
15 January 2014

The Transport Programme & Commissioning Team
Worcestershire County Council
FREEPOST
County Hall
WORCESTER
WR5 2NP

Dear Transport Programme & Commissioning Team

Consultation: The Proposed Withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services in Worcestershire

In light of the current consultation on subsidised bus service withdrawals, on behalf of the Pershore Market Town Partnership, I wish to register our concerns regarding the likely impact on the town. Therefore, we would respectfully request that the decisions regarding the town’s service are carefully considered bearing in mind the potential significant impact on the town's prosperity which could develop following severe cuts.

The Pershore Market Town Partnership involves key stakeholders in the town with representatives from the public, private, voluntary and community sector working together to address local needs. Through the multiple representatives on the board, this consultation on routes at risk presented serious concerns and is deemed extremely urgent.

A strong message from the local economy is to keep trade local and Pershore puts considerable effort into encouraging town and nearby residents to support the businesses and services available. With Pershore’s demographics showing a high percentage of residents in the 65+ age range (27.2%, notably higher than Wychavon 21.6% and Worcestershire 19.5% as a whole), local public transport is paramount to not only the businesses, but also to the residents.

The two main routes – the Wychavon Hopper and the Pershore Plum Line – are considered extremely important in local transportation. It would be seen as a considerable blow should these routes be affected with fears that Pershore would become isolated from the surrounding area. We fully respect the difficult period you are in and the tough decisions that will follow, but urge you to consider the repercussions of affecting Pershore’s main services when finalising your verdict.

Kindest Regards

Steve

Steve Knight BA
Pershore Market Town Partnership Manager
Direct Dial (01386) 565519 Fax (01386) 561634
steve.knight@wychavon.gov.uk
Wyre Forest District Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee’s Response to Transport Review 2013:

Worcestershire County Council Consultation on Subsidised Bus Service Withdrawals

Wyre Forest District Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Committee has fully considered the consultation documents at its meeting held on 19th December 2013. The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee authorises the submission of the following points and comments made by Committee Members.

1. The potential loss of a regular bus service will particularly hit the elderly, especially those in sheltered accommodation who are less likely to have access to a car. There are high numbers of rented sheltered units along a number of “at risk” routes including those serving Fairfield (bus routes 4A, 7 and 580), Lickhill (bus routes 15, 192 and 294), George Street/Offmore Road (bus route 7A), Deansway (bus route 7), Blakedown (bus route 197) and Bliss Gate (bus route 291), together with small developments around Chaddesley Corbett parish (bus route 133) and Shatterford (bus route 297).

2. The Sion Hill estate is amongst the 20% most deprived areas in England and car ownership within the ward is around only 1 in 4 households (2011 Census). Two of the at risk bus routes serve this community, numbers 7 and 580. This estate is situated up a very steep hillside and access to services in the town centre by foot is not really practicable for most residents. It is requested that due consideration should be given to topographical barriers to movement on foot or by bicycle when considering service reductions.

3. The Committee is very concerned about the potential loss of a number of school services, both those bringing children in from the rural areas (routes 15 and 291) and those providing access to Wolverley School (routes 830, 831, 833, 834 and 835). The route to Wolverley School is unlit and has very poor pavements, it is not considered to be a safe route to school for children to walk along.

The Committee also expresses great concern about the potential loss of routes connecting Halesowen College and Worcester University (routes 192, 294 and 295). Reduced bus services also have implications for students accessing Kidderminster College and the Kidderminster Academy. Worcestershire County Council has a Duty of Care to enable children to get to school safely, and indeed all those people wishing to access education. Members of the Committee consider that access to education is of paramount importance.
4. The potential loss of off-peak services through Callow Hill has implications for sustainable tourism initiatives at the Wyre Forest itself and could therefore have an adverse impact on the local economy.

5. It is considered that the loss of these bus services would have significant adverse impact on the District’s economy at a time when there is a strong drive to regenerate Kidderminster. The loss of these services would particularly hit the District’s night time economy through reduced levels of accessibility. The Committee does not consider that these proposals have had due regard to the Wyre Forest District Adopted Development Plan (Adopted Core Strategy (Dec 2010), Adopted Site Allocations & Policies Local Plan (July 2013) and Kidderminster Central Area Action Plan (July 2013).

6. A number of sites recently allocated for development though the Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan lie along “at risk” routes. Sites affected include those along route 15 (SAL.WS1 Midland Industrial Plastics, SAL.EA3 Parsons Chain, SAL.EA4 Worcester Road Garage, SAL.EA5 Baldwin Road and SAL.KSS1 Chester Road South Service Station), the Broadwaters Community Centre SAL.KSS1 (routes 7 and 580) and SAL.RS2 at Clows Top on route 291. The impact on the site at Clows Top is especially concerning as this is intended to be an affordable housing development.

7. A number of the “at risk” routes are presently subject to minimal subsidies of less than 50p. A small increase in fares would potentially aid the retention of a number of services including those serving Sion Hill, Fairfield, Halesowen and Wolverley School.

8. Members of the Committee also wish to make a number of points about the consultation process and the consultation material. Firstly, there is little or no information available about user numbers for each of the services at risk. This information is essential to make informed judgements about the potential loss of these services and should be made publicly available. Secondly, the consultation process itself is considered to be found wanting. There is an over emphasis on the use of internet and no contact number is provided for those people who do not have access to email or wish to contact the County Council with specific queries. Therefore it is not considered to be an inclusive consultation which addresses the needs of some of the more vulnerable service users such as the elderly and disadvantaged.

9. To conclude, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee wishes to express its outrage at the potential losses of key bus routes, many of which serve communities which have low car ownership and high numbers of elderly people and also suffer from high levels of multiple deprivation. It is also
considered that this will have severe impacts on accessibility levels across the District.

Councillor Mrs Helen Dyke
Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee
3rd January 2013.
Appendix L
Town and Parish Responses
Peter Blake
Head of Integrated Transport
Worcestershire CC
County Hall
Spetchley Road
Worcester
WR5 2NP

12 September 2013

Dear Mr Blake

BUS SERVICE 182 / 183
REDDITCH – ALVECHURCH – BROMSGROVE

I am writing to you on behalf of the Alvechurch Parish Council to ask for reassurance that Worcestershire County Council will do its utmost to retain the existing once-daily 182/183 service to Redditch and Bromsgrove. This service is currently operated by Johnsons but we understand that there could be a change of operator in the near future. (*It was running twice a day morning and afternoon-has that changed?)

Local residents in the Parish are concerned that the current, or any future, operator may seek to reduce costs by reducing services on this route. Many older residents in the Parish, and especially those in Rowney Green, rely on this bus service to go shopping and they would be particularly vulnerable to any service reduction. Alvechurch has a proportionally larger older age population than other Bromsgrove Districts.

The Parish Council is in the process of producing a Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to assess future community needs in terms of housing, leisure . . . . and transport. We are conscious already of the needs of older and the more vulnerable members in our community and retaining bus services linking to shops and rail stations is emerging as a key element for the Plan. This is especially important in view of other bus service reductions made in recent years.

I hope you can reassure the Parish Council, and our residents, that service levels on this, and other routes in the Alvechurch area, will be maintained.

Yours sincerely

Andy Humphries
Chairman Alvechurch Parish Council
Response to Worcestershire County Council’s consultation on the withdrawal of subsidised bus services

1. Barnt Green Parish Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on Worcestershire County Council’s (WCC) consultation on the withdrawal of subsidised bus services but regrets that such a consultation is necessary.

2. The Parish Council supports the recent cross-party call by Bromsgrove District Council for the County Council to rethink the withdrawal of its £3m bus subsidies.

Transport for pupils attending secondary schools

3. Although pupils in Barnt Green attend secondary schools across a variety of schools in Bromsgrove, Redditch and Birmingham, most attend either North Bromsgrove High School or South Bromsgrove High School.

4. It is WCC’s policy to subsidise the transport of pupils to their nearest secondary school, which in the case of Barnt Green pupils is North Bromsgrove High School. The 83 bus service currently meets this need. Pupils attending South Bromsgrove High School have to pay for transport to school.

5. The Parish Council notes that although pupils from Barnt Green travelling to South Bromsgrove High School have access to the 145 bus service and a number of coaches provided by WCC the cost per pupil is close to £600 per annum.

6. The Parish Council welcomes the subsidy provided to enable pupils to travel free of charge to their nearest secondary school but recommends that WCC place a cap on the cost to families where more than one pupil in the family pays for their transport to attend a secondary school in Worcestershire.

Concessionary bus passes

7. Concessionary bus fares are available to residents having reached an age when they are entitled to receive a state pension and to persons with a recognised disability.

8. These fares are available on journeys after 9.30am and on selected routes prior to 9.30am if the next service does not arrive until after 11.00am.

9. The Parish Council recognises that in order to retain important bus services efforts must be made to reduce the current levels of subsidy. Accordingly, the Parish Council recommends that the County Council lobbies the Westminster Government so that concessionary bus fares entitle the traveller to a half price fare, not free travel, unless there is clear financial need.

Rationalisation of 145 bus route
10. The 145 bus service plays an important part in linking Bromsgrove to its surrounding communities. It also provides an essential link between villages such as Burcot, Blackwell and Barnt Green that would otherwise be isolated from one another. For example, residents in Blackwell rely on medical and other support services available in Barnt Green and would be denied easy access to these if the 145 bus service was withdrawn.

11. Although residents of Barnt Green are well served by rail links to Redditch and Birmingham, their only public transport link to Bromsgrove is by bus. Although rail links to Alvechurch exist, access to the village is hampered by the location of Alvechurch rail station which is some distance from the village centre.

12. The 145 bus service currently runs from Bromsgrove to Longbridge rail station. With the introduction, in 2015, of 3 trains per hour from Barnt Green to Longbridge, the Parish Council recommends that, in order to cut costs, the 145 bus service between Barnt Green and Longbridge be terminated.

13. In order that Barnt Green residents have improved access to Alvechurch, and Alvechurch residents to Bromsgrove, it is further recommended that the 145 bus service be re-routed to connect Alvechurch, Barnt Green, Blackwell, Burcot, Lickey End and Bromsgrove.

Rationalisation of 182 and 183 bus routes

14. The Parish Council has no comment to make on the current 182 and 183 bus services other than to note that if the 145 service connected Barnt Green to Alvechurch these services might not be required.

Other comments

15. The Parish Council believes that where possible users should cover the cost of maintaining local bus services. Accordingly, it expects one outcome of this review to be an increase in fares. However, it is clear that not all services can be funded without subsidy and the Parish Council believes that for the reasons indicated above, the 145 bus service must be maintained.

16. The Parish Council believes that subsidies for essential bus services should be publicly financed and that it is not acceptable to expect essential services to be provided by volunteer organisations.

17. The Parish Council recommends that District Councils ensure that housing developers contribute to the maintenance of buses serving communities within which new houses are built.

For further information regarding this response please contact the Executive Officer.
Dear Ms Fletcher,

Re: Subsidised Bus Services Review 2013

Further to your letter dated 8th November 2013 requesting a response on the Consultation, the Belbroughton Parish Council has the following comments.

The Council strongly disapproves of the proposal to cut the subsidy currently supporting bus services. Withdrawal of the subsidies will probably result in the ending of the services. These services are a vital link for the rural community and for many residents, especially vulnerable groups it would increase feelings of isolation. Also a withdrawal of services potentially encourages greater car use which is at odds with a ‘Green’ transport policy.

Yours sincerely

John Farrell
Clerk to Belbroughton Parish Council

www.worcestershire.gov.uk/myparish/
From: Stephen Inman
Sent: 17 December 2013 14:43
To: Bus Service Review
Subject: Consultation Response - Bewdley Town Council

Dear Sirs

The Town Council met on 6th December to give consideration to the consultation exercise and questionnaire that the County Council had provided to review the level of subsidies to various routes across Worcestershire.

The questionnaire itself was obviously designed for individuals to give responses so in many respects it is easier to set out the views of the Council in this email which primarily correspond with questions 7-10.

The Council only considered those services at risk within the Wyre Forest area and not further afield.

We noted that many existing services which presumably do not receive a subsidy are not the subject of review. That needs to be emphasised because there may be a tendency to think that more services are under review than is the case – for example in Bewdley’s case the 2 and 2A service to Kidderminster.

You will not be surprised to learn that the Council felt that any loss of service was not compatible with the County Council’s overall obligation to work with operators to provide a reasonable bus service for the benefit of communities especially those without personal transport living away from the main urban areas. Nevertheless given it is not a statutory responsibility to provide subsidised services, there was a reluctant acceptance that subsidies may be reduced and that as a result certain services may no longer be able to function.

Question 7

It was agreed that bus fares represented good value for money and that there was scope for the fares to be increased. Indeed the point was made that many people who were entitled to and took up a bus-pass (a) could in fact afford to pay something towards the fare and (b) may be unaware as to how low a full fare is – i.e. compared with the true cost per mile of using the private car. Fares should therefore be increased; the amount per journey obviously being linked to the length of the journey so a £1 increase in the fare to Ludlow from Bewdley may be reasonable but to Kidderminster would not.

Question 8

The Town Council does not know the exact workings of the bus pass scheme and its net cost to the County Council but there was some feeling that those that can afford to pay more should do so. The reason why more people do not use the bus services may not be economic but perceived lack of comfort, reliability and availability. Fares could rise marginally particularly if quality was improved.

Question 9

Of the initiatives mentioned those of (1) ticketing incentives (2) promotion and publicity and (3) real time information displays at bus stops should be the priorities.
Question 10

The Council were very concerned at the withdrawal of the following services:

- 15 to Stourport
- 291 to Tenbury Wells
- 292 to Ludlow
- Services to Wolverley School

The Council’s view was that these bus services help to keep communities together and provide an essential service for what is a growing number of people who do not have access to a private car either because of cost or because they are unable to drive through diminished faculties linked to age. Without the service to Stourport, it would be time consuming to travel there via Kidderminster. Given the size of the two towns and being only three miles apart from one another, it seemed strange that this service could not be made to be economic i.e. with greater publicity better timetables etc. The service to Tenbury Wells though further afield was also important not least given the link to Tenbury Hospital which serves people from Bewdley and surrounding villages. The service to Ludlow is important not so much for the reason of necessity of Bewdley people travelling to Ludlow but to serve the intervening communities including Cleobury Mortimer. Overall the elderly rely very much on these kinds of services. The alternative would be a taxi service which although convenient is disproportionately expensive and beyond the reach of many.

In relation to the Wolverley School services though there are few if any children from Bewdley/Wribbenhall who attend, for those that do and for those who come from Kidderminster area the services are absolutely vital and should be retained. The School is otherwise too isolated and too distant for walking which would be unsafe on dark winter mornings and evenings.

The Council were grateful for the opportunity of being able to comment on this review but felt disappointed that once again the need to make further savings of this kind had arisen.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Inman
Town Clerk
Bewdley Town Council
The Guildhall
Bewdley
Worcs
DY12 2AH

Email: townclerk@bewdley.org.uk
Website: www.bewdley.org.uk
Dear Sirs

SUBSIDISED BUS SERVICES REVIEW 2013

We are in receipt of your letter of 8 November 2013 regarding the above.

The Parish Council are most concerned that the withdrawal of subsided bus services is proposed as this represents a life line to the elderly members of our parish. The Chaddesley Corbet surgery is situated in the village at the centre of our parish and serves a very wide area, including residents in Stone, Rushock, Elmbridge as well as Chaddesley Corbet.

Chaddesley Corbet parish consists of 13 hamlets including The Village, Bellington, Bluntington, Lower Chaddesley, Mustow Green, Tanwood, Winterfold and Woodrow. None of these areas have access to shops other than at the Village, and most are too far away to walk into the village centre.

We realize that many people have their own transport, but there is still a number of residents who rely on the 133 bus service to get them to the village for shops and the surgery.

Whilst we understand and agree that savings have to be made, the complete withdrawal of all subsidized bus services is likely to further isolate those residents dependent on the service. We therefore recommend that this decision is reconsidered. Savings could be made by reducing the size of the bus used or perhaps even replacing it with a mini-bus.

We also have a school in the parish and students come from the wider area to include Spennels. If the bus service is withdrawn those students who currently use the bus service to school would have to be provided with alternative transport.

We hope you will take these comments into consideration.

Yours faithfully

Yvonne L Scriven
Clerk to the Parish Council
Dear Sirs  
5 February 2014  

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/BUS SERVICES  

The Parish Council submission on this was, I believe, submitted by us recently. It has been drawn to my attention by a number of Harvington residents how the withdrawal of the X3 service will adversely affect them. At least 14 people will be severely disadvantaged, names and addresses can be supplied. Particularly affected will be those with medical needs, including the elderly with mobility problems and weekly shopping requirements.

Withdrawal of the service will affect parishioners in Sam Spencer Court, Park Lane, Harvington Hall Lane and Morton Road.

Our own Housing Needs overview, December 2013, notes that 41% of respondents were over 65 and also it acknowledged that the Parish has a significant proportion of “older people”.

We all understand that cost/benefit rules apply in most situations, but social needs cannot be ignored completely.

Assuming that the Public Consultation is “public” is it possible for you to facilitate a Parish Councillor’s attendance?

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Geoff Vernon
For the attention of Nicky Fletcher

Dear Ms Fletcher,

Subsidised Bus Services Review 2013

As you will have seen from letters, emails and petition there is great concern in Churchill and Blakedown Parish at the possible loss of the important 197 service through the villages.

This matter was again discussed at this week’s meeting of Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council, and members of the public again were expressing their grave concern at the loss of this service.

The Parish Council is concerned with the way that this consultation process is being conducted by the County Council and I have been asked to draw your attention on two aspects.

First, there are notices displayed in the 197 buses stating that the service is being withdrawn at the end of February. One driver told passengers that he was being made redundant at that time. This information makes a mockery of the details given on page 7 in your consultation booklet that the proposals would not be implemented until September 2014. With this conflicting information how can the County Council be trusted to make a fair judgment?

Second, there has been no opportunity for possible modifications and alterations to existing services to discussed, or how the service could be provided differently.

Generally, this Parish Council sees the County Council’s proposal as discriminatory against rural communities, it fails to consider and help the elderly in these communities, and the action of withdrawing buses is clearly not ‘green’ or sustainable

I trust that proper recognition is given to these comments and those objections received, and that

Yours sincerely,

Roger Gurney
Roger Gurney
Clerk to Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council

Ms Nicky Fletcher
Transport Consultation Co-ordinator
Worcestershire County Council
County Hall
WORCESTER
WR5 2NP
Clent Parish Council wishes to support the needs of its parishioners who rely on the service to meet the needs of their communities and would ask that the subsidies remain. However, recognising the County's obligations to make economies, further exploration is needed to fund the bus services through Precept and/or individual contribution.

Kind regards

Ruth Mullett
Clerk, Clent Parish Council

Ms N Fletcher
Transport Consultation Co-ordinator
County Hall
Spetchley Rd
Worcester WR5 2NP

14th January 2014

Dear Ms Fletcher,

Re: Subsidised Bus Services Review 2013

Further to your letter dated 8th November 2013 requesting a response on the Consultation, Clent Parish Council has the following comments to make.

After consultation with its Parishioners and adjacent Parish Councils, Clent Parish Council strongly objects to the proposal to cut the subsidy currently supporting essential rural bus services. Complete withdrawal of the subsidies will almost certainly result in the ceasing of this valuable service.

After much discussion the following reasons have been identified to support our objections:

- Many of the users are elderly or identified as vulnerable groups
- Without public transport many of the users will become isolated
- Isolation leads to loneliness and in turn to ill health and dependency
- The very fact that subsides exist identifies that although there is not widespread usage and high passenger numbers the value is still greatly needed.
- School children rely on the buses to get them to school as they are not entitled to free school transport.
- Students use the buses to enable them to get to Sixth Form Colleges such as King Edwards in Stourbridge.
- Young people can often be wholly dependent on public transport
Subsidised Bus Services Review
Consultation Pro-forma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Cook Hill Parish Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>2S Birmingham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alvechurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birmingham  B48 7TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact name and title:</td>
<td>Parish Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Mary Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest (e.g. trade; school, local authority; passenger representative)</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kent.

(Lemma (also) 850) is likely to be growth or something. How can it be that this

We also wish to express our shining concern. How is it that we have hit some

on record. Having the London Hptp is to C. It is

in the Council so that. Having a map. The implications. This reduction you have

The Council is unable to understand that financial benefit. How can it be

It's, well, some.

We do our best to 15.10. For example, does not ship it. Colours, and so on.

At 16.10 for 17.10 for. However, does not ship it. Colours, and so on.

We understand that has 350 some via. Colours will be reduced. How

Would you like to make any comments on the proposals for the Subsidised Bus Service?
Our ref: TC13/1

15 January 2014

Mr John Hobbs
Director of Business, Environment and Community Services
Worcestershire County Council
County Hall
Spathchley Road
WORCESTER
WR3 5NP

Dear Mr Hobbs

TRANSPORT REVIEW 2013: Consultation on Subsidised Bus Service Withdrawals

The Town Council notes the above consultation currently underway.

Whilst the Town Council is concerned to ensure the provision of the best possible bus services for our town, it is well aware of the financial constraints under which the County Council is operating and understands and accepts the need to make savings.

The Town Council wishes to submit the following views with regard to the future of subsidised bus routes serving the town.

Droitwich Town Services, routes 17-20, operated by the County Council, are most important and used by many elderly town residents on outlying housing developments. They enable residents to access the town centre and key facilities such as the town’s health centre. They are also vital to provide transport for people to access employment.

According to County Council statistics, the Droitwich Town bus services are well-used and operate with only a minimal level of subsidy. To carry 138,000 passengers per annum at a subsidy of only 15p per passenger per journey indicates a total service subsidy of approximately £21,000 per annum.

In order to retain these services we therefore ask if it is possible:

1. For the County Council to maintain the subsidy to ensure that services continue to be provided.

2. To secure a private operator willing to take on the service. Could the private sector operate the service more efficiently, at nil or lower subsidy?

3. To consider a slight increase in fares to recover a portion of the subsidy. An increased fare would be preferable to service reductions.
The Town Council hopes that the County Council will consider all of these options and that a service reduction would only be considered as a last resort once all other options have been exhausted.

The Town Council wishes to be informed of progress with the consultation process and the consultation results from Droitwich passengers together with results for all Droitwich services. The Town Council also wishes to be advised as to any proposed actions to be taken following the consultation process.

Droitwich is also served by a number of rural bus services which link the town to outlying communities. Some rural services require very high subsidies, e.g., Services 356 and 358 operated by Diamond Bus. These routes may not carry many passengers and therefore appear to be an easy target for savings but they do provide a vital lifeline for small rural communities helping to avoid rural isolation. Whilst such services may not be financially viable, Droitwich Spa Town Council hopes that some solution may be found that will enable services to continue wherever possible.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Councillor K Jennings
Leader of the Majority Party

Cc: County Councillor J H Smith OBE, Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Highways
Mr Peter Blake, Head of Integrated Transport, Worcestershire County Council
# Subsidised Bus Services Review Consultation Pro-forma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>EARLS CROOME PARISH COUNCIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3, ORCHARD CLOSE, EARLS CROOME, WORCESTER, WR8 9DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact name and title:</td>
<td>Mrs. Ann. H. Smith, Clerk to Earls Croome, P.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest (e.g. trade; school, local authority; passenger representative)</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attention Nicky Fletcher:

I am sorry this submission is late, and hope that it can still be included. I was under the impression that one of the other members was making the comments from our Parish Council.

A.H. Smith
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Subsidised Bus Services Review</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the overall proposed approach to efficiency savings for:</td>
<td>INITIALLY WE THINK THE BUS SERVICES SHOULD BE LOOKED AT WITH A VIEW TO REDUCING THE NUMBER OF BUSES SO THAT RURAL VILLAGES LIKE OURS ARE NOT LEFT WITH NO PUBLIC TRANSPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidised Bus Services</td>
<td>It would be disastrous for the elderly people in our village who have no transport or their own and are dependent on the buses. We are a small rural village with less than 200 on the electoral role but we know that at the moment one resident is dependent on the buses to get to work in Worcester and at least one student uses it to go to college. The village has numerous teenagers and without a future bus service they will have no option of further education in Worcester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, please explain how you would change the approach to meet the efficiency savings required</td>
<td>If the subsidised bus services were no longer available to you, how would that affect yourselves?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would you like to make any other comments on the proposals for the Subsidised Bus Services?

We can only reiterate what has been said on the previous page and implore the County Council to find a way to leave a few buses in place at peak times so that villages like ours do not end up completely isolated.

A H Smith
Clerk to Ears Croome Parish Council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl Farnbrough</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W M &amp; B Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would you like to make any comments on the proposals for the Subsidised Bus Services?

To save money it may be useful to consider:
1. Using smaller buses - very few passengers on the bus.
2. Less frequent service.

Concerns have also been expressed about the proposal from other companies who intend to
charge for pupils attending schools.
11 Simon de Montfort Drive  
Greenhill  
EVESHAM  
Worcestershire WR11 4NR  

29th December, 2013

Worcestershire County Council  
Spetchley Road  
Worcester WR5 2NP

Dear Sirs,

I feel most strongly that the threatened withdrawal of the subsidy and the consequent reduction in bus services should definitely not go ahead. I am at a loss to understand that if this is, as stated, a legal function of the council then to remove it must be illegal. When the initial survey was carried out in 2010/2011 reductions were made to various services so why do we have to take another hit now. Transport has done its bit. Save money from another source. When set against priorities such as elderly and child social care is it surprising that the public have opted to cut bus services but I am sure there are other options open to the Council from non-VITAL services.

It is going to have a detrimental impact on the most vulnerable members of society — the elderly — who can no longer drive or (in line with your once important green policy) choose not to. They will become housebound due to services being cut and you will have a catch 22 position when the public are afraid to go out for fear there will not be transport for their return and consequently the bigger the subsidy will become to maintain bus services. To go out and about meeting friends and relations and having a social life has a beneficial effect and to deny the public this will lead to more isolation and depression and fuller surgeries and a yet greater demand on our health services.

It was suggested at the Town Council meeting that if we had ideas of how to avoid cutting bus subsidies they would be welcomed. If figures were readily available I am CERTAIN other funding could be cut to save our precious bus services.

Yours faithfully,

Cllr Beryl Gurden
Mr Stuart Carter  
Town Clerk  
16 December 2013

Worcestershire County Council  
County hall  
Spetchley Road  
Worcester  
WR5 2NP

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Consultation: The proposed withdrawal of subsidised bus services in Worcestershire

I write to advise that the Town Council considered the consultation relating to the proposed withdrawal of subsidised buses at a meeting on 25 November 2013.

At the meeting, the Council resolved not to submit a response to the consultation. However, members were encouraged to respond in their capacity as Town Councillors.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Stuart Carter  
Town Clerk
Worcestershire County Council
County Hall
Spetchley Road
Worcester WR5 2NP

For the attention of Chris Holloway

Dear Sirs

BUS SERVICE THE HOPPER SOUTHERN ROUTE

Representatives from the Parish Councils of Great and Little Comberton, Elmley Castle (inc Bricklehampton and Netherton) and Wick met on Tuesday 14th January 2014 to discuss the possible withdrawal of the bus subsidy and to identify a suggested way forward to maintain a service that will enable our residents to have good quality of life.

Discussion with bus users firstly identified the fact that LMS drivers are friendly, courteous and most helpful to the needs of the passengers.

Analysis of the situation divides the problem into two areas:

EMPLOYMENT (WORK, SCHOOL/COLLEGE AND VOLUNTARY WORK)
The current daily service Monday to Saturday is still required to get people to work/school and college, and back home as per the current timetable:-
- morning bus
- two buses returning late afternoon/ early evening

SOCIAL (SHOPPING, ROUTINE MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS, VISITING FRIENDS/RELATIVES AND SPORTING ACTIVITIES)
It was felt that there is some margin for rationalisation and the suggestions are as follows:-
- For a fuller service on any two days Monday to Friday AND on a Saturday, rather than six days currently available
- To have the timetable arranged so that users can have 1.5 to 2 hours in Pershore. The current timetable is either too short (about 50 minutes) or too long (about 3 hours)
- In discussion with bus users, the reasons for requesting the fuller service (3 days per week) is that it allows people (passengers) greater flexibility to travel further afield e.g. into Worcester and the hospital, use the local sports facilities, visit family and friends and routine medical appointments in Pershore
The request for the fuller service on Saturdays was to meet the needs of young people.

Additional suggestions are:
- Use of smaller buses during the day
- Investigate the bus pass users contributing to the cost either per journey (e.g. 50p) or an annual fee (e.g. £10/20)

We trust that our comments are constructive and we would welcome the opportunity to further discuss them with you to find a way forward that will meet the needs of all our residents young and old alike.

Yours faithfully

Lynne Yapp
Clerk – Great Comberton Parish Council
To whom it may concern

Consultation
The Proposes Withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services

On Monday 6th January a public meeting was held in Hanley Swan Village hall to discuss the Consultation document and the community’s response to the questions and to air concerns. This letter reflects the corporate feelings of the meeting and as a Parish Council we wish to submit it as our response to the consultation.

Over 90 people attended – The majority were over 45 years of age but there were a significant and vocal number of young people 16-25 years.

Q1a The bus services that would be under threat which affect this parish are 363, 362 364 42 & 43

Q2 The majority of people use the service to and from Worcester ongoing to Upton

Q2 1/3rd of the audience were regular users with others using the bus intermittently

Q3

- Many young people told of their fears that they would no longer be able to attend courses at college in Worcester.
- Students would find it difficult to travel to Hanley Castle High School from Worcester or Malvern (a significant % of the sixth form come from out of area and this would threaten the viability of the Sixth form)
- In area students require the bus service to get to school
- Travelling to school by bus from Hanley Swan or Upton is important as students in Senior years have so many files etc to carry cycling or walking is not an option.
- Young people on apprenticeships rely on getting to Worcester for training on some days as well as work.
- Others felt their options on where to seek work, both full and part time, would be reduced.
- There are 2 centres for people with Special Needs within the parish who often rely on public transport.
- Cycle routes to Hanley Castle, Malvern and Worcester are inadequate.
- Young people without transport rely on the bus services to provide for their social/leisure life in holidays and Saturdays to visit towns etc.
- Some people chose to travel to work by bus and would have to resort to car which would add to congestion and delay.
- The Doctors surgery in Upton is served by the buses and many people use them.
• Many people saw the possibility of using buses to get to hospital in Worcester especially if they could not drive through medication or disability in the future.
• There are caravan parks in this parish and the buses are used regularly by their customers which is an attraction to holiday makers.
• Without the buses people said they would not only be deprived of travelling to visit friends but they could not come to visit them.

Q4

• All the above would have significant impacts on the individuals concerned. From the parish status it could discourage people from choosing to live here which would impact seriously on the villages.
• Young people may migrate to towns to live in order to work.
• Older people would become isolated in rural villages
• The Planning Authorities categorisation of Hanley Swan may be reduced due to the loss of a good bus service.
• Impact of local economy if tourists no longer come to this area.

Q5 The location of our villages mean that walking is not an easy practical option. Cycling, whilst possible, lacks good provision of cycle tracks apart from Upton to Hanley Castle. Numbers are such that an occasional mini bus would not satisfy the regular need. Train stations would only be possible after a car journey, and taxi costs are prohibitive in local areas on a regular basis. The inevitable result would be increased car use adding pressure on congestion and parking.

Q6 All of the above suggests that services to towns and between villages, for work and education are particularly important in this parish. Journeys to surgeries etc for older people are also important especially as the new surgery was specifically located where it is on the basis that it would be on a bus route (2 buses)

Q7 The question of fare prices is misleading. A return from Hanley to Worcester is £3 and very few people pay that fare through concessions etc. It is also unclear what the true cost would be without subsidies. In the audience there was a clear sense that people would be willing to pay (but not those who already pay the full cost.) It was observed that more paying people should reduce the dependency on subsidies.

Q8 Suggestions were;

• A voluntary donation by concessions
• Those eligible for concession pay the full fare on a voluntary basis
• Oyster-like cards which can be used on any service would encourage users and be easier.
• More competition between the bus companies
• The County Council should renegotiate a more effective agreement with companies
• Review routes and timetabling to eliminate duplication and make connections smarter, and suited to users.
Q9 The Parish Council has worked over the years to press for improvements to bus stops, bus shelters, level of service and up to date timetables. All of these as well as effective publicity are very important to deliver a service which people want reliable, affordable, and easy to access. 21st technologies are also useful but these should be rolled out across the area served and not confined to the towns. Driver training is the responsibility for the bus companies.

Ticketing incentives are a good way to encourage car driver conversions especially if prioritising buses is a disincentive to car drivers and results in buses being more reliable.

Q10 There is a real concern that a proposal to reduce bus services in rural areas is against many policies which have been shaping our communities for many years.

- Planning policies which encourage sustainable communities which have transport provision
- Planning policies which locate amenities on or close to bus routes
- Environmental policies which encourage the use of public transport and discourage car use thus reducing Co2 emissions and town congestion and pollution.
- Educational policies which encourage pupils and students to choose their schools/colleges which may be in other towns or villages.
- Rural Economic policies which encourage people to live in rural areas, and find work in the locality.
- Housing Policies which locate affordable houses on bus routes.
- Integrated transport policies

In conclusion this Parish believes that the withdrawal of bus services as listed above would have a serious detrimental impact on the communities of this parish from which it would find it difficult to recover.

Yours faithfully

Rebecca Abunassar

Clerk to Hanley Castle Parish Council (covering the villages of Hanley Castle & Hanley Swan)
The Transport Programme & Commissioning Team
Worcestershire County Council
FREEPOST RSGG-HSZK-HSGL
H1 County Hall
Worcester
WR5 2NP
7th January 2014

Dear Sirs,

Re: Subsidised Bus Service Review

Of the services threatened by the above review two are the services that serve Kempsey (362 and 364), and we would like to register our amazement at their inclusion in this exercise.

Kempsey is a very large village, and with up to almost 400 new homes expected to be built in the next two years it seems quite ridiculous that we should be left with no regular bus service.

Each of the developers of these new homes are required to produce Travel Plans to promote the use of public transport; they will also have to make large six figure payments to Worcester Transport Strategy before Highways will not object to the plans; and a further six figure payment to supposedly improve the bus services to Kempsey!

It appears that the County Council is going to be considerably richer after these developments are completed, whilst the residents of Kempsey are left with either no bus services or a very limited number of an extended service 32 to Baynhall. Please explain this contradiction.

This gives residents very little choice but to use their cars on already heavily congested roads, causing an enormous increase in pollution, lost time and well-being.

Kempsey residents do not just travel north – many use public transport to visit the doctor’s surgery in Upton upon Severn, and to shop. Are they expected to change doctors?

If these services are cut parishioners will be unable to get to medical appointments, students will be unable to get to college and workers won’t be able to get to work. High Street shops are still suffering from the economic recession, and rather than battle the congested streets of Worcester many residents will use their cars (if they have them) to travel further afield to less congested shopping centres. We presently have no Sunday and evening services during the week, so trips to the theatre and cinema are impossible when the last bus leaves Worcester at 17.45. Even workers struggle to get home Monday to Thursday, when there is no bus after this ridiculously early hour. Increasingly isolated elderly residents will be a burden on the NHS, and their quality of life diminished.
Cutting these services will have a far reaching effect on the whole county. Why not charge senior citizens 50p when they use their bus passes and allow them to use any bus after 08.30?

If more effort was put into scheduling buses at times when they are required, and time keeping improved more residents would use them.

Instead to cutting bus services the County Council and operators should be promoting the services in an effort to try to reduce the diabolical congestion on the A38 and A4440.

Yours faithfully

Sharon Baxter
Clerk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Lomber, Parish Clerk</td>
<td>Contract Name and Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Church Common, Whitchurch</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linlithgow Parish Council</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Pro-Forma
Subsidised Bus Services Review
Worcestershire County Council
Would you like to make any comments on the proposals for the Subsidised Bus Services?

At our recent Parish Council meeting we discussed this issue. The only bus service that would affect our Parish is the 291 operated by R+B Travel - Tenbury to Kidderminster. Our concern for losing this service is that Young People from Tenbury Wells and within our Parish are able to use this service to get access to Kidderminster College. The area is quite restricted to what buses serve the area and this is felt a necessary one to keep for the young for further educational needs.
Worceshireshire County Council
County Hall
Spetchley Road
Worcester WR5 2NP

For the attention of Chris Holloway

Dear Sirs

BUS SERVICE THE HOPPER SOUTHERN ROUTE

Representatives from the Parish Councils of Great and Little Comberton, Elmley Castle (inc Brickelhampton and Netherton) and Wick met on Tuesday 14th January 2014 to discuss the possible withdrawal of the bus subsidy and to identify a suggested way forward to maintain a service that will enable our residents to have good quality of life.

Discussion with bus users firstly identified the fact that LMS drivers are friendly, courteous and most helpful to the needs of the passengers.

Analysis of the situation divides the problem into two areas:

EMPLOYMENT (WORK, SCHOOL/COLLEGE AND VOLUNTARY WORK)
The current daily service Monday to Saturday is still required to get people to work/school and college, and back home as per the current timetable:
- morning bus
- two buses returning late afternoon/early evening

SOCIAL (SHOPPING, ROUTINE MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS, VISITING FRIENDS/RELATIVES AND SPORTING ACTIVITIES)
It was felt that there is some margin for rationalisation and the suggestions are as follows:
- For a fuller service on any two days Monday to Friday AND on a Saturday, rather than six days currently available
- To have the timetable arranged so that users can have 1.5 to 2 hours in Pershore. The current timetable is either too short (about 50 minutes) or too long (about 3 hours)
- In discussion with bus users, the reasons for requesting the fuller service (3 days per week) is that it allows people (passengers) greater flexibility to travel further afield e.g. into Worcester and the hospital, use the local sports facilities, visit family and friends and routine medical appointments in Pershore
The request for the fuller service on Saturdays was to meet the needs of young people

additional suggestions are
  * use of smaller buses during the day
  * investigate the bus pass users contributing to the cost either per journey (e.g. 50p) or an annual fee (e.g. £10/20

We trust that our comments are constructive and we would welcome the opportunity to further discuss them with you to find a way forward that will meet the needs of all our residents young and old alike.

Yours faithfully

Lynne Yapp
Clerk – Little Comberton Parish Council

Lickey and Blackwell Parish Council supports the recent cross-party call by Bromsgrove District Council for the County Council to rethink the withdrawal of its £3m bus subsidies.

As a parish council we seek to retain a vital community, to promote the reduction of the parish carbon footprint (through a Green Page in our newsletter and other measures) and to improve the lives of all our residents. These aims will be undermined if bus services are reduced further. We have no rail station, no post office and an unlit road with no footway (or footpath) between Blackwell and the nearest medical facilities and post office at Barnt Green (just over 1 mile away). In the last consultation in April 2011 59% of respondents stated that the 145 bus service was an essential lifeline for them.

Service 145
The parish council has been asked by several local residents, for whom the 145 service is essential, to do all we can to keep the service and, if possible, improve it. Currently there is no evening or Sunday service, making retail and medical services inaccessible from Blackwell though we are only approximately 5 miles from the Birmingham boundary. We have a higher than national average number of older residents and as they stop driving formerly active and adventurous residents become village bound and lead very restricted lives compared to their city counterparts. A bus between Barnt Green and Blackwell is an absolute necessity. In addition, the 2011 survey found that 23% of respondents were workers, who would find it impossible to make journeys to work without the 145.
South Bromsgrove HS pupils need the 145 service and some parents already find the current fares a burden if they have two or three children at that school. Parents should have a choice of school for their children but currently it is free to travel to North Bromsgrove High School but pupils at South Bromsgrove pay. Making their fares even more expensive would limit that choice. If a dedicated school bus could be provided at reasonable cost from the villages to North and South Bromsgrove High Schools subsidised by the education budget (did we hear your laughter??) that would allow the County Council to spend its resources on non-school passengers.

Service 181
The curtailment of service 181 to St Bede’s would make it impossible for our Roman Catholic families to have a choice of middle school. If they had to pay the full cost of the service it would result in hardship especially to those families with several children at the school.

Particular cases.
You will have received a number of responses from Blackwell residents, who rely on bus service 145. These include

- a gentleman, who works as a car deliverer and can only get to the depot where he picks up the car by public transport (bus in our village)
older people, who never drove or have given up driving
an older lady, who has regular visits to her doctor in Rubery and cannot drive
older people who need to use Barnt Green post office, doctors, hairdressers and shops and the bank in Bromsgrove. We have none of these amenities in Blackwell apart from a good but limited village stores. Burcot, our neighbouring village, does not even have a local shop! The 145 service needs to improve rather than contract if more of our residents are to look to the bus as a sensible way to travel.

Marketing the bus service.
If we add to these users the many young people, who come to use the facilities at Blackwell Court Scouting Centre, Birmingham Scouting’s large, well-equipped camp site on the edge of the village, some of whom use the bus, it is surprising that the service is not better used. This may be thanks to a lack of active and positive marketing and it is encouraging that the question of spending money to improve this has been asked in the questionnaire. It is our opinion that with attractive and well focussed advertising this service could attract more passengers. Why not use smaller but smarter buses to attract shoppers? Why not ask Sainsburys and other retailers at Longbridge to subsidise shoppers' buses? The Whoosh buses were popular but were discontinued -why? Regular 'busy buses' backed by an advertising campaign using well-known local and national celebrities could easily convince young and old that using the bus is not a sign of failure but a trendy and fashionable thing to do.

Our suggestions.
To save public money we would make the following suggestions:
1 Pensioners' total concessions could be removed and a pensioners' concessionary fare (eg half the price of the full adult fare) introduced.
2 As a last resort we would support an increase in County and local funding for alternative providers eg Rural Rides but WRVS is reporting a shortage of volunteer drivers , who are usually fairly elderly themselves.
3 Local retailers eg supermarkets should be asked to subsidise bus services bringing customers to their shops.
4 As in the 2011 consultation it may be possible to amalgamate bus services but we would not support anything less than a 90 minute rural bus service between Bromsgrove town centre and Birmingham/Longbridge taking in Lickey End, Burcot, Blackwell, Barnt Green and Cofton Hackett.

Councillor Janet King
Agreed by Lickey and Blackwell Parish Council
December 2013
Dear Lucy,

**Potential withdrawal of bus subsidy**

Malvern Wells Parish Council is extremely concerned at the plans to cut the level of subsidy paid to local bus companies which will have a disastrous impact, not only on Malvern Wells itself, but also on the wider area of the Malverns and the County of Worcestershire as a whole.

The County Council is considering proposals to cut over £3m from the budget for subsidised bus transport, which is effectively the current entire budget for the service! If such cuts are approved they will have devastating impact on local residents and on the sustainability and viability of the local economy.

Of particular concern are the threats to the services which serve routes from Malvern Wells to Great Malvern, Upton upon Severn and Worcester. These routes are all currently subsidised, and very well used, services. A reduction of the subsidy available would inevitably result in cuts to these popular services, and quite possibly to their entire removal.

The demographic structure of our Parish is such that a very significant proportion of our local residents are dependent on public transport for journeys to work, hospital and medical appointments as well as tasks such as essential shopping.

Any cuts to bus services will inevitably mean a significant increase in the use of car travel, forcing yet more vehicles on to a road infrastructure that is already struggling to support current vehicle numbers.

The impact of a reduction to, or the withdrawal of, public bus services would be disastrous for the economic prosperity of the local area. This largely rural county has to support an inherently mobile workforce, and the viability of many of the local shops and businesses relies on a population which is easily able to access them.

If residents are to be left without affordable local public transport, or alternatively are left to rely on even more limited bus services (which have already been severely truncated in recent years) we will surely see a quickening in the already visible signs of decay in local economic activity.

The proposed cuts have the potential to exaggerate social exclusion for many already disadvantaged sections of our community. The effect of a reduction in bus services would be to leave the elderly and other vulnerable groups feeling increasingly isolated. Those people without access to other means of transport, or who cannot afford the cost of private cars or taxis, would be left without affordable access to services.
A further concern is the potential for the increase in costs for school pupils travelling across the District. Whilst we recognise that the subsidy for these services is partly protected, there will be a knock on strain placed on family budgets if the level of the cuts proposed deepens.

For many school pupils locally there is little or no alternative to school bus transport other than recourse to the private motor car.

School buses are the greenest, safest, most sustainable option for our young people and all services need to remain affordable for our many hard pressed families during the prevailing economic climate.

The Parish Council fervently hopes that the wide ranging opposition to the proposed cuts from the majority of local residents will be taken into account during the debate on this issue.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

David Taverner
Clerk and Responsible Finance Officer
Malvern Wells Parish Council

Councillor Lucy Hodgson
Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Localism and Communities
Worcestershire County Council
County Hall
Spetchley Road
Worcester
WR5 2NP
Cllr Adrian Hardman
Leader of the Council
Worcestershire County Council
County Hall
Spetchley Road
WORCESTER WR5 2NP

10th January 2014

Dear Cllr Hardman

**Bus Service Consultation – routes “at risk”**

As Clerk, I have been asked by Mathon Parish Council to write to the County Council in connection with the review of subsidised bus routes in the County.

One of the routes “at risk” is the 417 which serves Mathon, Cradley and Ledbury. This service is used regularly by a large number of seasonal workers in Mathon parish from May to the end of October/early November along with many other residents in these three areas. Without this service, these workers would be left totally isolated in Mathon, and would not, therefore, be able to shop in Ledbury, Malvern or Worcester as they have done in the past.

The Parish Council, therefore, strongly urge you to keep this 417 bus route in operation. There is no other alternative form of transport available.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

DIANA TAYLOR (Mrs)
Clerk to Mathon Parish Council
Ms Michele Jones
Worcestershire County Council
County Hall
Worcester

Dear Michele,

Bus Consultation

Pershore Town Council considered their response to the County Council’s consultation on bus subsidies yesterday evening and agreed on behalf of local bus users, to call on the County Council to think again about the removal of bus service funding in the coming County Budget. Two of the Pershore services – the LMS Wychavon Hopper 564/5 and Plumline 566 are among those that would certainly fold if the funding is removed. We are also concerned about the loss of Friday and Saturday evening services from the First Service 382 and Diamond 551.

The Town Council has held two public meetings at which many members of the public spoke of the importance of bus services to both town and village residents. There are three main groups that will suffer particularly should the funding be removed. They are:
- young people who rely on the buses for transport to school and to Worcester
- people in work or seeking work, who have no other means of transport
- older, less mobile residents, who rely on the buses to get to shops and other facilities

Pershore has 40% more than the county average of people with no access to a car (27.2%). Many of these are elderly and infirm – and the number of people over 65 in Pershore is 20% higher than the county average. They rely on the 566 Plumline Bus in particular. It is truly a lifeline for some, who otherwise would be unable to live independently. Without the bus they will become increasingly isolated and be forced to call on social care for support. Yet it is clear that social care is also under threat and will be less available in future. How will the county take into account the additional costs these residents face?

Pershore has a vibrant High Street, with many small shops. How will the county take account of the effect on our local economy of reduced access to the town as bus services are lost?

The LMS services 564-6, when aggregated, show a very high level of funding per passenger. Yet one of these services, the 566 Plumline, when reviewed in 2011, required much lower funding. We believe that there is a strong case to return the Plumline to its original concept of a town service with a town loop via the Abbey Estate and a service to Station Road and Pinvin. This service ran successfully for 30 years before amalgamation in a joint contract with the Village Hopper in 2012.

Pershore faces a 25% increase in population over the next ten years. We all expect developers to contribute to provision of bus infrastructure through S106 payments. But what is the value of bus infrastructure if there

Cont/....
are no buses?

The Town Council recognises, of course, the financial pressures you face and would be interested in meeting with you to discuss how essential local bus services can be maintained whilst reducing costs to the county.

Some initial suggestions are attached to this letter.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Ann Dobbins A.C.I.B.
Town Clerk

Some suggestions for economies

- Could the Saturday service on the Hopper be discontinued without too much detriment for passengers?

- Could all services on the Hopper before and after the school runs be discontinued so that is it operating village services just between 0930 and 1530 rather than from 0730 until 1800?

- Could the PlumLine revert to its original concept as a town service with a town loop via the Abbey Estate and a service to Station Road the Station and Pinvin

- Do the services to Peopleton and Upton Snodsbury have disproportionate cost?

- If the Wychavon Hopper service is to be further reduced perhaps the 382 Worcester-Eckington-Pershore could divert on a regular basis via the Combertons (as per the Flood timetable) so that Great and Little Comberton still have local services to Pershore - as well as a new service to Worcester!

- *Three buses - two LMS and one Aston - are currently travelling back dead mileage from Pershore to Worcester between 1800 and 1830 - one of these could surely provide an additional service to Worcester and one of the companies be encouraged to operate a late evening return (c.2230/2300) on every night of the week? This could well prove better value than the present Friday/Saturday evening services on 382 and 551 routes which involve use of two drivers and two buses on the former and one bus one driver on the latter for the whole evening.
14 January 2014

The Transport Programme and Commissioning Team
Worcestershire County Council
H1 County Hall
Worcester
WR5 2NP

Dear Sirs

On behalf of Ripple Parish Council I am writing to express our serious concerns about the possible withdrawal of subsidies from public transport. The issue was discussed at our meeting on 9th December 2013 when it was agreed that the proposed cuts would have grave consequences for those living in our rural communities namely Ryall, Holly Green, Naunton, Ripple, Uckinghall and Stratford Bridge.

The removal of subsidised buses would leave us with no public transport links to Upton-on-Severn, Worcester, Malvern and Tewkesbury; a completely unacceptable situation. Indeed if enacted the policy would be discriminatory against those living in the villages of South Worcestershire.

Recent successful planning applications and the South Worcestershire Development Plan support the construction of a significant number of new homes in the area. A main feature of these proposals is the sustainability of the development, which includes the provision of public transport!

The withdrawal of bus services to Worcester, Upton, Malvern and Tewkesbury would have a detrimental effect on students attending schools and colleges. With no transport links they simply cannot enhance their education and career prospects. For those residents already employed, who use public transport to commute to work, the cessation of these services would be disastrous. An utterly false economy.

The 2011 Census found that in all the RPC settlements of Ryall, Naunton, Ripple, Uckinghall and Stratford Bridge, a highly significant 8.5% of households have no access to a car or van. As demographic effects take place the number of our elderly residents is increasing and many regularly use their bus passes. At worst they will have their free passes but no buses on which to use them. This is hardly government policy! They rely on the buses to carry out essential food and clothes shopping, visit the doctor/dentist surgery at Tunnel Hill or Tewkesbury and attend clinics at Worcester Royal Hospital or Tewkesbury Hospital. These are absolute priorities. Many people who have retired have limited mobility or are unable to drive and consequently the removal of subsidised bus services would leave them isolated. The current services allows them to lead independent lives.
Whilst we recognise the financial constraints placed upon Worcestershire County Council and the necessity to reduce budgets, we trust that common sense will prevail and that our bus services will be retained. If there is a reduced service, here are some suggestions which we suggest you consider, cost and subsequently consult on:

351/361 Upton – Tewkesbury – Gloucester Service

Currently this service is provided by Astons using two vehicles, but jointly funded by Worcestershire County Council and Gloucestershire County Council for which we understand that WCCs contribution is approximately £33,000. This could be reduced to one vehicle, but still offer a viable alternative with a suitable timetable. It may also be possible to incorporate with a schools service in the mornings and mid afternoon.

This service provides the parish with the most vital links between Upton and Tewkesbury. It is essential that these links are maintained as the two Towns are also the hubs for onward connecting services. From Tewkesbury there are more direct route connecting services to Gloucester and Cheltenham, as an alternative to the Staunton, Maisemore, Gloucester route of the 351. We therefore suggest in the following section an alternative service to retain the essential Upton Tewkesbury link.

362 (364) and 351/361 Upton – Tewkesbury – Gloucester Service

Currently the 363 service operates between Worcester and Upton via Powick and Hanley Swan to the west of the river Severn. It then continues to Malvern (42 and 43).

The 362 (364) service operates between Worcester and Upton via the A38 to the East of the river Severn. It then continues to Malvern also (42 and 43).

The 362 (364), having arrived at Upton, could be re-routed to Tewkesbury via Ryall, Naunton, Ripple and Twyning, returning by the same route to Upton and Worcester. At no additional cost the essential link between Upton and Tewkesbury would be maintained, whilst still allowing passengers to travel to Malvern on either the 363 or its continuations of 42 and 43 services. The part of the 351/361 service from Tewkesbury to Gloucester would remain the same being the responsibility of Gloucestershire County Council (GCC), but with Worcestershire County (WCC) reclaiming from GCC subsidy for the cross border section of the route.

362 (364) and 363 Worcester - Upton – Malvern Service

Currently these two services operate half an hour apart every hour. This could be reduced using only half the vehicles to an hourly service alternating between the two routes.

In conclusion we would ask you to consider the above points and recognise the importance of allowing these vital bus services to continue.

We look forward to a positive outcome.

Yours faithfully

Ripple Parish Council

Rous Lench Parish Council would like to submit the following comments regarding the above review:

Rural bus services provide an essential lifeline for communities which are now bereft of shops, post offices and pubs.
Rous Lench has none of these, Radford has a pub.
The nearest doctor is in Inkberrow, the nearest dentist is in Evesham, the nearest Post Office is in Inkberrow, the nearest shop is, depending on the precise location, up to three miles away.

Currently both villages are served by the Wychavon Hopper bus on Mondays to Saturdays which provides a reliable and excellent service every two hours to and from Evesham, Pershore and Inkberrow.
It enables those with no access to private transport to lead a normal life by making available shops, hospitals, Post Offices, doctors, dentists and perhaps the most important of all interaction with the world outside the immediate vicinity.
This in turn alleviates isolation of the poor, vulnerable and elderly together with young families who may only have one car which is not available during the day.
Depression in rural communities is common amongst these groups and it is not an exaggeration to say the bus service provides much needed prevention of this blight on people’s lives.

The villages do also have a couple of weekly services provided by Dudley’s Coaches and the Council are aware that these are effectively provided as a service to the community rather than being operated on a genuine commercial basis.
The impact of changes elsewhere within the bus network may well have an effect on these, the current Senior Citizen reimbursement payment is not enough to make these viable and it is Senior Citizens in the main that use the buses.

The Council does understand that all aspects of expenditure need to be looked at but this must take into account the needs of the area, the affect any reduction in service may have and what this may do to rural and isolated parishes such as ours. The retention perhaps of a service a day in both directions enabling life to go on normally would go a long way reassuring the electorate that they being considered.

Rural bus services are an emotive and powerful subject with electors, even for those fortunate few who do not and will not need a rural lifeline such as that provided by the local bus.

Rural communities need diversity; many are becoming dormitories for larger towns, in seeking to withdraw rural bus services this process may well become irreversible.

Yours sincerely

Nicky Holland
Clerk to Rous Lench Parish Council.
Worcestershire County Council.
Freepost RSGG-HXZK-HZGL.
County Hall.
Spetchley Road.
Worcester.
WR5 2NP.

Claremont.
Severn Stoke.
Wors.
WR8 9JA.
19th December 2013.

Dear Sir or Madam,

WITHDRAWAL OF SUBSIDISED BUS SERVICES IN WORCESTER.

I am a member of the Severn Stoke Parish Council and recently I received from the secretary a notification that your council intends to withdraw twenty six bus services from the whole of the Worcester area. This in turn will isolate the rural district including the residences in Severn Stoke, and those within the parish perimeter.

Because the approximate distance to Worcester on the main A38 highway is 3.5 miles, it will mean that many of these people who do not possess alternative reasonable transport, will be left to their own devises on how to travel daily into their place of work. It is also a fact that a great proportion of pensioners rely on public transport to shop at the supermarkets in the district, and of course as a consequence they will be unable to use their cherished bus passes. Furthermore during the week days the children attending Hanley Castle School will also be left without public means of making their way to their classes, and no doubt will be confronted with great difficulties if not impossibility to attend school.

Recently your council was advocating the use of the public transport in place of the use of peoples own cars, with the express desire to preserve precious fuel, and that would give us all a cleaner atmosphere, however your latest indication quoted above reveals the fact that the rapid abandonment by this council of past decisions mean absolutely nothing to you, and the integrity of the county council.

If I haven’t already impressed you with my discussion above and with my disgust of the whole indications surrounding your statement, may I now say that as a local parish councillor it will be a complete disaster if you continue with the implication that in January you intend to withdraw all twenty six services from the surrounding rural districts within the Worcestershire County Council, because of your need to make financial savings, which incidentally could no doubt be partially made from other departments within the council.

I am,

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Mr B. Male, M.C.I.O.B.
Severn Stoke Parish Councillor.
15 January 2014

The Transport Programme and Commissioning Team
Worcestershire County Council
H1 County Hall
Worcester
WR5 2NP

Dear Sirs

On behalf of Severn Stoke & Croome D’Abitot Parish Council I am writing to express our grave concerns regarding the proposed withdrawal of subsidised bus services in Worcestershire which serves our community.

We have discussed this matter at our recent Parish Council meetings and have gained the opinion of many residents within our parish. Our parish is made up of the small villages and hamlets of High Green, Kinnersley, Severn Stoke, Croome D’Abitot and Clifton.

All of the buses which service these areas are covered under your consultation which would leave us with no public transport links to Worcester, Upton-on-Severn, Malvern or Tewkesbury. We have been contacted by many of our residents who use these buses daily.

For many of our elderly residents this is their only means of transport. They use public transport for shopping, getting to doctors and hospital appointments etc and without this facility they would be forced to use taxis or community transport schemes. As they currently have free over 65’s bus passes provided under the Government Scheme this would be at large additional costs to them.

We have also been contacted by school/college age students. The public bus service, particularly the 362, 363 and 364 services, is their only means of transport to further education in Worcester and Malvern. Again when these students are not old enough to drive/or cannot afford a motor vehicle this is their only means of accessing further education without having to rely on parents/third parties for lifts.

Some residents also use the bus service as their way of commuting to their employment.

Severn Stoke and Croome D’Abitot Parish Council fully understand the financial situation Worcestershire County Council are in and appreciate some cuts have to be made. A reduced service with buses passing through these areas less frequently may be a solution.

We urge you to take our community’s needs into consideration and appreciate the importance of this service to our rural communities. We sincerely hope there is no remove of these services completely.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Lorna Gower
Clerk on behalf of Severn Stoke & Croome D’Abitot Parish Council
The Proposed Withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services in Worcestershire

The County Council is currently consulting on whether to eliminate the existing £3 million per annum subsidy on 97 bus services within the County. It is understood some 80% of bus travel within the county is on commercially operated routes with 20% via subsidised ones. The Parish Council notes an earlier consultation across the county identified that residents ranked subsidising bus routes as less of a priority behind adult social care, children’s social care and highway maintenance whilst a subsequent one showed a reduction in the level of service was preferred to the complete withdrawal of specific routes.

Shrawley is primarily serviced by the 294 / 295 from Kidderminster to Worcester although there are other routes where there is a peripheral interest, for example the Holt Heath to Droitwich and Redditch service that runs Tuesdays and Thursday. The 294 / 295 both have the same basic route although there is a variation between Kidderminster and Stourport. The service runs Monday to Saturday with a similar timetable throughout the week where the former Rose & Crown in Shrawley is one of a number of designated stops along the route:

- To Worcester  07.44*, 10.01, 12.11, 14.21, 16.06, 17.04 - *07.52 on Saturdays
- To Kidderminster  08.52, 11.00, 13.10, 15.20, 17.08, 18.08

There has been no Sunday service for many years whilst a late night bus at weekends was withdrawn several years ago. The service is said to carry around 66,000 passengers per annum, averaging 210 a day with the average bus carrying fewer than 20 passengers although the length of each journey along the approximate 18 mile route is not known.

This service is believed to have a subsidy of £0.97 per passenger journey or some £63k per annum. This is marginally lower than the average £1.04 per passenger journey for all such routes although the subsidy does range from £0.10 per passenger journey up to £8.24. As the average bus fare paid for each journey is given as £1.60, the average subsidy appears to be around 40% of the £2.64 operating cost of these average journeys.

It is recalled there have been at least 3 different bus operators during in the past 10 years or so. The service is currently operated by Diamond Bus who took over from First probably at the beginning of 2013 whilst First in turn may have taken over from Stagecoach. It is understood the route has required subsidies over many years.

The Parish Council published its Parish Plan in 2005. This was preceded by a Parish Survey which found that 3% of all the respondents (74% of village households) said they used the public bus service frequently, 24% used it occasionally whilst 73% never used it. At the same time 92% of respondents had access to a car with only moderate support for car sharing, except in an emergency or to help those who did not have their own transport.
When asked what improvements residents would like to see to the bus service, one third specifically stated they had no opinion whilst a quarter commented about timetabling, including more frequent buses, evening services and connections to Droitwich, Kidderminster and Worcester railway stations. The price of fares, reliability and lack of bus shelters were amongst other factors mentioned.

The vision for Transport & Highways within the Parish Plan was for “Parish roads being as safe as possible for all road users, and the maintenance of viable transport options other than the private car for those who wish to use them”. The main suggested actions concerning the bus service were the introduction of smaller buses along with an enhanced timetable and seating at bus stops. The Parish Councils Policy Statement included “the continuation of the Worcester to Stourport bus service will be encouraged.”

Although it is 10 years since the Village Plan survey was undertaken, it is unlikely there has been any radical movement in usage or the factors quoted as deterring usage. Moreover the Parish Council has recently reiterated its support for a continuation of the bus service.

The current County Council consultation form is aimed specifically at those who do use the bus services. There is a specific onus on them to respond so that their opinions can be collated with the actual usage of the services. As always in these circumstances there is a large element of “use it or lose it”. Nevertheless there is a community requirement to ensure that those dependent on the bus service are not left disadvantaged or isolated.

- The County Council could leave matters broadly as they are. However, the status quo may well not be sustainable as, even without the inevitable financial pressures, the bus service has experienced operational difficulties over a long period of time. Moreover, it would exert further pressure on other council services seen to have a higher priority.

- If the 294 / 295 service were to be be withdrawn without any alternative provided, it would without doubt leave several residents severely disadvantaged and isolated as well as being contrary not only to the findings of an earlier consultation, whereby a reduction in the level of service was preferred to the complete withdrawal of specific routes, but also the approved Sustainable Transport policy.

- The County Council and the current / alternative local bus operators are encouraged to work together, using the detail of this consultation with passengers, to find ways towards eliminating the subsidy and making the 294 / 295 commercially sustainable. This would typically include a combination of initiatives such as family tickets, timetabling and route adjustments aimed at increasing demand together with fare increases along with a review of all costs through revised operating practices, for example the use of smaller buses.

- Nevertheless a degree of subsidy may always be necessary as alternative provisions to meet the needs of those genuinely dependent could be more costly and less effective. But consideration may ultimately have to be given to replacing the bus with a guaranteed cost effective alternative although innovative thinking will be required to devise a range of schemes appropriate to Worcestershire and in particular its rural areas.

Richard Tesh
Chairman
South Lenches Parish Council would like to submit the following comments with regard to the bus service review consultation.

Church Lench and its surrounding villages have few amenities e.g. no village shop, no visiting medical facilities, no post office etc.
The villages are made up of an older population who rely on the Wychavon Hopper service. The bus route provides the main alternative to cars and taxi usage which are environmentally unfriendly options.
The loss or reduction of the Wychavon Hopper service would add to the already declining image of the villages leaving it less likely to attract investment or new residents.

This was recognised in the 2011 Local Investment Plan for Worcestershire prepared by the Local Enterprise Partnership which states:

Priority 6: Delivering Sustainable Rural Housing:

“With large rural areas, the provision of sustainable housing development in Worcestershire’s many villages and hamlets represents a thematic priority for the county in its own right. There are established rural regeneration programmes across the County, together with significant pressures for Worcestershire to sustain a thriving rural business base, including a significant agricultural sector. In a period which has seen strong demand for rural housing from higher paid people commuting from villages and hamlets or setting up small businesses, affordability for lower paid residents has continued to be a problem. Together with higher transport costs and limited public transport provision, these are key factors in rural deprivation and exclusion “

Yours sincerely

Nicky Holland
Clerk to South Lenches Parish Council.
13.12.13

Mrs. N. Holland
Clerk to South Lenches Parish Council
Tel: 01386 793050
Email: southlenchespc@gmail.com
23rd December, 2013

Ms N Fletcher
Transport Consultation Co-ordinator
Worcestershire County Council
County Hall
Spetchley Road
Worcester WR5 2NP

Dear Ms Fletcher,

Subsidised Bus Services Review 2013

Thank you for your letter of the 8th November 2013 by way of consultation under the above Review.

Your consultation received detailed consideration by the Town Council at its last Meeting held on the 3rd December 2013, and I was instructed to inform you of the Council’s views as follows.

The Meeting had little difficulty in concluding that the services numbered 192, 294 and 295 could be regarded as essential local services, were well patronised by passengers so far as it was possible to ascertain and, as such, should be retained. If those services are to be at risk under the Review it is hoped that the County Council would enter into discussions with the omnibus companies to urge them to take on some of the journeys currently undertaken by the services.

In addition, there would be great dismay within the Town Council if a direct link between the Town of Stourport-on-Severn and the County Town was to be replaced by a service which would necessitate passengers having to undertake the journey circuitously by first having to travel to Worcester, via Kidderminster.

There is a further consideration which the Town Council would ask the County Council to take into account please. There are currently three services (those mentioned above) serving the Areley Kings area of Stourport-on-Severn which are then routed north towards Kidderminster. It would be a great help to the residents of the Burlish Estate if at least one of those services leaving the Areley Kings area could instead of heading straight towards Kidderminster could be routed to enter Lower Lickhill Road from the Town’s High Street and head towards the Burlish Estate, and
from the Estate then head back to Minster Road (A451) to continue the journey towards Kidderminster? Burlish Estate is a large Estate and, like everywhere else there are ageing residents and the walk from parts of the Estate to Minster Road (A451) to use local bus services represents a considerable walk for residents. This suggestion would necessitate a bus detour which of itself is not that great in distance but which could provide an additional and valuable local service having the potential for being well patronised.

It is hoped that the foregoing submissions on behalf of the Town Council will be given due consideration and that the above local services which are regarded as essential will be safeguarded.

Thank you for consulting with the Town Council.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Town Clerk
Worcestershire County Council
County Hall
Spetchley Road
Worcester
WR5 2NP

13th January 2014

Re: Consultation: The Proposed Withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services in Worcestershire

Dear Sirs

I have been asked to write to you behalf of Tenbury Town Council in response to the above Consultation document.

Members of the Council are gravely concerned at the potential impact of the loss of the 291 Tenbury to Kidderminster bus service on residents of Tenbury Wells and the surrounding areas. The service runs between Tenbury and Kidderminster but also serves the villages of Newnam Bridge, Mamble and Bayton, Rock, and Bewdley.

This service is a lifeline connecting those in the town to hospital services, education services, work opportunities and larger shopping facilities. Such services are of much greater importance in rural communities such as Tenbury.

Removal of the subsidy would make the cost of the service so prohibitive that people in the community would be unable to afford to use it. We feel this will unfairly discriminate against the less well-off members of our community who rely on public transport services because they have no access to a private vehicle. The Town Council is active in support of the Citizens Advice Bureau, Food Bank and No Interest Loan scheme in the town and is aware that there is a great deal of hidden hardship in this rural area. The loss of the 291 service will hit these disadvantaged people harder than most.

Today bus services are often considered to be for a minority but this does not mean that services used by a minority are any less important than those used by the majority. Public transport is one of those services where changes will have a major impact on the lives of users in our community.

A snapshot survey of 202 passenger journeys on the 291 service which operates between Tenbury and Kidderminster shows usage as follows:-
38% to attend doctor or hospital appointments
18% to access further education
8% to access work
28% for shopping trips
8% for other reasons e.g. visiting family or friends, and job centre appointments.
N.B. included in the 18% using the bus to access further education are 6 young people from Tenbury, all of whom have learning disabilities, who use this bus service every day to attend specialist courses at Kidderminster College; courses that are not available elsewhere.

64% of passengers use the bus to access essential services not available in Tenbury and 36% of passengers use the bus to visit family or access a wider range of shops which we consider to be equally essential.

Without the 291 service those journeys will become impossible for many, thereby increasing the risk of rural isolation particularly for the elderly and disadvantaged members of our society. There are no alternative public transport routes for the people of Tenbury to use. For many this bus is their only lifeline to essential services.

The same group of passengers surveyed also signed a petition requesting that the 291 service be saved. These petitions have been given to the Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee looking at these proposals.

We urge you to make a special case for the 291 service and feel confident that with some imaginative thinking around scheduling and fare structures the impact of the proposed cuts can be mitigated.

For all of these reasons Tenbury Town Council cannot support the proposal to scrap the subsidy on the 291 bus service.

Yours sincerely

Dawn Worgan
Town Clerk
Dear Mr Blake

Upton Snodsbury Parish Council would like to strongly support the continued provision of buses from our parish to both Pershore and Worcester.

The two bus services that could be affected by the proposed cuts are:

1. Worcestershire County Council 350
   a. Redditch - Worcester via Alexandra Hospital, Astwood Bank, Inkberrow, Upton Snodsbury, Worcestershire Royal Hospital Monday to Saturday

2. LMS Travel 566
   a. Upton Snodsbury - Pershore Estates via Pinvin, Pershore, Pershore PlumLine Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday (this bus is paired with Peopleton - Pershore Estates via Pinvin, Pershore, Pershore PlumLine on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday)

The 350 bus service is extremely important to us here in Upton Snodsbury:

- The service is used by people in Upton Snodsbury to travel to and from their places of:
  o employment
  o and study, especially in and around Worcester

- It gives our parishioners access to the hospitals at both Worcester and Redditch

- Access to the shopping and leisure facilities is important, especially in Worcester

- It is also important to connect to coaches, buses and trains for onward travel

Upton Snodsbury is in the middle of the 350 service between Worcester and Redditch and as such is an important link in this chain of travel. It is good that we have a good bus shelter for people travelling in the Worcester direction and a bus stop with a sign on showing current bus times.

The 566 bus service is also extremely important to us here in Upton Snodsbury:

- The service is used by people in Upton Snodsbury to travel to and from the medical practice in Pershore. This is perhaps above everything else the key reason why a bus service to Pershore is essential for our parish. People who have used doctors in Pershore for up to 30 years would be severely disadvantages without a bus service to Pershore

- It is an important link to places of study

- It gives our parishioners access to the shopping and leisure facilities which is important

- It could also be an important connection Pershore train station, especially for trains towards London and beyond
Rural isolation would be a huge problem for our village if the bus services were cut. We are well aware that we are at the end of the line for the 350 to Pershore and although it is well used between Pershore and Pinvin, it is used far less all the way to Upton Snodsbury.

We would welcome the opportunity to talk further about a change in the bus service. We would be very receptive to a bus service Tu & Th & Saturday which travels to BOTH Upton Snodsbury AND to Peopleton and onward to Pershore, thus freeing the M, W and Friday bus up to carry out another route. This is just one of the many options that I am sure you would be able to consider.

Please do not cut us off from either Pershore or Worcester. Our parish (soon to be growing considerably) and parishioners would suffer greatly if this were to happen.

Yours sincerely

Catherine Milner
Parish Councillor
Upton Snodsbury
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Council</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Clerk</td>
<td>MRS JO ADEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>WORCESTER W8 0HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UPTON-UPON-SEVERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O(l) STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEMORIAL HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UPTON-UPON-SEVERN TOWN COUNCIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Pro-Forma
Subsidised Bus Services Review

Worcestershire County Council
Lutterworth is a tourist destination in the centre of an

family.

education, accessing specialist shops or visiting friends and
or at least clinic appointments, accessing further or higher
or impossible to carry out simple tasks like attending hospitals.
not with Malvern or Worcester where major public amenities are
which depend upon the town for the delivery of some services.
Seven with no public transport links with neighbouring

The removal of subsidized buses would leave Lutterworth-

If the subsidized bus services were no longer available to

you, how would that affect yourselves?

In previous rounds of financial retrenchment

The town has already suffered a diminution of transport services

would preclude any savings that might be achievable.

the economic and social damage to the town and its residents

upon Seven and that if the proposals were to be implemented,

essential to the prosperity, growth and social cohesion of Lutter-

The Council believes that a strong public transport system is

oppose the proposals.

2013, the County Council unanimously and urgently asked

No. The County Council proposals were discussed at the Lutter-

The County Council proposals were unanimously rejected.

Do you support the overall proposal approach to efficiency

Savings? For:

Worcestershire County Council

Subsidised Bus Services Review
The Council believes the proposals to be socially divisive and is seriously concerned. It believes that the proposals will have a negative effect on the members of the community and will result in increased risk to the vulnerable residents. It will also affect those who are unemployed and those who rely on public services for their livelihood.

The proposals will have a severe effect on the unemployed and those who rely on public transport. Without the proposed bus services, it will be impossible for some employed residents to travel to work and for the unemployed. The lack of transport will severely affect the ability of some employed residents to travel to work and for the unemployed. The lack of transport will severely affect the ability of some employed residents to travel to work and for the unemployed.

The proposals are not in the best interests of the community and will not benefit the economy or the surrounding area. The proposals are not in the best interests of the economy or the surrounding area. The proposals are not in the best interests of the economy or the surrounding area. The proposals are not in the best interests of the economy or the surrounding area. The proposals are not in the best interests of the economy or the surrounding area.
For all of these reasons and many more we believe that the cost to the community of these proposals far outweighs any potential saving.

Three million car journeys.

The environmental impact of the proposals throughout the county as three million passenger journeys are translated into community and a general improvement of the life of the town and its residents. We could also mention the adverse impact on the lives of vulnerable groups in the local economy with the potential for increased unemployment, the impact on the lives of vulnerable groups in the town. We have pointed to some of the adverse consequences of the proposals. Would you like to make any other comments on the proposals for the subsidised bus services?
West Malvern Parish Council

Worcestershire County Council
Bus Service Consultation
16th January 2014

Dear Sirs,

I am writing on behalf of West Malvern Parish Council regarding the bus service consultation that Worcestershire County Council are currently conducting.

West Malvern has a single bus service running through it, the 675, which travels between Ledbury and Great Malvern that is currently under threat as it is subsidised.

Since the consultation period began we have engaged with our local community to understand their views on this proposal. This bus service is an important link for our village which is used by a wide range of people from elderly residents to parents with their children. To some it is a life-line without which they would find it very difficult to go shopping, travel to work or access local services and the wider travel network in the larger towns.

As you may be aware, the local geography of West Malvern is such that walking into Great Malvern is difficult for a lot of the elderly residents and without alternative means of transport would mean they are left isolated. A number have expressed the view that they would have to leave the community in order to retain independence. This is not something that we would wish to see happen. The bus service was also the only means of travel for many residents during the snow and ice of previous years as many cars were stuck on steep drives or side roads.

As a more rural community we are faced with the argument of minimal service use and large subsidies but after looking at the figures for the 675, the passenger numbers are relatively high for this rural service and the subsidy is minimal.

Many passengers would be willing to pay more to retain this service and it has been suggested that more needs to be done to advertise the fact it exists. Malvern has some very good walks on the Hills which can be reached by using the 675 but visitors to Malvern are not aware of its existence.

In summary, the West Malvern Parish Council does not support the bus subsidy removal in its entirety and hopes that Worcestershire County Council will continue to support rural communities rather than isolate them further.

Yours faithfully,

David Sharp
Clerk to the Parish Council
WICK PARISH COUNCIL
Wick, Pershore, Worcestershire

Please reply to the Clerk:
Mrs Margaret Williams,
Ryecot,
Owletts Lane,
Wick,
Pershore WR10 3PB.

Tel: 01386 553442
Email: wickparish@aol.com

Worcestershire County Council               5th January 2014
County Hall
Spetchley Road
Worcester WR5 2NP

For the attention of Chris Holloway & Nicky Fletcher

Subsidised Bus Service Review 2013

Dear Sirs,

Whilst we understand the need to review all items of County Council expenditure we strongly urge you to re-consider the complete cutting of the current bus subsidy as the short term gain will harm the long term well being of residents.

Analysis of the data from the 2011 census shows that in Wick 7.8% of households do not have a car and 36% of residents are 60+.

Employment (inc education, training and voluntary work)
- buses are vital for people getting to work especially those with part time jobs
- buses make it possible for people to seek employment, accept job offers
- buses make it possible for adult learners to attend courses
- buses make it economically possible for voluntary workers to make valuable contributions to society

Comments from Residents
"My young adult children relied on the buses to get to work"
"I do voluntary work without the buses I cannot do this"

Social (inc shopping, visiting friends/relative and routine medical appointments)
- buses enable residents to be independent
- regular buses enable residents to plan their appointments
- buses add to residents well being in terms of social interaction which is vital for healthy lifestyle
- buses enable those who cannot drive for medical reasons to still be able to get out and about

Comments from Residents
"Without the buses my life would be awful"
"How will I manage without the buses?"
Residents recognise that the W.C.C. does not have all the funds it would like to fund the current service and therefore accept there may have to be rationing of the bus service in terms of need. We strongly request that the matter is discussed with us and other rural Parish Councils to look for a solution to identify a workable way forward.

Yours faithfully

David Scott
Chairman
WICK PARISH COUNCIL
Wick, Pershore, Worcestershire

Please reply to the Clerk:
Mrs Margaret Williams,
Ryecot,
Owletts Lane,
Wick,
Pershore WR10 3PB.

Tel: 01386 553442
Email: wickparish@aol.com

Worcestershire County Council
County Hall
Spetchley Road
Worcester WR5 2NP

16th January 2014

For the attention of Chris Holloway

Dear Sirs

BUS SERVICE THE HOPPER SOUTHERN ROUTE
Representatives from the Parish Councils of Great and Little Comberton, Elmley Castle (inc Bricklehampton and Netherton) and Wick met on Tuesday 14th January 2014 to discuss the possible withdrawal of the bus subsidy and to identify a suggested way forward to maintain a service that will enable our residents to have good quality of life.

Discussion with bus users firstly identified the fact that LMS drivers are friendly, courteous and most helpful to the needs of the passengers.

Analysis of the situation divides the problem into two areas:

EMPLOYMENT (WORK, SCHOOL/COLLEGE AND VOLUNTARY WORK)
The current daily service Monday to Saturday is still required to get people to work/school and college, and back home as per the current timetable:
- morning bus
- two buses returning late afternoon/ early evening

SOCIAL (SHOPPING, ROUTINE MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS, VISITING FRIENDS/RELATIVES AND SPORTING ACTIVITIES)
It was felt that there is some margin for rationalisation and the suggestions are as follows:
- For a fuller service on any two days Monday to Friday AND on a Saturday, rather than six days currently available
- To have the timetable arranged so that users can have 1.5 to 2 hours in Pershore. The current timetable is either too short (about 50 minutes) or too long (about 3 hours)
In discussion with bus users, the reasons for requesting the fuller service (3 days per week) is that it allows people (passengers) greater flexibility to travel further afield e.g. into Worcester and the hospital, use the local sports facilities, visit family and friends and routine medical appointments in Pershore.

The request for the fuller service on Saturdays was to meet the needs of young people.

Additional suggestions are:
* use of smaller buses during the day
* investigate the bus pass users contributing to the cost either per journey (e.g. 50p) or an annual fee (e.g. £10/20)

We trust that our comments are constructive and we would welcome the opportunity to further discuss them with you to find a way forward that will meet the needs of all our residents young and old alike.

Yours faithfully

Lynne Raymer

Vice Chair Wick Parish Council
Mr John Smith
Cabinet Member for Highways
Worcestershire County Council
County Hall
Spetchley Road
WORCESTER
WR 5 2NP

Dear Mr Smith,

Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council would like to submit a response to the Consultation on the proposed withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services in Worcestershire.

There are 22 Services affected in the Wyre Forest District, of which 7 affect the Parish, 6 being Services running to Wolverley High School. If the subsidies are withdrawn the cost to run the service will increase and most parents of school children are not in a position to afford an increase which will ultimately result in the possibility that services are withdrawn. This could result in pupil numbers decreasing which could cause a serious threat to the long term viability of the future of the school. The Parish Council are most concerned about this. In addition there are no safer routes to walk to school, pupils from Caunsall and Cookley would not be safe walking along Lea Lane, pupils from the Son Hill/Broadwaters area would be in danger using the very narrow path along the B4189 and pupils from Franche / Marlpool area adjacent the very busy B4190.

The Parish Council urge you to not remove the subsidies on these services, particularly the school services as this will definitely have a detrimental effect on the school and the Parish. County Councillor Gordon Yarranton has submitted a petition, Wolverley High School have submitted a response and many local Parishioners have completed the questionnaire.

The Parish Council await your response,

Yours sincerely,

Mrs B J Drew
Clerk to Parish Council

cc Annette Moore
Nicky Fletcher
## Subsidised Bus Services Review Consultation Pro-forma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Wythall Parish Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Beaudesert Road Hollywood Worcester B47 5DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact name and title:</td>
<td>Miss Pat Harrison Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest (e.g. trade; school, local authority; passenger representative)</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Subsidised Bus Services Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the overall proposed approach to efficiency savings for:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidised Bus Services</td>
<td>The criteria for bus subsidies are unclear so we are not certain how the final decision can be transparent or be explained and justified. Make them clear and transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, please explain how you would change the approach to meet the efficiency savings required</td>
<td>The questionnaire appears to be aimed at those who currently use buses. We consider this excludes many future potential residents who could make a valuable contribution to the consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the subsidised bus services were no longer available to you, how would that affect yourselves?</td>
<td>The direct impact on the Parish Council would be in facing the increase in residents’ complaints with regards the inadequacy of public transport provision within the Parish. There would be an indirect impact on all of our residents who currently use the service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Would you like to make any other comments on the proposals for the Subsidised Bus Services?

The proposals do not appear to acknowledge the existence of a public transport system which has been paramount in the agenda for planning decisions for some time now. We have S106 monies agreed for standard bus shelter along the S3 route.
Notes:

1. Opportunity to influence and explanation of constraints:
The views of the Stakeholder will be considered and taken into account wherever possible within the context of the technical assessments that have already been undertaken to date.

2. Contact:
   If you wish to submit a response to this consultation, or have any questions about the consultation process, please e-mail to Hub@worcestershire.gov.uk or alternatively send to:
   
   The Transport Programme and Commissioning Team
   Worcestershire County Council
   FREEPOST RSGG-HSZK-HSGL
   H1 County Hall
   WORCESTER
   WR5 2NP

4. Deadline: Responses should arrive no later than 5pm, 14th February 2014, please.

5. Worcestershire County Council’s Code of Practice on Consultation

This consultation has been produced in accordance with the Worcestershire County Council’s best practice principles that can be viewed at:

http://worcestershire.whub.org.uk/home/wcc-con-strategy - cs-con-strategy-appendix1
If you have any suggestions of others who may wish to be involved in this consultation please contact us.


The information you provide to us will be held Worcestershire County Council. It will only be used for the purposes of consultation and research, in order to improve our services. We may send you a written reminder(s) or contact you in order to award any associated prizes, you may also be sent feedback of the results. Sometimes, we share consultation
results with our partner. Anonymous results will be published on the Council’s Ask Me! Consultation Planner & Finder web database. Survey results will never contain your name or anything that could identify you. “Our partners may want to contact you to carry out similar research in the future. This would mean that we would pass your details on to our partners. If you do not wish us to do this, please write/phone to let us know.”
Appendix M
Bus Service Operators’ Responses
## Subsidised Bus Services Review
### Consultation Pro-forma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>CEN GROUP LIMITED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Address**              | UNIT 14A TAMEBRIDGE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE  
PERRY BARR  
BIRMINGHAM  
B42 2TX |
<p>| <strong>Contact name and title:</strong> | MAT HIDSON, OPERATIONS CO-ORDINATOR |
| <strong>Interest (e.g. trade; school, local authority; passenger representative)</strong> | BUS OPERATOR OF ONE LOCAL BUS CONTRACT IN WORCESTERSHIRE |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Subsidised Bus Services Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the overall proposed approach to efficiency savings for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidised Bus Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, please explain how you would change the approach to meet the efficiency savings required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate that savings have to be made but it appears that pots of money are still being used to fund non necessary projects such as upgrading ticket machines and RTI amongst other things. Although these schemes are positive for the specific areas they affect, this seems ridiculous when complete withdrawal of buses services in some areas is a potential outcome of these budget cuts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot make any specific suggestions as to where savings could be made but I think that bus services are in some ways are an easy target, although they may not affect the greatest number of Worcestershire residents the effect of losing all supported services could rob some elderly/less affluent people of their independence and therefore the social implications should be considered very carefully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The less opportunities there are for these people to get out and about means there are less opportunities for them to spend their money in towns and cities in the county, which surely cannot be good for the local economy. A wider view needs to be taken!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the subsidised bus services were no longer available to you, how would that affect yourselves?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would you like to make any other comments on the proposals for the Subsidised Bus Services?

I feel that subsidised bus services should not be looked at in isolation and part of the consultation process has identified possible opportunities for operators to make adjustments to commercial services although I fear these will be limited. A wider view should be taken which looks carefully at home to school transport expenditure and how resources which could possibly be spread over the two. For example, as was evident in a previous WCC tender round some local bus service timetables were scaled down slightly to incorporate school movements which were previously carried out by separate buses/operators; therefore reducing resources required and cost to the county council.

I would suggest that this approach is extended to incorporate some contracts which are currently `closed door’ status. These may be duplicating routes which the council is currently supporting financially. Operators may also see opportunities to cover off peak services using vehicles on used school movements and the overheads are already factored in.

I would like to see a home to school tendering process which is weighted in favour of bidders who offer a commercial commitment to a service which is currently supported by the county council. I believe that bus operators are innovative enough to identify any such opportunities and that even if the level of service offered is less than that currently in operation, it will be much less of a 'hammer blow' than total withdrawal. However, it would be beneficial for operators to have adequate time to consider possibilities and an ongoing dialogue with the county council would be needed. Finally, I am unconvinced that the current rigid e-auction setup is the best platform to implement such a process!
Notes:

1. Opportunity to influence and explanation of constraints:
The views of the Stakeholder will be considered and taken into account wherever possible within the context of the technical assessments that have already been undertaken to date.
2. Contact
If you wish to submit a response to this consultation, or have any questions about the consultation process, please e-mail to Hub@woroestershire.gov.uk or alternatively send to:

The Transport Programme and Commissioning Team

Worcestershire County Council
FREEPOST RSGG-HSIZK-HSGL
H1 County Hall
WORCESTER
WR5 2NP

4. Deadline: Responses should arrive no later than 5pm, 17th January 2014, please.

5. Worcestershire County Council’s Code of Practice on Consultation

This consultation has been produced in accordance with the Worcestershire County Council’s best practice principles that can be viewed at:


If you have any suggestions of others who may wish to be involved in this consultation please contact us.

6. Data protection statement

The information you provide to us will be held Worcestershire County Council. It will only be used for the purposes of consultation and research, in order to improve our services. We may send you a written reminder(s) or contact you in order to award any associated prizes, you may also be sent feedback of the results. Sometimes, we share consultation results with our partner. Anonymous results will be published on the Council’s Ask Me! Consultation Planner & Finder web database. Survey results will never contain your name or anything that could identify you. "Our partners may want to contact you to carry out similar research in the future. This would mean that we would pass your details on to our partners. If you do not wish us to do this, please write/phone to let us know."
### Subsidised Bus Services Review
Consultation Pro-forma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>The Diamond Bus Company Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Beacon House, Long Acre, Birmingham B7 5JJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact name and title:</td>
<td>Stephen Haselden, Business Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest (e.g. trade; school, local authority; passenger representative)</td>
<td>Bus Operator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Subsidised Bus Services Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you support the overall proposed approach to efficiency savings for:</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsidised Bus Services</td>
<td>We feel that a completely fresh approach to the provision of subsidised bus services is required. The existing pattern of subsidised services has accreted over time and is therefore more driven by history than it is by customer need in today’s world. Tendering routes according to historical patterns, in our opinion, has created a situation where the subsidised services are inefficient and the available subsidy is being spent haphazardly. Therefore a much more organised approach is necessary, with a root and branch Network Review. This should involve engaging with operators to create a network of services that are suitable for the current day, rather than relying upon service numbers and routes that are “traditionally” run. In this way, local operators would be able to use their knowledge to design routes. It will be clear to operators if they can take any of the network on to a commercial basis. The aim should be to use this local knowledge fully. The advantage of a “new” network would be that operators could be encouraged to tender for a “package” of routes, or routes in particular area, that would enhance their own services in that geographic location. The current process of “tendering” for random, single routes only guarantees the lowest price for that individual route. If tenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, please explain how you would change the approach to meet the efficiency savings required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
If the subsidised bus services were no longer available to you, how would that affect yourselves?

| were issued as part of a properly designed network, and the bidding for packages of tenders were encouraged, we feel that passenger requirements could be better met, at the same time as reducing overall funding levels. For example we have approached the council with a proposal for a “package” of routes and an overall subsidy that would be required to keep a good level of service in Redditch and Kidderminster whilst taking on, commercially, what we feel is viable. This proposal decreases dramatically the funding required from the council and puts emphasis on our ability to effectively market services to try to make them commercial. We have developed this proposal ourselves as a result of conducting a fundamental review of travel patterns and customer needs. The available transport funding needs to be spent wisely to support bus services where such support is actually needed. Such encouragement of bus usage may also, in time, lead to the creation of commercially viable bus routes. Instead funding is being expended in an unsystematic fashion. |
Would you like to make any other comments on the proposals for the Subsidised Bus Services?

We see a secondary effect of the withdrawal of subsidy funding. In Worcestershire, as in many areas of the country, the smaller operator bases the core of his work on subsidised bus routes. The removal of funding would therefore very likely cause the number of bus operators to contract. This will over time decrease competition in the area as many smaller operators would cease to exist or find competing extremely difficult. We therefore see that funding not only provides transport for passengers, but also helps create a competitive market in which there is greater choice at the most economic price.

We would also point out that the removal of bus subsidy would hit hardest those with no other available means of transport. This inevitably means the poor, the pensioner, children and the disabled. In the areas we serve in Worcestershire our customers are often totally reliant upon public transport to get around. Many of the older people in these areas and the less well-off cannot run cars and thus our services, often partly paid for by the council, are their only lifeline and provide the access they need. Cutting subsidy to routes, and thus forcing their closure, would leave people isolated and without access to transport. There would no doubt be concomitant economic effects from the loss of employment for our drivers (who live locally), and for the towns they serve.

We feel that a more structured approach to reduction in funding is required. An complete cut of all subsidised services will have
Notes:

1. Opportunity to influence and explanation of constraints:
The views of the Stakeholder will be considered and taken into account wherever possible within the context of the technical assessments that have already been undertaken to date.
Mr. Chris Holloway  
Sustainable Transport  
Worcestershire County Council  
County Hall  
Spetchley Road  
Worcester WR5 2NP

Dear Mr Holloway

Withdrawal of Bus Service Subsidies

I am writing to register my concerns relating to the proposals to withdraw funding for Bus Services in Worcestershire.

Bus travel plays a vital role for the whole community and in particular for those who are restricted with suitable alternatives. I have listed below some of the adverse effects that service reductions within the county will have on both Bus users and operators:

- School Travel – we need to ensure that an alternative to the car is provided for younger people, and encourage the benefits for public transport. The reduction in support for transport to and from educational establishments will restrict access to many schools and colleges.

- The Environmental benefits for public transport need to be considered, for the long term, as a reduction in bus travel opportunities will increase car journeys. The congestion being experienced in Worcestershire at present is evidence that we should be encouraging more people from their cars.

- There are plans for increased house building within the county, and I am sure that additional footfall in the City of Worcester will have economic benefits. Access to and from the City via a good public transport network will only help to generate the movement the businesses require.

- First will indeed be affected if subsidies are removed, and a review of the company’s operations will be required, to accommodate any changes that would result in a reduction of resources. This may also have a detrimental effect on future planning and also the extent in which the company may plan to invest for the future.

Finally, we do want to work in partnership with Worcestershire County Council, to offer better Bus Service for all communities, and at present our plans include the development of ‘Mobile Ticketing’ for the area and further enhancements to the Bus fleet. A reduction in Bus Subsidies will not help First to demonstrate a similar commitment for bus services and I hope that financial support will remain for the future.

Yours sincerely,

Steve Zanker  
General Manager
Good afternoon Annette

I know that the cut-off date for consultation for the withdrawal on 318 is fast approaching but I will be away on leave so I thought I would drop you a line now.

I think to withdraw this service is wrong on so many levels. Not only is the service well used for the schools but there are increasing numbers of students travelling between Stourbridge and Bromsgrove to go to colleges. As their courses do not always fit in with the school service which is commercial and therefore safe they need the bus at varying times throughout the day and will not be able to travel outside of school hours. It could possibly lead to many students having to cancel their courses because they cannot travel at the right times.

I also think that it is very bad to consider isolating the people of Hagley, Holy Cross and Clent many of whom are elderly and not able to drive. Many people in these villages don’t have cars and therefore will be isolated. There are no local amenities in these villages and they rely on public transport to reach essential facilities in Bromsgrove and Stourbridge and beyond.

Please reconsider the withdrawal of this service

Regards

Margaret Hanson
Hansons Buses
60a Hayes Lane
Lye
Stourbridge
West Midlands
DY9 8RD
Tel: 01384 894020

Fax: 01384 894030
## Subsidised Bus Services Review Consultation Pro-forma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Henshaw’s Executive Travel Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>The Red House London Road Moreton in Marsh Glos GL56 0HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact name and title:</td>
<td>Daniel Henshaw Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest (e.g. trade; school, local authority; passenger representative)</td>
<td>Local Bus Service Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Subsidised Bus Services Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you support the overall proposed approach to efficiency savings for:</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidised Bus Services</td>
<td>Many of our customers are Elderly and have no other means of transport to socialize and get essential supplies, by cutting the service you would effectively be hurting the surrounding community and also the business they frequent. We would rather see a service run less frequently than not at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, please explain how you would change the approach to meet the efficiency savings required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the subsidised bus services were no longer available to you, how would that affect yourselves?</td>
<td>As an operator it would greatly reduce our need for vehicles and drivers resulting in redundancy and less income for all concerned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would you like to make any other comments on the proposals for the Subsidised Bus Services?

We appreciate that cuts need to be made, but living in such a rural area the cuts proposed would have a devastating impact on all concerned which would in turn cause a knock on effect for all local businesses, Operators and public alike.

We as an operator would be more than willing to help plan a revised timetable and try to help where possible.
16.01.13

My name is Raffi Ali and I am the Transport Manager at LMS Travel. I am also a senior partner of this family run business which employs 24 full time and 12 part time staff.

Currently we operate, Wycheavon Hopper (56/5/6), 21/22/23/24, 423/425 & 377(sat only) - this is 6 buses, mon-fri and 7 buses on Saturday.

I would like to take this opportunity to view my opinions without having any repercussions. I am from the Private Sector and if you listen to all of our leading economists, they all say - it’s the private sector that will take our country out of recession.

I was listening to John Smiths views on Hereford and Worcester(15/1/14) and one the solutions he suggests is community transport. The private sector has been suffering for a while now and below is an article which I fully support and would like to know how many cabinet members are aware of the following and the difference between o license/section 19 & 22 permit;

*Around midnight on Monday 18 November 1993, 12 schoolchildren were killed on the M40 when their Transit minibus crashed into the back of a maintenance vehicle on the hard shoulder. The teacher driving the minibus was also killed. The nation was shocked. How could this have happened and what could be done to ensure it never happened again? Twenty years later and nothing has changed. Yes, the crash saw an end to side-facing bench seats in minibuses, brought in seatbelts, while motorway maintenance vehicles now have rear-end collision retarders and lighting that puts Blackpool to shame. It was chance that the minibus hit the maintenance lorry. It could have been any stationary vehicle, or other immovable object such as a tree. Crucially, the underlying root cause of the crash – i.e. a tired ‘volunteer’ minibus driver – was never tackled. And, while the crash was shocking for the number of lives lost in a single collision, there have continued to be deaths of minibus passengers due to tired, non-regulated drivers. A recent example was an old people’s home care worker using a hired self-drive minibus. Opponents of change and regulation of this so-called ‘grey’ area, usually*
running with Section 19 permits, cite the cost of O-Licensing and Category D driver training as an unaffordable barrier. In other words, they are saying it’s acceptable, because it is cheap. Why should some of the most vulnerable members of our society be exposed to this risk, because it is cheap? Why should they be driven by people with no statutory requirement for initial or ongoing driver training, or to meet EU drivers’ hours and be properly rested before driving, because it is cheap? How cheap is a life? Yet because someone may drive less frequently, or driving is not their main occupation, or because “it would cost too much,” successive governments choose to ignore the clear safety breaches that routinely happen as a result of having a massive non-regulated sector. Over the years, they have argued that voluntary codes are satisfactory and the risk is low enough to be acceptable.

My Final Views

1. I agree that if there are buses running empty than we should tackle this. I do not agree with community transport as this is affecting us in the private sector. In other words WCC officers are actively encouraging community transport and are deliberately taking business away from the private sector.
2. WCC should not have his own in house bus company as this again is taking business away from the private sector. Prices being charged by WCC fleet are not visible on £500 expenditure list. WCC has the best buses , brand new. They pay their drivers the most in the industry, how can this be cheaper in the current competitive arena?
3. We know that for any operator worthy of the name, the last thing they would do is betray their reputation by taking on work and failing to deliver. WCC e auction encourages you to do this by accepting multiple bids from operators. Reputable e auctions allow one bid, on line submission. WCC e auctions run for hours and hours. E auctions have driven companies out of business.
4. Ask yourself this question, would you want your special need child(or any other child) to be carried on a transport procured in this manner. E auctions have completely driven the prices down to the ground at dangerous levels.
5. WCC drivers and community transport do not require additional entitlements to drive a 16 seater minibus. They do not need to abide by EU driving hours and do not need to do continuous training like we have to in the Private sector.
6. The existence of section 19/22 permits has led to a distortion of the market i.e the absence of a level playing field in that all important commercial arena of competitive tendering.
7. It causes me great concern that volunteer drivers, school teachers for example, can work long hours and then be asked to drive a minibus full of children.

Finally I have been doing business with WCC for over 12 years. We are in desperate need of fresh blood in the Integrated Passenger Transport Unit. We need officers who are going to work with the Private Sector and not against. All the decisions that have been made in the last 8 year have all been against the Private Sector. During this time WCC have built up there fleet and in many cases up until 2011 picked and chose their own work without tender(and continue to do so), whilst they have encouraged
the private sector to vigorously compete with each other. Nothing makes sense to me as WCC should be a non profit making organisation. Transport in the private sector is not a good place to be in right now. We all have to make difficult decisions with budget cuts but please do not screw the private sector any more than its been screwed already. Under the Labour government there was plenty of money made available for transport. Had this money been used wisely then we would have a great environment for companies like ours to succeed, sadly this is not the case. Cutting bus subsidy, without no doubt would probably reduce our staff by at least 60%.

Private sector and the Public sector must work together in my opinion, to create the ideal environment for small companies like ours to flourish. If we do not do this, then I’m afraid we will be out of business sooner than you think- another quality operator gone!

Thanks

R. Ali
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Representative)</th>
<th>Interest (e.g. trade, school, local authority, passenger)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Operator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Receiver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name A. Acme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Z. B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Pro-Forma
Subsidised Bus Services Review

Worcestershire County Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due to reduction in income</th>
<th>If the subsidised bus services were no longer available to you, how would that affect you personally?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial loss of 2 members of staff. Proposed closure of company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Employment &amp; Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational As there town services are vital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction may affect travel to workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241. Number of town services in area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services could be reduced for + time of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no, please explain how you would change the approach to subsidised bus services:

Savings for:

Do you support the overall proposed approach to efficiency:

[Signature]

The Subsidised Bus Services Review

County Council

Worcestershire
Would you like to make any other comments on the proposals for the Subsidised Bus Services?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority Community Transport Provider</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Griffin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B98 8AH Redditch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcester Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redditch Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Pro-Forma
Subsidised Bus Services Review

Worcestershire

county council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Subsidised Bus Services Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the overall proposed approach to efficiency savings for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidised Bus Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, please explain how you would change the approach to meet the efficiency savings required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is not easy to answer yes or no. There is a need to look at investing in transport and, through subsidies, offer transport solutions in our district. Subsidies should not be forever but should be used to create a transport network that works and is eventually sustainable. There are savings to be made and maybe looking at those CT schemes that could help with small routes that do not make money commercially but will sustain for nonprofit making social enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the subsidised bus services were no longer available to you, how would that affect yourselves?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would probably see more demand on our community transport operations which eventually would see less capacity on our vehicles. Residents rely heavily on CT schemes for medical appointments and assisted travel. CT helps to maintain independence for those with poor mobility and disabilities. If there is more demand for our service, then the health of our residents could be affected by not being able to make appointments or clinics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The longer term costs to other County Council and other public bodies by the loss of bus services needs to be assessed. The alternative services will be achievable if an appropriate bus infrastructure is in place.

The impact to residents on the efficiency savings for subsidised routes needs to be considered alongside the wider County Council efficiency savings. Proposals in other County Directories for efficiencies that will require residents to travel to other areas need to be considered alongside the wider County Council efficiency savings.

Would you like to make any other comments on the proposals for the subsidised bus service?
Notes:

1. Opportunity to influence and explanation of constraints:
The views of the Stakeholder will be considered and taken into account wherever possible within the context of the technical assessments that have already been undertaken to date.

2. Contact:
   If you wish to submit a response to this consultation, or have any questions about the consultation process, please e-mail to Hub@worcestershire.gov.uk or alternatively send to:

   The Transport Programme and Commisioning Team
   Worcestershire County Council
   FREEPOST RSGG-HSZE-HSGL
   H1 County Hall
   WORCESTER
   WR5 2NP

3. Deadline: Responses should arrive no later than 5pm, 14th February 2014, please.

5. Worcestershire County Council's Code of Practice on Consultation

   This consultation has been produced in accordance with the Worcestershire County Council's best practice principles that can be viewed at:


   If you have any suggestions of others who may wish to be involved in this consultation please contact us.

6. Data protection Statement

   The information you provide to us will be held Worcestershire County Council. It will only be used for the purposes of consultation and research, in order to improve our services. We may send you a written reminder(s) or contact you in order to award any associated prizes, you may also be sent feedback of the results. Sometimes, we share consultation results with our partner. Anonymous results will be published on the Council's Ask Me! Consultation Planner & Finder web database. Survey results will never contain your name or anything that could identify you. *Our partners may want to contact you to carry out similar research in the future. This would mean that we would pass your details on to our partners. If you do not wish us to do this, please write/phone to let us know.
Response by Whittle Coach & Bus Ltd. to Worcestershire County Council’s consultation on withdrawal of bus subsidy.

January 2014

Please accept this as our formal response to the Council’s proposal to withdraw all funding for subsidised bus services in Worcestershire.

I am sure it will be understood that this concerns us greatly and we feel it is imperative that the Council fully understands the true implications of such a decision. We assume that the Council has (or will in the near future), before making a final decision, carried out its obligations under the 2010 Equality Act – namely that no Local Transport Authority can carry out such an action until it has carried out an impact assessment to identify vulnerable groups affected, and what alternatives will be put in place to make sure they are not prejudiced by their condition and only then withdraw services if it can be reasonably shown that the alternatives are sufficient.

It is appropriate to highlight the already increasingly difficult situation which already faces bus operators. In particular the cut of 20% in the payment of Bus Service Operator Grant (BSOG) imposed by Government in April 2012 had a significant impact on operators’ income. And reimbursement to operators for the compulsory National Travel Concession Scheme has in most local authority areas fallen consistently since introduction despite rising costs of operation. In Worcestershire the average payment per concessionary passenger has reduced from 96.4p in 2010/2011 to 74.2p to date in 2013/2014. Despite the relevant legislation including a provision that bus operators should be no better but no worse off under the scheme there is absolutely no doubt that most if not all operators are worse off – considerably so in some cases.

In 2012 ‘Greener Journeys’ commissioned a report from the Leeds University Institute of Transport Studies which concluded “there are 2.5 million bus commuters, and a further 1 million use the bus as backup. This is around 12% of the working population, accounting for £64 billion of Gross Value Added (GVA). With 1.4 billion shopping trips per year and an average spend of £29.66 this gives a total estimated retail spend by bus users in GB of £21 billion”

“The benefits of the bus are indisputable. However, the bus sector faces its greatest financial challenge for a generation. Buses have been more adversely affected by cuts to Government spending than other modes of transport. Whilst it is very important that sufficient investment is given to transport infrastructure, one consequence is that greater priority has been given to capital expenditure. Revenue budgets have fallen by as much as a third, whereas capital budgets have fallen by only 6%. Since bus services are especially dependent on revenue funding they are particularly exposed by these cuts”.

‘The Campaign for Better Transport’ has very recently published a report ‘Buses in Crisis’, once again highlighting the vital importance of buses but also the large number of bus route cuts which are now likely to take place leaving some areas completely devoid of this form of public transport, causing considerable harm to individuals and whole communities.
We fully appreciate the pressure the County Council is under to make significant savings in its overall budget and we understand that no matter what products or services receive financial support from the Council many if not all must bear some impact of the cuts.

In this instance however the Council is proposing not just to make a reduction, but to withdraw financial support entirely, for all ‘less popular’ bus routes. This appears to be based on two assumptions which we believe to be false. Firstly that a great majority of residents have no interest in these services and secondly that operators will continue to run these services commercially (perhaps with some modifications) once the subsidy is removed.

We accept that the percentage of all residents that use the relevant bus services will be fairly small percentage of the overall population of that area. However it is critical to remember that this still represents a significant number of people many of whom are the communities’ most vulnerable and often isolated individuals and include many for whom the bus is their only form of transport and for whom the loss would be a significant and life changing event, cutting off their access to many basic and essential services.

As to operators continuing these services commercially, whilst we cannot speak for other operators, we will be more than happy to discuss options and future provision with the Council, however Whittles is not in a position to do this – apart from perhaps one or two minor exceptions and then probably only after making some significant changes to timetables and fares. Indeed we are already making a loss on the majority of local bus services we operate in Kidderminster and the Wyre Forest area even with the subsidies at their current levels. This includes most of the routes we run which are subsidised by the Council. This situation has arisen mainly because costs have outstripped passenger revenues and subsidy payments since the contracts were originally costed, not least because of the loss of 20% of the Bus Service Operator Grant (BSOG) which was imposed by the Government in April 2012. The reductions in Concessionary Travel reimbursement mentioned above have also contributed to the losses as these have reduced income on these journeys.

The Council may wonder why we continue to operate most of these routes even with subsidies at their present level. This is because EYMS Group (of which Whittles is a wholly owned subsidiary) is not in business simply for profit nor do we have any desire to fail in our obligations to the communities which rely on our services or the 50 or so employees for whom Whittles provides employment directly related to our local bus operations.

However, like any business, we rely on profit to keep going, satisfy the financial institutions to which we look for finance for fleet replacement, and to satisfy the financial standing requirements which are required by the law (failure to meet which could result in the loss or curtailment of an Operator’s licence).

EYMS Group is an independent family-owned private company with no outside shareholders to satisfy with dividends etc. and has a need for only modest profits (essentially sufficient only to ensure adequate fleet replacements) and a deep-rooted commitment to the communities which it serves and to maintaining employment for its staff.

It is important to understand that Whittles, and we believe this applies to many if not all other operators in the area, is not running what are otherwise actually commercially viable
services whilst accepting an additional subsidy from the Council. The reason these services are subsidised is genuinely because they are not otherwise commercially viable and would probably have ceased to exist (certainly in anything like their present form) some time ago had not the subsidy been available.

In a few cases there may be a chance that if the operator is left to provide these services commercially changes could be made to improve their financial performance. However there is no doubt at all that this would be with no guarantees to operators, only increased risks, and that it would certainly mean significant fare increases and less attractive routes for local residents which, in turn, will mean a sustainable performance even less likely.

Whittles’ current financial performance will not allow us to take such risks and we believe this will apply to many of the small independent operators too. These operators represent the life blood of the bus industry in many parts of the country especially in rural areas unserved by the five major plc’s, and taken together are roughly equivalent in size to any one of these largest operators, thus accounting for approximately 20% of the UK bus industry.

Whilst only 20% of services in Worcestershire may be subsidised, many commercial services are supported by this income and operate more efficiently on the back of these subsidised services. For example some off-peak journeys may be possible by using the bus and driver who operate subsidised school or other peak journeys. Thus if the current subsidised services disappear it is likely that some services currently operated without subsidy many have to be withdrawn or severely curtailed as well.

Not only that but the disappearance of many routes, subsidised or not, will undoubtedly start to undermine the whole network as people lose faith in the bus network and turn (where they can) to other forms of transport which they would then naturally use instead for journeys which they may currently make on non-subsidised routes. Travel involving the use of both subsidised and commercial journeys would no longer be possible so the commercial route would lose income as well. The same applies where one part of a single route is subsidised and the other not – some ‘through’ journeys would no longer be possible with consequential lost income on the commercial section.

The reality is that rather than subsidised services simply being operated commercially they may actually disappear and for the reasons outlined above the operational benefits of integrating commercial and subsidised journeys will be lost. This could easily lead in the end to many smaller independent operators facing the possibility of going out of business, as is already happening in increasing numbers in the UK given the increasingly challenging financial climate for the UK bus industry.

Losing many of these independent operators will have serious repercussions for the local communities they serve and for the local economies. This in itself could represent a false economy to the Council and could even end up costing the Council more in the long run, as increased support payments may be needed for people to access essential services in other ways.

The problems can apply equally to Community Transport operators who are seen by some as being able to fill the gaps left by the withdrawal of conventional services. However this is unlikely to be possible in more than a very few instances as CT operators are not sufficient in number and have inadequate resources to deal with the scale of
withdrawals being considered – not only in Worcestershire. Furthermore CT operators are by no means immune from similar problems and some have already run into difficulties and in a number of cases have ceased trading in the last few months.

Neither the importance of local bus services in the local economy nor the impact of the withdrawal of all subsidies should be underestimated. It is not just the subsidised services that are at stake here.

As stated earlier, we do understand that savings have to be made but if it is unavoidable that cuts do have to be made to bus subsidies (ie if the savings required cannot be achieved elsewhere) we urge the Council to very carefully consider the following suggestions before coming to any irreversible decision to cut all bus subsidies.

Option 1) Carefully consider each service individually with the relevant contracting operator before withdrawing subsidies. Some may be obvious candidates for either operating commercially or withdrawing completely and some may simply be able to sustain a subsidy reduction, but at least the Council would be clear on the implications of such decisions, given open dialogue with operators. On behalf of Whittles I can assure you that we would be open to this dialogue on the understanding that sensitive commercial information is dealt with in the utmost confidence.

Option 2) Alternatively consider the fact that operators would have a far greater chance of coping with these if they were not made in one fell swoop. The Council is facing the need to make savings in future years too. If the subsidies were reduced gradually over two years or more this would give operators a fighting chance to respond to the financial implications. For example higher fares could be introduced in stages which would be less likely to deter passengers, as it is well known through industry experience that passengers are very resistant to single large fare rises. This option would also leave the Council with future saving options.

One of the additional problems operators face in assessing this situation is the unknown factor of what other operators may choose to run commercially or not if subsidies are withdrawn. We are unable to discuss this with other operators for commercial and legal competition reasons, and therefore unable to assess what proposals might be put forward to the Council for amalgamating subsidised services which may be sensible to coordinate but may currently be operated by different firms.

For example there are currently two school services which are operated by one operator in the morning and another in the afternoon. The majority of revenue is taken by the morning operators. The afternoon journeys would be loss-making without a subsidy and could be withdrawn by the operator, leaving the unacceptable situation of a bus to school in the morning but no return journey in the afternoon. However the morning and afternoon journeys together may be viable for one operator, even if a lower overall subsidy is still necessary if the ‘profit’ from the morning journey is still insufficient to offset the ‘losses on the afternoon run.

We submit this response in good faith and are happy to enter into any further discussions which the Council may deem useful in an effort to reduce the impact of this proposal which particularly if implemented in full and at once will have a devastating impact and on some smaller bus operators.