

Executive Decision Report

Supported Bus Services – 2012/13 Budget Reductions Proposals

Decision to be taken by: City Mayor

Decision to be taken on: 2nd September 2013

Lead director: Andrew Smith

Useful information

- Ward(s) affected: All
- Report author: Mark Wills
- Author contact details: 01162528933
- Report version number: v1

1. Summary

1.1 This purpose of this report is to seek the City Mayor's approval to the supported bus service proposals detailed in Appendix 3 which achieve the required budget reductions approved by Council in March 2012.

2. Recommendations

The City Mayor is recommended:

- 2.1 To approve the supported bus services funding proposals described in paragraph 3.6 and detailed in Appendix 3.
- 2.2 To delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transportation and Economic Development to procure contracts to implement these proposals.
- 2.3 to note that any feasible mitigating actions identified through the consultation exercise and equality impact assessment work will be implemented where practicable

3. Supporting information including options considered:

Background

3.1 The City Council financially supports a number of bus services operated by private bus companies under contracts awarded on competitive tenders. These services are not commercially viable but have been provided to fulfil a social need. Typically these services support elderly and disabled people, are not "direct" routes on main radial roads into the city and are provided where commercial bus services do not operate. The list of all currently supported bus services is provided at Appendix 1. Also included in Appendix 1 is the list of current services ranked using the assessment criteria described in paragraph 3.4 of this report. The Greater Leicester bus map shows all local bus service routes included supported services routes.

3.2 In the 2012/13 budget, the Council agreed a budget saving of £200k p.a., resulting in a remaining annual budget of £300k p.a. However, no service reductions have yet been implemented. The budget reductions are being covered on a non-recurrent basis from within the CDN departmental budget.

Options

3.3 There are five principal areas that have been examined in the formulation of the proposals:

i) Supported bus services to Schools.

In accordance with previous decisions, most supported bus services to Schools have

been continued commercially (without subsidy) or (in two cases) terminated due to low usage. This removal of subsidy saved approximately £40k. Hence these newly commercial Schools services have not been considered further.

ii) Reducing Services

Service reductions, in terms of day, time of day or frequency, have been examined. Appendix 2 shows the various options that have been considered.

iii) Combining routes or parts of routes

In some cases there may be potential for routes, or parts of routes, being combined with other commercial bus services, thereby requiring less support. Appendix 2 shows the various options that have been considered.

iv) Using the in-house Passenger and Adult Transport Service (PATS)

PATS is the in-house “yellow” fleet of minibuses which operates the Dial-a-Ride Service along with many other activities. The option of using Dial-a-Ride has been considered and it is proposed to use PATS to replace the “supported” section of service 21A between Hamilton Centre and Hamilton Lane.

v) Route closures caused by budget restrictions

The service at greatest risk of termination on financial grounds is Service 10/11 (Inner Circle clockwise and anticlockwise), which currently is supported at a net cost of approximately £200,000 per annum. The proposal relating to Service 10/11 is shown in Appendix 3. The proposal offers a lower cost means of catering for the Clarendon Park area which is the section of Service 10/11 which has generated most support for the service.

Assessment of proposals for supported bus services

3.4 The criteria provided in Table 3.0 have been used to help assess the overall value of services and possible changed services. The criteria have been developed for Leicester noting; the results of the initial consultation, the financial situation at Leicester, Leicester’s compact urban area, Leicester’s current bus service network and having consulted with other areas such as Passenger Transport Executives (PTEs) and County Councils. The PTEs and Counties contacted have comprehensive methodologies due to the complexity of their geography/communities, size of budgets and number of contracts. Transport for Greater Manchester has 477 supported bus service contracts for example. Criteria used by other authorities as part of their policies and assessments include:

- Cost per passenger trip
- Percentage of households without cars
- Percentage of trips for other purposes
- Percentage of trips unable to use fixed route services (DRT)
- “access standard” – proximity of nearest bus stop/service,
- “demand standard” based on the number of passengers per journey

3.5 The criteria in Table 3.0 are mostly self-explanatory. The lack of alternative services is a measure of access, or lack of, to a nearby bus service. For example users of the inner circle service could generally use radial bus services for most trips to go into and then out of the city for their trip. Whilst users of the outer circle could also do this their overall journey time would very long. The availability criteria has

been developed from the initial survey conclusion “Based on all respondents (women and men) 60% preferred the services to be available during the weekdays rather than the weekends and evening. The most popular times passengers used the bus services was between 9am-6pm”. Where information is not available for a service, assumptions have been made using “professional judgement”.

Table 3.0 Criteria to help assess overall value of service

Volume of patronage	Subsidy per passenger journey	Lack of alternative services (access)	Cost	Availability of supported service
20k = 1	£5 = 1	Good alternatives = 1	£200k pa = 0 £150k pa = 1	Sunday evening = 1
40k = 2	£4 = 2		£100k pa = 2	Evenings, Sunday = 2
80k = 3	£3 = 3		£60k pa = 3	Sat, Sun, evenings = 3
150k = 4	£2 = 4		£30k pa = 4	Daytime Mon to Fri = 4
250k = 5	£1 = 5	Poor alternatives = 5	£10k pa = 5	Daytime everyday = 5

Proposals for public consultation

3.6 The proposals developed have taken the findings from the initial consultations (see below) into account and aim to achieve the maximum amount of user value for the budget available. The proposed supported bus service network to be provided within the resources available, including assessment score, is detailed in Appendix 3.

Consultation

3.7 Initial consultation by way of a survey of supported bus services users was carried out between 20 January 2012 and 10 February 2012 in which 1021 of people took part. Information on the purpose of their journeys and views as to the effects of possible service reductions has been used to help identify transport needs to be met by the supported bus services network within the resources available and to develop the assessment methodology.

3.8 The Bus User Panel (BUP), Inclusive Design Advisory Panel (IDAP), Leicester’s Disabled Persons Access Group (LPDAG) and Transport and Climate Change Scrutiny Commission were consulted on the proposed assessment methodology. No specific comments were made relating to the proposed methodology by the BUP. The Panel’s comments related to the importance users place on certain supported bus services.

3.9 Feedback from IDAP/LPDAG was to suggest an assessment involving a weighting to the equality/social aspects of supported bus services. It would include focussing on a) people who would be particularly vulnerable to service changes/ losses, and b) the constraints and possible opportunities of mitigation in relation to these vulnerable users. It would also include accessibility to alternative bus services, local topography and time of day of services. The issue of including a weighting relating to equality/social aspects was considered when developing the proposed methodology but was discounted due to complexity and appropriateness of comparing impacts

across the different protected groups and the reasons for the journeys (comparing journeys for work against shopping for example). The equality issues will be addressed through the equality impact assessment process. The feedback also suggested considering possible mitigating actions such as looking at retaining particular sections of current routes and/or re-routing sections of routes. This has been addressed through the option appraisal work described in this report.

3.10 The Transport and Climate Change Scrutiny Commission were very supportive of the proposed assessment methodology as a tool to help inform decision making.

3.11 There was a full public consultation exercise on the proposals at Appendix 3 from 17th June to 22nd July 2013. The consultation included notices advising of the consultation, which went out to bus operators for posting in all buses operating in Leicester. Consultation leaflets were available at Customer Service Centres, Libraries and on line. The consultation exercise was launched through the media on 15th June and a reminder article in the local press.

3.12 174 responses were received from the consultation, 141 from leaflet returns and 33 from the web consultation. Two thirds were received from women and one third from men. Most respondents were people over 60. Of the responses 74 were received from users of service 10/11 and 87 from users the service 36, 17 to Service 21A. The main purpose of the journeys made by the respondents was for shopping, followed by medical visits and leisure.

3.13 The main messages from the consultation are:

i) A strong feeling against the proposed withdrawal of service 36. Users tend to be elderly, have said they have no other form of transport and rely on this service for accessing shops, medical centres and leisure/social events. Many say they have mobility issues due to medical conditions and feel that the removal of this service would render them 'house bound'. Service 36 proposals were discussed at length at the Evington ward community meeting on 19th July 2013.

ii) The proposed withdrawal of service 10/11 also attracted a lot of adverse comments about how this would affect passengers, again mostly elderly, in accessing leisure centres, shops and medical facilities, including hospitals.

3.14 The BUP, IDAP, LPDAG, the Older Persons Forum and the Economic Development, Transport and Tourism Scrutiny Commission have been consulted on the proposals provided at Appendix 3. The BUP have made comments via their individual groups. General comments were made about coordinating timetables of bus services to make 'cross Leicester' journeys more time efficient.

3.15 A summary of IDAP's comments are that it is concerned that any cuts to services will have a negative impact on disabled and other users, and will make getting around the city more difficult. However, the Panel understands the challenges and difficult decisions which have to be made following last year's budget cuts and that the very high subsidies and low use of some of these services make them unsustainable in their present form. The Panel welcome the latest efforts to establish clear evaluation criteria to inform proposals and to mitigate the impact of cuts e.g. by retaining sections of routes with more use/ value by combining these with other services.

3.16 The LPDAG welcomed the approach but concerns were raised about the methodology in responding to access and the evaluation of access, in particular the

weighting of alternatives. Officers feel that this proposed approach would be over complex and that a use of local knowledge to measure and assess access is preferable in regard to supported bus services.

3.17 The Older Persons Forum received a presentation on the methodology and proposals on the 31st July. The forum accepted the proposals, but noted particular comments in regard to Service 36. The City Mayor's decision following the results of the consultation will be reported back to the Forum in due course.

3.18 The Economic Development, Transport and Tourism Scrutiny Commission supported the proposals and complemented officers on the thoroughness of the consultation carried out.

3.19 While reductions to supported services will mean changes for some users the overall objective is to maintain the best value overall. Hospital journeys were specifically referred to and it is clear a significant number of users do make hospital journeys. Alternatives for the 36 for example are to use the 16, 40, UHL hopper, which will mean taking other services such as the 22 from Evington to reach these service routes. With reference to the message from consultation exercise (paragraph 3.13) mitigation measures identified through the Equality Impact Assessment and consultation exercise, as noted in paragraph 5.4.6, will be implemented where feasible.

3.20 The proposals developed have taken the findings from the various consultations (see below) into account and aim to achieve the maximum amount of user value for the budget available. Subject to the City Mayor's approval service changes will be implemented during September/October 2013 noting the need to give the Traffic Commissioner 56 days notice. The proposed supported bus service network to be provided within the resources available is detailed in Appendix 3.

The City Mayor is recommended to approve the supported bus services funding proposals described in paragraph 3.6 and detailed in Appendix 3.

The City Mayor is recommended to delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transportation and Economic Development to procure contracts to implement these proposals.

4. Details of Scrutiny

4.1 The Transport and Climate Change Scrutiny Commission was briefed, at its meeting on 30th April 2013, on the current situation regarding supported bus services and on the methodology developed to help to determine the network of services to be provided within the budget available. The Commission was fully supportive of the methodology developed.

4.2 The Economic Development, Transport and Tourism Scrutiny Commission considered the supported bus services proposals and consultation on the proposals at its meeting on 31 July 2013. The Commission supported the proposals.

5. Financial, legal and other implications

5.1 Financial implications

Financial Implications

5.1.1 Implementing the proposals detailed in this paper will achieve the savings of £200k in the 2012/13 budget strategy and result in the costs balancing to the budget of £300k for future years.

Colin Sharpe, Head of Finance, City Development and Neighbourhoods

5.2 Legal implications

5.2.1 The Transport Act 1985 empowers the Council to secure the provision of such public passenger transport services considered appropriate to secure to meet any public transport requirements within the area which would not in the Councils view be met apart from any action taken by the Council for that purpose. The report details the need to reduce the spending on subsidised Bus Services and the options available.

5.2.2 The Council has a public sector equality duty it must comply with under the Equality Act 2010 which requires it to ensure that it does not discriminate against any protected groups with protected characteristics. These groups are detailed in the Equality Impact Assessment introduction paragraphs. The Council must ensure that these groups are not discriminated against by any changes. The Equality Impact Assessment covers these aspects and the effect the proposals have on the groups involved.

Jamie Guazzaroni, Solicitor , Legal Services

5.3 Climate Change and Carbon Reduction implications

5.3.1 Carbon emissions from transport make up nearly 20% of city-wide carbon emissions and supporting bus patronage is a significant area of action to tackle these emissions. All of the options being considered are likely to impact negatively on levels of bus patronage. However, the potential impact of these options on carbon emissions is difficult to quantify as it is difficult to predict the response of bus users to the different options being considered. Bus users may choose to use their private car, or not make the journey at all, use an alternative bus route, walk or cycle.

Carol Brass 29 6732

5.4 Equality Impact Assessment

5.4.1 An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out on the proposals using the findings of the early 2012 passenger survey and the consultation feedback. The EIA highlighted the following impacts for persons in the following categories;

- Age:
- Low Income
- Disabled
- Gender
- Race.

5.4.2 With regard to each route data has been gathered in relation to users characteristics and purpose of journey. The impact assessment has referred to a method for evaluating supported services. The method takes account of the cost, usage, access, time of day in order to evaluate services. Data from the 2012 passenger survey has informed the methodology. Options available to the Council include reducing services, blending services and adjusting routes and using alternative forms of transport such as dial a ride service to help those with restricted mobility.

5.4.3 The routes and proposals have been evaluated and scored using the method and prioritised to ascertain the best value for money options to provide for the majority of passengers and therefore mitigate against negative outcomes. It is inevitable that some negative outcomes will occur. These outcomes will involve walking to other routes or catching more than bus to reach a destination or using an alternative form of transport.

5.4.4 Those services with users most affected are the 10/11 and the 36 which are proposed to be ended in their present form. The proposals maintain services for the majority of current users.

5.4.5 Continued mitigation is to remain aware of the impact on affected groups and take further advice from representative organisations and to minimise the impact of any future changes to bus services on vulnerable groups by using the evaluation model to evaluate future service changes in terms of value for money, usage and accessibility and passengers characteristics.

5.4.6 To implement any possible actions as a result of consultation feedback and following the meeting with the Disabled Access Group with regard to outstanding concerns on the 10/11 and 36 services, especially in relation to hospital users. This will include seeking to link the Hospital Hopper with the new service 73, liaising with the bus companies regarding amending commercial services to improve links to the General Hospital and pursuing improvements to bus services connectivity in the city centre through the proposed new Haymarket Bus Station.

The City Mayor is recommended to approve pursuing implementing any feasible mitigating actions identified through the consultation exercise and equality impact assessment work.

5.5 Equalities Implications

5.5.1 The consultation survey was useful in identifying the range of transport needs for bus passengers along these routes. The main uses were for shopping, medical and hospital appointments. The largest proportions of bus users surveyed were young and older people, women, and disabled people who indicated that they would experience negative impacts should their subsidised bus services end. Many users indicated that they would find it difficult to use other bus routes or find alternative means of transport. The consultation survey findings, on a route by route analysis, show different patterns of need (demonstrated by purpose of journey) for the main protected characteristics cited: age, gender, disability and ethnicity.

5.5.2 The proposals in Appendix 3 seek to maintain some element of service to

enable continued use of public transport for those with no/limited access to alternative provision – the 2011 census findings indicate that 37% of city households have no access to a car or van. The proposals aim to mitigate the potential negative impact of having no provision, within the existing resources available. Although some users will experience some loss of service, the resulting negative impact can be further reduced if they can exercise choice as to when they make their journeys. This would apply to all protected characteristics.

5.5.3 The Leicester Disabled People's Access Group have identified other equality issues for consideration, among which are the difficulty for some disabled people of having to change buses in the city centre, and that for some disabled people, they can only cope with a single bus journey. These are broader issues relate more to the infrastructure of the bus service provision across the city.

Irene Kszyk, Corporate Equalities Lead

6. Background information and other papers:

Equality Impact Assessment Supported Bus Services

Consultation Findings Report on supported bus services May 2012

7. Summary of appendices:

Appendix 1 - List of all currently supported bus services

Appendix 2 - Potential Future Options for each current Service

Appendix 3 - Proposed supported bus service network

8. Is this a private report (If so, please indicated the reasons and state why it is not in the public interest to be dealt with publicly)? No

9. Is this a “key decision”? Yes

10. If a key decision please explain reason Proposals affect all wards

Appendix 1 List of all currently supported services and assessment score (Passenger data based on most recent data available (full year based on Apr-Dec 2012)

Service	Route	Details	Operator	Current Annual Net Subsidy Cost	Annual Passenger Total	Net Cost per passenger journey
10/11	Inner Circle	Complete Daily Service	Centrebus	£199,551	38,682	£5.16
17	Centre – Highfields	Evening service	First	£7,967	14,208	£0.56
21A	Centre – Nether Hall	Extension to Hamilton Lane	First	£25,000	N/A	N/A
36	Centre – Evington	Complete weekday Service	Centrebus	£87,264	27,037	£3.23
40	Circle line	Complete Weekday Service	Centrebus	£62,011	249,713	£0.50
55	Centre – Thurcaston	Complete weekday service	Centrebus	£68,225	36,821	£1.85
70	Centre – Winstanley Drive	Complete evening service	First	£38,125	13,104	£2.91
70	Centre – Winstanley Drive	Complete Sunday daytime Service	Kinchbus	£8,178	8,600	£0.95
73	Centre – Gilmorton	Post Oct '10 Service	Veolia	£64,995	29,711	£2.19
81	Centre – Highway Road	2 peak hour journeys plus the Saturday service	Centrebus	£15,637	33,991	£0.46
162	Centre – New Parks	Weekday service	Roberts	£80,703	40,036	£2.02
S1005	Northfield – Judgemeanow	Schooldays	Total Travel	£9,197	13,729	£0.67
805	Crown Hills – Evington Schools	Schooldays	Confidence	£19,766	9,169	£2.16
878	City of Leicester Sch - Nether Hall	Schooldays	Confidence	£8,550	N/A	N/A

Service	Route	Annual Net Subsidy Cost	Annual Passenger Total	Net Cost per passenger journey and score (low subsidy is high score)	Lack of Alternative Availability Score (lack of is high score)	Time of day/day of week Score (daytime, week - high score)	Overall Score (high is good)
81	City Centre Highway Rd	£15,637 5	33,991 2	£0.46 5	5	5	22
40	Circle line Outer ring	£124,000(50%) 1	249,713 5	£0.50 5	5	5	21
878	City of Leicester School Netherhall	£8,550 5	1	5	4	5	20
162	City Centre New Parks	£40,000 4	18,016 2	£2.22 4	4	5	19
70	City Centre Winstanley Sundays	£8,178 5	8,600 1	£0.95 5	5	3	19
55	City Centre - Thurcaston	£68,225 3	36,821 2	£1.85 4	4	5	18
162	City Centre New Parks	£80,703 3	40,036 2	£2.02 4	4	5	18

73	City Centre – Gilmorton	£64,995 3	29,711 1	£2.19 4	3	5	16
36	City Centre – Evington	£87,264 2	27,037 1	£3.23 3	5	5	16
17	City Centre – Highfields	£7,967 5	14,208 1	£0.56 5	3	2	16
70	City Centre Winstanley Evenings	£38,125 4	13,104 1	£2.91 3	5	2	15
21A	City Centre – Hamilton Lane	£25,000 4	1	3	1	5	14
10/11	Inner Circle	£199,551 0	38,682 2	£5.16 1	1	5	9

Appendix 2 - Potential Future Options for each current Service

Service	Route	Option(s)	Estimated Cost
10/11	Inner Link	a. Withdraw the service	£0
		b. Merge service 73 with the southern part of services 10/11 and part of 36 to form new 10/10A service	£115k
		c. Continue the service	£200k
<p>Comment: The sector between the General Hospital and Fosse Park is better used than the northern part of the service. The Disabled Peoples' Access Group and residents in Castle and Freeman Wards made representations to retain the service.</p> <p>Option b combines the most used section of services 10/11 with Gilmorton estate and part of service 36. Most of the lobbying to retain services 10/11 comes from the Clarendon Park area, which remains catered for – though the link to the General Hospital is lost. There is low usage on the rest of the 10/11 route and users will have to travel via the City Centre using 2 bus services.</p>			
17	City – Highfields	a. Withdraw funding for the service	£0
		b. Continue the service	£8k
<p>Comment: The supported service comprises the last hour of operation between 1900 & 2000.</p>			
21A	Hamilton Lane	a. Operate a “Dial a Ride” facility serving Hamilton Lane	£7.5k
		b. Continue the service	£25k
<p>Comment: The service caters for residents with mobility issues who cannot access services on Nether Hall Road. Usage is low and could be more cost effectively catered for by a Dial a Ride service. Conversion to a Dial a Ride Service will reduce the service as follows: Current Service - 0630 – 1900 Monday to Saturday, Dial a Ride Service - 0915 – 1500 Monday to Friday</p>			
36	City – Evington	a. Withdraw the service	£0
		b. Reduce to 0930 – 1430 only	£30k
		c. Merge with Services 22/22A to form new 22A/B	£20k
		d. Leave service unchanged	£87.2k
<p>Comment: Usage is low but it is the only service that:</p>			

a) Serves Green Lane Road b) Links Green Lane Road and Spinney Hills to General Hospital c) Serves Davenport Road d) Serves Whitehall Road/Goodwood Road Option c provides lower cost replacements for most of the route. Most of the route between the City Centre and Goodwood Road would be withdrawn. The section of route at Goodwood Road/Whitehall Road, would see an improvement in service hours, but would lose the link to the General Hospital and Green Lane Road.			
40	Outer Circle	a. Withdraw the service	£0
		b. Leave the service unchanged	£62k
Comment: This orbital route is co-funded with the County and links outlying housing estates with local centres such as hospitals, industrial estates and shopping centres.			
55	City – Thurcaston	a. Withdraw the service	£0
		b. Withdraw the Beaumont Centre - Thurcaston section	£35k
		c. Withdraw the Saturday service	£55k
		d. Leave the service unchanged	£68.2k
Comment: Relatively few passengers use the service between Beaumont Centre and Thurcaston. Option b -there would be no service remaining in Leicester Road Thurcaston (County) or Thurcaston Pastures (City). The route between Beaumont Centre and Thurcaston would cease. Beaumont Lodge is served by other services, Thurcaston Pastures (the future Ashton Green) loses it's only service as does most of Thurcaston.			
70	City – Braunstone (Evenings and Sundays)	a. Withdraw the evening and Sunday service	£0
		b. Withdraw evening journeys after 2100 and the Sunday service	£12k
		c. Keep the Sunday service	£8.4
		d. Leave the service unchanged	£46.3k
Comment: Service 70 is the only service to Winstanley Drive – the eastern part of Braunstone estate. If withdraw evening journeys after 2100 and the Sunday service there would be no bus service on Imperial Avenue or Winstanley Drive. The nearest other services are in Hinckley Road, Fosse Road (not Sun) and Narborough Road.			
73	City – Gilmorton	a. Withdraw the service	£0
		b. Proposal to include an offpeak service replacing 10/11	Cost incl in

			10/11 above
		c. Operate a “Dial a Ride” facility serving Gilmorton Estate	£30k (guesstimate)
		d. Leave service unchanged	£65k
Comment: This is the only bus to Gilmorton Estate without which residents face a steep gradient to Lutterworth Road. Option b for services 10/11 provide a lower cost but offpeak replacement that links Gilmorton and the Centre.			
81	City – Highway Road	a. Withdraw the service	£0
		b. Reduce the frequency to hourly	£10k
		c. Leave the service unchanged	£15.6k
Comment: This is the only service to the “hilly” areas comprising the “Way Roads” between Evington Road and London Road.			
162	City – New Parks	a. Withdraw the service	£0k
		b. Withdraw the Saturday service	£60k
		c. Withdraw the peak time service and Saturday service	£40k
		d. Leave the service unchanged	£80.7k
Comment: Some sections of the route in New Parks Ward are not served by any other bus service. If withdraw the Saturday service and reduce Mon – Fri to operate between 0930 & 1500 only users travelling before 0930, after 1500 and on Saturdays would need to walk to use alternative bus services on Stephenson Drive, Dominion Road and Liberty Road.			
878	City of Leicester School – Nether Hall	a. Withdraw service	£0
		b. Leave the service unchanged	£8.6k
Comment: This service is required to take pupils from St Paul’s and City of Leicester Schools to Nether Hall. In the morning they are accommodated on a commercial service. Split School finishing times require the supported afternoon service.			

Appendix 3 - Proposed supported bus service network

Service	Route	Option	Score
10/11	Inner Link	Option b - It is proposed that service 10/11 is withdrawn , but that users in the Clarendon Park and Knighton areas, which is the only area where there is significant usage, are served by revising the route of Service 73 to serve the 10/11 route between Aylestone Road and Victoria Park Road.	n/a
Impact – The link to the General Hospital is lost. There is low usage on the rest of the 10/11 route and users will have to travel via the City Centre using 2 bus services.			
17	City – Highfields	Option b - This service is proposed to continue without change . The support funds the last hour of the service which is otherwise commercial	16
Impact – The supported element comprises the last hour of service between 1900 & 2000 hours.			
21A	City to Humberstone and Hamilton	Option a - The supported section of this service, extended to serve Hamilton Lane, is proposed to be replaced by a pre-bookable Dial a Ride service that could be used by residents of Hamilton Lane with impaired mobility who cannot access bus services on Nether Hall Road, New Romney Crescent or Ivychurch Crescent. The service will be available 0800 – 1700 Monday to Friday and 1000 – 1400 Saturdays.	18
Impact – Conversion to a Dial a Ride Service will reduce the service as follows: Current Service - 0630 – 1900 Monday to Saturday Dial a Ride Service - 0915 – 1500 Monday to Friday			
22/22a	City – Evington	It is proposed that the route of Centrebus service 22A/B is amended to serve Whitehall Road, replacing the 36. While this does not provide a link to Spinney Hills, it provides a better, cost effective, link to the City Centre.	16
36	City – Evington	Option c - proposal to merge the Whitehall Road/Goodwood Road section of route with Services 22/22A. The rest of the route between the City Centre and Goodwood Road to be withdrawn.	n/a
Impact – Most of the route between the City Centre and Goodwood Road would be withdrawn. The section of route at Goodwood Road/Whitehall Road, would see an improvement in service hours, but would lose the link to the General Hospital and Green Lane Road.			

40	Outer Circle	Option b - leave the service unchanged	21
Impact – None			
55	City – Thurcaston	Option b - proposal to withdraw the Beaumont Centre - Thurcaston section	19
Impact – The route between Beaumont Centre and Thurcaston would cease. Beaumont Lodge is served by other services, Thurcaston Pastures (the future Ashton Green) loses it's only service as does most of Thurcaston.			
70	City – Braunstone (Evening & Sunday)	Option c - The Monday to Saturday evening journeys First service 70 are proposed to be withdrawn . Alternative services are available on Hinckley Road, Fosse Road or Narborough Road. The Sunday operation of Kinchbus service 70 is proposed to be continued without change .	n/a 21
Impact – There will be no evening bus service on Imperial Avenue or Winstanley Drive. The nearest other services are in Hinckley Road, Fosse Road and Narborough Road.			
73	City – Gilmorton	Option b - It is proposed that Service 73 continues to operate from Gilmorton estate but the route is amended to operate via Aylestone Leisure Centre, Clarendon Park, Victoria Park, Leicester University and the Rail Station.	12
Impact – There is little impact as the service is retained, but operates via Clarendon Park instead of Aylestone Road.			
81	City – Highway Road	Option c - This service is proposed to continue without change . The area served is hilly and remote from other bus services. This daytime service caters for core needs with journeys being made for retail, health and employment purposes.	22
Impact – none			
162	City – New Parks	Option c - This service is proposed to be amended to operate between peak times on Monday to Friday only. This retains a service for users who cannot access mainstream bus services at off peak times. Passengers wishing to travel at peak time or Saturday have access to other services in New Parks but may have further to walk to access them.	19
Impact – Users travelling before 0930, after 1500 and on Saturdays would need to walk to use alternative bus services on Stephenson Drive, Dominion Road and Liberty Road.			
S1005	Northfields – City of Leicester School	Option b - commercial operation	n/a

Impact – None – so long as the service remains commercially viable.			
805	Spinney Hill - City of Leicester School	Option b - commercial operation	n/a
Impact – None – so long as the service remains commercially viable.			
878	City of Leicester School – Nether Hall	Option b - This service is proposed to continue without change . It caters for pupils travelling home from City of Leicester and St Paul’s Schools to Nether Hall who would otherwise have to walk home or make two bus journeys via the centre.	20
Impact – None.			

