

Overview & Scrutiny  
In-Depth Review Report

## **Passenger Transport Review**

Special Joint Overview & Scrutiny Panel

comprising 3 O&S Panels

Planning, Transportation, Economy & Sustainability  
Health & Social Services  
Education, Youth, Culture & Leisure

9 March 2005

**Review Panel Members:**

Andy Furse (chair)  
Gerry Curran  
Sally Davis  
Peter Edwards  
Hilary Fraser  
Peter Metcalfe  
Bryan Organ

With participation from  
Ruth Griffiths  
Leila Wishart

## Report Structure

1. Introduction
2. Context
  - 2.1 Headroom
  - 2.2 Overview & Scrutiny Involvement – A Joint O&S Panel
  - 2.3 Bath & North East Somerset Corporate Priorities
  - 2.4 Purpose of the Overview & Scrutiny Review
  - 2.5 Objectives of the Overview & Scrutiny Review
3. Review Method
  - 3.1 Background Briefing
  - 3.2 Seminar
  - 3.3 Market Research Study
  - 3.4 Correspondence & Submissions
  - 3.5 Public Contributor Meeting
4. Findings & Recommendations
  - 4.1 Models of Service Planning and Delivery
  - 4.2 Transport Route Planning
  - 4.3 Innovative Services
  - 4.4 Supported Bus Services
  - 4.5 Support for Elderly
  - 4.6 Dial a Ride / Voluntary Community Transport
  - 4.7 Concessionary Travel Schemes (Bus Passes & Travel Tokens)
  - 4.8 Social Services Transport
  - 4.9 School Transport
5. List of Appendices
6. Review Structure & Organisation

## 1. Introduction

A joint Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Panel has undertaken a review of Passenger Transport Services managed by Bath & North East Somerset Council, with a view to recommending improvements to the ways in which these services are prioritised, developed and organised in the future.

This report sets out the Panel's approach to the review, its findings and recommendations to the Council Executive.

The report is supported by a number of important appendices which are seen by the panel to also warrant careful attention.

## 2. Context

### 2.1 Headroom

The Council is pursuing a series of 'Headroom Projects' with the aim of creating best value efficiencies within the organisation. Priority has been given to opportunities that were already being addressed to a degree through current activities within services.

A *Passenger Transport Headroom Project* has been initiated, from an original idea raised by the EYCL O&S Panel, to investigate opportunities around improving service delivery and costs across the whole range of Council managed passenger transport provision, including:

- Home to school transport routes and costs
- Supported public transport services
- Use of Council fleet
- Opportunities for discretionary charging under the Local Government Act 2003
- Cost & use of concessionary fares
- Community Transport initiatives (inc. volunteer drivers & dial-a-ride)
- Changing needs of Social Services
- Supported taxi services

The headroom project is investigating issues and opportunities around these themes with a view to seeking improvements to the way in which passenger transport services are managed and provided by the Council. Main project stages are:

1. Research & identification of best practice (Jan – June '04)
2. Engagement with relevant stakeholders to inform a comprehensive needs analysis (July -Nov '04) (with O&S acting as the principle consultation channel)
3. A range of options identified with recommendations to the Executive for an improved service delivery model (early 2005)

### 2.2 Overview & Scrutiny Involvement - A Joint O&S Panel

The issues raised by the Passenger Transport Headroom Project cut across the remit of 3 different O&S Panels, so a special Joint Panel, comprising councillors from each, has been set up. The relevant Panels contributing members to this review are:

- Planning, Transportation, Economy & Sustainability (PTES)
- Education, Youth, Culture & Leisure (EYCL)
- Health & Social Services (H&SS)

The Chairs of these 3 panels have agreed membership arrangements for this Panel to ensure wide geographic representation (city, town & country) from

across the Local Authority area. The Panel is politically proportional as per other O&S Panels operated by the Council.

### **2.3 Bath & North East Somerset Corporate Priorities**

Ten improvement priorities were defined in the Council's 3 year Financial & Corporate Plan adopted in February 2004 and three of these are applicable to the O&S Review:

- Improving customer satisfaction
- Promoting the independence of older people
- Improving the quality of public transport, roads and pavements and easing congestion

### **2.4 Purpose of the Overview & Scrutiny Review**

The purpose of O&S Panel involvement has been to support the headroom project by acting as the key communication & consultation channel for the Engagement phase of the project (stage 2 above).

Members have been able to take soundings from a range of consultees through the open public O&S process, and represent these views as findings to support recommendations in this report to the Council Executive. The Executive (in consultation with the Headroom Project Team) will come to decisions on the issues raised.

This method of working is classified as the 'overview' role of Overview and Scrutiny, where the Panel is acting in a pathfinder context to support the Executive in developing policy, formulating plans and making decisions around important community issues.

### **2.5 Objectives of the Overview & Scrutiny Review**

The objectives of this Overview & Scrutiny Review have been to:

- Understand the issues relating to passenger transport provision by Bath & North East Somerset.
- Undertake public engagement on the issues to inform and widen the debate around the future direction of passenger transport provision by the Council.
- Provide the Panel's findings and recommendations on the issues to the Council Executive to enable decisions on implementation of future plans to be well informed.

Appendix A provides the full Terms of Reference for the review.

### 3. Review Method

The review has used a number of research and fact finding methods to gather information:

#### 3.1 Background Briefing

At the start of the O&S review, a background briefing and comprehensive report was provided by the Headroom Project Team to support Panel members' understanding of the broad range of issues and opportunities relating to Passenger Transport for Bath & North East Somerset, including:

- the current range of Council supported public transport services: Taxis; Dial-a-ride, supported bus services, etc.
- current Council plans and policies to address local issues as well as initiatives already under development within existing service plans.
- government policy that regulates the Council's role in providing services and future opportunities developing nationally through recent changes in Government policy.

Discussions allowed Members an opportunity to clarify the scope of their review and contributed to the definition by the Panel of their Terms of Reference.

#### 3.2 Seminar

The panel hosted a one-day seminar on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2004 with national and regional speakers from organisations engaged authoritatively with passenger transport services. The Panel, speakers and service officers were able to explore collectively the principles underpinning successful delivery of passenger transport services.

Appendix B provides a list of speakers, organisations and topics covered. Copies of the presentations are also included.

#### 3.3 Market Research Study

A market research study was commissioned jointly by the O&S Panel and Headroom Project to support the Review. The comprehensive survey involved 300 on-street questionnaire interviews with demographically selected members of the public, across the Authority areas. A figure of 300 interviews is enough residents to be a statistically accurate poll (within 95%) of the views of all Bath & North East Somerset citizens.

Some of the key conclusions of the poll:

##### *Bus services*

- Bus usage is more prevalent amongst the youngest (<25) and oldest (65+).
- Bus access to hospitals is a priority for improvement.

- Weekend, evening and night-time bus services are the most in need of improvement.

#### *Council funding*

- Strong public support for the majority of council funded services (most home to school transport\*, dial-a-ride & community schemes assisting elderly & disabled, supported bus services on non-commercial routes).
- Strong view that schemes should be available to all and not means tested.

*\*Exceptionally, there was little support for free transport for children who attend a denominational school outside their area.*

The Panel found the results of the survey very useful in objectively supporting its findings and recommendations and we urge that the results should also be considered by Executive members.

Appendix C provides the full Market Research study and results.

### **3.4 Correspondence & Submissions**

The Panel considered views expressed in letters and emails from the public and interested organisations. These were received either in response to a direct invitation to organised groups to provide comments, or from individuals as a result of press coverage about the review initiated through press releases. A webpage about the review with an on-line feedback form was created for the review and publicised in a press release.

Appendix D provides the press release and correspondence received by the Panel.

### **3.5 Public Contributor Meeting**

An all day public meeting took place on 16th November 2004.

#### ***Morning: Council Service Teams involved in Passenger Transport.***

The Panel received an introductory presentation from the project manager of the Council's Headroom project on Passenger Transport, outlining the current services and potential opportunities for improvement and development in services.

This was followed by four separate in-depth briefings from Council service teams / service officers that contribute to the provision of passenger transport services, to fully explore specific issues:

#### *Service providers:*

- Supported & Community Transport Services
- Commercial Services

*Internal Customers:*

- Social Services Transport issues
- Education Transport Issues

***Afternoon: Wider perspectives.***

The Panel sought the views of local service users, service providers, and representative support organisations to explore the Council's passenger transport services from the community's perspective.

The contributions covered:

*Community Transport Providers*

- Success of Dial-a-Ride and the opportunities and challenges for the future (Keynsham Dial-a-Ride)
- Role of commissioned taxi services in supporting Council provision (Abbey Taxis & Somerset Taxis)
- Difficulties in securing grant funding (Farmborough Good Neighbours)

*Service Users:*

- Difficulties with school bus services (Hayesfield School & St. Marks School)
- Issues affecting elderly persons' use of bus services (Action for Pensioners)

Appendix E provides a full record of the public contributor meeting.

## 4. Findings & Recommendations

A large amount of information was provided to the Panel in the course of undertaking this review, and given the widespread and numerous sources, the Panel determined to take a thematic approach to reporting its findings, general conclusions and recommendations.

Under each category documented in this section of the report, the Panel have provided general comments and on some we provide specific recommendations. These are each numbered and highlighted in boxes at the end of relevant sections.

Through the O&S Recommendations Tracking Process, we will be requesting an Executive response to all our recommendations. Given the extensive range of issues raised by this review relating to efficiencies and savings, our report and recommendations will be sent to the Executive Member for Resources for his response in consultation with the whole Executive.

Our full findings and recommendations follow below. Appendix F provides a summary.

### 4.1 Models of Service Planning and Delivery

The Panel considered the current departmental structures and methods of service delivery by Bath & North East Somerset and compared this with alternative models from local authorities recognised for the quality of their transport services.

We found that a popular structure of operation is the 'Integrated Transport Unit'. This is typified by a single service team with responsibility for all aspects of transport including:

- a single team co-ordinating all the Council's transport services, empowered to make decisions on the most efficient modes of service delivery, whether that be in-house or via contracted transport suppliers.
- organising the sharing of vehicles and drivers to deliver transport solutions across all council services, rather than segmented service provision. Typically this mode of operation seeks to extend the use of vehicles to maximise their utilisation, e.g. school buses used for daytime Social services transport and evening use as Community Transport.
- investment in modern, high quality, multi-purpose vehicles to support the variety of uses and durability requirements of increased utilisation.
- operating at full cost recover through a combination of trading and council subsidy with the service customers across the Council (Education, Social services departments) and external clients.

In comparison our Bath & North East Somerset transport is currently provided in a structure of 4 separate service areas (Commercial Services, Transport & Highways, Education, Social Services) operating under 3 different Directors.

The Panel heard that an integrated unit has the ability to concentrate on and excel in the provision of a comprehensive transport service (rather than the broader needs of services, e.g. education, social care, etc). Typically, a core list of services supported by an integrated team includes strategic & operational management of the entire passenger transport service, including:

- Home to school transport (all aspects including – Special Educational Needs (SEN), hazardous routes, statutory distance routes and denominational transport)
- Social services transport
- Supported bus services
- Advice/support to voluntary & community transport services
- Concessionary travel (bus passes & travel tokens)
- Management of the vehicle fleet

We believe the Council could learn more about integration from a bordering neighbour; South Gloucestershire are currently modernising their transport service structures to deliver integration using a successful model previously tried and tested in Telford & Wrekin Council (also in our National Unitaries Benchmarking (NUB) family). The seminar presentation by South Gloucestershire provided great inspiration and demonstrated a practical local example.

Essex County Council also demonstrated the benefits of integration, particularly for school bus services. Their representative spoke openly about the fears (unrealised) of individual services 'before' integration and the successes 'afterwards'.

Devon County Council provided a good example of an integrated unit, having established the concept and set up a team in 1986. Mr Tim Davies, Head of Transport Coordination at Devon, and Chair of the Association of Transport Coordinating Officers spoke authoritatively at the Panel's seminar about his personal experiences and the benefits of integration - both for a Council and its service users. His exuberance was equally tempered with reality by pointing out the difference in scale of County Council transport operations vs. those of a unitary authority. Nevertheless, opportunities abound.

The Panel discussed that, given the relatively small scale of our unitary authority, some of the advantages of integration may be difficult to achieve but the Panel suggest that the opportunities outweigh these restraints and integration is a model worthy of further detailed consideration.

In light of these findings, the Panel make the following recommendations:

**Recommendation 4.1.1**

The Executive should develop and bring together a Vision and a Strategy for integrated passenger transport services in Bath & North East Somerset, along the lines of the South Gloucestershire model, taking account of:

- Children and young people
- Poverty & Social Exclusion
- A safe, clean, sustainable environment
- Safety
- The local economy
- Accessibility
- Integration

In addition, planning of services should note the emphasis being placed by the Government via the preparation of the 2006 –2011 sub regional Transport LTP on four key criteria:

- Access
- Congestion
- Highway Safety
- Air Quality

**Recommendation 4.1.2**

Economies of scale in delivery of passenger transport services may be possible through close working relationships with neighbouring local authorities. Opportunities should be investigated.

**4.2 Transport Route Planning**

Bus route planning in Bath & North East Somerset tends to follow traditional patterns of routes linking between bus stations / interchanges in major town centres. However, these interchanges are rarely the final destination point of travellers and there are potentially other more suitable hubs that could be developed.

Most notably, hospital sites are (or could be) a prime consumer of passenger transport services for patients, their visitors, and hospital staff.

Universities offer a similar transport hub opportunity, as do major schools as potential nodes on a network of co-ordinated school bus services to interchange pupils and provide a wider network of home to school transport provision, particularly across the city of Bath.

**Recommendation 4.2.1**

A study should be undertaken to clearly identify core transport corridors, e.g. to and from the Royal United Hospital (RUH), universities, colleges, schools, social services centres, etc. In light of the results of the study, it may be possible to re-think the network of transport hubs, and hence transport services, across Bath & North East Somerset.

### 4.3 Innovative Services

At our Seminar we heard about innovative services developed by other local authorities to solve specific transport problems. Highlights were:

- The 'Fare Car' concept where a private hire car is operational in outlying rural communities at bus fare prices as part of an integrated system (Devon County Council)
- Spare capacity of the Council vehicle fleet made available to the NHS ambulance service for routine (non-emergency) patient transport.

#### Recommendation 4.3.1

Introduce the fare car concept to Bath & North East Somerset, possibly as an improved 'demand responsive' alternative (or replacement) to existing supported bus routes.

#### Recommendation 4.3.2

Seek to maximise the use of our commercial fleet through partnership working with the NHS ambulance service.

### 4.4 Supported Bus Services

The existing Council strategy of supplementing commercial bus routes with additional 'supported services' funded by the Council was considered by the Panel.

Low use rural, evening and weekend services tend to typify supported services. Council support costs per passenger journey vary widely from 53p to £6.53 (source: Headroom Report) and it is questionable whether this always represents good value for money. We heard about the difficulties the bus operator face in staffing the 'out of hours' services and the low quality of service that can result.

In other parts of this report we point towards innovative solutions that can provide passenger services (community services, integration, Fare Car or taxi buses) and we believe these should be evaluated for expansion / additional support in place of traditional subsidies to commercial bus companies.

#### Recommendation 4.4.1

Cease high cost supported bus contracts and evaluate alternatives that can provide improved services to customers, increase ridership and deliver better value to the council.

#### **4.5 Support for Elderly**

At the public contributor meeting, representatives from Action for Pensioners discussed the specific experiences of elderly transport users with Members of the Panel.

##### **Recommendation 4.5.1**

The series of points made by Action for Pensioners need investigation and methods for improvement planned and implemented, e.g:

- driver training in working with elderly people;
- safety at bus stops especially at night;
- route information weaknesses;
- more generous interpretation of bus pass usage;
- hours of operation, and;
- improved access

#### **4.6 Dial a Ride / Voluntary Community Transport**

The panel were greatly impressed with the variety of community services operating in Bath & North East Somerset and recognise the dedication of the volunteers that enable such schemes to flourish.

The Keynsham dial-a-ride was highlighted to us in a presentation from one of their volunteer organisers. This successful scheme, targeted at the elderly, had proved itself as a valuable service for the community. Plans for expansion to outlying areas are constrained by the utilisation of their single vehicle. An additional small vehicle (not necessarily another 16-seater with specialist wheelchair access) would allow them to expand the service across a wider catchment area to Saltford and surrounding villages.

The success of Keynsham dial-a-ride prompted interest from the Panel in seeing further similar schemes develop elsewhere in the district. It was noted that a new scheme was just launching in Midsomer Norton.

Transport & Highways officers have a role in supporting the set-up, co-ordination and funding of these schemes as well as providing advice and training. We discussed with some organisations the support provided.

Keynsham Dial-a-Ride had high praise for the support provided in accessing funding and help with vehicle specification and procurement. The only issue arising was a question over the status of individual volunteer organisers in respect of personal income tax, even though the organisation is registered as a charity.

Farmborough Good neighbours, however, told us that whilst well meant, the support was not always helpful as it seemed to take little account of the

individual needs of volunteer organisations. Support, as such, tended to be in the form of long advisory documents or written requests for information.

Serious concerns were expressed at the level of bureaucratic paperwork, e.g. grant applications, risk assessments and , criminal record bureau (CRB) checks, etc. which, for small community organisations (often just a handful of volunteers) is a demand too great. They felt the hassle of form filling and checks were:

- (a) not worth the potential financial gain, and;
- (b) a bureaucratic imposition on their organisation (some have existed longer than the Council have had a role in supporting them).

#### **Recommendation 4.6.1**

Note seriously the suggestion for a supplementary vehicle for the Keynsham dial-a-ride to extend services to Saltford and surrounding villages. Investment in an additional vehicle should be considered.

#### **Recommendation 4.6.2**

The feasibility of a new Dial-a-ride service in Chew Valley area should be explored. This could provide valuable rural service for the elderly.

#### **Recommendation 4.6.3**

Work with the Community Transport Liaison Group to improve Council support for volunteers, particularly:

- tailoring support to suit the needs of individual organisations (reduction in paperwork & form filling, more consultative style of support on basis of needs)
- investigate and advise on the tax liability issue reported by Keynsham Dial-a-Ride organisers.

### **4.7 Concessionary Travel Schemes (Bus Passes & Travel Tokens)**

The Panel considered the Council's concessionary travel schemes of bus passes and travel tokens for the over 60's.

We heard about the current administration processes and costs of these schemes and, in particular, concerns over misuse of Travel Tokens by some recipients.

Obviously the Panel wish to see the Council's financial resources protected but do not believe that wholesale withdrawal of the scheme is in the best interests of those genuine users for whom the scheme was conceived, e.g. where regular bus services may be inaccessible and taxis are the only viable option.

**Recommendation 4.7.1**

Reform the Travel Tokens scheme by:

- (a) Considering the possibility of means testing the allocation of travel tokens.
- (b) Any development of the scheme should include an appraisal of the administrative costs of means testing to ensure viability within existing resources.
- (c) Investigate offering a senior citizens rail card as an alternative option to tokens.

**Recommendation 4.7.2**

Review the administration costs for the issuing of bus passes, currently running at £17,000 per annum, possibly by issuing a long-term pass at age 60, valid for life, rather than the current annual replacement process.

**Recommendation 4.7.3**

Investigate further the advice from Transport 2000 ( D Redgewell) and the Joint Planning, Technical & Environment Unit about bus pass eligibility throughout the Greater Bristol area, connections to hospitals and other similar public bodies and ascertain the current position.

**Recommendation 4.7.4**

Any savings made in the administration of these schemes should be re-allocated corporately to enhance community transport schemes, as per our recommendations in section 4.6.

**4.8 Social Services Transport**

Council transport for Social Services' clients provides a supporting role in accessing care packages as well as travel from home to shops and social events – effectively supporting social inclusion.

Current provision includes 7 buses and 6 drivers. The yearly cost for these services is around £500,000 funded from within the general Community Care budget, not a specific transport budget. Users are not charged for transport at the moment but Social Services are suggesting a nominal charge of £2 per day. Social Services suggested that income should remain in the service and go into the Community Care budget, not be recouped to other corporate transport needs - a view not necessarily aligned to that of the wider corporate headroom project.

We noted the number of dedicated buses set aside solely for Social Services transport and that there is no sharing of these assets (both vehicles and drivers) to meet the needs of other Council services or agencies such as the NHS. Our seminar had brought forward such examples to demonstrate the principle of shared use as a benefit of integrated transport planning.

**Recommendation 4.8.1**

The moves towards nominal charging and promoting greater independence and reliance on public transport are bold and demonstrate the direction the council needs to take. There was a minority view from the panel to uphold the request; that any monies saved/generated on Social Services transport should stay in Social Services. A majority of the Panel members expressed an alternative view that savings should be recouped corporately to spend on other passenger transport priorities. The Executive must consider these issues and make the decision based on the full corporate picture.

**Recommendation 4.8.2**

In line with our earlier recommendations on integrated transport (4.1), we would like to see Social Services transport assets utilised more effectively. For example, the same vehicles and drivers could operate at different times of day for Social Services and Education (home to school) and then in the evenings and at weekends for other community transport services.

**Recommendation 4.8.3**

Opportunities for joint ventures with the NHS (Avon Ambulance Trust) should be explored.

**4.9 School Transport**

School transport accounts for almost half of all the Council's expenditure on all passenger transport services; annually £2.7m (out of £6.2m total), of which:

- £1.4m is spent on statutory school travel arrangements
- £1.3m is incurred due to local discretionary policies set by the LEA

**Statutory Services**

It was confirmed to us that Local Authorities have an obligation in law (1944 Education Act) to provide free home to school transport for children:

- up to age 8, living over 2 miles from their nearest available school, and;
- over 8 years old, over 3 miles from the nearest school.

The council has no discretion over the provision of these statutory services defined by national legislation but it may be possible to provide them more cost effectively.

A crude analysis of the £1.4m spent on these services, supplied to 1192 pupils shows that this service costs:

- £1175 per pupil per year
- = £30 per pupil per week (assumes a 39 week school year)
- = £6 per pupil per day
- = £3 per journey

**Discretionary services**

The Panel were interested to consider the discretionary services defined by local policies which are the responsibility of the Local Education Authority. There are 3 categories of discretionary services, providing free transport for children that:

- choose a denominational (religious) school, where statutory distance rules apply (£344k annual spend);
- would have to travel a hazardous route (mostly rural areas – e.g. narrow roads without pavements or main roads without safe crossing points) (£388k annual spend);
- have special educational needs (£589k annual spend).

We considered whether these policies were equitable:

- The services are not means tested. Should they be? The eligibility for free school meals is means tested.
- Why should some children (and their families) receive free benefits based on their personal choice of a religious school whilst others expressing their parental choice for a number of reasons (single sex, mixed sex or simply exam results) are not eligible?
- How does the denominational policy on a matter of personal choice stand against other matters of choice? The 1996 Education Act gives the legal right to give a preference for attending a certain school.

We also considered how school bus services could be developed:

- Should not any children living inside the statutory distance thresholds (2 or 3 miles, dependant on age) benefit from spare capacity on existing school bus services?
- If so, would this yield a reduction in congestion as parents no longer need to do the school run by car?
- What are the possibilities in light of the new charging powers given to Local Authorities in the Local Government Act 2003? E.g. would parents rather pay than drive their children to school? What ticket price would be acceptable?
- How can the effects of pupils travelling by car to Independent Schools be mitigated? Is there scope for providing services to this sector?
- There is a need to evaluate school bus contracts – understand routes and usage.
- Consider extending schemes to enable over 16s (living in the authority) to travel to colleges.

It was raised with us that for some routes the ticket price of existing commercial bus services may be a lower cost than the Council's provision, particularly where regular commercial routes are commonplace. A parent, whose child was not eligible for free transport but travelled across the city of Bath on commercial bus services, told us that her child's bus fares were approx. £10 a week. Could the Council more equitably support all pupils

making choices about their school by subsidising more passes for children to use regular bus services, rather than providing free services only to a minority?

**Recommendation 4.9.1**

Remove or radically reform the current discretionary policy of free transport for pupils attending denominational schools.

In its place, we would like to see a school transport policy that provides free transport to those in most need (use means testing to assess eligibility) and introduces charging (using the new Charging Powers, on a cost recovery basis) for anybody else who wishes to use a bus to get to school.

The aim of a new policy should be to target current expenditure more equitably, taking account of all aspects of school choice and travel needs, to provide low cost transport to a much wider group of users than current policies allow. The overall objective should be to provide more bus services, increase ridership and reduce 'school run' congestion.

**Recommendation 4.9.2**

Set up a partnership between the Council, schools and bus operators for dialogue with a view to establishing more useful and cost effective bus routes to all schools (including independent) whose travel needs may not be currently met.

**Recommendation 4.9.3**

Use any financial savings created by adoption of other listed recommendations to invest in capital projects that will reduce the need for transport over designated hazardous routes, e.g. create safe routes to school, cycle routes, e.g. across Lansdown Road and also in rural areas where transport costs are high.

**Recommendation 4.9.4**

In reforming school bus services, take account of the great possibilities for tackling congestion:

- School transport must be provided so as not to force more cars on roads.
- Create more bus lanes to be used by greater number of vehicles, e.g. school buses, Social Services vehicles, community transport, etc.
- Implement staggered starting times for schools.
- The potential of travel plans to reduce unnecessary bus/car use and promote more safe cycling and walking routes.
- Investigate the principles that underpin the 'yellow buses concept' and look at how these have been developed by other Local Authorities.

## 5.0 List of Appendices

Appendix A	Terms of Reference for the Overview & Scrutiny Review
Appendix B	Presentations provided at the Passenger Transport Seminar, 20 <sup>th</sup> October 2004
Appendix C	Market Research Study
Appendix D	Press release, letters & e-mails,
Appendix E	Public contributor meeting, 16 <sup>th</sup> November 2004. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• statements</li> <li>• presentations</li> <li>• notes of the meeting</li> </ul>
Appendix F	Review recommendations – collated into Executive response table

*Appendices are available separately by contacting the Overview & Scrutiny Team, Democratic Services, Guildhall, High Street, Bath, BA1 5AW. Tel: 01225 477329.*

## 6.0 Review Structure & Organisation

O&S Panel:	Joint Panel, comprising members of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning, Transportation, Economy &amp; Sustainability</li> <li>• Education Youth Culture &amp; Leisure</li> <li>• Health &amp; Social Services</li> </ul>
Chairs:	Cllr. Peter Metcalfe Cllr. Andy Furse Cllr. Gerry Curran
Panel Members:	Cllr. Hilary Fraser Cllr. Sally Davis Cllr. Bryan Organ Cllr. Peter Edwards
With participation from:	Cllr. Ruth Griffiths Cllr. Leila Wishart
O&S Project Manager:	David Langman
Panel Administrators:	Michaela Gay Jack Latkovic