

**TENDER PT1301 – Award of new contracts following tender for supported bus services
Schedule of Consultation responses and Issues Arising**

Responses from Elected representatives			
Item	Response from	Key Points	Comments
1.	Cllr. Cherry Beath	The No 1 and No13 Services here are vital to protect. Communities like Foxhill, and indeed Combe Down are otherwise disadvantaged in access to town and return at these times, and public transport is not plentiful.	Noted – existing pattern of services included in tender
2.	Cllr. Alan Hale	I reply in direct support of the services 683 and 678 that serve Keynsham. I believe that as a council we must seek to maintain a bus service that serves those who live a significant distance from transport hubs otherwise social isolation will quickly follow. Far from everyone has or can afford their own private transport.	Noted – existing pattern of services included in tender
3.	Cllr. Nathan Hartley	I'm in favour of the 778 and 173 continuing as they are. The services are fine as they at present.	Noted – existing pattern of services included in tender
4.	Cllr. Nigel Roberts	I know that a number of people appreciate the late 17 and 14 buses	Noted – existing pattern of services included in tender
5.	Cllr. Tim Warren	I feel the buses that run through the Chew Valley are absolutely essential to the area, and that without them a considerable number of villagers would be disadvantaged. I also feel that the evening bus along the A37 is necessary. Without this the residents along that stretch of road would be somewhat 'marooned.'	683 and 834 services refer - noted – existing pattern of services included in tender 376 services refer - Noted – existing pattern of services included in tender
6.	Bathford PC	With regard to service 713 that serves Bathford in the evenings, Sundays and Bank Holidays, the service appears to be very well used. In view of the popularity of the service and the benefits it brings to residents of Bathford the Parish Council requests that the current timetable and frequency of operation remain unchanged.	Noted – existing pattern of services included in tender
7.	Compton Dando PC	The parish is not seriously affected by the alteration of or loss of the services being tendered.	Noted but disagreed, the services 178 and 678 provide a good service for Burnett.

**TENDER PT1301 – Award of new contracts following tender for supported bus services
Schedule of Consultation responses and Issues Arising**

Responses from Elected representatives			
8.	Keynsham Town Council	Keynsham Town Council would like to emphasise their support for all existing services.	Services 178, 678, 683 refer. Noted – existing pattern of services included in tender
9.	Radstock Town Council	<p>Consultation – the spreadsheet you sent was not accessible to a number of our Members or the public. We ask that you consider producing your documents in a more accessible format/presentation in future.</p> <p>Radstock to Writhlington – with the development of Writhlington Business and Enterprise Specialist School and Sports Centre, there is an increased need for access to their facilities in the evening. An improved service is requested.</p>	<p>Hard copies of .xls spread sheets are available on request</p> <p>Noted – service 768 provides links at 18:26 but no return is available. Options considered to split evening 178 service (as Sunday 678) and terminate at Writhlington in evening, but subject to commercial timetables.</p>
10.	Stowey Sutton PC	The parish council believes that the service operated by CT Coaches for Chewton Mendip - Bishop Sutton - Weston super Mare should continue to receive your support as it would appear that the average weekly number of passengers is very reasonable at approximately 50 per week.	Noted – existing pattern of services included in tender

Operator Responses			
Item	Response from	Key Points	Comments
1.	Citistar Ltd	<p><u>13 Foxhill to Bathford (Sunday Evenings and Bank Holidays)</u> Consider splitting this contract to one for the Sunday Evenings and a separate contract for Bank Holidays.</p> <p><u>834 Chew Valley to Weston-super-Mare</u> Rather than requiring operation by a low floor vehicle, perhaps operation with a vehicle with sufficient capacity would be a better starting point? The contract should be issued for a vehicle with an absolute minimum of 40 seats. From personal observation, the patronage figures shown on the spread sheets are false and do not reflect the many occasions when standing passengers have been illegally carried on</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted. Updated patronage information provided to operators has been verified as correct by survey. This does indicate a larger vehicle is necessary and this will be reflected in the tender specifications.</p>

**TENDER PT1301 – Award of new contracts following tender for supported bus services
Schedule of Consultation responses and Issues Arising**

Operator Responses			
		<p>a vehicle not certified for them nor when intending passengers at the western end of the Chew Valley have been unable to travel. Issuing the contract to an operator who will then use a 25 seat low-floor bus on it will do considerably more damage than good and I would hope the council will act in the public interest on this occasion. The withdrawal of the 835 in April led to an increase in passengers on what was already a busy route and I feel a new contract should take this into account.</p> <p><u>Non contract specific matters</u> I think Bath & North East Somerset would benefit from having more spot checks on supported services to ensure they are being operated properly.</p> <p>There are a number of anomalies in fare tables on council supported routes, those which spring particularly to mind are the 768 and 791 contracts around Norton Radstock and the difference between fares to common destinations from the Chew Valley (Bristol / Weston). Where there are equivalent commercial services, surely there can be little justification for making fares unrealistically low, which also prevents certain routes from being operated commercially. It has been the case for many years that supported services to First routes operate on the same fares as their commercial counterparts, perhaps it would reduce the cost burden to you if other routes were brought in line?</p>	<p>A low floor vehicle remains an option for this service, subject to affordability.</p> <p>Noted, but ability to do this is limited by available resources.</p> <p>Noted. Fares are reviewed as part of the tender round, and fares tend to rise in line with commercial equivalents. In many cases, however, the proportion of fare paying passengers is very low compared to the total.</p>

Stakeholder Responses			
Item	Response from	Key Points	Comments
1.	Travelwatch SW	<p><u>Bath City Services 1/6/17 (evenings)</u> The contract for services 1 and 6 costs the Council a subsidy of £2.18 per passenger, while the contract for service 17 costs the Council a subsidy of £2.09 – the Council may therefore wish to consider operating these two contracts with a single vehicle as follows:- Service 1 (City Centre – Combe Down) – to be withdrawn and replaced by an extension of hourly journeys on service 13 (which currently have considerable 'lay-over' time in the City Centre) to Combe Down village Service 6 (City Centre – Larkhall) – every hour Service 17 (Kingsway – Upper Weston) – every hour between the City Centre and</p>	<p>Not agreed: Extension of service 13 to Combe Down to serve village stops would require a sharp right turn at Hadley Arms. Further would involve loss of evening 17 service to Penn Lea Road.</p>

**TENDER PT1301 – Award of new contracts following tender for supported bus services
Schedule of Consultation responses and Issues Arising**

Stakeholder Responses		
	<p>Kingsway (Ambleside Road) only via a 'shortened' route</p> <p><u>178 (Bath – Paulton)/179 (Bath – Midsomer Norton) (Sundays)</u> Local members of TravelWatch SouthWest consider that it is a priority for the Council to restructure these contracts to provide a thirty-minute frequency on the Greater Bristol Bus Network Corridor Ten between Bath and Midsomer Norton on Sunday and Public Holidays for departures from Midsomer Norton between 0915hrs and 1715hrs and from Bath between 1000hrs and 1800hrs, in substitution to the current 'customer-unfriendly' frequency of forty-five minutes. Local members of TravelWatch SouthWest would be prepared to see a reduction in the number of return journeys on service 179 (Bath – Midsomer Norton) to partially meet the cost of the requested enhancement on corridor 10.</p> <p><u>678 (Bristol – Writhlington) (Sundays)</u> Local members of TravelWatch SouthWest have proposed three alternative options for the provision of bus services on Sunday and Public Holidays between Bristol and Midsomer Norton/Radstock:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the introduction of four journeys in each direction on service 379 between Bristol and Radstock on Sunday and Public Holidays ii) the provision of a 'shuttle' service linking Midsomer Norton, Paulton and Radstock with a 'suitable' interchange on the A37 road and connecting with service 376 journeys to and from Bristol iii) rerouting journeys on service 179 (Bath – Midsomer Norton) on Sunday and Public Holidays to operate between Paulton and Midsomer Norton via Farrington Gurney to provide connections with service 376 journeys to and from Bristol 	<p>Noted: to be considered in context of affordability of bids and commercial service operational proposals. This proposal may require de-minimis funding.</p> <p>Not Agreed. The 678 provides services via Timsbury and Keynsham that would require replacement</p> <p>Not Agreed: As above</p> <p>Noted: to be considered in context of affordability of bids and commercial service operational proposals</p>