

**TENDER NO. PT 1003 – 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	Supports proposals to improve services in consultation letter. Supports continued operation of 20A/C service via Hawthorn Grove.	Noted. 20A/C service will continue to serve Hawthorn Grove after survey data identified passenger origin & destination points
2.	Cllr. Douglas Deacon	Feels strongly that the 768 service should not be altered as this is a vital lifeline for residents to access local health services locally.	Noted. The service is largely unchanged other than the withdrawal from Hinton Blewett where patronage is minimal.
3.	Cllr. Barry Macrae	Continuation of B&NES support for 768 service is essential to the wide spread of communities it serves.	Noted. (see 2 above)

Town & Parish Council Responses			
Item	Response from	Key Points	Comments
4.	Dunkerton PC	Support proposals to split the 768 into two services with services intertimed with 179 journeys to achieve a combined hourly frequency.	Not agreed. Single service retained, timings work reasonably well with 179, unable to be more precise without much more resource.
5.	Englishcombe PC	Notes how vital the 768 service is to the village.	Noted. Service retained at Englishcombe
6.	Keynsham TC	Support continued operation of 665 service and would welcome extended operation and improved vehicle specification.	Noted. Investment in service vehicles planned with new contracts
7.	Norton Radstock TC	Support continued operation of 768 as an essential service.	Noted. Service retained at Norton Radstock
8.	Timsbury PC	Fully support continued operation of 768 service, especially for those elderly residents of Greenvale Drive area of Timsbury.	Noted. Greenvale Drive area retains current service

**TENDER NO. PT 1003 – Award of new contracts following tender for supported bus services
Schedule of Consultation responses and Issues Arising**

Stakeholder & Partner Responses			
Item	Response from	Key Points	Comments
9.	Bath University	<p>Welcomes potential improvements to the 20A/C service from the S106 contributions, particularly the increased capacity and accessibility of vehicles.</p> <p>Note the requirements for the new vehicles to meet the emission standards of the University Bus Operators Code of Practice.</p> <p>University would wish to be involved in discussions regarding timetabling of services where this affects the Arrival Square, which has limited available capacity.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed – additional journey on 20C operates off-peak when capacity is greatest</p>
10.	Bath Spa University	<p>Would most welcome improvements to the 20A/C service in morning peak hours (07:00-09:00). Off peak services have less impact on students or staff</p> <p>Note that term-time increases in service levels should take account of early start dates for BSU PGCE students at Culverhay who commence academic year in mid September.</p>	<p>Noted. Culverhay site already served by extra a.m. and p.m. peak services. Subsequent service increases will be dictated by shop times</p> <p>Note that peak services are specified to operate in school and University terms, which fits with these students</p>
11.	Ralph Allen School	Peak time service adjustment to 20A/C seen as acceptable.	Noted

**TENDER NO. PT 1003 – Award of new contracts following tender for supported bus services
Schedule of Consultation responses and Issues Arising**

Stakeholder & Partner Responses			
12.	TravelWatch SW	<p>Proposes 20A/C route should be split to provide:</p> <p>For RUH via Combe Down to the University</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mon- Fri daytime - 30 minute frequency (journeys inter-timed with service 42 departures from RUH) ▪ Mon- Fri Evenings – hourly frequency ▪ Saturday – hourly <p>For RUH via Bus Station to University</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mon- Fri daytime - 90 minute frequency ▪ Saturday – 4 “shopper” return services at minimised cost <p>In addition all services should call at RUH entrance stop.</p> <p>Not opposed to withdrawing from Hawthorn Grove.</p> <p>Support introduction of low floor buses.</p>	<p>Proposal requires one additional bus to operate after allowance for peak services (5 PVR vs. 4PVR at present) and substantially reduces Saturday service to Widcombe</p> <p>The extra bus could be covered by the additional recurrent S106 funding – but only for a 3 year period. Preference is for a long term investment in vehicles on the current route structure.</p> <p>One extra call included but journey time limitations prevent more calls to this stop.</p> <p>Surveys indicated Hawthorn Grove should remain as part of the route</p> <p>Noted</p>
13.	TravelWatch SW	<p>Preference for a more direct morning service between Courtenay Road and the Co-Op supermarket on the 665 service</p> <p>Should aim to minimise layover at Ashton Way for cross-town customers.</p> <p>Would support low floor bus introduction.</p>	<p>Agreed. Service specification amended to include this journey.</p> <p>Noted but no cross town journeys observed during surveys</p> <p>Noted</p>
14.	TravelWatch SW	<p>Support splitting of service into two elements.</p> <p>For Bath – Writhlington section propose standard routing via Inglesbatch, Englishcombe and Oldfield Park, with counter-peak journeys via A367/B3115 to Camerton.</p> <p>Would support low floor bus introduction.</p> <p>For Hinton-Writhlington section of route propose inter-peak service.</p> <p>Journeys in Paulton to serve Hallatrow Road and Downsway.</p>	<p>Noted– conflicts with user representations (see below) that wish to see the through service retained</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted – as specified</p> <p>Agreed. Downsway included in service specification</p>

**TENDER NO. PT 1003 – Award of new contracts following tender for supported bus services
Schedule of Consultation responses and Issues Arising**

Stakeholder & Partner Responses			
15.	South West Transport Network	<p>Welcome low floor bus introduction for 20A/C and would welcome low floor vehicles on 665 service.</p> <p>Would wish to see service 768 retained as at present.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Service retained as at present except for Hinton Blewett</p>
16.	Widcombe Bus Passenger Group	<p>Extension of service into early evening would be desirable.</p> <p>Concern that service still omits Terrace Walk in the afternoons.</p> <p>Welcomed provision of low floor vehicles.</p>	<p>Agreed - additional 20C journey included in service specification</p> <p>Noted – but timetable restrictions limit number of calls that can be made. One additional a.m. call on 20A included in specification</p> <p>Noted</p>
17.	Marlborough Lane and Marlborough Buildings Association	<p>Strongly support continuation of 20A/C service and would welcome improved frequency and more evening journeys.</p>	Noted
18.	Macauley Buildings & Prospect Road Association	<p>Happy with operation of the service.</p>	Noted
19.	Radstock Action Group	<p>Note that distinct markets are served by the 768 service and suggest daily split service rather than 2 day enhancements.</p> <p>Believe the service to Radstock should be enhanced and that regular service introduced between Farrington Gurney and Radstock to link to the 376 Wells-Bristol services.</p> <p>Believe that fares are prohibitively high and would seek introduction of a Youth Bus Pass and integrated ticketing.</p>	<p>Noted– conflicts with user representations (see below) that wish to see the through service retained</p> <p>Enhancing service requires significant additional resources. Linking services are not part of this tender round, and in any case needs are better served by direct services to Bristol rather than connections.</p> <p>768 fares are relatively low compared to commercial fares. Other issues are not part of this tender round</p>

**TENDER NO. PT 1003 – Award of new contracts following tender for supported bus services
Schedule of Consultation responses and Issues Arising**

User Responses			
Item	Response from	Key Points	Comments
20.	Lewis Hands	Service times from Weston to Bath on the 20C are not suitable for city centre workers. Journey required at 8:15 instead of current 07:30 and 09:09.	Noted – Only feasible with complete timetable recast that has adverse consequences in other areas. Otherwise requires additional peak resources.
21.	Evelyn Cox	768 should have Nailwell as a journey timing point. A departure from Bath at ~ 14:00 would be beneficial. A departure to Bath to arrive by 10:00 would be preferred. Add Nailwell, Englishcombe, and Priston as request stops on the first departure from Bath.	Agreed – included in service specification Not feasible with current resources Available on Tues & Thu only Service does not operate this route for timing purposes
22.	Tracey Winsley	Concerned that elderly residents of Greenvale Drive in Timsbury would be unable to access services and facilities if 768 service is discontinued.	Noted - current service specification retained
23.	Bridget Hopkins	Require Timsbury (Greenvale Drive) connections to Radstock which are not provided by the 179 service. 179 service not suitable to travel to Paulton Hospital as this is too far uphill from Greenvale Drive. Through service from Timsbury (Greenvale Drive) required as far as Farrington Gurney, which is a key destination for a number of residents. Observed requirements for through journeys from Clutton to Timsbury.	Noted - current service specification retained Noted - current service specification retained Noted - current service specification retained Noted
24.	Greenvale Drive Residents	Strongly hold the view that 768 service should continue as at present.	Noted - current service specification retained