

Community Impact Assessment Outline

Name of Proposal: Supported Local Bus Service Network

Project Sponsor (if applicable):

Project Manager (if applicable) or Lead: Clive Thomson

Date: 8 June 2017

the knot unites



Outline Community Impact Assessment Template

***This is an initial outline Community Impact Assessment which has been written prior to public consultation. The overarching recommendation of this is to consider views expressed to us through the emerging public consultation, and if a particular group or area is identified, this will need to be mitigated for as part of the final decision.**

The current general mitigation is through community and voluntary transport schemes and the potential for people’s interest in expanding these as part of the People Helping People agenda.

Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) – Use this section to identify if the proposal will impact on our legal obligations under the Equality Act 2010 for both residents and staff. In summary, those subject to the general equality duty must have due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, advance equality of opportunity between different groups and foster good relations between different groups.

Please consider:

- Who is currently using the service, across the protected characteristics?
- What do we know about their experiences and outcomes?
- What relevant information is available from the Census and population trends data?
- What were the findings of the engagement/consultation?
- Is there any relevant national, regional and/or local sources of research/evidence available?
- Is there any relevant information from partners or voluntary, community, social enterprise organisations?
- What is the analysis of the impact on those with relevant protected characteristics?

| Protected Characteristics: | Which groups will be affected | Benefits | Risks | Mitigations / Recommendations |
|---|--|----------|-------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Race | The proportion of population from minority ethnic groups in Staffordshire is 6.4% which is significantly lower than the regional proportion (20.8%) and the national proportion (20.2%). However, the rate in East Staffordshire (13.8%) is higher than other districts/boroughs and in the wards of Anglesey (50.3%), Eton Park (32.3%) and | N/A | N/A | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | Burton (31.4%) the rates are considerably higher than the national average. While it is not possible to analyse bus usage by minority ethnic groups, potential impacts on this group should be considered in these areas in particular. | | | |
| • Disability | The changes could have an impact on people with disabilities. The percentage of people claiming Disability Living Allowance in Staffordshire (7%) is similar to the England figure (7.1%). However, there are some districts/boroughs with higher percentages as follows: Cannock Chase (8.8%), Tamworth (8.1%), Newcastle (7.5%) and Staffs Moorlands (7.4%). | There could be an increase in passenger loadings of commercial services if Sundays/Bank Holidays supported services cut – people may choose to travel Monday to Saturday. | Risk that disabled people may become isolated or have reduced accessibility to services/support. See also ENCTS patronage data in the 'Age' protected characteristic row. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. The continuation of the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme will help to ensure that financial impacts on disabled people which could be caused by having to make interchanges, are minimised. |
| • Sex | The changes are unlikely to have any specific impact on gender. In all districts and boroughs of Staffordshire except Stafford, females make up a greater proportion of the total population than males do, but it is not possible to split bus passenger numbers by gender. | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| • Age | Age is one of the protected characteristics that could be negatively affected most by the potential changes to public transport provision in Staffordshire without mitigation, | There could be an increase in passenger loadings of commercial services if Sundays/Bank | Older People Risk that older people may become isolated, lonely and/or have reduced accessibility to | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. The continuation of the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme and the local Your |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>particularly those aged 65+ and those aged between 11 and 19 years with a Your Staffordshire Card.</p> <p>According to Department for Transport figures¹ across Staffordshire approximately 41% of total passenger journeys in 2015/16 were made by elderly or disabled concessionary passengers which is significantly higher than the regional and national figures (25% and 22% respectively).</p> <p>Staffordshire has a higher proportion of residents aged 65+ (20.8%) when compared to both England (17.7%) and the West Midlands (18.2%).² All districts within Staffordshire have higher than average proportions of people aged 65+ apart from Tamworth. The highest proportion of people aged 65+ are in Staffordshire Moorlands (23.9%) South Staffs (23.4%), Lichfield (22.9%) and Stafford (21.6%).</p> | <p>Holidays supported services cut – people may choose to travel Monday to Saturday</p> | <p>services/support. See Health & Care section for further information on older people and loneliness.</p> <p>Annual ENCTS Patronage data shows numbers of passenger journeys made by older or disabled people on the services within this review. This often makes up a large proportion of annual passenger numbers. In Staffordshire there are 17 services that operate with over 70% ENCTS patronage, six of these services operate with 100% ENCTS patronage as follows: Service nos.T3/T5 Cannock; Coppenhall and Lodgefield Park,</p> | <p>Staffordshire Card will help to ensure that financial impacts on elderly and young people which could be caused by having to make interchanges are minimised.</p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

¹Department for Transport statistics, table BUS0113, last updated October 2016 <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/bus01-local-bus-passenger-journeys>

² Staffordshire Locality Profile 2016 <https://www.staffordshireobservatory.org.uk/documents/LocalityProfiles/Locality-Profiles-2016/March-2017-Amendments/Staffordshire-Profile-2016-FINAL.pdf>

| | | | | |
|---|--|------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>Stafford; 6 Staffs Moorlands; 72 Newcastle; 411 East Staffs. See table 2.</p> <p>Younger People Risk that younger people cannot access employment/training opportunities.</p> <p>Annual Your Staffordshire Card patronage data shows numbers of passenger journeys made by people aged 11 to 19 on the services within this review.</p> <p>There are three services with significant Your Staffordshire Card patronage as follows: Service nos. 182, 108, 109 Staffs Moorlands.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Religion or Belief | <p>The changes are unlikely to have any specific impact on religion/belief. Although a district breakdown of</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>Risk that people may not be able to get to places of worship.</p> | <p>*See above overarching recommendation and mitigation.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----|--|--|
| | <p>religion is not available, the 2011 census shows that Christianity is still the main religion (60%). However despite population growth the number of Christians in Staffordshire fell from 650,000 in 2001 to 580,000 in 2011. At the same time, there has been a rise in the numbers of residents classing themselves as not having a religion. In line with the changing ethnicity in Staffordshire there has been a 5% increase in Islam in Staffordshire.</p> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender Reassignment | <p>The changes are unlikely to have any specific impact on gender reassignment.</p> | N/A | <p>Although we do not collect data on this protected characteristic, it is recognised that any changes to bus provision could affect access for anyone to leisure and cultural opportunities, support groups, medical appointments, places of faith etc.</p> | <p>*See above overarching recommendation and mitigation.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sexual Orientation | <p>The changes are unlikely to have any specific impact on sexual orientation.</p> | N/A | <p>Although we do not collect data on this protected characteristic, it is recognised that any changes to bus</p> | <p>*See above overarching recommendation and mitigation.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----|---|---|
| | | | provision could affect access for anyone to leisure and cultural opportunities, support groups, medical appointments, places of faith etc. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pregnancy and Maternity | The changes are unlikely to have any specific impact on pregnancy and maternity. | N/A | It is recognised that any changes to bus provision could affect access to medical appointments, support groups etc. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marriage and Civil Partnership The duty to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination also covers marriage and civil partnerships in relation to employment issues. | The changes are unlikely to have any specific impact on marriage and civil partnership. | N/A | It is recognised that any changes to bus provision could affect access to leisure and cultural opportunities, support groups etc. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rurality/Isolation Though not a protected characteristic of the Equality Act 2010, this is a relevant consideration. | The changes are likely to affect people living in a rural area. The proportion of people living in rural areas in Staffordshire is higher than in England (24% and 17% respectively). Some districts have a higher proportion than others: over a third (39.8%) of the population in South Staffs live in a rural area, 32% of the population in | N/A | Several proposed route changes could have implications for rural isolation in South Staffs, Stafford, Staffs Moorlands, East Staffs and Lichfield | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | Stafford live in a rural area, 30.4% of the population in Staffs Moorlands live in a rural area and 29.5% of the population in Lichfield live in a rural area. | | | |
| Impact on SCC Staff If the proposal affects SCC staff, consider the workforce profile compared against the protected characteristics pre and post change, the impact of job losses, available support for staff, and HR protocols. | This proposal may affect some SCC employees who use the bus services to get to work. | | | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |

Evidence Base: (Evidence used/ likelihood/ size of impact)

See tables below:

- 1. Population Characteristics – Staffordshire**
- 2. Passenger Journey 2016-17**

Table 1: Population Characteristics – Staffordshire

Compared to England:

| | | | | | | |
|--------|---------|-------|-------|---------|--------|---|
| Better | Similar | Worse | Lower | Similar | Higher | Suppressed / not tested / not available |
|--------|---------|-------|-------|---------|--------|---|

| Indicator | Time period | Cannock Chase | East Staffordshire | Lichfield | Newcastle-under-Lyme | South Staffordshire | Stafford | Staffordshire Moorlands | Tamworth | Staffordshire | West Midlands | England |
|---|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Population characteristics | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mid-year population estimate | 2015 | 98,500 | 116,000 | 102,700 | 127,000 | 110,700 | 132,500 | 97,900 | 77,100 | 862,600 | 5,751,000 | 54,786,300 |
| Percentage under five | 2015 | 5.7% (5,600) | 6.3% (7,300) | 5.1% (5,200) | 5.1% (6,500) | 4.5% (5,000) | 5.0% (6,600) | 4.6% (4,500) | 6.1% (4,700) | 5.3% (45,300) | 6.4% (365,300) | 6.3% (3,434,700) |
| Percentage under 16 | 2015 | 18.1% (17,800) | 19.3% (22,400) | 16.9% (17,400) | 16.5% (21,000) | 15.5% (17,200) | 16.7% (22,100) | 16.2% (15,900) | 19.5% (15,000) | 17.3% (148,800) | 19.5% (1,122,400) | 19.0% (10,405,100) |
| Percentage aged 16-64 | 2015 | 63.7% (62,800) | 62.2% (72,200) | 60.1% (61,700) | 63.6% (80,800) | 61.1% (67,600) | 61.8% (81,800) | 59.9% (58,600) | 63.2% (48,800) | 61.9% (534,400) | 62.3% (3,582,800) | 63.3% (34,669,600) |
| Percentage aged 65 and over | 2015 | 18.2% (18,000) | 18.5% (21,500) | 22.9% (23,600) | 19.9% (25,300) | 23.4% (25,900) | 21.6% (28,600) | 23.9% (23,400) | 17.3% (13,300) | 20.8% (179,400) | 18.2% (1,045,800) | 17.7% (9,711,600) |
| Percentage aged 85 and over | 2015 | 2.1% (2,100) | 2.3% (2,600) | 2.6% (2,600) | 2.4% (3,100) | 2.7% (3,000) | 2.7% (3,500) | 2.7% (2,600) | 1.8% (1,400) | 2.4% (21,000) | 2.4% (136,600) | 2.4% (1,295,300) |
| Dependency ratio per 100 working age population | 2015 | 57.0 | 60.7 | 66.4 | 57.2 | 63.7 | 61.9 | 67.0 | 58.1 | 61.4 | 60.5 | 58.0 |
| Dependency ratio of children per 100 working age population | 2015 | 28.4 | 31.0 | 28.2 | 26.0 | 25.4 | 27.0 | 27.1 | 30.8 | 27.8 | 31.3 | 30.0 |
| Dependency ratio of older people per 100 working age population | 2015 | 28.6 | 29.7 | 38.2 | 31.3 | 38.2 | 34.9 | 39.9 | 27.3 | 33.6 | 29.2 | 28.0 |
| Population change between 2015 and 2025 | 2015-2025 | 3.0% (3,000) | 5.5% (6,400) | 3.9% (4,000) | 4.2% (5,300) | 3.0% (3,300) | 4.0% (5,400) | 1.6% (1,600) | 1.7% (1,300) | 3.5% (30,200) | 5.8% (335,200) | 7.3% (3,989,600) |
| Population change between 2015 and 2025 - under five | 2015-2025 | -4.1% (-200) | -1.2% (-100) | -2.2% (-100) | 2.5% (200) | 3.1% (200) | 0.5% (0) | -2.0% (-100) | -5.8% (-300) | -1.0% (-400) | 2.0% (7,200) | 2.0% (67,200) |
| Population change between 2015 and 2025 - under 16s | 2015-2025 | -1.0% (-200) | 4.2% (900) | 0.8% (100) | 4.5% (900) | 5.1% (900) | 0.4% (100) | -0.2% (0) | -2.1% (-300) | 1.7% (2,500) | 6.6% (74,100) | 8.2% (848,800) |

Compared to England:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------|-------|-------|---------|--------|---|--|
| Better | Similar | Worse | Lower | Similar | Higher | Suppressed / not tested / not available | |
|--------|---------|-------|-------|---------|--------|---|--|

| Indicator | Time period | Cannock Chase | East Staffordshire | Lichfield | Newcastle-under-Lyme | South Staffordshire | Stafford | Staffordshire Moorlands | Tamworth | Staffordshire | West Midlands | England |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Population change between 2015 and 2025 - ages 16-64 | 2015-2025 | -1.6% (-1,000) | 0.8% (600) | -1.3% (-800) | 0.3% (200) | -4.0% (-2,700) | -0.3% (-300) | -4.2% (-2,400) | -4.1% (-2,000) | -1.6% (-8,500) | 2.1% (76,900) | 3.2% (1,123,600) |
| Population change between 2015 and 2025 - 65 and over | 2015-2025 | 23.1% (4,200) | 22.8% (4,900) | 19.8% (4,700) | 16.4% (4,100) | 20.0% (5,200) | 19.4% (5,500) | 17.2% (4,000) | 27.0% (3,600) | 20.2% (36,200) | 17.6% (184,200) | 20.8% (2,017,200) |
| Population change between 2015 and 2025 - 85 and over | 2015-2025 | 51.0% (1,100) | 41.5% (1,100) | 62.7% (1,700) | 34.8% (1,100) | 58.4% (1,800) | 45.0% (1,600) | 46.3% (1,300) | 58.5% (800) | 48.8% (10,400) | 36.8% (50,300) | 35.5% (460,700) |
| Proportion of population living in rural areas | 2014 | 9.1% (9,000) | 21.8% (25,200) | 29.5% (30,200) | 20.4% (25,700) | 39.8% (44,000) | 32.0% (42,300) | 30.4% (29,800) | 0.0% (0) | 24.0% (206,300) | 14.7% (841,800) | 17.0% (9,260,900) |
| Proportion of population from minority ethnic groups | 2011 | 3.5% (3,400) | 13.8% (15,700) | 5.4% (5,400) | 6.7% (8,400) | 5.4% (5,800) | 7.4% (9,700) | 2.5% (2,400) | 5.0% (3,800) | 6.4% (54,700) | 20.8% (1,167,500) | 20.2% (10,733,200) |
| Index of multiple deprivation (IMD) 2015 weighted score | 2015 | 20.9 | 18.8 | 12.7 | 18.5 | 12.5 | 13.5 | 15.2 | 20.3 | 16.4 | 25.2 | 21.8 |
| Percentage in most deprived IMD 2015 quintile | 2015 | 13.7% (13,500) | 17.7% (20,400) | 3.9% (4,000) | 11.2% (14,100) | 1.3% (1,500) | 5.4% (7,100) | 4.6% (4,500) | 17.5% (13,500) | 9.1% (78,600) | 29.3% (1,675,800) | 20.2% (10,950,600) |
| Percentage in second most deprived IMD 2015 quintile | 2015 | 29.8% (29,300) | 16.6% (19,200) | 10.7% (10,900) | 29.1% (36,700) | 9.7% (10,800) | 12.4% (16,400) | 18.1% (17,700) | 21.9% (16,900) | 18.4% (157,900) | 18.6% (1,061,500) | 20.5% (11,133,400) |
| Mosaic profile - most common geodemographic group | 2016 | H Aspiring Homemakers | L Transient Renters | B Prestige Positions | F Senior Security | E Suburban Stability | A Country Living | A Country Living | H Aspiring Homemakers | H Aspiring Homemakers | H Aspiring Homemakers | H Aspiring Homemakers |
| Mosaic profile - percentage of population in the most common group | 2016 | 20.7% (20,400) | 13.4% (15,500) | 16.8% (17,200) | 13.0% (16,500) | 15.5% (17,200) | 15.3% (20,300) | 15.8% (15,500) | 23.3% (17,900) | 12.9% (111,000) | n/a | n/a |
| Mosaic profile - financial stress | 2016 | 28.7% (28,300) | 28.4% (32,700) | 22.5% (23,000) | 27.5% (34,000) | 21.6% (23,600) | 24.4% (31,900) | 24.5% (23,900) | 29.9% (23,200) | 25.8% (220,600) | n/a | n/a |
| Disability living allowance claimants | Nov-2015 | 8.8% (5,500) | 6.2% (4,450) | 6.1% (3,790) | 7.5% (6,070) | 6.3% (4,260) | 5.9% (4,810) | 7.4% (4,340) | 8.1% (3,950) | 7.0% (37,150) | 7.5% (267,430) | 7.1% (2,467,980) |

Table 2 – Bus Passenger Journeys

| District / Borough | Service No. | Route Description | Days of Operation | Operating Days Per Annum | Price Per Day | Annual Cost | Subsidy Per Passenger Per Journey | % Annual On bus Patronage | % Annual ENCTS Patronage | % Annual Peak YSC Patronage | % Annual Off-Peak YSC Patronage | % Annual Scholar Passes |
|---------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Cannock Chase | 2E | Cannock - Walsall | Mon-Sat Eves excl Bank Hols | 306 | £87.87 | £26,888.22 | £1.29 | 65 | 28 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Cannock Chase | 2E | Cannock - Walsall | Sun & Bank Hols Eves | 56 | £207.51 | £11,620.56 | £2.63 | 61 | 31 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Tamworth | 5 | Tamworth - Amington | Sun & Bank Hols | 56 | £89.77 | £5,027.12 | £0.58 | 46 | 48 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Cannock Chase & Lichfield | 62 | Cannock - Hazelslade - Burntwood - Lichfield | Sun & Bank Hols | 56 | £236.70 | £13,255.20 | £1.48 | 49 | 37 | 0.0 | 14 | 0 |
| Cannock Chase | 71 | Cannock - Wolv | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £201.70 | £61,720.20 | £0.59 | 34 | 62 | 1.0 | 4 | 0 |
| Cannock Chase | 70 | Cannock - Wolv | Sun & Bank Hols | 56 | £105.32 | £5,897.92 | £1.08 | 65 | 26 | 0.0 | 9 | 0 |
| South Staffs | 10A/B/ S | Perton - Codsall | Mon-Fri excl Bank Hols | 254 | £305.98 | £77,718.92 | £1.91 | 45 | 37 | 2.9 | 3 | 12.0 |
| Cannock Chase | 21 | Cannock – Longford / Shoal Hill | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £141.40 | £43,268.40 | £2.80 | 9 | 90 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stafford | 8 | Parkside - Stafford - Moss Pit | Mon-Sat Eves excl Bank Hols | 306 | £58.00 | £17,748.00 | £1.52 | 53 | 41 | 0.0 | 6 | 0 |
| Stafford | 9 | Stafford - Highfields | Mon-Sat Eves excl Bank Hols | 306 | £79.00 | £24,174.00 | £3.14 | 51 | 43 | 0.0 | 6 | 0 |

| District / Borough | Service No. | Route Description | Days of Operation | Operating Days Per Annum | Price Per Day | Annual Cost | Subsidy Per Passenger Per Journey | % Annual On bus Patronage | % Annual ENCTS Patronage | % Annual Peak YSC Patronage | % Annual Off-Peak YSC Patronage | % Annual Scholar Passes |
|-----------------------|-------------|---|--|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Cannock Chase | 61 | Cannock - Heath Hayes | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £64.52 | £19,743.12 | £1.41 | 36 | 58 | 0.4 | 6 | 0 |
| Stafford/South Staffs | 76A | Stafford - Penkridge - Wolv | Sun & Bank Hols | 56 | £237.00 | £13,272.00 | £0.88 | 60 | 20 | 16.4 | 3 | 0 |
| Staffs Moorlands | 123 | Cheadle Town Service | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £189.00 | £57,834.00 | £1.08 | 8 | 92 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Staffs Moorlands | 455 | Blythe Bridge High School | Mon-Fri Sch days | 190 | £79.00 | £15,010.00 | £0.64 | 72 | 0 | 19.4 | 0 | 8.9 |
| Cannock Chase | T3/T5 | T3 Thornhill Road - Cannock; T5 Bradbury Lane - Cannock | Tu, F excl Bank Hols | 104 | £63.25 | £6,578.00 | £0.94 | 0 | 100 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lichfield | 35B | Lichfield - Walsall | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £197.90 | £60,557.40 | £1.49 | 38 | 60 | 0.6 | 1 | 0 |
| South Staffs | 16 | Essington - Bloxwich | Mon-Fri excl Bank Hols | 104 | £71.41 | £7,426.64 | £6.42 | 9 | 91 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stafford | | Lodgefield Park - Stafford | Tu, Th excl Bank Hols | 104 | £43.48 | £4,521.92 | £5.70 | 0 | 100 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stafford | | Coppenhall - Ten Butts - Stafford | Tu excl Bank Hols | 52 | £34.89 | £1,814.28 | £3.95 | 0 | 100 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Staffs Moorlands | 16 | Leek - Cheddleton - Hanley - Stoke Stn - Stoke | Mon-Fri excl Bank Hols: 2 x Early morning journeys | 254 | £93.25 | £23,685.50 | £3.35 | 67 | 20 | 9.5 | 4 | 0 |
| Staffs Moorlands | 16 | Leek - Cheddleton - Hanley - Stoke Stn - Stoke | Mon-Sat Eves excl Bank Hols | 306 | £90.90 | £27,815.40 | £2.96 | 63 | 29 | 0.1 | 8 | 0 |
| Staffs Moorlands | 16 | Hanley - Leek - Buxton | Sun & Bank Hols | 56 | £384.56 | £21,535.36 | £2.54 | 54 | 34 | 0.4 | 12 | 0 |

| District / Borough | Service No. | Route Description | Days of Operation | Operating Days Per Annum | Price Per Day | Annual Cost | Subsidy Per Passenger Per Journey | % Annual On bus Patronage | % Annual ENCTS Patronage | % Annual Peak YSC Patronage | % Annual Off-Peak YSC Patronage | % Annual Scholar Passes |
|------------------------|----------------|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Staffs Moorlands | 30 | Leek - Ipstone - Cheadle - Tean | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £267.57 | £81,876.42 | £2.49 | 31 | 50 | 6.3 | 12 | 0 |
| Newcastle | 33/35 | Newcastle - Chesterton | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £90.00 | £27,540.00 | £2.42 | 17 | 82 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Newcastle | 85 | Newcastle - Keele - Madeley - Crewe | Mon-Sat Eves, Sun & Bank Hols | 362 | £130.23 | £47,143.26 | £2.56 | 77 | 20 | 0.0 | 3 | 0 |
| East Staffs & Stafford | 841/842 | Uttoxeter - Hixon - Stafford | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £765.12 | £234,126.72 | £2.07 | 32 | 42 | 10.1 | 15 | 0.5 |
| Stafford | 12/13/15/S1-S6 | Stone Area Package | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £805.73 | £246,553.38 | £2.37 | 18 | 70 | 5.4 | 5 | 1.6 |
| Stafford | 14/14A/14B | Hanley - Stone - Eccleshall - Stafford | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £555.92 | £170,111.52 | £1.17 | 50 | 39 | 1.3 | 6 | 4.3 |
| Newcastle | 74A | Newcastle - Audley | Sun & Bank Hols | 56 | £85.85 | £4,807.60 | £0.81 | 49 | 48 | 0.1 | 2 | 0 |
| Newcastle | 74A | Newcastle - Audley | Mon-Sat eves excl Bank Hols | 306 | £75.75 | £23,179.50 | £2.59 | 69 | 28 | 0.0 | 3 | 0 |
| Staffs Moorlands | 93/116 | Biddulph - Brown Edge - Leek; Cheddleton - Leek | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £413.19 | £126,436.14 | £2.90 | 19 | 71 | 5.3 | 5 | 0 |
| Newcastle | 80 | Kidsgrove Town Service | Mon-Fri excl Bank Hols | 254 | £142.00 | £36,068.00 | £4.59 | 5 | 95 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Staffs Moorlands | 6 | Longton - Blythe Bridge | Sun & Bank Hols | 56 | £184.85 | £10,351.60 | £1.49 | 10 | 85 | 0.0 | 5 | 0 |
| Newcastle | 72 | Newcastle - Clayton | Sun & Bank Hols | 56 | £86.00 | £4,816.00 | £2.84 | 10 | 85 | 0.0 | 10 | 0 |
| East Staffs | 10 | Burton - Rough Hay | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £129.76 | £39,706.56 | £1.62 | 25 | 71 | 1.6 | 2 | 0 |

| District / Borough | Service No. | Route Description | Days of Operation | Operating Days Per Annum | Price Per Day | Annual Cost | Subsidy Per Passenger Per Journey | % Annual On bus Patronage | % Annual ENCTS Patronage | % Annual Peak YSC Patronage | % Annual Off-Peak YSC Patronage | % Annual Scholar Passes |
|------------------------------|--------------|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| East Staffs | 18 | Burton - Dalebrook | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £79.79 | £24,415.74 | £1.18 | 6 | 94 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| East Staffs | 402/402A/403 | Uttoxeter - Draycott - Burton | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £442.87 | £135,518.22 | £1.84 | 25 | 60 | 5.7 | 10 | 0 |
| East Staffs | 401 | Uttoxeter - Tutbury - Burton | Mon-Sat Eves excl Bank Hols | 306 | £181.32 | £55,483.92 | £2.70 | 59 | 35 | 0.0 | 5 | 0 |
| East Staffs | 401 | Uttoxeter - Tutbury - Burton | Sun & Bank Hols | 56 | £227.58 | £12,744.48 | £2.20 | 56 | 40 | 0.0 | 4 | 0 |
| East Staffs & Lichfield | 811/812 | Burton - Barton - Alrewas - Fradley - Lichfield | Mon-Sat Eves excl Bank Hols | 306 | £93.85 | £28,718.10 | £7.59 | 48 | 42 | 0.0 | 10 | 0 |
| East Staffs & Lichfield | 811/812 | Burton - Barton - Alrewas - Fradley - Lichfield | Sun & Bank Hols | 56 | £134.65 | £7,540.40 | £1.74 | 60 | 23 | 0.0 | 17 | 0 |
| East Staffs | 411 | Uttoxeter - Leigh Circular | Wed excl Bank Hols | 52 | £85.85 | £4,464.20 | £1.96 | 0 | 100 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Staffs Moorlands | 182 | Blythe Bridge - Cheadle Schools | Mon-Fri Sch days | 190 | £82.93 | £15,756.70 | £0.39 | 0 | 0 | 32.4 | 68 | 0 |
| Cannock Chase & South Staffs | 67 | Cannock - Featherstone - Brinsford - Wolv | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £193.59 | £59,238.54 | £1.91 | 20 | 77 | 1.9 | 1 | 0 |
| South Staffs & Stafford | 877/878 | Brewood- Wheaton Aston- Church Eaton- Stafford; Brewood- Wheaton Aston- Penkridge-Acton Trussel- Stafford | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £403.00 | £123,318.00 | £2.05 | 23 | 44 | 12.4 | 6 | 14.9 |

| District / Borough | Service No. | Route Description | Days of Operation | Operating Days Per Annum | Price Per Day | Annual Cost | Subsidy Per Passenger Per Journey | % Annual On bus Patronage | % Annual ENCTS Patronage | % Annual Peak YSC Patronage | % Annual Off-Peak YSC Patronage | % Annual Scholar Passes |
|---------------------|-------------|--|--|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Stafford | 11/73 | Stafford - Coton Fields | Mon-Fri excl Bank Hols | 254 | £177.14 | £44,993.56 | £1.81 | 10 | 71 | 8.4 | 10 | 0 |
| Tamworth | 82 | Tamworth - Clifton Campville | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £191.32 | £58,543.92 | £5.17 | Figures unavailable | | | | |
| Newcastle | 429 | Milehouse Silverdale - Newcastle Academy | Mon-Fri excl Bank Hols | 190 | £262.60 | £49,894.00 | £1.10 | 100 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Staffs Moorlands | 18 | Hanley - Endon - Leek | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £134.30 | £41,095.80 | £3.76 | 64 | 25 | 1.4 | 9 | 0 |
| Staffs Moorlands | 108/109 | Ashbourne - Leek - Macclesfield | Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols | 306 | £531.48 | £162,632.88 | £3.68 | 35 | 36 | 20.2 | 2 | 7.7 |
| Lichfield | 10 | Burntwood - Brownhills | Mon-Sat Eves excl Bank Hols; Sun & Bank Hols | 362 | £128.59 | £46,549.58 | £1.39 | 96 | 4 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Staffs Rural | Dial-a-Ride | Border Car | Mon-Fri excl Bank Hols incl Good Friday | 255 | £130.00 | £33,150.00 | £5.32 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Lichfield & Rugeley | Dial-a-Ride | Lichfield & Rugeley Connect | As above | 255 | £154.00 | £39,270.00 | £10.87 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Staff Moorlands | Dial-a-Ride | Moorlands Connect | As above | 306 | £318.51 | £97,464.17 | £7.43 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| East Staffs | Dial-a-Ride | Needwood Forest Connect | As above | 306 | £174.38 | £53,360.00 | £13.56 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| South Staffs | Dial-a-Ride | South Staffs Connect | As above | 306 | £587.53 | £173,663.04 | £8.61 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Percentage patronage data calculated using data supplied by bus service operators

Health and Care – Use this section to determine how the proposal will impact on resident’s health and wellbeing, and whether the proposal will impact on the demands for, or access to health and care services. Please consider the Care Act 2014 and the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

| Category Area (Areas highlighted are suggestions only and there may be other impacts in these categories) | Which groups will be affected | Benefits | Risks | Mitigations / Recommendations |
|--|---|-----------------|---|--|
| Mental Health and Wellbeing Will the proposal impact on the mental health and wellbeing of residents or services that support those with Mental Health issues? | The proposals could affect people who use the bus services to access support groups and medical appointments. | n/a | The collaborative LGA, Age UK and Campaign to End Loneliness Report published in January 2016 ³ states that loneliness is a significant and growing issue for older people and cite research that lonely individuals are more likely to visit their GP, have higher use of medication, higher incidence of falls and increased risk factors for long term care, undergo early entry into residential or nursing care, use a&e services. The report draws a link between social isolation and loneliness but also recognises that they are separate and those socially isolated aren’t necessarily lonely. Key risk factors for loneliness include being in | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. The LGA has a wide range of case studies and information to help local authorities address loneliness, which will need to be explored. However, it is recognised that this alone will not mitigate for loss of transport access, so consultation feedback will need to be carefully analysed in relation to this risk and potential impact. |

³ <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/combating-loneliness-guid-24e.pdf>

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| | | | later old age, on a low income, in poor physical or mental health, living alone or in isolated rural areas or deprived urban communities and having no access to a car/never using public transport. | |
| Healthy Lifestyles Will the proposal promote independence and personal responsibility, helping people to make positive choices around physical activity, healthy food and nutrition, smoking, problematic alcohol and substance use, and sexual health? | The proposal may affect both people who are able to make healthy lifestyle changes and people who rely on the bus services to access support to make changes to their lifestyle. | People may make positive choices around physical activity e.g. walking or cycling to get to places as opposed to using transport. | People may not be able to access support groups that help them to make positive healthy lifestyle changes. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |
| Accidents and Falls Prevention Does the proposal reduce or increase the risk of: falls in older people, childhood accidents, road accidents, or workplace accidents? | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Access to Social Care Will the proposal enable people to access appropriate interventions at the right time? | The proposal may affect people accessing early | n/a | People may need to access Council services if not able to attend early intervention support groups. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----|---|---|
| | intervention support groups. | | | |
| Independent Living Will the proposal impact on people's ability to live independently in their own home, with care and support from family, friends, and the community? | The proposal may affect people who rely on the bus service to be independent. | n/a | There is a risk that people who are independent may need to rely upon Council services if they cannot afford taxis and/or do not have the support of family to maintain their independence. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |
| Safeguarding Will the proposal ensure effective safeguarding for the most vulnerable in our communities? | The proposal may affect vulnerable people | n/a | Risks to vulnerable when taking taxis on their own or asking a neighbour to provide transport | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |

Evidence Base: (Evidence used/ likelihood/ size of impact)

LGA, Age UK and Campaign to End Loneliness 'Combating Loneliness – A Guide for Local Authorities' January 2016
<https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/combating-loneliness-guid-24e.pdf>

Economy – Use this section to determine how the proposal will impact on the economy of Staffordshire and the income of residents.

| Category Area (Areas highlighted are suggestions only and there may be other impacts in these categories) | Which groups will be affected | Benefits | Risks | Mitigations / Recommendations |
|--|--|----------|---|---|
| Economic Growth Will the proposal promote the county as a “go to” location for business, and make it easy for businesses to start up, innovate and expand? | People who use the bus to access training and/or employment | n/a | There is a risk that businesses may not be able to access quality employment if people cannot attend work or training. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |
| Poverty and Income Will the proposal have an impact on income? Will it reduce the gap between high and low earners? | People who will not be able to access training and/or employment | n/a | <p>There is a risk that those people living in areas without bus services and who cannot afford alternative transport will have reduced opportunities to attend work or training opportunities.</p> <p>The Greener Journeys report ‘The Value of the Bus to Society’⁴ states that a 10% improvement in local bus service connectivity in the 10% most deprived neighbourhoods across England would result in: 2.8% fall in income deprivation. There is therefore a risk that those areas most</p> | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |

⁴ <http://www.greenerjourneys.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/The-Value-of-the-Bus-to-Society-FINAL.pdf>

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----|---|---|
| | | | deprived in Staffordshire will see an increase in income deprivation. | |
| Workplace Health and Environments Will the proposal impact on working conditions and the health of Staffordshire's workforce? | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Access to jobs/ Good quality jobs Will the proposal create the right conditions for increased employment in more and better jobs? | People who use the bus to access training and/or employment | n/a | <p>There is a risk that those people living in areas without bus services and who cannot afford alternative transport will have reduced opportunities to attend work or training opportunities.</p> <p>The Greener Journeys report 'The Value of the Bus to Society'⁵ states that a 10% improvement in local bus service connectivity in the 10% most deprived neighbourhoods across England would result in: 2.7% fall in employment deprivation. There is therefore a risk that those areas most deprived in Staffordshire will see an increase in employment deprivation.</p> | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |

⁵ <http://www.greenerjourneys.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/The-Value-of-the-Bus-to-Society-FINAL.pdf>

Evidence Base: (Evidence used/ likelihood/ size of impact)

Greener Journeys – The Value of the Bus to Society Report <http://www.greenerjourneys.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/The-Value-of-the-Bus-to-Society-FINAL.pdf>

Environment – Use this section to identify the impact of the proposal on the physical environment. How does the proposal support the utilisation and maintenance of Staffordshire’s built and natural environments, thereby improving health and wellbeing and strengthening community assets?

| Category Area (Areas highlighted are suggestions only and there may be other impacts in these categories) | Which groups will be affected | Benefits | Risks | Mitigations / Recommendations |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Built Environment/ Land Use Will the proposal impact on the built environment and land use? | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Rural Environment Will the proposal impact on the rural natural environment or on access to open spaces? | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Air, Water and Land Quality Will the proposal affect air quality (e.g. vehicle, industrial or domestic emissions), drinking water quality or land quality (e.g. contamination)? | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Waste and Recycling Will the proposal affect waste (e.g. disposal) and recycling? | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Agriculture and Food Production Will the proposal affect | The proposals may affect | n/a | There is a risk that if seasonal farm workers cannot attend work due to not | See above mitigation measures. |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| the production of healthy, affordable and culturally acceptable food? | seasonal farm workers who contribute to the production of food. | | being able to travel by bus that agriculture and food production be affected. | |
| Transport Will the proposal affect the ability of people/ communities/ business to travel? Will the proposal impact on walking/ cycling opportunities? | The proposals may affect people whose only means of travel is by bus, businesses providing alternative travel options e.g. taxis and people who are able to make healthy lifestyle changes. | People may make positive choices around physical activity e.g. walking or cycling to get to places as opposed to using transport. Taxi businesses may benefit from increased fares. | People who cannot afford to take alternative travel or able to walk or cycle to destinations may become isolated. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |
| Noise Will the proposal cause disruptive noise? | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Evidence Base: (Evidence used/ likelihood/ size of impact)

Localities / Communities – Use this section to identify the impact of the proposal on communities. How will the proposal strengthen community capacity to create safer and stronger communities? It is important to recognise the different localities and communities your proposal may impact upon, and identify any communities that could be more adversely impacted than others. District Commissioning Leads (DCL's) have a great deal of knowledge about their relevant locality and they must be engaged with as part of your Project Team at an early stage of the process.

| Category Area (Areas highlighted are suggestions only and there may be other impacts in these categories) | Which groups will be affected | Benefits | Risks | Mitigations / Recommendations |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Community Development/ Capacity Will the proposal affect opportunities to work with communities and strengthen or reduce community capacity? | The proposal may affect current and potential communities providing transport | Strengthen community capacity to deliver further transport services | A number of the Voluntary Car and Community Bus Schemes rely partly on grants from SCC. If these grants were cut it may impact upon these schemes. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |
| Crime/ Community Safety Will the proposal support a joint approach to responding to crime and addressing the causes of crime? | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Educational Attainment and Training Will the proposal support school improvement and help to provide access to a good education? Will the proposal support | Home to school movements which have been transferred to the local bus network and associated SCC home to school contractual | N/A | Risk of further bespoke home to school contracts being reinstated as a consequence of reduced income to the commercial operators. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| the improved supply of skills to employers and the employability of residents? | cost increases | | | |
| Leisure and Culture Will the proposal encourage people to participate in social and leisure activities that they enjoy? | The proposals may have an impact upon people who use the services to access social and leisure activities | May encourage people to engage in local social and leisure activities | People may become isolated and lonely | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |
| Volunteering Will the proposal impact on opportunities for volunteering? | Current and potential volunteers | May increase the number of volunteers who provide transport. | May impact upon people who use the bus services within the proposal to access volunteering opportunities. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |
| Best Start Will the proposal impact on parental support (pre or postnatally), which helps to ensure that children are school-ready and have high aspirations, utilising a positive parenting approach? | The proposals may have an impact upon people being able to access pre and postnatal support groups and play groups | n/a | Parents may become isolated which may impact upon children | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |
| Rural Communities Will the proposal specifically impact on rural communities? | The changes are likely to affect people living in a rural area. The proportion of people living in rural areas in Staffordshire is higher than in England (24% and 17% respectively). Some districts | n/a | Areas of the county with no access to any transport resulting in isolation and loneliness. | *See above overarching recommendation and mitigation. |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>have a higher proportion than others: over a third (39.8%) of the population in South Staffs live in a rural area, 32% of the population in Stafford live in a rural area, 30.4% of the population in Staffs Moorlands live in a rural area and 29.5% of the population in Lichfield live in a rural area.</p> | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

Evidence Base: (Evidence used/ likelihood/ size of impact)