

Community Impact Assessment

Name of Proposal: Supported Local Bus Service Network

Project Sponsor (if applicable):

Project Manager (if applicable) or Lead: Clive Thomson

Date: 18 October 2017

the knot unites



Community Impact Assessment Template

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 	<p>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 Burton (31.4%) the rates are considerably higher than the national average.</p> <p>While it is not possible to analyse bus usage by minority ethnic groups, we are aware through the</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A

	<p>consultation results that the respondent ethnicity profile is similar to the Staffordshire proportions for the population overall; 98% of respondents described themselves as 'white', 1% as 'mixed' and 1% as 'other'.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disability 	<p>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%).</p> <p>The consultation responses show that 39% of respondents indicated a long term disability or illness which affects their day to day activities. This is twice the proportion of Staffordshire residents overall who have a disability which affects their day to day activities (19%).</p>	<p>There could be an increase in capacity of commercial services if Sundays/Bank Holidays supported services cut – people may choose to travel Monday to Saturday.</p>	<p>Risk that disabled people may become isolated or have reduced accessibility to services/support.</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;</p>	<p>Concessions 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.</p> <p>Voluntary/Community Transport We are aware through the consultation that a number of respondents with a disability/impairment are aware of and/or use local community or voluntary transport schemes to get around.</p> <p>There are also a number of respondents with a long term disability, a mobility impairment or a learning disability who wanted to use a community/voluntary transport scheme if the buses they currently use, at the times that they use them, were not available.</p> <p>There was an indication within the consultation results that a small</p>

			<p>Coppenhall and Lodgefield Park, Stafford (5 respondents to the consultation use this service); 6 Staffs Moorlands (59 respondents to the consultation use this service); 72 Newcastle (14 respondents to the consultation use this service); 411 East Staffs (14 respondents to the consultation use this service). See table 2 below and Appendix 1 of the Analysis of Results Report.</p> <p>Nearly three quarters (73%) of respondents indicated that they hold a concessionary pass for free travel.</p> <p>In terms of the extent of the agreement / disagreement and levels of impact of</p>	<p>number of respondents (15%) expressed an interest in supporting local community and voluntary transport schemes. There is therefore the potential to support further people to use voluntary/transport schemes to minimise the impacts to these groups of people.</p> <p>Alternative approaches Through the consultation there were some suggestions for alternative approaches to the supported bus network, which are set out in the Analysis of the Results of the Consultation. The service area has received all the comments and suggestions put forward to consider.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>the four options; 47% of all respondents to the consultation expressed agreement for option 1. However, 44% of those with a 'long term disability which affects their day to day activities' and 37% of those with a 'learning disability' were least likely to agree to option 1. 66% of those with 'a learning disability' and 65% of those with 'mobility impairment' and 60% of those with a 'disability' felt the option would have an above average 'quite a big/big effect' on them.</p> <p>25% of all respondents expressed agreement for option 2 with minimal variation by the majority of respondent groups. 57% of those with 'a</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>learning disability' and 56% of those whose 'mobility was impaired due to a disability' felt the option would have an above average 'quite a big/big effect' on them.</p> <p>23% of all respondents expressed agreement for option 3 with those with a 'disability which affects mobility' and those with a 'long term disability' were more likely to be in agreement with this option (27% and 26% respectively). 66% of those with 'a learning disability' and 56% of those whose 'mobility was impaired due to a disability' felt the option would have an above average 'quite a big/big effect' on them.</p> <p>27% of all respondents</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>expressed agreement for option 4 with those with 'a learning disability' (32%) more likely to be in agreement. 60% of those with 'a learning disability' felt the option would have an above average 'quite a big/big effect' on them.</p> <p>There were a number of key themes within respondent's comments that spanned across all four proposed options, the following comments relate to respondents' mobility/ability to get out and about:</p> <p>"It would limit journey opportunituies without walking". "I fear without subsideised bus services I wont be able to travel. I live</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>in a village and I don't drive so rely on the subsidised bus services".</p> <p>"We would be very restricted without the bus to take us to the town".</p> <p>"I couldn't go out on my own without this service, I would lose my independence".</p> <p>Respondents were asked to consider how they would travel if the buses they currently use, at the times that they use them, were not available. Over half of those responding said they would not be able to travel (56%). A higher proportion of the 56% were 'aged 75+', 'female', had a 'long term disability' a 'a mobility impairment' or a 'learning disability'.</p> <p>Those who wanted to use a community/voluntary</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>transport scheme were more likely to be under the age of 24, aged 75+ or have a long term disability, a mobility impairment or a learning disability.</p> <p>We are aware through the consultation that a number of respondents with a disability/impairment are aware and/or use local community or voluntary transport schemes – see mitigation for further information.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sex 	<p>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. We are however aware through the consultation responses that the response rate from female residents was disproportionately high when compared to the mid-year population estimates from the Office of National Statistics 2016. 66% of</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A

	respondents were female compared to 34% who were male.			
• Age	<p>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, 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</p>	There could be an increase in capacity of commercial services if Sundays/Bank Holidays supported services cut – people may choose to travel Monday to Saturday	<p>Older People Risk that older people may become isolated, lonely and/or have reduced accessibility to 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</p>	<p>Concessions The continuation of the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme and the local Your 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>(23.4%), Lichfield (22.9%) and Stafford (21.6%).</p> <p>While it is not possible to analyse bus usage by age, we are aware through the consultation results that the majority of the respondent profile (64%) were aged 65 or above. Responses were received from all age groups including those under the age of 18.</p>		<p>these services operate with 100% ENCTS patronage as follows: Service nos.T3/T5 Cannock; Coppenhall and Lodgefield Park, Stafford; 6 Staffs Moorlands; 72 Newcastle; 411 East Staffs. See table 2.</p> <p>The consultation invited respondents to articulate the level of impact the four options presented to them would have. The level of impact varied by respondent type. Set out below for each option are the proportions of 75+ year olds who felt that the option would have an above average 'quite a big'/'big effect' upon them:</p> <p>Option 1 – 72% Option 2 – 57% Option 3 – n/a</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Option 4 – 62%</p> <p>The level of agreement for each option is also available for all respondents and by respondent types. In total 47% agreed with option 1, 24% agreed with option 2, 23% for option 3 and 27% for option 4. Significantly for the 75+ year olds is that 30% agreed with option 3 and 34% agreed with option 4.</p> <p>Respondents were asked to consider how they would travel if the buses they currently use, at the times that they use them, were not available. Over half of those responding said they would not be able to travel (56%). A higher proportion of the 56% were 'aged 75+', 'female', had a 'long term disability' a 'a mobility</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>impairment' or a 'learning disability'.</p> <p>Those who wanted to use a community/voluntary transport scheme were more likely to be under the age of 24, aged 75+ or have a long term disability, a mobility impairment or a learning disability.</p> <p>We are aware through the consultation that a number of respondents are aware and/or use local community or voluntary transport schemes. The results are broken down by respondent type and in terms of those aged 75+ 19% or 105 respondents had used these services.</p> <p>Younger People Risk that younger people cannot access</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>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> <p>It is important to note that figures for annual ENCTS and Your Staffordshire Card patronage is unavailable for Dial-a-Ride services. However, research into patronage on these services shows that the majority of passengers are</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>ENCTS patrons and very little Your Staffordshire Card patrons use these services.</p> <p>The consultation invited respondents to articulate the level of impact the four options presented to them would have. The level of impact varied by respondent type. Set out below for each option are the proportions of under 18s who felt that the option would have an above average 'quite a big'/'big effect' upon them:</p> <p>Option 1 – 58% Option 2 – 77% Option 3 – 71% Option 4 – 57%</p> <p>The level of agreement for each option is also available for all respondents and by respondent types. In total 47% agreed</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>with option 1, 24% agreed with option 2, 23% for option 3 and 27% for option 4. Significantly for the under 18s, 38% agreed with option 4.</p> <p>We are aware through the consultation that a number of respondents are aware and/or use local community or voluntary transport schemes. The results are broken down by respondent type and in terms of under 18s, 12% or 3 respondents had used these services and 12% or 4 respondents were aged 18 to 24.</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 religion is not available, the 2011 census show that Christianity is still the main religion (60%). However despite population growth the number of Christians in Staffordshire</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Risk that people may not be able to get to places of worship.</p>	

	<p>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> <p>Respondents' religion or belief characteristics were not provided in the public consultation.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender Reassignment 	<p>The changes are unlikely to have any specific impact on gender reassignment.</p> <p>Respondents' religion or belief characteristics were not provided in the public consultation.</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>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexual Orientation 	<p>The changes are unlikely to have any specific impact on sexual orientation.</p> <p>Respondents' religion or belief characteristics were not provided in the public consultation.</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</p>	

			opportunities, support groups, medical appointments, places of faith etc.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pregnancy and Maternity 	<p>The changes are unlikely to have any specific impact on pregnancy and maternity.</p> <p>Respondents' religion or belief characteristics were not provided in the public consultation.</p>	N/A	It is recognised that any changes to bus provision could affect access to medical appointments, support groups etc.	
<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. 	<p>The changes are unlikely to have any specific impact on marriage and civil partnership.</p> <p>Respondents' religion or belief characteristics were not provided in the public consultation.</p>	N/A	It is recognised that any changes to bus provision could affect access to leisure and cultural opportunities, support groups etc.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rurality / Isolation Though not a protected characteristic of the Equality Act 2010, this is a relevant consideration. 	<p>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 Stafford live in a rural area, 30.4% of the population in Staffs Moorlands live in a rural area</p>	N/A	Several proposed route changes could have implications for rural isolation in South Staffs, Stafford, Staffs Moorlands and Lichfield	

	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.			

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

Consultation Results of Analysis Report October 2017

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	0	100	0.0	0	0
Newcastle	72	Newcastle - Clayton	Sun & Bank Hols	56	£86.00	£4,816.00	£2.84	0	100	0.0	0	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	1	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	1E	Uttoxeter - Tutbury - Burton	Sun & Bank Hols	56	£227.58	£12,744.48	£2.20	56	40	0.0	4	0
East Staffs & Lichfield	7E	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	7E	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				
East Staffs & Newcastle	429	Marchington - Silverdale - NCHS	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

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 later old age, on a low income, in poor physical or	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>

			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.	
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 intervention support	n/a	People may need to access Council services if not able to attend early intervention support groups.	

	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.	
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	

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.	
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>	

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>	

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	

<p>the production of healthy, affordable and culturally acceptable food?</p>	<p>seasonal farm workers who contribute to the production of food. It was most common for respondents to the public consultation to use buses 'to go shopping' (86%), 'for leisure/social purposes' (75%), 'to visit friends/family (71%) and 'to get to a doctors or medical appointment' (61%). 35% of respondents used buses regularly 'to get to work' and 24% used them 'to get to education or</p>		<p>being able to travel by bus that agriculture and food production be affected.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

	training'.			
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.	
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.	
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 the improved supply of skills to employers and the employability of residents?	Home to school movements which have been transferred to the local bus network and associated SCC home to school contractual cost increases	N/A	Risk of further bespoke home to school contracts being reinstated as a consequence of reduced income to the commercial operators.	
Leisure and Culture Will the proposal	The proposals may have an impact	May encourage people to engage in local	People may become isolated and lonely	

encourage people to participate in social and leisure activities that they enjoy?	upon people who use the services to access social and leisure activities	social and leisure activities		
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.	
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	
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 have a higher proportion than others: over a third (39.8%) of the population in South Staffs live in a rural	n/a	Areas of the county with no access to any transport resulting in isolation and loneliness.	

	<p>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>			
<p>Evidence Base: (Evidence used/ likelihood/ size of impact)</p>				

Now transfer the main findings of this assessment to the ‘**Checklist and Executive Summary**’ template. Then both documents need to be approved/signed off by the appropriate people. For CIAs that are going to **Cabinet**, only the ‘**Checklist and Executive Summary**’ should be submitted as part of the **Cabinet Papers**. The full CIA document should be submitted as a **Background Paper**.