

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

#### Why we consulted?

Over the last four years we have had to make savings of £23m because we've received less money from central government. We have done this by becoming more efficient at what we do, by reducing some of our administrative functions and increasing our income. Throughout this period we have done our best to protect front line services.

We now have to find another £20m over the next four years, with almost £11m to be found in 2016/17. Much of this will come from further efficiencies within the council, but £4.6m will have to come from services that will impact the public.

In order to inform the budget setting process for 2016/17 we published a list of those proposals which would likely have a direct impact on service users, and sought the views from those affected and interested:

- to understand the likely impact
- to identify any measures to reduce their impact
- to explore any possible alternatives

#### Approach

All the proposals were published on the council's website on 3 November 2015 with feedback requested by 14 December 2015. Respondents were directed to a [central index page](#), with a video message from the Chief Executive outlining the background to the exercise.

Information relating to this proposal was linked directly from this index page. This contained more detailed information on what was specifically proposed, information on what we thought the impact might be, as well as what else we had considered in developing and arriving at this proposal. Feedback was then invited through an online form, through a public meeting in relation to the Willink route, and through a dedicated email address.

Each individual budget proposal was placed on our [Consultation Portal](#) which automatically notified those registered that an exercise had been launched. Members of the West Berkshire community panel (around 800 people) and local stakeholder charities, representative groups and partner organisations were also emailed directly, notifying them of the exercise and inviting their contributions.

Heads of Service made direct contact with those organisations affected by any of the budget proposals prior to them being made publically available.

A press release was issued on the same date, as well as publicised through Facebook and Twitter.

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

#### Background

Parents are legally responsible for making sure that their children get to and from school at the appropriate times each day. This includes a parent making arrangements for their child to get to and from school when they have work commitments.

West Berkshire Council's Home to School Transport Policy sets out the circumstances in which it will provide free transport to children and young people travelling to school or college. It relates to West Berkshire residents of statutory school age (from the term following the fifth birthday to the end of Year 11). We spend £1.6m per year on transport to mainstream schools. This is a significant cost at a time of reducing financial resources.

We also provide additional help on a discretionary basis. The scale of budget reductions means that the council needs to prioritise statutory functions and review discretionary services.

It is proposed that discretionary aspects of the Home to School Policy are reduced through the following actions:

**Re-assess every route where transport is currently provided under the 'Availability of a walking route' criteria. Where an available route is identified, the provision of buses would be removed or substantially reduced from April 2016.**

These proposals reduce the council's free transport provision for mainstream pupils to the statutory minimum. The national transport guidance says that discretionary elements can be charged for. Where discretionary elements have been retained, the price has been revised to reflect the cost of providing the service. Summary below:

<b>Actions</b>	<b>Pupils</b>	<b>Savings</b>
<b>Available Routes</b>		
Aldermaston Wharf to Aldermaston Primary School	54	£55,400
Bucklebury to the Kennet School	70	£42,000
East Garston to Shefford Primary School	6	£18,700
Gidley Wood to Chieveley Primary School	3	£6,800
Mortimer to the Willink School	233	£123,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>£246,400</b>

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

#### Summary of Key Points

	<b>Pupils Affected</b>	<b>Responses</b>
<b>Available Routes</b>		
Aldermaston Wharf to Aldermaston Primary School	54	30
Bucklebury to the Kennet School	70	78
East Garston to Shefford Primary School	6	1
Gidley Wood to Chieveley Primary School	3	0
Mortimer to the Willink School	233	373
Comments which do not identify the route they relate to		60
<b>Total</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>542</b>

These figures include letters which were added to the online consultation response in their entirety and also responses received from the following:

- Aldermaston CE Primary School
- Aldermaston Parish Council
- Bucklebury Parish Council
- Bucklebury Primary School
- Burghfield Parish Council
- Garland Junior School
- Kennet school Governing Body
- Kennet school
- Little Heath School
- Padworth Parish Council
- Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust
- Shefford Primary School
- Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council
- Willink school community group - Save Our Buses
- Councillor Pask
- Joint response from Councillors Bridgman, Jackson-Doerge, Morrin and Lock

The responses also included the following on-line petitions:

- Willink school community group - Save Our Buses – 544 signatures
- Aldermaston route – petition led by Councillor Macro – 70 signatures

In relation to the Mortimer to Willink route, views were also sought from:

- Thames Valley Police local neighbourhood Inspector for Burghfield and Mortimer
- Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust, which manages Wokefield Common by agreement with the landowner

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

There are two key questions which have emerged from the consultation:

**Are the route assessments in line with the nationally-recognised guidelines<sup>1</sup> and therefore as a tool to assess free entitlement, is it reasonable that free entitlement is withdrawn?**

The assessment is solely to determine whether the child qualifies for free transport under the regulations. We make the assessments against the Standard<sup>2</sup> explained in the nationally-recognised guidelines from Road Safety GB (2012) and the statutory Home to School Transport guidance<sup>3</sup> (2014).

The test is whether a child could walk the route “in reasonable safety” accompanied by an adult. By child, we mean a pupil or student of the relevant age group for the specific school. Assessments do not determine whether a route is “safe” or “dangerous”. All routes are thought to present some element of risk.

We do not determine the arrangements a parent may wish to put in place for their child. It is the parents’ responsibility to determine how their child will get to school and this includes making appropriate arrangements.

The proposal reduces the Council’s discretionary mainstream transport provision. Statutory provision is retained. Local authorities are not legally obliged to provide free transport just because parents perceive the route to be unsafe on the grounds of personal safety and security.

Respondents **strongly objected** to the assessment that the route was an “available route” under the national guidelines and questioned the validity of the assessment which determines whether **free** transport must be provided. The concerns which have been raised about the assessment of the route are covered in the “You said, We responded” document at Appendix A. There is additional information in Appendix C in relation to the Willink Route.

Respondents for the Mortimer to Willink route stated that the route had been reviewed in 2006 and that they had a legitimate expectation that free transport would always be provided, unless material changes were made to the route.

Respondents from the Mortimer to Willink route also alleged that the proposal was indirect discrimination against women, and this is assessed in the accompanying Equalities Impact Assessment.(Appendix B). It is a statutory requirement under Public Sector Equality Duty that the decision-makers must fully consider the detail provided in this Appendix as part of their decision-making process.

A Mind Map (Appendix D) summarises all of the issues which have been examined as a result of the consultation.

A decision is required for each of the 5 routes in the consultation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Assessment of Walked Routes to School: Guidelines, 2012, Road Safety GB.

<sup>2</sup> Where we have applied definitions and case law from the Road Safety GB document, these are referred to as the Standard

<sup>3</sup> Home to School travel and transport guidance (Statutory guidance for local authorities), July 2014, Department for Education.

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

**For each assessment which stands, how could we respond to feedback about the impact of the assessment on families?**

Respondents expressed a **strong desire for a school bus service to continue**, and outlined the impact of the removal of a bus services on family arrangements, children and on arrival at school. Respondents also described their views about the Council's duty of care to children.

#### 1. Are you, or anyone you care for, a user of this service?

The majority of responses were from users of the services or their families. Some individuals submitted multiple responses.

#### 2. What do you think we should be aware of in terms of how this proposal might impact people?

Respondents **strongly objected** to the assessment that the route was an “available route” under the national guidelines. The assessment determines whether free transport must be provided. Concerns included:

- The Highways assessment, in relation to speed and volume of traffic, perceived danger of crossing the road, and perceived danger from the use of step-offs and verges on country roads without pavements.
- The Footpath assessment, in relation to surface conditions, lack of lighting, safeguarding, occasional interruption to the route i.e. seasonal weather conditions.
- Length of time the journey would take
- Distance of the journey
- That the assessment focuses on a child as accompanied by a suitable adult

Respondents expressed a **strong desire for a bus service to continue**, and outlined the impact of the removal of a bus services on family arrangements, children and on arrival at school:

- The impact of the proposal on **family arrangements**:
  - Parents rely on the bus
  - Parents cannot afford the time to go with their children/ work commitments
  - Parents have younger children to get to other schools
  - If parents resort to taking their children by car instead, there will be environmental, congestion and parking impacts. Many responses saying they would have to resort to driving their children to school.
  - Some responses from parents who feel disadvantaged as they do not have a car and would be forced to walk
  - Responsibility of getting child to school would mean changes to working pattern and this is inconvenient to and detrimental for family life.
  - Impact on parents who rely on their wages to make ends meet (including single parents). Some respondents said they would have to resign their jobs.
  - Adults would feel vulnerable on the route, if they were accompanying their children, including on the return journey when they are alone.

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

- The impact of the proposal on **children**
    - Dangers to unaccompanied children (attacks, bullying)
    - Unaccompanied children would not be able to access help on an isolated route
    - Children may get injured, killed or fall and need first aid or assistance
    - Children will be tired because they have had to walk
    - Children will not want to wear appropriate footwear/ clothing
    - Children have too much equipment to carry (i.e. musical instruments, DT equipment, sports clothing, homework) and carrying addition clothing/footwear is impractical
    - Children will get dirty
    - Children will have to get up earlier
    - Children will not have time to do their homework
    - Risk of being unwell because the child had to walk outside
    - Children should be allowed to travel independently on a bus
    - Secondary pupils should not have to be accompanied by their parents
  - **Issues on arrival at school**
    - Children would be wet and muddy
    - Storage of boots, wet weather clothing at school
    - Not arriving at school in a fit state to learn or concentrate, due to the stress of the journey
    - Reduced school attendance
    - Increased truancy
    - Poorer academic attainment
    - Traffic flow around the school (significant concerns about congestion, pollution and parking issues)
- 3. Do you feel that this proposal will affect particular individuals more than others, and if so, how do you think we might help with this?**
- Concerns about the impact on children with disabilities (although these may be entitled through the Policy provision for such cases)
  - Risk for children with existing medical conditions e.g. asthma, epilepsy
- 4. Do you have any suggestions as to how this service might be delivered in a different way? If so, please provide details.**
- **Responses overwhelmingly asked the Council to keep the free bus and make savings elsewhere.**
  - Suggested that re-tendering the bus contracts to save money or finding a lower cost transport operator could deliver savings
  - Suggested that families would be willing to pay a Fare Payer charge for a seat - most responses suggested less than £100 p.a. and would expect the Council to subsidise the rest of the cost. Perhaps a sliding scale/means-tested charge for a seat on the bus. Provide a sibling discount on the charge for a seat. Make allowance for low income families who could not afford to pay for a seat.
  - Responses also listed actions the Council could take to make the proposed routes more acceptable to local communities:

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

#### **The Mortimer to Willink route**

- Install a lit footpath through Wokefield Common
- Install a crossing on Goring Lane
- Install a full length cycle path alongside the road from College Piece to the roundabout at 3 Firs, and provide extra funds to ensure bikes, wet clothing and shoes can be stored safely
- Co-ordinate a chaperone service / woodland wardens, sponsored by local companies

#### **The Bucklebury to Kennet route**

- A fully-lit footpath from Bucklebury to Thatcham.
- Increase the frequency of the no. 101 public bus at school times

#### **The Aldermaston Wharf to Aldermaston route**

- Put in a crossing at the Wharf
- Put in a crossing in Aldermaston village
- Speed restrictions in the Wharf
- Add School Crossing Patrollers to help people cross the A340, in two places

### **5. Is there any way that you, or your organisation, can contribute in helping to alleviate the impact of this proposal? If so, please provide details of how you can help.**

Responses suggested:

- Parents could make car sharing arrangements
- Parents could group together and take it in turns to walk groups of children to school. This will help generate a sense of community and get children more active
- Could parents take it in turns to act as walking to school chaperones on the footpath with hi-viz jackets?
- Could there be a school-owned bus?
- Better parking provision at the school?

### **6. Counter proposals: No responses**

### **7. Other issues:**

- The proposal is discriminatory between those who can afford to transport their children and those who have to walk – affecting their health and attainment
- The proposal is discriminatory against Mortimer residents
- The proposal is discriminatory on the basis that parents would have to leave their jobs to accompany their children, which is discrimination against women as most of those parents would be female.
- Low income families should not have a seat on a bus, and should be made to walk like everyone else
- Some responses commented on the dangers of routes which were not the proposed route under consideration.

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

#### 8. Any further comments?

- Phase in any change over time, so existing pupils are not affected
- A phased consultative approach over a number of years, with investment in the infrastructure

#### Conclusion

There are 5 routes which have been included within the consultation, although the principles will apply to other routes in the future.

If an aspect of a proposed route was deemed not to be appropriate in any circumstances, we would consider the wider impact – are there any other proposals or routes which would be affected by this stance? We would re-assess our interpretation of all routes and adjust our Policy if such a decision was taken and a precedent was set.

If there were very specific aspects of a proposed route which were deemed not appropriate but these did not affect any other proposals or available routes, it is conceivable that some of the routes in this consultation could be approved as available routes and others may not. Therefore, a decision is required for each of the 5 routes.

#### **Are the route assessments in line with the national guidelines and therefore as a tool to assess free entitlement, is it reasonable that free entitlement is withdrawn?**

Respondents have questioned the validity of the assessment which determines whether free transport must be provided. This has included raising a wide range of concerns:

- The Highways assessment, in relation to speed and volume of traffic, perceived danger of crossing the road, and perceived danger from the use of step-offs and verges on country roads without pavements.
- The Footpath assessment, in relation to surface conditions, lack of lighting, safeguarding, occasional interruption to the route i.e. seasonal weather conditions.
- Length of time the journey would take
- Distance of the journey
- That the assessment focuses on a child as accompanied by a suitable adult

Appendix A provides further information on how the assessments were reached. The factors which have been raised within the consultation responses have been considered by Highways (road) and the Education Service (footpath).

Case law has found that assessments must look at “*the relationship between pedestrians and traffic only. Personal safety issues of children travelling alone are not considered*”. There are very few requirements in the standards to satisfy when determining that a footpath is an available route.

Case law says “*Local authorities are not legally obliged to provide free transport just because parents perceive the route to be unsafe on the grounds of personal safety and security.*”

Equally, we are able to determine whether to make discretionary provision and whether a charge for such provision would be made.

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

We do not determine the arrangements a parent may wish to put in place for their child. It is the parents' responsibility to determine how their child will get to school and this includes making appropriate arrangements if they do not wish to walk.

Therefore, **the test of our assessment against the Standard is whether a child could walk the route “in reasonable safety” accompanied by an adult.** By child, we mean a pupil or student of the relevant age group for the specific school. Therefore, for the Mortimer to Willink route for example, we considered a secondary age student, accompanied by an adult.

Assessments do not determine whether a route is “safe” or “dangerous”. All roads may be thought of as presenting some element of road safety risk, whether they are heavily trafficked urban routes, or more lightly trafficked rural routes. Statutory guidelines confirm that available routes may include crossing fields, wooded areas and public parks. Footpaths are only required to be wide enough for a person to walk along and free of overgrown shrubs. Rights of Way will normally be considered available at all times as well as Permitted Paths and Bridleways. No crossing point can be absolutely safe; the term used in the guidance is “reasonable safety” which would make the walking route available.

We have considered the significant volume of feedback from the public about this matter. Responses have included comments about the numbers affected by the proposal and whether the route would be suitable for large numbers (especially in the case of the entire Willink route and notably about the crossing point at Goring Lane, but also the volumes affected on the Bucklebury to Kennet route and the Aldermaston Wharf to Aldermaston route).

In order to satisfy the Standard, we are not required to consider the volume of walkers that may use the route. This does not mean that we cannot take this into consideration by including discretionary mitigation in our decision-making about the outcome of the proposal, (and this is covered in the conclusions) but we should not consider this in terms of whether the assessment itself meets the Standard.

In assessment terms only, modifying our interpretation of the nationally recognised guidelines could leave us open to challenge for other route assessment factors, which we may struggle to counter if we set a precedent of disregarding the nationally recognised Standard. Within the Road Safety guidelines it says “ *Authorities should consider seeking elected Members’ approval if they propose to deviate from these Guidelines*”, and to date we have not done this.

#### **Mortimer to Willink Route**

A community group – Save Our Buses (SOB) – submitted a report as part of the consultation on behalf of the Mortimer residents.

The respondents alleged that the proposal was indirect discrimination against women and this is addressed in the Equalities Impact Assessment (see [Appendix B](#)). The Assessment considers all protected characteristics, outlines consideration of the issues raised in the consultation and explains any mitigation which has been included in the revised proposal as a result. There has been carefully considered by the Education Service, the Council's Equalities Officer and the Council's Legal Team in relation to all characteristics, and especially these 4 characteristics which are directly relevant to the proposal: Age; Disability; Pregnancy and Maternity; Sex.

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

Appendix C contains the Highways response to the specific points about the road aspects of the Mortimer to Willink route.

The Report also makes claims about previous communication between the residents and the Council with regard to the route to school through Wokefield Common. These claims have been examined in order to assess whether the residents have a legitimate expectation that the provision of free transport to school would continue. For full details see Appendix E.

**We recognise that communities wish the Council to use a higher standard when assessing routes, but this is not what we are required to do.**

We are satisfied that the standards which apply to Local Authorities in terms of the assessment of entitlement to free transport have been correctly applied to the following routes:

- Aldermaston Wharf to Aldermaston Primary School
- Bucklebury to the Kennet School
- East Garston to Shefford Primary School
- Gidley Wood to Chieveley Primary School
- Mortimer to the Willink School

**The routes are confirmed as available routes, in terms of the assessment for entitlement to transport.**

**How could we respond to feedback about the impact of the assessment on families, given that families and communities have expressed a strong desire for a school bus service to continue?**

Appendix D outlines the key themes which have emerged and summarises the Council's response to these factors. In considering the impact of the proposal, we have sought to explore where this can be mitigated.

#### **1. Option to mitigate impact on large volumes of non-entitled pupils (>50)**

We could continue to operate the school buses. Where free entitlement to a seat has ceased, we could offer a seat on a Fare Payer basis. Capacity could be based on applications made during the application window in Term 6 for September. This could provide a significant number of Fare Payer places at the new Standard Rate of £684 (£3.60 per day).

This approach would:

- respond to parents' concerns about loss of the bus which they rely upon, and
- by charging, this option would reduce the financial risk to the Council, as we would know the numbers wanting a seat in advance, and could therefore still deliver savings via additional income offsetting the increase in bus costs.

We will not know the level of demand for September until the Fare Payer window closes in June. Some families may not take up the Fare Payer option (for example: deciding to walk or drive, or because they could find cheaper transport options i.e. Public transport).

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

We could not financially sustain a position whereby a few extra children meant a much bigger bus and significantly increased costs which would not be offset by the income generated. Therefore, an annual decision about capacity would be carefully considered to maximise capacity in line with the level of demand for Fare Payer places up to but not exceeding a cost neutral position. We could make substantial and planned provision where this could be off-set by additional income or adjusting bus sizes, but we could not guarantee a Fare Payer place for every child that may want one.

It may also lead to uncertainty for operators about the bus sizes we would require, which could in turn impact on the cost of transport provision. Therefore, this proposed amendment does carry a low level of financial risk, as the level of uptake from families and the impact of transport costs for specific bus sizes with operators are inter-dependent unknown factors at this point.

This approach would set a precedent that we provide a Fare Payer option rather than removing seats on buses in the future, where route assessments change due to changes in infrastructure or requirements.

Families have suggested that they are willing to pay a low amount (i.e. less than £100) for a seat on the bus. Offering a heavily subsidised seat would not only affect the savings identified for these routes, but would also cost more for Fare Payers across West Berkshire, and would result in a large increase in the cost of Fare Payer provision. For example the current Scheme has banded prices of £230/ £440/ £800, and therefore a reduction to a price of £100 would create a financially unsustainable position. There is a separate proposal about the cost of a Fare Payer seat being set at a Standard Rate of £684. This feedback will be included in the Summary Report for that specific proposal.

It is possible that the Standard Rate of £684 would be a disincentive for parents to use the Fare Payer Scheme as an alternative to walking. However, the retention of a bus service would address the many concerns expressed by parents about the impact on their family lives, and especially where working parents have outlined their concerns about the impact on their ability to work.

Some consultation responses mentioned the ability of low income families to pay for a Fare Payer place. The Scheme allows payment in up to 8 instalments. Also, there is already additional statutory provision for low income families within the Home to School Transport Policy.

We will consider the principle of offering a Fare Payer solution to the affected families for the 3 routes from Aldermaston Wharf, Bucklebury and Mortimer.

## **2. Option to mitigate impact: School or Community-led Bus Service**

We could encourage the school or community to set up a bus service. In other schools where there are large numbers of non-entitled pupils, arrangements for a replacement service have been put in place between either the parents or the school/community and the relevant operator. The operators are also more experienced in making commercial decisions on passenger choices and how to price commercial tickets to reflect this. Examples are private buses arranged by parents of The Downs School students who live in Oxfordshire and or Trinity School's bus scheme.

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

We could offer to:

- Give advice and guidance on tendering procedures, legal requirements and good practice for vehicle operations
- Provide a draft contract and code of practice which the procuring body (parental group/school/community group) could use/adapt to formalise their arrangements, as required.
- Assist with arranging and/or hosting meetings between the procuring body and prospective operators
- Provide details of operators that the Council use and for whom we hold valid insurance and operating licence details, that they may wish to use or invite to tender or set up public transport arrangements with.
- Permit operators with whom we hold an ongoing home to school transport contract for entitled pupils attending the same school, to use a larger vehicle than we require (subject to their being no additional cost to West Berkshire Council) and make the additional capacity available for private arrangements, whereby pupils could apply for a seat direct from the operator involved. The price and terms for the 'private seats' would be as determined by the operator. Similar arrangements exist at The Downs School.
- If the procuring body contract a route, or a commercial operator sets up an operation in the area, and there is spare capacity, then if there are pupils who remain entitled to free home to school transport, we would look to purchase annual passes from the procuring body or operator for these individuals. Payments could be made annual in advance to assist with the overall financing of the service. Similar arrangements exist at Trinity, Theale Green and Little Heath Schools.
- Facilitate DBS Checks for drivers and/or passenger assistants through our Human Resources team.
- Provide details of and timetables for relevant public transport services

### 3. Option to mitigate impact for walkers: School Lockers

We could work in partnership with the affected schools and offer to provide lockers for students affected by this proposal who walk to school, so that they can store their outdoor clothing and equipment. This could only be provided if the school agreed to the provision, and were able to offer the space/location for the lockers. We would not fund lockers for the whole school population, just the numbers affected by the proposal. The school may decide to offer lockers to all students and in this scenario, a proportionate contribution could be made. As a rough estimate, 360 lockers would cost £12-£15k. The Council's contribution would be a one-off cost in 2016/17, reducing the level of savings in that year. We would ensure that we got best value in locker procurement.

### Other Relevant Points

**Parents or Pupils with Disabilities.** Some consultation responses mentioned students with physical disabilities which would prevent them walking the route, or where a parent has a physical disability which affects their ability to accompany their child. There is already provision for these circumstances within the Home to School Transport Policy.

**Pupils with Special Educational Needs.** The proposal is about mainstream transport provision for mainstream pupils. Pupils who qualify for SEN transport provision are not affected.

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

**East Garston to Shefford route.** This is a school-run bus which the Council subsidises for the 6 students that are affected by this proposal. Shefford Primary School is also accommodating 4 other children through a private arrangement between the family and the school. Therefore, the infrastructure is in place for a school-led bus provision for these pupils, and no further mitigation is suggested.

**Gidley Wood to Chieveley route.** Two of the 3 children affected by the consultation have left and the last child leaves in July 2016. The transport route will therefore be removed.

**Mortimer to Willink route.** We will explore whether signage can be added to the route through the woods to aid navigation.

**All routes.** We will also explore what is required to improve the footpath to the standards that residents request (which is above the standard required for a route to be classified as available). However, any works would be subject to the availability of capital or other sources of funding.

We believe the most likely outcome of the removal of free entitlement would be a combination of the following choices for getting from home to school:

- Some families would pay for a seat on a Council-run or school/community-led Bus (if this was available)
- Some families would decide to drive their children to school (and this may include car sharing arrangements with other parents)
- Some families would walk together, and it is likely that those walking would be in friendship clusters or location-based clusters
- Some families will decide to allow their children to walk in a group with their friends

By virtue of undertaking a public consultation and demonstrating a detailed consideration of the response and the issues that have emerged, the Council has:

- satisfied its promise that substantive policy will not be changed and/or a substantive benefit will not be removed before consultation, and
- shown that the consultation responses have had a direct impact on the mitigation measures considered by the decision-makers.

The mitigation measures outlined in this Report would have the following impact on the savings proposal:

<b>Savings outlined in proposal</b>	<b>£246.4k</b>
<b>Cost of mitigation proposals</b>	
1. Mitigate impact on large volumes of non-entitled pupils (>50) by Fare Payer provision	Cost-neutral provision only – no additional cost to the Council
2. School or Community-led Bus Service	Private arrangement – no cost to the Council
3. School lockers for walking children affected by this proposal	£12k- £15k (one-off cost)

## Budget Proposals 2016-17: Home to School Transport – Available Routes

### Summary of Feedback Received and Key Findings

---

***Please note:** In order to allow everyone who wished the opportunity to contribute, feedback was not sampled. Therefore this wasn't a quantitative, statistically valid exercise. It was neither the premise, purpose, nor within the capability of the exercise, to determine the overall community's level of support, or views on the proposals, with any degree of confidence.*

*The feedback captured therefore should be seen in the context of 'those who responded', rather than reflective of the wider community.*

*All the responses have been provided verbatim as an appendix to this report. Whilst this summary seeks to distil the key, substantive points made, it should also be read in conjunction with the more detailed verbatim comments to ensure a full, rounded perspective of the views and comments are considered.*

Caroline Corcoran  
Service Manager (Access, Planning and Trading)  
Education Service  
8 January 2016  
Version 1 (CB)