



**Report to Economic and Environmental
Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development
Committee
17 September 2012**

Subject: Call-In of Cabinet Decision on the Sheffield Bus Agreement

Author of Report: Emily Standbrook, Policy Officer (Scrutiny)
0114 27 35065

Type of item:

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	x
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	
Other	

1. Background

1.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report to Cabinet on August 22nd 2012, proposing a new Bus Agreement for Sheffield. The report is attached at appendix A.

1.2 Cabinet:

- (a) noted the results of the public consultation and work to date on the options for delivering a new Bus Agreement for Sheffield;
- (b) endorsed the Voluntary Partnership Agreement option as the preferred delivery vehicle at the present time, noting that South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE) work on the Quality Contract option is to be suspended to allow the Partnership Agreement to progress; and
- (c) agreed to the principle of the Council being a co-signatory to the Sheffield Bus Agreement and endorsed further work to facilitate a City-wide launch in October 2012.

- 1.3 As per Part 4, section 16 of Sheffield City Council's Constitution, this decision has been called in, preventing implementation of the decision until it has been considered by the relevant Scrutiny Committee.
- 1.4 The Committee may wish to note that for the Sheffield Bus Agreement to go live in October as envisaged in the original Cabinet report, the Bus Service Registrations would need to be submitted to the Traffic Commissionaire no later than September 21st 2012. Should the Committee decide to refer this issue back to Cabinet, or request a deferral of the decision, the earliest possible implementation of the Bus Agreement would be early 2013.
- 1.5 The Call-In notice is attached at appendix B, and asks the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee to consider this issue to allow for greater examination of what the agreement is proposed to contain, and how this might impact on the city's transport offer.
- 1.6 To assist this meeting further background papers on the consultation undertaken and changes arising are enclosed at appendix C

2 The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

As per the Scrutiny Procedure Rules, scrutinise the decision made by Cabinet and take one of the following courses of action:

- (a) refer the decision back to the Cabinet for reconsideration in the light of recommendations from the Committee;
- (b) request that the decision be deferred until the Scrutiny Committee has considered relevant issues and made recommendations to Cabinet;
- (c) take no action in relation to the called-in decision but consider whether issues arising from the call-in need to be added to the work programme of an existing Scrutiny Committee;
- (d) if, but only if (having taken the advice of the Monitoring Officer and/or the Chief Finance Officer), the Committee determines that the decision is wholly or partly outside the Budget and Policy Framework, refer the matter, with any recommendations, to the Council after following the procedures in the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules

Background Papers:

Report of the Executive Director, Place, to Cabinet on the 22nd August 2012 (attached)

Call-in Notice (attached)

Consultation process and changes arising

Category of Report: OPEN



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Cabinet Report

9

Report of: Executive Director of Place

Date: 22nd August 2012

Subject: Sheffield Bus Agreement

Author of Report: Dick Proctor, tel: 273 5907

Summary:

This paper briefs Members on the progress of plans for the “**Sheffield Bus Agreement**” – a Voluntary Partnership approach to improving the bus offer in Sheffield, principally through network design changes, new ticketing products and by reducing the price of the more expensive fares. It seeks agreement to enter into the Partnership, and to endorse specific further work

Reasons for Recommendations:

Improved Public Transport will contribute to the objectives of ‘Standing up for Sheffield’ and the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy.

Recommendations:

- 1) That Members note the results of the public consultation and work to date on the options for delivering a new Bus Agreement for Sheffield;
 - 2) That the City Council endorse the Voluntary Partnership Agreement option as the preferred delivery vehicle at the present time (noting that SYPTE work on the Quality Contract option is to be suspended to allow the Partnership Agreement to progress);
 - 3) That the City Council agree to the principle of being a co-signatory to the Sheffield Bus Agreement and endorse further work to facilitate a city-wide launch in October 2012.
-

Background Papers:

Held by the Council's Transport Vision and Strategy team, also by the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive.

Category of Report: OPEN

Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

Financial Implications
YES Cleared by: Catherine Rodgers
Legal Implications
YES Cleared by: Deborah Eaton
Equality of Opportunity Implications
YES Cleared by: Ian Oldershaw
Tackling Health Inequalities Implications
NO
Human rights Implications
NO
Environmental and Sustainability implications
YES – see paragraph 7.5
Economic impact
NO
Community safety implications
NO
Human resources implications
NO
Property implications
NO
Area(s) affected
All
Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader
Councillor Leigh Bramall
Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in
Economic and Environmental Well-being
Is the item a matter which is reserved for approval by the City Council?
NO
Press release
YES

SHEFFIELD BUS AGREEMENT –
RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION, PROPOSED CITY-WIDE LAUNCH**1.0 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This paper briefs Members on the progress of plans for the “**Sheffield Bus Agreement**” – a Voluntary Partnership approach to improving the bus offer in Sheffield, principally through network design changes, new ticketing products and by reducing the price of the more expensive fares. It seeks agreement to enter into the Partnership, and to endorse specific further work
- 1.2 Buses play a key role in supporting economic growth by linking people to key facilities, education and job opportunities. This is particularly relevant in South Yorkshire where there is a dispersed population and relatively low levels of car ownership. This innovative partnership aims to improve the service offer, grow patronage and support economic growth.
- 1.3 Research indicates customers are seeking an acceptable bus product, namely one that is simple to understand, easy to use, affordable and delivers the right customer experience. The current situation is variable in its delivery of these service attributes and as such hinders people’s ability to use the bus to access employment and training opportunities as well as achieve social inclusion and environmental objectives.
- 1.4 Furthermore the bus network is not currently sufficiently punctual, reliable or stable for customers to use the bus by choice and for patronage to grow.
- 1.5 Subject to approval of the Partnership approach following the planned consultation stage, implementation is likely to be the 28 October 2012 service change date. SCC, SYPTE, First, Stagecoach, Sheffield Community Transport and TM Travel are all currently involved but the Partnership is open to others to join.
- 1.6 Overall, the objective is to offer a stable network of services across the city that broadly matches the existing whilst better matching resource to demand, with the majority of customers benefitting from reductions in the price of day and period ticketing.

2.0 WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR THE PEOPLE OF SHEFFIELD

2.1 The Partnership proposes to offer customers (and reliably deliver):

- high quality, reliable, punctual services;
- a stable, clear to understand bus network, promoted as a whole;
- affordable, cost competitive, value for money fares and ticket products;
- a high quality customer experience both on and off bus;
- promote and market services;
- optimise joint resources to achieve efficiency; and
- maximise the positive environmental impact of the bus.

2.2 These measures will encourage existing users to continue using the bus, and encourage people who travel by other modes to switch voluntarily to the bus, thereby improving problems of congestion and the associated environmental impact this has.

2.3 On this basis the Partnership will make an important contribution to the Council's Corporate Plan "Standing Up for Sheffield". Out of 8 main themes in this document, the Bus Partnership work would contribute to:

- A strong and competitive economy (by improving access to jobs)
- Better Health and Well-being (by promoting active travel)
- Tackling Poverty and Increasing Social Justice (by providing access for all)
- A Great Place to Live (by providing safe and sustainable transport)
- Environmentally Responsible City (by helping reduce carbon emissions)
- Vibrant City (by contributing to fast and frequent transport connections)

2.4 The Bus Partnership work will also play a key role in delivering the Council's "Transport Vision". This aims to provide an improved range of travel options, describes a more integrated, reliable and accessible bus service that better meets passengers' needs as being central to this.

3.0 OUTCOME AND SUSTAINABILITY

3.1 The purpose of the Bus Partnership is to:

- provide a quality transport option for those without use of a car;
- provide a quality choice for those with use of a car;
- increase the overall volume of people using Sheffield bus services;
- prioritise resources to support sustained economic growth and reduce worklessness;
- reduce the environmental impact of travel.

3.2 The key outcome of this report will be the acknowledgement of feedback from public consultation on the proposed bus "offer" (including network and tickets / fares); and the subsequent endorsement of the City Council being signatory to the Partnership

prior to the Agreement being launched on a city-wide basis in October 2012.

REPORT

4.0 WHY IS INTERVENTION NEEDED IN SHEFFIELD?

4.1 As described in the summary section of this paper, the decline in bus patronage in Sheffield needs arresting for the reasons outlined. In particular, customer complaints and market research show that the main areas of passenger dissatisfaction are:

- Bus routes and times of operation;
- Bus quality (including facilities, ability to get a seat and cleanliness);
- Value for money (including product range, interchange ability, cost and variation in fares across Sheffield), in particular by First customersⁱ.
- Wait time at the stop (including punctuality/lateness, reliability and frequency);
- Driver standards (including driving standards, customer care and failure to stop);
- Differing standards of service, and operating times from the two main operators (see Appendix 1)

4.2 Independent research from “Passenger Focus” (2012) confirms that says passengers across South Yorkshire want to see the following aspects of their bus journey improved:

- Punctuality of bus 25%
- More frequent buses 9%
- Improved driver attitude 8%

4.3 It is therefore in the public interest to intervene in the bus market.

5.0 WORK TO DATE ON DELIVERY OPTIONS

5.1 The differing options for delivery of improved bus services across South Yorkshire have been reported to the South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (SYITA) in July 2011 and October 2011 for the Optio Partnership in Sheffield, and again in June and August 2012 as a general update on progress. At these meetings SYITA Members have been briefed on the progress under the differing arrangements under which improved bus services might be achieved, namely:

- Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPA) - where agreement is reached between Operator(s), SYPTTE and the City Council on a package of measures to improve bus satisfaction, introduce stability and affordability and thereby grow patronage. The VPA will set out what the local Transport Authorities will provide, and to what standards Operators will provide their services.
- Statutory Quality Partnership Schemes (SQPS) - where the Council/SYPTTE improve the physical facilities on, or along, the line of a bus route(s) and in turn for using these facilities Bus Operators must meet certain physical attributes in their services.
- Quality Contracts (QC) - this option replaces the existing on-street competition with a franchised network option which is put in place, following a tender process. SYPTTE specify the franchise but the associated risk sits within the public sector.
- Do Nothing – This option is not considered in this report but in view of the falling bus patronage across many parts of the County is not considered an option.

- 5.2 At the July 2011 meeting SYITA Members noted the improvements made in Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham in partnership with local Bus Operators and endorsed that the VPA approach continue to be worked up and be formalised where the opportunity exists.
- 5.3 SYITA Members have also previously approved the implementation of the first two phases of a Voluntary Agreement for Sheffield (Optio Orange and Red) and in turn endorsed the delivery of a VPA across the whole of the Sheffield area, in parallel with a “twin-track” approach that also continued work on a potential Quality Contract.
- 5.4 ITA members were keen on the attractions of early delivery of the VPA option and that this might avoid the need for a QC, with its associated financial risk, but recognised that work should continue on the QC in case the VPA option encountered problems. The PTE has continued working on the Quality Contract option in refining costs, modelling, reducing risks and refining specification. The work has shown that this could be a plausible option but one which significantly shifts the onus of risk onto the public sector.
- 5.5 The key pros and cons of each approach as identified by the PTE are now summarised below:

a) VOLUNTARY PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

Delivery

- Launch in October 2012 is possible
- Investment ongoing

Pros

- This option has been shown to grow the market
- The main risks lie with the Operators

- Operators continue to actively work with SYPTTE and SCC on this approach. This is especially relevant giving the alignment of timing to the PFI project.
- Agreement to share performance and related data
- It reduces the risk of commercial competition undermining the viability of the secondary (socially necessary) bus network
- The retention of operators' own ticket schemes avoid the risks of fares rising for customers of certain operators and on competitive corridors
- Eligible for Better Bus Area Funding, under current DfT plans and as part of the recent "City Deal"
- Retains higher frequencies than QC option, especially High Green, Ecclesall Road and Woodhouse Lane area and the new SL3 ("Supertram Link No.3")

Cons

- Control over under performance remains influential rather than contractual
- Operators free to supplement Partnership marketing with their own marketing activity
- Risk that Operators exit the Partnership

b) QUALITY CONTRACT

Delivery

- Would take approximately 3 years to reach "launch date", allowing for statutory process including 2 x consultations, ITA (and SCC) approvals, QC Board deliberations, ITA responses procurement and contract award

Pros

- Contractual relationship
- Performance management through incentives and penalties
- Public sector sole responsibility and control
- Complete public transport co-ordination and integration without risk of being undermined by competitive practices
- Benefits equally applied across entire area, rather than some areas being favoured through competition promotions
- Full passenger travel data from ETMs will help to develop the public transport offer to meet passenger needs and supply detailed information to support funding applications
- Single operational brand will help improve marketing opportunities and remove confusion of operational responsibility
- More simple and equitable ticket scheme
- Improved links between hospitals, to Meadowhall from South East and North Sheffield

Cons

- Financial risk shared by ITA and SCC

- Uncertainty of future SYITA/SYPTE/SCC finances going forward, whilst committing to retain funding levels in the QC area via contract
- By adopting a single equitable ticket scheme, by implication this means that high fares reduce whilst low fares rise. Or contingency is invested into lower fares
- Cost and degree of commitment to delivery, including legal challenge
- Transitional risks, including non-cooperation of existing operators during the initial 3 years of the PFI project up to when the QC would go live.
- 10-year scheme with limited opportunities for making changes other than re-applying for a revised scheme
- Increased expectation that we can deliver exactly what is requested regardless of financial considerations
- Operator bids may be more expensive than expected making the scheme unaffordable
- Not eligible for Better Bus Area Funding under current City Deal.

5.6 A realistic minimum timescale for bringing the Quality Contract scheme into operation is considered to be 3 years, mindful of the threats of challenge from bus operators who oppose this option as they believe it to be a threat to their business. In comparison, a Voluntary Agreement could be in place as early as October 2012 and, if deemed less than successful could still provide much useful data for the preparation of a subsequent Quality Contract.

5.7 One of the problems any potential scheme promoter is facing at the moment is the lack of a precedent. Although QC legislation describes the Public Interest tests, supported by guidance, there is no directly prescribed approach and it is for the Local Transport Authority to determine how to apply the tests to the Scheme. As Members will be aware, both Nexus and Metro are considering a QC whilst continuing to discuss equivalent Partnership options. Most recently (29 June 2012), West Yorkshire ITA considered that the Partnership proposals put forward in West Yorkshire were lacking, especially in terms of accountability and adopting a single integrated ticketing scheme, they then endorsed further development of the QC option as their preferred approach.

5.8 The lack of a clear precedent for meeting the public interest criteria exposes this area as a very high risk to the Scheme. Additionally, this is the area which is most likely to be subject to challenges from interested parties. As well as the QC Board considering the Public Interest criteria in substantial detail, opponents of the Scheme will also recognise that this is their best opportunity to challenge the Scheme. As such, it is likely that they will also analyse our assessments in considerable detail and challenge them through the QC Board. We will need to closely examine at this stage whether our data is sufficiently accurate to stand the rigour of operator challenge.

5.9 By definition, a Quality Contract would require a standard fare to be set on a city-wide basis, and would preclude the possibility of "special

offers” on specific corridors. A QC would therefore disadvantage between 25-30% of existing customers. In comparison, the VPA option has very few losers as operators are able to maintain their own products (in addition to the new joint products).

- 5.10 The recently announced City Deal for the Sheffield City-Region enables the ITA, the City Council and bus partners to become a fast-track “test-bed” Better Bus Area, supported with additional Government funding from October 2012 onwards to enable us to become the first area to receive Bus Service Operator Grant (BSOG) devolution once the necessary powers are in place. The Government would provide between £1.5m- £2m per annum additional resources for use on initiatives agreed within a Partnership approach, but has confirmed it would not financially support the Quality Contract approach.
- 5.11 It should be noted that either option means a range of commitments on the City Council and the ITA – for example to operate and enforce bus priority measures, to manage the highway network as efficiently as possible for buses, and to make significant investments in transport infrastructure and traffic management over a period of several years.
- 5.12 In summary therefore PTE and SCC officers favour the Voluntary Partnership Agreement option, because it delivers most of the benefits of a Quality Contract and for the following reasons:-
- Speed of delivery.
 - Ticketing offers immediate benefits to customers using the Sheffield all-operator ticket products and day/period full price First customers, without asking customers of lower cost tickets to pay more.
 - The financial risk rests with the Operators, and the significant transitional risks of introducing a Quality Contract are avoided. It is therefore affordable despite the reductions in government funding over current and future years.
 - It has the opportunity to draw down significant funding through the City Deal (an estimated £8m over five years)
- 5.13 The PTE reported the above assessment of the two main delivery options to SYITA at its August meeting, and ITA Members resolved to support the Voluntary Partnership Agreement approach to improving bus services in Sheffield..
- 5.14 ITA also agreed to bring the work on the Quality Contract option in Sheffield to a sensible stopping point and suspend it (as opposed to abandon the work) in case it is ever needed in the future (e.g if the Partnership approach subsequently encounters unresolvable problems).
- 5.15 This paper therefore proposes that the City Council endorses and supports the ITA decisions for the way forward, noting that the Quality Contract option is essentially at that point of being ready to progress

into the more formal, statutory, stages of development and can therefore be suspended to allow the Voluntary Partnership Agreement option to be pursued

6.0 PROGRESS ON POTENTIAL NETWORK, TICKETING ETC.

6.1 Broader progress on the Sheffield-wide Partnership proposal has considered a wide range of network and ticketing issues, a Joint Investment Plan and a Marketing and Communications Plan. All these are described in more detail in Appendix 3. From an early stage, the need to involve the public was recognised as central to identifying problems and drafting solutions for an improved bus service in Sheffield.

6.2 To this end, a large-scale consultation exercise has been undertaken, from 18 June until 14 July, the overarching message being to seek to improve travel opportunities and optimise Sheffield's bus services to make them more attractive to customers.

6.3 Consultation tools included:

- A dedicated website with feedback tool.
- Letter briefing Members, MP's and key stakeholders.
- Briefings for all seven Assembly meetings within the consultation period, plus articles for Community Assembly websites and newsletters concentrating on affected areas.
- Stand in Sheffield Interchange.
- Briefing for local/regional media.
- Information on buses
- Sheffield Transport User Group, South Yorkshire Transport User Group and Sheffield On The Move presentations
- Briefing for national stakeholders and trade media.
- Monitoring of local media, website forums and social media.

6.4 By the end of the consultation, over 2500 responses had been received, including a total of 10 petitions regarding proposed changes to bus service routes. The key issues included:

- **Lack of service on Psalter Lane (and Ringinglow)** – In the light of the petitions and the level of public concern, SYPTTE have proposed an hourly “tendered” service, and are seeking to actively engage with the local community to help grow the market.
- **Bus route in Millhouses** – The revised route would allow the Operator to improve commercial opportunities with improved frequency and commercial evening and Sunday journeys. Given local concerns raised, the Partners propose to reverse the route in the Millhouses area.
- **Wincobank** – Various views about the proposed new service pattern have been raised, but the emphasis is on providing a more reliable service. Present performance has been heavily criticised.

- **Cross Chapeltown link** – the existing service between Rotherham and Sheffield via Chapeltown and High Green is proposed to be split into Sheffield - High Green and Rotherham - Chapeltown links. Public concern reflects this loss of the through service, principally between High Green and Rotherham. The PTE believe that services into Sheffield are adequately provided for by other existing services but are now looking more closely at access to Rotherham including the colleges
- **Fulwood (Brooklands)** – Residents are unhappy at the prospect of a 20 minute frequency service compared to existing hourly.
- **Service 87** – The consultation material erroneously suggested a reduction in service to every 20 minutes during the weekday. No frequency in reduction is planned. A proposed change via Archer Road is still being progressed in response to earlier passenger requests, notwithstanding frontage objections
- **Service 57 / Supertram link SL** – Service operations across the Stocksbridge area are being reviewed in the light of the comments made, it is proposed that services will be remained broadly on their existing routes
- **Service 44** - Issues with loss of service on the number 44 bus in the evenings, the PTE will provide a tendered service in the daytime and evening.
- **Services 75 and 76** – routing options in the area of the Northern General and Flower Estate are still being reviewed

6.5 The consultation response from “Passenger Focus” is worthy of mention, they were supportive of the overall approach to the consultation exercise and the methodology for subsequent review.

6.6 Overall, many of the issues noted also refer to existing unreliable service operation by First and fears that any new service changes will not result in improved performance. First have recognised past problems and responded by restructuring their local / regional management team.

7.0 IMPLICATIONS

Financial

7.1 The Voluntary Partnership option discussions have been based on a commitment to retain existing levels of tendered service and concessionary funding, whilst at the same time introducing stability to the areas of budget which SYPTE are most exposed to uncontrolled change.

7.2 Formal signing of the Partnership Agreement will be conditional upon

the City Council and SYITA agreeing to allocate capital programme funding to bus related interventions, and the creation of a five-year programme to support this. Funding already exists through

- The Local Transport Plan (LTP) within which allocations already exist for individual corridors and for city-wide programmes;
- Pre-agreed allocations within the Better Buses Area Fund, a two-year grant provided by Government to SYITA;
- Approved measures within the existing Phase 1 of the Local Sustainable Transport Funds (LSTF); and importantly
- The recently announced award of significant further funding for “main” South Yorkshire LSTF programme, which includes a range of bus related, traffic management and “modal shift” measures

Equal Opportunities

- 7.3 Fundamentally the Bus Agreement will be of universal benefit to all users regardless of age, race, faith, sex, disability, sexuality, etc. However, it will be of particular benefit to certain groups including the young, elderly, disabled and their carers, the partners have undertaken an Equality Impact Assessment. Investment in vehicles and highway infrastructure will take into consideration the needs of users with reduced mobility, including people with visual impairments, and incorporated measures such as tactile paving where appropriate.

Legal and Freedom of Information Act

- 7.4 The PTE, on behalf of the Partnership, have prepared a Competition Test paper to demonstrate that the VPA meets the public interest test set out in Part 2 of Schedule 10 to the 2000 Act.

Environmental

- 7.5 On 11 July 2012, Cabinet approved the **Sheffield Air Quality Action Plan** (AQAP). The Plan describes issues relating to air quality and recognises the problems created by emissions from all categories of motorised traffic, with particular problems areas being busy roads (especially where the annual average daily traffic flow is greater than 17,000 vehicles per day) and busy junctions, as well as certain city centre locations affected by high levels of nitrogen dioxide, where bus traffic is a contributory factor.
- 7.6 Public consultation on the AQAP in 2011 showed strong support for the Plan’s aspirations to (1) reduce emissions from traffic, (2) encourage public transport use and (3) promote improvements in engine technology and the use of less polluting fuels. Respondents identified and ranked the following activities in order of preference (top three):
- Smarter Choices, to influence travel behaviour
 - City Centre Low Emission Zone
 - Sustainable Transport Policies
- 7.7 In addition to considering the problems of overall traffic volumes and the problems caused by heavy goods vehicles, the paper notes that one way to achieve air quality improvements would be through

improvements in the bus fleet, and one way to achieve that would be by agreement with bus operators through a partnership scheme. This would involve investment from the bus companies, City Council and Passenger Transport Executive to improve the environmental performance of the fleet.

- 7.8 The Bus Partnership recognises the importance of a lower-emission bus fleet, including in order to improve city centre air quality and to help with the promotion of smarter/sustainable travel choices.
- 7.9 It is important, however, that bus operators are not targeted disproportionately or without evidence to back up any proposed interventions. The AQAP recognizes this and stresses the need for further research to provide an evidence-based approach. For example, nationally there has been a general expectation that cleaner engine technologies (newer Euro standards) would lead to some improvement in air quality. However, this has not been observed either in Sheffield or other urban areas. This is thought to be related to the actual on-road performance of diesel road vehicles when compared with test bed calculations.
- 7.10 Further research will include the detailed feasibility/modelling study that is being undertaken to demonstrate the costs and potential air quality improvements of introducing a Low Emission Zone (see the AQAP report).
- 7.11 For these reasons, the AQAP 2015 is the first report in a three year rolling programme. It will be reviewed and updated shortly following completion of the Low Emission Zone feasibility study, due in Autumn 2012, and again in 2014 as the research and evidence-base is developed. The results of this will feed into the monitoring and review process for the Bus Partnership and may lead to agreement on amended measures and timescales.

Community Safety

- 7.12 The Bus Agreement would be neutral or provide a positive indirect contribution to Community Safety through better operated and more stable bus services. Investment in infrastructure, including improved facilities and lighting at all bus stops (linked to associated PFI measures) will also contribute.

Human Rights

- 7.13 The rights of any affected parties under the Human Rights Act 1998, particularly Article 1 of the First Protocol, have been taken into account. Having regard to the public interest and the improvements the scheme will bring to the transport network, the proposed alterations to the highway network and to private means of access do not constitute an unlawful interference with any of these rights, nor do the acquisitions constitute an unlawful interference with any of these rights.

8.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 Improved Public Transport will contribute to the objectives of 'Standing up for Sheffield' and the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy.

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 That Members note the results of the public consultation and work to date on the options for delivering a new Bus Agreement for Sheffield;
- 9.2 That the City Council endorse the Voluntary Partnership Agreement option as the preferred delivery vehicle at the present time (noting that SYPTE work on the Quality Contract option is to be suspended to allow the Partnership Agreement to progress);
- 9.3 That the City Council agree to the principle of being a co-signatory to the Sheffield Bus Agreement and endorse further work to facilitate a city-wide launch in October 2012.

Simon Green
Executive Director of Place

06 August 2012

APPENDIX 1 – CURRENT PASSENGER SATISFACTION ISSUES

A1.3 In Sheffield there is a marked difference between the two main bus operations, these can be characterised as follows:

- First – the main Operator with around 60% of Sheffield bus services, providing both frequent main road services and a less frequent but comprehensive network penetrating into residential areas.
- This secondary network amounts to around 40% of their high frequency network. The secondary network typically attracts lower patronage and lower income, which has led First to maintain higher ticket prices (e.g. First Day Sheffield £4.60) to fund its secondary network.
- This pattern has characterised First's history, as has struggled to afford its customer offer and maintain profit margins, and as a result, has repeatedly increased fares and reduced network, both of which have resulted in reputational damage.
- Stagecoach – As the secondary Operator, offering around 30% of Sheffield's bus services, Stagecoach operate a predominantly main road network (their lower frequency services amount to around 11% of their high frequency network), with less hours of operation.
- This more limited network and timetable means that Stagecoach offer customers a considerably cheaper travel option (e.g. Sheffield Bus Day Rider £3.40, Bus and Tram £3.90) and carry a passenger volume in excess of their market share.
- Stagecoach not only compete on price but quality, they have built a solid reputation (when compared to First or Yorkshire Terrier), and have progressively expanded since they entered the market in late 2005.

A1.2 The implication of the above has been that by providing a better customer offer (during the daytime) on the busier main corridors, Stagecoach have been attracting customers from First and in so doing they have reduced First's ability to cross-subsidise between the better used services and those which are commercial (at a higher fare value) but socially important.

A1.3 In an ideal world the high frequency main road services would support a similar level of secondary network, but under the free market the current arrangements place the secondary network at significant risk – and public authorities have not previously had the powers to intervene.

APPENDIX 2 – OPTIO ORANGE AND RED

- A2.1 Optio Orange and Red were introduced in Sheffield in July and October 2011 respectively, against a background decline in bus patronage. These pilot schemes have allowed the partnership to trial new ideas, learn lessons for future phases (e.g. consultation) and evidence success. This has led to growth of +1.9% for Orange services (Period 5-10) and +5.16% for Red (Period 8-10), although growth has fallen in 2012 due to weather, holidays and market conditions.
- A2.2 As well as co-ordinated timetables, more flexible ticketing, bus investment and marketing, other measures of success contributing to this growth include:
- Punctuality and reliability are higher than other Sheffield services and are better than achieved by the Optio services during the same 3/6 months in the previous year. There is still work to do to further improve delivery and the Partners are collaborating on this.
 - Mystery Shopper audits show higher standards of service than the average across Sheffield or South Yorkshire.
- A2.3 As well as increasing patronage, Optio Orange service users are overall positive about the bus service offer, whereas across Sheffield and South Yorkshire they remain negative overall. The exception to the above is from the Fulwood community who continue to be unhappy with the Optio Orange changes, notwithstanding steps to address or mitigate their concerns.
- A2.4 One of the issues was that, because the Fulwood end of the service changed from Stagecoach to First and the ticket did not cover Supertram, inter-availability of ticketing worsened for significant number of people. This work, whilst not addressing the differing market dynamic between First and Stagecoach, did prove that collaboration and inter-availability of ticketing were achievable, advantages which had previously proven to be elusive through negotiation.

APPENDIX 3 – DETAILED ASPECTS OF THE SHEFFIELD AGREEMENT

The current state of play across the six main “work packages” can be described as follows:

Network

Discussions have resulted in broad agreement on a network at an officer level, based largely around the existing network but with local variation, to reduce the volume of buses where demand does not justify overbussing and increases in frequency on a number of corridors where current service is lower than found in other parts of the City. It was heavily influenced by the Bus Vision consultation undertaken in the summer of 2010. A key element of this Work Package is not only to offer a good bus network better linking people to jobs, training and facilities, but importantly also bringing stability to the market and in doing so making the network easier to understand.

Stagecoach are interested in retaining a network largely based on expanding their existing network, but are open to operate more routes. To activate a long term sustainable business (with more cost attractive ticketing), First have made clear which parts of the network they wish to retain, a proportion of which they wish to share with other Operators as they are less profitable.

Investment

The proposed Investment Plan will cover a five year period from October 2012 – 2017. It will cover all partners – operators and SCC and SYPTE investment, as a demonstration of commitment to Partnership and because all have a role to play in raising quality standards to make a step-change in improving the all-round door-to-door customer experience. An annual review mechanism will monitor progress against these standards and agree new investment requirements.

For Operators, the Investment Plan will include agreed timescales for:

- vehicles being low-floor and fully DDA-compliant in advance of national timescales;
- Smartcard-compatible ticketing machines;
- tracking systems that link with traffic management systems to help late-running buses and also with real-time public information systems;
- improving emission levels through ‘Drive Green’ systems; the Eco Stars award system; and improving/newer engine technology;
- reducing the age of the fleet - towards achieving a recommended national level.

The Partners are now in a position to agree realistic but ambitious timescales for new and newer buses, with all vehicles to a minimum standard of DDA-compliance; Euro 3 engines or better; smart card ticketing; and fully-operational tracking systems.

For SCC/SYPTE, the Investment Plan will include agreed timescales for:

- coordination with the Highways PFI Core Period programme so far as possible;
- a 5-year bus hotspots programme;
- measures to improve on-street bus performance on the Ecclesall Road corridor, with similar measures on the City Centre-Woodhouse (Optio Red) and City Centre to Halfway (Optio Orange) corridors;
- the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Northern Route;
- new Interchange facilities as appropriate geared to the opening of new City Centre retail development (e.g. the Markets; NRQ);
- a city-wide programme of updating on-street signs and lines to enable 100% enforceability;
- roll-out of the innovative management regime of mobile and re-locatable cameras, supplementing an enhanced programme of permanent fixed location cameras to enforce bus priority facilities and Traffic Control strategies;
- an enhanced real-time information and incident management system through the South Yorkshire Intelligent Transport System (syITS);
- an enhanced programme of bus stop infrastructure incorporating real-time information (to be agreed once real-time is working better & consideration has been given to how the displays can be used as a more advanced communications tool);
- DDA-compliant kerbs, tactile paving and clearways at all bus stops, as part of a programme of “reasonable adjustments” to meet DDA regulations by 2017 at the latest;
- consideration of enhanced street lighting at all bus stops.

Some of these interventions are funded through LSTF and the Better Buses Area Fund and carry with them short delivery timescales).

Ticketing

The ticket discussions (aimed at introducing a simplified ticket range offering more affordable fares to customers) are focussed on improving the multi-operator Travelmaster range of products - with Operators free to maintain their own ranges. The advantages of going through Travelmaster are that it allows more influence over future price rises, encompasses Supertram and other Operators, encourages the move to ‘Smart’ and has a moderating effect on individual Operator price rises/fare levels.

Although Operators remain free to retain their own tickets, negotiations have achieved a significant 14% reduction in “day city-wide Travelmaster” tickets (from £5.00 to £4.30) with even greater reductions in weekly and monthly products (over 20%).

The principal operators both have smartcard-compatible ticketing machines (smaller operators will be encouraged to partake in this) that can be used with the current national concessionary ticket scheme (ENCTS). 98% of ENCTS cards are now “read” by Stagecoach machines, A separate “Better Buses” funded project will roll this out to other existing cards (e.g. Megacards) and develop new products and sales methods.

Information & Marketing

It is proposed to jointly agree information and marketing material, to help both existing and potential customers know the travel options on offer and understand that is now easier and more cost attractive to use the bus, but at present work is focusing on branding and consultation activities linked to the possible network and ticket changes. There will be a single Sheffield bus/tram network map, something we haven't had since the 1980's

Business Management

It is intended that the Partnership will be supported by a Legal Agreement. To pave the way for this, a "Heads of Terms" document is proposed and the SYITA have authorised the Chairman to sign this document. The target implementation date is the 28 October 2012 service change date. It will also be necessary for Sheffield City Council to approve entering into the VPA.

Sheffield City Council Equality Impact Assessment



[Guidance for completing this form is available on the intranet](#)

Help is also available by selecting the grey area and pressing the F1 key

Name of policy/project/decision: Sheffield Bus Agreement

Status of policy/project/decision: New

Name of person(s) writing EIA: Cate Jockel

Date: 26.07.12

Service: Development Services

Portfolio: Place

What are the brief aims of the policy/project/decision? To improve the bus offer in Sheffield for all customers in order to increase patronage and support economic growth. Through a better co-ordinated service with improved accessibility (physical, information, etc).

Are there any potential Council staffing implications, include workforce diversity? No

Under the [Public Sector Equality Duty](#), we have to pay due regard to: “Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations.” [More information is available on the council website](#)

Areas of possible impact	Impact	Impact level	Explanation and evidence (Details of data, reports, feedback or consultations. This should be proportionate to the impact.)
Age	Positive	High	Elderly will benefit from accessibility improvements in particular, but also have lower car ownership/use than the general population. Likewise younger people, who will be better able to access employment and training opportunities.
Disability	Positive	High	Newer buses will mean the introduction of DDA-compliant buses into the fleet prior to the legal deadline. Alongside bus stop improvements to provide level boarding and tactiles, the bus will enable increasing social inclusion.
Pregnancy/maternity	Positive	Low	Bus services will be easier to understand and use, with co-ordinated timetables, multi-operator ticketing, more accessible vehicles and infrastructure and better information.
Race	Positive	Low	Bus services will be easier to understand and use, with co-ordinated timetables, multi-operator ticketing, more accessible vehicles and infrastructure and better information.
Religion/belief	Positive	Low	Bus services will be easier to understand and use, with co-ordinated timetables, multi-operator ticketing, more accessible vehicles and infrastructure and better

Areas of possible impact	Impact	Impact level	Explanation and evidence (Details of data, reports, feedback or consultations. This should be proportionate to the impact.)
			information.
Sex	Positive	Low	Bus services will be easier to understand and use, with co-ordinated timetables, multi-operator ticketing, more accessible vehicles and infrastructure and better information.
Sexual orientation	Positive	Low	Bus services will be easier to understand and use, with co-ordinated timetables, multi-operator ticketing, more accessible vehicles and infrastructure and better information.
Transgender	Positive	Low	Bus services will be easier to understand and use, with co-ordinated timetables, multi-operator ticketing, more accessible vehicles and infrastructure and better information.
Carers	Positive	High	Newer buses will mean the introduction of DDA-compliant buses into the fleet prior to the legal deadline. Alongside bus stop improvements to provide level boarding and tactiles, the bus will enable increasing social inclusion, including for carers of young children as well as disabled people.
Voluntary, community & faith sector	Positive	Low	Bus services will be easier to understand and use, with co-ordinated timetables, multi-operator ticketing, more accessible vehicles and infrastructure and better information.
Financial inclusion, poverty, social justice:	Positive	High	Bus services will be easier to understand and use, with co-ordinated timetables, multi-operator ticketing, more accessible vehicles and infrastructure and better information. Reliability should be improved. Younger people, who have lower car ownership/use than the general population, will be better able to access employment and training opportunities.
Cohesion:	Positive	Low	Bus services will be easier to understand and use, with co-ordinated timetables, multi-operator ticketing, more accessible vehicles and infrastructure and better information.
Other/additional:	-Select-	-Select-	

Overall summary of possible impact (to be used on EMT, cabinet reports etc):

Fundamentally this proposal is positive for all Sheffield people regardless of age, sex, race, faith, disability, sexuality, etc. However, it is particularly positive for more vulnerable

members of society such as the young, the elderly, the disabled and carers. No negative equality impacts have been identified.

City-wide consultation has been carried out and the results are included in the report. There are a few areas where bus services have been struggling to survive and where it was proposed that a service should not continue. The reaction to this, and subsequent mitigation proposed, is in the report.

If you have identified significant change, med or high negative outcomes or for example the impact is on specialist provision relating to the groups above, or there is cumulative impact you **must** complete the action plan.

Review date: The Agreement will include a comprehensive Monitoring Plan.

Q Tier Ref / **Reference number:** /

Entered on Qtier: No **Action plan needed:** No

Approved (Lead Manager): Cate Jockel **Date:** 07/08/12

Approved (EIA Lead person for Portfolio): Ian Oldershaw **Date:** 07/08/12

Does the proposal/ decision impact on or relate to specialist provision: no

Risk rating: Low

Action plan

Area of impact	Action and mitigation	Lead, timescale and how it will be monitored/reviewed
All groups		
-Select-		
-Select-		
-Select-		
-Select-		
-Select-		
-Select-		
-Select-		
-Select-		
-Select-		
-Select-		

Area of impact	Action and mitigation	Lead, timescale and how it will be monitored/reviewed
-Select-		

Approved (Lead Manager): Date:

Approved (EIA Lead Officer for Portfolio): Date:

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

CALL-IN PROCESS FOR EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

I IAN AUCKLAND (Name of Member in Block Capitals)
under the provision of Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16, wish to call-in Item No. 9
relating to SHEFFIELD BUS AGREEMENT
of the meeting of CABINET (meeting title)
on 22nd AUGUST 2012 (date) for consideration by the
ECONOMIC & ENVIRONMENTAL WELLBEING Scrutiny Committee.

The relevant Scrutiny Committee will be indicated on the Checklist within the report relating to this matter.

Reason for Call-In

To allow for greater examination of what the agreement is proposed to contain and how this might impact on city transport offer

Signed [Signature] Date 23.8.12

I have obtained the following signatures of the other Members who wish to call-in this item:-

Name (in Block Capitals)	Signature
1. <u>JOE OTTEN</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>
2. <u>ROGER DAVISON</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>
3. <u>SHAFFA MOHAMMED</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>
4. <u>COLIN ROSS</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>

(NOTE: Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16 requires five Members, including two from the appropriate Scrutiny Committee to 'call-in' an Executive decision for scrutiny. This can be done up to **4 working days after the decision publication**.)

The five signatures required for the call-in process must be submitted by the deadline date, but need not all be on one form.

**Completed forms to be returned to the
Head of Democratic Services (Room G13/14, Town Hall),
by the deadline referred to above.**

The request will be logged and forwarded to the Director of Performance and Communications for action.

SHEFFIELD BUS PARTNERSHIP

CONSULTATION

The consultation on the proposed changes to the bus network took place between 18 June and 14 July 2012. The design of the proposal was influenced by the 'Vision for Buses in South Rotherham and Sheffield' consultation which was undertaken 2 years ago and attracted 1,268 responses following a 3 month consultation exercise.

The consultation this time around included:

- Posters on Sheffield based buses run by Partnership Operators
- Posters in Sheffield Interchange
- Briefing to both Labour and Liberal Democrat politicians
- Letters to key stakeholders (MPs, Parish Councils, SCC Community Assembly Managers, 231 x Community Groups, NHS Trusts, 4 x Housing Associations, Sheffield Chamber and Commerce, Passenger Focus)
- A dedicated website (the main consultation tool)
- Consultation leaflet and network maps
- Interchange drop-in meetings at 5 sites
- Engagement with all seven SCC Community Assemblies (CA) including briefings, attendance at meeting and articles for CA websites and newsletters, concentrating on affected areas
- Presentation to South Yorkshire Transport Users' Group
- Single item meeting of 'Sheffield on the Move' forum and a further more detailed briefing on the delivery options to interested and available attendees of this forum.
- 'Transport for All' briefing
- The consultation was supported by a proactive media campaign to further engage the wider community.

In line with Government recommendations, the consultation was targeted at existing users - as the most likely to be disadvantaged by changes - and was web-based with hard copy and telephone options available for those without access to the internet.

In total over 2,600 responses were made to this consultation and additionally 11 petitions have been received.

In summary the key points arising relate to:

- Existing punctuality and reliability (25% of consultees raised such concerns).
- The withdrawal of service from Psalter Lane (578 responses and 3 petitions).

All comments made were considered in some detail, and the attached table (**Annex A**) summarises the deliberations of the services attracting 25 or more comments, or where changes are proposed. This shows that the Partnership have made positive changes to 16% of services.

Of particular note is the consultation response from Passenger Focus, which is attached hereto (**Annex B**). This evidences that the methodical and consultative approach adopted accords with best practice.

SHEFFIELD BUS PARTNERSHIP CONSULTATION RESPONSE SUMMARY

2654 Consultation responses have been received (as at 21 July 2012). The main areas of concern (which have received at least 25 individual responses or where less and changes have been made) are indicated below with the action to be taken by the Partnership.

Service No	Route	No of Comments (up to 21/07/12)	Welcomed	Opposed	Issues	Action Taken Y/N	SYPTE Action in Association with Operators
1	Jordanthorpe, Gleadless, Meadowhall	21	62% ✓	29%	<p><u>PROPOSAL</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequency improved to half hourly daytime Extended to City via Chancet Wood and Meersbrook <p><u>ISSUES</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the main people welcome the improvements. 	N	No change proposed as welcomed as a positive change
4	Millhouses - Darnall	578 + approx 800 signatures (3 petitions)	2% ✓	42%	<p><u>PROPOSAL</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section between Millhouses and City via Psalter Lane/Cemetery Road withdrawn. (Banner Cross – Millhouses section transferred to Stagecoach #83). Section between City and Darnall will be retained, although operator has yet to be determined. <p><u>ISSUES</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliability of current service leading to poor patronage Service removal cuts off access to city centre, Ecclesall Road and beyond for largely elderly population (and access to facilities for elderly who cannot negotiate steep hill) 	Y	<p>SYPTE has tendered for an hourly Monday – Saturday daytime service between Sheffield Interchange, Psalter Lane and Ecclesall Road.</p> <p>Existing evening and Sunday services between Darnall, City and Psalter Lane will continue, although will not operate to Millhouses as the latter destination is dealt with on a commercial basis by Stagecoach.</p> <p>The Darnall to City section will be retained.</p>
6	Fulwood - Darnall	83 (includes 83A, which replaces Fulwood leg of service 6)	34%	51% ✓	<p><u>PROPOSAL</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Darnall section is dealt with under service 4 proposals (above). Any opposition to service 6 between City and Fulwood refers to its replacement by Stagecoach route 83A, which will result in a 20 minute daytime frequency along Brooklands Avenue and Moorcroft Road: - residents are generally unhappy with this potential service. <p><u>ISSUES</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residents do not want bus service on Brooklands Avenue, or Moorcroft Road but users welcome a change in Operator and frequency 	N	In order to provide a better service between Fulwood, Ecclesall Road and Sheffield, it is considered that the benefits afforded by Stagecoach 83A to the travelling public, outweigh those of residents who do not wish to have a bus passing their homes.
11 & 12	City-Hillsborough Stannington/Hall Park Head	14	14% ✓	64%	<p><u>PROPOSAL</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to turning problems the service will no longer serve Nethergate <p><u>ISSUES</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of bus service 	Y	Following concerns about the safety to reversing of buses this service will no longer serve Nethergate, instead this area will be served by tendered routes 61/62

Service No	Route	No of Comments (up to 21/07/12)	Welcomed	Opposed	Issues	Action Taken Y/N	SYLTE Action in Association with Operators
13 & 66	City – High Green Chapelton - Rotherham	74 + 900 (1 petition)	12%	74% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved frequency between City, Grenoside and High Green via Penistone Road but do not continue to Chapelton or Rotherham, necessitating interchange. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic strong links to Chapelton for local services Withdrawal of direct access to Rotherham affects a lot of workers and students at RCAT and TRC colleges (particularly from High Green end) Length of time it takes to travel to city centre via Hillsborough Over bussing in High Green 	Y	First have agreed to restore the link between High Green and Chapelton and Rotherham. The ability to improve interchange between #13 and #66 becomes possible at High Green.
14	City – Hillsborough – Loxley – Wisewood	14	21%	57% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised route. Buses will operate via Ben Lane, Rodney Hill Hanson Road, Chase Road, Ben Lane returning to City via Wisewood, Hollowmoor Road, Wisewood Avenue, Hollowmoor Road, Ben Lane and reverse of outward route. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of service 	Y	The service will be retained on its existing route
30 & 70	Crystal Peaks - Dore	60 (includes service 70 City – Dore)	25%	45% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Route to be split to run as City – Dore and City – Crystal Peaks. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of direct access to Hallamshire Hospital from Beighton/Woodhouse/Handsworth 	Y	The City – Dore section whilst welcomed in the main, will be extended to serve Sheffield interchange offering better links to rail services. The concern which is not being addressed is the loss of direct links to the Hallamshire Hospital from Beighton/Handsworth, but same stop connections in High Street or Pinstone Street are available during the main day. On evenings and Sundays the 2 routes are linked, thus providing direct services between Plumley, Beighton/Handsworth and Hallamshire Hospital. Services operating to Dore will also serve the interchange at these times, so as to introduce new connections.
35/36/ 37	City – Hillsborough/ Northern General Hospital	131	15%	79% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in frequency for each service from every 30 minutes to hourly main day. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't access grounds of Northern General Hospital No access to parts of Flower Estate where there are a high number of elderly residents 	N	Most locations will continue to be served by this route, although at a reduced frequency, but the Flower Estate will receive a substantially improved level of service by First service 76. The stop within the hospital grounds no longer serviced by this route but SCT services P1 and P2 will continue to do so and the proposed new stopping arrangements near the hospital on Barnsley Road offers an alternative.
42/44	City - Birley	45 + 180 (1 petition)	0%	85% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is to terminate all service 44 journeys at Birley and for evening services 42 and 44 to be withdrawn. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birley and Base Green residents potentially isolated in the evenings with no access to family visiting/hospitals Loss of connection to Crystal Peaks shopping centre (also issue with 42) 	Y	SYLTE have tendered for the restoration of evening service on both routes, and also to extend a number of Monday – Saturday daytime journeys between Birley and Crystal Peaks.

Service No	Route	No of Comments (up to 21/07/12)	Welcomed	Opposed	Issues	Action Taken Y/N	SYLTE Action in Association with Operators
47/48	Shiregreen - Herdings	27	52% ✓	22%	PROPOSAL • Frequency improved from every 6 minutes combined to every 5. ISSUES • Service reliability	N	Many correspondents have expressed concerns at the unreliability of the present operation and expect the improved frequency to offer a more reliable facility. However most people welcome the proposals
49	City – Killamarsh – Harthill - Rotherham	25	8%	80% ✓	PROPOSAL • Service withdrawn but replaced by hourly service 74, seven days a week, and new Supertram Link SL3 providing a 10 minute service between Killamarsh and Crystal Peaks. ISSUES • Concern about link to Rotherham and Harthill echoes a number of comments that routes are predominantly radial rather than perimeter or circular	N	Although overall there are more travel opportunities, concerns have been expressed as to the retention of services between Harthill and Rotherham, and the detailed route in Killamarsh. Trips are replaced by #77, only loss of service is Harthill to Sheffield (only on 1 trip in every 7 buses are there through passengers)
51	Charnock – Lodge Moor	44	27%	43% ✓	PROPOSAL • Service diverted via West Street rather than Broad Lane. ISSUES • Walking distance from stop to NHS Drop-In Centre • Reliability of Service	Y	It is proposed to retain the existing Broad Lane route
52	Woodhouse - Hillsborough	37	16%	32% ✓	PROPOSAL • General satisfaction with service but could each operator's services have separate route numbers to identify different roads covered in Woodhouse. ISSUES • Confusion about different routes but the same service numbers.	N	Most comments relate to route numbering and performance issues. The latter issue is being addressed by timetable changes.
57	City - Stocksbridge	117	11%	80% ✓	PROPOSAL • Service reduced from every 20 minutes daytime to hourly, but following a quicker route. Supertram Link route amended to cover more of Stocksbridge. ISSUES • Concern that the last bus from City – Stocksbridge is too early at 22:55. • Lack of service/connectivity for upper Stocksbridge	Y	Stagecoach have agreed to operate a 30 minute frequency on service 57 Mon - Sat daytime (hourly evenings and Sundays under contract to SYLTE), serving Garden Village and Deepcar. This represents a major improvement on the proposed hourly frequency, although at present buses run every 20 minutes. (First). By having Stagecoach operating service 57 customers are able to benefit from lower cost Stagecoach products. Also see #5L.
61/62	Hillsborough – Loxley – Bradfield - Hillsborough	14	57% ✓	43%	PROPOSAL • Re-routed via Loxley Road as part replacement #14. ISSUES • Concern about loss Nethergate service	Y	Services diverted to serve Stannington Nethergate to mitigate changes to #11/12
72	City - Shirecliffe	16 + 391 (1 petition)	0%	94% ✓	PROPOSAL • Withdraws as #35/36 continue to serve the main links to Hillsborough and #83/83A Firshill Crescent ISSUES • Service Parkwood Academy and local routes	Y (ongoing)	School bus provided by MASS for Parkwood Academy and very little use of #72 at other hours. Other passengers within criteria for alternate service 83/83A on Shirecliffe Road and 35/36/P1/P2 on Longley Avenue and H1 Herries Road. Petition relates to Cookswood Road community - all within 540m of high frequency 83/83A (and other services). Meeting being arranged with Academy to discuss wider community cohesion issues (540m = 600m hill adjusted). Meeting held with Cllr Hussain and Parkwood Academy representatives and will check that school bus has sufficient capacity. Other issues are still in abeyance as petitioner on holiday until 08 Sept

Service No	Route	No of Comments (up to 21/07/12)	Welcomed	Opposed	Issues	Action Taken Y/N	SYPT Action in Association with Operators
75	Batemoor-City-Chapelton	13 + 300 (1 petition)	31%	15%	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unchanged <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bus goes one way around Church Street/Mill Road. The petitioners want it to go via Mill Road both ways to serve Doctors. <p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service operates between Low Edges, City and Firth Park as now then revised route via Flower Estate and Newman Road to Meadowhall (section between Firth Park and High Green discontinued) <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well received changes via Barnsley Road and Stubbin Lane with stop outside Northern General Hospital at Firvale, but concern about Flower Estate link direct to Clocktower. 	N	The service is unchanged therefore no action is planned and service 79 operates from Ecclesfield High Street via Church Street to Mill Road
76	Lowedges, City, Firth Park, Chapelton, High Green	28	57% ✓	29%	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service operates between Low Edges, City and Firth Park as now then revised route via Flower Estate and Newman Road to Meadowhall (section between Firth Park and High Green discontinued) <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well received changes via Barnsley Road and Stubbin Lane with stop outside Northern General Hospital at Firvale, but concern about Flower Estate link direct to Clocktower. 	N	No change proposed as benefits outweigh disadvantages
77/78	City - Chapelton	221 +200 (1 petition)	4%	15% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services discontinued but replacement 79A buses to operate via Bevan Way on improved frequency. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access from Grenoside to Chapelton Perception that over all, Chapelton is one of the losers in the Partnership's proposals (see also 13) 	N	Improved evening frequency well received at the expense of a small section of Burncross Road that will lose its service. The Grenoside community can still access Chapelton via the 79A and M92 services although frequency is reduced.
79, 79A	City, Foxhill, Chapelton,	20	15%	55% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services co-ordinated to provide 10 min headway over common sections Re-routed via Southey Green Road and Foxhill Road/Deerland Avenue areas Evening frequency improved. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against - Diverts from Bochum Parkway For - Introduction of evening service (with PTE support) well received 	N	At Ecclesfield, #79 to operate clockwise loop providing service to Mill Road from High Street. No change proposed from consultation.
	City, Burncross, Chapelton	9	75% ✓	0%	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services co-ordinated to provide 10 min headway over common sections Re-routed via Southey Green Road and Foxhill Road/Deerland Avenue areas Evening frequency improved. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against - Diverts from Bochum Parkway For - Introduction of evening service (with PTE support) well received 		
81	City - Bents Green	32	78% ✓	16%	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daytime frequency improved from every 30 to every 20 minutes but evening service will be hourly compared with every 30 minutes. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction of evening service potentially isolating for some members of community 	N	Daytime service enhancement well received. We have examined an enhanced evening service at greater frequency than hourly but patronage figures and availability of high frequency alternatives for the majority of users do not justify this improvement.
82	City - Ecclesall	29	34% ✓	17%	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in frequency from every 5 to every 10 minutes. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bunching and service punctuality 	N	General acceptance that a bus every 10 minutes is perfectly acceptable but management needed to reduce risk of bunching and issues of congestion at Angel Street. Additionally entire route has other services overlaid, thus increasing frequency.

Service No	Route	No of Comments (up to 21/07/12)	Welcomed	Opposed	Issues	Action Taken Y/N	SYPTC Action in Association with Operators
83	Ecclesfield - Millhouses	107 +63 (1 petition)	19%	67% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The service will no longer serve Bents Green (service 88 offers alternative), but will run to Millhouses via Silverdale Road returning via Springfield Road and Button Hill. Frequency enhanced from every 60 minutes (current service 4) to every 20 minutes. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Button Hill is unacceptable route to some residents due to road suitability and safety concerns because of location of school Subsequent additional consultation on reverse route resulted in frontagers in Button Hill/Silverdale Road opposing reversal of route 	Y	During the consultation concern was expressed by local residents at the tight left turn from Millhouses Lane to Button Hill and therefore after route testing it was considered that a more effective alternative route change would be to run the Millhouses loop in an anti clockwise direction rather than clockwise and reroute the service to run via Button Hill on to Carterknowle Road thus allowing a traffic light controlled exit on to Ecclesall Road. In changing the loop to anti clockwise, buses can run along the more populous Silverdale Road over its full length rather than use the full length of Dobcroft Road (which was only selected because it there was a better chance of getting on to Ecclesall Road at the junction with Dobcroft and is used by the present Service 4) . Previous surveys have indicated no particular preference whether the Millhouses service loop operates clockwise or anti clockwise. It is proposed to operate the alternative reverse route.
83A	Ecclesfield – Fulwood	58	36%	43% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service no longer to operate to Bents Green, instead serving Fulwood via Nethergreen. Existing hourly service by service 6 replaced by 20 minute frequency on 83A. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents object to service using Brooklands Avenue and Moorcroft Road (fear of bus stop and/or shelter outside homes) 	N	Negative response entirely from householders in Brooklands Avenue and Moorcroft Road area who do not want additional bus services (present service hourly, proposed service every 20 mins). However, the proposed new service does offer a number of links from the Westminster Estate to Co-op and Post Office on Brooklands Avenue and Ecclesall Road, which offers overall passenger benefits.
84	City - Ringinglow	70 + 84 (1 petition)	1%	19% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This service only runs twice a day in each direction Monday – Friday and is used by 40 people a week on average, of which some are travelling from City – Ringinglow to undertake leisure walks. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal of service is especially detrimental for leisure travel to access Ringinglow for walking although access can be obtained using Peak District services 	Y	First have advised they will provide a School/College only journey in the morning and back in the afternoon between City and Ringinglow (this could operate via Psalter Lane). SYPTC have tendered for a City – Psalter Lane route which will offer an occasional extension to Ringinglow to ensure that the present service level is retained. We will also ensure that these buses operate via Knowle Lane thus giving an improved facility in this location, which has been the source of more responses than Ringinglow village regarding the removal of service 84.
87	Lowdges – High Green	208 + 87 (1 petition)	26% ✓	37%	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Route diverted via eastern part of Archer Road. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eor - Direct access to Sainsbury's using Archer Road Against - Residents don't want service using eastern end Archer Road (fear of bus stop and/or shelter outside homes), although existing bus stop infrastructure is still in place (ex 293) 	N	Archer Road diversion well received by bus users as serves Sainsburys and the Periwold Estate, although a number of residents are unhappy about a bus on this stretch of Archer Road. The original proposal for a frequency every 20 minutes daytime had been confirmed to run every 10 minutes and therefore drew complaints of a downgraded service. However this was an error on the consultation map and 10 mins (daytime) is the intended frequency.
88/88A	Bents Green – Ecclesfield – High Green	36	19%	42% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evening service extension on service 88A to High Green and via Ecclesfield to Bents Green withdrawn (all journeys to follow standard #88 route to Bents Green). <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Punctuality affecting patronage 	N	Although there are a number of requests for the 88A route to be retained in the Greystones area, this is more as a result of criticism over the First standard of service with a preference for Stagecoach to operate buses. Enhanced evening/Sunday service cannot be justified under existing tender criteria.
120	Halfway – Crystal Peaks – City – Hallamshire – Fulwood	63	14%	27% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Punctuality 	Y	Minor timetable changes being made to help address punctuality

Service No	Route	No of Comments (up to 21/07/12)	Welcomed	Opposed	Issues	Action Taken Y/N	SYLTE Action in Association with Operators
123	Crystal Peaks, Woodhouse, City and Endcliffe	36	11%	58% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Truncated at Endcliffe Road via Endcliffe Vale Road Westminster Crescent served by #83A <p>ISSUES</p> <p>Against - Loss of through route to Hallamshire Hospital without changing buses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of changing from Stagecoach Bus/Tram ticket to First for certain journeys <p>For - Link to #83A gives access to Ecclesall Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keeps direct link to Hallamshire hospital from Crystal Peaks 	N	The network changes and increased frequency on the 83A are welcomed by some but not others who would prefer to retain the 123 at the Fulwood end. In the round no changes are proposed.
M92	Chapelton – Foxhill	2	0%	50% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To operate Foxhill, Grenoside Chapelton only. <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of service to Harley 	Y	Following representations from local residents the service is being restored to Harley
SL	Stocksbridge - Middlewood	132	16%	72% ✓	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The longer route in Stocksbridge penetrates more areas of the community and gives an enhanced town service to some locations at the expense of a longer journey time to Middlewood in one direction for tram connection and a major reduction in through bus services between Stocksbridge and Sheffield on service 57 <p>ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perception that Stocksbridge and Deepcar residents feel that they are among the overall losers in the Partnership's proposals for buses. 	N	Following consultation and concerns at the longer journey time for many Stocksbridge residents, Stagecoach will retain the existing SL route, offering connections to the tram service at Middlewood 7 days a week. Also see #57
X52	City – Beighton – Crystal Peaks	13	0%	46%	<p>PROPOSAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unchanged from service introduced July 2012 	Y	Re-routed via Sothall to operate in line with #30 (renumbered #X30)

South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive
Freepost NEA3487
Sheffield
S2 5ZQ

7th Floor, Piccadilly Gate
Store Street, Manchester, M1 2WD

w www.passengerfocus.org.uk
t 0300 123 2140 f 0161 236 1574
e info@passengerfocus.org.uk
direct 0300 123 2150
e david.sidebottom@passengerfocus.org.uk

9 July 2012

Sheffield Bus Partnership

Dear Sirs,

I am writing in response to your Sheffield Bus Partnership consultation and our meeting on 4 July at which we promised some comments on the proposals.

As the statutory body representing the interests of bus passengers in England (outside of London) our starting point is to focus on the outputs to passengers. The acid test for any proposal will be in terms of the benefits it brings to passengers and how it will improve the delivery of services.

Passenger Focus's research gives us a good understanding of passenger expectations and aspirations. In 2010 we conducted research into passengers' priorities for improvement. Some 3800 passengers across a section of rural, urban and metropolitan areas in England were asked to rank 30 different criteria. The results for the metropolitan area are perhaps the best fit for Sheffield.

Top 10 areas for Improvement – Metropolitan areas (in order of importance – 1 being highest priority for improvement)	Ranking
More buses are on time or within five minutes of scheduled time	1
All passengers are able to get a seat on the bus	2
Buses run more frequently at a time when you want to use the bus	3
All bus drivers are helpful and have a positive attitude	4
Buses go to a wider range of destinations	5
Tickets and passes allow you to travel on all bus services in your local area	6
Bus fares offer better value for money	7
Personal security on the bus improved through CCTV on buses	8
Personal security while waiting for the bus improved through CCTV at stops	9
All bus stops have a well maintained shelter	10

We also carry out the Bus Passenger Survey (BPS). The March 2012 wave included results for the South Yorkshire PTE area and can be split between both the principal bus operators, First



and Stagecoach. The table below looks at satisfaction for those criteria that best reflect the priorities listed above.

Satisfaction (% passenger satisfied)	Total	First	Stage coach
Overall journey	86	83	87
Punctuality	75	70	78
Helpfulness / attitude of driver	72	69	73
Availability of seating or space to stand	85	85	84
Value for money	65	53	78
Personal security whilst on bus	83	82	83
Personal security at bus stop	73	73	73
Overall satisfaction with the bus stop	75	74	76

As part of the survey we also gather comments from passengers about what they feel could be improved. The results again emphasise punctuality, frequency and driver attitude.

The "Sheffield Bus Partnership" website lists the benefits of the partnership proposals as:

- A single ticket allowing travel anywhere across the city on the new network, even if you have to change buses.
- Greater choice of tickets with tickets being available for a day, a week and 28 days as well as the current city wide day ticket.
- Better connections with "through" ticketing which avoids having to pay twice and offers better value for money when you have to change buses.
- The option of a 60 minutes transfer time before you change buses to complete your journey.
- Better coordinated bus services resulting in more reliable and punctual as services keep to scheduled timetables

We are pleased that these fit well with the passenger priorities outlined above. Improvements to frequency and subsequent improvements to punctuality are clearly important to passengers. However, in any change of such magnitude there will inevitably be winners and losers: we are aware for instance of concerns with services to Ringinglow and Psalter Lane. This makes it all the more important that there is extensive local consultation – the people best able to judge and comment on services being those who use them. To this end we would congratulate you on the efforts made – especially through the route maps – to engage with passengers. Following the consultation it will be important to identify those areas that will receive a worse service and to see what can be provided in mitigation – for example in terms of demand responsive transport.

One area of particular interest is value for money. The table above shows this as one of the lower areas of satisfaction, particular so for First's passengers. Reducing the city wide day fare



from £5.00 to £4.30 will help to address this in general. It should also provide an incentive for First to lower its own “First Day” fare from its current £5 level: why, for instance, buy a higher-priced operator specific fare when you can have a multi-operator ticket for less? This move ought to help drive up value for money scores. We are strongly supportive of the move to reduce the city wide day fare and also to introduce weekly, monthly and annual products.

We would also look to the partnership to provide greater stability of service. As part of our Bus Passenger Survey we ask passengers for the main reason they chose the bus – some 30% of passengers in the South Yorkshire PTE area said that it was because they had no other option. Passengers rely on bus services for work and to access local services – for many people it is an essential part of their lives – and so stability of service is important. We understand from our meeting that the partnership would provide more protection and regulate changes to timetables – this is also something that we would welcome.

Finally, we would like to see any partnership agreement include qualitative targets within the contractual framework. It is not clear from the consultation material how this is to be addressed. “Hard” measures of punctuality and service frequency are very important but there is also a need to keep one eye on service quality. Our strong preference is for targets based on what passengers think – the best judge of quality being those who have used the services in question. This could encompass driver attitude (the fourth highest priority of improvement in our research) and also such things as personal security, the condition and upkeep of the bus stop and the provision of information.

As you are aware Passenger Focus conducts the Bus Passenger Survey and we would be pleased to discuss how this might play a role in monitoring performance going forward.

Yours sincerely,

David Sidebottom
Passenger Team Director

This page is intentionally left blank