

# ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION 25 SEPTEMBER 2006

Report of the Corporate Director, Regeneration and Community

# ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR COUNCIL SUPPORTED LOCAL BUS SERVICES

### RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 To note the proposed assessment criteria for council supported bus services
- 1.2 To provide comments on the suitability of these proposals forming the basis of future council support for bus services.

#### SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 2.1 The majority of bus services in Derby are operated by the various bus companies in the area on a commercial basis without any direct financial support from the City Council. This is a result of the 1985 Transport Act which deregulated and led to the privatisation of the bus industry. Therefore the route a service takes, the frequency it operates, the type of vehicle used and the fares charged are all decided by the bus company themselves to meet their own business objectives.
- 2.2 In the main this system has provided most suburbs of Derby with a reasonable bus service. There are however certain areas in the City which may need a bus service for social or accessibility reasons but which would not generate sufficient passenger numbers to make the service commercially viable. In this situation the City Council can choose to pay for a service to be introduced.
- 2.3 Last autumn the City Council paid for the introduction of a series of new bus routes following request from members of the public who found it difficult to reach the existing commercially operated bus services. These services were paid for using some of the money generated by the increase in car parking charges from earlier in the year. The new services were-
  - the 17A from the city centre to the Park Farm Centre Allestree via the Broadway and Darley Abbey village
  - the 19 from the city centre to Spondon via Waterford Drive and

the Asterdale Estate

- the 35 from the city centre to Havenbaulk Avenue via Mickleover and Littleover
- the 111 from the city centre to Wyvern Park via Pride Park and the park and ride site

The exact routes the services took were decided following analysis by officers of where in the city there was sufficient demand for new bus routes and detailed discussions with Councillors on the Bus Consultation Group. These new services have attracted a growing number of users over the last year and it has been agreed that the contract to operate should be extended for another year.

2.4

There is a steady demand from the public and Councillors for the introduction of additional new council supported bus routes or extensions to existing services. However as there is always going to be a limit to the financial support that is available some sort of system needs to be established which allows the costs and benefits of the various proposals to be assessed. This will ensure that the money that is available is spent to the best effect.

2.5

Based on assessment procedures developed by Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council, we have devised a system which could assess the value of providing financial support to a bus service. This process includes the appraisal of several factors. These are —

- Subsidy per passenger Services which require lower levels of subsidy per passenger are scored higher than those require more.
- Passengers per journey Services which carry on average more passengers per bus are scored higher than those that carry less.
- Availability of alternative Public Transport services in the area to be served by the supported service and the walking time required to access them. - Locations that have limited alternative services to the city centre and local district centre which can only be accessed by a long walk are scored higher than those with regular services within easy walking distance.
- Index of Multiple Deprivation Using work done as part of the Local Transport Plan each of the areas in the city has been ranked in terms of deprivation compared to city and national averages. Routes which serve more deprived areas are scored more highly than those that served less deprived areas.

2.6

An overall score is arrived at by combining all the marks from these factors. Services which score more points are assessed as being of more value than those which get less. Whilst there is not an exact score

below which support for an existing service will be withdrawn the other authorities which have used this method have stated that for a new service to be introduced it would need to gain 50% or more of the available points.

2.7

As an example this scoring system has been applied to the services introduced last autumn the 17A, 19, 35 and the 111. The results are shown in the table below

Factor	Performance level	Score
Subsidy per passenger	Making money Subsidy of less than a £1 per passenger	5 4
	Subsidy between £1.00-£1.99	3
	Subsidy between £2.00-£2.99	2
	Subsidy between £3.00-£3.99	1
	Subsidy of more than £4 per	0
	passenger	
Worked example	<b>17A</b> De Minims = £0.58	4
Average subsidy per	19 = £0.25	4
passenger from	<b>35</b> = £2.15	2
September to June (cost	<b>111</b> = -£0.17	4
of service minus revenue)		
Factor	Performance level	Score
Passengers per bus journey	More than 20 15-20 10-15 5-10 1-5	5 4 3 2 1 0
Worked example Average number of passengers per bus from September to June	17A =5.19 19 = 5.45 35 = 5.98 111 = 45.75	2 2 2 5
Factor	Performance level	Score
Availability of alternative commercially operated bus services in area served and walk time required to access it	Monday to Friday daytime alternative bus services to the city centre in walking distance (this is set at 400m by the DfT)  No service to the city centre Hourly service to the city centre 2 buses an hour to the city centre 3 buses an hour to the city centre 4 buses an hour to the city centre 5 or more buses an hour to the city centre	5 4 3 2 1 0

	Monday to Friday daytime alternative bus services to local district centre or supermarket in walking distance (this is set at 400m by the DfT)	
	No service to district centre/supermarket	5
	Hourly service to district centre/supermarket	4
	2 buses an hour to district centre or supermarket	3
	3 buses an hour to district centre or supermarket	2
	4 buses an hour to district centre or supermarket	1
	5 or more buses an hour to district centre or supermarket	0
	Walk time to access alternative bus services to anywhere	
	More than 25 minutes walk to access alternative services	5
	20-25 minutes walk to access alternative service	4
	15- 20 minutes walk to access alternative service	3
	10 -15 minutes walk to access alternative service	2
	5-10 minutes walk to access alternative service	1
	Less than 5 minutes walk to alternative service	0
Worked example	17A – Alternatives to city centre 4 commercial buses per hour on Duffield Rd (6.1-6.4). No direct link to Park Farm. Some areas beyond 400m walk to bus stops average walk time 20 minutes	10
	19 – Alternatives to city centre 7 buses per hour Nottingham Rd for Albert Rd (R4, 5 and 9) 3 buses per hour Asterdale Estate (R4) No direct link from Asterdale to Spondon district centre. No area beyond 400m walk. Average walk time 10 minutes	7
	35 – Alternatives to city centre 7 buses per hour for Bretton Avenue on Burton Rd (33, V3 Harlequin) No direct link to Mickleover or	10

	Hospital. 3 buses per hour for Havenbaulk Lane on Rykneld Rd (V3 and Harlequin).No direct link to Mickleover or Hospital. Some areas beyond 400m walk to bus stops average walk time 20 minutes  111 - Alternatives to city centre 3 buses per hour for Pride Park on Pride Parkway (68a/b) No other direct bus services for Park and Ride site or Wyvern. Nearest	12
Factor	district centre Wyvern which has no other bus service. Large areas beyond 400m walk to bus stop. Average walk time 25 minutes  Performance level	Score
ractor	Performance level	Score
Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) score	Worst 5% of areas nationally (most deprived)	5
of areas served	5-25%	4
	25-50% 50-75%	3 2
	75-95%	1
	Best 5% of areas nationally (least deprived)	Ö
Worked example	17A - None of the areas it is there to serve eg Darley Abbey, Broadway are in bottom 50% nationally for deprivation with most being above average for Derby.	1
	19 - Some areas in the 25% most deprived nationally eg Albert Drive, Asterdale Estate. Rest of route at Derby average or above.	3
	35 - Some areas served are in the 10% most deprived nationally eg parts of Abbey Ward. The majority of the route however is in areas at the Derby average or above particularly the areas it was put to serve eg Littleover and Mickleover.	2
	<b>111</b> - All of the route is in an area classified as in the most deprived 25% nationally.	3

It is possible to gain a maximum score of 30. The combined scores for the services in operation at the moment are -

**17A** =17

**19 =** 16

**35** = 16

**111=**24

So of the services that went into operation last autumn the 111 is of most value and the 19 and 35 the least. However the 19 and 35 did pass the 50% threshold score set by the other councils using this type of system when they look at whether a new service should be introduced.

For more information contact: Chris Hegarty 01332 715045 e-mail chris.hegarty@derby.gov.uk

Background papers: Appendix 1 – Implications

List of appendices:

#### **IMPLICATIONS**

#### **Financial**

1. None arising from this report but it could influence spending decisions in the future.

# Legal

2. None arising from this report.

#### Personnel

3. None arising from this report.

## **Equalities impact**

4. Improvements to public transport can play an important role in raising the quality of life of people in disadvantaged groups. For example better bus services can make it easier for people without access to a car to reach key services such as education, food shopping and health as well as opening up greater employment opportunities.

# **Corporate Objectives, Values and Priorities**

- 5. This report has the potential to link with the following Corporate Objectives,
  - Improve the quality of life in Derby's neighbourhoods
  - Build healthy and independent communities
  - Deliver excellent services, performance and value for money