

**Concessionary bus travel -  
Consultation Feedback Analysis**  
Summary report  
January 2019

## Contents

1	Introduction .....	1
2	Resident feedback summary.....	1
3	Stakeholder feedback summary.....	2
4	Qualitative analysis .....	5
4.1	Impact on People .....	5
4.2	Impact on 'Place' .....	5
4.3	Pass use & / or the Surrey bus network .....	5
4.4	Mitigation .....	6
4.5	Council.....	6
4.6	Other comments & no comment.....	6
5	Specific question response summaries.....	7
5.1	Responses from disabled pass holders.....	7
5.2	Responses from companion pass holders .....	8
5.3	Responses from people stating they had caring responsibilities .....	9
5.4	Responses from people stating this is an appropriate area to look for savings .....	10
5.5	Email and written correspondence .....	11
5.6	Responses by question.....	13
5.7	Comments from other consultations related to concessionary travel or transport ..	16
5.8	Equalities monitoring data.....	17
5.9	Postcode Breakdown .....	19

## 1 Introduction

A public consultation on proposed changes to concessionary travel schemes for disabled people and their companions was launched on Tuesday 30 October 2018 and concluded on Friday 4 January 2019. This was to get the views of the public and stakeholders on the removal of:

- free concessionary travel for disabled pass holders before 09.30 and after 23.00 Monday to Friday, which is currently paid for by Surrey County Council. Pass holders would still be able to travel for free after 09.30 and before 23.00 Monday to Friday, which is paid for by the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS). Free travel at any time on Saturdays, Sundays and Public Holidays would be unaffected.
- companion passes. Pass holders would continue to travel for free, however, their companions would no longer receive free travel. This is currently funded by Surrey County Council

Consultation material was available on buses, at the larger bus stations, at libraries and at council offices. Material was sent to stakeholders raising awareness of the consultation.

In addition, the project team attended meetings with the Disability Empowerment Networks (DENs), the DENs Chairs and the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People.

## 2 Resident feedback summary

3,082 surveys were completed, including 690 hard copy surveys. 19 emails and 1 letter were also received.

This section summarises some of the key findings from the consultation responses.

Just under 80% of respondents (2,433) were responding for themselves. Of these, 964 and 516 respondents said they had a disabled or companion pass respectively.

When asked about travelling before 09:30, just over 35% of people said they travelled for medical appointments. 24% travelled before 09:30 for essential shopping, 22% for work and just under 12% for education.

When asked what they would do if free travel before 09:30 was removed – just under 40% of those people said they would pay to travel before 09:30, if they had to. 35% stated they would not be able to travel before 09:30 because of the removal of free travel.

For the removal of companion passes - 30% of respondents said that they or their companion would have to pay for the companion to travel. 22% said they would not be able to travel at all and a further 22% did not know what they would do if free travel for a companion was removed.

When people were asked whether they had a disability or long standing health condition - nearly 50% said they had a disability or health condition that affected their day to day activities, while just over 40% said they did not.

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

When people were asked whether they had caring responsibilities or not, 26% said they were a carer for a friend or relative. 64% said they did not have any caring responsibilities with around 10% of people preferring not to say or did not answer.

Overall, 60% of respondents (1,870) did not believe savings should be made in this service area. Just under 30% of respondents (913) said they agreed this area could be looked at for savings. 52% of people (1,621) said they believed savings should be made from other areas of council spend. 21% said no savings should be made in this area and 26% did not know or did not answer.

Demographic analysis is covered on pages 19 and 20.

The full consultation analysis can be found in section 3 of this document.

### 3 Stakeholder feedback summary

Formal stakeholder responses were received from 26 stakeholders. In addition, a specific stakeholder meeting was arranged for the representatives of the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People's Board to meet with the Member Reference Group for them to share their concerns around the impact on disabled people, their families, friends and carers.

This group consists of borough and district councils, parish councils, organisations and groups representing those with disabilities and health and transport groups. A full list is provided below:

Action for Carers	Spelthorne Borough Council
Cranleigh Parish Council	Spelthorne Health and Wellbeing Group
East Surrey Mencap	Surrey Coalition of Disabled People
East Surrey Transport Committee	Surrey Disability Empowerment Boards
Epsom & Ewell Borough Council	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Family Voice Surrey	Surrey Local Valuing People Groups -
Farnham Society	Learning Disability Network
Halow Project	Tandridge District Council
Mole Valley District Council	The Grange Centre
Reigate & Banstead Borough Council	Waverley Borough Council
Runnymede Borough Council	Windlesham Parish Council
Shalford Parish Council	Witley Parish Council
Sight for Surrey	Woking Borough Council

The main findings are summarised below:

- 16 of the 26 key stakeholders all commented on the adverse impacts which would be felt if the Companion Pass was removed. It was suggested that those who have been issued a Companion Pass have been because they have a disability where they are unable to travel alone.
- It was also suggested that the most vulnerable e.g. those registered deafblind, blind or with severe visual impairment and also those with learning difficulties, would be impacted and unable to travel alone. Due to the financial impact on carers, this could ultimately prevent disabled people from travelling at all and accessing their local communities, leading to isolation, which could also be interpreted as contrary to the Care Act 2014.
- 11 stakeholders also provided comments on the negative impact these proposed changes may have financially. Firstly, it was suggested the changes could lead to further financial hardship for some individuals and their families, as additional expense would be required to be spent on transport if the additional concessions are removed. Secondly,

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

nine of these 11 stakeholders also commented that if these proposed changes were made, costs would be shifted to other Surrey County Council (SCC) services, including Adult Social Care (ASC) and Children, Schools and Families (CSF), and the NHS.

- Examples included transport costs for getting disabled young people to places of education being transferred to CSF and personal budgets allocated by ASC would be reduced for important leisure/ social inclusion activities. Sight for Surrey also provide some services for SCC and they indicated their contract prices would be increased if the proposed changes are introduced. Action for Carers highlighted the benefit figure registered carers receive (£64.60 per week) and that a 2018 State of Caring report gave a figure of 47% of carers having to cut back on food and heating to cope with the cost of caring. They also stated that the estimated saving in Surrey from carers to the healthcare system is around £1.8 billion per year and that the numbers of identified carers was estimated to increase to around 125,000 by 2025.
- A third of the key stakeholders were against the removal of the concessionary travel before 09:30, due to the impact it will have on disabled people accessing places of education, employment (on both a voluntary and paid basis) and training. It was also suggested that the impact may be worsened for disabled people who have fewer alternative options for travel and will also depend upon the financial situation of individuals and/or their families.
- Nine of the 26 key stakeholders also commented that the proposals are contrary to other SCC and national government policies and/ or legislation. Three of these nine stakeholders suggested that the proposal to remove concessionary travel before 09:30 was at odds with the national policy of getting more disabled people into employment, as they would be prevented from using their concessionary pass before this time. Whilst not explicitly named, this is referring to the Inclusive Transport Strategy: achieving equal access for disabled people, which aims to have 1 million more disabled people working by 2027.
- Several respondents have also considered the Community Vision for Surrey in 2030 and that “journeys across the county are easier, more predictable and safer” and the Health and Social Care 10 year strategy between SCC and NHS highlights “supporting the carers of Surrey” as a key strand, which they argue are two examples of how the proposal to remove the Companion Pass is contrary to these policies. Other local/ national policies were identified which these proposals are argued to be contrary to, including the Surrey Learning Disability and Autism Strategy, the Preparing for Adulthood outcomes within the SEND offer and the Government’s Loneliness Strategy. It was also stated that the saving from this area would push costs onto other SCC services, the NHS, charities and the voluntary sector, and that this cost would be far greater than the saving delivered.
- Underpinning all of these points above, a third of key stakeholders also suggested that these proposals would impact most on the most vulnerable residents within Surrey.

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

The table below highlights the key themes and points raised within the key stakeholder responses received to the consultation:

	<b>Companion pass holders should still be entitled to travel for free</b>	<b>SCC should manage their finances better and financial implications</b>	<b>Travel off-peak is not an option for work/ education</b>	<b>This penalises the most vulnerable Surrey residents</b>	<b>Proposals are contrary to other SCC or national policies/ legislation</b>
<b>Feedback</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was suggested that those who have been issued a Companion Pass have been because they have a disability where they are unable to travel alone.</li> <li>• It was also suggested that the most vulnerable e.g. those registered deafblind, blind or with severe visual impairment and also those with learning difficulties, would be impacted and unable to travel alone.</li> <li>• Due to the financial impact on carers, this could ultimately prevent disabled people from travelling at all and accessing their local communities, leading to isolation; this could also be contrary to the Care Act 2014</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals would lead to hardship to individuals and their families, as additional expense would be required to be spent on transport if the additional concessions are removed.</li> <li>• Costs would be shifted to other SCC directorates, including Adult Social Care (ASC) and Children, Schools and Families (CSF) and the NHS. Examples were given that transport costs for getting disabled young people to places of education would be transferred to CSF and personal budgets allocated by ASC would be reduced for important leisure/ social inclusion activities.</li> <li>• Sight for Surrey also provide some services for SCC and they indicated that their contract prices would be increased if the proposed changes are introduced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders were against the removal of the concessionary travel before 9.30 am, due to the impact it will have on disabled people accessing places of education, employment (on both a voluntary and paid basis) and training.</li> <li>• It was also suggested that the impact may be worsened for disabled people who have less alternative options for travel and will also depend upon the financial situation of individuals and/or their families.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders also suggested that these proposals would be impacting the most vulnerable residents within Surrey, who are disproportionately affected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal to remove concessionary travel before 9.30am is at odds with the national policy of getting more disabled people into employment, as they would be prevented from using their concessionary pass before this time [Inclusive Transport Strategy].</li> <li>• Several respondents have also considered the Surrey 2030 vision and that “journeys across the county are easier, more predictable and safer” and the Health and Social Care 10 year strategy between SCC and NHS highlights “supporting the carers of Surrey” as a key strand, which they argue are two examples of how the proposal to remove the Companion Pass is contrary to these policies.</li> <li>• Other local/ national policies were identified which these proposals are argued to be contrary to, including the Surrey Learning Disability and Autism Strategy, the Preparing for Adulthood outcomes within the SEND offer and the government’s Loneliness Strategy.</li> </ul>

## 4 Qualitative analysis

1,886 of the 3,082 respondents left a comment. This section covers those thematic responses to the consultation. These include “Impact on People”, “Impact on Place”, “Pass use & / or the Surrey bus network”, “Mitigation” and “Council”.

The first part of this section covers consultation surveys returned. Section 5.5 covers email and written correspondence from the public.

### 4.1 Impact on People

The largest set of comments related to the impact that the proposals on pass holders and companions/carers. These focus on the impact on people’s ability to live independently, impacting their financial circumstances and ability to access work and education. There were also views that the proposals impact people the most who have no access to private transport. Other comments were related to the impact of making people more isolated and the potential disproportionate impact on people with learning difficulties.

Tags covering the Impact on People

TAG	COUNT
<b>This penalises the most vulnerable Surrey residents</b>	677
<b>Will impact on people's ability to live independently</b>	563
<b>This penalises people who rely on buses</b>	445
<b>Will impact people's well being</b>	456
<b>Travel Off-Peak is not an option for work / education</b>	482
<b>This would cause / increase social and rural isolation</b>	404
<b>I would not be able to afford to pay - either as a pass holder or companion</b>	165
<b>The proposals particularly affect people with learning disabilities</b>	98

### 4.2 Impact on ‘Place’

The comments in this area were around concerns around pushing people to having to drive.

Most respondents raising this as an issue stated that the proposals will have a negative impact on the local environment, congestion and air quality.

Tag covering the Impact on ‘Place’

TAG	COUNT
<b>Will cause more people to drive / increase congestion</b>	348

### 4.3 Pass use & / or the Surrey bus network

The theme covers comments relating to how people use, other people perceive pass use and the wider Surrey bus network.

These comments captured comments made by more people who did not hold a disabled or companion concessionary pass affected by the consultation proposals. This may be why these comments were less focused on potential impact and more agreeable to the proposals.

However, some comments made reflected the small number of people who would be affected and also the specific value people place on having access to their free pass and ability to use it, particularly under the additional discretionary offer.

A small number of comments were made suggesting that savings should be reinvested into the Surrey bus network in order to improve the overall public transport offer.

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

Tags covering Pass use & / or the Surrey bus network

TAG	COUNT
I agree with the proposals as free travel is available most of the day	168
This is a small number of people and journeys so should be maintained	86
It is not fair that some people get free bus travel and others do not	67
I value my bus pass and free travel	74
Bus passes are not useful because of the Surrey bus network	78
People can adjust their travel to still travel for free	40
People are misusing their passes	19
Any saving should be spent on / protect public buses	12
The proposals make this fair across types of pass holders – older / disabled	11

### 4.4 Mitigation

These comments covered options that should be considered to mitigate, help manage or remove any negative impacts that could be felt by disabled and companion pass holders, should the proposals be agreed.

Comments from the public and stakeholders have fed directly into an options assessment presented to the Cabinet and discussion with the bus operators, which is still ongoing.

Tags covering mitigation

TAG	COUNT
Can bus passes be Means Tested so people who really need it can get it?	98
Can I pay a part fare with my pass, rather than full fare?	68
Can you charge for bus passes to keep free travel?	56
Remove companion passes and keep 24 travel for disabled pass holders	26
Remove 24hr travel for disabled pass holders and keep companion passes	2

### 4.5 Council

These comments focused on the survey and/or consultation process as well as the operation of the county council.

Tags covering the council

TAG	COUNT
Make savings from efficiencies or other SCC areas	325
SCC should manage their finances better	176
The survey is badly designed and the consultation process flawed	37
Increase Council Tax rather than cut services	34
The result is already decided / outcome predetermined	6

### 4.6 Other comments & no comment

Some people made comments that were unrelated to the proposals in the consultation.

Where comments were made that were related to the other consultations that were open at the same time, these were shared with the relevant consultation project team.

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

Most of the comments made in this section covered wider government funding and policy decisions, such as the incremental increase in retirement age to 66 by 2020 meaning people will have to wait longer to get a free bus pass.

Tags covering other comments and number of people who felt no comment

TAG	COUNT
Other	103
<b>No. of people who made no comment</b>	789

## 5 Specific question response summaries

This section covers responses from people, or behalf of people, who said they hold a disabled or companion pass. This is because they are the residents who would be directly affected should the proposals be agreed at Cabinet on 29 January 2019.

### 5.1 Responses from disabled pass holders

964 respondents to the consultation said they, or on behalf of someone else, had a disabled person's bus pass.

When asked what pass holders might do as an alternative should 24hr free travel be withdrawn, the responses are shown in the table below.

ALTERNATIVE	COUNT
Not travel	489
Pay for a bus journey	374
Change travel plans to travel between 9.30am and 11pm	172
Use an alternative mode of paid transport (e.g. taxi)	153
Use an alternative mode of free transport (e.g. get a lift)	143
Would be unable to work/study/attend appointments	27
Can't afford travel costs	11
Walk	7
Get a lift	7
Would become isolated	5
Social care will pay	3
Drive	3
Would get a job closer to home	2
Use hospital transport	2
Carer would push me in wheelchair	1
Find a job with higher income to pay for bus	1
Use TFL	1
Require added support to care plan	1
Claim bus fare from Charity	1
Only travel if necessary	1

Over 52% of all disabled pass holders said they would not be able to travel. The majority of these responses covered travel before 09:30 and focus on the additional expense, link between the need to travel for work or medical appointments, which cannot always be flexible around timings, and the limited frequency of bus services.

Some sample comments made by people who said they have a disabled bus pass are below:

“On behalf of my son approaching 18 and moving to a full time, residential care home this was to be his primary mode of travel as his benefits will all go towards his care. He won't

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

have enough left £20 per week to pay his travel plus two carers so will be rendered housebound.”

“The bus pass allows me to attend my Dr and hospital. We have one bus an hour, not being able to travel because of additional cost would be difficult on my limited benefits.”

“There is only one morning bus to get me to work this runs at 8:05am. My work is flexible with hours but with lack of buses to and from my village there is no flexibility. This would mean paying every morning for the bus. I'm on a low wage and struggle to work but do so as it improves my mental health. Currently I have a blue badge and can drive myself in but with more traffic meaning a longer commute and pain from driving and less parking available in Guildford, especially available disabled bays, I am relying more and more on the bus.”

“Living with a disability is difficult enough and there are significant extra costs. Getting employment as a disabled person is almost impossible and reducing our capacity to get about is loading even more obstacles in our path. In addition, living with disabilities is terribly isolating and again, limiting our options to get around also impacts on those isolating factors.”

“On one hand the Government is trying to get people back into work. On the other hand you are looking to cut subsidised travel for those with disabilities at the peak time they would be looking to travel to work.”

### 5.2 Responses from companion pass holders

516 responses to the consultation said they, or on behalf of someone else, had a companion bus pass.

When asked what pass holders might do as an alternative should free travel for companions be withdrawn, the responses are shown in the table below.

ALTERNATIVE	COUNT
<b>Wouldn't be able to travel</b>	359
<b>Travel alone</b>	180
<b>Pay for companion's travel</b>	146
<b>The companion would pay to travel</b>	108
<b>I don't know</b>	40
<b>Unable to travel alone</b>	9
<b>Unable to pay for additional traveller</b>	7
<b>Carer would push disabled person to destination in her wheelchair</b>	3
<b>Would become isolated</b>	2
<b>Social care will pay</b>	2

The majority of people stated they would not be able to travel, mainly because of the additional cost and the financial burden of cost of bus travel or need to find alternative transport.

A lot of comments made were around the feeling that there are multiple levels of “cuts” disabled people face from government, nationally and locally.

Some comments related specifically to people with complex needs such as people with either physical disabilities or mobility problems along with learning difficulties and dementia. These comments focused on the need for people to travel with a companion to prevent financial hardship and social isolation on behalf of the pass holder and the companion. Some comments along the same theme also mentioned the difficulties parents of children with learning difficulties face when those children become 18 and the need for those young adults to be helped to live independent lives.

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

Some sample comments made by people who said they have a companion bus pass are below:

“These proposals will isolate disabled Surrey residents who rely on free travel for themselves and their carers/companion to get to work or to even get out of the house. This will result in some residents being unable to leave their own home which can lead to loneliness, isolation, depression and ill-health.”

“Why can you not charge the elderly discounted travel with the old age concession there are far more of those pass holders than Disabled with a +C. My mother has stated she would not be able to go out on the bus if you charge for +C on the disabled pass and effectively stop her from going out as everything she does in public requires a companion.”

“The savings the council needs to make should come from savings on buildings and expenses plus other areas where it wastes money.”

“These proposals will seriously impact on the independent travel of so many people with SEN in areas where services are already stretched and limited”

“The travel component of his PIP doesn't come anywhere near being able to pay for carers travel. His carers are mostly on very low income and so would not be willing to pay for themselves.”

### 5.3 Responses from people stating they had caring responsibilities

810 responses to the consultation said they, or on behalf of someone else, had a caring responsibilities.

When asked what alternative arrangements they be able to make should 24hr free travel and/or companion passes be withdrawn, the responses are shown in the table below.

ALTERNATIVE	COUNT
<b>Not travel / Would not be able to travel</b>	552
<b>Pay for bus journey</b>	309
<b>I don't know</b>	186
<b>Change travel plans to 9.30am-11pm</b>	167
<b>Use alternative mode free transport</b>	146
<b>Pay for Companions travel</b>	139
<b>Use alternative mode paid transport</b>	129
<b>Companion would pay to travel</b>	127
<b>Travel alone</b>	112

Responses from people who said they had caring responsibilities covered a large range of comments. The majority focused on the problems people caring for disabled family members face around finances, maintaining social inclusion and the possibility of managing caring and work responsibilities.

However, a small number of comments came from people who were not concessionary pass holders. In those instances the comments highlighted a lack of fairness between what they may be entitled to when compared to the recipients of free bus passes.

Some sample comments made by people who said they have a companion bus pass are below:

“Concessionary bus travel is important for those who are on low paid incomes, however the buses need to exist in the first place.”

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

“Completing on behalf of my disabled son who will need to travel by bus next year when he moves onto secondary school. Although I am able to drive him to begin with, it would help him gain his independence by being able to take the journey himself.”

“Support the restriction on times of travel but I think companion travel should be supported as some people need a companion with them if they are to have a reasonable chance of getting out and about.”

“They provision of bus services in my area (West Horsley) is already poor and limiting the availability of companion passes will mean that many elderly people will be even less able to get out. Many elderly are socially isolated and this cut would make this worse and ultimately increase costs and demands for social services.”

“I think this is an essential place for the council to save money. I see no reason as to why as a tax payer, I am paying for the disabled to travel before 9.30 and after 11, or why I should be paying to get a companion of theirs on the bus. I know this seems unsympathetic to the needs of some, but I feel some disabled people receive more than they should from the tax payer.”

“Many older people cannot afford to run a car or have given up their cars due to health reasons. These residents would become socially isolated. Also reduces car journeys thus reducing pollution. Wealthier residents don't use a free bus pass so taking away this concession would affect the less well off.”

“Many of my clients, would be unable to travel without the concessionary travel bus pass, as their income is very small receiving only a weekly allowance of £24.90 and minimal mobility allowance”

### 5.4 Responses from people stating this is an appropriate area to look for savings

913 people said 'Yes' to the question on whether they felt it was appropriate to look for savings in this area.

Of those 94 people stated they had a disabled person's bus pass and 35 stated they had a companion pass. However, on examination of comments left by pass holders, some of these seemed to contradict a choice of 'Yes' in terms of this being an appropriate area for savings.

Most of the comments suggested they agreed with the proposed withdrawals as free travel was available most of the day. They also suggested mitigation options, such as passes being means tested and companion passes retained so that only the most vulnerable people could access additional free travel.

The top 10 tagged comments from people who said it was appropriate are below

TAG	COUNT
<b>I agree with the proposal as free travel is available most of the day</b>	142
<b>Can bus passes be Means Tested so people who really need it can get it?</b>	64
<b>Make savings from efficiencies or other SCC areas</b>	49
<b>Companion should still be entitled to travel for free</b>	42
<b>It is not fair that some people get free bus travel and others do not</b>	35
<b>This penalises the most vulnerable Surrey residents</b>	34
<b>Can I pay a part fare with my pass, rather than full fare?</b>	30
<b>SCC should manage their finances better</b>	28
<b>People can adjust their travel to still travel for free</b>	27

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

<b>This penalises people who rely on buses</b>	26
--	----

Some sample comments are below.

“I do not think that the elderly or disabled should have free or reduced bus fares. If the council needs to save money, this is the perfect area to save it in. Make it fair - everyone should pay”

“I believe that given the current usage I see on the buses, that the vast majority of users in my area are old people. I feel that this would likely make things worse for me. As someone who is disabled, I would happily pay a reduced bus fee instead of getting free travel. I also believe that it should count for old people as well.”

“If someone can't travel without a companion, their companion should be able to travel for free.”

“Why should less able people get free travel? If they are working then they should pay for travel, like the rest of us. If they are not working, they can travel later.”

“Council tax should be increased to balance the budget, particularly for those living in upper band properties (which includes me).”

“Bringing times into line with other Authority's seems fair. Free travel for companions - could a fixed contribution e.g. capped £2 be applied rather than removal completely?”

“By reducing investment to the transport services for disabled people it will impact on their independence and isolate people even more. The council should be looking to make people (particularly disabled people) to be more independent.”

### 5.5 Email and written correspondence

The consultation received 18 emails and 1 letter from the public.

Of the 19 responses:

- 11 opposed the proposals
- Five gave no view either supporting or opposing
- Three gave comments unrelated to the consultation and

The tagged comments relating to the identified themes of the consultation are collated below

TAG	COUNT
<b>Will impact on people's ability to live independently</b>	8
<b>This penalises the most vulnerable Surrey residents</b>	5
<b>I value my bus pass and free travel</b>	5
<b>Will impact people's well being</b>	3
<b>The proposals particularly affect people with learning disabilities</b>	3
<b>The survey is badly designed and the consultation process flawed</b>	3
<b>Can I pay a part fare with my pass, rather than full fare?</b>	3
<b>This penalises people who rely on buses</b>	2
<b>I would not be able to afford to pay - either as a pass holder or companion</b>	2
<b>SCC should manage their finances better</b>	2
<b>Travel Off-Peak is not an option for work / education</b>	1
<b>This would cause / increase social and rural isolation</b>	1
<b>Increase Council Tax rather than cut services</b>	1

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

<b>This is a small number of people and journeys so should be maintained</b>	1
<b>Can you charge for bus passes to keep free travel?</b>	1

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

### 5.6 Responses by question

**Q. Are you responding for yourself or on behalf of a family member, friend or assisting someone?**

RESPONSE	TOTAL	PERCENT
For myself	2433	78.94%
For someone else	632	20.51%
Not Answered	83	2.69%

**Q. Do you have a Surrey disabled person's bus pass?**

RESPONSE	TOTAL	PERCENT
Yes	964	31.28%
No	2015	65.38%
Not Answered	103	3.34%

**Q. Do you travel before 9.30am or after 11pm Monday to Friday? If so, could you let us know why you travel then?**

RESPONSE	TOTAL	PERCENT
Yes	1475	47.86%
No	1283	41.63%
Not Answered	324	10.51%

REASON FOR TRAVEL BEFORE 09.30	TOTAL	PERCENT
Attending medical appointments (hospital doctor dentist)	1131	36.70%
Travelling to do essential shopping (e.g. food)	729	23.65%
Not Answered	729	23.65%
Travelling to/from work	678	22.00%
Travelling to/from leisure/recreational activities	628	20.38%
Visiting friends or relatives	548	17.78%
Travelling to do other shopping (e.g. clothing)	522	16.94%
None of these	500	16.22%
Visiting care/community centres	371	12.04%
Travelling to/from school college or university	218	7.07%
Taking children/dependents to/from school college	149	4.83%

Where people stated another reason these are covered in the categories below

REASON FOR TRAVEL BEFORE 09.30	COUNT
Not applicable / relevant to the question	40
Medical Appointments	19
Leisure	16
Don't travel at this time	14
Connection for longer journey	11
Caring for family, friends etc.	10
Education	8
Day Centre / Community Group	7
Church or other place of worship	4
Avoid peak time	2
I would pay if I have to	2

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

**Q. If you need to travel before 9.30am and after 11pm weekdays and free travel was no longer available with a disabled person's concessionary bus pass, what would you do as an alternative?**

OPTION	TOTAL	PERCENT
Pay for a bus journey	1181	38.32%
Use an alternative mode of paid transport (e.g. taxi)	414	13.43%
Use an alternative mode of free transport (e.g. get a lift)	438	14.21%
Change travel plans to travel between 9.30am and 11pm	660	21.41%
Not travel	1079	35.01%
Not Answered	420	13.63%

392 people had responded to this question giving another response. These are captured in the table below.

Some of these comments focused on the outcome for them should the decision be made to withdraw the discretionary concessions. These are captured along with the alternative options stated.

ALTERNATIVE	COUNT
N/A	129
Drive	32
Arrange free transport - school or hospital transport	27
Just keep funding	22
Not travel	18
Miss medical appointments	18
Pay	16
Walk	16
Re-arrange appointments	14
Will have restricted travel options	8
Arrange alternative transport	6
Don't know	5
Travel by train	3
Essential for work	3
Change job	3
Cycle	3
Miss groups - social care / education	3
Only travel if necessary	3
Arrange a lift	2
Change work start time	1
Travel alone	1

Most of the comments classified as Not Applicable were from people who did not hold a disabled person's bus pass and was therefore not relevant to them.

OUTCOME	COUNT
Financial hardship	24
Increase Social Isolation	13
Impact on health & wellbeing	10
Impact on ability to work	7
Impact on education	5
Be forced out of work	4

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

<b>Stop working</b>	4
<b>Stop volunteering</b>	1

Some comments focused on the impact of the proposals as well as or instead of what alternative arrangements people might make.

The largest number of these focused on the cost of any alternative transport requirement and the potential to push those individuals or families into financial hardship.

### Q. Are you entitled to travel with a companion and have a C+ on your free bus pass?

Option	Total	Percent
<b>Yes</b>	516	16.74%
<b>No</b>	2409	78.16%
<b>Not Answered</b>	157	5.09%

### Q. If you could no longer travel with a companion who travelled with you for free, which of these statements would best describe what you would do?

Option	Total	Percent
<b>Pay for companion's travel</b>	519	16.84%
<b>The companion would pay to travel</b>	413	13.40%
<b>Travel alone</b>	462	14.99%
<b>Wouldn't be able to travel</b>	664	21.54%
<b>I don't know</b>	690	22.39%
<b>Not Answered</b>	658	21.35%

Where people gave other options these are summarised below.

ALTERNATIVE	COUNT
<b>N/A</b>	178
<b>Not Travel</b>	37
<b>Retain free companion travel</b>	17
<b>Pay for Companion</b>	15
<b>Rely on carer</b>	4
<b>Don't know</b>	2
<b>Pay to travel when I have to</b>	1
<b>Drive</b>	1
<b>Use mobility grants</b>	1
<b>Walk</b>	1

Most of the comments made about that were classified as Not Applicable were from people who did not hold a companion bus pass and was therefore not relevant to them.

Some comments focused on the reason why people would not travel. The largest number of these was based on the cost of having to pay for the companion or the companion having to pay.

### Q. Do you feel this is an appropriate area for the county council to make savings?

Option	Total	Percent
<b>No</b>	1870	60.67%
<b>Yes</b>	913	29.62%
<b>I don't know</b>	251	8.14%
<b>Not Answered</b>	48	1.56%

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

### Q. Do you feel savings should be made from other county council services?

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	1621	52.60%
No	645	20.93%
I don't know	746	24.21%
Not Answered	70	2.27%

### 5.7 Comments from other consultations related to concessionary travel or transport

As this consultation was run in conjunction with four others looking at different service areas, there were occasional comments submitted to those consultations that focused on concessionary travel. Below are comments that were submitted to the special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) strategy consultation, which related to concessionary travel or transport.

#### **Question 1: Thinking about the feedback on what young people with SEND and their families have told us, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? – Respondent's Comments**

"My autistic 18 year old daughter is not safe to go out in the local community without a responsible adult, cannot use public transport alone and needs constant verbal reminders and advice but has been assessed by Transition as not meeting threshold for ANY services."

#### **Question 2: Thinking about the five principles that the SEND strategy is based on, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each? – Respondent's Comments**

"How can Surrey say that they support young disabled persons to become independent when they scrapped the travel training budget over three years ago. Now they are proposing to restrict their travel on buses which will isolate and depress these vulnerable young persons further."

#### **Question 3: In early years settings, schools and colleges, we will ensure children and young people with additional needs are identified earlier and receive the assessment and support they need when they need it – Respondent's Comments**

"How can they? Will a family living in Cranleigh really get on a bus to go to Losely Fields for early help?"

#### **Question 4: We will provide more local provision to enable children and young people with SEND to achieve their full potential and be part of their local community – Respondent's Comments**

"Again, too vague, particularly about school places and the practicalities of this. Big focus in the strategy on cost savings for transport, when focus should be on most appropriate setting. Better SEN training needed within mainstream settings."

"It seems to a lot of buzz words with no substance. When you look at this consultation along with other consultations such as concessionary transport how are our children with special needs going to be encouraged to be more independent in their own community. They can't even get to college!"

#### **Question 17: Additional comments**

"I think the amount of money spent on transportation is ridiculous. I have a child with SEN, we manage our household finances so that I can drive him to school and pick him up every

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

day, I think others should really be doing the same so that £28 million pounds could be spent on education, not on taxis. Your child, your responsibility.”

“Transport budget needs reining in. Taxis almost running a cartel.”

“It feels like another box ticking consultation as with SEND Transport Consultation where Surrey continued to use bad practice whilst "consulting with parents.”

### 5.8 Equalities monitoring data

#### Gender

Option	Total	Percent
Female	1440	46.72%
Male	1403	45.52%
Prefer not to say	164	5.32%
Not Answered	75	2.43%

#### Age

Option	Total	Percent
65-74	911	29.56%
45-64	727	23.59%
Over 75	572	18.56%
25-44	473	15.35%
18-24	157	5.09%
Prefer not to say	132	4.28%
Under 18	61	1.98%
Not Answered	49	1.59%

#### Disability or long standing health condition

Option	Total	Percent
No	1348	43.74%
Yes - by a lot	910	29.53%
Yes - by a little	578	18.75%
Prefer not to say	194	6.29%
Not Answered	52	1.69%

#### Caring support

Option	Total	Percent
No	1965	63.76%
Yes - 1-19 hours a week	551	17.88%
Yes - 20-49 hours a week	109	3.54%
Yes - 50 or more hours a week	150	4.87%
Prefer not to say	219	7.11%
Not Answered	88	2.86%

#### Employment status

Option	Total	Percent
Retired	1385	44.94%
Full-time employment (30 hours or more per week)	478	15.51%

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

<b>Part-time employment (less than 30 hours per week)</b>	309	10.03%
<b>Not required to work due to a disability or illness</b>	268	8.70%
<b>Voluntary employment</b>	160	5.19%
<b>Not employed</b>	129	4.19%
<b>Self-employed (full-time or part-time)</b>	114	3.70%
<b>In full-time education (school college or university)</b>	106	3.44%
<b>Not Answered</b>	61	1.98%
<b>Homemaker</b>	43	1.40%
<b>In part-time education (school college or university)</b>	29	0.94%

### Ethnicity

Option	Total	Percent
<b>White British</b>	2565	83.23%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	269	8.73%
<b>White any other background</b>	91	2.95%
<b>Not Answered</b>	84	2.73%
<b>Asian or Asian British</b>	40	1.30%
<b>Mixed race</b>	17	0.55%
<b>Black or Black British</b>	12	0.39%
<b>Gypsy, Roma, Traveller</b>	4	0.13%

44 respondents gave another response to the categories listed. Many of these questioned the need to ask for this information.

### Religion

Option	Total	Percent
<b>Christian (including all Christian denominations)</b>	1751	56.81%
<b>No religion</b>	647	20.99%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	519	16.84%
<b>Not Answered</b>	112	3.63%
<b>Muslim</b>	16	0.52%
<b>Buddhist</b>	15	0.49%
<b>Jewish</b>	11	0.36%
<b>Hindu</b>	8	0.26%
<b>Sikh</b>	3	0.10%

61 respondents gave another answer to the categories lists. Many of these questioned the need to ask for this information.

5.9 Postcode Breakdown

Post Code	Count	Post Code Area
GU21	131	Woking, Bisley, Brookwood, Chobham, Weybridge, Horsell, Knaphill, Sheerwater
GU15	120	Camberley
RH1	104	Redhill, Merstham, Nutfield, Bletchingley, Salfords, South Nutfield, Whitebushes, Outwood
GU1	92	Guildford
GU7	85	Godalming, Shalford, Eashing, Hurtmore
GU22	77	Woking, West Byfleet, Brookwood, Pyrford, Send, Mayford, Ripley
KT12	75	Walton-on-Thames, Hersham, Weybridge, West Molesey, Molesey
KT19	69	Epsom, Ewell
CR3	67	Woldingham, Woldingham Garden Village, Caterham, Whyteleafe, Kenley, Chaldon
GU6	66	Cranleigh, Ewhurst, Alfold, Alfold Crossways, Ewhurst Green,
KT22	66	Cobham, Oxshott, Fetcham, Leatherhead, Fetcham, Ashtead, Great Bookham
KT15	65	Addlestone, Woking, Weybridge, Chertsey, Ottershaw
GU16	63	Aldershot, Deepcut, Lightwater, Frimley
RH6	60	Burstow, Charlwood, Horley, Crawley, Horne, Lowfield Heath, Norwood Hill, Hookwood, Tinsley Green, Shipley Bridge, Smallfield
GU4	57	Guildford, Woking, Shalford, West Clandon, Chilworth, Albury, West Horsley, East Clandon, Sutton Green, Jacobs Well, Blackheath
TW18	57	Staines-upon-Thames, Hythe End, Weybridge, Laleham, Stanwell
GU8	55	Chiddingfold, Milford, Elstead, Dunsfold, Witley, Plaistow and Ifold, Shackelford, Hydestile, Hambledon, Hambledon, Pitch Place, Thursley, Bowlhead Green, Enton, Loxhill, Busbridge, Wormley, Sandhills, Brook, Peper Harow, Highstreet Green, Enton Green, Hascombe
KT23	55	Little Bookham, Great Bookham, Effingham
RH2	55	Reigate, Reigate Heath, Sidlow, Buckland, Irons Bottom, Leigh
TW20	55	Egham, Englefield Green, Staines, Chertsey, Thorpe
RH4	53	Dorking, Brockham, Wotton, Westcott
TW15	53	Ashford, Weybridge
GU10	50	Farnham, Churt, Frensham, Tilford, Tongham, Crondall, Wrecclesham, Rowledge, Ewshot, Runfold, Bucks Horn Oak, Dippenhall, Spreakley, Shortfield Common, Batt's Corner, Bentley, Charleshill, The Sands, Millbridge, Headley, Holt Pound, Rushmoor, Surrey, Dockenfield, Seale

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

TW17	<b>48</b>	Shepperton, Upper Halliford, Littleton, Spelthorne, Lower Halliford
KT17	<b>45</b>	Epsom, Ewell, Banstead, Sutton
GU27	<b>43</b>	Haslemere, Chiddingfold, Fernhurst, Easebourne, Grayswood, Linchmere, Kingsley Green, Henley, Easebourne
KT10	<b>43</b>	Esher, Claygate, Oxshott
KT20	<b>43</b>	Epsom, Banstead, Tadworth, Walton-on-the-Hill, Buckland, Pebble Coombe, Lower Kingswood, Box Hill, Mogador, The Hermitage
KT21	<b>43</b>	Ashtead, Epsom
RH5	<b>43</b>	Capel, Ockley, Okewood, Walliswood, Forest Green, Newdigate
KT13	<b>42</b>	Weybridge, Addlestone
GU12	<b>41</b>	Aldershot, Ash Vale, Tongham, Ash, Normandy
GU3	<b>41</b>	Guildford, Normandy, Compton, Woking, Pirbright, Worplesdon, Puttenham, Fairlands, Wood Street Village, Wanborough, Artington
GU5	<b>41</b>	Shere, Bramley, Gomshall, Shalford, Peaslake, Albury, Shamley Green, Wonersh, Farley Green, Stroud Common, Thorncombe Street, Palmers Cross, Grafham, Burrows Cross
KT18	<b>41</b>	Headley, Epsom, Leatherhead, Ashtead, Langley Vale
RH8	<b>40</b>	Oxted, Limpsfield, Crowhurst Lane End, Tandridge, Titsey, Chart
KT7	<b>38</b>	Thames Ditton, Molesey, Esher, Long Ditton, Molesey
SM7	<b>38</b>	Banstead
KT16	<b>37</b>	Chertsey, Ottershaw, Addlestone, Chobham, Longcross, Lyne
KT8	<b>37</b>	Molesey
TW16	<b>37</b>	Sunbury-on-Thames, Feltham, Walton-on-Thames, Hampton, London
KT11	<b>27</b>	Cobham, Oxshott, Hersham, East Horsley, Great Bookham, Fetcham, Stoke d'Abernon, Downside, Martyr's Green, Ockham
GU24	<b>26</b>	Woking, Chobham, Bisley, Pirbright, Brookwood, Donkey Town, Surrey, West End, Normandy, West End
KT14	<b>22</b>	West Byfleet, Byfleet, Woking, Weybridge
KT24	<b>22</b>	Shere, East Horsley, Effingham, West Horsley, Ripley
RH3	<b>22</b>	Brockham, Betchworth, Buckland
TW19	<b>19</b>	Wraysbury, Horton, Stanwell, Old Windsor, Slough, London
GU25	<b>18</b>	Virginia Water, Chobham, Lyne, Surrey, Stroude
CR6	<b>17</b>	Warlingham, Farleigh, Hamsey Green, Chelsham

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

GU18	16	Lightwater
GU26	16	Hindhead, Grayshott, Beacon Hill, Headley, Bramshott Common
GU14	14	Farnborough
GU19	13	Bagshot
GU23	13	Guildford, Farnham, Cranleigh, Aldershot, Woking, Haslemere, Camberley
KT4	10	Worcester Park, London
RH9	10	Godstone, South Godstone
GU	8	Guildford area
GU46	7	Guildford, Yateley
KT1	7	Kingston upon Thames, Molesey, Hampton Wick, Molesey
SM2	7	Sutton, Belmont
GU11	6	Guildford, Aldershot, Farnham, Haslemere, Godalming, Woking
GU20	6	Windlesham, Bagshot, Chobham, Sunningdale, Winkfield Row
RH7	6	Dormansland, South Godstone, Lingfield, Felbridge, Newchapel, Felcourt, Crowhurst
GU52	5	Church Crookham, Crookham Park
CR5	4	Coulsdon, Chipstead, Banstead, Old Coulsdon, Hooley, Mugswell
KT2	4	Kingston upon Thames, Coombe
KT6	4	Surbiton, Tolworth, London
RH19	4	East Grinstead
RH19	4	Brockhurst, Dormans Park, East Grinstead
CR2	3	Croydon, Caterham, Mitcham, Warlingham
GU17	3	Guildford, Farnham, Cranleigh, Aldershot, Woking
GU35	3	Bordon, Lindford, Headley Down
KT	3	Kingston area
RH11	3	Crawley, Ifield, Southgate, Broadfield
CR8	2	Croydon, Caterham, Mitcham, Warlingham
GU51	2	Fleet, Edenbrook
KT9	2	Chessington, Hook
RH	2	Redhill area
RH10	2	Crawley

## Concessionary Travel Funding Consultation Response Analysis

RH12	2	Horsham, Warnham
RH13	2	Horsham
RH18	2	Forest Row, Wych Cross
TN16	2	Tonbridge, Kent
TW7	2	Isleworth, Osterley, Woodlands
BH17	1	Bournemouth, Canford Heath, Creekmoor
GU13	1	No longer in use
GU31	1	Petersfield, Buriton, Chithurst, Dumpford, East Harting, South Harting, Elsted, Hill Brow, Nursted, Nyewood
GU34	1	Guildford, Haslemere, Godalming
IG9	1	Epping Forest, Buckhurst Hill
N10	1	London, Colney Heath, Muswell Hill
PO19	1	Chichester
RH27	1	Reigate
SM1	1	Sutton, Carshalton
SM6	1	Sutton, Carshalton
SW19	1	Wimbledon, Mitcham
TW	1	Twickenham area
TW1	1	Twickenham
TW12	1	Hampton, Hampton Hill
Bookham	1	
Caterham	1	
Epsom	1	
Frimley	1	
Guildford	1	
Woking	2	