

TOTAL TRANSPORT PILOT PROPOSAL

To: **General Purposes Committee**

Meeting Date: **Tuesday 15 March 2016**

From: **Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment**

Electoral division(s): **Those divisions substantially affected by the proposal are;**

- **Ely North & East**
- **Ely South & West**
- **Haddenham**
- **Littleport**
- **Soham & Fordham villages**
- **Sutton**

In addition a small number of individual residents of the following divisions may be affected, in so far as all transport to Highfield Special School is included in the proposal and some pupils reside outside of the pilot area.

- **Chatteris**
- **Cottenham, Histon & Impington**
- **Forty Foot**
- **King's Hedges**
- **March East**
- **March West**
- **Romsey**
- **Somersham & Earith**
- **Waldersey**
- **Waterbeach**
- **Willingham**

Forward Plan ref: **2016/007** *Key decision:* **Yes**

Purpose: **The Committee is asked to consider the proposal for a Total Transport service in the northern half of East Cambridgeshire, replacing the currently separate arrangements for all transport services supported by the Council. This includes: home-to-school/college transport, social care transport, dial-a-ride services (DAR), and contracted local bus routes.**

Recommendation: **It is recommended that the Committee affirms its support for the introduction of a Total Transport service within the stated pilot area from 1 September 2016, subject to:**

- a) the outcome of a public consultation, inviting views on the detailed proposals**
- b) a formal procurement exercise to establish the exact cost of delivering the new service**
- c) a further paper at the Committee's May 2016 meeting, setting out the results of (a) and (b) and inviting a final decision from the Committee**

<i>Officer contact:</i>	
Name:	Toby Parsons
Post:	Transport Policy & Operational Projects Manager
Email:	toby.parsons@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 743787

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. In early 2015 the Council was awarded central government funding of £460,000 to research, design, implement and evaluate a pilot Total Transport service.
- 1.2. The principle behind Total Transport is simple – that, on the ground, it doesn't make sense for different vehicles to collect neighbouring residents who are making similar journeys but for different purposes (for example, healthcare, education, or social care).
- 1.3. Currently, the Council issues separate contracts for different transport services, and pays for each on a standalone basis. A minibus may therefore be booked with one company to undertake a school journey at full price, with a second company being contracted by the Council's social care team to do a nearby journey, also at full price. Bringing both of these requirements into one place would allow a single contract to be issued at a lower combined cost than the two separate prices. This principle, and variations of it, applies to many services across the pilot area, and indeed the county.
- 1.4. In other situations, there may only be one contracted service from a given location. The current separate arrangements often mean that residents who do not meet the relevant eligibility criteria for that specific service cannot travel, even if they are willing to pay and there is space on the vehicle. A more open and integrated approach to transport would allow mixed client groups on the same vehicle, when it is safe and reasonable for this to happen, creating new travel opportunities.
- 1.5. In rural areas in particular, integrating the provision of transport in the way set out above would allow scarce resource to be used more efficiently. This can produce financial savings, and also improve the offer to residents. It does require a change in approach, however, and it would raise issues including revised journey times for some current service users, as well as concerns about managing mixed client groups.
- 1.6. In establishing a pilot area, the intention was to identify a reasonably distinct geographical area that included special schools, mainstream schools, day centres, healthcare facilities, and a mixed geography of rural areas and market towns. The northern half of East Cambridgeshire District was selected, centred on Ely and including both Littleport and Soham.
- 1.7. The Council's combined transport spend in the pilot area was slightly under £3m per annum, as of 1 October 2015. This represented almost 720,000 trips per year. The biggest single spending category was mainstream home-to-school transport, followed by special educational needs (SEN) home-to-school transport, which together accounted for over 70% of spend.
- 1.8. The development of the pilot proposals has been overseen by a project group including the Head of 0-19 Place Planning and Organisation (mainstream schools); the Head of Commissioning Enhanced Services (SEN schools); the Head of Passenger Transport (local bus and community transport); and nominated representatives of adult social care services and public health. It has been chaired by the Service Director: Strategy and Development, and has fed into a wider, director-level Programme Board.

- 1.9. The Total Transport Member Steering Group (previously Cambridgeshire Future Transport Member Steering Group) has met roughly once a month since spring 2015 and has provided insight and steer on the content of the proposals. It includes representatives of all groups; the chair and vice-chair are Councillors van de Ven and McGuire respectively. A draft version of this paper was presented at the meeting of 29 February 2016, to which members representing the divisions substantially affected by the proposal were invited.
- 1.10. During January 2016 surveys of specific user groups were undertaken, to gain feedback on some of the possible changes. The analysis was presented to the project group and member steering group and has influenced the content of the proposal now presented.

2. MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 The proposal is for a new Total Transport service, comprising four elements: fixed bus routes; a flexible minibus service; a social car scheme; and a Booking & Information Centre. These are considered in more detail from section 2.3 to 2.15 below. They replace existing services, including; school buses, community transport (dial-a-ride), subsidised local bus routes, and adult social care transport.
- 2.2 Existing commercial bus services, specifically Stagecoach routes 9/X9 and 12, are not affected by this proposal. Similarly route 15/15A/15B (Ely circular) will not be impacted, as it is separately funded by East Cambridgeshire District Council under a specific developer agreement.
- 2.3 Three networks of **fixed bus routes** are envisaged, centred on Ely College, Soham Village College, and Witchford Village College; each network would also include services for their partner primary schools, where required. The majority of routes would be open to school pupils only, and routes / schedules would be set to allow the most efficient use of vehicles.
- 2.4 The Council's current *Home to School/College Travel Assistance Policy* commits to arrival times being "well in advance of registration" and departure times being "within 20 minutes of the end of the school teaching day" (point 1.3 of section A). The current expectations are often for vehicles to arrive/depart within 10 minutes of the start/end of the school day. The proposed new networks would extend the range of arrival and departure times.
- 2.5 Under the Council's *Home to School/College Travel Assistance Policy* there is no requirement to provide separate vehicles for primary and secondary age pupils. It is therefore proposed to use shared vehicles across primary and secondary age ranges in the pilot area, when this offers the most efficient option.
- 2.6 Based on current modelling, fewer than 20% of routes would involve earlier/later times than at present and/or primary/secondary sharing.
- 2.7 In specific locations, routes would be extended to the local town centre and made available to the general public (i.e. as a local bus service). Following feedback from the original surveys undertaken in January 2016, it is proposed to do this only where there is a clear benefit and local support (for example

requests from residents or through the Parish Council or local member). It is currently envisaged that such routes would operate from areas around both Little Downham/Pymoor and Prickwillow/Queen Adelaide into Ely, and possibly from Wicken into Soham.

- 2.8 In addition to the above services, the Ely Zipper service would continue in broadly its present format, but with local discussion to agree actions to improve its long-term viability, including the use of the vehicle to support a school journey. The importance of a regular service to/from Ely is recognised.
- 2.9 A new **flexible minibus service** would bring together all types of small vehicle transport into a new single service. This would allow the benefits of integration to be maximised, whilst still recognising the distinct needs of certain clients. This service would be scheduled at the Booking & Information Centre (see 2.14 below), which would have oversight of all transport requests and would also be able to allocate users to social car journeys instead.
- 2.10 The regular core of the service would be journeys to and from Highfield Special School. There would consequently be very limited availability for other users of the service from 7:30am to 9am and from approximately 3pm to 4:30pm. This would require adjustments to the existing journey and session times of the majority of adult social care users. This offers opportunities to introduce greater flexibility – both shorter and longer sessions, and at different times (for example including an evening meal instead of lunch) – and this may offer advantages for some service users as well as maximising the use of day centre premises. There would inevitably be an impact on both service users and staff, which may not always be welcome.
- 2.11 The service would increase the choice for existing dial-a-ride and local bus users, as for the majority of areas there is currently a single inbound and outbound journey each day (or indeed once a week, on market days only). For local bus users there would be a need to pre-book travel; the option of making on-going regular bookings would remove the need for repeated phone calls, however.
- 2.12 The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has expressed its support for using the flexible minibus service to transport patients to and from the Princess of Wales Hospital in Ely, subject to agreeing financial arrangements that incur no net additional cost to the CCG. Negotiations would continue to achieve this aim, reinforcing the integrated nature of the service and the benefit of the single point of contact through the Booking & Information Centre.
- 2.13 The Council currently funds a **social car scheme** in the pilot area (and elsewhere in the county). It is envisaged that this element of the service would continue largely unchanged. Work with the provider would take place to recruit more volunteers and to encourage a focus on longer distance journeys, which are both more difficult and/or more expensive for residents to make in other ways. The flexible minibus service would be considered the first choice for local journeys, unless an individual has a particular need that cannot be met in this way.
- 2.14 A new **Booking & Information Centre** would provide a single point of contact for local residents wishing to access Total Transport services. This would be based locally in the community that it serves and when procuring this facility

attention would be paid to added value options (such as the ability to link directly with other community or voluntary services).

- 2.15 Modern scheduling software would be procured by the Council for use in the Booking & Information Centre. This would improve efficiency by allowing the potential duplication of journeys for different purposes to be identified. It would also support improved reporting and monitoring, allowing the Total Transport service to be refined over time.
- 2.16 The success of the pilot project would be judged against three criteria: the impact on the Council's total spending on transport in the pilot area; the number of trips carried out; and the satisfaction of service users. It is not necessarily expected that the number of trips would increase, however if the current patronage is maintained (whilst spending is reduced) this would be considered successful.
- 2.17 It is anticipated that once the Total Transport service in the pilot area is established and has been evaluated, options for rolling out this model across the county will be considered.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- The flexible minibus service may help younger residents access apprenticeships, jobs or training placements. This would benefit both individuals and businesses, by supporting access to a wider pool of employees or apprentices, including those for whom the cost and/or unavailability of transport are currently prohibitive.
- Increased ability to travel to local shops and service providers may support the economy of East Cambridgeshire, by allowing residents to purchase from local businesses rather than relying on internet shopping or simply being unable to access town and village centres.

3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- The flexible minibus service would help residents to access services, including healthcare, social activities, work, education and day-to-day facilities (e.g. supermarkets). This would assist in reducing both the practical and emotional effects of isolation, particularly in remote rural areas. Benefits would apply across age ranges and levels of need.
- Existing services (including traditional dial-a-ride and patient transport) can achieve some of the same benefits. However eligibility criteria can act as a barrier to these services, and there will always be individuals who fall just the wrong side of the line. The flexible minibus service would remove these barriers, empowering all residents to access the services they need.

- Providing a transport service for all local residents (i.e. not segregated by age or mobility, for example) would support community cohesion and resilience. It may add value through increasing awareness of different needs, and supporting local solutions (both as a result of this awareness and by providing the means to access any new activities).
- Reducing duplication of journeys would minimise unnecessary vehicle emissions, offering a positive environmental and health benefit.

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- Developing a sustainable model of integrated transport provision would help to protect access to services in the face of financial constraints.
- Focusing on a smaller number of contracts and services would increase the opportunity for a consistent standard of delivery, including accessibility and training requirements. Further, the scheduling software envisaged would allow needs and resources to be matched accurately, in a way that is not always possible with existing systems.
- Providing a single point of contact for all transport requirements would remove real or perceived obstacles to accessing services, making the user experience more straightforward.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- It is expected that the new Total Transport service would be provided for less than the combined cost of the current separate services. This would be confirmed by the procurement exercise in recommendation (b).
- Integrating services would deliver best value for money, by avoiding duplication of journeys for purely administrative or eligibility reasons.
- The work on Total Transport to date has highlighted that having sufficient staff time to monitor, review and model services is key to maximising efficiency. Given the relatively high cost of transport (a single school bus can easily cost in excess of £30,000 per annum), investment in an appropriate level of staff resource is justifiable. This has been incorporated into the operational plans for the new service.

4.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The Council has statutory obligations to provide certain types of transport, for example home to school transport for eligible pupils. The proposed services would continue to meet these legal obligations, with changes only being made to the method of delivery.
- Changing transport provision may generate criticism from some residents. The second consultation proposed in recommendation (a) is intended to mitigate this risk to a certain extent, but communicating and working with individuals over the implementation period would be key to the success of the pilot (but resource intensive).
- Total Transport is a national initiative, and the Council would therefore be implementing a model that is in line with current Department for Transport expectations.

4.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- A Community (Equality) Impact Assessment has been carried out. This identifies both negative and positive impacts, but with an overall improvement in this area. This is included in **Appendix 1**.

4.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- Initial surveys have been undertaken, during January 2016. A further consultation exercise is proposed in recommendation (a), with details set out in **Appendix 2**.
- A cross-service project group has overseen the development of these proposals. In addition, a full draft of this report has been shared for comment in advance with 5 service directors and 16 other officers (primarily at head of service level).
- Meetings have been held with the two main community/voluntary providers affected by this proposal. As the new service would be subject to tender (partly replacing an existing grant), there is a possibility that a contract would not be secured by these organisations.
- Local and other members have been engaged in the development of these proposals, particularly through the Total Transport Member Steering Group.

4.5 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The report above sets out details of significant implications in 1.9, 1.10, 2.7, 2.14 and in recommendation (a)

4.6 Public Health Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The 2015 Transport and Health Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) report identified that access to healthcare required particular attention. The new services, particularly the flexible minibus service, would provide new travel options for local residents needing to travel to their GP or the Princess of Wales Hospital, for example. Those with mobility issues, those living in rural areas, and those without access to private transport would benefit in particular.
- The commitment of the CCG to support the provision of patient transport through the flexible minibus service represents a positive starting point for greater cooperation and integration between the Council and the CCG in respect of transport.

Source Documents	Location
Cambridgeshire County Council: Home to School/College Travel Assistance Policy (July 2015)	Room 020, Shire Hall, Cambridge www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Department for Education: Home to School Travel and Transport Guidance (July 2014)	Room 020, Shire Hall, Cambridge
Cambridgeshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (Transport and Health)	Room 020, Shire Hall, Cambridge www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/jsna

APPENDIX 1 - COMMUNITY (EQUALITY) IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Directorate / Service Area

CFA and ETE

Service / Document / Function being assessed

Total Transport

(note this is a pilot project, replacing existing school transport, social care transport, community transport and passenger transport services in a defined area)

Officer undertaking the assessment

Name: Toby Parsons

Job Title: Transport Policy and Operational Projects Manager

Contact details: 01223 743787

Aims and Objectives of Service / Document / Function

To meet the Council's statutory and policy commitments in supporting the travel requirements of those needing to access services (including education, social care and healthcare) and of those wishing to travel for general purposes from rurally isolated areas. The intention is to support interventions that are already needed, and to take preventative steps that reduce the likelihood that future interventions will be needed (e.g. supporting individuals to maintain their independence).

What is changing?

The Council currently supports different types of transport service to meet specific needs, for example distinct home to school transport contracts and specific community transport grants. The current focus is on the needs of one group of service users; neither the planning nor the delivery of services is integrated across different groups.

The new service will consider all transport needs together and will seek to deliver an integrated model that improves efficiency. This may allow the impact of reduced budgets on the level of service to be softened.

From a practical perspective, the proposal is to: review and amend the fixed bus routes (including school services) that currently exist; replace the current range of small vehicle services with a new flexible minibuss service; support the development of the social car scheme; and establish a new booking & information centre, to provide a single point of contact.

Who is involved in this impact assessment?

The assessment has been prepared by the Total Transport team, based on feedback received from service users (through surveys undertaken in January 2016) and in anecdotal format via email or phone. It is underpinned by an analysis of the data relating to current transport.

What will the impact be?

Age	Positive and negative
Disability	Positive and negative
Gender reassessment	Neutral
Marriage and civil partnership	Neutral
Pregnancy and maternity	Positive
Race	Neutral
Religion or belief	Neutral
Sex	Neutral
Sexual orientation	Neutral
Rural isolation (local requirement)	Positive
Deprivation (local requirement)	Neutral

What are the positive impacts?

For the four categories identified above (age; disability; pregnancy and maternity; and rural isolation) the main positive impact is increased opportunity to access flexible door-to-door services. A greater choice of times would exist than at present, with more flexibility as to possible destinations. This would support journeys to social and support activities (lunch clubs; parent and toddler groups; activity

sessions; etc), as well as assisting with affordable transport to work or volunteering placements.

The establishment of a service open to all local residents would assist with community cohesion, by raising awareness of different needs and interests. Both this greater understanding of what takes place in the local community and the increased ability to access new activities and groups may support the development of local ways of meeting need.

What are the negative impacts?

The changes required to times of transport to/from social care settings may be unsettling for service users; there may also be an impact on their carers.

The replacement of existing local bus routes would require individuals to pre-book journeys, which may be considered an obstacle to travelling. Further, if concessionary bus passes are not accepted on the flexible minibus service (this would be a discretionary decision by the Council) then pass holders who can currently travel for free would incur new costs.

What issues or opportunities need to be addressed?

The flexible minibus service and the social car scheme, in particular, could be developed over time, drawing on the data available through the new Booking & Information Centre. The ability to plot all journeys in one place would improve efficiency and would allow demand to be reviewed as a whole, rather than in a fragmented way. It would be important that sufficient resource were in place to maximise the benefits available; close involvement with service users, community groups, local members, etc would be needed, all of which requires time.

What is the impact on community cohesion?

There is potential for a positive impact on community cohesion, as set out above (i.e. greater awareness of needs within local communities, and increased ability to access new groups and activities). Continued engagement with service users, community groups and local members would be important.

APPENDIX 2 – CONSULTATION

Background

As noted in point 1.10 of the full report, surveys of specific user groups were undertaken in January 2016. Over 300 responses were received, and the views expressed helped to shape the proposals now put forward.

At the meeting of Group Leaders on 25 February 2016, the importance of a robust and comprehensive consultation programme prior to final acceptance of the proposals was underlined by members.

Consultation Content

It is intended that there will be a core set of questions which respondents will be invited to answer. Analysis of these responses will produce a quantitative report of public views.

These questions will focus on the following areas;

- The design of the **fixed bus routes**, including points such as the approach to mixed client groups and the introduction of smartcards to manage capacity.
- The design of the **flexible minibus service**, including points such as the reserving of capacity at school times (requiring changes to times for other client groups).
- The design of the **social car scheme**, including the sort of journeys that users would be interested in providing/travelling on.
- The design of the **booking & information centre**, including the notice periods users would be willing to give for bookings, and the preferred methods of contact.
- The **specific proposals** (e.g. the individual school routes to be converted to local bus services) that may be controversial, based on the outcome of the original survey.

In addition, respondents will be invited to submit comments. This qualitative research will allow both analysis of common themes and consideration of individual case studies.

In all consultation work, the respondent's location and pattern of service use will be identified if possible. This will allow results to be filtered based on these factors, as it is expected that there may be variation between responses of groups of different service users, for example.

Consultation Methods

The Council is committed to using online tools wherever possible, and it is therefore intended to publish an **online survey** (via the SmartSurvey tool). The link to this survey will be promoted as the simplest way of responding, and all schools in the pilot area will be asked to send it to parents/carers through their standard e-updates.

It is recognised that many potential respondents may not be comfortable with an online survey, however. **Printed leaflets** will be produced, with a freepost return address, to allow residents to complete a hard copy of the survey. These will be distributed via the following routes;

- Existing **day centres** (Bedford House and Ely Community Centre), where staff will be asked to actively make them available to all users.
- Where the Council holds names and addresses of existing service users (including concessionary pass holders within the pilot area), a leaflet will be sent **by post**.
- Operators of existing local bus routes, community transport services, and social care journeys will be asked to offer leaflets to all **passengers**.
- **Public locations**, such as the District Council offices and libraries, will be asked to stock leaflets.
- **Parish Councils, District Councillors** and **County Councillors** will be invited to take leaflets where they have opportunities to arrange for their delivery, or to identify other groups/individuals to whom leaflets should be sent.

In order to promote awareness of the survey and the proposed new service, posters will be produced and made available for local notice boards and the like. In a similar vein, appropriate press releases and social media items will be issued in order to generate awareness.

Public drop-in sessions will be arranged, for local residents and other interested parties to discuss the proposals. It is intended that at least one will be held in each of Ely, Littleport and Soham, as well as Little Downham and Prickwillow (as these are areas with specific proposals relating to a local bus service operating very differently from now). These will be scheduled to fit as best as possible with existing transport options, meaning they are likely to be in the middle of the day (potentially prompting an adverse reaction from those at work at these times).

Consultation Cost

The approaches set out in section 3 of this appendix involve a relatively significant commitment of both staff resource and budget. The cost of posting survey forms out

to concessionary pass holders, in particular, will run into several thousand pounds, once printing, postage and reply costs are taken into account.

The Total Transport funding received from central government included a £20k budget line for consultation and stakeholder engagement. It is proposed to use this amount to pay for the approaches set out in section 3 above. This will leave relatively little, if any, funding remaining for future consultation (although there is a separate budget of £10k for project evaluation).

Consultation Targets

The current data for the pilot area indicates just over 700,000 single trips per year. Many individual users will make 380 trips per year (i.e. two trips on each schoolday); others will make weekly return journeys on a local bus service; some may be very irregular users. It is therefore difficult to estimate the number of unique users.

The best interpretation of the available data is that there are between 2,000 and 3,000 unique users in the pilot area. There will also be an unknown number of potential users, who do not or cannot access services at the moment, but who may be able to use the Total Transport model. Finally, there will be individuals who do not travel themselves but who are affected by transport (e.g. as a carer).

Noting all of the above, a target of 750 responses would represent a likely participation rate of at least 25% of current service users. Around two thirds of all replies would be expected to come from home-to-school transport users (or their parents / carers), based on the relative trip numbers of each user group.

In order to paint a realistic picture of public opinion, it will be necessary to secure both robust statistical data (from the analysis of the formal survey questions) and individual comments. Both angles will be considered in preparing the final report to General Purposes Committee in May.

Consultation Timings

The deadline for submission of papers to the May meeting of GPC is expected to be around the middle of May. The full analysis of the consultation process will need to be completed by then, although the SmartSurvey tool makes the statistical part of this instantaneous (subject to paper responses having been uploaded).

It is therefore anticipated that the closing date for consultations will be no later than Friday 13 May. The preferred launch date for the survey would be immediately after the GPC decision on 15 March. If content were pre-prepared and the consultation were started on Friday 18 March, that would allow 28 working days during school term time and a total of 54 days in all.

APPENDIX 3 – IMPACT ON DIFFERENT GROUPS

The proposed Total Transport services are intended to deliver a more comprehensive service within the financial constraints facing the Council. They involve changes to existing services and to the way in which resources are used; there is no injection of new funding or capacity.

The following table therefore gives specific examples of how different service users and local residents might be affected, both positively and negatively.

Secondary school pupil with free home to school bus pass from Pymoor to Ely College	Journeys would be at a similar time to now, but the bus would be open to members of the public wanting to travel to and from Ely. Those wishing to stay late at school would be able to book a flexible minibus journey at a later time, subject to capacity and paying any required fare.
Primary school pupil with free home to school bus pass from Wicken to St Andrew's	Journeys would be at a similar time to now, but in the afternoon the bus would be shared with pupils from Soham Village College. A passenger assistant would be present to monitor behaviour, and options such as having separate primary and secondary areas on the vehicle would be considered.
SEN pupil with place on taxi from Stretham to Highfield	Journeys may be with a different operator (although once a new routine is established, this would be kept as consistent as possible). More pupils would travel on a slightly larger vehicle, as minibuses would be used rather than taxis wherever possible.
Local resident in Prickwillow, using bus 129 to Ely each Thursday	The current Thursday-only bus service would stop, although there would be a journey available at school times. Residents would also be able to use the flexible minibus service, offering more choice of times and days, but requiring booking in advance.
Adult with social care transport from Littleport to Bedford House (day centre)	Journeys would be at a slightly different time, operating to Bedford House after the morning school runs (so first pick-ups between 9am and 9:30am). Return journeys would be complete by 3pm or would start around 4:30pm, prompting users to make a choice between shorter or longer days. The same flexible minibus service would also be available for other journeys, for example to the doctor or to visit relatives in the pilot area.

Resident of Coveney who uses community transport (dial-a-ride) to the shops	The flexible minibus service would offer a very similar way of travelling, but with greater choice of times (not just one journey per day).
Resident of Haddenham who travels on Ely Zipper to town	The Ely Zipper would continue largely unchanged, other than some small adjustments to the timetable (for example, to include a school journey). Users would be encouraged to support the service actively in their communities, to help it become more sustainable.
Young adult from Isleham wanting to start part-time job locally	The flexible minibus service would be able to provide journeys to and from work, subject to capacity and payment of the appropriate fare (noting that no evening or weekend service is anticipated).