

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

		Concerns
Anthony Tschuk Social Worker (ASYE Disability focussed)	<p>I am a social worker with the Community Health and Social Care team based in Newton Abbot. I am currently supporting Mr SG. I have been advised that there has been a consultation with regard to school transport, whereby DCC will not offer any assistance with travel unless there is no other means for the young person to access education.</p> <p>S has previously been assessed by DCC Behaviour Support worker as unable to access any other means of transport to get him to college. I feel that this is the case at this moment in time. I am working with S in conjunction with the Community Enablement Team to reassess him and support him to use public transport. However, he may not be ready to use an alternative before returning to college in September</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specialised provision for students with SEND</li> </ul>
Dr Phil Le Grice Principal Bicton College and Director of Rural Economy The Cornwall College Group	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the consultation on education transport policy for 2016/17 and 2017/18.</p> <p>In overview, anything that makes the decision to embark upon further study cumbersome or financially challenging will affect participation at our college. In particular, at a time when the raising of the participation age is having the unintended consequence of leading families to the belief that learners might need to stay on in their current schools with 6<sup>th</sup> forms, any bureaucracy that tends to reinforce that misconception, or emphasise alternatives is unhelpful. I make this overview and point two and three below, with particular reference to the Impact Assessment (Version 2016) which helpfully references the social and environmental impact of policy changes that these points will help mitigate.</p> <p><b>Point 1</b> Section 5- Eligibility for travel assistance.</p> <p><i>Where a student does not attend the nearest establishment because of their chosen course, they will be required to provide evidence that the course is essential for entry to Higher Education. 13 It must be evidenced that a similar alternative course is not available closer to home.</i></p> <p>As a specialist provider of land-based education is it possible to work with your team to formalise a block position for our suite of specialist vocational courses that lead to HE in land-based disciplines to avoid repeated representations on evidence requirements?</p> <p><i>Nearest appropriate establishment.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on choices for students</li> <li>Access to specialist courses</li> <li>Signposting to advice and support</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>Landex, the national association of Landex Colleges (<a href="http://www.landex.org.uk">www.landex.org.uk</a>) audits the facilities, staffing and resourcing that allows an institution delivering land-based programmes to be recognised by funders and stakeholders as 'specialist' colleges. Bicton College and Duchy College along with Bridgewater are the only colleges covering Devon that have this designation. I seek assurance that a learner seeking to travel to these establishments is supported to do so even if, ostensibly, the title of the programme of study at a non-specialist college suggests that a nearer college is a 'designatable' alternative.</p> <p><b>Point 2</b> Residential Bursaries are currently available (means tested) for learners taking part in Specialist Land-Based Provision. I seek advice on how we bring residential bursaries and the opportunities for post 16 residential study options to public attention through travel advice and guidance issued by the Local Authority. Promotion of residential places will help impact upon road travel problems, mitigate travel costs for some families and offer a very rich educational experience for some learners.</p> <p><b>Point 3</b> Alternatives in post 16 study. Travel Policy guidance might seek to draw attention to apprenticeship opportunity as an alternative route to post 16 participation. As a reminder that travel to some form of college is not the only available route to education and training.</p>	
<p>Alan King Business Manager, Okehampton College</p>	<p>Okehampton College's strategic philosophy has always been to provide and outstanding education opportunity for all of the young people who live in our catchment area. Our results we feel demonstrate that this strategic aim is realised consistently year on year. It is therefore difficult to understand why our County Council would wish to put forward a proposal that undermines the "outstanding opportunities for all" philosophy adopted by one of their own maintained secondary schools. I am of course referring to the proposal to remove access to school transport for Post 16 students. Given the rurality of our catchment area and the extremely inadequate public bus services into Okehampton, the decision would be catastrophic both in terms of disenfranchising future generations of local young people from access to outstanding education provision and the viability of Post 16 provision at Okehampton College.</p> <p>The majority of public transport routes from our area head towards Exeter and the inevitable outcome of the County's proposal would be to create a thriving independent sector within Post 16 educational provision to the detriment of its' own maintained sector. Transport, inevitably in a rural area, is a key ingredient for students and parents when choosing which Post 16 provision they will enrol with. Surely</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> <li>• Impact on choices for students</li> <li>• Sufficiency of Bursary funds</li> <li>• Safeguarding responsibilities</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>the Government initiative to raise the leaving age for young people to 18 will also mean more courses and options being needed for them to access. Post 16 providers, such as Okehampton College, can support this expansion of places if it can rely on all the other key ingredients following suit. Logically then County ought to be considering how it can support the increase in the required expansion and inevitably that will mean overcoming access issues in terms of transport.</p> <p>The majority of Post 16 students and their parents/guardians recognise that transport to the educational provider of their choice will require a financial contribution on their part. However, what they don't understand is how the County proposal will create greater efficiency and save the County money when school buses continue to run through their village but with empty seats? Assuming that County will maintain transport provision for 11-16 year old students and in most cases continue to use the same bus companies and the same buses as at present. If this assumption is correct then school buses will be travelling to Okehampton College with empty seats, seats currently occupied by fee paying Post 16 students. How will this save the County money?</p> <p>On the point that parents can provide or arrange lifts for their Post 16 child can we ask if this a serious option or simply an alternative suggestion someone in County thought of? It is true that most of our families do have access to a private car but for the majority it is one car per household and this is used by the main bread winner to travel to work. This will rarely be in the direction of Okehampton. The suggestion that parents/guardians could rely on friends and/or neighbours to transport their children to school is in direct contradiction of safeguarding principles we adhere to and fully endorse. Are County proposing that parents, through schools, could have the friends and neighbours DBS checked? Equally to think that personal transport provision or transport provided by friends can be sustained for 190 days each year is also way off the mark. What happens when the car is off the road or is needed for other purposes such as emergencies? Post 16 students, through no fault of their own will miss significant parts of their learning and subsequently be penalised through the grades they can achieve as a result of missing topics.</p> <p>Within our current Post 16 cohort we have a number of young people for whom the thought of having to travel anywhere to access learning would be a journey too far. They need a significant level of support and encouragement on a daily basis, especially during the early stages, to get them through the door. They do not possess the confidence, organisational skills or academic ability to access education provision anywhere but on their doorstep. These will truly be the disenfranchised in education terms by any decision that threatens to remove the support structures available to them in their local school. Staff who know them and with whom they have become familiar with are essential to the potential success of this particular group of young people.</p>	
--	--	--

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>Whilst we fully appreciate that local authorities are facing challenging times in budgetary terms we don't accept that removing Post 16 transport is a means to reduce the fiscal pressures. Some of the arguments above demonstrate why we strongly feel that alternatives need to be discussed. Any decision which denies future generations of young people access to outstanding education opportunities has got to be a cause of concern. Currently 65% of our Post 16 cohort require school transport to access education at Okehampton College. No transport provision to our College will inevitably mean students accessing the limited public transport services available in our rural patch and that will not, as previously mentioned, be towards Okehampton. The end result is likely to be the closure of Post 16 provision at Okehampton College and for some young people the opportunity to participate in 'education' beyond the age of 16. Further, it is likely to reduce the educational aspirations of many young people and impact on their GCSE performance as they settle for what they need to enter further education rather than what they are capable of and striving to get the grades to undertake A level courses.</p> <p>A final point is whether Cabinet members have considered the possible impact of this proposal on rural communities across Devon, of which Okehampton is typical. Consider the scenario of transport routes being focused on the major cities of the County and young peoples' only choice of education provision going the same way. Bus companies will no longer be able to maintain rural bus routes or need to think about rural communities. Young people will be given the impression that their education and employment needs can only be realised in larger cities. Families wishing to support their children will want to move closer to the provision and support they need. The impact on local businesses and service providers, such as schools, would be significant and in many cases bring into question the viability of them continuing. The community of Okehampton relies on its young people and their families coming to the town to enjoy their social/leisure time nearly as much as it needs them to attend our schools. Any factor which diverts them away will inevitably lead to less reasons to make the journey.</p> <p>No one at Okehampton College underestimates the challenge Cabinet members' face but equally we strongly feel they need to reflect on their proposal in terms of maintaining quality education opportunities for all young people in their local communities.</p>	
<p>Lynne Williams Finance Manager Bidwell Brook School</p>	<p><b>Proposal to remove the concessionary rate of travel for low income households</b></p> <p>We are a special needs school and a lot of our families have huge stress and difficulties associated with having children or young people with complex needs. This can impact on family finances with it being difficult to work full time and find suitable child care.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficiency of Bursary funds</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>This move would put additional stress and financial pressure on families.</p> <p>Schools have very limited amounts of discretionary funding and would possibly not be able to meet all requests for financial help</p> <p>If we were able to meet all requests, it would mean that we have no bursary funding to meet other requests for specialist equipment or help towards residential etc</p> <p>When young adults are entering post 16 education, it would be a retrograde step for parents to start bringing them in to school as they need to start learning independence. I am not sure how many of our post 16 students would be able to access independent travel training, although this would be a welcome initiative.</p>	
<p>Darren Armstrong Head of Learner Services, Petroc</p>	<p>I am writing in response to Devon County Council's proposed changes to the Post 16 Transport Scheme for 2017/18.</p> <p>The rural nature of our location at both Barnstaple and Tiverton Campuses means that our learners rely heavily on transport that is supplied and supported by Devon County Council. We have serious concerns about how the proposed changes are likely to affect learners both logistically and financially.</p> <p>We have a number of learners who access Devon County Council's Transport Scheme each year using either feeder buses or contract coaches; without this scheme their ability to get to college, and thereby their access to education, will be seriously impaired.</p> <p>Although the proposed changes have included an appeals process to support learners in exceptional need, having no defined scheme or application process is likely to discourage learners who cannot easily access public transport. Of particular concern is how relevant families will be made aware of the appeals procedure, and how long an appeal is likely to take, as well as what will constitute 'exceptional need'. A major concern is that some learners will be left with no means of getting to a public transport route, and therefore no means of getting to college in time for the beginning of term, which is a crucial time for learners (both academically and in building relationships with their tutors and peers).</p> <p>We strongly believe that the proposed withdrawal of funding and services over the next couple of academic years will inevitably build significant barriers to many learners being able to continue with their education. Government policy is clear that all 16-19 year old learners should be given the opportunity to take a study programme which reflects their prior attainment, education and career goals. Petroc is unique within the area that we service, in that we are able to offer a variety of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signposting for advice and support</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	programmes, both academic and technical to suit all abilities. Removing transport and financial support ultimately removes choice for those learners, and we strongly urge you to reconsider.	
Peter Gregory Director of Finance, Ivybridge Academy Trust	<p>Having considered your consultation document on education transport policy for 2017/18, we would raise the following concerns:</p> <p>1. We believe your proposal to remove the FSM subsidy of post 16 transport will place a serious barrier to participation in post 16 education for many disadvantaged students (particularly those living in rural areas of Devon). Removal of the subsidy would undermine the Government's policy of closing the gap in our education system (underpinned by such initiatives as Pupil Premium funding) and of offering all students equal opportunity to partake in higher education. Your suggestion that the subsidy could be funded from schools' Post 16 Bursary is mis-guided as these funds are already limited and fully utilised in supporting the less advantaged attend sixth form.</p> <p>2. Whilst we acknowledge the fiscal constraints in which education transport must operate and reluctantly accept that, with the exception of the FSM subsidy referred to above, post 16 students will have to pay for their transport to school; we do not support the proposed removal of a student's entitlement to education transport (provided they pay for it) from 2017/18. The current public transport service is simply inadequate to readily transport students living in rural Devon to school. The removal of the entitlement would therefore again place a significant barrier to such students attending sixth form, contrary to the Government's policy of widening participation in post 16 education.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficiency of Bursary funds</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>
Alison Pollentine Business Manager Sidmouth College	<p>As a secondary school we would not be able to fund the whole cost for a post 16 student on DCC provided transport, as it will be much more cost effective to provide students with money to buy their own season tickets on service busses if they are available.</p> <p>My concern is for those students with SEND; please be aware in your deliberations that policy surrounding the Bursary funds means that discretionary support is only available to those in financial need, and does not take into account disability or other needs.</p> <p>The Guaranteed Bursary Award of £1200 per year for Vulnerable Learners is available to young people in Care, Care Leavers, Young People in receipt of Income Support and <b>Disabled Young People in receipt of Employment Support Allowance who are also in receipt of Disability Living Allowance</b>. In my experience no disabled students at Sidmouth College have received both ESA and DLA, so many students with special needs or disabilities may fall through the cracks if policy makers rely on schools' Bursary funds to support their transport costs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficiency of Bursary funds</li> <li>• Availability of Bursary to students with Special Educational Needs or Disability (SEND)</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

<p>Penny Clark Communications Officer, South Dartmoor Community College</p>	<p>The effect of the changes to the current transport policy will be extremely detrimental to our Sixth Form intake.</p> <p>We currently have a higher than average proportion of rural families who struggle to afford transport Post-16. This year we have had 42 students who successfully applied for our Bursary fund, 19 of those to cover the full cost of transport as families are on low-incomes, and 14 to cover part of the cost (where the rest is born by Devon County) – a total of 33 students who would not be able to attend otherwise. This represents our full Bursary entitlement this year, and has eroded our contingency for administrative costs.</p> <p>If next year's application for the Bursary rise substantially, we will effectively have to refuse some students who are deserving of a place here, on the grounds that they cannot afford the transport costs. As an Academy, about the join a multi-Academy trust, we hope that there will be ways to generate more funds or reduce admin costs, but in the current climate we are already having to advertise further afield and encourage applications from more external students each year as there is competition from other local education providers. We are already bearing the cost of transporting students in by minibuses for the Sports Academy, where families have proven low income.</p> <p>The costs of these reductions to transport are not just about our intake or finances. This is likely to affect students opportunities to continue in education and force more into low paid jobs instead.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficiency of Bursary funds</li> <li>• Impact on sixth form numbers</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>
<p>Kirsty Matthews Deputy Principal: Director of Sixth Form, South Dartmoor Community College</p>	<p>I have copied in Mel Stride, Member of Parliament for Central Devon, Graeme Cock, our Chair of Governors at South Dartmoor Community College and Hugh Bellamy, Executive Principal of South Dartmoor Multi Academy Trust in order to inform them also of my disquiet regarding the proposed policies.</p> <p>I am concerned that there is an implicit assumption on the part of DCC that Post 16 providers will use the Learner Bursary grants to block subsidise the increased transport costs for our disadvantaged learners. Not only would this transfer an extra administrative burden to school staff it would also have the effect of creating a significant strain on the fixed bursary grant the college can otherwise use to overcome a range of factors that are barriers to access and attainment for vulnerable learners. The bursary was designed by the government to be used not just for transport costs, but also for books, learning resources, meals and costs of open day visits and interviews. The proposed suggestion would surely lead us to "rob Peter to pay Paul". In a time of increasing hardship for many of our poorer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficiency of Bursary funds</li> <li>• Administrative burden on colleges to manage the Bursary scheme</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> <li>• Impact on low income families</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>families this could lead to necessary short-term economic savings removing the chances of longer term benefit. By any definition this must be a false economy. Not only our students but also the country would lose by this.</p> <p>The transport policy proposals would seriously impact our ability to 'close the achievement gap' for disadvantaged students – a current DFE priority. To illustrate this point, this year we have used £1500 towards the payment of six students' concessionary transport costs. Assuming the same number of students continue into next year we would experience an increase of cost to £3360 [2016-17] and in the following year to £3600 [2017-18]. In total we support thirty three students with transport costs using the learner bursary and we would be unable to sustain this level of support if the overall costs are raised. To exacerbate this even further schools, in Devon, are still receiving less per capita income than the rest of the UK.</p> <p>As a predominantly rural school, with a two-hundred and fifty square mile catchment area, efficient and <i>affordable</i> transport is a matter of social necessity. There is no workable public transport alternative to bring students from the moor to our site. If our poorer families do own cars they usually rely on them to get them to work and so a school run is often out of the question. Their poverty is compounded by the, quite frankly, urban-biased calculations used to denote areas of deprivation taking rate of car-ownership into account.</p> <p>Finally, in a sector where social responsibility is a core value, how is it fair? how is it equitable? how is it just to treat the poorest families in the same way disreputable utility companies are being chastised for? by asking them to pay more than the rich? by offering a £30 discount for paying an up-front lump-sum of £560? a sum which represents a huge amount to a family on the average family income here in rural Devon?</p> <p>Thank you for taking the views of South Dartmoor Sixth Form into account as part of this consultation process.</p>	
<p>Laurence Frewin Vice Principal Corporate Service and Deputy CEO, South Devon College</p>	<p>Proposed changes for 2017/18:</p> <p>There has been a lot of emphasis placed on the use of College bursary funds to meet the increased cost of travel assistance in the proposed withdrawal of a universal Post-16 assisted travel scheme. We want to make it clear that the College bursary funds are limited and, in light of continued Government austerity policies, our allocations have been reduced significantly year on year and have not reflected the significant increase in demand from those learners who are most in need and qualify for this funding. Therefore, we have also had to make some difficult decisions about what level of support we can offer learners to help them overcome barriers to learning. It is highly unlikely that we will be able to subsidise the full cost of assisted travel even for those households who qualify.</p> <p>It would appear from the proposal that learning providers will need to also play a key role in assessing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficiency of Bursary funds</li> <li>• Assessing need</li> </ul>



## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>and evidencing whether the lack of local authority support will prove an unsurmountable barrier to education. This will bring an additional administrative burden and cost to the College. We would like to know from Devon County Council how this additional burden will be funded?</p> <p>Within the list of circumstances deemed by the local authority not to be exceptional we would like further clarification please on what is meant by 'an unavailable route, assessed by the local authority'</p> <p>We also feel that it is important that parent's working patterns are taken into account when assessing "unsurmountable" reasons. We consider this approach to be counter to Governments policies for supporting parents to engage in employment to support their families. Finally, please will you provide the College with a copy of the Equality Impact Assessment undertaken when drafting your proposals?</p> <p>We would also ask that this is provided prior to the end of the consultation period to ensure that we have received all of the relevant information to provide a fully informed response.</p>	
Helen R	<p>I was very concerned to read the above consultation/proposed policy. We live on the edge of the moors on the outskirts of Lustleigh and have three children (in years 8, 10 &amp; 12) who attend South Dartmoor Community College and catch the School bus from Lustleigh. Our eldest son is in year 12 (post 16) and we pay £500 for him to catch the bus which has plenty of seats and is travelling to/from school anyway. This seems to be a perfectly sensible arrangement rather than "the last resort" proposed under the Policy. There is no public transport from Lustleigh, it is too far to walk from, too dangerous to cycle from (A38/dual carriageway) and the assumption that a parent could take their child to/from school on a daily basis would preclude the parent from having a 9-5 job. All of the children catching the bus from Lustleigh would be in the same position in terms of their inability to catch public transport, walk or cycle. South Dartmoor Community College has a catchment area consisting of schools from rural communities which means that the majority of its pupils arrive by school bus and given that the majority of post 16 students will come from the school, by definition they will also come from those catchment areas and, I imagine, walking and cycling (and probably public transport) are unlikely to be feasible options for them, too.</p> <p>I therefore urge you to reconsider the proposed policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>
Alistair C	<p>I write regarding the Devon County Council proposed post 16 education transport policy for 2017-18, affecting current Yr 10 pupils. I am very concerned by this proposal.</p> <p>On a personal level, Liverton is served by the X38 bus service, as the only means of public transport to Ashburton. It is too far to walk, and cycling along the A38 is not a safe option, particularly in the dark. The current bus timetable lists stops in Liverton at 0648 and 0918 Mon - Fri, arriving in Ashburton at 0659 and 0929.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with Raising of the Participation Age (RPA)</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>Clearly, neither of these bus services is suitable for the school hours operating at South Dartmoor Community College.</p> <p>It is not acceptable to expect a young single female (or male for that matter) to hang around in Ashburton for more than an hour prior to the start of school. In winter time, much of that would be in the dark. Likewise, it is not acceptable for the child to be forced to miss the first hour of the school day.</p> <p>I am sure there are countless other areas with a similar problem, particularly after the council has cut funding, resulting in a reduced bus timetable on many routes, including the X38.</p> <p>I feel that a statutory requirement to provide a transport solution should be in place post 16, following the change in FTE leaving age to 18. It seems that one piece of legislation has not caught up with another, and Devon County Council are using this loophole to try and cut costs. I would hope that legislation is introduced, to require LA provision up to FTE leaving age at 18.</p> <p>In my younger daughters case (Yr 10), who will be affected by the proposal - she will not be able to drive, prior to starting 6th form, as her birthday is in August - it is not reasonable to expect her to pass a test and procure a car in a 2 week period following her 17th birthday! There is then the issue of parking in the school area which is another can of worms!</p> <p>The council suggest Parents should change their work hours to suit. A nice theory, however as an example, if a have a legal duty to be in a place of work as a responsible pharmacist during the business hours of the Pharmacy- eg 9am and 6pm, the choice is to drive my child to school and back, and stop working as a pharmacist, and presumably look for a different job, probably less well paid, meaning a reduced tax contribution to the state or indeed state support via job seekers allowance or similar; OR continue working, and have an alternative means of transporting my child. Until now that was the LA bus service. With that removed, there is no choice. There will be countless similar jobs where flexibility is not an option. Maybe we should all get jobs at the council, and enjoy such perks!</p> <p>Practically, we already pay a contribution for our eldest (yr 12) daughter to travel on the school bus. Whilst not covering the full cost of the service, it is money that the council will no longer get if she were no longer allowed to travel as a 6th former.</p> <p>In her case, 4 or 5 6th form children travel each day on the bus. That bus would still run for yr 7-11's with no reduction in cost, as it is not quite full, but a smaller bus would not be suitable, so in fact, it seems that the council would be losing money with this proposal.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidencing inability to make private arrangements</li> <li>• Students continuing to access contracted vehicles</li> </ul>
--	--	--

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>The only way this policy makes sense, is if a suitably timetabled public bus service was introduced. That would presumably require funding or incentivising by the council, so again - where is the saving?</p> <p>I would hope that the school would consider running a service for affected pupils to travel on. Obviously this could be chargeable, in a similar way to the late bus service currently operated by SDCC. Is this something every school can operate, and to every area? I doubt it.</p> <p>Please pass these comments on to the council as part of their consultation process.</p> <p>I hope they and other such comments will force a rethink.</p> <p>I have CC'ed our local MP into the email, as I feel there are issues here that he, and the government should be getting involved in.</p>	
Sue and Pete V	<p>We are writing to express our concern at proposed changes in post 16 transport. Without the provision of door to door transport our son would be unable to attend college and have access to further education and would be unfairly disadvantaged.</p> <p>Our son is 18 and currently attends South Devon College on a Level 1 course. He has a taxi to and from our home in Kingsteignton to the college in Paignton and without this provision would be unable to attend college. He has various disabilities including Worster Drought Syndrome, keratoconus (a degenerative eye condition), communication difficulties, global delayed development, asthma and is severely dyslexic. After leaving school he did a one year vocational course at the college in the Learning Opportunities Section which helped him settle into college life and with their support he has felt confident enough to undertake a Level 1 course this year. He is hoping to progress to a Level 2 course in September but unless he is provided with transport this will be impossible. Due to his medical conditions he is unable to travel independently - he would become lost or confused and may not be able to communicate with people.</p> <p>It would be grossly unfair if our son was not allowed to continue making progress in his education and training due to changes in the transport policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specialised provision for students with SEND</li> </ul>
Mr AR & Mrs HJ M.	<p>Having been notified of this policy change by a third party and having read through both documents, we are left feeling alarmed and dismayed.</p> <p>In particular, the policy for the 2017/18 school year would result in our daughter in being unable to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specialised provision for students with</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>complete her education to an extent that she would'nt then have the best chance of securing some kind of employment.</p> <p>She will be 19 at 31st August 2017 and will be looking to begin a new course in September 2017. She has a complex diagnosis which includes learning difficulties, resulting in her being unable to begin the course in 2016, rather she is to do an individually tailored course.</p> <p>Her English GCSE grade was an F and her final Maths GCSE grade was U at the end of year 11. She is still at Entry 1&amp;2 for Maths and English and is not expected to be able to get up to GCSE level within the next academic year ... This would mean her leaving education without usable qualifications, this would be solely down to the changes in transport policy should this new document go forward.</p> <p>There is no way we would be able to provide transport as we live a minimum 45 minute journey from the college our daughter currently attends as what employer would tolerate an employee being at least 45 minutes late to work every day and then leaving early also? The result would be the loss of parental employment, which would result in there being no family transport anyway due to financial hardship.</p> <p>At present she depends on a taxi to get her to college and back. But it would seem that she would not qualify for a taxi should this document be approved as we have already established that she would be 19 and looking to start a new course on September 2017, due to her Learning Difficulties.</p> <p>This policy is very short sighted and far too restrictive for those who live so far from the college that provides the course that would have the best chance of our daughter succeeding. She will ultimately end up claiming Job Seekers Allowance or ESA, and probably have to attend some kind of course aimed at bringing up her Numeracy and Literacy skills, which would seem to be a failure on the part of the LA, when it comes to a young person with extra needs.</p> <p>We also feel that the lack of public awareness to this consultation, combined with the short time period for this consultation, is very underhand.</p>	SEND
Fiona C	<p>Having read through the transport policy for 201617 and 201718 the following observations can be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students residing in rural areas have no public transport options to choose from; there are no buses or trains</li> <li>• the use of a bicycle, motorcycle or moped is dangerous more so on rural roads especially with winter icy conditions on untreated rural roads</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a car cannot be provided to a student who does not have a driving licence</li> <li>• There will be huge transport bottle necks on roads surrounding the schools with even more cars parked improperly or illegally dropping/collecting students to school</li> <li>• Many redundant buses being used for what purpose?</li> <li>• Parents don't oppose to paying for post 16 transport, but wiping it out completely is not a solution for any student who now has to stay in education until they turn 18 years old.</li> </ul>	
Rachel A	<p>I have read the consultation document for the proposed changes to Post 16 school transport provision by DCC and would be grateful if you could clarify a point for me. Are you proposing there will be no DCC school transport provided for students from September 2017/18? My son is currently in Y10 at South Dartmoor Community College and we plan for him to attend the school's sixth form. As we live in Bovey Tracey, there is no possibility of him getting to and from school on public transport; a bus does not run from Bovey Tracey to Ashburton. I work in Kenton and my husband is in the Royal Navy and will be working away from home. How will my son travel to and from school sixth form under these proposed changes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>
Janet F	<p>I was really shocked to receive this letter concerning changes to transport, regarding my daughter SF. S is partially sighted and also has developmental delays. It would be very dangerous for her to use public transport. I have recently lost my husband to cancer, who was the main wage earner. I have worked part time for many years in Newton Abbot. I am now the sole earner with only part-time wage. Not only am I trying to live every day without my husband, and S without her dad, but if S didn't have transport I would have to give up work, which would be detrimental to both S and myself. I hope you will consider our circumstances, as S needs education and we need income.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialised provision for students with SEND</li> </ul>
Liz J	<p>I am writing as I have just received a letter from South Devon College (Laurence Frewin – Vice Principal Corporate Services and Deputy CEO) concerning your Post 16 Transport Consultation and the significant proposed changes to the current services.</p> <p>My son MJ who is 18 years of age currently attends South Devon College and, M has special educational needs, is on the autistic spectrum and has recently been diagnosed with Crohn's disease. He is currently transported via a taxi (with other students) at a subsidised cost. I currently contribute financially to this service. This has worked well for M needs, as he has around a 25 minute journey and is dropped directly at the door of the College. Any changes to this scheme will have a dire effect on M's ability to attend College in the almost independent way in which he currently manages using the taxi service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialised provision for students with SEND</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>Over the past 8 months M has had several hospital admissions and has missed a great deal of the course he has been attempting to complete. His poor attendance records mean that he would like to stay on at College for at least another 12 months/24 months from September 2016 in order to have any chance of obtaining some kind of meaningful qualification if he is to have any chance of future employment. Obviously this will be subject to his health improving and he is currently undergoing regular infusions at hospital which we are hopeful will bring him into remission. If the current service was to be discontinued it would mean that M would almost certainly be unable to attend college due to the difficulties in getting there using public transport – even if this were attempted utilising a travel pass scheme or bursary scheme. Whilst the difficulty is partly due to the geographic rural nature of our home, the nearest bus stop to our home is over 1 mile away and due to M's conditions, autism and Crohn's disease, he would not be able to make this walk unaided to the nearest bus stop. In addition this journey would also mean crossing the main A381 and Myles would need at the very least someone to accompany him on the journey and ensure his safety, assuming he was well enough to make this long walk, through narrow rural lanes. I believe his safety would be highly compromised if he were to have to make this walk on his own during all seasons (it would be dark at 4.30pm during the winter months). In addition the nature of his Crohn's disease means that he can have frequent and uncontrollable urges for the toilet and as such there are no such facilities on route. The bus journey would also involve changing buses at least once and utilising public transport. Something which is outside of his current ability. Whilst this might be something he could learn with a great deal of support, in particular the toileting issues mean that the best and safest way for M to make the 25 minute journey directly to college is by car or taxi, door to door. Using a bus is not reasonable considering his conditions and due to the extended journey times involved, safety issues and the lack of available public toilets on route.</p> <p>I would urge the authority to continue the support currently offered for students like M by utilising a taxi service, I can accept that the most cost effective way to organise this will be for a drop off by 9am and a pick up at 4.30pm which I feel is reasonable. If the current taxi service is withdrawn then M will almost certainly be unable to attend College as the transport issue would be a barrier to independent learning, and I feel he would be unfairly disadvantaged by both his special needs, health issues and rural location of his home.</p>	
Heather L	<p>I have been looking at your proposed changes to the post 16 transport policy. Our daughter enters sixth form in Sept this year and it looks like she will still be eligible for travel assistance until Sept 2017 at an annual cost of £560.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuity for students already</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>However, if I understand the proposed changes, she will have to look to get to college by alternative means from next year. Whilst I understand the need to review these things, it seems unfair that she will possibly not be able to use the same transport she has had since entering secondary education and be expected to look at a service bus that may not run at appropriate times and all at full cost to ourselves if we aren't eligible for assistance.</p> <p>As education is now compulsory until 18 these proposals seem exceedingly unjust. What if the only alternative is a service bus that runs at totally unsuitable times? Are we then entitled to assisted travel? We would welcome some clarification on these matters and await a response from you.</p>	receiving support
Karen K (Mrs)	<p>I am writing to express my deep concern over the proposed changes which Devon County Council are looking to make to Post 16 Transport which will affect all Post 16 students who need or normally get assistance with travel from the local authority. I am a single parent and sole carer to 3 boys all with autism and additional needs. My eldest who also has complex physical and medical needs is now at a specialist residential college in Exeter for young people with visual and sensory impairments although he previously attended Ellen Tinkham School up to the age of 19. The proposed changes DCC are looking to make in the next 2 years will not affect him but will certainly go on to affect his 2 younger brothers – both of whom have significant but very different special educational needs and 2 attend different special schools. My 12 year old attends Ellen Tinkham School in Exeter and my 13 year old attends Ratcliffe School in Dawlish. We live in Moretonhampstead which has an extremely limited bus service to Exeter and no buses to Dawlish. Like all parents, I wish all my sons to continue their education for as long as possible in order for them to achieve the best possible life chances – certainly Post 16. Both of my sons are unable to travel unaccompanied without supervision because of their behavioural issues, lack of awareness in all areas making them extremely vulnerable and communication difficulties. My youngest who is severely autistic doesn't talk and engages in obsessive, repetitive and inappropriate behaviours which could upset others and my 13 year old suffers with anxiety issues, for which he receives psychiatric support and medication from CAMHS, which also cause obsessive and inappropriate behaviours. At present, they both travel in taxis with an escort which, given their level of needs, is appropriate. Once they turn 16, I understand DCC are proposing that their current arrangements change and that families look to their own resources. I don't have any resources. We don't have a reliable bus service in Moretonhampstead and even if we did neither of my 2 sons could travel on their own and would each need an escort each way. My 13 year old will no longer attend Ratcliffe School Post 16 – however he will be looking to further his education and career prospects by attending a specialist college either in Dawlish or Bickton and neither of these 2 establishments can be accessed via public transport from Moretonhampstead. I cannot cut myself in half and transport my 2 sons in different directions at the same time and I need to be able to work so how do my sons get to their educational settings? We have lived in Moretonhampstead for many years</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialised provision for students with SEND</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>and the environment and our home is sympathetic to my sons' autistic difficulties and needs and also to my older son's physical needs (wheelchair access, downstairs bedroom, etc) – to have to up and move would cause my sons great distress. I accept that savings need to be made and, in this respect, the increase in parental contributions and the removal of low income waiver, which will affect me, I can see are necessary. However, living in a rural area, and having 2 sons with significant behavioural/learning difficulties attending specialist educational establishments in different directions it is neither possible or practical to remove their current transport arrangements without having to end their education Post 16. Both children already share their taxis with 2/3 other young people who attend their schools so they do not travel in a taxi alone. I think DCC should look at the young people who travel alone in taxis and try to combine them with other young people who are travelling to the same destination thereby increasing the number of pick ups but reducing the number of cars and escorts which are used. Young people living in cities close to their educational establishment Post 16 should be encouraged to use public transport but only if they can cope with it or are able to access independent travel training. Obviously, it is easier for 2 parents living in the city to get their young person to college than a single parent in a rural area who has more than one child with special needs going to a specialist educational establishment Post 16 so every individual case should be judged on its merits. This will be affecting young people's and families lives and futures and Devon County Council need to consider the impact this will have on extremely vulnerable young people before sweeping changes are made. What is right for one person's situation won't be for another's. From a parent's point of view, my life as a single carer is already extremely exhausting, worrying and stressful where everything has to run like clockwork because of my sons' needs. The impact of having my sons' educational transport taken away from them once they reach 16 would be enough to tip me over the edge which would result in 3 young people having to go into expensive, specialised full time residential care and the cost of that financially to Devon County Council &amp; Social Services would be astronomical not to mention the emotional cost it would have on each of my 3 sons being apart from each other and their mother. I know I am not the only parent who is in such a difficult situation so there could be dire repercussions throughout Devon as a result of these changes, and, ultimately, more cost to Devon County Council and Social Services.</p>	
Andrew B	<p>Dear Sir/Madam ,I read with deep concern your proposed changes for college transport . My daughter as a disability and learning difficulties . and the reason I use the current transport for her is because she is just not able to use public transport safely . the prospect of travel training her apparently was rejected by a gentlemen who works for DCC , for reasons of safety . These changes are very unreasonable as not only will it increase the number of vehicles using the road it will also put my daughter and other children and young adults in great danger , I would urge you at county hall to reconsider these changes and hope you can see the danger you will be putting these people in .</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specialised provision for students with SEND</li> </ul>



## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

Yvonne C	<p>I have just read your proposed Transport Policy for Post 16 education at state schools. This would severely affect ourselves and many others in our locality as we wholly rely on the school bus service to ensure our children can continue their education at their local school. We currently pay for our son to use the school bus service which is fine but if this provision is no longer available then we do not know how he and latterly his sister who is currently in Year 10 will be able to travel to and from school.</p> <p>It seems ludicrous as it is obligatory that children should remain in some form of education until they are 18 years of age that transport for those over 3 miles from their local education provider cannot make use of a bus service that literally passes their property.</p> <p>I note that your policy has extremely limited exceptions and that the work commitments of parents is not one of them - my husband starts work at 3.30am and myself at 7.15am. He is unable to even collect the children in the afternoon and I am only able to from 5.00pm onwards. It is mentioned in the policy that those over the age of 16 should use public transport or a moped. There nearest village to us has a bus once a week that goes in the wrong direction. The idea of using a moped against is not always a practical or safe solution if you live in amongst narrow, country lanes that many use as a short cut to the local village and ignore all realms of safety. Even if a moped was a possibility we would certainly not let our children go to school through the country lanes during the winter months as there is not one route from our property that is salted by highways.</p> <p>I understand that the Council are under pressure when it comes to budgets but surely it makes sense to continue allowing parents to pay for their children to access transport passing their door. Parents do not expect this to be subsidised.</p> <p>Please reconsider your proposed policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>
Wendy H	<p>The address for correspondence is the same so I hope you do not mind me raising my concerns about post 16 transport with you; perhaps you can forward it on if necessary.</p> <p>We live in Moretonhampstead and our daughter attends South Dartmoor in Ashburton and intends to stay on in the sixth form in September. Ashburton is 16 miles from our home and at present two buses take the children to school, I understand public transport is not an option as it would involve buses from Moreton to Bovey Tracey and then onto Ashburton, the latter journey alone taking 50 minutes via Newton Abbot!</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>We are very concerned that transport may not be provided, we are both working parents and to know that our daughter is on safe, timely transport locally is very important to us in our rural location. Children have to stay on in education until age 18, which we support but we need to know she can get there easily and safely given the distance involved and lack of other options.</p> <p>We would be grateful if you could ensure our comments are noted and that we are kept up to date with any developments as September will come round quickly and we need to plan as this will affect our daughter considerably. Can we seek assurance that transport will continue for those in year 11 now entering year 12 in September?</p>	
Tina B	<p>Having received the proposal letter on Friday I have to say I am rather shocked !</p> <p>The government have made the decision that these children should stay on at school until 18, therefore the transport to get them there should be available the same as the younger children.</p> <p>I am a single parent of twins and couldn't possibly afford over £1000 a year to get the children to college, I work full time and leave the house at 6am.</p> <p>Whilst I note your comments for subsidised travel in certain circumstances, this will not cover many like myself.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to free transport</li> </ul>
Rosie W.	<p>Hello, thanks you for your letter highlighting the proposed changes to transport arrangements for post 16 education from 2017.</p> <p>I would like to make the following comments</p> <p>The rise in school leaving age to 18 that took place a couple of years ago means that all post 16s will need to continue in education unless they manage to secure one of the few apprenticeships on offer or have a part-time job/ do voluntary work and carry on with part time education. I know from experience that the opportunities for 16/17 year olds are very minimal and the wages very low even if they do get a job, so that most post 16s will need to continue in full time education as there is little provision for them to do anything else and the law says they have to. The lack of provision of A-level courses in our local area will mean that our daughter will need to travel for over an hour to Exeter every day and whilst the college should be able to offer a bursary to help with travel costs, it is unlikely that their budget will be enough to cover the proposed shortfall in which case they will no doubt change their criteria so only students from the lowest income families will be eligible.</p> <p>We are getting fed up with the way young people are penalised in this country. Not only do they get no longer get financial assistance towards the cost of attending college, they now have to pay for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>university tuition. Those that are not academic and were not lucky enough to know what career to pursue and obtain a place on an apprenticeship scheme then have no choice but to try to find work. Job opportunities are minimal for them as they have little work place experience and whilst they could potentially do volunteer work, there is no financial reward for this, so it will be up to parents to continue to support their children despite having their child benefit removed as their kids are no longer in full time education - only possible if they have a good income themselves. Young people continue to be penalised by low wages when they can work, no benefits when they can't, and having to pay full fares on public transport.</p> <p>I am therefore objecting to the proposed changes. It is wrong that the central government are reducing the budget for county councils when they have yet to be repaid from bailing out the banks following the financial crisis a few years ago - CEOs continue to be on exceedingly high salaries and receive 'bonuses' at the expense of our children's education and I think it would be wrong for DCC to support this.</p> <p>So getting rid of the college transport assistance will mean that not only will we be penalised for where we live, but also our income, and by the lack of funding to our local college so it can no longer offer A-level courses. If we are expected to pay for getting our daughter to Exeter because the government says she needs to stay in education and there are no other options for her, then it is unlikely that we will be able to afford the bus fare and she will therefore be forced to stay at home and we will presumably be breaking the law. She is too young to drive and doesn't have the finance to run a car even if she could and as we live in a rural area, opportunities for her to do anything other than go to college don't exist.</p> <p>I hope you consider the implications of this proposal carefully as it will considerably affect a large number of families which have already been affected by other government cuts and will mean that a proportion of students will no longer be able to attend college.</p>	
Helen H	<p>I am writing to express my disquiet with the way transport provisions are heading. You allow parents to choose whichever secondary school meets their child's needs but then refuse to provide transport to that school. When I complained that I had to pay for my son Pierre's transport when he started secondary school I was told to move him to a closer school!</p> <p>Since I am already paying for my son, your changes won't actually make much difference to our family. However for people on low income who have bright children, transport costs may now play a factor in whether they choose to send their child to the grammar school. This is discrimination by the back door. I believe all school transport will become private in the long term as councils struggle to balance the books but feel you should put in place support for all pupils on low income who choose to go to schools other than their nearest one.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Impact on low income families</li> </ul>
Lisa C	I have just received the above letter suggesting changes that may be made to travel arrangements for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>students who now HAVE to attend either education or an apprenticeship between the ages of 16-18. Not only has this been forced upon them, it seems that the proposal is that family members or friends now have to take them to the place of education, rather than them being able to apply for a concession bus pass? Does the council think that we are all 'at leisure' so able to ferry these children around? Does the council not realise that we have to work? Does the council not realise that some of us are one-parent families (through widowhood) and may have to also work shift work? We are not all free from 8 in the morning until 6 at night? Maybe a good idea would be to provide all 16-18 year olds with a bus pass or a reasonably priced weekly/monthly ticket for transport - thus enabling the coffers to be filled and the use of public transport figures to rise? This should even be extended to younger members of Devon - maybe from the age of 11 upwards? I would be happy to discuss this matter - or be 'put right'!</p>	<p>entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</p>
Gail Y	<p>I am writing in response to the consultation on proposed transport arrangements for 2017/18.</p> <p>I currently have a son doing A levels at Exeter College and have paid £520 for a travel pass. I did accept this as my son could have gone to Petroc College in Tiverton to do his A Levels but it was his choice to go to Exeter.</p> <p>However, I have a son who will be going to college in September 2017 and would make the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The school leaving age is no longer 16 but is 18 (children have to remain in education or training until 18).</li> <li>2. With the closure of Petroc College Tiverton to A Level students, there is NO provision for A levels in the Mid Devon area (we are in Cullompton). All the schools are to GCSE level only.</li> <li>3. Therefore students wishing to do A levels have no choice but to travel</li> <li>4. It is fundamentally not fair that students in the Mid Devon area have to pay for their schooling (by way of transport costs) when children in Exeter can walk, cycle or pay less for a travel pass.</li> <li>5. Yet again students in a rural area with no provision for Post 16 education in their area (A Levels), through no fault of their own are having to bear the burden.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>
Rachael H	<p>I am in receipt of your letter dated 8 April 2016 and note that it invites me to share my views.</p> <p>I feel it is extremely unfair cutting services for post 16 students when it is a stipulation made by the government for students to remain in further education until the age of 18. It is extremely daunting for any child going on to further education let alone a child with learning difficulties and for them to have</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>the added pressure of arranging their own transport is just awful. Education for my son has been a huge struggle and one that he has not been very fond of and if he has to arrange travel himself I know for a fact he will be purposely dragging his feet and will be late on every occasion. He does not have much concept of time and I can already foresee that whatever further education he chooses will be very short lived.</p> <p>I am a working single parent and I just simply would not have the time to escort my son to his college placement. My son is currently awaiting travel training, however due to his visual impairment he does struggle with spacial awareness and dim lighting and I really do not know how he would manage on public transport.</p> <p>It makes me very sad that every single cut which seems to be made to County funding always seems to have an impact on those more needy who desperately need the extra support to be in place for them.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialised provision for students with SEND</li> </ul>
K G	<p>Parents are expected to send their children to college post schooling. However in rural areas such as Lynton (20 miles to Petroc and a one hour journey time) at a cost of £3.20 on public transport return every day we are definitely penalised for living where we are.</p> <p>Colleges are not 'round the corner', as they are in larger conurbations. Why is it that free transport is provided for ages up to 16, but when you are over 16 you are discriminated against because of your age? Who knows.</p> <p>More cuts are forced on local authorities by central government as government misspend their income and fail to balance their books. Local authorities are soft targets as they cannot fight back. A bit of bullying going on.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> </ul>
Dawn	<p>Thank you for the letter regarding charges for transport to school for my son, who travels now to school for which we as his parents pay for now, he is a year 10 student. It is a lot of money for which we have to find to pay for my sons /travel/education. Obviously we want the best for him and he does not go to his 1st feeder school.</p> <p>I agree on paying for so much but I do feel that there should be some kind of contribution that should be made via the school/education/council and that seems to be less and less each year.</p> <p>There is an ever increasing cost to putting your child through school at the moment and i suppose this</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>is going to increasing each year, from books, uniform, trips and travel etc. ....</p> <p>We live in a rural location, I do not live near a bus stop and find it really difficult at the moment to get him to the nearest bus stop on time, because the bus timetable is clear but the buses do not run everyday the same time by 10/15 minutes difference some days. Then if the bus is early then he misses the bus and I have to take him to school which is an inconvenience because I have work and get another child to get to school.</p> <p>I already pay for his travel, I would be not be happy to have to pay more for his travel than I do. I have always had to pay and never get anything for free. I think there is a lot of people out there that play the system and get a lot help when they don't need it and could do more for there own children but chose not too and think that society should pay.</p>	
Maggie S	<p>I am writing in response to the recent letter regarding proposed changes to Post 16 transport</p> <p>Please could you advise what evidence you require to confirm that there are no alternative options to transport my children to school ?</p> <p>We live rurally (EX6 7QX) with no access to a bus service. My working hours necessitate that I am in work by 8.30am This means that I would be unable to give my children a lift (in the opposite direction) to school. Equally my husband needs to be on site for work at 8.30am</p> <p>The bus would (I presume) still be coming to Higher Ashton for our younger son (currently year 7) so it would seem ludicrous if his bus is continued (which I sincerely hope it will be) for my 2 older children not to be allowed on the same bus (which is not full to capacity anyway. Please can you provide some specific reassurance about our particular bus service and whether our elder two children (currently year 10 and year 12) will be able to continue getting a lift on that bus (albeit with a substantial cost to ourselves)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing evidence of need</li> </ul>
Katie H	<p>Hi there as a parent currently with son in 6th form we couldn't afford bus so Tom cycled every day and I drove him when able ....</p> <p>I think it's herendous we have to pay so much my daughter will be in the same boat it's cheaper for me to drive than pay herendous bus fayre middle man struggled we both work long hours and it's hard to get pennies to cover it all terrible costs thanks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on low income families</li> </ul>
Mrs S	<p>I find it shocking &amp; upsetting to learn of the proposal to withdraw financial support to post-16 students at the very time it is compulsory for them to remain in education. It would be a real hit to the majority of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>families such as ours who's income is not low enough to get help but not high enough to cover all our needs as it is &amp; is no where near high enough to cover this sort of cost for our two teenagers. As it would mean, on your suggestion, that one year we would have travel costs of £1120. It is just beyond us to afford this. As I am not clear if we would qualify for help through the college Bursary scheme. So the thought fills me with deep concern &amp; dread.</p> <p>My husband takes the car early to work &amp; I work mainly nights to make ends meet &amp; share the car, so to transport them ourselves would be impossible.</p> <p>Please consider these points before you act.</p>	<p>transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</p>
Lee E	<p>My daughter attends Okehampton College and is currently in Year 10. We received the consultation letter via the school yesterday. I have one simple question as I am confused as to what this means for my daughter and her 6<sup>th</sup> form choice.</p> <p>She lives outside Lydford and currently gets a school bus. She has to travel into the village to get it and it is free. Will she still be able to pay for a seat on that bus post-16 or has that option been removed and will we therefore have to transport her the 8 miles to college every day ourselves?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to contract vehicles</li> </ul>
Ruth B	<p>Dear Sirs, thank you for your letter, received through my daughters' school yesterday about the proposed cuts to the post-16 transport costs for 2017-18.</p> <p>I am only too aware of the cuts needed in local government spending at the moment, however, these particular cuts do concern me.</p> <p>I cannot see how these particular measures will be administered or measured. You state that you will support where there are no other transport options available, but how will you work that out? Such a high proportion of Devon students live in very rural areas without public bus services, so will you always expect the parents to take the children in? Would there be an assumption that they would have to find a lift somehow? How will you take into account parental working patterns or car availability? How can we demonstrate 'evidence of no alternative options' I can see this being an administrative nightmare!</p> <p>Post-16 is no longer optional, so it is just as important for these students to be able to reach their place of study as it is for earlier years.</p> <p>It is also important that this vital study time is used well. I am only too aware of how quickly these 2 years go by, &amp; how much time the students should be giving to studying, without the stress of having to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing evidence of need</li> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Operation of the Bursary scheme</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>arrange lifts every night!</p> <p>Not all schools have bursary schemes &amp; it is unfair to put the onus back on them to enable disadvantaged young people to study when their own budgets are so tight.</p> <p>I have been happy to pay a contribution to my sons transport costs (he is in post-16 study at the moment. But all out removal of transport is short-sighted. Our school bus has all our village secondary age children on it &amp; there is room for post-16s as well. It will be uneconomical (for everyone involved, especially you, not to mention un-environmentally friendly) to have a bus with spaces leaving at the same time as lots of cars all going to the same destination. This will also have quite an impact on congestion around schools &amp; colleges with everyone making their own way in - an issue that I am sure many other County departments will be concerned about.</p> <p>I can see that there would be an economic case for these cuts within an urban authority where public transport can fulfil the needs of post-16 students but you are talking about vast amounts of rural pupils who you will either end up helping anyway (if you can't get the measurements of need clear) or it will have a big financial &amp; environmental impact. These are poorly thought-through proposals &amp; I would urge you to look at the wider implications again, not to mention the real cost of these proposals versus any cost savings you may make short-term.</p>	
Mr & Mrs C	<p>Today I have received a letter informing me of the proposed changes to transport 2017-2018 academic year.</p> <p>My daughter is currently in year 10 and intends to continue with further education. If this transport isn't available this may alter her plans.</p> <p>As students now have to stay in education of some sort, without earning on an apprenticeship scheme, she would have no way of paying for this transport and we couldn't afford to pay for it. With this in mind, this would be effectively forcing her into a corner and onto an apprenticeship so she has enough funds available not only for extra books etc but for transport as well.</p> <p>I appreciate that there has to be savings made, but taking this from our young students, our future workers, is not either fair or right and when I hear that the council will match funds raised for a bronze otter in Bideford, as well as other ridiculous matters where money doesn't <i>need</i> to be spent, it certainly beggars belief.</p> <p>I certainly hope that this will be reconsidered or an agreement can be made to secure futures for our youngsters.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> </ul>
Sarah S	Thank you for the letter you sent regarding changes to your Post 16 Transport Policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the</li> </ul>



## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>I would like to provide my feedback on the subject, and request you reconsider.</p> <p>I feel that the new policy will adversely affect children living in rural areas since the public transport available is sketchy at best, and non-existence at worse. I support County Council making sensible cuts but to penalise parents and children living within very rural areas seems a mistake.</p> <p>Could you perhaps ask Post16 students for a contribution to transport costs on transport provided by the Colleges?</p> <p>I do hope you will reconsider this change.</p>	<p>most rurally isolated families</p>
Karen S	<p>I am writing in response to a letter that came home from Chulmleigh Community College. My daughter will be taking her GCSE's in the summer of 2017, it is my understanding that the law on leaving school has changed and she will need to stay in education until she is 18 (and to continue to study English and Maths should she not pass them at school). As there is no provision for this at Chulmleigh, she will need to go elsewhere, the nearest provision is Barnstaple which is 16 miles away. My older children, who did not have to continue in education, travelled to college on a subsidised pass which we paid £500 for this which I considered fair, as we were able to afford this. However I do not consider it is fair that families with children living in rural areas should be expected to provide transport and have no alternative except to pay £560 if they have no other means of transport.</p> <p>If these children have to stay in education why not give them a suitably subsidised transport pass (after all pensioners get free transport) they would then be able to use it, if they wanted or needed to, to get to areas where they could work at weekends to subsidise their education – this would make good sense giving them the opportunity to get work experience too.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> </ul>
Mrs K C	<p>I am writing with concern about the transport proposal for 2017-2018.</p> <p>The new government rules are that children up to the age of 18 have to be in either full-time education, on an apprenticeship or in full time employment. This changed from the age of 16. Therefore I cannot understand why transport support is not offered to children, in whichever situation, up to the age of 18 or 20 if in full time education.</p> <p>This would help children, parents and carers, as £560 a year for a term time only bus pass, to be used at restricted times, days and places is a substantial amount to afford.</p> <p>For a child to have to depend on an adult to get them to their place of education, apprenticeship or place of work is not helping a child become an independent adult.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Choice of course location</li> <li>• Operation of the Bursary scheme</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>Not being able to afford public transport is not encouraging children to attend further education, an apprenticeship or a place of work.</p> <p>An apprenticeship wage and minimum wage are not enough to afford public transport costs at £560 per academic year and then to have to find more funds to pay for non-term time transport.</p> <p>I would propose that a weekly bus pass, wherever the child lives (discrimination towards a child's address should not be allowed as in the vast majority of cases, it is not the child's choice as to where they live), should be priced at no more than £10 a week for unlimited travel, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks of the year. This will help all children to get to their required destination(s) at all times and help them get to other required places of education during term time when required and places of work during holiday times.</p> <p>£10, I feel after research, is an affordable amount to pay for transport for children of all financial backgrounds and in all financial situations. If a child is required to work to pay for their transport, £10 a week is an affordable amount to pay out of a low wage. I say a low wage as this is what a child of 16 - 19 receives.</p> <p>For example, children living in Exeter may only be able to study their chosen subject in Plymouth. Charging unaffordable transport fees and/or restricted times will have a great impact on whether a child continues with education or not.</p> <p>A child wishing to study aircraft engineering at Flybe at Exeter Airport, living in Stoke Canon at present has to pay £621 a year for transport costs and this is term time only. The journey also takes an hour on public transport when the actual time to get to the airport is only 20 minutes. This all adds to the discouragement of children applying for further education.</p> <p>Discouragement to enjoy further education should be avoided at all costs.</p> <p>Encouraging children to get to their required destination, to be free and able to get out and about at all times is a great need in this country. It is a fact that children spend far too long in their homes on pointless technology products from games consoles to social media sites on their mobile phones.</p> <p>Children from all levels of financial backgrounds should have the same choices and this should not be means tested. This is not a fair way of deciding whether a child should have financial support towards their transport requirements.</p>	
--	---	--

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A child living with one parent on benefit support will be entitled to transport support, even if the parent whom they do not live with is on a very substantial wage, however this child's friend who has both parents living at home, on an income that is low and extremely lower than the parent of his friend, will not qualify for transport support as the total income may just be £1 over the qualifying criteria.</li> <li>2. Using the same situations as above; the child with the one wealthy parent may not have access to transport at home but the child with parents on a joint low income may have one car and be expected to drive their child to their chosen place of education even if this does not tie in with the parents times of work. This will cause even more financial hardship for the parents on a joint low income.</li> <li>3. A child with wealthy parents will not be entitled to transport support, however the parents may not help the child financially at all. Just because parents are wealthy we should not assume that they give their child financial support. This will leave the child in a situation that could possibly discourage them from further education.</li> </ol> <p>All children should be treated as equals and not according to the financial situation of their parents, this is highly discriminating not to mention unfair and in many cases embarrassing, for the child with poorer parents receiving support (colleagues know the parents are poor if you are receiving support and can be a little nasty) for child with parents in the middle who cannot afford to help their child with transport (therefore the child has to explain to colleagues that they have to choose a different direction in life because their parents cannot afford otherwise) and for the child with rich parents who won't help with transport costs and has to explain to colleagues that their parents won't help them.</p> <p>The above examples are real life.</p> <p>Help children have equal opportunities by making them equal.</p>	
Stuart & Carolyn A	<p>In response, can you please raise the following questions and hopefully give me some answers:</p> <p>My son is considering Post 16 education at Okehampton College where he is currently a student in Year 10. At present he catches the bus in the village of Northlew (Oke 14).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>When in Post 16 education (Sept '17), will he be able to use this service and at what cost? Currently Post 16 students are able to use this service. There is no public service bus that runs from the village of Northlew.</p> <p>Other public transport services (the nearest being at Castle Cross) will not be appropriate because they run at the wrong times for him to travel to and return from college.</p> <p>As it is now compulsory for students to remain in education until 18 years old, why does the onus fall on the parents/carer to pay for transportation?</p> <p>Do you realise how much extra traffic this will cause on the roads with this proposed policy? Many people, ourselves included, are inclined to drive our son to/from college to save the costs and being in a rural area like Devon it is not easy to share/combine travel.</p> <p>This proposed policy will increase pollution, traffic and totally ignores carbon free policies.</p> <p>At times of drop off/collection times at Okehampton College this policy will increase the volume of traffic in an area where there is already major congestion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on volume of traffic</li> </ul>
Kate W and Nick D	<p>I am writing in regard to the proposed alterations to post 16 school transport from September 2017.</p> <p>We live in Drewsteignton and our children travel to Okehampton College on two buses: a mini bus travels from the village centre to a pick up point to meet with the large bus that transports them on to College. We are very happy with the way this works and hope the arrangements will continue.</p> <p>Our elder daughter is currently in year 10 and hopes to continue to Okehampton College sixth form in September 2017.</p> <p>We are concerned at the proposals which may mean the financial contribution from parents for school transportation rises to £560 per annum as this is far beyond our means as a low income household.</p> <p>Unfortunately, we do not have the capacity to take our daughter to school ourselves as our work takes us in other directions.</p> <p>There is no public transport option from the village to Okehampton College, so we are very reliant on her being able to continue to take the College bus as she does at the moment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operation of the Bursary scheme</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>We would be grateful if Devon County Council could take our concerns into consideration when considering the proposed steep rise in parental contributions. We are happy to pay something towards costs but £560 is prohibitive.</p> <p>Our children are very happy at Okehampton College and we very much hope they will be able to continue to attend post 16</p>	
Nicola K	<p>Forgive my late reply have only just been handed letter from the bottom of my daughters bag. I am very distressed to hear these latest plans, i am disabled and my husband is working long hours just to keep our heads above water, as it were!</p> <p>We are currently paying £50 a month for our son to use school bus, (he's post 16) which is crippling us but the only way we can manage to get him to school, unless he cycles which is ridiculous if you had ever felt the weight of his bag!</p> <p>I think transport should be provided for free when its compulsory for them to stay in education until they are 18, yet it seems to made difficult at every step of the way and now you'll be removing it altogether!</p> <p>We live in a rural village where buses are very few and far between, i just don't know how we'll manage without it. Life is very hard being disabled and i don't want my daughter to suffer because of it too.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Specialised provision for students with SEND</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>
Jane B	<p>This seems to be a way of trying to recoup the debt that the school has got itself into.</p> <p>The buses are already funded &amp; running, there are spaces on the buses. This is a way of asking the 6th form students to subsidize the bus service.</p> <p>I think Bideford College will be discouraging its students to continue until the 6th form.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies of Bideford College</li> </ul>
Neil P	<p>I am raising my concerns over the proposed changes for the school transportation for 2017-18. I understand the financial constraints on the council and why some cuts have to be made but the government are stating children are to stay in full time education until they are 18 years of age so surely the government / council should provide transport while the children are at secondary school. It can be difficult to provide for children when they go to college as a lot of children go to colleges that aren't as close as their local school so I think a contribution to their transport by parents as I do for my daughter is warranted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Impact on volume of traffic</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	The other concerns are around congestion and pollution surely by asking people to take their children to school even with car share will lead to higher congestion on our roads and even greater pollution which for all our sakes is something we should try to avoid.	
Louise M	<p>I have been prompted to write concerning the impending changes to school transport in Sept 2017. My son at Okehampton college will be affected by this as he goes into year 12 on this date. We live in a rural area near Chagford and although there is a bus stop with local buses running to Okehampton they are not at times that would get him to school in the morning or indeed bring him home at the end of the school day. I am a single working mother and although I have a car would not be able to transport him to and from Okehampton on a daily basis.</p> <p>As he catches a school bus to and from Chagford at the moment with other post 16 students, I cannot see why this facility cannot continue as we do not require a specific post 16 bus and there are spaces on the normal Okehampton college school bus.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> <li>• Continuity for students already receiving support</li> </ul>
Tom W	<p>I have received the recent communication on changes to post 16 transport. I am a bit unsure on some aspects and would appreciate some clarification.</p> <p>My son attends Colyton Grammar and we pay a private contract bus company for his transport. I am unclear whether the price we pay is subsidised at all by DCC and could therefore increase substantially when he moves into year 12 and beyond which would present a significant difficulty for us. Could you help please?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuity for students already receiving support</li> </ul>
Dr R B	<p>We are in receipt of your letter detailing possible changes to the transport arrangements for 16 + students.</p> <p>Your letter is very ambiguous and the details sketchy at best. It is difficult to form an opinion or ask questions about such a letter. This is the minimum that I feel as parents we need to know.</p> <p>Are you planning the following changes;</p> <p>To cease transport for all 16 + students?</p> <p>Or, maintain transport, but only with an increased contribution of £560</p> <p>Maintain transport for those that live greater than 3 miles distant, but with an increased contribution</p> <p>Maintain transport for those with Special educational needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on volume of traffic</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>It is very difficult to have a view on this proposal, when we are unsure as to what Devon Transport is actually proposing. For a rural county I would suggest the Environmental impact of removing post 16 transport on our county will be substantial. Those parents with younger children on school transport will be forced on to the roads in order to deliver older children to the same school (in the case of QE). Again, where there is no rural public transport, parents will need to make arrangements to transport their children. This is another example of how the rural community is being hit with costs that those that live in cities will avoid.</p> <p>I would suggest that an environmental impact assessment would show a greater cost to the council and the county than is presently incurred, e.g. road damage, pollution, congestion and public health. I would suggest that removing post 16 transport is ill conceived at best and with potential to cost Devon (its tax payers) Millions of pounds in repairs and increased pollution levels and public health issues.</p>	
Phil S	<p>Thank you for inviting responses to your letter of 8<sup>th</sup> April 2016 regarding Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18. As you must be aware, after the Government's decision to, in effect, make education compulsory for 17-18 year olds, the response in Mid Devon was to remove opportunities to study A-levels by ending such at Petroc Tiverton – a move that was only realised by many parents such as ourselves by reading it in the Press.</p> <p>Faced with the prospect of their children having to travel to Exeter to study A-level maths, for example, parents are now being told it is likely there will be no assistance with transport. Please rethink this approach. Surely after removing A-level facilities from the largest town in Mid Devon and, more importantly, from the students present &amp; future who live there, more help with transport will be required, not less? It seems very unfair that families who live in Mid Devon have services removed &amp; then have extra costs to face on top.</p> <p>We feel we must comment on some of the 'solutions' your letter mentions which are, frankly, not reasonable. For example, you say the responsibility falls to the 'students and their families where a family vehicle or one available through friends could be used'. What in practice will this mean? Who makes the decision on whether one is 'available'? E.g. We have a vehicle but my wife doesn't drive &amp; I would be at work nowhere near Exeter. True, we have friends who own vehicles but what authority are we expected to have over these vehicles and who will be expected to be the driver? Who will be assessing the situation? Is it fair to view two round trips totalling 80 miles per day as a 'school-run'? This requirement needs adjustment as it is unrealistic. If it is reported that a vehicle is not available then the students/parents word on the matter should be accepted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Choice of course location</li> <li>• Assessing need</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>We realise Councils face many pressures from so many different angles but do hope you will reflect on the proposed changes &amp; see how these young people who seem to be having more &amp; more expected of them, yet more and more taken from them, can be better served.</p>	
Eric D	<p>I recently received a letter regarding proposals for revised travel arrangements. It is unfortunate that these proposals coincide with the raising of the school leaving age to 18.</p> <p>Devon is a rural county with poor public transport. The bus service in our village is virtually non-existent and those buses which stop here are not at suitable times for travelling to and from school.</p> <p>My children currently attend Uffculme School. In recent years they have tried to provide a sixth form, but DCC has been opposed to the idea. Currently the closest provider of post 16 education is Petroc in Tiverton. It is not possible to get from Kentisbeare to Tiverton by public transport.</p> <p>Petroc has recently announced that it is to cease 'A' level provision. This means that anyone wishing to follow this educational route will now be forced to travel to Exeter or further.</p> <p>Removal of council provided transport will give rise to an urban / rural divide that is deeply unfair to families living in rural locations.</p> <p>Even where parents own a car and could theoretically take children to college, the reality is that this will often be incompatible with going to work. This may force families to choose between sending their child to the most suitable educational establishment or giving up work. This may then result in additional calls on local government budgets through council tax and housing benefit.</p> <p>I would therefore urge you to reconsider this proposal.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> <li>• Choice of course location</li> </ul>
Andy H	<p>I have a daughter in year 10 at Colyton Grammar School who will fall foul of this change and I have to say that I am deeply concerned.</p> <p>My daughter currently catches a bus to school with students from all year groups (7 – 13). Schools such as Colyton have students from a wide area so buses are more of a necessity than a luxury and one that we already pay for. I am also aware that other government funding for well performing schools such as Colyton has already been cut and this has had a detrimental effect on the schools operation that is another area of significant concern for me.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Continuity for students already receiving support</li> </ul>



## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>Firstly, can you please spell out in plain English precisely what this will mean for me and other pupils and parents. Can you please answer the following questions:</p> <p>Will a bus service be available or will we be required to use public transport? If a bus is provided what will this mean in terms of additional costs? I cannot believe that this is going to cost any less than it currently does.</p> <p>Secondly, as I understand it the law for children up to 18 years of age has changed and they are now required to remain in some form of fulltime education (or other qualifying course) until what is the end of year 13. Surely, if this has changed then the law in relation to what has to be provided for post 16 students should have been reviewed and amended to reflect this change. In other words, now there is a legal requirement for students to remain in fulltime education until aged 18 then it should be a statutory requirement for the local authority/government to provide transport as the statutory school age has effectively changed. This would mean that it is not a discretionary arrangement but a statutory one so would be required to be funded.</p> <p>In general it just seems that we are still paying the same or more taxes for less services. I work in a public service organisation so fully understand the need to make “efficiencies” and do more with less but it is getting to a point where someone needs to wake up and smell the coffee as there is only so much that the public are prepared to stomach!</p>	
Barry and Gabrielle K	<p>Our daughter is currently in Year 10 at King's School, Ottery, and we have received a letter about the proposed amendments to the post-16 transport policy for 2017-18.</p> <p>We live in Tipton St John. The public bus timetable presently would be unsuitable for sixth formers because it does not operate at the right times. The 1st public bus of the day gets into Ottery at 9.25am, and on the way home the only bus they could catch is at 16.50 from Ottery - an hour and a quarter after school finishes. If I am working, I would be unable to take my daughter to school. because it would severely limit my working hours. My husband is blind and unable to drive.</p> <p>Currently she goes on the school bus, which has plenty of spaces available for sixth formers. It would be ridiculous to have a school bus with spaces, and then insist that parents have to get their sixth formers to school. That would not be a sensible proposal, surely?</p> <p>If the statutory school age is going to change, then I believe that the free school transport should change to include sixth formers as well.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Access to LA contract vehicles</li> </ul>
Hannah	<p>Thank you for your letter issued to our son who is in Year 10.</p> <p>This letter is well written and clearly explains the changes and the need to change due to lack of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>funding, however as a parent I would like to express my view on this matter.</p> <p>As it is compulsory for post 16 to not be NEET I find this letter upsetting for all parents who will not longer qualify for support.</p> <p>My husband and I work 70 hours a week, pay a mortgage, all associated taxes, contributions, insurances, full council tax, prescriptions and receive no other allowances other than child benefit for one child as our eldest child, though still in full time education, has turned 18 and has a university place to commence in September, yet we are struggling financially. I cannot to bear to imagine how hard it must be for other families and I would hate to think that their children were to suffer because of transport costs. Surely it is basic right to support children to get to a building which can educate them.</p> <p>The cost of child benefit we receive on a weekly basis, does not cover the cost of a weekly bus pass to get our son to college. If we had a college provision within 3 miles, we would get him to walk, but we don't so we need to use public transport. It seems criminal to watch the retired population get issued with a bus pass for free and listen to them on public transport announce that they like using the bus as it saves them car parking in town. The other day I was on the park and ride and when I got on the bus at 09.30am, I was the only person who paid for a ticket, as all other's showed their OAP passes. The irony with this journey was the bus became full and I offered my seat to an elderly person, so I was paying to stand!</p> <p>If the government would like all our young people to stay in education I feel strongly that the cost of transport should be covered. I appreciate that due to a lack of funding this will not be available to all, but please support the most vulnerable children. Education is what will unlock the future of many of our young people, will provide us with a better society, teachers are amazing at supporting children to make the right choices allowing them to contribute to society and develop into well rounded individuals.</p> <p>I would fully support that they council continues to support vulnerable children and families and that they 'enlighten' the government just how hard it is to support our children, when we are working as our salaries just tip the other side of receiving support.</p> <p>I always thought if I worked I'd be able a treat or two for my hard work, but alas this is not something that our family can afford.</p>	<p>16 students in line with RPA</p>
Liz M	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments to the post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18. The requirement that young people stay in some form of learning or training should have been accompanied by sufficient funding and transport provision. Given that this does not appear</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>to be the case and given the financial pressure on local authorities, I can see why Devon might be reviewing their provision. However the proposals outlined cause concern for a number of reasons and raise a number of questions.</p> <p>First, if a public service bus runs from where we live, in Chagford, to Exeter but not to Okehampton, would students be expected to attend an Exeter college rather than Okehampton College, regardless of whether this would be in their best interests? Young people in rural areas have very limited choice already. And having embarked on their studies in Exeter, rather than the nearer Okehampton, what would happen if this service were cut at a future time?</p> <p>Secondly, depending on informal arrangements such as lifts with family/friends is an unreliable means of transporting children. What if the driver were ill or the vehicle became unavailable e.g. through breakdown? How many of us know if our friends' vehicles are properly maintained or insured or whether another parent had a drink at lunchtime before collecting children? How would issues around safeguarding be resolved? And could the commitment to driving children to and from college be an obstacle to a parent being able to seek and maintain employment?</p> <p>Thirdly, from an environmental point of view, it makes little sense to encourage use of private vehicles. If there are spaces on school buses they should be filled. A financial contribution for this is, perhaps, not unreasonable from those who can afford it, although, given the requirement to stay in learning or training, there is logically no difference between older students and those pre-16 who currently do not pay. Are all school and college Bursary funds sufficient to meet the transport costs of all those in financial need? Who would make the decision as to whether a student qualifies for support?</p> <p>Fourthly, what evidence would a student have to provide that there are no alternative options? If a parent were not prepared to allow another parent to drive their child would they have a defence in law should their child fail to attend college?</p> <p>Finally, these proposals seem to impact disproportionately on those children in rural areas where there is little public transport and limited choice of post-16 education? Choices should be made on the basis of what is in the best interest of the young person rather than on what transport is available. I suspect that some rural areas of Devon already have below average progression to Third Level Education.</p> <p>This move is unlikely to help.</p> <p>I should be grateful if you would answer those questions you are able to and also pass on all of my concerns to Cabinet Members.</p>	<p>16 students in line with RPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Choice of course location</li> <li>• Impact on volume of traffic</li> <li>• Sufficiency of Bursary funds</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>
K B	<p>further to a letter received via school regarding proposed changes to the transport policy - would it not be possible to divert funding from free bus passes for the over 60's - many of whom can well afford and do not necessarily use bus passes, to those youngsters remaining in further education? Of course the ideal solution would be for children to be able to attend their local secondary school (so they could walk or cycle) thus reducing the need for any transport costs at all and improving fitness!</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

		with RPA
Mrs Sarah D	<p>I have received your letter of the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2016. My son will be starting Year 12 in September 2017 having just turned 16 in the July.</p> <p>Considering the Government are making children stay in education now until they are 18 (unless they get an apprenticeship/traineeship) then I think it is unfair to make parents pay for the transport to take them to school and back. If the children are earning some money under an apprenticeship or working 20 hours a week in paid employment then they may have the means to pay to get to their place of work and back, which again depends on the apprenticeship/work they are able to get and how much they get paid, of course. I believe the following is the new rules to the education system, taken from the government website today:-</p> <p>You can leave school on the last Friday in June if you'll be 16 by the end of the summer holidays. You must then do one of the following until you're 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>stay in full-time education, eg at a college</li> <li>start an <u>apprenticeship</u> or <u>traineeship</u></li> <li>work or volunteer (for 20 hours or more a week) while in part-time education or training</li> </ul> <p>I have enough trouble getting my teenage son to school, which he doesn't seem to enjoy very much at all and now the Government are asking children to stay in education until they are 18. I left school at the age of 15, not turning 16 until late July, I then went to college in the September until the following June using a moped bought for me by my mother, which I had to maintain myself by getting a Saturday job! I then started my first full time job in September 1984, at the age of 17 and left home 2 days before starting that job – my mother never had to keep me as I was able to support myself through work. Is the new ruling above an indication that there aren't enough jobs for our 16 year olds who DON'T want to go into further education, but want to make their own way in the world of work???</p> <p>Both my husband and I work full time, so not only are we going to have to keep our son in food, clothing, shoes and uniform etc until such time he is allowed to leave the new education system, (without any assistance from the State Welfare System), the Government are cutting budgets to Council's such as yourselves with regards to transport, when in fact they should be increasing them to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>cover the costs of the extra children now having to stay in education/apprenticeships under the new system!! It all seems a bit bonkers to me!!</p> <p>My husband has to be at his place of work by 7.30am in Marsh Barton, Exeter and I have to be at work for 9am (sometimes earlier) in Cheriton Bishop, both of which are in the complete opposite direction to A's school in Dawlish and/or Exeter College and if one of us did have to take him, our fuel costs would go up considerably along with the inconvenience to our time schedules. The alternative being public transport, paid for by us! A bit unfair as we didn't get a say about the above new legislation!! I often work away from home for my job and travel all over the south of England, which means I am not always around to take Aaron anywhere. We are both tax payers, so no doubt as we are working, we wouldn't get any help towards bus fare money we would also have to find on top of our normal outgoings just so that Aaron can go to school/college/apprenticeship/traineeship. What happens to children who DON'T want to go into any kind of further education but want to get a full time job – why is this not possible???</p> <p>If the Government wishes to keep children in the education system past the age of 16, again at the tax payers expense, then they should subsidise the transport to and from school/college so that each family subjected to this new system doesn't have to find any more money out of already stretched incomes towards the cost of transport.</p>	
Andrew B	<p>The proposed change in Devon transport arrangements will have a significant impact on students accessing post 16 education. The school bursary funds are insufficient to make up the current contribution that DCC makes towards Post 16 student transport costs. This significant shortfall will mean that many young people who currently are able to access school or college at subsidised rates will no longer be able to do so, this will deter many from remaining in education and will force them into low paid/low skill jobs with minimal training. It is disingenuous to suggest that all those who are currently supported by Devon will be able to be supported by school bursary funds in the future.</p> <p>Now that the School leaving age has been raised to 18 it is unreasonable to rely on the justification of age 16 as the limit to the local authorities requirement to support post 16 transport.</p> <p>Budget cuts should be made in areas where those affected will be more able to bare the financial impact.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficiency of Bursary funds</li> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> </ul>
Richard G	<p>I write to express my view on the policy that the Council has in respect of children in year 12 and above having to pay for transport to school. I believe that this is an unfair policy because the Government made it compulsory for children to go to full time education up to the age of 18 years and so in effect</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>there is no option for children in rural areas to pay for some sort of transport. This would either be the payment direct to the County Council to be allowed on the School bus or through payment to a bus company for a public bus home. There is really no alternative to this when both parents work. This is essence means an introduction of a tax amounting to the level of the payment that is necessary to be made to get a child to and from school. From my own personal point of view it is preferable for my eldest son to use the school bus not only because it is more convenient it is also a safer means of getting to and from school not only for him but also for my younger two sons as it means that my eldest can see that they get to and from school. I appreciate that the Government has cut payments to the County Council and so there is less money available but taking money from parents in this way when they is really no valid alternative is really a cheap shot. The Council should be encouraging children to get education at a higher level not providing disincentives for children to go to school. There seems to be a climate developing where higher level education is no longer a right but something that has to be purchased. This is inherently wrong. This transport policy is ethically incorrect. It also makes little sense that my younger children can be on the same bus not making any payment sitting next to my eldest son who has to pay. If he were not there the bus would make the same journey and the seat would just be empty.</p>	<p>16 students in line with RPA</p>
Ian Y	<p>Having school transport for our daughter, to Okehampton college during her sixth form (2017-2019) is vitally important, as our son is at Exbourne primary school and therefore my wife would be unable to drop him off and our daughter at the same time. I am already at work. My daughters birthday is at the end of August and therefore she is unlikely to pass her driving test until mid 2019. This also applies to her contemporaries, that live in the village, in her school year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessing need</li> </ul>
Elsa F	<p>I am a year 10 student at Okehampton College and I recently received your letter regarding the proposed amendments to the post-16 transport policy for 2017-18. As a regular user of my local school bus, I have always intended to continue to use the service when I go onto sixth form, despite being put off slightly by the fare, which I was aware of as my sister, a sixth former, already uses the bus. Imagine my dismay, then, when I discovered that the price had climbed still higher!</p> <p>However, I understand that the proposed changes are not as a result of a motivation for profit or simply to inconvenience passengers, but by pressure on the budget for transport. As you say in your letter, you just want to be "as efficient as possible" and that your policies have to be reviewed. From this I gather that these changes are only possibilities, so I am sure that you will be interested in my arguments and suggestions and take them into account in order to make the most "efficient" decision. You wrote in your letter that "local authorities must provide free transport to children who are of statutory school age" and I think that this is an excellent policy. Then again, it is "statutory" that all children up to the age of 18 stay in full time education or equivalent and therefore I believe that the service should extend to all children up to the age of 18. Obviously, I realise that this is not possible as</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>Assessing need</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>this is not government policy and it is not financially sustainable for the council, but surely it is not unreasonable to say that it is unfair that we have no choice but to stay in education (or equivalent) and yet have to pay a huge amount to get to school? Isn't English education supposed to be free? Frankly, I think that your proposition that "where a student has other sources of support, the local authority will not assist" is a little ridiculous. How many people in this area of Devon have a regular public bus service that runs perfectly in time with school hours? Or a family member or friend who can be relied on to take them to and from school every single day, without fail? Of course the local authority is going to have to "support" the majority of students travelling to school each day! I believe that to suggest that the use of the bus will only be "in cases of last resort" is laughable as it suggests that only a few pupils will have to use it.</p> <p>To me, the financial contribution seems high, too, although I will not pretend to be an expert in economics. I presume that the bus service will run as usual for the younger pupils and therefore it is not going to make a difference to the size of the bus or the number of bus drivers required.</p> <p>Furthermore, with free periods giving them extra free time, sixth form students may not use the bus regularly, choosing on some days to make other arrangements to travel home earlier than the school bus. A more sensible solution, in my opinion, would be to give the option for the post-16 students to purchase a bus pass (costing maybe £5) which would allow them to travel on the school bus and pay a small fee (perhaps £1.50) per journey to travel on the bus when they need to. Surely, if every sixth former outside of walking distance to the school took this up, it would both cover costs and be proportional to the amount of times they use the bus?</p> <p>I hope that you take my views into account and that this has been helpful to you.</p>	
Mr and Mrs W	<p>We do not agree with the proposal to remove free transport for post 16 students, as they are still in full time education and required to attend school.</p> <p>Furthermore we believe this requirement should continue due to the distances some students must travel to school due to the catchment areas they live in.</p> <p>It is vital to continue to provide this support to all school students to help fulfill their education</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>
Mrs Rachel J	<p>We live in a rural area. My child currently attend Chulmleigh Community College, which unfortunately has no 6<sup>th</sup> Form facility. Therefore my daughter will be having to travel to either Exeter or Barnstaple (a journey time of over an hour each way) to study for her A Levels when she finishes year 11 in July next year. I have received a letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> April which starts that it is anticipated that we will need to pay £560 towards the transport for her to attend.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>Whilst I appreciate that transport is expensive and has to be paid for somehow, I have to say I feel this is an excessive amount of money for people to find, especially in view of the fact that students are expected to continue in education after year 11 and also, as is the case for my daughter, there is no alternative other than Exeter or Barnstaple.</p>	
Dawn R	<p>I remember contacting the local authority when the Route 39 Free School was first mooted, expressing concern that within a few years, Devon would stop funding children's transport to attend their (nearest) local school of preference. This has not yet happened but you are now proposing to remove school transport from post-16 rural children in Devon.</p> <p>On the one hand, we have the Government saying young people need to be educationally engaged until they are 18, but on the other, Devon County Council seems to be suggesting that austerity means children post-16 should not have any transport provision. This seems to be contradictory.</p> <p>Yes, I have a car. Yes, if push comes to shove I can drive 52 miles a day to deliver my daughter to and from school. Yes, this will take a minimum of 2 hours out of my day, and yes, it is incompatible with me working. Yes, I suspect no one cares about that impact!</p> <p>Luckily, I can afford the petrol, but many cannot.</p> <p>We live 13 miles away from school in the rural hamlet of Tosberry, North Devon. Budehaven is my daughter's nearest school offering post 16 provision. While it is nearer, I do not believe that Route 39 will be in any position in a year's time to offer comparable post-16 education. Additionally, the Budehaven 6th form is deemed good by Ofsted, so it is tried and tested.</p> <p>Meanwhile, public transport to and from Hartland (our nearest village) and Bude is at best unreliable. As you can see from this, there is not really any useful public transport for school hours: <a href="http://www.visitbude.info/bus-timetables/bude-going-north-bus-timetable/">http://www.visitbude.info/bus-timetables/bude-going-north-bus-timetable/</a></p> <p>Currently, the school bus collects my daughter for school. My belief is that if school buses are taking under-16s to school and there are spaces on the buses, then over-16s should be accommodated, as the parental 'contribution' of £560 towards transport is probably a useful extra income to maintain the said transport.</p> <p>I appreciate the statutory guidance on the subject of school transport but believe Mr. Cox should be</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Impact on volume of traffic</li> <li>• Route safety</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>



## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>looking to encourage the Government to amend this for post 16, now the leaving age has effectively been raised.</p> <p>The guidance mentions sustainable transport. I'm not sure if anyone at Devon County Council has tried cycling from Tosberry to Bude along the A39, but I'd be happy follow you in my car to see how you get on if you fancy giving it a whirl. The road is quite dangerous and generally lacks pavements. In winter, in the dark, it would be treacherous. Walking 13 miles a day x 2 is not an option. It would take far too long and the same problems apply.</p> <p>If my daughter has to rely on parental transport to and from school, it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Diminishes her independence.</li> <li>2. Means that if ever transport is unavailable she misses lessons.</li> <li>3. Encourages under-achievement and low aspiration in what is one of the poorest areas of the country.</li> <li>4. Means I will seriously consider leaving North Devon.</li> <li>5. Adversely impacts upon my work in local tourism which brings money into this area.</li> <li>6. Means more cars on the A39, as post 16 parents have to drive their children to and from school = less sustainable.</li> </ol> <p>In short, this seems to be an unimaginative and deleterious solution. Frankly, I am surprised that Devon County Council is targeting young people in this way when there are surely other items of expenditure which might be more efficiently reduced.</p>	
Mrs T.E	<p>May I point out that it is a statutory requirement that all children continue full-time further education until the age of 18 unless they have an apprenticeship or traineeship, or can work part-time for 20 hours or more while in part-time education and training. Thus nearly all 16-18 year old's in Devon will HAVE to attend either 6th form or College. For those schools in North Devon who do not have either a 6th form or limited 6th form options this will mean a necessary trip to PETROC college in Barnstaple. We are a remote rural community here in North Devon and places such as Ilfracombe score in the top 10% of deprivation under government indicators. Ilfracombe has the most deprived ward in Devon. How you expect families to pay the full cost of transport when they have no option but to send their children to college is beyond me. As I say is is a statutory requirement. Rurality is a given here in North Devon and is beyond anyone's means to alter. To put the cost onto schools in areas where that demand would be high, like Ilfracombe is an unacceptable pressure and will disadvantage those schools and pupils. This measure is discriminatory and does not set out the conditions which a family would have</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>to meet to qualify for help from the local authority. Also the letter was given to the children rather than sent direct which means many parents will never see it. What is additional need also? The letter was written in confusing and complex language making it difficult to interpret. I refer to paragraph 3.</p> <p>Disgraceful way to bamboozle parents and make sure responses are low. You are slipping this cut to vital services in without proper widespread consultation and I suggest you put it to schools to make sure more parents know about these changes</p>	
Lilian D	<p>I have a 15 year old foster child at Bidwell Brook School who travels on school transport from our home in Newton Abbot. I am writing to express my concerns at the proposal to stop transport for over 16 ,she is going to require transport as Bidwell is the only school suitable for her needs. Tina is non verbal and has severe learning difficulties and would be unable to travel on public transport.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialised provision for students with SEND</li> </ul>
Lara B	<p>After reading the proposed changes to your transport policy I was very shocked to see that some students will not be eligible for transport to and from college from 2017.</p> <p>Our daughter is currently in year 10 at Southbrook College. She has Autism, learning disability and ADHD. She has challenging behaviour and has a staff ratio of 2-1 when she is off site. We hope that next year she will attend a specialist sixth form somewhere in our area. There is NO WAY she would be able to attend sixth form without council transport. The nature of our daughter's additional need /learning disability means that it would be IMPOSSIBLE for her to use public transport and my husband and I would not be able to do the journeys without giving up work. I would be happy to make the £560 contribution (or even slightly more) but I could not contemplate our daughter not having access to transport.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialised provision for students with SEND</li> </ul>
Jane W	<p>It is with the greatest concern that I write to you regarding the proposed changes for 16/17.</p> <p>I must offer some incite into my son J's situation. His needs are complex because although looking able bodied, he suffers from a moderate learning disability and Asperger's Syndrome. First impressions are that he is bright and clever because he talks non stop about history and Monarchy, with his party trick being when asked any year from the last 600 years, he will tell you the King or Queen and when they reigned and how long for.</p> <p>However, he cannot think for himself. Not only needing help with all aspects of self care and needing routines and forward planning, even what to wear in precise detail, insisting on a particular shirt on a certain day of the week, which if not laundered and ready to wear causes a major meltdown.</p> <p>These things may not seem relevant to venturing outside, but not being able to plan journeys, problem solve, keep himself safe <u>IS!</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialised provision for students with SEND</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>J can say what time it is but his time concept is lacking, if something is imminent but not straight away he is time checking constantly then fretting it should be now, why is it not happening, he gets into a panic. He has a selective memory, if it is not history related he doesn't retain it. He cannot remember how to turn on his mobile phone, even after countless demonstrations. If someone turns it on for him he cannot hear what the other person is saying.</p> <p>J is sound sensitive, he hates motorbikes, lorries, buses. When walking the dogs near Dawlish train line if a train goes by he almost 'hits the deck', certainly crouches with his head in his hands and freezes which attracts strange looks from passers by. But we get lots of people staring at him when he gets anxious and cries out as a young child might do because he effectively IS a young child in a mans body.</p> <p>J is seriously afflicted by O.C.D currently, with an irrational fear of toilet germs which results in him being able to use only one toilet in particular at home. He will not use any public toilet or go whilst at College – South Devon, Paignton. The distances involved in getting to and from College from Dawlish means a very long time to not relieve himself. He refuses to drink more than just a few sips during a College day which is not healthy and could be impacting on his concentration, because he is not keeping himself hydrated.</p> <p>He has mentioned regularly of almost soiling himself in the Taxi home and in fact on many occasions doesn't wet himself just after getting through the door but not being able to undo his trousers in time whilst getting to the bathroom.</p> <p>Your proposal of home journeys not commencing until 4.30pm which would presumably mean mixing in with the rush hour traffic, therefore significantly extending what is already a long journey, will mean the increase in the likelihood that J will indeed wet himself in the Taxi. He would no doubt be so humiliated and mortified and this will impact on his self esteem. Not to mention we would have a very annoyed Taxi firm facing a costly and smelly clean up operation.</p> <p>The changes as proposed, given the very complex needs as I have outlined, will have a negative and detrimental effect on J's wellbeing and his limited sense of security. The actual lengthening of his time out of his home, which he currently finds a distress will only serve to compound his anxieties.</p> <p>I am the sole carer for J and for his twin brother who is also on the Autistic Spectrum. I do not have any extended family or friends and no outside assistance and as yet haven't been able to split myself in</p>	
--	--	--

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>two. So I was greatly offended to read the line "Parents need to get other children to and from school" not exceptional. I know of many ladies who have wide age ranges between their children. In this day and age who is deeming it reasonable to expect an extremely young child to travel alone or even an older offspring who may have developmental delays, to cope alone?</p> <p>Shocking and Shameful in equal measures.</p> <p>I would just add that the short notice of this consultation period, being notified on Good Friday right as children start the holiday, has placed an extra burden of anxiety on my family with the pressure to write within the time frame and not having access to the internet. I am convinced many other families affected by this will not have had time or energy to respond. Surely carers should be being supported and not worried out of their minds or is it a trend started by the Government.</p>	
Shanti S	<p>My son recently came home with a letter informing me of the consultation and proposed changes to school transport Post 16. I feel strongly that the current transport support is essential in rural areas. My children are currently taken to/from school by a DCC provided taxi because of our rural location, no school or public bus serves the area. When my son starts his Post 16 study, which is compulsory for him, transport to school will be critical to him being able to attend. We do not live on a public bus route, and it is over a 3 mile journey to get him to a public bus route that runs frequently enough to get him to/from college. I am not in a position commit to drive him as 9 out of the last 18 months I have been without a driving license on medical grounds. If school transport is not provided then our only option would be to have a private taxi pick him up which is unaffordable. Study at a Post 16 level requires hard work and commitment from the student, and it is only fair that this is not disrupted by poor and uncertain transport to and from their place of study. We do not qualify for benefits. Please can you confirm that DCC will still provide transport for my son Post 16 otherwise I don't know how he will continue to attend college.</p> <p>I feel free school transport for all students up until statutory school leaving age, is important to ensure equality for all. The removal of transport to Post 16 year olds effectively means that families living in rural areas are being penalised. Government Policy dictates that we now have to send our children to school/education until 18. I understand there is currently no legislation for local councils to provide transport for free, and really value the provision that Devon has offered to date. If DCC remove this service it effectively means rural families with post 16 year old children will have to pay even more to send their children to school, this is wrong.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the most rurally isolated families</li> <li>• Lack of statutory entitlement to transport for post-16 students in line with RPA</li> </ul>

## Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Post-16 Transport Policy for 2017-18

	<p>I was made aware of this consultation because one of my children is currently in year 10, I feel that the consultation should be publicised much more widely, preferably to all families whose children currently receive free transport to school (ie Yr 7 and upwards). The proposal that parents will be required to pay for their child's post 16 school transport is very significant to rural families, and all families who will be affected by it should be made aware and offered the opportunity to give you their views and opinions.</p> <p>I urge DCC to continue to exercise discretion and to provide free transport support for its Post 16 students from 2017/2018 and onwards.</p>	
--	---	--