



Social exclusion and the provision of public transport - Main report

Table of contents

- [Foreword](#)
- [Acknowledgements](#)
- [Executive Summary - Key Results and Conclusions](#)
- [Chapter 1 Introduction](#)
- [1. Background to the Study](#)
- [2. The Research Programme](#)
- [3. The Steering Committee/Advisory Group](#)
- [4. The Structure of the Report](#)
- [Chapter 2 Current knowledge on Transport and Social Exclusion](#)
- [Definitions of Poverty and Social Exclusion](#)
- [Social networks and inclusion](#)
- [Measurement](#)
- [Transport And Social Exclusion](#)
- [Measures to address 'transport poverty'](#)
- [Summary](#)
- [Chapter 3 - Carrying out the fieldwork](#)
- [Introduction - A working definition of the Socially Excluded](#)
- [1. Particular Considerations for Fieldwork with Socially Excluded People](#)
- [2. Considerations in New Deal Areas](#)
- [3. Considerations In Rural Areas](#)
- [4. Survey Techniques](#)
- [5. Incentives](#)
- [6. Transport Supply](#)
- [Chapter 4 - The Study Areas - Urban](#)
- [1. The New Deal Areas](#)
- [2. The Neighbourhoods](#)
 - [Birmingham - Kings Norton](#)
 - [Bradford - Park Lane, Marchfields, West Bowling](#)
 - [Bristol - Barton Hill](#)

- East Brighton - Moulsecoomb And Whitehawk
- Hackney - Shoreditch
- Kingston Upon Hull - Preston Road
- Leicester - Braunstone
- Liverpool - Kensington
- Manchester - Beswick and Openshaw
- Middlesbrough - Whinney Banks and West Lane
- Newcastle Upon Tyne - West Gate
- Newham - West Ham and Plaistow
- Norwich - North Earlham, Larkman and Marlpit
- Nottingham - Radford and Hyson Green
- Sandwell - Greet Green
- 3. General Overview of Transport and Its Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues in the New Deal Areas
- Chapter 5 The Study Areas - Rural
- 1. Introduction
- 2. The Areas
- West Sussex
- South Shropshire
- East of Doncaster
- West Devon - Tavistock and Princetown
- 3. General Overview of Transport and Its Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues in the Rural Areas
- Chapter 6 The People (effects of transport on different social groups)
- Introduction
- 1. Very Young Children and Their Escorts and Families
- 2. Children from 5-16, Statutory School Attendance Age and their Families
- 3. Young Adult (After the Statutory School Leaving Age, 16)
- 4. Adult Job Seekers
- 5. Working Adults and Their Families
- 6. Lone Parents
- 7. Women (General) Working and Non-Working
- 8. Those With Physical and Learning Disabilities, and Those with Poor Short-Term Health or Chronic Health Problems.
- 9. Older People
- 10. Local Traders
- Conclusions
- Chapter 7 The Adequacy of Public Transport
- 1. Introduction and background
- 2. The adequacy of current public transport
- 3. Traffic and suggested improvements to the public transport environment
- 4. Conclusions
- Chapter 8 Transport Provision
- Introduction - what does "public transport" mean now?
- 1. Commercial Buses and Tendered Buses

- 2. Other transport providers
- 3. Rural bus grants, 1998
- 4. Meeting the public transport needs of socially excluded people
- 5. A co-ordinated approach to the needs of socially excluded areas
- 6. Concessionary fare schemes
- 7. Estimation of potential patronage and revenue impacts from public transport improvements
- Chapter 9 Overview
- 1. The Multiple functions of public transport
- 2. Basic Mobility Provision, Expectations, and Rights
- Chapter 10 Conclusions, policy implications and recommendations, summary recommendations, and topics for further research
- I General conclusions
- II Recommendations[55]
- 1. Deficiencies in Transport Provision and How They Should Be Funded
- 2. Fares And Ticketing
- 3. Accessibility[58]
- 4. Acceptability
- 5. Co-Ordination
- 6. Co-Ordination Of Feeder Services
- 7. Partnerships With Commercial Concerns, Statutory Service Providers, And Employers
- 8. Needs And Supply Audits
- 9. The Voluntary Sector
- 10. Transport And Travel Familiarisation Programmes
- 11. Infrastructure And Traffic Management
- 12. Walking And Two-Wheeled Traffic
- 13. Non-Transport Policies
- 14. Health Access
- III Summary of Recommendations
- IV. Topics Requiring Further Research
- 1. The Need for a Broad Definition of 'Adequate' Transport
- 2. Driving and Cars
- 3. The Real Costs and Benefits of Putting Conductors Back On the Buses
- 4. Demand-Responsive Transport
- Bibliography
- Appendix 1 Attributes of "adequate" public transport
- Appendix 2 Summary of research methods used in each area
- I. Urban Areas
- II Rural Areas
- Appendix 3 A comparative analysis of journey characteristics (NTS)
- Appendix 4 Profile of Respondents
- A Profile Of Questionnaire Respondents: Gender And Age
- A Profile of Questionnaire Respondents: Employment Status and Ethnicity
- A Profile of Questionnaire Respondents: Disabilities Affecting Travel, Household Car Ownership

- [A Profile of Questionnaire Respondents: Mode and Ticket Type Normally Used](#)
 - [A Profile of Questionnaire Respondents: Travel Problems.](#)
 - [A Profile of Questionnaire Respondents: Social Networks](#)
-

Foreword

By Keith Hill
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State

This report is the first to explore, in depth, the links between public transport and social exclusion in urban and rural areas across England.

The findings raise challenges to all of us involved in improving the availability, accessibility, affordability and acceptability of public transport services. The report clearly demonstrates the importance of transport needs being assessed - and catered for - when health, education, employment, commercial and social service policies are being implemented. 'Joined up' thinking needs to result in effective joined up working and action, particularly in these deprived neighbourhoods. This applies not only to those in the 'traditional' transport sector (be it public, community or voluntary transport) but also to those of us across central and local government.

The report also highlights the fact that public transport is not simply a means of access - it has other social, health, economic and symbolic functions. These functions need to be recognised by transport planners and providers.

The report will be used as a basis for further research by the DETR and will be fed into the work of other Government departments, including the Cabinet Office's Social Exclusion Unit. I am certain that this report will prove invaluable to all of us concerned with tackling social exclusion.

Keith Hill

Acknowledgements

Fieldwork for this project was conducted by Social and Transport Research Services, and their director Diana Wofinden, whose input went well beyond the fieldwork and who, although they cannot be held responsible for the output, were effectively partners for a great deal of the project. Other staff at TRaC who contributed to the project are Steve Shaw, Stuart Cole, Torben Holvad and Pauline Dibben.

Further acknowledgements are due to an enormous number of people, without whom the project would have been considerably more difficult to undertake. All of them willingly gave up time to provide assistance and information and introductions where it would be helpful.

- New Deal co-ordinators and associated workers in New Deal partnerships in all 15 New Deal for Communities neighbourhoods
- Officers from local authorities in almost all of the areas surveyed, and officers in employment centres, youth centres, community centres, health centres, libraries and leisure centres, sheltered housing, and other survey venues

- Representatives of 10 bus operators
- Representatives of 5 Community Transport organisations
- Representatives of 4 Passenger Transport Executives
- Active members of several residents and tenants groups
- A number of helpful publicans who found spaces for and facilitated group discussions
- All those who were called upon to do rather less conventional market research than normal
- DETR officials other than those on the Steering Group who provided information, criticism and statistics
- All those who took part in the surveys
- The "Children's Express" for background information

Membership of the Steering/Advisory Committee, which helped determine the direction of the study, is given in Chapter I. I should particularly like to thank Miranda Carter and Tracy Wallace of the DETR Mobility and Inclusion Unit for being supportively and helpfully available throughout the duration of the project.

Juliet Solomon, Project Co-Ordinator, TRaC, University of North London

Executive Summary - Key Results and Conclusions

- Although transport is not necessarily high on the agenda of residents in New Deal for Communities areas, there appear to be clear connections between transport and social exclusion. This was particularly marked among unemployed people, families with young children, young people, older people, and all those on low(benefit level) incomes.
- In rural areas, socially excluded people are not found in dense numbers like in urban areas. However, transport is a very important consideration to many rural and small- town/village dwellers, and to most of those who have no access to a car.
- Transport provision must be considered across central and local government and as a component part of all services, e.g. work, health and social services, shops, education, leisure etc. Welfare State provisions were instituted at a time when average weekly mileage per person was about 25 miles. Now it is nearer 130. If a provision has a high transport cost it ceases to be a welfare benefit.
- Affordability is a key issue. Considerations should include extending, changing or standardising concessionary fares eligibility and looking at fare differentials.
- Availability and accessibility are also key issues. There is a need to try to define what is an acceptable basic minimum mobility/access provision. There is also a need to define how much travel an individual should be prepared to undertake, e.g. to access work.
- Enhancing social mobility requires more physical mobility. Given the current distribution of opportunities, some people need both to be able to travel more and to accept the need to travel more if they are to be socially "included". This may appear to lead to a short-term conflict with the DETR's objective of reducing the need to travel.
- The current distribution of travel patterns is both a cause and a result of travel possibilities. It has generated an urgent need for more flexible public transport provision to be considered.
- Improvement of travel possibilities might make areas more desirable to live in. However, (as has already happened in some places) while it could enhance the lives of many people, it could also possibly accelerate the loss of facilities from the area unless care is taken to make sure that the travel

is two-way.

- One of the factors we had anticipated would play a major part was information. It was not a major issue among our sample of public transport users; it would seem that those who are dependent on a service tend to know their way around it in some detail. However, this applies to journeys regularly undertaken; there seems to be more of a problem with information for unfamiliar journeys. Even regular public transport users are not aware of other possibilities open to them.

Chapter 1 Introduction

1. Background to the Study

In 1998 the Social Exclusion Unit published "Bringing Britain Together", a report outlining plans for the development of a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal. The report noted in particular that many poor neighbourhoods have become more isolated over the last two decades and that this trend had often been exacerbated by inadequate transport links.

In September 1998 the "New Deal for Communities" initiative was launched. This initiative was designed to target money on the most deprived neighbourhoods to:

- improve job prospects
- bring together investment in buildings and investment in people; and,
- improve neighbourhood management and the delivery of local services.

Seventeen local authorities that had areas with very low scores on the Index of Local Deprivation were chosen to submit bids to establish Pathfinder areas to try to pioneer new ways of working to cut across traditional barriers.

The feature which distinguishes the New Deal for Communities from previous regeneration initiatives is that it is flexible and very local. To ensure that it remained local, the bidding guidelines suggested that the size of neighbourhood should be approximately 4000 households.

It was against this background that the DETR, who have a forward programme to identify and analyse social inclusion issues, developed the current project.

In December 1998, Transport Research and Consultancy, and the University of North London, working with Social and Transport Research Services, were commissioned by the DETR (through the Department's Mobility and Inclusion Unit) to examine the relationship between social exclusion and transport and to identify the contribution that public and community transport can make to reducing levels of exclusion.

In order to try to develop a more generally applicable model of the relationship between transport and social exclusion, the project extended beyond the New Deal areas to cover rural areas, some of which were part of the hinterland of New Deal towns and cities and fell within their travel to work area.

The brief was divided into three sub-sections:

- To investigate the causal connections between social exclusion and transport, and identify those groups particularly affected
- To assess the ways in which public (and community) transport can reduce social exclusion, and
- To propose a range of measures to encourage ridership among excluded groups

Interpreting the Brief

The brief therefore consisted of four distinct, but overlapping questions

- How far is transport (or lack of it) a contributor to the social exclusion of neighbourhoods and groups?
- What are the specific problems of the case study New Deal areas, and which of these problems, if any, are common to all of them?
- What problems of social exclusion are encountered in the four chosen rural areas, and which of these problems are common to all of them?
- To what extent can these problems be overcome through the provision of public and community transport, and how much scope is there for operators to increase their ridership?

2. The Research Programme

Literature Search

The literature search covered literature in the following categories:

- i) Definitions of and perspectives on the nature of social exclusion, from the theoretical and ideological to the practical and descriptive. This work provides a crucial context for identifying the significance of transport as a contributory variable.
- ii) Measurements of social exclusion. This includes types of indicators of exclusion, and the extent to which both absolute and relative poverty(ies) are related to social exclusion. It also includes literature on social networks.
- iii) Transport and social exclusion. Insofar as the transport literature is concerned at all with social exclusion, its emphasis is largely on access to facilities. Much of the literature on this issue has come from outside the transport field.

Structuring the Survey Fieldwork

a) the *people*

People are excluded from activities they wish to undertake

- *spatially*, because they cannot get there at all,
- *temporally*, because they cannot get there at the appropriate time,
- *financially*, because they cannot afford to get there, and
- *personally*, because they lack the mental or physical equipment to handle the available means of mobility.

These exclusions affect everybody to some extent (even car drivers), but the effect is significantly worse for deprived groups or neighbourhoods. It was important to ensure that, as far as possible, all subgroups in the chosen neighbourhoods were represented in the research. We therefore decided that, given the problems of deciding precisely who is socially excluded and why, we should take a life-cycle approach to the research. We identified seven broad age groups, each of which contained a number of sub-groups. The groups combined the life-cycle concept with the more usual socio-economic concepts of social exclusion and, in order to structure the research, they are combined with the spatial element, which is essential when considering the inter-relationship between social exclusion and transport.

b) The *transport*

The four ways in which people can be socially excluded by transport constraints are mirrored, although not precisely, by a categorisation of what constitutes acceptable transport.

The role transport in general plays in the lives of most individuals is in the provision of affordable, available, accessible and acceptable transport to the location of activities which those individuals want to access. This is as true for socially included people as for socially excluded people. Full working definitions of these criteria are set out in Appendix 1. Transport will be referred to as "adequate" when it fulfils all four criteria. It will be referred to as "inadequate" if it fails on one or more of the criteria.

Although the brief specifies public and community transport, it has proved impossible to confine the research to these two types of transport. It was clear from our initial discussions that people were concerned with all means of getting about and that their views on public transport had to be seen in the context of the whole journey (if not the whole lifestyle). The resident of the fourteenth storey of a block of flats, unless extremely fit and not carrying heavy shopping, needs a lift in working order. The rural dweller wanting to use a service bus needs to be able to reach the bus stop, and needs somewhere to stand or sit while waiting. The user also needs to be able to board the bus; this, due to sustained efforts by special interest group campaigners, politicians, and the DETR, is one of the aspects of transport provision that is now being addressed.

Carrying out the Fieldwork

The first phase of fieldwork was to take place in those ten New Deal areas which had been asked to proceed to Stage 2 of the New Deal bid. Although all these areas were collecting baseline data, the transport data was limited to details of available buses and trains (with timetables), how often people used buses, and the percentage of households owning a car. [While this latter measure may be indicative of income levels, as an aggregate it does not help to find pockets of exclusion.]

Rather than this being an information-gathering exercise for the DETR and the Social Exclusion Unit, it was agreed that in the chosen neighbourhoods any results that we had would be available to those areas that they could benefit from our research. Because of this, and

- because there was to be (and already had been, in some areas) a great deal of survey work;
- because of the need for our work to contribute to the New Deal areas, and
- because of the need to avoid wasteful duplication,

we had quite detailed initial meetings with the New Deal co-ordinators and researchers, who also provided us with background data on the neighbourhoods.[1] The New Deal areas were extremely helpful both with this and with helping us to find "gatekeepers" who might help us to access people who would not normally take part in any kind of survey work.

It was clear that, particularly within those neighbourhoods with already developed community structures, there would be no shortage of "community leaders" and "movers and shakers" who would participate, and who would persuade their friends to do so. However, the research was designed to reach beyond those people and to hear the views of people who might not normally participate.

Thus a variety of types of group discussion, individual interview and questionnaire surveys were used. As well as more formal types, all possible opportunities were taken by the researchers and interviewers to get into conversation with local people and to listen to what they have to say. Chapter 3 describes these methods in detail and assesses their advantages and disadvantages.

- The decision about which types of group should be the main focuses in each area was made both with reference to the need to ensure comprehensive coverage, and with the demographics of each area. Thus, for example, in that area of Hoxton where there is a prevalence of older people, it was decided that they should be a principal focus.
- The other consideration in deciding which groups should be sought out was the needs of the New Deal co-ordinators or, in rural areas, local authority officers and others. For example, one neighbourhood was suggested by a bus company from their local knowledge.

NOTE - all the survey work is intended to be qualitative. The household surveys were not intended to provide accurate quantitative data (although we looked at the aggregate results to derive estimates of possible patronage and revenue impacts of changes to public transport) but rather to give a broader spread of views in each area to provide a cross-check on what was said in interviews or in discussion groups etc.

3. The Steering Committee/Advisory Group

A Steering Committee/Advisory Group was established at the outset of the project to guide and monitor progress. It was selected to give as broad a range as possible of people who were in some way concerned with the associated issues which impact on transport and socially excluded people. It included local authority representatives from transport and social services, community transport facilitators, a Passenger Transport Executive, an urban local authority transport and land use planner (ex London Transport planner), a rural transport planner, and Crime Concern. Members were:

Miranda Carter	DETR
Tracy Wallace	DETR
Steve Shaw	TraC
Stuart Cole	TraC
Juliet Solomon	TraC (Project co-ordinator)
Andrea Horne	TraC (Project Administrator)
Sue Quick	TraC (Project Administrator)
Murray Grant	Merseytravel
Jenny Meadows	Community Transport Association
Julia Stafford	Crime Concern
Tim Davies/ Mark Goodman	Devon County Council
Karen Hickey	Bristol Community Transport
Steve Atkins	Southampton City Council
Peter Coysh	Somerset County Council
Phil Clapp	Social Exclusion Unit

The Steering Committee met five times during the course of the project.

4. The Structure of the Report

Chapter 2 summarises some of the key existing literature on the subject

Chapter 3 describes and assesses survey methods used in the study

Chapter 4 gives descriptions of the urban areas

Chapter 5 gives descriptions of the rural areas

Chapter 6 summarises the transport needs of different groups of people

Chapter 7 looks at how far transport in the areas meets the "adequate" set of criteria

Chapter 8 is about transport provision

Chapter 9 gives an overview of the relationship between transport and social exclusion

Chapter 10 draws conclusions, makes recommendations and suggests research areas where gaps need filling.

[1] It is unfortunate, although inevitable, that given the changes in economic geography, work patterns, car ownership etc., in the last ten years, much of the data necessarily relied on the 1991 census.

Chapter 2 Current knowledge on Transport and Social Exclusion

The literature reviewed for this study can be broadly divided into three topic headings. Under the first heading several definitions of poverty and social exclusion are considered. Under the second, methods of measuring poverty and social exclusion are discussed. The third section provides an indication of the relationship between social exclusion and transport, and mentions some initiatives already taken to address this question.

Definitions of Poverty and Social Exclusion

Social exclusion and poverty are strongly linked, and discussion has developed around their respective definitions. Generally there seems to be agreement that poverty can be seen as "distributional," linked to resources, and social exclusion as "relational" (Room, 1995; Spicker, 1997). "Relational" issues include *"inadequate social participation, lack of social integration and lack of power"* (Room, 1995). The term 'social exclusion' was originally coined in 1974 and first used by the European Commission in 1989 when the Council of Ministers requested the European Commission to study policies to combat social exclusion (Cousins, 1998).

Research into poverty as a social phenomenon has been described as an Anglo-Saxon product of the 19th Century (Rowntree 1901, Townsend 1979), associated with the liberal vision of society in which atomised individuals compete in the market place, and social policy provides people with enough money to survive. However, Bhalla and Lapeyre (1997) argue that the economic aspects of exclusion are just as important as the sociological and the political. They stress the importance of the precariousness of the labour market and unemployment in relation to economic and social respects, suggesting that there are three main categories of the social aspects of social exclusion: access to social services (such as health and education); access to the labour market (precariousness of employment, as distinct from low pay); and the opportunity for social participation and its effect on the social fabric (greater crime, delinquency and homelessness, as distinct from predictability and stability etc).

Oppenheim (1998) suggests that it is necessary to focus on social exclusion rather than poverty for a number of reasons. Social exclusion is multi-causal, relational, and it includes less tangible aspects than poverty such as the loss of status, power, self-esteem and expectations. Oppenheim identifies various high risk groups, such as lone parents, single pensioners, unemployed people, the economically inactive, and children. Those in Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Caribbean ethnic minority groups are also mentioned as at high risk, based on the fourth PSI study on ethnic minorities (Modood et al, 1997). We might also add here that another important aspect of exclusion is political exclusion and the inability to influence decision making, which can be affected by a lack of resources, including time, telephones, transport and articulacy

(Golding, 1986).

The present Prime Minister has described social exclusion as "*a short-hand label for what can happen when individuals or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health and family breakdown.*"

The "New Deal for Communities" neighbourhoods all share these characteristics. But despite this, it is not necessarily the case that all individuals in those areas can or should be defined as 'socially excluded'; the extent of their exclusion may depend on their support network.

Social networks and inclusion

The link between social networks and social exclusion is a difficult one. On the one hand, it can be argued that one of the main aspects of social exclusion is the lack of a strong and supportive social network of family and/or friends. On the other hand, it has been suggested that a strong network of a certain type can limit expectations and prevent the attainment of a high income and 'higher level' goods and services. Examining consumption patterns, Douglas and Isherwood (1996) suggest that linkages between people can be divided into social, technological and information links. They describe how "*to be rich means to be well integrated into a rich community*". The poor may be linked socially, but have lower technological and information links. These weak information and technological links contribute to exclusion from the wider community.

The existence of kinship and strong social networks is still often assumed, especially in rural areas. For example, 'Rural England: A Nation Committed to a Living Countryside' (DOE and MAFF, 1995) refers to "*rural communities which are smaller and more closely knit*" (p9); and to "*looking after themselves and each other.*" But a close examination of the discussion document reveals an acknowledgement of "*pockets of hardship*", (p24) "*inequalities*" (p33) and "*deprivation*" (p62), which is linked to the lack of access to services, and reference is made to the decline in number of local facilities and limited public transport. 'Rural England: A Discussion Document' (DETR and MAFF, 1998) is more explicit in its recognition of hidden poverty in rural areas and the fact that "*social exclusion can be a feature of rural life*" (point 5.17).

In relation to lack of access to facilities, recent research shows that 70% of rural parishes now have no general store, half have no school and three quarters have no daily bus service (Matson, 1998), and that lack of transport has severe implications for young people (Davis and Ridge, 1997) and other key groups in rural Somerset (Dibben, 1997). This latter research draws attention to how a lack of transport could lead to exclusion from education, employment, and social interaction.

Measurement

Measurements have been put forward for both absolute and relative poverty. Townsend (1979) refers to relative poverty as when people "*lack the resources to obtain the type of diet, participate in the activities and have the living conditions and amenities which are customary, or at least widely acknowledged or approved, in the societies to which they belong*" (p31 in Golding, 1986). He drew up a deprivation index from a survey of 2,050 households covering a variety of aspects including diet, clothing, and housing conditions, and concluded that there was a poverty threshold at 150% of the supplementary benefit level, below which families were deprived.

Recently, a set of indicators have been drawn up which attempt to measure social exclusion. Howarth and Kenway (1998) suggested that a 'scorecard' of indicators would enable new indicators to be introduced or others removed without damaging the integrity of the rest, and let people focus on what matters to them, e.g. pensioner poverty or long term unemployment. It is intended that the forty-six indicators constructed by the New Policy Institute will "*help the Government to 'keep its eye on the ball' in tackling social exclusion*" (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 1998). These indicators are based around people on low incomes, children, working-age adults, pensioners and communities.[2]

Transport And Social Exclusion

Travel trends use of and attitudes to public transport

Several sources provide information on transport use and expenditure among different social groups, of which the Family Expenditure Survey and the National Travel Survey are examples. Car ownership and travel to work data is available from census figures (the 1991 figures are now rather too old to be very informative).

Recent trends in car ownership and use are shown in a study which builds up a picture of who owns cars, what they use them for, and how much they spend on transport (Glaister & Graham, 1996). The study found that most households whose head is economically active and in a profession have at least one car, while more than half have two or more cars. On the other hand, less than 45% of unskilled manual and economically inactive households have a car. Car ownership is particularly low for an older person living alone: only 18% of single-person households aged over 65 own cars, and for women over 75 who live alone the figure is just 7%. For children, walking is an important mode of transport, especially for short distances. Those under 10 are heavy car users because adults ferry them about, whereas 11 to 20-year-olds are relatively heavy bus users; they become independent, but have not yet obtained the use of a car for themselves. Further findings show, for example, that only 51% of unemployed people spend money on motoring whereas the figure is 72% for all other households. It has also been shown that there can be some variation in travel patterns for people from ethnic minorities. For example they are more likely to use public transport for travel-to-work (Green, 1998).

In another study in rural areas of Scotland, 89% of rural households were found to own at least one car (Martin et al, 1998). However there was a small minority that faced mobility problems because of the constraints of public transport options. These were typically those on low incomes, including job seekers, those unable to drive, such as the young and older people, and mothers with young children. There was also a significant group at risk from being pushed into this mobility deprived group due to the costs of maintaining a motor vehicle. A further study in rural areas was carried out by Root, Boardman, & Fielding (1996). Their report is based on research in two 'commuter' Oxfordshire villages, and findings again show differences in travel patterns based on income. For example, travel poor, non-car-owning rural residents went to only a third of the places visited by car-owners, which indicates less access to facilities than car-owning households. In Merseyside, trip rate was directly related to income level (which is related to car ownership) - lower income households made far less trips than high income ones (Grant, 1998).

Three groups will serve as examples of the travel poor: people with physical disabilities, young people, and job-seekers. With regard to people with disabilities it has been suggested that transport disability is "*the unnecessary exclusion of disabled people from current forms of transport, especially public transport*" (Heiser, 1995, p49). Difficulties include those linked to operating regimes: fixed routes; tight

scheduling; little time to get on and off; and passengers conforming to the schedule rather than vice versa. It is also suggested that until most of the buses are accessible on a route, people with disabilities will not go to the bus stop, whereas current transport planning tends to be based on demand. Other difficulties are economic: taxis, minicabs and hire cars tend not to be subsidised.

In addition to operational and economic difficulties, there may also be others related to physical needs: in OPCS Disability Surveys (1988) it was shown that 3 million people cannot walk 200 yards without stopping and without severe discomfort, 2.3 million people cannot stand for 5 minutes without severe discomfort and 0.5 million people lose control of their bladder at least daily.

Research on young people has shown that independent travel for non-car owners may be severely restricted. Research on rural young people (Root et al, 1996) found that for 16-29 year olds, convivial and communal forms of culture are associated with car travel. Further, the absence of good transport and facilities led to anti-social behaviour, boredom and frustration through lack of choice. Other research (Devon County Council, 1999) has demonstrated that education and training opportunities are also severely restricted by transport constraints. Attitudes to public transport among urban young people vary and may affect the way it is used, particularly where it is seen as a symbol of authority (Cetur 1993, Brown 1994).

A number of studies (Cooper Sims, 1998; Audit Commission 1998) have found a clear link between travel barriers and employment possibilities. These are related to routes, affordability, timing (particularly for shift or Sunday working) and, in particular, reliability. Choice of job, or even the possibility of taking a job at all, is thus positively correlated with the ability to travel.

Measures to address 'transport poverty'

A number of initiatives exist which are intended to address transport poverty and social exclusion. Concessionary tickets are one of these. Another is the introduction of accessibility regulations under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 that will require new taxis, buses and coaches, trains and trams, to be accessible to disabled people. Bus fleets contain an increasing proportion of low floor and wheelchair accessible buses. These buses are helpful to all those who cannot manage steps, are carrying loads or travelling with wheeled vehicles such as buggies. However, as with concessionary tickets, the availability of accessible transport varies greatly between areas and operators.

Other initiatives include schemes such as "Dial-a-Ride" which may be run by local authorities, and schemes making use of community transport such as the Hackney PlusBus. Community transport schemes also address the question of transporting groups with particular travel problems, which can vary from physical problems to cultural ones. Voluntary car schemes, where they exist, provide individualised door-to-door service. These services are, however, subject to a number of constraints caused by legislation, finance, and the level of volunteers.

Local authorities and PTEs also run tendered bus services to address the question of a shortage of services where commercial viability is impossible.

Although an important factor in travel choice seems to be cost, this does not appear to have been a major preoccupation with transport policy makers. Indeed, the Rural Bus Service Grant for rural areas specifically precludes spending on concessionary fares (Local Transport Today, 2 July 1998). The Transport Bill will introduce a national minimum standard for concessionary fares for pensioners and

disabled people, involving a free annual pass entitling them to half-fares on local buses.

Suggestions for measures to address transport cost issues include those on Transport 2000's 'welfare to work' agenda (Joseph, 1998), such as reducing fares through travelcards and general subsidy, and targeting people and areas who are most transport-poor, using systems such as the Hertfordshire Smartcard which will give discounted travel for unemployed people. Where there are route and time limitations on travel, they also recommend support for local services such as home deliveries.

There are many ways in which local authorities can take the lead in addressing travel needs. For example, Somerset County Council has attempted to incorporate the needs of the community in transport planning, using, since 1986, the Social Need and Transport Accessibility (SONATAS) system to prioritise its expenditure on rural public transport. This includes analysis of use of buses for work, adult education, shopping, leisure and health purposes. In addition, it uses car ownership and demographic information on young people aged 12 to 19, women aged 20-59 and retired people based on parishes (Somerset County Council Public Transport Plan, 1997-2000).

Other local schemes include a scheme in Merseyside, run by Merseytravel, which involves initiatives such as a Community Links project to provide information and consult people on developing future policy; a trolleybus passing through five of the 'Pathways' areas; and a community transport initiative.

Herefordshire and Suffolk Community Councils have established an initiative called "Wheels to Work", which has now run for four years. It includes loans of motorcycles (for 16-25 year old students and trainees living in rural areas), subsidised driving lessons (for non-drivers who have access to a car), and financing for car repairs and insurance. A car sharing scheme has also been proposed, subject to funding.

Rural (Community) Transport Partnerships have been established in some shire counties such as Devon and Gloucestershire. These are aimed at trying to assess both needs and provision, and to provide overall co-ordination of all local services that are publicly funded in any way (and, in some cases, services that are not publicly funded). They are often associated with rural community councils. They aim both to co-ordinate and rationalise transport provision, as well as to ensure that the impact of transport and implications for transport services are considered in the other rural strategies and policies developed by central and local agencies and authorities.

Summary

From the existing evidence it is clear that travel poverty can be a significant problem for those already experiencing social exclusion, with a lack of real travel choice and, therefore, a lack of choice in activities and destinations. It is also, in some cases, one of the causes of social exclusion. Travel poverty is strongly associated with the inability to participate, since it can result in lack of access to both essential and 'non-essential' services and facilities; work, hospitals, shops and education are examples. Travel poverty is not confined to "excluded" areas; individuals within affluent areas (such as parts of Herefordshire) can also be travel poor.

Those without cars usually need more time, greater effort, and pay a higher marginal cost to reach the same destinations as people with cars. These problems apply in urban, peri-urban and rural areas, but take rather different forms and demand different solutions. Such solutions, although currently often embryonic, are being actively investigated in an encouraging number of local authorities.

[2] This research has recently been updated.

Chapter 3 - Carrying out the fieldwork

Introduction - A working definition of the Socially Excluded

The definition of "social exclusion" which we are using for the purposes of this study, which is basically Townsend's definition of relative poverty (Townsend 1979), is at the heart of the approach we are taking that people or groups are excluded if they are effectively unable to participate in activities which would be considered normal in their society.

As will be obvious from this definition, there is a strong element of relativity involved. One person's view of "ordinary living patterns" may include twice-weekly trips to the pub, a weekly shopping expedition, and a couple of visits to local friends, with perhaps a very occasional trip further afield. Clearly the transport element of this lifestyle is predominantly confined to walking. Many people, however, would define this type of life as out of the ordinary, assuming that a daily commute journey, a couple of annual foreign holidays, a few weekends in the country, and a twice-monthly trip to an out-of-town shopping centre are more normal. Equally, some people would regard a day as finishing well before half past ten at night, while others might assume that the need for transport in the small hours was normal.

Clearly any definition is dependent on several levels of cultural norm and research results will, therefore, need to be interpreted with caution.

1. Particular Considerations for Fieldwork with Socially Excluded People

It is a truism in schools that the parents who are most difficult to reach are those who the school most needs to reach. The same could be said of research which is intended to reach the "excluded". If they are not in the mainstream "social game" then a) finding them, and b) persuading them to participate in surveys is not a straightforward task.

The original proposal for this study contained three basic research methods: household questionnaires, focus groups and "triad" surveys." These involve on-the-spot recruitment and are therefore suitable for people who do not habitually use diaries.

2. Considerations in New Deal Areas

Co-ordination with New Deal Research

The first phase of fieldwork was to take place in those ten New Deal areas which had been asked to proceed to Stage 2 of the New Deal bid. Although all these areas were collecting baseline data, the transport data was limited to details of available bus and train services, how often people used buses, and the percentage of households owning a car. While this latter measure may be indicative of income levels, as an aggregate it does not help to find pockets of exclusion.

Rather than this being a one-way information-gathering exercise for the DETR and the Social Exclusion Unit, it was agreed that in the chosen neighbourhoods any results that we had would be also available to those areas that they could benefit from our research. Because of this, and

- because there was to be (and already had been, in some areas) a great deal of survey work;
- because of the need for our work to contribute to the New Deal areas, and
- because of the need to avoid wasteful duplication,

we had quite detailed initial meetings with the New Deal co-ordinators and researchers, who also provided us with background data on the neighbourhoods.[3] The New Deal areas were extremely helpful both with this and with helping us to find "gatekeepers" who might help us to access people who would not normally take part in any kind of survey work.

Observation

The first action taken by the researchers was an anonymous trip to, and investigation of, the neighbourhood. This visit, lasting probably half a day, would involve a walk around the area to establish where everything was, and a visit to a pub or shop (if there was one), to listen to conversations and to have a chat with passers-by. Strangers in an area, particularly if they look lost, are often approached by residents who are only too happy to talk about the area.

Finding the Non-Joiners

It was clear that, particularly within those neighbourhoods with already developed community structures, there would be no shortage of "community leaders" and "movers and shakers" who would participate, and who would persuade their friends to do so. However, the research was designed to reach beyond those people and to hear the views of people (non-joiners) who might not normally participate. Initial visits to a couple of the areas indicated that a wider variety of research techniques would be both useful and necessary than were originally proposed. While suspicion of researchers is common, those whose opinions are less often sought are likely to be initially more suspicious, although when they participate they are likely to be equally vociferous.

It was helpful to regard everybody encountered as a "gatekeeper". If, for example, a researcher got into conversation with a shopkeeper or publican, they would very often be given ideas for other people who might have something to contribute. This would be a very different selection of people from those who were "formally" involved in the community (residents' associations, parent-teacher groups, etc.). It was therefore extremely important that as many as possible of the outside researchers should have the ability to strike up a friendly conversation in a new environment.

Interviewers and recruiters were, where possible, chosen from an area near the surveyed neighbourhood, and in the case of ethnic minority groups, from among that minority; this is obviously particularly important where a minority language is spoken. There can be a problem using interviewers from their own locality since they may well have a particular bias. Since all the surveys were conducted by an interviewer and there were no self-completion questionnaires, the question of written translations did not arise.

Eventually a very wide variety of types of group discussion, individual interview, and questionnaire survey were used. Attempts were made to tailor the research in each area to what seemed suitable for that area and to try to ensure that the research would not duplicate or impede any other survey work in the area.[4] Most of the New Deal teams were delighted at the idea of extra input and extremely helpful. In the end, all but one was immensely co-operative, and it was decided to exclude the one from the study. It appeared that it was in many ways an especially sensitive neighbourhood in which there were worries about the effects of too many surveys on an extremely disaffected population, and who did not think that they had a transport problem.

The disadvantage of carrying out the research as described above is that it takes a great deal longer and is more demanding of the interviewers than more standard methods. It would have been much more straightforward to do some household surveys and set up a few focus groups of local activists and people on market research panels, and to have simply repeated the procedure in all areas. It was not believed, however, that useful results could have been obtained by this method.

In the end, all possible opportunities were taken by the researchers and interviewers to get into conversation with local people, whether residents, traders, business people, taxi drivers, etc., and to listen to what they had to say.

3. Considerations In Rural Areas

The principal differences from urban areas are that the rural population is more dispersed than the urban population, and socially excluded people in some of the most rural areas we studied could only be found in small pockets. This was one of the reasons that it was decided that it would be worth conducting on-bus and mobile library surveys, and surgery questionnaires.

We were also fortunate in that in or near three of the rural areas researched, attention had already been given to the transport question, partly prompted by the Rural Bus Grant allocations in 1998, which meant that background information was quite easily available.

4. Survey Techniques

It was considered important from the outset to find out whether transport problems arose naturally and spontaneously, and where they fitted into the overall picture. This was easier in the case of the household questionnaires/interviews, since transport questions came near the end of a twenty minute interview, but harder with pre-recruited groups since they had been asked to discuss a particular issue.[5]

- **"Focus" groups.** For people who do not normally keep a diary these are not easy to set up. Some formally recruited focus groups were nonetheless set up with the object of recruiting a precise number of certain ages and groups. Attendance tended to be either rather higher or rather lower than the target number (one group, targeted at 8-10, ended up as eighteen people).

Groups were also convened in women's and family centres, etc., for this study. They proved to be very useful, although there were some problems with size. If people were keen to come, which might be a result of the powers of persuasion of the centre workers, the groups might be very big. Some of the groups had nearly 20 people in, which is really too big for a focus group. Where they were not so keen, numbers might be very low; the smallest number was two, which is a bit small.

There is a much debated question about whether or not to tape record group discussions. It was left to the group facilitator to assess how far the tape recorder was likely to alter the discussion and what the participants felt about it.

- **"Informal" discussion groups.** These are "convened" in pubs, working mens' clubs, day-centres etc., and the composition of the group depends on word of mouth and who happens to be there at the time. They are, however, based on focus group methods in that the facilitator will be working to a topic guide, might tape record the discussion, and will take notes.

Tape recording is difficult in these groups because setting it up introduces an air of formality that can be off-putting, although once enough has been drunk, the tape recorder is likely to be forgotten by the participants! However, a group such as this may become fairly heated, with several people speaking at once or talking in sub-groups, in which case the tape recording will not be of much use, particularly if the transcriber is trying to decipher the accent.

These groups (of which fourteen took place during the study) seem to be particularly successful. The most "unbuttoned" conversations take place when the facilitator (who ends up just being a "listener") does not write during the session but makes notes immediately afterwards.

It is also important, if meeting in a pub or working men's club, to make sure the barperson knows precisely who is to get free drinks. During the study a bill of over £200 (which should have been about £50) was run up in one pub because the publican had failed to distinguish between those who were to get free drinks (in the group) and other people around the group!

- **Hall-test surveys.**

In this type of survey a room or hall is booked and recruiters go to nearby pubs, streets, shopping centres etc., and recruit directly. People are offered tea/coffee and a small incentive payment to come and discuss an issue. This method is particularly appropriate to this project because of the nature of recruitment and the immediacy of the groups, and also for those casually and spasmodically employed. Informal discussions are held in small groups, normally about three recruits at a time, which is why this type of survey is sometimes called a "triad."

The success of this type of survey depends on three variables: the location and atmosphere of the "hall", the skills of the recruiters, and the weather. The hall needs to be very close to a well populated area, such as a market, and the recruiters need to have sufficient magnetism to "invite" people to join in. When the weather is bad, not only do less people come out but those people do not want to be accosted on the street, even if they are to be invited to a warm hall to drink coffee and talk about transport.

The halls were also used as a "base" for interviewers, particularly where teamwork was involved. Some of the survey neighbourhoods did feel rather intimidating and work carried out in teams, with support from the organisers, was more successful than that which was not. Halls were also used for valuable debriefing sessions, in which particular issues and problems could be discussed, in the middle and at the end of the day.[6]

- **Photographic surveys**

There were some problems getting disillusioned teenagers to participate, but in two of the areas they were happy to contribute by going out with throwaway cameras to take photographs of what they saw as transport problems.

In one inner city area this produced a good collection of photographs which could then be described by somebody to whom words came more easily. In the other, the cameras - and any photographs - never came back.

The difference between the two areas was the strength of the local contact and their desire to see the project through. In the first of these two cases, the detached youth worker was very enthusiastic; in the second, the youth worker was less involved and it was an area with a greater feeling of alienation.

We also took photographs to describe areas where one photograph could provide more illustration than several pages of text.

- **On-street interviews and discussions**

Assuming the weather is not bad, many people are very happy to sound off about their transport (or other) problems if they do not feel they are going to have to spend a great deal of time doing so. During the course of the study, a short on-street questionnaire, which could be used by local interviewers, was developed, initially for use in areas where there was no suitable "hall." A large number of formal (questionnaire-based) and informal street interviews were held.

- **Household questionnaires**

In each of the survey areas, a set of people in about 50 households was interviewed, to reflect as far as possible the characteristics of the different parts of the neighbourhood. This was not designed to provide quantitative data but

- i) to serve as a check on the results of the other types of survey
- ii) to reach those who do not go out, and those who might not have the confidence to have a discussion away from their own familiar territory
- iii) to reach those who cannot go out by virtue of a mobility impairment
- iv) to have a base set of broad statistics available

These 20-minute questionnaires were not designed to give quantitative results in each area, although the aggregate results would provide an overview. They were a part of the qualitative surveys and were intended to give a broader spread of views in each area to provide across-check on what was said in interviews or in discussion groups etc. and to provide further evidence.

Households in some areas, where the area was fairly homogenous, were selected at random. In others, the areas were divided into sections and streets from within them were sampled, to ensure spatial representation. Interviewers were told to avoid dwellings where, for example, new cars were parked or which looked obviously very prosperous, to minimise representation from the "socially included".⁷ They were, however, told to try to make sure their sample ended up being as representative as possible of the gender, ethnic and age cohorts of the area. The first of these criteria was easier to meet than the second;

the large majority of those questioned could be included in Market Research Society categories C2, D and E. The second was less easy to meet, largely because there was no time to research the make-up of each household in advance, and interviewers were therefore knocking on doors and had to "take what came".

- **On-vehicle surveys (rural areas + Nottingham)**

Since the study was addressing public transport issues, it was decided that while not all respondents were users, some on-vehicle interviews would be informative. This was not done in the urban areas because it was felt that it would not be cost-effective, and because the Metropolitan areas and London Transport, at least, undertake their own research. However:

- where a **new bus route** had been put on since the Rural Bus Grants, and this had enabled people to travel by public transport who could not previously do so, it was decided to ask them how they were affected by the service

- **surveys** (short questionnaires) and interviews were also carried out on some existing services

- many **supermarkets** run free courtesy buses that are a part of many people's weekly trips. One of these was one of our survey venues.

- **mobile libraries** provide for people who cannot or do not want to go into the nearby town for their library books. A day was spent accompanying the mobile library in West Sussex, talking to the users.

We had the full co-operation of the local authorities and operators to undertake this research, and these methods proved to be very well suited to rural areas. Journeys were mostly rather longer than their equivalent would be in an urban area, so there was time for passengers to fill in questionnaires and talk to interviewers. It is also not difficult for a skilled interviewer to get a good discussion going on a bus journey.

The two supermarket bus routes on which an interviewer travelled were run by West Sussex County Council and operated by Brighton and Hove buses. Thus permission to work on the bus could be obtained from the County. However, given the popularity of these buses among users, more account should, in transport research in general, be taken of their function.

Accompanying the mobile library (for one day in one area) also proved to be profitable. It was a pleasant day so there were quite a lot of people around. Users were, in general, very happy to chat; they were people who had some time on their hands and were very friendly (none of the library users refused to take part), and easily chatted in a group. However, there was a shortage of time at each stop - except in the bigger villages. By the time the users had chosen their books and got off, there was only just time to listen to their views before the library moved off.

It would have been possible, with a co-operative librarian (as the one in West Sussex was), to conduct interviews in the vehicle if the weather was poor.

- **Schools groups.** These fall into a category of their own because none of the work fits the other categories. There were group discussions, sometimes with very large groups (about 20), and, in primary schools, classes were conducted by a trained teacher around the topic to try to find out what the children felt.

Mostly the pupils were very happy to express themselves, and some useful information could be gained. However, particularly in secondary schools, some of the pupils were likely to be showing off to each other or trying to avoid uncomfortable issues such as having a parent in prison or a mother "on the game". It was therefore necessary to find out something about the pupils from the school so that their answers could be realistically interpreted.

In such a situation, there will still be problems (and possibly moral dilemmas) for the interviewer. A 12 year old boy says his father is working (and has 2 cars) and the school says he lives with his unemployed lone mother who lives on benefits. It is possible that his mother is living with his father who is earning substantial sums in the black economy. It is equally possible that the boy is trying to impress the other pupils.

- Interviewing in a **health centre**, and a **surgery** which included questionnaires left in a doctors' surgery. This proved to be a useful venue because many of the excluded are suffering from sickness or disability, and because people are happy to have discussions while they wait.
- **Individual discussions with local "officials"**.

These include informal discussions and formal meetings with youth and community workers, New Deal workers, local community leaders, local councillors, teachers, and, where a prison was the main business of the village, prison officials. All these people help to build up a picture of an area and its problems, and why transport is or is not an important consideration.[8] They may have a particular bias or prejudice, or be taking part in political in-fighting, and the interviewer needs to try to find out what this bias is to interpret their view of the "facts."

5. Incentives

In many areas incentives were used, as is common in market research. In some places where people were particularly poor, they were totally unable to understand why we wanted to give them something. Some were suspicious and felt there was a catch. Social and Transport Research Services, who were undertaking the market research, received a number of phone calls from people in one neighbourhood who just could not believe that they were getting a fiver for taking part in a household interview. Some were delighted, but others were worried that their benefits might be affected.

6. Transport Supply

Interviews and meetings have taken place with people from the following groups:

- Three Shire County public transport organisers
- Two PTE representatives
- Five Community Transport organisers
- Eight commercial (large and small) bus and coach operators

- 5 taxi drivers (individuals only) [9]

[3] It is unfortunate, although inevitable, that given the changes in economic geography, work patterns, car ownership etc., in the last ten years, much of the data necessarily relied on the 1991 census.

[4] For example, in one area we had a specific request to talk with Yemeni women since it was considered that the methods we were using might reach them where others had failed.

[5] Structured questionnaires tend to underplay problems, and qualitative approaches to exaggerate them.

[6] Local interviewers were not asked to work in the evenings.

[7] If the scale of the study had been larger, the less disadvantaged would have been included as a control group.

[8] A group which is probably highly significant, but which is missing from this work, is probation officers and others concerned with the treatment of young offenders. It is believed that transport to probation appointments, or transport for visitors to young offenders' centres, is a problem. For young offenders in Somerset, for example, the nearest centre is near Oxford.

[9] The significance of taxis was, unfortunately, realised too late in the work to be able to include representatives of taxi drivers' organisations.

Chapter 4 - The Study Areas - Urban

This chapter starts by describing what was intended for New Deal areas and how they were selected. There then follows a summary description of each area, with a brief conclusion to each section about the relationship of transport to social exclusion issues in the area. Full descriptions of each area are available on request from the DETR's Mobility and Inclusion Unit.

1. The New Deal Areas

The New Deal for Communities is a key programme in the Government's strategy to help some of the most deprived neighbourhoods in the country. At the launch on 15 September 1998, the Deputy Prime Minister said:

"This Government is committed to tackling the problems facing our most deprived communities. The Social Exclusion Unit's report - Bringing Britain Together: a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal - makes it clear that while standards of living across Britain have risen over recent years, there are exceptions. Some of the very poorest areas have become increasingly run down and crime ridden, cut off from jobs and from other services."

The programme aims to bridge the gap between some of the poorest members of our society and the rest of Britain. By focusing resources on small deprived areas, and dovetailing its work with other initiatives operating in the area, it seeks to achieve maximum impact.

Although problems vary from area to area, there are four themes - common to most deprived neighbourhoods - which the programme will seek to address:

- tackling worklessness
- improving health
- tackling crime, and
- raising educational achievement

The new NDC partnerships will work with national, regional or local services from the very start and with other organisations and bodies that are already delivering services and running programmes. They will provide "joined up solutions to joined up problems".

In February 1999, Ministers announced 17 pathfinder neighbourhoods and partnerships. Ten of these partnerships have now started to develop a detailed long-term strategy for change (Phase 2 of the programme). These are based in:

Birmingham (King's Norton)

Bradford (Little Horton)

Bristol (Barton Hill)

Hackney (Shoreditch)

Leicester (Braunstone)

Manchester (Beswick and Openshaw)

Middlesbrough (West)

Newham (West Ham and Plaistow)

Sandwell (Greets Green)

Southwark (Aylesbury Estate)

These areas are drawn from the top scoring areas in the Index of Social Deprivation. The indices used to compile the overall index include the following:

Borough-wide indices are:

Unemployment, Low Income, Health, Education, Environment, Crime, Housing

Ward and Enumeration District Level Indexes are:

The indicators that make up the ward and ED level indexes are all from the 1991 Census. There are six indicators at the ward level and five at the ED level. These are:

At both ward and ED levels:

- i) unemployment (rates are generally 9% and over)
- ii) children in low earning households
- iii) households with no car
- iv) households lacking basic amenities

v) overcrowded households

At the ward level only (i.e. a less localised measure):

i) 17 year olds no longer in full time education

(Source: DETR, 1998 Indicators of Local Deprivation)

Seven other partnerships have been offered support to build and develop their partnership and their long-term vision before assessment and progression to Phase 2. These are based in:

Brighton (East Brighton)

Hull (Preston Road)

Liverpool (Kensington)

Newcastle (West Gate)

Norwich (North Earlham and Marlpit)

Nottingham (Radford)

Tower Hamlets (Ocean Estate)

Research was carried out in all the New Deal for Communities areas with the exception of Southwark (Aylesbury Estate) and Tower Hamlets (Ocean Estate) where co-ordinators felt that transport access was not a problem and where the resources needed for co-ordination with the DETR transport study would be greater than they could spare.

The size of the cities and towns in which the New Deal areas have been selected is very variable, as was the type of neighbourhood. The densely populated inner city neighbourhood of Shoreditch, much of it housed in high or medium-rise housing, for example, provides a strong contrast to the much more sparsely populated, low density estates on the edge of Norwich. Equally, the extent to which transport might be a factor contributing to social exclusion looked, at first sight, as though this was likely to be very different in each area.

The research approaches used for this part of the study include:

i) Focus groups

ii) Hall-test mini-groups and/or on-street interviews

iii) Household interviews

iv) On-bus surveys

v) Informal and formal interviews and group discussions in various locations including

- health centre
- travel centre
- community centres of various types, including day-care
- a "people's laundry"
- on-street
- bus stops
- working men's club
- youth centre
- sheltered housing

vi) Discussions and meetings with "officials" e.g. community workers, employment agencies

vii) School groups and classes

viii) Photographic surveys by young people (2 examples)

2. The Neighbourhoods

Birmingham - Kings Norton

The Area

The area comprises three main housing estates: Primrose Hill, Pool Farm (The Folds) and Hawkesley Estate, Kings Norton. Local residents know it as 'The Three Estates'. The number of households is 4,226. The hallmark of this area is the fast turnover of population on its council housing estates and tower blocks. This exacerbates problems of social exclusion on the Three Estates, perhaps most dramatically illustrated by the 30% annual turnover in pupils of the three local schools.

The 'Three Estates' is on the border of Birmingham and Worcestershire, and can be reached from the main radial Redditch Road, which acts as a boundary. It is not visible from the main road and has open field on all sides. It is not a place that you would 'pass through'. Rather like other edge of city estates, it has a high proportion of green space and must have seemed very attractive when it was first built forty years ago. In fact, the rural character of the area, with thickets of tress and uninhabited green space, makes it feel (with justification) very threatening.

Bounded by a dual carriageway on one side, and the countryside on two others, the Pathfinder Area is a very clearly defined geographical area on the southern outskirts of Birmingham. Despite a population of over 10,000 residents, there are no banks, supermarkets or launderettes in the area. There is very little direct employment available, and public transportation, for an area so geographically isolated, is patchy within the estates, although there are good services on the main road around the estates. It is an area of

high deprivation, with certain areas, notably Pool Farm, having a city-wide reputation as "bad places to live".

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

This area is typical of a peripheral estate which, because of the closure of reasonably local employment opportunities, has become too poor to be self-sustaining and is too remote from major centres to share easily in their wealth creation, medical, educational, shopping, leisure, and other facilities.

Transport, or problems with it (as well as actual traffic), is certainly contributing to the social exclusion of a number of groups in this community. It is possible that almost all non-car-owning households are excluded to a greater or lesser extent.

In particular, job-seekers, young parents, older people, and young people, all seem to be affected. If facilities locally could be improved - and maintained - for younger people, some of these problems could be alleviated. The overwhelming impression is that although there are quite a lot of bus services, none of them - especially the No. 35 - can be counted on. When an appointment has got to be kept absolutely on time, either a disproportionately long time has to be allowed to get there, or alternative means of transport, probably ill afforded, has to be sought, which further reduces the probably already inadequate income of the traveller.

Bradford - Park Lane, Marchfields, West Bowling

The Area

The New Deal area in South Bradford extends from virtually the centre of the city (near the Bradford Interchange) southwards to the Marshfields Roundabout (Morrison's Supermarket) and the A6177 Ring Road. It includes 3 areas: West Bowling, Park Lane and Little Horton. The three estates are of mixed housing types, with about 10% void. There is a significant ethnic minority population (43%).

Manchester Road bisects the area and is one of the main radial routes for Bradford, leading from the M62 via the M606 Motorway. At one time the Manchester Road had been a vibrant road, with many pubs, shops and facilities for the local population. After it had been made into a main radial route many of these facilities disappeared.

The road has fast moving traffic in the off-peak periods and is subject to considerable traffic congestion during the peak. It has a central reservation, with some gaps (to allow people to cross the road) and two overhead footbridges for people to cross. The Marshfields roundabout has pedestrian underpasses that are perceived by local residents to be unsafe. The Manchester Road is served by fast, frequent bus services, some of which have low floor (accessible) buses and other 'walk-on' type buses. The Nipper Bus Route 628 runs to Little Horton and uses a wheelchair-accessible vehicle.

Each side of the Manchester Road has a bus service that penetrates the residential area. However, these are far less frequent than the services on the main Manchester Road. Here the bus stops have no information and no stop furniture. Many people walk to the Manchester Road to catch one of the more frequent services. St. Luke's Hospital is within the New Deal area and there are special hospital buses running from the Interchange.

Taxi (mini cab) services are ubiquitous and reasonably cheap. The cab fare equivalent to a 50p one-way bus journey is Â£1.50 to Â£1.80.

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

Transport links to Bradford Centre and surrounding areas were felt by residents to be generally quite good, although complaints were made about reliability and the lack of Sunday services on some routes, and about prices. Complaints were also made about the volume and noise of traffic.

Subways across the main road are unpleasant and avoidance of them can trap people, particularly on a Sunday or in the evening when the bus route serving that road does not run. Although other services are very close, they stop on the other side of the roundabout. Crossing points are much more accessible on the Manchester Road nearer to Bradford.

The most concerned group encountered were the traders. Because there were no financial facilities nearby and main road buses were frequent enough for people to shop elsewhere, the number of traders was below the critical mass necessary to keep the area vibrant, which was a major contributor to the problems of the area.

Bristol - Barton Hill

The Area

The New Deal area is the historic neighbourhood of Barton Hill, which includes the core residential area known as Barton Hill and The Dings, a smaller residential area that is closer to the City Centre. The area is located on the southern edge of Lawrence Hill ward. It lies to the east of the traditional industrial heart of the city behind the railway station, and is bound on all sides by physical barriers that separate it from the city. These barriers include an urban motorway, a canal and a major pedestrian underpass.

The Dings is fairly obviously socially and spatially excluded. It is cut off from the main part of Barton Hill and from schools, community facilities and shops by the "spine road". There is a steep hill walk to local schools (25 minutes to the secondary). The road leading to the central part of Barton Hill is busy, uphill, winding and reputedly dangerous, as there is a narrow pavement and poor visibility for through traffic.

Barton Hill comprises social housing stock, consisting mostly of high-rise and low-rise blocks, some Edwardian terraced housing and comparatively modern, detached/semidetached/maisonette social housing. Some of the high rise blocks have been refurbished and concierge schemes put in, but there is an air of unkemptness about the area, including rubbish and abandoned cars. There is a useful range of small shops and a doctor's surgery, also a fairly large open space which is used for football and recreation. Barton Hill has a frequent, 10 minute, bus service to and from Bristol City Centre (Route 36 low-floor, single deck bus), but the journey time is long and the route is indirect. There are more frequent buses along the main road at the bottom of Barton Hill, which is a short walk.

There is a high proportion of lone mothers and older people in the Barton Hill neighbourhood. There are four supermarket buses a week, which are much appreciated, although mothers with buggies find one of them difficult to board and cannot get on one of the others if it is full up.

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

Public transport in this area seems to be a very limiting factor, and is a cause of considerable inconvenience and irritation to a number of people. There are people spending a long time travelling quite short journeys because although some services are theoretically frequent, they can be unreliable. Choice, for example, of school, is being constrained by this inadequacy. Almost half of the household interviewees said they found travelling a problem, that there were places they wanted to go to that they could not get to and that it seemed expensive. It is clearly contributing to social exclusion.

We think it would be worth investigating the use of and routes of courtesy buses. Although we did not meet many people who used them regularly, those who did suggested that they are well used. It seems possible that they may take a significant number of potential passengers from the commercial public transport network and that the interaction between the two networks could be co-ordinated.

East Brighton - Moulsecoomb And Whitehawk

The Area

The East Brighton New Deal area, which is physically and socially isolated from the rest of the town, comprises two very distinct parts -Moulsecoomb and Whitehawk. They comprise a mixed housing stock of which about two thirds is social housing. Each is situated in valleys/hillsides separated from the town centre by the Downs and the Brighton Racecourse. There is no direct road or bus link between the two estates, although there appear to be family links between them. It is too far to walk between the two, particularly because of the steep slopes.

Moulsecoomb has few facilities - one pub, a corner shop with a post office, some sports and keep fit facilities, but little else. The lower end of Whitehawk has a reasonably extensive range of shops at the southern (downhill) end of the estate including a greengrocer, butcher and baker. There are no banks, pharmacies, hairdressers or support services on the estates. Both areas are very hilly, so less than fit people or encumbered people living in the higher roads and streets have obvious problems of getting to and from buses and trains. This is significant as the area contains a very high proportion of older people and lone parents with buggies (25% of last year's school leavers were pregnant).

Buses on the main roads are very frequent during the day, although expensive. There is not a great deal of penetration into the estates, although problems of vandalism of buses have been solved. Unlike most of the other areas in this study, the train is used by the less well off; a train/bus ticket can be bought and it is not seen as part of amore affluent culture by the locals.

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

East Brighton is a very isolated area and other than to visit friends or relations, there is no reason to go to or through either of the two estates. Like the estates peripheral to major industrial cities, it is effectively invisible. Its general decline is due to the closure of major local employment opportunities, and the concomitant decline of everything else in the neighbourhood. Work is a problem: there appear to be a certain number of service opportunities in Brighton that are accessible by bus, but many of these are extremely low-paid and seasonal. There are some jobs at Shoreham and further afield, but these are very difficult to reach by public transport. Public transport is almost good enough to cover most non-work

needs, although leisure opportunities are few because of timetables.

Within the estates, there are difficulties getting around because of the very hilly topography, and going out at night is constrained by a justified fear of intimidation and/or violence.

While mobility and accessibility difficulties undoubtedly contribute to the exclusion of many in this area, it is unclear to what extent the inadequacy of public transport could be considered a contributory factor, except in the case of work journeys outside central Brighton.

Hackney - Shoreditch

The Area

The neighbourhood area for Shoreditch was chosen to encompass an inner or core area for major social housing investment and an outer wider area for social and economic investment. The whole area extends from the borders of Islington in the west to the Queensbridge Road in the east. The southern border of the extended area is Old Street and the northern border is the Regent's Canal. The area also includes social housing estates to the east of Queensbridge Road. To the east are other districts with high levels of deprivation. Parts of the area are easily accessible and are on through routes; other parts feel as if they are extremely isolated (only one way in and out).

Housing is interspersed with small pockets of commercial and light industrial sites as well as open public space. There is a park in the centre of the area, a sports centre and a small enclosed garden. Hoxton Street has a full range of small shops, although some of them are rather run down, and a market on Saturdays that is reputedly 'dying', but still seems very well attended. There are doctor's surgeries, community centres, pubs, clubs and cafes in the area, also a Hackney Council 'First Stop Shop' and library. There are, however, no banks or building societies. There is also a growing cultural industries sector, e.g. photographic studios and clubs.

There are reasonably frequent bus services running from south to north up New North Road and East Road in the west and Kingsland Road towards the east. However, there are no services running from east to west, other than along Old Street to the south. People going to destinations in the main part of Hackney have to change buses, although there are direct services to shopping destinations like Dalston. The nearest Underground is Old Street.

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

This area contains a high proportion of older people, who have, and greatly appreciate, their free passes for transport. However, many of them do not want to make long journeys but just want to be able to get around Hackney. At present, this is very difficult because most routes are radial and does seem to be limiting their movement quite significantly. There is also a problem of accessibility on most of the bus routes.

There is a shortage of unskilled/semi-skilled work in the immediate vicinity so people have to travel some way. Buses are not perceived as particularly reliable and the Underground is expensive.

This area is unique in that there is a problem of getting visitors out of it, i.e. the young people who come for the club scene. There is inadequate late night transport to get them out of the area (are taxis possibly refusing to take them?) and so they are hanging around being troublesome.

Kingston Upon Hull - Preston Road

The Area

The community lies on the east side of the River Hull, three miles from the City Centre, and is physically divided into four quarters by the Holderness Drain and Preston Road, which is dual carriageway for much of its length. There are about 3,000 households in the community, with a population of about 8,000. Male unemployment is 27% and incomes in the area are very low indeed. Preston Road lies close to the docks, but is isolated from it by a number of physical barriers - a closed railway line (now converted to a cycleway/footpath) and Hedon Road, the major access into the docks. The Holderness Drain, which bisects the area, presents a barrier and a potential hazard for the many small children on the estate.

There is one small corner shop in the centre of the estate that has a run down and battered appearance, although it is obviously well frequented; all other facilities are outside the estate, at either end (including health and post office facilities and a cycle shop, which is indicative of the local cycling culture).

There is a large turnover of residents. Older people complained that young people did not stay in the area long, contributing to the lack of community feeling. Conversely, younger people complained that older people kept themselves to themselves and did not socialise. There appears to be a high proportion of single mothers housed in the area. There appeared to be no facilities for organised activities for children or a designated play area.

Overview of Transport Connections and its Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

Although there are some quite significant issues associated with transport provision in the area, crime, drug abuse and unemployment are the dominant concerns of the community. One person said that she felt there to be a form of "collective trauma" in the Hull area and that the City as a whole had not recovered from the bombing during the Second World War and the collapse of the shipping and fishing industries. The area (apart from activities at the community centre) had no feeling of buoyancy at all. The Preston Road estate was a reflection of wider social deprivation in the Hull area.

Complaints about transport services were of a minor nature; mainly concerning bunching of buses, the rudeness of drivers and the difficulties of travelling with large amounts of shopping or children. Many stops have shelters and timetables. Few people used Hull station on a regular basis, but all felt that it was easily accessible by bus. In fact, many people felt little need to travel away from the estate at all. Cycling was not uncommon. Few of the people questioned felt that transport presented a serious barrier to mobility or accessing educational or work opportunities, although the younger people felt that they would like a driving licence.

However, very few of the respondents appear to have considered taking work or using other facilities at any distance from the estate, and so the possibilities and limitations resulting from the present or an improved transport system had not really been considered.

Leicester - Braunstone

The Area

Braunstone New Deal for Communities area is located on the western fringes of Leicester City and is bisected by the Ring Road (A563), which causes noticeable severance of the area.

Braunstone Lane, to the west of the area, marks the divide between the 'County' and the City - it is perceived by some local people in the New Deal area to mark the divide between 'them [relatively well-off] and us'. The main Hinckley Road, which runs from a Park and Ride at the junction with the M1 into the City Centre, borders the area to the north. In the south of the area there is the A4560 leading from the M1 to the City Centre.

There are few employment sites in the area and no chemists, launderettes, financial outlets or other meaningful retail options. There is no physical presence from social services. The north area housing office has been closed and only recently has the local community centre reopened. Medical facilities in the area are inadequate and of poor quality.

The north-western part of the area is on higher land than the other parts, so all pedestrian journeys between different parts of the area involve walking up/down a hill. One informant suggested that the north-western part was a

"Ghetto, cut-off from the decent area and fenced in by the ring-road"

Cort Crescent, which runs alongside the park, is served by a double deck bus route. This was described as a bus that you could "drive your buggy onto" by one of the young mothers. There are two hoppla bus services in the New Deal area. The 64, Fox Cub (operated by Arriva) runs through the north-western area from Leicester Forest East to the City Centre. The 51 Hoppla bus service serves the north-eastern and south-eastern parts. There are bus services on the Hinckley Road and Braunstone Lane that can be accessed via a short walk if you live on the fringes of the area. Also there is a Park and Ride with an express (non-stop) bus service to the City Centre.

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

Although the background household interview sample is too small to be statistically significant, the fact that 29 of the sample of 50 did not drive, and 33 of them travelled as a passenger once a month or less, coupled with the fact that 20 never used a bus and only 25 used a bus two or more times a week, does concur with impressions gained from groups and interviews that people's horizons were very limited and that, on the whole, many people, for whatever reason, tended not to go anywhere very much. [One researcher described the level of movement in Braunstone at 8.30 a.m. giving the feeling of being in the 1950s.] There was, in fact, a very strong sense of community. The lack of travel would also explain why people did not, on the whole, see travelling as a problem; they mostly did not equate possible improvements to their life (if, indeed, they really believed their lives could be improved at all) with mobility possibilities.

Liverpool - Kensington

The Area

The Kensington New Deal for communities area is an integral part of inner-city Liverpool, a couple of miles east of Liverpool City Centre. It is bounded by two major roads to the city. The area is characterised largely by pre-1919 commercial and residential development suffering market collapse. House prices have collapsed, and there is a high level of prostitution, drug abuse and other crime in the area (7 murders within 2 years). Many of the houses in Kensington are two-up two-down terraces on narrow streets (which are used by commuters for daytime parking). 10% of the properties are voided and there is a general air of neglect and dilapidation. This is mirrored in the high percentage of voided shops, particularly on Kensington Road, and the run-down Kensington Shopping Arcade

The area is bounded by busy radial routes -Kensington Road in the north and Edge Lane/Wavertree Road (which is effectively a continuation of the M62) in the south. Both are well served by bus services.[10] Buses are quite frequent during weekdays, but are less frequent at off-peak hours and on Sundays. Reduced fares, using various types of travelcard, are available for a variety of groups. Edge Hill station is a ten-minute walk from the New Deal area. Taxis are reasonably cheap and it is considered normal to use them. The pedestrian environment is very poor (some pavements are in poor repair and roads are hard to cross) and the area is not considered safe at night.

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

In this part of Liverpool, the contribution of transport to social exclusion is less concerned with public transport services, which are good, than with the whole transport environment. There is a great deal of through traffic and because there are direct bus services to the city centre, non-residents use the very small side streets as park-and-ride nodes. Local residents resent this. Traders are hampered by the lack of passing trade and the ease with which local people can leave the area to do their shopping. But it would appear that public transport, while catering well for radial and a few orbital single-stage journeys, does not cater well for job opportunities which, such as they are, are rather dispersed.

Older people, although appreciative of the cheapness with which they can travel, do seem to feel that they are rather treated as second-rate citizens by drivers. It was reported that the same was true of young people. But public transport itself is not a major problem. Its daytime effectiveness does, however, contribute to the social exclusion of the neighbourhood. Firstly, as car ownership in the area is low, streets are used as parking places for ongoing bus users. Secondly, people can, and do, escape easily to spend their time and money elsewhere.

Manchester - Beswick and Openshaw

The Area

The East Manchester community comprises a heterogeneous, but geographically distinct area totalling 9,417 households across Beswick, Openshaw and Clayton. The New Deal area comprises Beswick and Openshaw and a small fraction of Clayton.

The three parts of the New Deal area are separated from each other by roads and in the centre by industrial land use. Residents consider themselves to belong to one or other of the three "villages" rather than to East Manchester as a whole. Facilities in Beswick are very poor; there is a small shopping precinct and a run-down Saturday market. There is no surgery or community centre. Openshaw, on the other hand, has slightly better facilities, but still no banks or petrol stations.

Beswick and Openshaw are located between the Ashton Old and New Roads to the east of Manchester City Centre. There are frequent and fast bus services running to and from Manchester City Centre along both the main radial routes; there is a bus service, with low-floor buses, that crosses Beswick, running North to South up Grey Mare Lane, but no equivalent for Openshaw. The new metrolink system in Manchester will eventually be extended to Beswick to coincide with the opening of the Commonwealth Games Sports City 2002. The Ashton New Road is served by four routes. Clayton has the Route 216. The Manchester Minibus agency had, very shortly before this research was carried out, launched a circular route Hail and Ride service called the E1. This was designed to link the residents of inner parts of Clayton and Beswick with essential facilities and services.

There is a "hire car" culture in the area. The cost of hire car journeys was very competitive when compared with bus fares, particularly if more than one person was travelling. There was a stand in Beswick by the shopping precinct and on a Saturday we observed a continuous stream of shoppers making use of this service. [About a third of respondents to our household questionnaire said they used a taxi at least once a week.]

During off-peak periods there is a considerable amount of traffic on both the radial roads. The New Deal team is concerned about the level of road accidents and has asked the DETR to include this as a monitoring factor. Some work has been done in terms of School Travel Plans and Initiatives.

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

There are many reasons why the area is considered difficult to live in. "Problem families", nothing for young people to do, little local employment, and dangerous roads, are all important. All of these lead to a feeling of helplessness and contribute to the feeling experienced by many of being trapped. Transport, or the problems associated with it, which include cost and the difficulties of getting to workplaces, and the need to be endlessly waiting - hanging about - contribute to these feelings of being trapped and existence being rather bleak. So does the difficulty of getting out cheaply and easily in leisure time (particularly Sundays.)

Middlesbrough - Whinney Banks and West Lane

The Area

The New Deal neighbourhood is on the western fringe of Middlesbrough, adjoining the town centre at its north-eastern edge. It is bisected by two of the region's major trunk roads, the A19 running north-south and the A66 running east-west. The A66 was driven through a traditionally cohesive neighbourhood, separating residents located just 50 metres apart. Other busy arterial routes, the A1032, A1130 and B6451, separate people from local facilities such as shops and schools. As a result, the different parts of the neighbourhood are now connected by footbridges, pedestrian walkways, and crossings. It is basically in two parts: Whinney Banks is some distance from the centre of Middlesbrough (20-30 minutes walk); West

Lane is in Middlesbrough (5-10 minutes walk), but cut off from the town centre by main roads and a very busy roundabout. There are quite frequent bus services on the main roads near both neighbourhoods.

There is some shopping in the area and, in addition, there is the Teesside Retail Park on the other side of the A19 dual carriageway, which also has a nightclub. But the walk from the estate to the Retail Park is regarded as being dangerous after dark and unsuitable for returning with heavy shopping.

The neighbourhood is not at first sight unpleasant, much of it being well laid out, with houses grouped around courtyards and local green spaces. However, it is a poor environment. There are very limited employment opportunities and few facilities, not even a GP surgery or bank; residents have to go to the town centre and beyond for almost all their services above and beyond basic shopping, which is often inconvenient and time-consuming.

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationships to Social Exclusion Issues

Transport was not perceived by a large number of people as causing a particular problem for adults (for shopping, school, leisure activities, etc), although it was made clear that there were many transport constraints on everyday activities. Young people, however, found their activities restricted not only by lack of direct buses but also by problems understanding bus and train timetables (the coast was not far away by train). They were very underconfident about travelling. For adults, employment was constrained by transport. This was underlined by those respondents who have a car, who made it clear that the pattern of their lives (in particular their jobs) would not be possible without the car.

In the household survey done for the New Deal, transport featured both directly and indirectly. When respondents were asked what they thought was the major barrier to employment, the most common response was "shortage of local vacancies" (36%), and lack of transport was also a barrier (21%). However, there was a feeling that people did not actually want to travel very far to work. This was to some extent confirmed by the New Deal survey which found that of those surveyed who were looking for work, 44% were not prepared to travel for more than half an hour (this included a couple of people who were not prepared to travel for more than 15 minutes).

Newcastle Upon Tyne - West Gate

The Area

The Newcastle upon Tyne New Deal area is extensive, encompassing Cruddas Park, Rye Hill, Elswick, Westgate and Arthur's Hill. The Eastern boundary of the areas is next to Newcastle City Centre, which is a potential source of employment. There are 3,975 households in the area with a total population of 8,500. About two thirds of the housing is Council or Housing association. The house types include pre-1919 terraced houses and flats modernised in the '70s; interwar maisonettes converted and updated in the '80s; 11 high rise blocks from the '60s and some '60s and '70s and '90s low rise housing. The area includes the Newcastle Arena, the new Gene Museum, Newcastle College and three primary schools.

The population contains several different social groups. There is a significant Bangladeshi population and, overall, 16.7% of the residents are from black and other ethnic minorities. The unemployment rate in the area is 36.2% (compared to a City average of 17.2%).

There has been high employment in this area for a number of years (generations in some families), and being without formal work has become a way of life. The traditional local employer was Vickers Armstrong. Before the demise of the ship-building and associated industries, Vickers had employed 50,000 people on the site. This has now been renovated and there is a small business park, including a call centre. The site now employs around 5,000 people, most of them in white collar occupations.

There are a number of quite fast and frequent bus services running east to west, but it is difficult to travel directly north/south by public transport; going in and out of the city is the only way to do this.

Overview of Transport Connections and its Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

This is an area of very low aspirations and a long tradition of any ambitions suppressed in the face of the reality of increasing unemployment over several generations. There were some rather negative comments about the grandiosity of projects such as the Gene Museum and the Opera House. There was also scepticism about the possibilities of any change, although people were keen to see environmental improvements in the area.

Transport is not a major preoccupation, probably because this is an area of historically very low mobility. It may also be because so many people are not constrained by a shortage of time and probably cannot afford to go out often, as it involves spending money both on transport and at the destination. However, for those who did want to work, journeys to some employment sites would be very tortuous and time-consuming because of the lack of direct routes and might well be a disincentive.

Newham - West Ham and Plaistow

The Area

The West Ham/Plaistow New Deal area comprises three main sections: Brooks and Plaistow North, Woodlands, and Eastlea. In the centre is the Memorial Recreation Ground and East London Cemetery, which tends to divide the area. It has a bad reputation and adults generally think of it as a 'no go' area. It is surrounded by low shrubs and bushes and has in the past been the site of a 'Klu Klux Klan' event. Each of the three parts is heterogeneous, but can be broadly differentiated by type of housing stock and population. Community severance is a key characteristic of Newham, mainly due to east-west transport axes such as major trunk roads (A13 and A11) and rail lines.

It is a very mixed area in terms of ethnic groups and age structure. Racial prejudice is rife. Some parts of the neighbourhood felt quite intimidating. However, within the various groups, particularly among the Pakistani population, there seemed to be a very strong sense of community and people helped each other out by doing chores or by giving lifts.

There is a wide choice of transport services on main routes in Newham. The extent to which transport was a problem or even an irritant varied very widely depending on the time constraints and the travel ambitions of the people being interviewed. There were many comments about bus bunching and being kept waiting in long queues; there were also problems financing bus travel. There were a few comments about the Jubilee Line, which it was felt was not for the locals, as they did not travel into the West End.

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

Although, in general, people did want more things to do in the local area, they were obviously prepared to travel a certain amount if they had to, but they wanted better and possibly cheaper transport.

They were aware of the wide choice of mode. There was no feeling that they were "trapped" and that they could not get to where they wanted to go. There was, however, a widespread feeling that because bus transport was so unreliable, disproportionate amounts of time had to be spent getting anywhere; people did not like the feeling that they could easily have to wait 25 minutes for a bus, or that it could take 45 minutes to get to Stratford. This made life rather difficult when there were definite time constraints, such as hospital appointments.

In this area the inadequacies of the transport system appear to contribute to residents' negative feelings about the area, probably do not help their self-esteem, constricts their lives, and can seem expensive. However, while transport is a limiting factor in many people's lives, it would be hard to attribute responsibility to it as a major contributory factor to the area's overall problems.

Norwich - North Earlham, Larkman and Marlpit

The Area

The New Deal area for Norwich is to the north of the city and consists of three peripheral estates. They are very different in character and even within each estate there is a great variety of housing and, apparently, income level. Most of the houses have gardens. There are three main roads in or around the area: Earlham Green Lane, which runs along the southern boundary, Guardian Road, which is the eastern boundary, and Dereham Road, which runs through the neighbourhood with Marlpit estate to its north. The area has been heavily traffic calmed as a result of accidents.

The Dereham Road has four lanes and there is fast moving traffic in off-peak periods, which serves to cut off the Marlpit housing area.

There is little for young people to do. There is no doctor in Earlham and no supermarket. The school that most parents want to send their children to is not in Earlham, which is just outside the southern boundary of the area, but in Hellesdon, which is just under three miles north of the New Deal neighbourhood. The community appears to be suffering from a great lack of morale and low self-esteem.

Most of the area is within about 500 metres of a radial road. There are a number of moderately frequent (10-minute headway) buses on these roads, following the lines of the old tramlines. There are no orbital routes and no direct bus routes to the preferred supermarkets. There are no routes through the estates. There was a tendered service in Marlpit, but ridership was too low for Norwich City Council to subsidise. The No. 18 still runs through Marlpit every 30 minutes, but not "round the houses". The fares are more expensive than in most of the areas in this study.

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

Respondents in this area were more aware of the relationship between the limitations imposed by public transport and the constraints in their lives than the respondents in the other urban areas we surveyed. There are several possible reasons for this:

- i) There has never been a large local paternalistic employer, so people are used to the need to travel more than walking distances to work. They are therefore more likely to be aware of the transport issues.
- ii) Norwich is not a large city and many facilities, such as supermarkets and places of employment, are beyond the boundaries of the city, either in the country or in other towns; in fact to get the kind of choice of job, shops, leisure pursuit, etc that is considered normal, it is probably necessary to travel beyond Norwich City Centre. This will necessarily involve a fairly long walk, a change of bus, and probably cost several pounds.

Nottingham - Radford and Hyson Green

The Area

Radford and Hyson Green is a multi-cultural area just to the north west of the City Centre. It consists mainly of pre-1919 terraced property with some in-fill areas of local authority housing and social housing on former clearance sites. It has quite a high population density. It is a very mixed area with a significant ethnic minority population, and also an above average proportion of students.

The area suffers from a poor reputation, although the main shopping road is not unduly run down. There also seems to be a strong sense of community, helping out, lift-giving etc. However, people do not want to move there, businesses do not want to be based there and employers do not want to employ people from there. [This is despite the fact that there are prospering businesses and skilled residents within the area.] There have apparently been previous attempts at regeneration initiatives within the area.

There are a number of bus routes down the radial roads in the area, but, as in most towns of this size, radial journeys are accomplished by taking one bus into town and taking another bus out again. A radial bus linking ASDA supermarket with Queen Mary Health Centre and the University has recently been started, but it is not very frequent and has not attracted many riders, although this may be because it is only a few months old. An important future element in the transport system is the NET (tram) which is due to be constructed shortly and which should link this area with areas of employment. However, traders are worried about it because the market will go when the NET arrives and there are worries about the impact it will have on the local ASDA.

Overview of Transport Connections and Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

Although isolation cannot be considered a major feature of this neighbourhood because of its proximity to the city centre, there are several groups in the area whose participation in all normal social activities is considerably constrained by their transport opportunities and are affected by its cost.

Hospitals and health centres were not easy to reach, which was causing people to miss appointments, wasting health resources. Women from ethnic minority groups were not very happy about public transport, did not really want to use it, and would rather drive, particularly if they were trying to juggle childcare and work responsibilities. Because of the dispersed nature of work facilities, jobs were not always easy to access. There were not enough activities for young people and transport affordability was a problem here (as with some other groups).

In common with many other neighbourhoods, the lack of orbital bus routes meant that, in general, because of the need to go into town and out again to travel anywhere except the town centre, disproportionate amounts of time were spent by non-car owners undertaking most activities. The NET, if affordable, could overcome some of these journey problems - but might on the other hand, through siphoning people away from trade in the area, contribute to its further decline.

Sandwell - Greets Green

The Area

The borough of Sandwell is akin to an inner city because all its boundaries are with other Metropolitan Districts. Some of Sandwell serves as a Birmingham dormitory, although this does not apply to the New Deal area. Industries have traditionally included metal, primary industries feeding metal industry, and metal manufacturings. Many industries are still in the area, although some factories have been replaced. Greets Green is in the heart of West Bromwich to the south and west of the town centre. As well as residential areas there are thriving industrial units, playing fields, shops, and running through all this, the canal, which in some senses, since it lost its predominant economic and transport function, plays host to a 'ribbon of poverty'.

In spite of the existence of several major employers within Greets Green, local residents are unable to secure quality employment. This is partly due to a lack of skills among the resident population and the absence of a locally directed employment link between residents and employers. In essence "*it reflects a lack of connection between residents and their community and between employers and residents.*"¹¹

The area has a significant ethnic minority population (about 30%), largely housed in the East End of the area, in Victorian terraced housing. This area, although run down, is lively and contains shops, health centres, places of worship, etc. It is also within easy reach of West Bromwich shopping centre. Six minority languages are spoken. All the communities have their own standing forums. The extreme west of the area contains the other residential part of the New Deal Area. This is low-density council housing, laid out with plenty of small green spaces.

The New Deal area is essentially served by two main bus routes. The 401/2 provides connections along main roads to West Bromwich from Tipton and has Bilston and a 10 minute frequency Monday to Saturday. The 74 is another major route that runs along the outskirts of the New Deal area at a 10 minute frequency and provides another useful connection to West Bromwich or Dudley. Most areas are within walking distance of these two routes. These two main routes are supported by a series of hail and ride services such as the 630/1 that go through estates to and from West Bromwich at 15 minute intervals. This is supplemented by a 458/9 service at 30 minute intervals. Bus Links across much of the Black Country are available from West Bromwich. There are also Midland Metro stops within walking distance of most of this area.

Overview of Transport Connections and its Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

It would be misleading to suggest that the contribution of transport to social exclusion problems in West Bromwich is very significant. There are certain problems of affordability. What is clear is that there are a number of cultural constraints among all groups (from Bangladeshi women through to young people) which limit the extent to which they are prepared to travel or see travel as a necessary part of daily life.

3. General Overview of Transport and Its Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues in the New Deal Areas

The New Deal neighbourhoods were chosen because they suffer from multiple deprivation. As is clear from the brief descriptions, this is a heterogeneous collection of areas, whose social and spatial characteristics are very varied indeed. So also are their environmental characteristics, and their provision of services and other facilities. The peri-urban estates such as Kings Norton, Preston Road, North Earlham and Moulsecomb share common characteristics in being quite detached from mainstream city centre activities and having mostly lost a major local employer. Similarly, inner-city areas such as Greets Green, Shoreditch and West Gate have characteristics in common. Many of the areas have a main road running through which contributes to community severance. While the main roads are often well served by bus routes, overall, the levels of transport provision vary widely. So do fares, and in all areas there were those who found public transport expensive.

There is a considerable amount of sharing and self-help in some of the neighbourhoods, which suggests that however depressed the area may appear and however short of formal support, many informal social networks function to fill the gaps. About a third of the people interviewed individually had various reciprocal arrangements to do with shopping and keeping an eye on children, and about a third also said that car-owning neighbours helped them out by giving lifts. Of the others, many who did not have such arrangements nonetheless said there was a good sense of community, although there were, in all areas, those who clearly did not feel part of a local community.

One of the distinguishing features of all the neighbourhoods is that while the residents sometimes have to leave them in order to carry out their daily business, there is little or no reason for them to be visited from outside except by people who have a particular personal connection. Nor do people, in general, want to go to live there if they do not do so already. The result is that families perceived by residents as "problem" families are often rehoused there, which has the result of making the area less pleasant for those who already live there. This may be a contributory factor to the residents' fears about going out. While there were few fears for personal security during the day, with the exception of some ethnic minority women, in most of the areas there were a significant number of residents who were not happy to walk about at night. Recent research (DETR, 1999) has shown that this would adversely affect their willingness to walk to, and wait at, bus stops, which this study found was certainly true at night.

Because there are few reasons for outsiders to visit most of the New Deal neighbourhoods, with the exception of one or two neighbourhoods such as Hoxton, with its clubs and thriving market, inadequate transport into the areas is unlikely to trouble non-residents.

Nor does transport, as an issue, often appear to be one of the primary preoccupations of the residents, since the deficits of income, work, housing, security, etc, are likely to loom larger. But because it is not one of their immediate preoccupations does not mean that it is not part of the problem. The immediate problems present as, for example, lack of inexpensive shops, lack of facilities for young people, lack of jobs, lack of healthcare provision, lack of choice of schools, too many "problem families". In a culture with a predominantly localised outlook, which the New Deal areas tend to be, it would be expected by many people that facilities should be available within a short distance.

However, in the current climate in which facilities such as hospitals and large shops are more centralised and where employment is likely to be dispersed (rather than being available at, for example, one large factory in the proximity of the neighbourhood), good transport is an essential factor for the accessing of these facilities. Car owners are at a considerable advantage. Only if public transport was "adequate", would it be possible for the occupants of the New Deal areas to access all these facilities without a disproportionate expenditure both of time and money. If going to a supermarket involves two changes of buses, if going to work takes an hour and a half, if leisure time on Sundays is rendered useless because of the difficulty of movement, then inadequate transport is clearly contributing to the inability of people to participate in what would be considered normal activities of today's society.

What this study has focused on is not social exclusion in a general sense, but "socio-spatial" exclusion, i.e. the concentration of social categories excluded in certain "deprived neighbourhoods". In these areas, while it is clearly not possible to establish a direct line of causation between "social exclusion" in a general sense, and transport, it is quite clear that the two are connected. Where transport is good, and people can easily leave the depressed area to go about their business, local businesses are suffering, which adds to the downward spiral. If transport were better, the spiral could be more pronounced. But if jobs and services - including, crucially, financial facilities - were locally available, many of the existing transport systems, with a few improvements, might prove sufficient.

[10] There are about eight routes on each road.

[11] This and other quotes are from "Greets Green Comes Alive", Sandwell Regeneration Partnership submission to the Government Office West Midlands, December 1998.

Chapter 5 The Study Areas - Rural

1. Introduction

"Rural" is a term whose meaning is not particularly clear. Some use the term in a very literal sense, and would exclude towns from "rural areas". Others might describe a whole county, for example Northumberland, as a rural county, even though much of it (in terms of population density) is urban. Cullinane and Stokes (1999) suggest that the concept of rurality can be divided into two categories:

- that which relates to the countryside, in which rural areas are defined in terms of size of settlement. Under this category, a rural area is synonymous with the countryside, but includes small towns and villages. This category would include the idea that rural areas are 'non-urban' areas.
- that which relates to the economics of an area. Rural areas are defined in terms of the rurality of the economy and its dependency on agriculture, quarrying, and other industries associated with the

countryside, such as tourism.

The definition we are using is the first of these two.

The rural areas chosen for the purposes of this study are four broad areas where it is possible to include respondents from different locations representing a hierarchy of settlement size and distance from the main attracting centres. The four areas are in different regions. The original intention was that three of the areas would be in the hinterland of towns and cities containing New Deal Neighbourhoods. This proved to be possible in the case of Brighton and Birmingham, but harder in the third case, which was Yorkshire. The North Eastern area eventually selected was an area east of Doncaster, towards Hull, whose principal attracting centres are Doncaster and Worksop. The area has very particular problems, being a poor rural area, and being on the cusp of three counties: Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire and South Yorkshire. As well as being rural, it is an area in process of regeneration.

The fourth area, Devon, is included because Devon has particular problems of employment and isolation, particular transport problems because of the tourist influx, extreme contrasts of wealth and poverty, and was very keen to be involved.

Except for East of Doncaster, all the areas have some tourist trade areas and, in some cases, provide summer public transport for visitors only during the tourist season.

It was known from previous studies that there was likely to be a stronger connection between transport and rural social exclusion than between transport and urban social exclusion simply because accessibility is, in general, lower. Distances covered for basic needs are further, public transport networks are less dense and public transport journeys (by virtue of the distances travelled) appear more expensive to the user.

For example, in a travel diary survey conducted for a 'Car Dependence' study in the West Midlands/Shropshire border, the respondents included people who lived in Cleobury Mortimer and worked in the quarrying industry, with 20 to 30 mile journeys to work. The respondents were on very low pay, worked anti-social hours and were unable to travel if they were not given a lift (or did not have their own vehicles). [12]

In the study undertaken for the DETR on 'Attitudes to Public Transport', [13] rural labourers were identified for whom travel without a car was almost impossible as they were served by a bus service that ran only once a week. In some circumstances, a wife/partner or a single parent who could not drive was totally dependent upon neighbours or costly taxis to undertake obligatory journeys to attend hospital appointments or purchase the household food and supplies. The use of taxis appeared to contribute to rural poverty.

The relationship between public transport and social exclusion in rural areas is, at first sight, more obvious than that in urban areas, if only because in some rural settlements there is no public transport and thus the movements of non-car owners are likely to be very restricted. As with urban areas, this is a two way problem: not only can residents not always travel but potential visitors (or carers) may not be able to visit.[14]

The research approaches used for this part of the study include:

- i) Focus groups - it is appropriate to use this approach for a specific target population living in more densely populated areas with identifiable public transport problems (e.g. older people living in a medium/small town or larger village)
- ii) Hall-test mini-groups and/or on-street interviews in shopping towns, making sure that there is a representation of people living in the range of settlements in the area i.e. from deep rural isolated farm-houses and hamlets to larger villages and medium-sized towns.
- iii) Household interviews - this approach is particularly appropriate to use for the more isolated respondents, particularly for people who are either too poor or disadvantaged to get to a market or shopping centre.
- iv) Interviews with users and providers of mobile services (a mobile library was used).
- v) On-bus surveys, including new routes and services, and courtesy buses.
- vi) Questionnaire surveys in doctors' surgeries etc.

2. The Areas

West Sussex

The Area

Steyning (population 5,785) was the major centre. It is part of a nucleus of small villages surrounding Shoreham-by-Sea. The village, although containing pockets of social exclusion, is apparently prosperous. There are two thriving butchers, a bakers, two fishmongers and a small supermarket and a post office. Although the two greengrocers have closed down, there has been a recent attempt to initiate a monthly farmers' market which, according to anecdotal evidence, appears to have been thus far well supported. There is a well-stocked library that has travel information readily available, a church and a community hall. There is a lively social scene in the village for those who are not young. There are a couple of restaurants, but no take away shops, except a fish and chip shop that is closed at weekends. There is a large health centre, a pharmacist, who will deliver if necessary, and a leisure centre; a new swimming pool is to be built in the near future. Parking is free, but one car park is to have a four-hour limit imposed. The nearby bypass has enabled the village to be quite traffic-free. There are several bus routes and services of varying use and quality.

The large area called 'Midhurst' has a very thinly spread population and consequently very few buses. The villages are gradually being bought up by "outsiders" who are well off and run several cars. Those who have lived in the villages for a long time (and those who are young) are at a disadvantage, since shopping, doctors etc., are in the towns of Midhurst and Petersfield, and there is a health centre in Harting, and buses are few and far between.

Overview of Transport Connections and its Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

For those who did not have a car, there were serious limitations about what could be accomplished in this part of the country. Because car ownership is high, there was quite a high reliance on lift giving. There were also quite a number of people (particularly older ones) who liked the slow pace of life in the country and were quite happy both to base their lives round bus timetables and to wait if necessary. Trains were also used by some people in this area.

However, those people who did not have access to lifts, and who had time constraints in their lives, did find travelling really quite problematic, although they had developed a number of strategies for trying to overcome the problems (riding a farmer's tractor to a bus stop was one of them). The overwhelming similarity to some of the urban areas was the amount of time that public transport users had to spend just hanging around and waiting, which was even longer than in the urban areas.

They were also well aware of how the poverty of their quality of life was connected with transport. Unlike in the seriously depressed urban areas, a question such as "what's it like round here?" which in the urban areas would elicit responses about vandalism and the respondent not wanting to live there at all, was likely to elicit a response about transport. And there was a feeling of genuine fear among some older people who knew they would not be able to replace their very old car (nor be fit to drive one much longer) about what they would or would not be able to do in future.

South Shropshire

The Area

South Shropshire is close to Birmingham and the West Midlands conurbation. Despite this proximity, many small communities are poorly served by rural bus services. The question is not "how frequent are the bus services?" but "on which days of the week is there a service?". Shropshire has received some rural bus grant money that is being used to improve rural routes to the main market towns of Bridgnorth, Ludlow, Shrewsbury and Kidderminster.

Three communities were involved in the study. The first one selected was **Cleobury Mortimer** (larger village, population 2,010). Although this is a largely middle class, high car owning household population, particularly in the small hamlets outside Cleobury, Cleobury itself does contain a council estate which is inhabited by less advantaged people. It also has a bus route, the 132 (Cleobury Mortimer to Bridgnorth) which, as a result of the rural bus grant, now runs on a Saturday; this service has a Super Low Floor bus. Cleobury is also served by services running to/from Ludlow and Bewdley/Kidderminster.

The second area was **Highley** (population 3,330). Highley is an ex-mining community and has a working class population, with only smaller proportions of middle-class and higher car-owning households. The area is rapidly changing into a 'more desirable' residential area since the mine closed. The town is served by the Route 125, which runs to/from Kidderminster/Bridgnorth.

The third was **Ditton Priors** (population 450). There is a small industrial estate near Ditton Priors and some social housing. The area is served by the Route 141/142, which runs between Ludlow and Bridgnorth on weekdays only. Some buses are subsidised by Shropshire County Council.

The major destinations from all these places for more than the most basic facilities are Bridgnorth, Kidderminster, Telford and Birmingham (in particular Merry Hill). There is a voluntary social car scheme that serves all the villages. There is also a pre-bookable hospital bus. There appears to be quite a strong tradition of lift-giving in the villages.

Overview of Transport Connections and its Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

People without cars had difficulty getting about and were clearly seriously disadvantaged in terms of access to facilities, be they work, education, personal services, leisure, or anything else. For many more, the lack of transport definitely reduced the quality of life. There were also questions of affordability, particularly among older people. However, although people would have liked more services, many seemed fully aware of the bus operating economics. They pointed out that there were very few people using the buses and they felt that there was little chance that any more services could be provided.

But this does not mean that people were happy with the situation, only that they were pessimistically realistic about the possibility of improvements. Despite this, where services existed, they did feel it worth while to make suggestions for changes; for example, to routes and timings.

East of Doncaster

The Area

The study took place in an area South-East of Doncaster which contains a number of villages which were once pit villages, one village which until recently housed an RAF base, and two small towns. These towns and villages are in South Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire and North Lincolnshire. The main employment-generating town is Doncaster, but Harworth and Bawtry are also equidistant from Worksop.

Much local employment has disappeared over the last few years with the closure of the mines and of the RAF base. The settlement pattern is typical of a mining area in that there are quite distinct, mostly quite large villages, each of which would once have generated its own employment, but which are only a few miles from each other.

Harworth (Nottinghamshire, population - with the bigger village of Bircotes - 7,405) is a small and declining pit village south of Doncaster. There is an open cast mine that is still being worked with a very reduced workforce. Workers drive in from surrounding areas for which they receive an allowance; few workers are local. A clothing factory had employed 500 women machinists until its closure in December 1998. There is a small parade of shops, two of which are derelict, with a charity shop, a bookmaker, a convenience store and post office, a Chinese take-away, a dentist and a pub. There is also a poor quality second hand market that has been functioning for a month. There is also a primary school. There are no accessible open spaces and the only leisure facility, apart from the public house, is the Miners' Welfare Club.

Misson (Nottinghamshire, population 665) is, on the surface, an attractive village lying to the south east of Doncaster, with tidy housing and tended gardens. The village has a part time post office, open three mornings per week, which is inside a private house and has no signage at all. There is one food shop that is part of a warehouse complex. The goods are stacked on pallets inside and outside of the shop. The beverages on sale are tea and coffee substitutes and fizzy, artificial bottled drinks. Food is dried and of

very poor nutritional value, with high salt and sugar content and many artificial additives. When visited, it was quite busy with customers, all of whom are young, with one family loading goods into a car. The remaining customers appear to have arrived on foot. There is a limited bus service provided by two routes with long intervals between services. Most of the route around the village is hail and ride. The only bus stop is on the village green.

Wroot (North Lincolnshire, population 402) was, at the time of the visit, effectively closed! Like Misson, the housing looks well cared for, although the single village shop and post office was a little shabby with fading signs. There was one post card on the door, from a local teenager seeking babysitting work. The pub was also closed and the village was deserted. There were no bus stops or evidence of buses, although there are three buses scheduled per day to and from Doncaster (via Armthorpe) during the week.

Finningley & Finningley Estate (Doncaster, population 1283) lie to the south east of Doncaster. The area was a former RAF base and has declined rapidly. Many houses are vandalised and there are acres of disused buildings. Kosovan refugees have been moved into the area and were in evidence on the main road. Of all the areas visited, it was the most lively, with several people of all ages going about their business. The primary school was also bustling. Three bus routes serve the area with a minimum of a half-hour service during the week and an hourly service on Sundays. Two buses were seen during the visit and both looked well used. Stops are clearly marked and all had up to date timetables. Most had some form of shelter, although no seating.

Rossington (Doncaster, population 12,472) is south of Doncaster. It has the largest functioning pit in the area, but employs a fraction of its previous work force and pays a travel allowance to workers to come in from surrounding ex-pit villages to staff its three shifts. It is believed that even this limited operation will be scaled down. All workers drive in as public transport is not available at suitable times or routes. There is evidence of decline with the remaining shops in the parade opposite the pit head gates looking shabby and poor. The complex bus services are scheduled for 7 - 8 minutes during the week and half hourly on Sunday. Shops were having a difficult time. They reported on the massive decline of the village in recent years and a dependence on the pit. "Miners used to be able to earn Â£1,000 in some weeks, now they can barely make a living. Anyway most of the people down the pit do not come from the area and drive away to shop where they live". There had been a building society in the parade, but it had closed and there did not seem to be any financial facilities in the area.

The very small villages are pleasant and are being 'colonised' by rather better-off incomers who are car commuters. The larger villages/smaller towns have good and bad elements, but both unemployment and bored, stuck teenagers and the consequent vandalism, are the subject of many comments. The level of bus service is extremely variable, but they have improved, thanks to the Rural Bus Grant.

Overview of Transport Connections and its Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

Many people in this area appeared to have very low expectations, and employment opportunities have been decimated. There is little chance of any employment outside the major employment generating towns; other facilities are in short supply. However there appears to be a sufficient level of equality of circumstance and community spirit for people not to regard themselves as "socially excluded". As so often, there was reckoned to be far too little for young people to do in their leisure time. For those in the smaller villages who wanted to work, there were problems both looking for jobs and for getting to jobs (once found) if the person involved did not have a car. Other facilities were also hard to reach. Car owners

said they could not imagine living there without a car. Choice of any activity, and the times at which it could be undertaken, was clearly extremely constrained by the existing transport network, both in terms of availability and affordability.

West Devon - Tavistock and Princetown

The Area

West Devon, focusing on Tavistock and Princetown, after consultation with Devon County Council, was selected as a rural area with the potential to research a "socially excluded" population. There was the added interest for the study in that a strategy was already in place to try to address the needs of the rural population for adequate public transport. **Tavistock** is a smallish town (population about 12,000) on the western edge of Dartmoor which attracts people from a number of neighbouring villages and hamlets. It was once a traditional market town and has long been a tourist centre. Buses run between Tavistock and Plymouth at approximately half-hour intervals in peak hours; the first bus is at 0600 and the last at 2335. There are early morning services towards Tavistock from some of the villages and from Tavistock in the evening to link in with work times. There is some social housing on the periphery of Tavistock, some down-market privately rented and some privately owned. People from these areas were apparently serviced by the Family Centre.

Princetown, a village with a permanent resident population of about 450, is located high on Dartmoor. Housing clusters around the large prison and the main intersecting roads to/from Moretonhampstead and Tavistock. Housing varies substantially, and a significant proportion of the population is from socially disadvantaged groups. The village has a community association project. The accommodation in some streets is very run down and roaming dogs add to the sense of decay and disadvantage. There are few shops or facilities, but there is a Post Office. An infrequent bus service, No. 82, from Exeter to Princetown runs in the summer only. There is also a 98 route to Yelverton, whose frequencies have been improved with a rural bus grant, and which now runs nine times a day between 0722 and 1825.

Overview of Transport Connections and its Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues

From our own research, and also from other research conducted in Devon, under the auspices of Devon County Council, it would appear that the current transport system cannot accommodate all those who need to get to work, health and education facilities. Even residents of Tavistock said that, particularly in the winter, there was little opportunity for most activities there, and that they had to go to Plymouth (where there was also a far greater likelihood of employment).

In villages like Princetown, the concept of choice (as in choice of shop, choice of school, etc) was really meaningless for those who did not have their own car; and Princetown is considerably better served by public transport than many of the smaller settlements. Even people from two-car households (which may have had to overstretch their budget to run them) can find themselves with almost as limited opportunities as people in non-car households, depending on the use to which the cars have to be put and how many people are using them.

3. General Overview of Transport and Its Relationship to Social Exclusion Issues in the Rural Areas

As is clear from the brief descriptions, this is a heterogeneous collection of areas, whose social and spatial characteristics are very varied indeed. There is also a wide variety of transport provision.

The rural part of the study has not had to deal with concentrations of social categories concentrated in particular areas to the same extent that the urban part had to, but with much smaller groups and also individuals. In these areas it is much easier to establish a direct line of causation between "social exclusion" in a general sense, and transport.

One of the distinguishing features of the rural towns and villages is that none of them carries a stigma of being a "no-entry" zone. Some of them are provided with services from outside, such as a mobile library. Several of them are areas into which people want to move to live. Few people actively did not want to live there, except in the case of one remote Devon village, where "problem" families are often rehoused, with the effect of making the area slightly less pleasant for those who already live there. For those areas which attract tourists, there may be a problem of inadequate transport into the area, but that is not our principal concern unless the lack of access from outside is impeding the tourist trade.

Transport often appears to be one of the primary preoccupations of the residents, since they are aware that adequate transport is the only way that they can connect with work, services, education, shops etc. There are, of course, as in the urban areas, immediate problems such as a lack of inexpensive shops, lack of facilities for young people, lack of jobs, lack of healthcare provision, lack of schools or choice of schools. Where the cultures still retain a predominantly localised outlook, such as the ex-mining towns, however, there is still some expectation that facilities should be available within a short distance.

As has been spelt out for urban areas, in the current climate in which facilities such as hospitals and large shops are more centralised and where employment is likely to be dispersed, good transport is essential, and car owners are at a considerable advantage. Even if public transport was "adequate", it could do little more than to begin to offset the disadvantages of those who cannot for whatever reason run a car. Accessing all normal facilities would still be likely to involve a disproportionate expenditure, both of time and money, without super organisation. People's schedules are, in any case, often built round public transport timetables, and reliability is thus a key issue. Lack of adequate transport is clearly contributing to the inability of people to participate in what would be considered normal activities of today's society, although some are quite happy not to participate.

Thus, at a very basic level, many essential activities are extremely difficult to undertake at all because of the inadequacy of transport links. Even the right to a pension is reduced because of the time and money costs of collecting it. At a less basic level, the right to choose between competing alternatives is a value which is prized highly in society. Since almost every possible choice of activity requires transport, clearly for non-car owners in rural areas, this right could be said not to exist.

[12] 'Car Dependence Study' for the RAC Foundation.

[13] 'Attitudes to Public Transport', with Transport Studies Group, University of Westminster and TGA

[14] A recent study, "Care in the Country" (Department of Health, August 1999) has highlighted transport difficulties as a

major problem in the provision of care in the community.

Chapter 6 The People (effects of transport on different social groups)

Introduction

The initial way of structuring the study methodology was to look at where transport might be associated with social exclusion through the whole of the lifestyle, from very young to very old. Additionally, other groups were selected who might have particular transport problems, such as ethnic minorities or people with various physical and learning disabilities. Gender was not, initially, an issue.

As the study proceeded it became clear that it would be more appropriate to report on slightly different groupings; these are the groupings used below.

The picture given here is a 'global' one. Transport impacts on people obviously vary depending on the size of settlement. However, there are major elements of transport effects that appear to be common to all the settlements studied.

1. Very Young Children and Their Escorts and Families

The travel patterns of young children under school age, who do not travel independently, are reflected in the travel patterns of their carers. More or less all journeys travelled by children of 5 or under are normally not made independently.[15] Thus the travel patterns of this group have to be considered in conjunction with the travel patterns of parents. Their destinations will tend to be nursery, childminder, travelling with parent/carer to shops/friends/personal business etc.

Particular problems include:

- Problems with buggy-accessibility, so parents tend to walk
- No time to get on and off buses with children
- Bus drivers don't wait for buggy types to get settled on the vehicle
- Travelling with families (once some of the children are at fare-paying age) can be very expensive and, where taxis are cheap, taxi prices for such a group tend to be comparable. However, taxis won't always take large numbers of children
- Shopping and travelling with children, buggies etc, is very difficult. Children can be difficult to control on buses, especially on long routes. Single tickets are bought because cheap fare passes cannot be used at peak times. Where trains are used, station steps are difficult to negotiate, especially with children
- Problems of access to children's hospital, clinics and other medical facilities
- Buses don't always stop if they see a family with a lot of children
- Access to split families for the non-custodial parent can be difficult and can reduce the number of visits made if too inconvenient.

2. Children from 5-16, Statutory School Attendance Age and their Families

By this stage the journey to school is one of the more important journeys undertaken. [About 35% of all journeys made by schoolchildren] [16] However, more of their time is spent out of school than in it. There are many possible out-of-school leisure activities such as clubs, swimming, sport, classes of all kinds. Bus use is at its highest in the age group 11-19.[17]

This study is not looking specifically at very detailed problems of school travel which have been quite extensively studied elsewhere. However, the journey to school was a major consideration both among the children and their parents.

A high proportion of petty and opportunist crime is carried out by teenagers, partly because of a lack of accessible fulfilling activities - something which better travel facilities might help to ameliorate.

For the public transport operator, teenage travel can be associated with some problems, particularly in relation to the 'schools peaks' when large numbers of school children can overload services and cause concern to other passengers. When it comes to non-school travel, however, teenagers in general travel at off-peak times and in small groups, and represent an important market which is not fully recognised or catered for by most public transport operators.

Considerations mentioned by both young people and adults

- Buses driving past bus stops when bus not full
- Not enough school buses
- Transport constraints on choice of school
- Morning buses often do not stop, as they are full
- Frequent lateness at school had elicited letters from the education department

Concerns expressed by children/young people

- Nothing much to do in the area
- Don't like buses
- No buses to swimming pool
- Unreliability and expense of buses
- Cannot get to leisure facilities (time, money)
- Bus drivers often unfriendly (with good reason)
- Big differences in travel patterns and opportunities between those in car-owning families and those who don't have a car in the household. Some of those in car-owning families go all over the place e.g. on Sundays, in the car. Those without a car did not, and at this point commented that they couldn't get anywhere much on Sundays because the bus services were so bad
- If you could get around and could afford any admission fees, there were things to do - in contrast to some of the New Deal areas, where it was often felt (with justification) that there was little or nothing to do
- A lot of children could not go swimming - cost of bath *plus* fare too expensive
- Journey to school for older children (even secondary age) unsafe on foot - main roads and busy

junctions, stranger danger

- Problems about locations of secondary schools. The further away the school, the greater the probability of non-attendance and unpunctuality; also, where bus rides necessary, cost of fares became an issue
- Some secondary age children did not want to travel out of the area to school
- Some problems with Saturday jobs (unlikely to be within the New Deal areas) because of transport
- Feeling of not being wanted on the buses; older people prioritised
- Bus routes slow and long, and often had to go into town before going out again
- Transport sometimes seen as too expensive, although they did not always understand saver tickets, or how to get the best deal for their money
- There was also an image problem in using cheaper operators, and, for some, an image problem with buses in general
- Don't like standing about in the cold

3. Young Adult (After the Statutory School Leaving Age, 16)

For most older teenagers and young adults in areas of low car ownership, public transport represents the main form of independent transport to reach activities both inside and outside their local area, and the main means by which they can explore their wider environment. Nationally, buses are particularly important for those aged 17-20, and the peak age for bicycle use is also 17-20, for both males and females. It also has an important educative social function, as a setting in which teenagers can observe and interact with various social groups with which they might otherwise have little direct contact (e.g. older people).

Those in this age group are likely to be travelling either to school, further education or college, or to be job-seeking or, because of their age and inexperience, are in lower-paid jobs. It is also an age when leisure travel is extremely important. Almost all their travel is likely to be independent. However, it is at precisely this age that concessionary fares cease to be universally available, although, in some areas, there are both educational and/or unemployed concessionary fare schemes. There is also often a very limited range of off-peak services, which will impede leisure activity and can cause resentment that buses are not designed around their needs.

Many of the young people are quite untravelled and unsophisticated, and have very limited horizons.

Although they are likely to have been on package holidays abroad, their radius of familiarity - territory they "own" and within which they feel really confident - is often only a mile or two. On the other hand, this is an age group in which people very much like to just "get out" for its own sake.

Young ethnic minority people reported that they could be racially harassed both walking to transport and on-vehicle. Many young people felt that they were harassed by drivers, either by being left standing at stops, or by being treated badly on the buses.

Other young people said they spent most of their time hanging out on streets or in recreation grounds etc. Some admitted that, if bored, they might smash up a park bench or "kick the s..t out of someone's fence, or throw things at buses". None took responsibility for muggings and burglaries, and none of those interviewed owned up to car theft (although one was apprehended later). Some said they 'did a few drugs'.

Where possible they travel sometimes, to electronic games parlours or occasionally to sports (formal and informal) or to a cinema. The more energetic go swimming and a few even go cycling. They don't like hanging around, changing buses, etc. A lot say they would like better facilities e.g. for skateboarding or cycling in local parks.

The main points emerging from each group are outlined below:

- ALL

- Often, very few local leisure opportunities. Fares to get there and times of buses sometimes make it all rather difficult, especially when the cost of the activity is added to the cost of the fare.

- STUDENTS

- Post 16 school choice limited by transport routes and time taken

- Concessionary fares schemes very variable. One student had to spend Â£72 a month getting from home to university and back

- Buses crowded at peak times, no room to carry things, can't always get on and are late

- In general, bus fares could use a large proportion of income

- YOUNG WORKERS (low income)

- In some places, no cheap returns are available before 9. a.m.

- UNEMPLOYED

- some wanted employment locally where they felt it should be

- there were some problems with job-seekers concessions

4. Adult Job Seekers

Unemployed people were by far the most alienated group in the study, particularly the long-term ones. They were unlikely to have access to a car. [18] Those who did not have families and therefore had very limited benefits indeed and no other possible workers in the household seemed the most alienated. The activity of most of them was extremely localised (i.e. the pub or working men's club). Many of those with whom we spoke had very quickly after becoming unemployed got into a mentality of basically not getting up until very late, and not going very far unless it was absolutely necessary. Some of them had small jobs in the black economy and were able to live fairly acceptable lives. However, black economy work is far easier to get in rich than in poor areas and it was not easy to find in or close to most of the New Deal areas.[19]

Concerns expressed by adult job seekers

- Transport is one of several barriers inhibiting access to employment
 - Women are prepared to travel shorter distances because of family responsibilities
 - Transport used when seeking work was thought to be expensive
 - There were problems with routes and timings of buses, in particular
- a lack of non-radial bus routes
- insufficiently early and late safe buses for some shifts
- reliability of bus services
- There was "Postcode" and route discrimination by employers: not employing people from certain places either because of the reputation of the place or because transport links were known to be inadequate and unreliable
 - Work available locally did not necessarily go to locals - that relationship needs to be made contractual. Particularly if people are rather demoralised about work, watching jobs go to outsiders seemed to be unhelpful
 - In an Audit Commission study (1999) of job-seekers, 52% said that lack of private transport inhibited them from getting a job, and 23% said that they had been prevented from getting a job due to poor public transport

However, not all in the study areas shared this view; one older informant who had worked for the whole of his life in the printing industry in Leicester City Centre, considered that there were plenty of employment opportunities advertised in the local papers, even though jobs were no longer in 'traditional' industries. He remarked that *"they're just used to being lazy - any excuse will do, all they need to do is to get up early and travel like I did"*. He wanted to try to get a job as a car-park attendant in Fosse Park to supplement his pension. He still had to pay full rent as he lived with a brother who was still working and neither could claim rent or rate rebates.

5. Working Adults and Their Families

This is the group who, if they can afford it, is most likely to own a car (Glaister and Graham, 1996). However, car ownership is low in New Deal neighbourhoods and only about 30% of the study respondents were in car-owning households. It should also be noted that the impacts of car ownership on a household are not the same as the sum of the impacts on the individuals within that household; household logistics are an important factor.

Clearly those who were in work had managed to sort out their travel. They could get to work, and could get there with sufficient punctuality and reliability to keep their jobs. But the capacity to get there does not mean that their travel patterns were necessarily comfortable or satisfactory; indeed, very many of them were not.

Concerns expressed by working adults and their families

- Need to take taxis, at extra expense, because of shift work
- Couple needs to spend Â£20 a week on family travel from a single (low) income. This is not unusual
- Great fear of losing job due to lateness leads people to allow up to 3 times the possible journey time to ensure always being at work on time, which often means a great deal of wasted and unusable time

"I have to be at work at 6, so I leave home at 4.45 and arrive at 5.30 - walk and bus - and then hang around until 6. That would be 15 minutes in a car. On Bank Holidays and Sundays there's no buses, so if I'm working I have to take a taxi, and then people can't go out - they're stuck at home. There used to be a Sunday bus; now they've took it off. The day they took it off I didn't know it wasn't running, so I waited and finally took a taxi and had my pay docked." (working man)

- Price increases. *"Travelcard costs increase every year but wages don't"* (working man)

6. Lone Parents

Most of the problems encountered by lone parents are included in the general problems of travelling with young children. They involve shopping, getting the buggies on the buses, and the cost of transport where there are several children.

7. Women (General) Working and Non-Working

Women's transport use and requirements, whether in paid work or not, are different to those of men. While, nationally, there is little difference between the average number of trips made by men and women, men travel on average 45% further. [20] On the whole, the care of the children and the home, and the journeys and tasks associated with this care, is still very largely their responsibility. This includes trying to make the household budget go as far as possible. Often local shops are inadequate and more expensive than supermarkets, which may be difficult to reach. And even where there is a supermarket courtesy bus, it may not be possible to board it easily with a buggy - or not at all if the bus is already full. Basically, the mothers' priority could be summed up as needing.

"A cheap source of food AND getting there AND getting back."

Women also feel at greater risk of attack than men. In one area, which was said to be dangerous at night, there had been a Safe Women's Transport bus at one time, which was taken off for lack of funding.

Women in the New Deal areas tended to undertake very many of their journeys on foot. A typical day might start with walking the children to school (primary age only) and then a visit to friends or (where one existed) the Women's Centre or the Family Centre via the local shop. They might then walk home and do some housework, etc., and then those with children at primary school would have to go to pick them up again. Mothers with evening jobs might then wait for their partners to come home to baby-sit and be involved in a longer-distance journey by public transport to work. Low paid jobs included working at fairly local (two stops on the bus) care homes or office cleaning (usually 'black economy') with a longer associated bus ride.

For those working, the nature of many of their jobs meant that they might have to travel very early in the morning or late in the evening, which could be difficult.

Particular problems of the white women included:

- local bus service unreliable
- buses too small
- limited running times
- long waits with children at bus stop
- buggy on bus difficulties

Ethnic minority women

Very little background information is available on the transport patterns of ethnic minority groups; most transport data does not include any ethnic data. This question is currently the subject of research commissioned by the DETR's Mobility and Inclusion Unit.

The ethnic minority women had different priorities. Whether or not they spoke much English (and it was mostly not very good), some of them would not leave their houses for cultural reasons. For similar reasons they could not use a public bus - community type buses would be much more suitable and are, indeed, used by the minority groups. However there is in general a strong sense of community and extended family support which ensures that the women, although often (through Western eyes) apparently rather limited in their possibilities, are looked after and taken to shops, doctors etc., by family and friends.

However, there were those for whom culture would not have been a bar to using public transport, but who could not afford to do so. Others found it unpleasant because they had been subject to racist abuse as they walked to the bus which made going out uncomfortable. Some also perceived their area as dangerous, even during the day, and did not want to go out for that reason.

Some had problems of understanding and being understood by the driver, not because they had no English but for reasons of pronunciation. There were some who did not like timetables; they were originally from Turkey and had grown up being used to just going out knowing when the bus would turn up.

8. Those With Physical and Learning Disabilities, and Those with Poor Short-Term Health or Chronic Health Problems.

OPCS Disability Surveys (1998) showed that 3 million people cannot walk 200 yards without stopping and without severe discomfort, 2.3 million people cannot stand for 5 minutes without severe discomfort and 0.5 million people lose control of their bladder at least daily.

Thus there is a variety of physical and learning disabilities which can affect ease of travel. These are, on the whole, fairly obvious in the case of physical disabilities (such as bad legs) but less obvious in the case of, for example, heart or breathing conditions which may limit the ability to carry things, to climb, or to walk easily (for example to and from bus stops). People who are very small can also find transport extremely difficult to deal with - not only getting on and off vehicles, up and down steps etc., but also reaching handrails and bells.

Where people have psychological disorders they may suffer from, for example, claustrophobia on a crowded bus. Where there is a language challenge which may be as common as dyslexia then there can be problems reading numbers correctly or following signage. Thus bus and train stations can be difficult to negotiate.

For the most confident person, taking a bus to an unknown destination can be extremely daunting. For the less than totally competent it can be very difficult, with the symbolic codes of transport maps and timetables often beyond their comprehension.

They may lack confidence and need to be taken on a journey several times in order to feel confident about undertaking it alone.[21] Others who have difficulty speaking clearly often feel that they are misunderstood by drivers. As well as people having difficulty with getting themselves cheap tickets, one parent who could not read and write was paying full fare for his 15-year old son because although he knew of the existence of Photocards, he could not organise and get the necessary form sorted out.[22] Other problems include:

- Difficulty in getting help from drivers or passengers - nobody with time to help on the bus
- No accessible bus service serving local supermarket
- Lack of buses for evening classes

"Evening buses are a problem. There is a special needs group held at the school which finishes at 9 o'clock, but a number of people have said that they can't come because of the buses, which stop too early." (social worker)

- Changes in routes and service times is unhelpful to everybody, but particularly for people who are less than 100% competent and confident

"One of the problems about buses is that nobody ever gives them time. It takes a long time to get used to a system - probably a year at any rate; people need to know they are there, where they go, and that they can trust them." (social worker)

Finally, people with physical or chronic health difficulties tend to need more medical facilities than healthier people. In most of the New Deal areas there is not only a disproportionately high number of people with such difficulties but there is also a disproportionately small number of medical facilities, and hospitals are mostly rather difficult to reach.

9. Older People

Nationally, the number of people over the age of 65 is projected to increase by 8% in the period from 1987 to 2006.

Many of the older respondents in the study said that they were not particularly anxious to seek activities at any significant distance from their homes. They tended to visit (or be visited by) their families and friends, go shopping, go to localised entertainment facilities such as pubs (if independent) and to day clubs etc., if less independent. Having said this, however, concessionary pass holders did make good use of their passes to get out during the daytime, and for some, buses were a lifeline which stopped them feeling isolated. Some respondents were using their passes to travel to go shopping with their friends several times a week and said how much better they felt to be able to do this.[23] Most of them did, however, not seem

particularly interested in going out a great deal in the evenings.

In terms of the New Deal areas, pensioners are not particularly badly off financially relatively to the surrounding population, since they have a guaranteed income in hand, often a number of other benefits, and usually concessionary travel passes. They are not likely to be saving to make major purchases.[24] On the other hand, in terms of facilities such as doctors and hospitals, they are not at all well off. In the rural areas some of the older people are relatively extremely badly off.

Those who did want to travel further for evening activities did not find it easy. Even if there was a bus, there was still the question of walking to and from the stop, in the dark. There could be a problem both with distance and perceived personal security.

Specific points about public transport included:

- boarding and alighting problems with non-accessible buses
- drivers not waiting until they had a seat
- no conductor to help them on the bus
- bus stops in inconvenient places, no shelters
- long waits for buses, sometimes in the cold
- poor lighting on streets makes them threatening at night
- need to spend money on taxis for some journeys
- cross-border inconsistencies in concessionary fares
- no bus links to local hospital
- problems getting to chemist and post office
- not enough GPs within reach, and lack of home visits

These concerns are very similar to those expressed by older people studied in Newham and Tower Hamlets by CILT and outlined in their 1998 report.

They also mirror those found in the Help the Aged Transport Council Report.[25] From the evidence of our study we would endorse their view that the top four issues for older people for transport are SARA - Safety, Accessibility, Reliability and Affordability. These are "*the four transport requisites for an inclusive society to ensure mobility, inclusion, quality of life and dignity*".

The report points out that "*. . . The whole philosophy of sustaining people independently in their own homes and meeting their needs in the community depends on their mobility Transport must offer a varied service with door-to-door flexibility to take people through transport interchanges, right to the heart of town centres, to ShopMobility schemes, hospitals, and libraries. . . In rural areas - more older people are having to travel out of their villages. . . one in four still rely on some form of public, community or voluntary transport. Where these services are not readily available every day, people's ability to live fulfilled lives is severely restricted.*"

10. Local Traders

Trade is (and has always been) the base of the social focus of most communities, not only for economic but also for social reasons. The village shop, pub, or corner shop, is often a meeting place, and the greater the selection of shops, the less likely people are to have to leave their area and spend their money elsewhere. It was therefore thought worthwhile to seek the views of at least a few traders.

Local traders in the New Deal communities were aware of the effects that transport had and might have on their businesses. While they could see the need for good transport, the better the transport, the more competition they would have from supermarkets and the likelier their businesses would be to be adversely affected.

A need for banks in the area so that people could get hold of cash to spend locally was expressed. The question also arose of whether a local supermarket would keep people shopping in the area and thus lead them to transact their other business locally.

Conclusions

Transport has a significant impact on the lives of socially excluded people in all age groups.

Families with very young children who need to be escorted often find travel difficult, expensive, and time-consuming, which constrains work and other opportunities. Bus unreliability and driver attitudes, as well as their own behaviour, can cause problems for children's and young people's school journeys, and constrain choice of school and college. Buses can also be expensive for young people in some areas.

While some young people welcomed and enjoyed public transport for the freedoms it could provide, others resented it as not catering for their needs, and it was very common to find reports of considerable antagonism between them and drivers, and between them and other passengers. On the whole, they were waiting for the day when they could acquire a car so that they would no longer be dependent on public transport.

For job-seekers and people wanting training, travel opportunities and costs have been shown to affect their ability to get a job. There was in some places also an apparent reluctance to travel more than a certain distance or time to work (in some cases it was as low as 15 minutes) which may be related to historic factors of past employment patterns, but was found also to be related to an unwillingness to spend long hours travelling for little reward.

Those who were in work were often spending a great deal of time travelling, allowing extra time because of a fear of losing a job through lateness. If working on shifts, they sometimes had to spend extra on taxis. It was not hard to find the family of a low income working person spending about Â£20 a week on the travel costs of all family members.

Women had different travel needs from men. Among our respondents women made more trips than men, largely because they were responsible for trips concerned with the care of the whole household. They also tended to want to travel more at off-peak hours, and some had difficulty with very early morning or late evening services associated with, for example, cleaning jobs. [26] For some, particularly among the older age groups and at night, there was a feeling of lack of personal security.

Ethnic minority women had very specific problems relating to language abilities and cultural constraints.

Those with physical and learning disabilities could find the system difficult to use, and were hampered by the lack of nearby help. They were faced with a "double whammy" in some areas, in that while they were the people most in need of medical facilities, they were also those who were likely to have the most difficulty reaching such facilities.[27]

Many older people, even in rural areas, expressed reasonable satisfaction with the transport available. They were not very time-constrained, and some appeared to prefer more localised activities to activities involving much travel. Many of them had concessionary passes which made travel relatively more affordable than it was to other groups, and made good use of these passes to get around. But where some form of public, community or voluntary transport was not readily available, or even where boarding and alighting points were inconveniently placed and lacked shelters, lives could be severely restricted.

Transport, how it was used, and what it symbolised, had different meanings to the different groups. But it would be fair to say that to many older people, while its access function was important, it also represented a meeting place, removal from isolation, a change of scene, and a warm "ride" and the possibility of remaining in touch with life outside the immediate vicinity.

[15] National Travel Survey HMSO London 1995.

[16] *ibid.*

[17] Focus on Personal Travel, DETR 1999, Chart 4.1.

[18] DETR (1999 Focus on Personal Travel, Table 5.4).

[19] A study on Travel Barriers to Employment carried out by Centro said that travel distance was not necessarily the major factor, but that two related factors were critical: "historical journey to work travel patterns and the nature/orientation of the transport network", which bears out the current research.

[20] NTS 1999. It should be noted that these figures are based on 60% household car ownership, which is not a characteristic of New Deal areas.

[21] Some careers services, e.g. Enfield, have travel training programmes to overcome this barrier to travel

22 This reinforces a case made several years ago that Photocards should ideally be distributed through schools

[23] Where new rural bus grants had led to the provision of new services there was considerable gratitude.

[24] This is not intended to mean that they are well off. They still have to count their pennies and anything resembling luxury expenditure is, on the whole, out of the question.

[25] Help the Aged, London 1998.

[26] NTS statistics (1996/8) for all journeys including walk for women and men aged from 16-29 in non-car-owning households are 1839 for men, 2118 for women.

[27] Problems of out-patient attendance have many reasons, but transport is important. See Pearson (1992).

Chapter 7 The Adequacy of Public Transport

1. Introduction and background

This chapter takes the definition of "adequacy" under the four separate categories of Affordability, Availability, Accessibility and Acceptability [see Appendix 1 for definitions] and draws some conclusions from the fieldwork (and other) evidence.

It is important to set the background which underlies the views expressed on public transport. Perceptions of adequacy are conditioned by the overall local situation and by the situation of the respondent. An older person who may have both a free bus pass, few time constraints, and decide on their destination according to where public transport routes run, is more likely to say that public transport is affordable and adequate in terms of timing and routes than a low-paid shift worker with no choice of destination or bus service.

There can be no doubt that travelling by public transport is invariably a great deal less convenient than travelling by car, with the exception of a journey on a service that is frequent, reliable, comfortable and cheap, and which goes directly to a destination where there is little or no chance of parking a car. Most of the people with whom this study is concerned, both in the New Deal areas and in the rural areas, do not have regular access to a car and are familiar with the public transport that is available to them. Their perceptions of an 'easy journey' cannot be compared with the perceptions of car owners; their base standard is considerably lower.

While many car owners and members of higher socio-economic groups might consider it normal and clearly consider acceptable to make quite long journeys to reach facilities such as schools, work, shops etc., those in this study have much more localised existences. In a number of the areas this is because there has been at one time a local, probably paternalistic employer (factory, coal mine etc.) which has provided employment for quite a high proportion of local residents. In some cases, it has been assumed that local jobs would always exist and they might pass from father to son. When the local employer has contracted or gone, a major underpinning of the local culture has been destroyed. This is true of both urban and 'new rural' areas such as former coal-mining villages.

Of the area North of Doncaster, one report writes, *'This is a rural area. It is considered "in many ways... not a typical rural area at all. It contains within it at least three different types of community, which have been overlaid on each other as economic activity and transport systems have developed." Once a farming community, then a coal mining community, with the closure of the local pits, "not only has the main source of local employment dried up, but with it has gone much of the social support network such as social clubs and sporting facilities. Residents are having to look further afield for work and other services, and neither they nor the transport systems have yet fully adjusted."* [28]

The whole of the local economy has been adversely affected by these changes, with a reduction of choice in e.g. local shops, at the same time as the general widening of car ownership has fostered a culture of choice. This has led to a situation in which residents are forced to make journeys which are frequently awkward and time-consuming (journeys which would be found intolerable by car owners). Perhaps not surprisingly, there are cases in which those who were accustomed to localised employment, even if they have the requisite skills, which is often not the case, have not adjusted to the need to travel further if they are to have regular employment. If they did, given the likely nature of their potential earnings, it is likely that travelling would take a disproportionately large amount of those earnings.

The journey patterns are also more dispersed. This does not help in terms of the provision of commercial services. The density of passengers to any one destination (whether working, shopping, leisure or schools) is likely to be too low for a commercial service to be viable.

What people say about the adequacy of public transport and improvements they would like to see made sometimes vary. They are identified separately below; the improvements are those suggested by respondents, which may not necessarily be the recommendations of this report.

Public transport is used in a wider transport context, which (in the case of most of the areas surveyed) involves a great deal of walking. The walking environment impacts directly on the public transport environment. As well as the "4 A's" constituting adequacy, there is also a section on traffic and suggested improvements to the public transport environment.

2. The adequacy of current public transport

Affordability

Affordability is clearly an extremely important consideration in most of the areas we have visited. The impression we have so far had is that public transport users are well aware of all the various ticket prices and the ticket differentials between the different services and operators. They were also clear about how it would impinge on their household budget. We had the impression that those who are having the most difficulty are working people on low incomes who have to travel to work. Their travel costs can be a significant part of their take-home pay and they have no choice but to pay it. They are also sometimes penalised by not being able to buy a (cheaper) return before 9 a.m. They are also financially penalised by restricted hours of service operation, which means that they may sometimes have to take a taxi.

Where there is no concession available for job-seekers, and even, in some instances, where there is, travelling to look for work can take up quite significant proportions of their income. As an example, someone who is on the minimum level of £50 in hand who wanted to spend time seriously job-hunting could easily spend £8-10 a week even with a concession; this would be nearly a fifth of his/her income and leaves very little indeed.

Many people who were on extremely low incomes and/or unemployed said that if ticket prices were cheaper, or better deals were available, they would be more likely to use transport more often. They were likely to be spending 10% of their very low weekly incomes on transport.

Getting to hospitals could be expensive; so could going to supermarkets - but local shop prices would be much more expensive, so the fare had to be paid. It was among the women in particular that there seemed to be a very low take-up of weekly tickets and a consequent higher total outlay on bus travel. Although, given their stated journeys, a weekly bus pass would have meant cheaper travel, they found it difficult to part with a large "up-front" sum. Research conducted elsewhere suggests that this is related not only to financial considerations but also to a lifestyle that is not particularly routinised.

Families could not all afford to go out together. The lack of concessions for older schoolchildren was also a financial penalty and provided a constraint on the school or college that the older child could attend.

There were also geographical limits to travel imposed by differential concessions which meant that even if half a journey was, say, half price, the rest of it might need a full fare.

A comparison was also made with the potential costs of travelling by car. Because public transport was perceived as expensive, there were those (among the less alienated and depressed) who had worked out that if a few people clubbed together and bought an old car then a great deal of money (and time, and hassle) could be saved on transport.

Rural dwellers found transport particularly expensive. Although their per mile costs were often a great deal lower than those in urban areas, they might have to make quite a long journey, spending several pounds, just to reach basic facilities or, indeed, to draw their benefits.

Suggested Improvements: Affordability

- better concessions and more uniformity from area to area
- a freedom ticket that covers a much wider area
- easier and cheaper concessionary tickets for job-seekers and young people
- cheaper tickets in general

Availability

A common feature was that while main road and radial services might be quite good, and possibly even quite frequent, other services were not. It was therefore often necessary to travel to a centre and then out again even when making a fairly short "as the crow flies" journey.

There was at least one instance of a bus that was supposed to go off the main road, but did not do so if it was behind schedule; there was also a problem with buses that were cancelled.

In each urban area there tended to be one rather local bus for which people had to spend a very large amount of time waiting, and which was known to be unreliable, crowded etc, as well as quite frequent services down the nearest main roads. In several areas there were problems of getting to work because of bus changes which led to quite excessive amounts of time being spent getting there and back, and also to a great variability in journey times. There were some problems with early morning buses, and often very few evening and night buses. There were also very few Sunday buses which was very unhelpful both for Sunday workers and those wishing to access leisure facilities or just to go out on a Sunday.

It was, of course, not just work journeys that were affected but also journeys to schools, hospitals etc.

The worst affected were those where time was crucial and people (schoolchildren, workers, patients) were likely to incur some kind of penalty if they were late. However, even if there is no penalty, waiting at bus stops (e.g. with small children) is in itself a stressful activity and is of course unpleasant and bad for those who have to stand for long periods (particularly older people and people with physical and illness problems). The availability situation is considerably worse in rural areas, and those reliant on buses tend to organise their lives round bus timetables.

The lack of public transport availability meant that in some areas, both urban and rural, employers were not very keen to employ people unless they had a car or transport which would guarantee to get them to work on time.

Where courtesy buses to shops and supermarkets existed, they seemed to be well known and, apparently, well used.

Rail and underground services were considered more reliable, but price, as well as the fact that the journeys they service tend to be in a wider than local area, makes them irrelevant to many of the people who are the subject of the present research.

Suggested Improvements: Availability

Routes[29]

- more transport between main roads, i.e. on very local routes
- a regular and reliable service with a maximum 10 minute headway on the main roads
- more transport to places of employment
- more transport to social facilities/entertainment
- more direct services where possible
- transport to stations
- transport to hospitals

Timings

- evening services
- more buses on Sundays
- more frequent and reliable buses on key routes, especially locally
- more reliability

Other Availability - Specific Suggestions for Various Improvements

- Taxishare arrangements for school run
- school buses
- a community bus for group trips out of the area
- a community bus route for inside the area
- a direct service to the bigger supermarkets; if not possible, at least a weekly shopping bus with a choice of supermarket
- more hail-and-ride services

Accessibility

Getting to the right bus stop was sometimes a long walk and sometimes quite difficult (e.g. up hill with heavy shopping). Sometimes people had to go through areas perceived to be dangerous or under unpleasant subways. If there was a long walk to a stop and then no shelter or seats, a journey could be particularly unpleasant. Sometimes the walk was difficult because of poor pavements or difficult roads to cross. It is difficult for many older people to carry even two heavy shopping bags from supermarket (where their food is affordable) to the bus stop, onto the bus, and back home at the other end. Mobility buses (where they existed) were a help.

Most buses are not yet buggy/wheelchair accessible. Those that were, were sometimes very crowded or full up. However, accessible buses were appreciated a great deal both by those with small children and by older people.

There was often a lack of information and facilities - no shelters, no directional signs, no timetable and no route numbers. This was particularly true of very local routes, but was also true of some main road routes. It should be noted that much information is spread by word of mouth or simply by people seeing the bus on the road, and that it takes many months (nearer 12 than 3) before people will begin to 'believe in' a route and become regular users.

Some people whose English was poor had difficulties, as did those who found it hard to read the number of the bus. Regular users often 'knew' the bus from its colour etc.

Suggested Improvements - Accessibility

- disabled and wheelchair accessible service to shops etc
- more buggy-friendly buses (e.g. low-floor)
- easier and more ubiquitous information
- more hail-and-ride type services
- more provision specifically for older people

Acceptability

There was a general feeling about quite a lot of services that they were dirty, unpleasant, or overcrowded. Some were considered old-fashioned, or just old and in poor repair. There were also problems with drivers: there was routes on which drivers were considered friendly and helpful, and others on which drivers were considered very unhelpful; for example, where they did not wait for people to sit down, which could lead to accidents, or drove past waiting passengers without stopping. People would have liked conductors; young people (who do not know what a conductor is) said that the presence of some kind of inspector on the bus would be likely to get them to moderate their excesses.

Teenagers and young people often behaved badly on buses; also teenagers didn't like the behaviour of older people on buses. However there were other people who perceived buses as being principally for older people. Changing buses with all the waiting involved was disliked. Waiting in the cold was a particular cause of misery. Buses were considered to be inferior transport; e.g. "it takes forever, you have to wait for twenty minutes and then it takes forever on the bus and you have to stand at the bus stop!"

(unemployed man age 18). There are some ethnic minority groups for whom the use of public transport per se is unacceptable. This is not related to the transport itself but to the culture of the non-users. There were also problems of racial harassment on buses which led to comments about single deckers being preferable because such harassment was less likely when a staff member could hear what was happening. An interesting point was also made about a Hail and Ride in London that had not been successful; its failure was attributed partly to the fact that nobody knew what it was because it was blue, but Londoners are "psychologically programmed for Red Buses." When a bus is the only way of getting around, the ability to make the journey seems to take priority over the quality of the journey. This was summed up by one middle-aged woman "You get used to it. It's take the bus, or stop at home."

Suggested Improvements: Acceptability

- more careful and more civil drivers
- bigger buses on crowded routes
- two-person buses so people can get help
- buses not to drive past unless full up
- better safety and security
- cleaner buses
- toilet facilities at all stations
- seats and bus shelters
- working on-bus machines for "Clipper" tickets

3. Traffic and suggested improvements to the public transport environment

- something to stop cars speeding through the area, particularly the joyriders, and to make it safer for children to walk to school
- separate pedestrians and cyclists from the cars
- traffic calming, including traffic lights and pedestrian crossings
- better consultation locally
- cycle-friendly routes - but making sure they are friendly also to mobility impaired people
- a community transport 'mother's shopping bus' (for shopping, clinics and classes)
- an alternative to subways
- better security at stations

4. Conclusions

Many of the people spoken to, whether in groups or as individuals, appeared to be fairly content with the public transport available to them. It is, however, difficult to assess how far their activities and aspirations are conditioned by existing transport and how their activity patterns might change if it were different. This showed up most clearly in rural areas, where the supply was mostly much more limited than urban

transport, and where a number of people consciously plan their activities round the bus timetables.

However, contentment was by no means universal. People were aware that transport was a factor which limited their activity patterns and possibilities. These patterns and possibilities ranged from the impossibility of finding convenient work through a lack of transport, to the curtailing of social opportunities - which might include visiting a family member in hospital. In all areas where surveys were conducted, respondents could indicate where possible improvements might be made.

Thus even where public transport could be considered to adequately cater for the needs of particular groups in particular areas, deficiencies could still be identified. Nobody really wants to stand waiting for half an hour in the rain waiting for a crowded bus which will only take them half way to their destination before they have to change.

In the context of neighbourhoods of low mobility and low car ownership, such as the New Deal neighbourhoods, mobility norms are lower than average.[30] Public transport may seem to many to be perfectly adequate for localised horizons. For those with no time constraints, and cheap tickets, leading quiet lives, there may be no problem. For people with time constraints or for people who want to choose when they travel, commercial public transport appears not to be adequate, and is probably therefore one of the barriers to social inclusion.

[28] North Doncaster Transportation Study. Carried out by the MVA Consultancy and MCL Transport for SYPTE in

collaboration with Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council and the Rural Development Commission.

[29] It is not suggested that this transport should necessarily be regular bus transport.

[30] The average person aged 30-49 in a car-owning household would travel 10,457 miles per year; in a non-car-owning household this figure would be 3,738 miles. Since 69% of households have cars, the social "norm" is skewed towards the higher figure.

Chapter 8 Transport Provision

Introduction - what does "public transport" mean now?

"Public transport" is generally used to refer to timetabled bus routes and train services. Thirty years ago, particularly in disadvantaged areas, discussions about ridership would have had to take into account walking, cycling and works buses, but would probably not have had to consider competition by any other forms of transport. However, the situation has now altered. While walking is still the basic mode of travel for many, cycling is uncommon. So are works buses. However, taxis and hire cars of various types are increasingly used, particularly by low income groups, and there are various more specialised forms of transport, some of which are designed for particular groups at particular times, and some of which would appear to have taken over to a certain extent the functions of normal buses.

"Public" transport used or available in the survey areas includes

- commercial and tendered bus services
- supermarket courtesy buses
- taxis
- health and social services transport
- education transport
- community transport of various types
- various types of rail and tram service

1. Commercial Buses and Tendered Buses

Since 1986, outside London, a bus operator can run any service as long as the route and timetable is registered with the Traffic Commissioners 42 days before the service starts, and that 42 days' notice of any changes are given. [In 1998, there were over 22,000 registration changes.] These are called 'commercial services'. Fares are not controlled; the operator sets the charges. There is no limit to the number of operators who may try to run a route. County councils and unitary authorities have the power to pay for a bus service to be provided along routes where there is no commercial service or where they wish to add journeys. Bus operators are invited to tender for these services. The bus company registers the route and then (almost always) it collects and keeps the fares while receiving a subsidy from the council. Bus infrastructure is provided by the local authority, sometimes via a Passenger Transport Executive. Bus quality contracts as proposed in the 1998 White Paper "A New Deal for Transport" would give operators exclusive rights to run a route or group of routes to local authority specification and subject to performance targets.

Some basic economics of bus provision

Because of the confidentiality requirements of commercial companies, accurate cost and revenue figures are difficult to acquire. One operator from a subsidiary of the "Big Three" companies said that he reckoned that for a daily service to break even, it would need to carry 2,500 trips per week; to earn the standard level of profit considered adequate for shareholders would require 3,000 trips. This approximate "rule of thumb" figure is normally based on 40 passengers per bus-hour. The average cost of a bus kilometre was estimated at 77 pence in 1997/8.[31]

As an example of the economics, in dense urban areas a passenger can be charged about 45 pence a mile, whereas in rural areas, where a shopping journey might, for example, be 20 miles rather than 2, it is difficult to charge much more than 10 pence a mile.[32] But whereas the urban bus might have 700 passengers during a single shift, the rural bus will be doing well if it has 30, and the outer city/suburban/off-peak bus will be somewhere between these two extremes.[33]

The figure of 40 passengers per bus hour can be attained by services running regularly down main radial routes in densely populated urban areas. There is normally also the space on such roads to carry large and accessible vehicles. Running buses off the main roads in less densely populated areas is normally commercially unviable, and if roads are too narrow and/or are calmed with traffic humps, it may be difficult or impossible for low-floor vehicles to enter the area.

Where tendering is concerned, West Yorkshire PTE, for example, when running tendered services (in a metropolitan area), provides a subsidy of about 25 pence per passenger mile. The average trip is about 3 miles. If on average more than 20 people are using the bus at any one time, they would expect a commercial operator to be interested in running the service. If the average is less than 6, then running a service cannot be justified.³⁴ Bus prices are about 50 pence a mile, half price for children under 16.

If services are bought in to enhance existing services, they must not inhibit competition. It is believed that this requirement has deterred local authorities from buying in services and modifications to the 1985 Act to qualify the requirement are being suggested.

2. Other transport providers

Other transport providers include post buses (in rural areas), school buses, social service and health service vehicles, taxis and taxi-buses (includes 'hire cars' and minibuses), courtesy buses, and social and voluntary transport.

It is difficult to estimate how many people or areas are served by these providers. Our evidence to date suggests that it is extremely patchy and that it is possible that, for example, the most rural areas may not be served.

In 1997, for example, of 8,212 rural parishes surveyed,^[35] 21% were served by a community minibus or social car scheme. The variation in transport provision was considerable; for example, 38% of parishes in East Sussex and West Yorkshire recorded the existence of a supermarket courtesy bus, compared to none in former Cleveland. However, the bigger the parish, the likelier they were to have one of the above types of transport.

Supermarket courtesy buses

In many areas now the major supermarket chains run courtesy buses which go to one of their bigger stores, allow a couple of hours shopping time, and then return. The trip is normally free and usage of the service is not confined to those spending particular amounts of money. One local authority in our survey has arranged to operate the route itself because it wanted more control, but the service is sponsored by Tesco. This authority (West Sussex) includes the times of all the courtesy buses - not just the Tesco one - in its bus timetable.

As far as can be ascertained, provision of these services is not organised from the store headquarters but is in the hands of the local stores. We do not have comprehensive information on these services, but we believe that they warrant further research; this study has consistently found them extremely popular. It is not clear, for example, how far they are duplicating commercial or tendered routes, or whether they are being used for journeys that could not otherwise be made at all.

Taxis and hire cars

The availability of these, and their price, varies very significantly between areas. In some places they are almost automatically preferred over buses when 2 or more people are travelling together. In other places they are too expensive to substitute for buses. It is believed by some that there may be a correlation between unemployment levels and availability of hire cars/taxis, and that they are invariably more

available during economic recessions.

Social Services and Health Service transport

Some transport to hospitals, day-care centres, etc, is provided by Health and Social Services. Provision of this varies from area to area; some is provided by the institutions themselves, some is provided by local authorities and some is contracted out to Community Transport organisations. This report does not go into the economics of this service except to make some comparisons where Community Transport provision of the same service is being made. In Sandwell, for example, in 1994,[36] a comparison between social service and other providers gave comparative average trip costs of Sandwell Community Transport Â£2.00, Ring and Ride Â£3.75, Social Services Â£6.25 and Patient Transport Services a cost of Â£8.00. In Hackney, it is reported that some Social Service trip costs exceeded Â£15, compared to a potential Â£2.60 on the Hackney Plusbus, which is an accessible Hail and Ride service which is free to the user and runs a half-hourly service.

Education transport (Bus and Taxi)

Education authorities have a duty to provide home to school transport free for a pupil of any age where they consider this necessary to facilitate his or her attendance at school or further education college. This transport will be to a school or a selection of schools determined by the LEA. The conditions under which it will be provided have remained basically the same since the 1944 Education Act. LEAs also have the power to pay all or part of the reasonable travelling expenses of any pupil who is not entitled to free school transport, and some do so. However the extent and provision of support to pupils also varies from area to area, as does the way in which provision is made.

Social and Voluntary Sector transport

Voluntary sector transport is "local passenger transport provision which is not provided through scheduled bus or rail services, and which is organised on a non-profit basis by voluntary organisations, community transport groups, and other non-statutory bodies." [37] Community transport covers the transport needs arising from the issues of gender, ethnicity, young people, isolation, poverty and people on low incomes, as well as older and mobility impaired people. The first generally recognised voluntary community transport scheme was established by a vicar and some social workers in Birmingham in 1966; it was initially founded to transport recycled furniture to those in need.

Originally, voluntary car schemes were almost exclusively concerned with transporting people for social services, health and education purposes; group hire minibus projects began to appear at the end of the 1960s. Demand-responsive services "Ring and Ride" etc., started to appear in the early 1970s. They were based on an American idea and their objectives included providing for widely dispersed trip patterns and of providing services to low density suburban areas. However, they were not very successful and began to specialise in providing transport for mobility impaired people.

The organisation of Community Transport has been gradually professionalised and in 1986 the Community Transport Association was formed. This provides an advice service, vehicle purchase schemes, and training course including the MiDAS scheme. It also acts as a lobby group.[38]

i) Minibus Schemes.

The Section 19 small bus permit allows the operator to charge for travelling - either one charge for hiring the whole vehicle or individual fares - but it does not allow the general public to be carried. The limitations are as follows:

- (the hirer) must be a non-profit-making operation
- the body applying for the permit must be concerned with, broadly speaking, charitable aims
- members of the public may not be carried
- travel will generally be pre-arranged
- the operator permit will cover the nature of the groups to be carried
- most Section 19 permits are for minibuses having 9-16 seats (small bus permit) plus the driver
- 'Large bus permits' for vehicles with 17 seats or more can be obtained, but there are restrictions on who may hold the permit and also on maintenance and driver licensing
- drivers may be paid for driving
- most drivers will not need to take a second driving test

The Section 22 Community Bus Permit allows what is effectively a public bus service which may 'ply for hire'. The limitations are:

- it must be a non-profit-making operation
- the general public may be carried
- booking in advance is not necessary
- it can be a conventional bus service with a fixed route or may introduce a fair degree of flexibility; in either case it will be to a published timetable
- other work may be undertaken at a profit, but only in order to support the bus service
- the vehicle may not have more than 16 passenger seats
- drivers may not be paid for driving (but may be reimbursed out-of-pocket expenses)
- most drivers will not need to take a second driving test

Some basic economics of Section 22 bus provision

The following was given as an example of how community bus provision compares in economic terms with tendered provision in a rural area.

Assuming 3 weekly return bus journeys to the local town, 1 hour each way, 150 bus/journeys per year. On a commercial basis that would cost about $\hat{\text{£}}100$ for each day, $\hat{\text{£}}300$ per week = $\hat{\text{£}}15,000$

The community bus will cost about $\hat{\text{£}}15$ per return trip - $\hat{\text{£}}45$ per week = $\hat{\text{£}}2,500$ per year (this includes maintenance and, if the bus is used every day, capital replacement).

ii) Social Car Schemes

Social car schemes are effectively formal lift-giving schemes. Transport is provided by a driver, through a co-ordinator. Fare payment can be made through the journey and the driver receives expenses.

The legislation (in the 1980 Transport Act) gives exemption from the laws governing taxis etc. provided

- the fares paid for a journey do not exceed the running cost of the vehicle for that journey - priced at average rather than marginal cost
- the journey and agreement to pay a fare are pre-arranged
- there is no 'plying for hire' (i.e. picking up casual passengers)

iii) Legislation

Relevant legislation from the Transport Act 1985

- Section 57 and 63 placed responsibilities upon Passenger Transport Authorities and local authority public transport departments relating to older people and people with disabilities. The authorities were required to have greater involvement in their transport and to allocate additional resources. Future legislation is to make it obligatory for these authorities to provide for a free pass to pensioners and disabled people which will give them transport on local bus services at a maximum 50% of the standard fare.
- The minibus permit system was simplified to make it easier for private organisations to run them.
- The Rural Transport Development Fund was established, to be administered by the Rural Development Commission (now part of the Countryside Agency). This has been responsible for the purchase of minibuses, the development of networks of community buses and the funding of rural transport advisor posts.
- Provision was made for operating minibuses under what are now known as Section 19 and Section 22 permits (see section on Community Transport.)

iv) Other functions performed by community transport organisations

While the provision of transport to disadvantaged groups and the transport of recycled furniture are the major aims of these groups, their role is in many cases a great deal wider.

Because they are very localised, quite small-scale, and depend to a great extent on volunteer labour, they do not have cumbersome bureaucratic structures to maintain. Because they are run on a not-for-profit basis, they do not have to produce revenues which exceed their actual costs.

Given the basis on which community transport organisations were first established, in the transport of furniture for the poor, it is not surprising that there is a considerable emphasis on what might be considered the "social work" element of what they do. Group hire itself is seen as community development and social inclusion by some funders, and the organisations themselves. Drivers are selected for certain trips on the basis of their potential empathy with the passengers; the importance of continuity of driver is a prime concern of those responsible for scheduling.

A number of community transport organisations are involved in Government training initiatives providing training in a range of areas from unskilled work such as cleaning, through office work and administration, and of course PCV driver training and customer awareness.

The community transport organisation with the widest brief encountered in the study is involved in group hire, door to door transport, a Plusbus (a free half-hourly accessible service), PCV training, other training programmes including the training of young people from the New Deal initiative, furniture removal and recycling, waste recycling, and travel training. They are developing a Transport Co-ordination centre (a one stop shop for people with mobility difficulties) and are involved in overall co-ordination of non-commercial transport with their local authority. They also undertake environmental projects and environmental education. This activity involves a large number of people, most of whom are drawn from the local area, and many from nearby disadvantaged estates.

Recently, as the results of a competitive tender, they have been awarded a contract with London Transport to run scheduled mobility buses.

3. Rural bus grants, 1998

Other government actions of importance include the Government announcement in 1998 of new funding of £50m. a year for three years for rural services. Rural Bus Subsidy grants are for providing new registered rural services, but could be used by Section 22 operators. Rural Bus challenge fund is to be used for innovation. Rural Transport Partnership funding is intended to reduce the social exclusion of rural people by giving them good accessibility to jobs, services and social activity by long-term improvements to transport services. It is designed to support community-based initiatives.

All of these grants could be used either for different types of tendered service or for community transport projects.

4. Meeting the public transport needs of socially excluded people

The inadequacies of the current public transport system, as expressed by the evidence drawn on in this study, seem to indicate that levels of social exclusion could be reduced by additional public transport services, particularly buses. Many of these would be likely to be commercially uneconomic and, given current levels of funding, might also be unlikely to meet the criteria for ordinary tendered services.[40]

More commercial services (and by the same token, tendered services) would be likely to be economic if operating conditions were improved. Oxford Buses, operating in what is probably one of the most favourable operating climates imaginable (dedicated bus lanes, major restrictions on where traffic may go, extensive Park-and-Ride schemes, etc) say that much of their success is due to this environment. Brighton and Hove Bus Company (a subsidiary of Go-Ahead) also attributes its commercial success to the "anti-car", but pro-bus operating environment. In Oxford there is the added bonus for the operators that the size and traditions of the town lend themselves to bus journeys (a "bus culture"), which is not the case in most towns and cities.

There seems to be general agreement among operators that the introduction of accessible buses provides a great stimulus to ridership. Pete's Travel, the third largest operator in the West Midlands (but still with only 3% of the ridership) estimates that the introduction of a low-floor bus can very quickly boost patronage by more than 15% (which offsets the 10% premium on the cost of the vehicle). Other operators agreed with this estimate, some reckoning that the increase could be over 20%. The other factor that appears to be considered a stimulus to ridership is the possibility of running very frequent buses with headways of about 6 minutes, when people can treat the service as "turn up and go" rather than having to

consult a timetable or wait for a long time.

While accessible buses are clearly increasing ridership, they appear to be introducing new conflicts. There is a limit to the number of pushchairs that they can take, and conflicts have been known between wheelchair and pushchair users. There is also a problem when a person with a physical disability who can board the bus cannot alight at their destination because the infrastructure is inadequate. For any one route to be useful, the infrastructure needs to exist along the whole length of the route.

They are also increasing expectations. Bigger wheelchairs cannot always board the buses, which can provoke complaints from those wheelchair users. One operator commented that while he was pleased to be able to transport more people more easily, he wondered what the limit would be to what public transport was expected to do. His view was that he was not in the business of providing ambulances, and that he had actually said at a meeting on this subject that he could not see how he could contrive for his buses to cater for stretchers. While he was being ironic, he was trying to make the point that the demand for transport was probably insatiable and that the opening up of one possibility would always lead to another set of demands. He had been unable to locate any policies which had given serious thought to this question.

There can be problems running buses through estates. One of these is the physical problem; some buses simply cannot go down the smaller roads. If there are road humps and parked cars it is particularly difficult. Where buses have to come to a virtual standstill to cross road humps, there can be a danger of the bus being "stoned" by vandals. Examples of vandalism of buses in what were generally considered less salubrious areas were given by all the operators approached during this study.

Probably the most cost-effective transport provision available, both urban and rural, is provided by community transport organisations. This is unsurprising since a great deal of volunteer labour is involved and because these organisations do not have to have a profit margin (indeed, those that are established as charities may not do so). It is also possible, operating at a very local level, to make sure that the specific needs of a small number of people are met; this particularly applies in remote rural areas.

In areas where hire cars are cheap, the needs of socially excluded people can also be met cost-effectively and conveniently by the use of hire cars. This mode is also favoured because it is simple, time-saving, and avoids difficult or dangerous walks or waits associated with public transport.

5. A co-ordinated approach to the needs of socially excluded areas

It is clear that transport for socially excluded people is now being provided from a variety of sources, but that although they are or could be complementary to each other, there is often a lack of overall co-ordination. Some PTEs, for example, seem to be almost unaware of the possibilities for community transport, while others not only provide quite large elements of funding support but are consciously trying to design transport systems which exploit the possible links between non-commercially and commercially provided transport. One, who has long had an emphasis on community affairs, has facilitated the establishment of a community transport organisation with which it is working to try to establish services that are complementary to mainstream services.

In an increasing number of rural areas, rural transport partnerships and rural community councils can be very effective. These often operate at a very local level and, at their best, audit transport provision, assess levels of need, and, as far as possible, try to integrate the various forms of transport. In, for example, Devon and Gloucestershire, these partnerships are facilitated by the County. ATCO (The Association of Transport Co-ordinating Officers) is the national body which specialises in trying to debate and develop co-ordination mechanisms. It also commissions research.

Without co-ordination there could be even more duplication of resources than at present is believed to exist. For example, little research has been carried out on the extent to which the provision of accessible buses could reduce the need for substantially more expensive specialist transport.[41] If, however, this need is reduced, then the question of who should properly be subsidising the bus will need to be raised.

Ultimately, some combination of all methods of transport provision would seem to be appropriate for areas or pockets of social exclusion. To achieve such a combination would require rather more expenditure on co-ordination than the current norm.[42] The level at which co-ordination takes place is crucial to determining the success of social inclusion transport policies. Very local and detailed knowledge is needed of characteristics of people and their trips, but for bigger and more strategic planning, and, for example, applications for large grants, a very small organisation is in a weak position. The co-ordination function could, as now, take place at local authority or PTE level, although it need not necessarily reside within the local authority. Co-ordination with appropriate employers to run suitable transport would also ensure that one of the most significantly transport disadvantaged groups, job-seekers from socially excluded areas, are not debarred from taking jobs because of transport.⁴³

6. Concessionary fare schemes

The provision of transport is not simply a matter of making sure that there is a vehicle on the road or the tracks but that people can afford to get on them. Of the Â£1bn. spend by Central Government on revenue support for public transport in 1997/8, Â£650m. was spent by PTAs and PTEs. Over half of this was used to finance historic debts. The remaining Â£290m. funded:

- concessionary travel - Â£189m.
- supported bus services - Â£46m.
- information and infrastructure - Â£22m.
- accessible transport and travel - Â£16m.

This is a wider range of activities than is generally supported by city councils which have mostly focused their subsidy on concessionary fares and socially necessary bus services.

Who receives concessions, how much the concession is worth, etc, are very much in the hands of the local provider and varies markedly between areas. In one of the rural study areas, for example, older people received about Â£15 of travel vouchers every year, in contrast to London, where they received free travel after the morning peak across the whole network. Similarly, concessions for young people are variable; sometimes they are operator concessions, sometimes local authority or PTA concessions, and sometimes a combination of both. A child in one area might pay only 25% of the adult fare to go to school; in another area it could be as high as 66%.

Whether concessions were available to unemployed people, and at what price, was also variable. Very few concessions are available for post-school students.

Variations in the schemes mean that people with similar personal circumstances receive differing levels of support from the public purse, depending on where they live. Those who live near authority boundaries may be particularly disadvantaged as concessions normally apply only within the authority funding them.

The Government has announced that from April 2001, the minimum level of concession for pensioners and disabled people will be half price, once a free pass has been acquired. However, while this will, to some extent, iron out equalities between areas, it is not yet known whether it will address the crucial question of travelling across local authority or PTA boundaries.

We believe that there is a case for re-examination of the provision and operation of concessions and the transport for which they can be used, and whether the concession-awarding body should have any control over supply. The level of disparity between areas and what transport can be used, and when, with concessionary passes is high. So is the amount being spent by local authorities. A PTA spending proportionately more on tendered services than on concessions has more control over supply than, for example, a PTA spending £55m. on concessions but only £3m. on tendered services.

However, re-examination of this question should not take place in a vacuum.⁴⁴ Currently, many authorities have very broad ideas about who they are trying to help. But this is all that they can do in the current policy climate. Until a Government policy is formulated which provides indicative guidelines about fundamental mobility and accessibility rights, the local authorities will simply have to carry on using their discretion.

7. Estimation of potential patronage and revenue impacts from public transport improvements

Overview

The project brief included specifications on analysis of the financial cost of lost transport patronage. A TRaC briefing note set out the approach to be adopted for this analysis. The briefing note identified that the task concerns the impacts on patronage and revenue of improving public transport provision for socially excluded persons in terms of:

- Affordability
- Availability
- Accessibility
- Acceptability

Each of these dimensions have been considered separately. Therefore, the results obtained exclude so-called synergy effects concerning the impacts in relation to improvements being implemented for two or more of the above listed dimensions. The analysis has focussed on bus services, given the importance of this mode compared to other public transport modes in the areas examined in the Social Exclusion Project.

Below is given a brief overview of the results obtained in terms of patronage and revenue impacts for different measures with respect to public transport improvements. The overview is followed by more detailed comments for each of the four identified areas. Overall, the analysis has demonstrated that there can be significant impacts on patronage and revenue due to public transport improvements. The examined improvements (in the four dimensions) all generate positive impacts on patronage, while revenue impacts are positive in all but one case (affordability). In particular, improvements in relation to public transport availability (e.g. improved frequency) seems to have positive impacts on patronage and revenue. This holds for both the urban and the rural areas examined as part of the Social Exclusion Project, but is strongest in rural areas, where a high proportion of the respondents indicated a negative assessment of this aspect of public transport. In addition, the analysis shows that accessibility improvements can have positive impacts on patronage/revenue impacts (identified on the basis of interviews among bus operators in the areas studied). Small positive impacts on patronage and revenue are likely in relation to changes influencing the public transport comfort and safety. These results are based on available information regarding fare and service elasticities (from DETR's Bus Fare Elasticity Project) together with questionnaire data collected as part of the Social Exclusion Project. The questionnaire data used for this analysis refer to the household data only.

It should be noticed that the identified revenue impacts exclude any cost implications.

The analysis has identified the problems associated with identifying how much a given public transport aspect should be improved before it ceases to be a barrier to social inclusion. Further research into public transport adequacy is required. This research should identify, through questionnaires, how much a range of public transport aspects should be improved in order for persons not to perceive these as barriers to use.

Affordability

Changes in public transport affordability were analysed using survey data [45] on whether public transport is considered affordable or not. It was assumed that the percentage reduction in public transport fares required in order for public transport not to be considered unaffordable would correspond to the proportion of those respondents who indicated that public transport is unaffordable. On the basis of available information about fare elasticity (see e.g. DETR Bus Fare Elasticity Project) the changes in patronage and revenue have been calculated. The analysis covered the urban as well as the rural areas included in the Social Exclusion Project.

For the urban areas approximately 20-25% considered public transport bus services to be unaffordable. If a 25% reduction is used as the required fare reduction to achieve provision of adequate public transport concerning affordability, then it follows that with a fares elasticity of -0.4 in the short run (after 1 year) and -0.9 (after 7 years) this reduction would generate patronage and revenue impacts as follows:

	Short run (%)	Long run (%)
Revenue impacts	+10	+22.5
Patronage impacts	-15	-2.5

For rural areas, approximately 35% considered public transport to be unaffordable. Using the same elasticities (-0.4 and -0.9) the patronage + revenue results are as follows:

	Short run (%)	Long run (%)
Revenue impacts	+14	+31.5
Patronage impacts	-21	-3.5

The results demonstrate that reduced fares are likely to have significant positive patronage impacts yet negative revenue impacts, at least in the short to medium term. In effect, this public transport improvement can therefore only be implemented through enhancing the concessionary fares system.

It is important to emphasise that these results are dependent on the assumed fares reduction required to achieve adequate public transport provision for this dimension.

Accessibility

The impact of changes in accessibility has been researched as part of this project. Bus companies operating in the surveyed areas provided information about the changes in patronage of introducing low floor buses, showing increases in the range from 14-23%. This information has been used as an estimate of the patronage/revenue impacts (the revenue impact will be identical to the patronage impacts provided the fare buying behaviour remains unchanged and the fare level is constant). The difficult aspect is to assess the proportion of the patronage which is generated traffic rather than transfer from alternative services. Information from bus companies operating in the areas examined suggests that about half of the patronage increase is generated travel while the other half is represented by route replacement.

Table 2 shows the results for patronage (revenue) impacts with 50% and 25% generated travel.

	High Patronage Impacts (%)	Low Patronage Impacts (%)
50% generated patronage	+7	+11.5
25% generated patronage	+3.5	+5.8

Availability

The household data include information on how public transport is perceived for a range of different qualities. Among these are reliability, frequency of services, and times of first and last buses. These aspects concern the availability dimension. The analysis of public transport improvement has focussed on frequency improvements (measured in terms of increases in vehicle miles). It has been assumed that the required percentage improvement in frequency to remove this barrier will correspond to the percentage of respondents giving a negative assessment of public transport frequency. With this assumption and information on service elasticity (see, for example, DETR's Bus Fare Elasticity Project) it is possible to

provide an estimate for the revenue/patronage impacts.

In the analysis a service elasticity of +0.4 has been used for the short run (after one year) and +0.9 for the long run (after 7 years). This research project's surveys indicate that 14.5% of the respondents in the urban areas have a negative assessment of the level of frequency compared to 33% in the rural areas. These percentages are assumed to represent the required increase in vehicle miles in order to remove this barrier for public transport usage. The analysis has been carried out separately for the urban and rural areas surveyed in the Social Exclusion Project. Tables 3a and 3b include the obtained results in terms of patronage/revenue impacts over the short and long run.

	Short run (%)	Long run (%)
Patronage impacts	+5.8	+13
Revenue impacts	+5.8	+13

	Short run (%)	Long run (%)
Patronage impacts	+13.2	+29.7
Revenue impacts	+13.2	+29.7

It should be noticed that the patronage and revenue impacts are assumed to be identical only when using the assumption that fare buying behaviour and fare levels remain unchanged. The results are also dependent on the assumed required percentage

in vehicle miles to remove the barrier for public transport usage in terms of availability.

Acceptability

This dimension of public transport barriers is probably the most difficult one because it concerns perceptions which cannot be objectively measured. However, using information available regarding station facilities and rolling stock improvements for passenger rail seems to suggest that an increase in patronage/revenue of approximately 5% is realistic comparing the before and after situation. It is important to notice that rather low proportions of the respondents in the Social Exclusion Project have a negative assessment of comfort and security aspects of public transport (approximately 5-10% of the respondents perceive these aspects negatively) compared to frequency and journey time aspects. This holds both for urban and rural areas. The results suggest that the priority of socially excluded people seems to be the ability to make the journey rather than its quality.

Data Sources

This analysis of revenue and patronage implications used a range of different data sources, including:

- Social Exclusion Project Transport Household Questionnaire (550 responses)
- Analysis of interviews, discussion and focus groups
- DETR's Bus Fare Elasticity Project
- London Transport Research on service characteristics and patronage
- Passenger Demand Forecasting Handbook
- TRACE (EC FP4 project).

[41] Preliminary research on the Hackney PlusBus indicates a significant take-up, and preference, from people who were previously using hospital or social services transport.

[42] This varied from 1 to 3 Public Transport officers employed in the authorities we dealt with, although there were exceptions. Co-ordination with Community Transport was variable.

[43] The Manchester Minibus Agency, for example, in conjunction with Manchester Airport, which is a major employer, is trying to establish a car-share scheme to transport employees from one of the Outer Manchester estates to the airport.

[44] For example, the Commission for Accessible Transport (TCfL, 1999) suggests that disabled Londoners have entirely reasonable aspirations to the same mobility as able-bodied Londoners. This is meaningless unless specified more precisely; as the NTS tables in Appendix 3 show, even average mobility levels among the able-bodied are subject to enormous variations.

[45] Data was taken from the household surveys in the first 8 New Deal neighbourhoods surveyed, and from all four rural areas.

Chapter 9 Overview

1. The Multiple functions of public transport

The findings of the surveys, and from some of the literature, suggest that to view public transport as simply a means of access is to ignore a number of functions it currently serves among (at least) the "socially excluded". Our definition of adequacy did not include these considerations because from our initial transport perspective, they seemed relatively unimportant. This is more indicative of the limitations of the perspective than of the significance of the functions.

The identifiable functions are:

- practical/access. Public transport permits access or faster access to a certain number of activities: work, food, health facilities, training, education, leisure etc. For the really deprived, in a neighbourhood where there is "nothing", the levels of adequacy of transport, as defined within this study can facilitate, compromise, or deny access to all these activities (and others not mentioned). Other practical functions, such as carrying parcels, are served by buses, particularly in rural areas. During this study an example of a bus operating as a "bank" was encountered; tickets were bought with a form of smartcard and a cashback facility was available on the bus.
- social. If normal activities are undertaken outside the neighbourhood, public transport can be a way of meeting people, and possibly different kinds of people. Particularly in rural areas, buses can be

quite a social experience; the same is true of some service buses in urban areas and certainly of many community buses, whether operating a scheduled service or catering for specific groups. To a certain extent, public transport is one place where the most disadvantaged and the non-disadvantaged meet; it has been suggested that these encounters might help to narrow the remoteness between those who are "inside" and those who are "outside" the mainstream social game.[46]

- social/health. The social function also serves to benefit the health of users. There is evidence that those who find it easy to get out and about are more likely to maintain their health (both mental and physical) than those for whom it is difficult to escape from their isolation. [47]
- symbolic. In neighbourhoods with very low self-esteem, few services, and pessimistic views about the possibility that "they" (those in authority) really want matters to improve, public transport, and a school, and now a New Deal office, may be one of the rare signs of the presence and help of "society" and the fact that at least somebody cares. The study found genuine gratitude to transport authorities for recognising their plight among those for whom new or improved services had been provided, particularly in rural areas where completely new life possibilities had sometimes been opened up.

This social symbol is also perceived negatively, particularly by young people. Not only do they often feel it is inadequate to meet their needs but, in their home neighbourhoods where they "make the law", the bus (or the station, in studies other than the present one) seems to represent one of the rare "controlled" spaces with its "representatives of order" who will insist on fares being paid, identity cards being produced, etc. The bus, particularly if it is also in the habit of driving past them at bus stops, seems to become symbolic of that society which rejects them and is regarded as fair game for vandalism, rowdiness etc. Antagonism between bus staff and groups of young people seems to be common.

- longer-term economic. This applies less to buses. Public transport, in particular "heavy transport" such as light rail or train, may have an effect on the price of property and therefore on offices and housing. The arrival of the Docklands Light Railway may have improved the lives of the inhabitants, but it has also led to the construction of offices and more expensive housing, inaccessible to the excluded.[48] For some, the arrival of rail transport ("not for us" is the opinion of many) may be an additional symbol of an unequal society.

2. Basic Mobility Provision, Expectations, and Rights

This study has defined public transport as "inadequate" where it fails on one or more of the "4 A's" tests. For the user, affordability has surfaced as a key issue, as have availability and accessibility. It has already been pointed out (Ch. 7) that the extent to which the user considers transport "adequate" is relative both to their own perceptions and to the mobility and access expectations of the wider society. The extent to which the supplier can provide what they consider "adequate" transport is dependent on both physical and financial constraints. [49]

Except in rural areas and for those with disabilities which make travel difficult, it is - theoretically - possible for most people to reach most destinations using a combination of walking and public transport. But this may be at the price of human dignity; it can take an hour and a half for a public transport user, standing in the cold, hanging around waiting for connections, to make a journey that a car user could do in ten or fifteen minutes.

What users, or potential users, in many cases cannot do is to travel in what they consider "reasonable" time and comfort and at a reasonable price, to destinations that they need or want to reach in order to support themselves and to participate in normal social activities.

This study, which is looking primarily at the part that public transport plays in mobility /access constraints, begs a very big question and one that has not, as far as can be ascertained, been considered at any length. The question concerns the basic "right to mobility".

We reiterate here our definition of social exclusion. Socially excluded people *"lack the resources to obtain the type of diet, participate in the activities and have the living conditions and amenities which are customary, or at least widely acknowledged or approved, in the societies to which they belong."*

Given that, as has been pointed out above, "normal" social activity and the accessing of basic rights, such as collecting pensions or going to hospital, requires increasing mobility, to how much are which groups or individuals entitled, who should provide it, and how much should who have to pay for it? This debate is familiar in the policy areas of housing, education, health etc., but not in the transport policy area.

The term "transport poverty" is increasingly used. There is an assumption that there exists a general understanding of this term. But unlike the term "income poverty" which is defined as being an income below half the national average, no common definition exists for transport.

Table 4, derived from National Travel Survey statistics, provides an illustration of the vast range of distances travelled per year, taking into account all journeys made by people in different situations, from 880 for an person over 80 in a household with no car, to 10,457 by an able-bodied person aged 30-49 in a car-owning household. These are averages, but the range is very much wider.

Similar tables, comparing number of trips and time spent travelling, can be found in Appendix 3. Taken with the present study, these figures raise questions about how far, for how long, and for how much, people should be expected to travel. Should a job-seeker be prepared to take a job which involves 3 hours travel a day for an hourly wage of £3.80 (particularly when all their other activities will also involve substantial amounts of travel time)? Or has he/she a right to refuse it on travel time grounds - or perhaps be compensated, in some way, for that time? How many times a week should Ms/Mr Average be able to go - shopping, to the doctor, to see friends, to work? How much should it cost?

Current planning policies such as those in PPG 13 and PPG 6 aim to persuade development to locate in such a way that transport needs are minimised. The presumption behind many of these policies is that needs can and should be met within "easy reach" of the users, and preferably within walking and cycling distances.[50] PTALs (Public Transport Accessibility Levels) can be used to assess levels of public transport accessibility. These are spatial measures; none of these measures is capable of assessing the time that will be needed to make related journeys, although the PTAL does address the issue of public transport frequency.

These are clearly necessary and useful guidelines. But because they are planning considerations, they consider location in terms of the development possibilities and public transport access. Planning policies and procedures do not currently take into account all the needs of individuals or groups of people and what is or is not "accessible" to them or within "reasonable" travelling time/cost/distance. It is beyond the scope of this study to suggest ways in which they might be incorporated. However, what could be done in the context of transport is to try to provide some objective criteria to assess what might be considered

"reasonable" amounts of time, money and distance to expect people in different subgroups to spend travelling.

Table 4: Distance travelled per person per year in the UK: 1996/98				
Miles				
		Households without cars	Households with cars	All Households
0 - 16	All young people	1,550	4,442	3,847
16 - 29	No mobility difficulty	3,665	8,997	7,870
	Some mobility difficulty	2,008	5,741	4,068
	All people	3,556	8,922	7,747
30 - 49	No mobility difficulty	3,738	10,457	9,617
	Some mobility difficulty	2,745	6,615	5,193
	All people	3,573	10,277	9,335
50 - 64	No mobility difficulty	3,066	9,357	8,550
	Some mobility difficulty	1,533	6,057	4,581
	All people	2,535	8,899	7,865
65 - 79	No mobility difficulty	2,610	5,890	4,877
	Some mobility difficulty	1,805	4,632	3,100
	All people	1,236	3,065	1,794
Source: National Travel Statistics, DETR				

[46] See for example CETUR, 1993.

[47] See studies quoted in "Our Healthier Nation", Department of Health, 1998.

[48] Examples in this study, of major transport improvements in or near "excluded" neighbourhoods include the Docklands Light Railway, the Midland Metro, possible extensions to the Manchester Metro and the Jubilee Line Extension. Current work in progress on the impacts of the JLE may help to answer this question.

[49] An example of a physical constraint would be an estate with a sufficiently high proportion of older persons for an operator to run a low floor bus service, but because of small roads or traffic calming, made this impossible.

[50] In most of the areas surveyed in this study, there was often a stated desire to be able to live life without excessive travelling by having services, work etc., in the local area.

Chapter 10 Conclusions, policy implications and recommendations, summary recommendations, and topics for further research

I General conclusions

1) From the existing literature, and from the results of the current study, it would appear that the importance of the travel habits, demands and expectations of socially excluded groups, with the possible exception of older people and people with disabilities, has not until now received sufficient attention. This may be partly because, with a few notable exceptions of areas that have carried out quite comprehensive research, it is largely aggregate figures that have been the basis of study. These cannot provide useful observations on localised, i.e. space-dependent problems. Those local studies that have been undertaken,[51] however, give an extremely good understanding of the relationships between transport and specific disadvantaged groups.

2) Because of spatial changes partly brought about by increasing car ownership, it is now necessary to travel ever-increasing distances to access almost everything (shopping, work, education, leisure, health etc), even in some parts of the inner city. Average personal weekly mileage has increased more than fivefold in the last 40 years. Thus transport to an activity is often an integral part of that activity, yet with the exception of a certain amount of social services, health and education transport, this is not acknowledged in price or benefit structures.

3) Households without a car, in a society in which household car ownership is the norm (peri-urban and rural areas), are "socially excluded" within our definition of the term, since they cannot fully participate i.e. behave as the vast majority of society behaves. Even non-possession of a driving licence can be a disadvantage in that, to take a specific example, it reduces job opportunities.[52]

Distances travelled by those in households with cars (69% of households) are substantially greater than those travelled by members of carless households.[53] In a number of areas surveyed as part of this study, car ownership was 30% or less. Thus, although non-car owners and non-drivers were not excluded from normal local social activities by virtue of existing local norms, they were excluded from the wider "social game," which has different norms.

Even in households who do own one or more cars, it is unlikely that all household members will have access to a car. The extent to which it is of benefit to all members depends on how it is used. Furthermore, the size of households owning a car can vary substantially: our research indicates that in certain cultures the "household" owning the car is an extended rather than a nuclear family and thus its use by any given family member may be very limited.

4) Transport does not often appear to be one of the primary preoccupations of socially excluded people in urban areas. Previous studies have shown that it is a significant preoccupation for some older people, people with disabilities, women at night, and younger people with no car. For other groups, work, housing, security, etc. are likely to loom larger.

But the fact that it is not a primary preoccupation for some groups does not necessarily mean that it is not part of the problem of their "exclusion". Chapters 6 and 7 demonstrate that the extent to which transport is connected varies significantly between individuals, groups, and geographical areas.

On the other hand, in rural areas, transport problems are a primary preoccupation for a much wider group of people because access to most facilities is almost impossible in some areas without a car. One of the reasons why it is not a preoccupation in urban areas is because many of those in socially excluded groups or areas have relatively narrow horizons and do not expect to have to travel for jobs or services. The problem is perceived as the lack of a local job opportunity or service, not the absence of transport. There is also a culture in some depressed urban areas which militates against personal ambition. This could include the concept of travelling outside an area to better oneself; many people's horizons are still extremely localised.[54]

5) Poor transport is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for an individual or neighbourhood to be "socially excluded." It is, however, one of a number of contributory factors and can be a very important one. Some areas of "social exclusion" such as peri-urban post-war estates and rural areas are profoundly affected by the inadequacy of transport. There is a great variation between individuals and areas.

6) The more mobility there is, the greater becomes the expectation of mobility. For example, now that buses can be boarded by some wheelchair users, the users of bigger wheelchairs (which cannot board them) start to complain. Similarly, once low floor buses have appeared in a particular locality, there is an expectation that they should be provided on all routes. One operator commented that while he was pleased to be able to transport more people more easily, he wondered what the limit would be to what public transport was expected to do. The demand for transport is probably insatiable and the opening up of one possibility may lead to a new set of demands.

7) There is a conflict, recognised in our survey particularly by traders, but familiar to all those concerned with regeneration, between the improvement of transport and the improvement of a neighbourhood. If better transport facilitates easy movement out of the neighbourhood, to jobs, schools, shops etc. that are perceived as "better", then it could hasten the further decline of the neighbourhood.

8) There is also an apparent conflict with the Government's sustainability objectives. Reduction of the need to travel is a current Government strategy to achieve sustainability and is incorporated into policy documents from the White Paper downwards. Despite the desired consequences of this strategy being an increase in very localised activity (which happens to be characteristic of some disadvantaged urban areas) it would appear that many socially excluded people need to travel more if they are to participate fully in society. That is, until planning and transport strategies have been implemented long enough to be fully effective. However the two objectives need not necessarily conflict; it is a question of balance.

9) This study has been looking not at general social exclusion but "social-spatial" exclusion, i.e. the concentration of social categories excluded in certain "deprived neighbourhoods" (as far as urban areas are concerned; the rural question is slightly different because the study areas did not include large concentrations of socially excluded people). In these areas, as already remarked, it is not always possible to establish a direct line of causation between social exclusion and transport in terms of access, but many links have become clear.

10) Preliminary investigations of the possibilities for increasing public transport ridership through improvements in affordability, availability, accessibility and acceptability suggest that it would be possible to expand the market and facilitate easier travel among socially excluded people. This is likely to involve at least a temporary injection of public money in the form of a broader range of concessionary tickets.

II Recommendations[55]

The objective of these recommendations is to suggest transport measures, particularly public transport, that might contribute to the reduction of social exclusion. However, it is important to stress that the social and transport objectives must acknowledge the wider environmental objective while reducing levels of social disadvantage. Seen from this viewpoint, the ideal would be to find a means of giving people the means of movement, but the desire and possibility of staying in the same place while reducing their level of exclusion. The achievement of this ideal would, however, depend as much on the relocation of jobs and service provision as on transport, and is the direction in which Planning Policy Guidance 13 is aimed.

Recommendations 1-4 relate to specific aspects of "adequacy" and are, broadly speaking, related to the availability, affordability, accessibility and acceptability of public transport. [Full details of suggested improvements can be found in Chapter 7.] The remaining recommendations cover a number of associated issues.

1. Deficiencies in Transport Provision and How They Should Be Funded

Many services cannot now be accessed without a considerable expenditure of both time and money on transport. The result of this is that deficiencies in transport needs frequently include more transport between main roads, i.e. on very local routes, regular and reliable services with a maximum 10 minute headway on main roads, more transport to places of employment, more transport to hospitals - and much more - to cater for access to places that are now difficult to get to or which are inaccessible at particular times of day or week.[56] In some cases, such routes and services, if unprofitable, may be defined as 'socially necessary' and augmented by means of subsidy from the public purse, out of the transport budget.

Effectively, the transport sector has to make provision for the results of policies in a number of other policy areas (e.g. centralisation of hospitals, choice of schools, closure of post offices). There appears to be no overall assessment of how far this is taking place.

Where transport is an essential part of a statutory activity (such as provision of health and education services, and distribution of benefits) the generalised transport costs of such provision need to be estimated and taken into account.

The analysis of potential outcomes of increases in availability in Chapter 8 suggests that increases in availability would lead to an increase in net revenues.

Recommendation 1

Local authorities should make comprehensive assessments of the transport needs of socially excluded people, within the framework of their local transport plan. They should work with regeneration bodies and rural development agencies to assess what current levels of transport provision exist, how far these meet the needs of socially excluded people and what could be done to fill the gaps, taking into account cross sector benefits.[57]

2. Fares And Ticketing

Fares in different places for journeys of similar length and duration vary widely between areas and operators. Some are perceived as extremely expensive, others acceptable. The availability of concessionary tickets also varies according to both operators and local authorities. The logic behind why older people, rather than young people and/or those on low incomes, are the main beneficiaries of concessions, seems to be historic. Young people need to be able to travel and cannot always afford it, especially over the age of 16 when they should be independent, but concessionary tickets are often unavailable.

There seems always to be a problem for people with low incomes and/or irregular schedules in buying cheap weekly tickets. Â£7 or Â£8 is a lot to pay up-front, even for those people who know that they are going to be travelling every day, if they are on low incomes. If a person's travel cannot be foreseen, then buying a period ticket is expensive and highly risky in terms of potentially wasted money. There is little that the operators can do about this. However, if a wider range of concessionary tickets were available, overall demand for transport would be increased, and commercial operators would presumably try to provide services to satisfy that demand. Repayment could be based on the amount the concessionary ticket holders are travelling.

The analysis in Chapter 8 suggests that the lowering of ticket prices would be likely to lead to a decrease in net revenues. For that reason, in the short term, concessionary tickets are the obvious way to increase affordability. However, increases in availability increase ridership. If the effect of concessionary fares was to increase services, there could be a knock-on effect of more overall ridership.

Recommendation 2

a) Local authorities should consider how far their criteria for eligibility for concessionary tickets could be profitably revised to extend travel benefits to a wider range of people (e.g. those on low incomes and young people) on either a temporary or a permanent basis to take into account people's changing circumstances.

b) Transport authorities should be empowered to set fare levels for services in their area at a level to meet social needs among targeted groups

3. Accessibility[58]

Physical accessibility to vehicles and to destinations is a problem to people with disabilities, people carrying things, and people with buggies. A number of bus services run with accessible buses which are very popular and which, according to operators, have resulted in significant increases in ridership, although it is not clear to what extent the trips are new trips or replacements for trips on other routes. In at least one case,[59] the provision of a scheduled accessible service has diverted riders from the more expensive door-to-door (pre-bookable) transport.

The provision of infrastructure has, however, not always kept pace with the provision of vehicles. Bus services exist where it is possible to board and alight from a vehicle at some but not all stops, for example. Bus stops may be difficult to access because they have to be reached via a busy road and there is no crossing place, or they may be dangerous to access because the route is, for example, poorly lit.

Finally, even where transport is physically accessible, actual use may be limited because the presentation of (or lack of) information makes it too difficult for some people to use. This does not seem to be a problem on familiar and regularly used routes, but may be a disincentive to travelling to new destinations.

Recommendation 3

- a) The faster adoption of accessible buses should be facilitated wherever possible.**
- b) Local authorities should ensure that complementary infrastructure is provided on the full length of routes served by accessible vehicles.**
- c) Simpler and more ubiquitous information should be provided. [60] [61] This should emphasis the range of opportunities offered by public transport.**

4. Acceptability

Travel by public transport, even where it serves its access function adequately, is not always perceived as a particularly positive experience, although we found a number of notable exceptions to this perception. Full buses, buses driving past waiting passengers, dirty buses, rude and inconsiderate drivers, a lack of shelters and toilet facilities, poor security, and unreliable machines where tickets were purchased automatically, were some of the deterrents to use, although where bus travel was essential, people were content to put up with these conditions.

Getting to the bus stop or station was problematic for personal security reasons, not during the day but at night when a significant number of people did not feel safe on foot in their neighbourhood.[62]

A number of people would have liked to see a second member of staff on vehicles to keep rowdy passengers under control and to help passengers who had difficulty boarding and alighting. Where trains were used, there were security fears about stations which, it was suggested, would have been reduced if a guard had been present.[63]

The situation with regard to driver attitudes was not unexpected. Most operators that we met do a certain amount of customer care training, but since drivers were poorly paid, passengers could be difficult to deal with and there was often a high turnover of staff, it was hard to see how attitudes could be radically changed.

These issues impact particularly on socially excluded people because of their enforced use of public transport. There is also a lack of self-confidence and self-respect among many socially excluded people, and this is unlikely to be enhanced by negative experiences of public transport staff.

Recommendation 4

Transport authorities should encourage operators and staff to consider the total impact of each journey on each passenger and to see how they could make it an enjoyable and safe trip for every passenger and potential passenger.

Customer care training should be mandatory and should attempt to ensure that all passengers are treated with dignity and respect.

5. Co-Ordination

In some areas there are a number of agencies providing the same service. If a supermarket is running a bus service, then there is no need for a tendered bus service to run the same route or, as in one existing example, [64] the supermarket and the transport authority could combine forces. If taxis are providing a cheap service, information about them needs to be easily available. In some places school buses are travelling with empty seats which, given appropriate insurance, could be available to other users.[65]

In the study areas, co-ordination was very variable. One PTE had no links at all with any transport providers except the operators of scheduled services and even appeared unaware of the extent to which taxis were used as substitutes for buses. Another, working together with the community transport sector, is intending to establish mobility shops to undertake both a co-ordination and information function.[66]

In general, those who already use public transport are quite well informed about the routes they habitually use. However, in some areas there is a need for better co-ordinated information so that users are aware of alternatives and of the possibilities of visiting hitherto unvisited destinations.[67] The small survey (49 people) on this topic conducted as part of this study suggested that mobility "shops" whether staffed or unstaffed, if sensibly sited (i.e. in shops) could be very useful.

Co-ordination is essential. The role of co-ordinating bodies is specified in local transport plans, but needs to be strengthened to include not only transport but also liaison with other service providers - housing associations, local authorities, schools, shops, health services etc. The level of co-ordination appropriate to particular authorities will vary, as will membership of co-ordinating bodies. Existing Rural Transport Partnerships, of which there are increasing numbers, some at a very local level[68] often include members of Parish and District Councils. Co-ordination should include all forms of public and semi-public transport, and should make information about all transport available from one easily contactable source.[69]

This would particularly benefit socially excluded people because they are disproportionately high users of all forms of public transport.

Recommendation 5

In the context of preparing and managing their local transport plans, local authorities should ensure that they bring together the complete range of public transport (including school and social service, taxis and voluntary transport), to ensure that the proposed strategies and implementation programmes meet the needs of socially excluded people, as well as the rest of the community. The level of such co-ordination will depend on local conditions.

6. Co-Ordination Of Feeder Services

In most of the study areas there were quite frequent services down major routes. These could be reached by all those who were fit, although sometimes a long walk was involved. Some routes had accessible services running on them. However, while the vehicles were easy for older people or people with slight mobility disabilities to use, the passengers sometimes had difficulty reaching the stops and needed to sit down when they got there. On the whole, however, such evidence as we found suggested that people preferred regular services to dial-a-ride schemes if they could use them.[70]

There were also areas where reaching stops at night could be a problem for personal security reasons.

There is a need to see how far feeder services, possibly some form of flexible transport, together with adequate waiting facilities, could be used to ferry people to and from transport nodes on well-served routes, both in urban and rural areas. Examples of possible complementary transport include voluntary transport, shared cars, or shared taxis.

Recommendation 6

Transport co-ordinators should investigate the possibility of providing complementary transport as feeder services to existing services.

7. Partnerships With Commercial Concerns, Statutory Service Providers, And Employers

One example of a partnership between a local authority and a supermarket, which results in both supermarket customers and other passengers using the bus, has demonstrated the possibility of commercial destinations entering into partnership with transport authorities and operators. In another study area, a supermarket bus was taken out of service because passengers were also using it for non-supermarket trips. It might be possible to increase both ridership and the clientele of the destinations by means of such co-ordination.

Because of public transport routes and timetables and the dispersed nature of employment opportunities, it is sometimes difficult or impossible for job seekers to guarantee arrival at work. Rather than subsidising tendered services during off-peak hours, it might be worth transport co-ordinating authorities investigating with employers the possibility of providing works buses or shared taxis. This could form part of Green Transport Plans which large employers are now instituting.

Similar considerations would apply where people cannot access education or further education institutions.

Recommendation 7

a) Transport co-ordinators should seek opportunities to set up partnerships with commercial destinations such as stores, employers, and leisure centres to try to meet the needs of people from areas where service provision is at a low level.

b) Local authorities should try to ensure that employers and service providers are more closely involved in the provision and funding of flexible transport

8. Needs And Supply Audits

The co-ordination function would exist fundamentally to try to match demand to supply and minimise the amount of supply wastage. This would involve two audits:

a) demand and suppressed demand

Service providers such as day centres, hospitals and the associated transport providers, often know the transport needs of people with specific mobility impairments. Some areas or authorities, and operators,[71] have started to investigate wider mobility constraints. This practice should be made general and needs to be done at the lowest possible level; enumeration districts would be suitable. It would effectively constitute an audit of transport need.

b) supply

Audits of transport provision, such as the TAS 1997 audit of rural services, have sought to assess the provision of local public transport services and to compare performance to funding levels. This work was confined to scheduled services, and the picture is necessarily incomplete.

Some areas or authorities, notably Local Transport Partnerships in rural areas, have started to audit area transport provision, taking into account all forms of transport. This more comprehensive approach is beginning to produce useful results.

Recommendation 8

Needs and supply audits of potential and actual transport demand and supply should be conducted, to include all forms of "public" transport. Particular priority should be given to known areas or groups of socially excluded people. This should be in the context of local authorities' local transport plans.

9. The Voluntary Sector

The voluntary sector has a considerable contribution to make. In "socially excluded" areas community transport could make a far greater contribution than simply the provision of transport from A to B. It tends to fulfil not only the access but also the social functions of public transport. Community transport groups also have potential for the employment of semi-skilled labour and are already performing a number of

training functions both within and outside the transport sector.

They could also have the potential to establish timetabled service routes which, if successful, might then be seen to be viable by a commercial operator.

Types of initiative that could be co-ordinated by the voluntary sector include: taxishare arrangements for school runs; community buses for group trips out of the area; community bus routes within an area; direct services, possibly Hail and Ride, to supermarkets and health facilities; or vehicle share arrangements to employment sites.

There are various amendments to the legislation governing community transport which would "level the playing field" for them with other transport operators. These have been spelled out in a 1999 report.[72]

Recommendation 9

The development of non-mainstream transport should be facilitated and resourced in order to meet demand which cannot reasonably be met by commercial operators or tendered services. This should include changes in the legislation, as already suggested in the DETR 1999 report.

10. Transport And Travel Familiarisation Programmes

One of the problems limiting choice of employment and other activities is not just the unavailability of public transport but an underlying unwillingness to travel for work into unfamiliar territory. For people lacking in confidence or with learning disabilities the problem is fear rather than unwillingness. So-called "travel training" programmes already exist for some job seekers, and some voluntary transport groups are providing escorts to help people who find transport hard to negotiate, sometimes because of a disability, to "learn" difficult routes.

Easy use of public transport, if it is affordable, can help to broaden the horizons of young people and give them a far greater set of opportunities than that available to the travel poor. Young people's use of public transport can also be limited by their ignorance of its possibilities - they need to be educated in them.

Young people can also be the cause of problems on public transport. A programme to familiarise particularly young people with public transport and how it should be used could also be an appropriate measure. PSE might be the appropriate place on the school curriculum. This would also include training about on-bus behaviour, and how to see things from the driver's point of view.

Transport familiarisation could also include education on the real costs of driving, both private and social, with comparisons with real private and social costs of public transport.

Recommendation 10

Programmes for transport and travel familiarisation for young people, those who have difficulties in using the system, and those who lack confidence should be established.

11. Infrastructure And Traffic Management

Four principal factors appear to have a very positive influence on ridership levels: accessible buses, restricted car access, frequent headways and, to some extent, price. If operating conditions for the bus companies are very favourable, it becomes worth their while to increase service levels.

If increased ridership on commercial, tendered, and voluntary sector routes is desired, then local authorities need to ensure that bus conditions are made more favourable than car driving conditions. Conditions should be better, both when the vehicle is in motion (e.g. bus lanes) and when it is stationary (e.g. good bus shelters, car parking charges). For those with lower incomes and localised activities, a high proportion of trips are walk trips. In one of the study areas, cycling was also a significant mode.

Recommendation 11

In areas of low car ownership and high dependence on public transport, infrastructure and traffic management schemes should favour the users of buses, pedestrians and cyclists.

12. Walking And Two-Wheeled Traffic

In socially excluded urban or village areas, walking is the principal means of transport. If people are to spend a great deal of time walking, then it should be made pleasant and, above all, safe. Pedestrians should not have to defer to cars. The presence of a trunk road running through the area was a characteristic of a number of the city study areas, and the free flow of traffic took precedence over the needs of pedestrians. Not only is this likely to lead to an increased accident rate but it becomes very clear whose interests are being best served. Where confidence is a problem, overwhelming priority for traffic over local walk journeys is not appropriate.

In rural areas, there was sometimes not even the possibility of pedestrian movement because of traffic moving too fast along a road with no footpath.

Where there already exists a cycling culture it would seem rational to exploit it; cycling is a very cost-effective way of travelling at a similar average speed to a bus. The provision of cycles, mopeds or motorcycles to help job-seekers makes both practical and psychological sense in that using them will facilitate access to more jobs than can reasonably be reached by public transport, and could therefore help to broaden the horizons of the users.

Recommendation 12

Conditions for walking and cycling need to be improved in areas of social exclusion and in rural areas. Where possible, "wheels to work" should be provided, particularly for job-seekers.

13. Non-Transport Policies

Transport policies and measures in Local Transport Plans have to be assessed for a number of impacts, including environmental and, to a certain extent, social impacts. It has been recognised that land-use planning policies should be applied in conjunction with transport policies.

Other policies have to be assessed for, for example, the impact on equal opportunities. But the adequacy of transport is dependent to a considerable extent on the outcomes of implementation of departmental policies outside the DETR, for example, the Departments of Health, Education, Employment, the Home Office, and the DTI. Very many of the decisions taken in these departments will have greater or lesser implications for transport, which will affect the effectiveness of the actual service. It follows, therefore, that transport implications should be taken into account when policies are being drawn up.

Recommendation 13

All non-transport policies should be automatically audited for their transport implications with a transport impact assessment and, where transport impacts will be adverse, should be modified accordingly.

14. Health Access

This could be regarded as a special case of (13) above. However, it is regarded as a very special case and singled out because it is the one service that is used by all groups in the population at some time in their lives.

Also, particularly in areas subject to regeneration initiatives, such as those in the New Deal for Communities areas, there is a very poor level of health. People with physical or chronic health difficulties tend to need more medical facilities than healthier people. But in many NDC and comparable areas there is both a disproportionately high number of people with such health difficulties, and a disproportionately smaller number of medical facilities of all types.

There can be particular problems also in rural areas, where healthcare facilities can be at a considerable distance (time/space) from the potential users.

Recommendation 14

All healthcare policies and provision should be assessed as a matter of priority for their access implications to ensure that socially excluded people are as well served as the majority.

III Summary of Recommendations

Recommendation	Body or bodies to whom recommendation addressed
-----------------------	--

<p>1 Availability deficiencies</p> <p>Local authorities should make comprehensive assessments of the transport needs of socially excluded people, within the framework of their affected local transport plan. They should work with regeneration bodies and rural development agencies to assess what current levels of transport provision exist, how far these meet the needs of socially excluded people and what could be done to fill the gaps, taking into account cross sector benefits.</p>	<p>Transport authorities, others e.g. hospitals schools, employers, transport operators, regeneration bodies</p>
<p>2 Affordability deficiencies</p> <p>a) Local authorities should consider how far their criteria for eligibility for concessionary tickets could be profitably revised to extend travel benefits to a wider range of people (e.g. those on low incomes and young people) on either a temporary or a permanent basis to take into account people’s changing circumstances.</p> <p>b) Transport authorities should be empowered to set fare levels for services in their area at a level to meet social needs among targeted groups</p>	<p>Local authorities</p> <p>Central Government</p>
<p>3 Accessibility deficiencies</p> <p>a) The faster adoption of accessible buses should be facilitated wherever possible.</p> <p>b) Local authorities should ensure that complementary infrastructure is provided on the full length of routes served by accessible vehicles.</p> <p>c) Simpler and more ubiquitous information should be provided. This should emphasis the range of opportunities offered by public transport.</p>	<p>Operators, transport authorities</p> <p>Operators, transport authorities</p> <p>Operators, transport authorities</p>
<p>4 Acceptability deficiencies</p> <p>a) Transport authorities should encourage operators and staff to consider the total impact of each journey on each passenger and to see how they could make it an enjoyable and safe trip for every passenger and potential passenger.</p> <p>b) Customer care training should be mandatory and should attempt to ensure that all passengers are treated with dignity and respect.</p>	<p>Transport authorities, operators</p> <p>Central Government, transport operators, transport authorities</p>

<p>5 Co-ordination</p> <p>In the context of preparing and managing their local transport plans, local authorities should ensure that they bring together the complete range of public transport (including school and social service, taxis and voluntary transport), to ensure that the proposed strategies and implementation programmes meet the needs of socially excluded people, as well as the rest of the community. The level of such co-ordination will depend on local conditions.</p>	<p>Local authorities, other transport service providers</p>
<p>6 Co-ordination of feeder services</p> <p>Transport co-ordinators should investigate the possibility of providing complementary transport as feeder services to existing services.</p>	<p>Transport co-ordinators</p>
<p>7 Partnerships with commercial concerns, statutory service providers, and employers</p> <p>a) Transport co-ordinators should seek opportunities to set up partnerships with commercial destinations such as stores, employers, and leisure centres to try to meet the needs of people from areas where service provision is at a low level.</p> <p>b) Local authorities should try to ensure that employers and service providers are more closely involved in the provision and funding of flexible transport.</p>	<p>Transport co-ordinators</p> <p>Local authorities</p>
<p>8 Needs and supply audits</p> <p>Needs and supply audits of potential and actual transport demand and supply should be conducted, to include all forms of "public" transport. Priority should be given to known areas or groups of socially excluded people. This should be in the context of local authorities' local transport plans.</p>	<p>Rural transport partnerships, regeneration partnerships, with transport authorities and providers of statutory services</p>
<p>9 Voluntary and community transport</p> <p>The development of non-mainstream transport should be facilitated and resourced in order to meet demand which cannot reasonably be met by commercial operators or tendered services. This should include changes in the legislation already suggested in the DETR 1999 report.</p>	<p>Central government, transport authorities</p>
<p>10 Transport familiarisation</p> <p>Programmes for transport and travel familiarisation for young people, those who have difficulties in using the system, and those who lack confidence should be established.</p>	<p>Departments of Health, Education & Employment, Home Office, DTI, New Deal schemes, voluntary transport providers, health providers</p>

<p>11 Infrastructure and traffic management.</p> <p>Particularly in areas of low car ownership and high dependence on public transport, infrastructure and traffic management schemes should favour the users of buses, pedestrians, and cyclists.</p>	<p>Local authorities</p>
<p>12 Walking and two-wheeled traffic</p> <p>Conditions for walking and cycling need to be improved in areas of social exclusion and in rural areas. Where possible, "wheels to work" should be centres provided, particularly for job-seekers.</p>	<p>Transport authorities, job centres and training</p>
<p>13 Policies outside the transport sector</p> <p>All non-transport policies should be automatically audited for their transport implications with a transport impact assessment and, where transport impacts will be adverse, should be modified accordingly.</p>	<p>Departments of Health, Education, Home Affairs (notably, but not exclusively; all departments should comply)</p>
<p>14 Healthcare policies</p> <p>All healthcare policies and provision should be assessed as a matter of priority for their access implications to ensure that socially excluded people are as well served as the majority.</p>	<p>Department of Health, health authorities</p>

IV. Topics Requiring Further Research

1. The Need for a Broad Definition of 'Adequate' Transport

The standard indicator for "poverty" (income) is normally defined as an income below half the national average. There are no adequate indicators of transport poverty, except car ownership and distance from a bus stop. Without indicators or a base for comparison it is not possible to be objective about transport "deficits".

In order to have a basis for assessment of transport poverty, work needs to be undertaken to try to provide a benchmark against which mobility and access provision can be evaluated. There is likely to be more than once benchmark; no single one would cover all individuals and groups

Research Recommendation 1:

To Establish Baseline Measures of "Adequate" Mobility and Access

2. Driving and Cars

In 21st century Britain, possession of a full driving licence is both a symbol of adulthood/responsibility and widens the choice of job available, because a car is often used in the course of work, and there are many jobs in which the main skill required is driving. One school in Lincoln (outside the study area) has driving lessons on the curriculum; one school adjacent to one of the study areas[73] is making driving

theory lessons available to pupils.

Systematic lessons are not easily available to those on low incomes, many of whom may have, by the age of about 15, developed rather unorthodox driving styles "in the field". Several skills training courses included driving as part of the syllabus. But it is possible that many of those with poor literacy skills, even if they could drive sufficiently conventionally, might be deterred from taking a test because of the requirements of the written test. Even as a boost to people's self-esteem, driving licences would be useful.

Those whose parents or friends have cars, even if they cannot afford to pay for driving lessons, have the opportunity to learn to drive under some form of supervision.

Those who can drive appear to have an advantage over those who can not in terms of the number of opportunities available to them. Many people complained about the difficulty of going out on Sundays, for example, because of the lack of transport. Car hire (shared with a group of friends) could be a solution for people if they had licences. Driving jobs clearly require a licence. There are also many non-driving jobs for which a licence is an advantage or a requirement, ranging from mothers helps jobs to local authority work. Anybody who wants to be a self-employed small tradesperson will also need a licence.

Research Recommendation 2:

To Ascertain

- **The Extent to Which Possession of a Driving Licence Helps In Finding Jobs**
- **The Extent of Suppressed Demand for Driving Lessons Among Socially Excluded People**
- **What Measures Should Be Taken to Compensate for Any Deficiency**

3. The Real Costs and Benefits of Putting Conductors Back On the Buses

Many of the respondents to the surveys wanted conductors, or their equivalent, back on the buses, and those who used trains wanted staff at the stations. These jobs can be done by those for whom other service or office jobs may be unsuitable. It is possible that, given the cost to the State of unemployed people, and the potential benefits to passengers and increase in revenues that could result from having staff on buses and stations, there would be net gains from increasing staffing levels.

Research Recommendation 3:

To Assess the Real Costs and Benefits of Using Government Training Schemes and Employment Follow-Up Initiatives of Putting Additional Staff on Buses and Stations

4. Demand-Responsive Transport

Uncertainty and long waits are typical of the problems faced by users of public transport.

Demand-responsive transport can overcome these problems. While commercial companies can not run profitable services on minority routes, there exists at least one example of a commercial demand-responsive service in the UK, run in the West Midlands. It covers its operating costs, but is partly dependent on grant funding for the purchase of vehicles, and on contract operations to cover some of the overheads.[74]

The development of technology has increased the possibilities for demand-responsive services (not-necessarily door-to-door services). Such transport approximates more closely to the convenience of a car than scheduled services can and could lower the initiative to own private transport.

Research Recommendation 4

To Investigate the Possibilities and Economics of Demand-Responsive Transport for Socially Excluded People.

[51] See literature list for references.

[52] This emerged from a number of interviews, most clearly from a meeting at Employment Links office in Liverpool: junior employees who can deliver, run errands etc., in cars or vans are more use than those who cannot.

[53] See Ch. 9

[54] It would be instructive to be able to compare the attitudes and ambitions of car owners and non car owners in depressed areas, but this study does not have data that will answer that question.

[58] See the quality Partnership provisions of the 1999 Transport Bill, which address this issue.

[59] The Hackney PlusBus.

[60] Bus companies such as the Brighton and Hove Company are producing simplified versions of their bus map in a format akin to the London Underground map. They believe they are much easier to use than standard bus maps.

[61] Merseytravel PTE, through its Community Links office, has devoted a great deal of attention to producing comprehensible information that engages people (of all ages). Their continual contact with the local communities and public transport users, and the resultant feedback and trust, is responsible for the level of quality.

[62] Our findings are similar to those of Crime Concern and the Social Research Associates, Personal Security Issues in Pedestrian Journeys DETR 1999.

[63] See also Perceptions of Safety from Crime on Public Transport, Crime Concern for DETR 1997.

[64] West Sussex.

[65] Fuel duty rebate is already arranged to encourage the use of school buses for the general public.

[66] Currently proposed for Merseytravel working with community transport operations

[67] There is a problem with ticket prices. While operators have to notify transport authorities of services, they do not have a duty to provide ticket price information, which leads to inconvenience for users.

[68] Devon, whose population is very widely distributed and whose area transport needs vary substantially, is making effective use of such Partnerships. Both they and ATCO (Association of Transport Co-ordinating Officers) produce co-ordination guidelines.

[69] The authority which appeared to have the most resources to devote to this was having considerable success and, for example, was running cheaper buses to school and facilitating more community transport than most authorities.

[70] E.g. the Hackney PlusBus.

[71] A & M Group in the West Midlands is an example of good practice in this respect.

[72] DETR Report on Voluntary Transport, July 1999.

[73] Norwich.

[74] Work undertaken by Paul Beecham and Associates for the RTDF, 1996.

Bibliography

Alcock, P. (1997), *Understanding Poverty* 2nd Ed (MacMillan, Hampshire)

ATCO (1999), *"Bus Fare Concessions and discounts for children and students"*

Audit Commission (1999), *"All Aboard; a review of local transport and travel in urban areas outside London"* (Audit Commission, London)

Audit Commission (1998), *"Provision of Advice, Information and Support for Jobseekers"* (Audit Commission, London.)

Bhalla, A & Lapayre, F (1997), Social Exclusion: Towards an Analytical and Operational Framework, in *Development & Change* (vol28, no3, 1997, pp413-433)

Birmingham Community Transport, *Report and Business Plan 1998*

Brown, S (1994), *"Whose challenge? Youth, crime and everyday life in Middlesbrough"* results of the 1993 City Challenge Youth Survey, Middlesbrough Council.

Carter, M (1998), *Transport and Social Exclusion: The New Policy Agenda and the Government*, paper presented to conference in Liverpool, March 1998 (DETR, London)

Centro (1994), *"An investigation into ethnic minority usage of transport services for people with Mobility problems in Sandwell."*

CETUR (1993), *D'Áplacements et Liens Sociaux Centre D' Átudes des Transports Urbains*, 92220 Bagneux, France.

Christi, C J S & Convey, E (date unknown), *Combating Isolation: the Case of Castle Vale* (The MVA Consultancy & Castle Vale Housing Action Trust)

CILT (1998), *"Accessible Transport in East London"* (CILT, London)

Cooper Sims for Centro (1998), *"Travel Barriers Study"*. (Centro)

Cloke, P, (1997), *Poor country: Marginalisation, Poverty and Rurality* in Cloke, P & Little, J, (Eds) *Contested Countryside Cultures: Otherness, Marginalisation and Rurality* (Routledge, London)

Cloke, Milbourne & Thomas (1994), *Lifestyles in Rural England* (Rural Development Commission, London)

Community Transport (1995), *Focus on Cheshire* in *Community Transport* (November/December, 1995, pp18-19)

Community Transport, (1999) *The Scottish Rural Community Transport Initiative* in *Community Transport* (January/February 1999, p7)

Community Transport (1999) *Budget Money nets Â£1.1m for CT in Northern Ireland* in Community Transport (January/February 1999, p11)

Community Transport Association (1997), *Blueprint For Change*

Community Transport Association and Rural Development Commission (1998), *Lets Get Going: an Action Guide for Rural and Community Transport in England* (Community Transport Association, Cheshire)

Community Transport Association (December 1997), *Mind the Gap: The Vital Contribution of Community Transport in Making Integration Work*

Community Transport Association (1999) *Going for Brokerage* in Community Transport (March/April 1999, p21)

Community Transport Association (1999) *Rural England Challenge Winners* in Community Transport (March/April 1999, p4)

Crime Concern and Transport & Travel Research (1997) *Perceptions of Safety from Crime on Public Transport* (DETR)

Crime Concern and Social Research Associates for DETR (May 1999) *Personal Security for Pedestrian Journeys* (DETR)

Crime Concern for DETR (May 1999) *Young People and Crime on Public Transport* (DETR)

Cullinane, S, and Stokes (1999), *Rural Transport Policy*, Pergamon, Oxford.

Curtis, C (1996), Can Strategic Planning Contribute to a Reduction in Car-based Travel? in *Transport Policy*, vol3, no1/2, pp55-65

DaRT (1998), What Users Want, *DETR Review of door to door transport in London*, Users/Providers Working Group

Davis, J & Ridge, T (1997), *Same Faces, Different Lifestyles* (Childrens Society, London)

Dennis, N, Henriques, F & Slaughter, C (1969), (2nd Ed) *Coal is Our Life: An Analysis of a Yorkshire Mining Community*, Tavistock Publications Limited, London

Department of the Environment and Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries & Food (1995) *Rural England: A Nation Committed to a Living Countryside* (HMSO, London)

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, with MAFF (1998) *Rural England: A Discussion Document*

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (1999), *Review of Voluntary Transport* (Steer Davies Gleave) (DETR)

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (1998), *Focus on Personal Travel* (The Stationery Office, London)

Department of Transport (1995), National Travel Survey 1992/4 (HMSO London)

Department of Transport (1996), *Door to Door: A Guide to Transport for Disabled People* (Stationery Office, London)

Devon County Council (1999), *Quality of Life survey* (Devon CC, Exeter)

Devon County Council (1999), Transport and access to further education in remote rural areas (Devon CC, Exeter)

Devon County Council 1999, *Devon on the Move* the Provision Local Transport Plan (Devon CC, Exeter.)

Dibben, P (1997), *Facing Reality in Rural Somerset* (Somerset County Council)

Dodgson, J & Katsoulacos (1991), Quality Competition in Bus Services: Some Welfare Implications of Bus Deregulation in *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, vol 22, pp263-281

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (1998), *North Doncaster Rural Transport Study*

Douglas, M & Isherwood, B (1996), *The World of Goods: towards an Anthropology of Consumption*, Routledge, London

Enoch, M (1998), Can Transport Policies Help to Re-integrate the Socially Excluded? in *Local Transport Today* 14 January, 1998

Fair Play North East (1999), *The Whole Journey Concept Report* (Fair Play, Cheshire)

Gillingwater, D (1999), *New Deal For Community Transport from the Margin to the Mainstream in Community Transport* (January/February, 1999, pp26-7)

Glaister, S & Graham, D (1996), *Who Spends What on Motoring in the UK?* Automobile Association, London

Gloucestershire Rural Transport Partnership (1999), *overview and project ideas*.

Godalming and District *Community Study for the Housebound and Elderly* (1995), Report prepared by Paul Beecham and Associates for Surrey County Council, December 1995

Golding, P Ed, *Excluding the Poor* (Child Poverty Action Group, London, 1986)

Goodin, R., *Inclusion & Exclusion* (Archives Europeenes de Sociologie, vol37, no2, 1996, pp343-371)

Goss, M (1998), *Breath of Fresh Air Transport Report* (April 1998, pp8-9)

Grant, M (1998), for Merseytravel *Addressing Social Exclusion in Liverpool; the Role of Public Transport*

Green, A, *Social Exclusion, the Journey to Work and Ethnic Minorities*, overheads of a presentation for a workshop on Social Exclusion and Transport at University of Manchester, 26 November 1998, on Manchester University Website

Hamblin, P (1997), *Improving Local Transport Policy* (CPRE, London, July 1997)

Harris Research Centre (1997). *Report carried out for Merseytravel Pathways and Public Transport Use and Awareness: a Research Report* (January 1997)

Heiser, B (1995), *The Nature and Cause of Transport Disability in Britain, and How to Remove it*, in Zarb, G *Removing Disabling Barriers* (Policy Studies Institute, London)

Howarth, C & Kenway, P (1998), *A multi-dimensional approach to social exclusion indicators* in Oppenheim (Ed) *An Inclusive Society: Strategies for tackling poverty* (IPPR, London)

Jackson, G (1999), *Better for Everyone in Community Transport* (January/February, 1999, pp18-23)

Joseph, S (1998), *Well-fares to Work?* Transport Report April 1998, p6

JRF Research findings (1998), *Monitoring poverty and social exclusion* (December, 1998)

Kelly, G & McCormick, J (1998), *Private interests and public purposes: exclusion and the private sector* in Oppenheim, C. (ed.), *An Inclusive Society: Strategies for Tackling Poverty* (IPPR, London)

Kempson, E (1996) *Life on a Low Income* (Policy Studies Institute, London)

Leonard Cheshire, London (1998) *Access denied: disabled peoples experience of social exclusion*

Local Transport Today, 2 July 1998

London Research Centre and Department of Transport (1994) *Travel in London, London Area Transport Survey 1991* (HMSO London)

London Transport (1998) *Annual Report 1997/1998*

Lu, X., Pas, E., (1998) Socio-demographics, activity participation and travel behaviour, in *Transportation Research Part A* (vol33, pp1-18)

Lynas, J (1998) *The Hackney Plus Bus Scheme: Initial Monitoring and Review*, Working Paper, University of London Centre for Transport Studies

Manchester Minibus Agency, *Report and Business Plan* 1998

Martin, S (1998) *Social Exclusion and Transport: The Rural Dimension*, Transport Seminar University of Manchester, 2nd December 1998, on website art.man.ac.uk

Matson, L, Killing the Countryside in *New Statesman* (22 May, 1998)

McLaughlin, E, *Taxes, Benefits and Paid Work* in Oppenheim (Ed) *An Inclusive Society: Strategies for tackling poverty* (IPPR, London)

Merseytravel (1994) *Survey with Young Children: Guidance from Qualitative Research with Children and Young People in Wirral and Speke*

Oppenheim, C (1998) *Poverty and Social Exclusion: an Overview* in Oppenheim, C. (ed.), *An Inclusive Society: Strategies for Tackling Poverty* (IPPR, London)

Pahl, S (1998) *Stores charge more in poor areas* (Guardian, 21 December, 1998, p7)

Pearson, M. *Outpatients outclassed* Health Service Journal pp. 28-29, 15 October 1992

Perri (1997) *Social Exclusion: Time to be Optimistic*, in *The Wealth and Poverty of Networks: Tackling Social Exclusion* (Demos, London)

Platt, L & Noble, M (1999) *Race, Ethnic Groups and Low Income Distribution* in *Joseph Rowntree Foundation Research Findings*, February 1999

Pilling, A, Holloway, B, & Turner, J (1998) *Catching them Young Young Peoples Travel and the Scope for Influencing their Behaviour*, Manchester University Website

Room, G (1995) *Poverty in Europe: Competing Paradigms of Analysis* in *Policy and Politics* (vol23, no2, pp103-113)

Root, A (1998) *Home Alone: Is Transport Poverty the Cinderella of Social Exclusion?* in *Transport Report* 21, p11, Transport 2000, London

Root, A, Boardman, B & Fielding (1996) *Rural Travel and Transport Corridors*, University of Oxford

Root, A, Boardman, B & Fielding (1996) *The Costs of Rural Travel*, University of Oxford

Rural Development Commission (1997) *Survey of Rural Services* (RDC, Cheltenham)

Rural Development Commission (1996) *Community and Voluntary Transport in rural England* (RDC, Cheltenham)

Rural Development Commission (1998) *Rural Transport Partnership: linking communities*

Sandwell Community *Transport, Report and Business Plan* 1998

Somerset County Council, *Public Transport Plan, 1997-2000* (draft copy)

Solomon, J (1998) *To Drive or to Vote? Young Adults Culture and Priorities*, CIT, London

Spicker, P, Exclusion, *Journal of Common Market Studies* (vol 35, no1, March 1997, pp133-143)

Steer Davies Gleave (1998) Review of *Voluntary Transport: Agenda for Action* (December 1998)

Stokes, G. and Parkhurst, G (1996) *Change through Interchange: Making complex journeys easier* ESRC Transport Studies Unit, University of Oxford,

SYPTE, Rotherham MBC and the RDC (1998) *South Rotherham Rural Transport Initiative*, Strategy Report

SYPTE (1996) *North Doncaster Transportation Study*

Town, S.W. (1980) The social distribution of mobility and travel patterns *TRRL Laboratory Report 928*

Turner, J & Grieco, M (1998) *Gender and User Group Protocols: the Need for New Transport Planning Practices*, paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, January 1998

Walker, R & Park, J (1998) *Unpicking Poverty in Poverty and Social Exclusion: an Overview* in Oppenheim, C. (ed.), *An Inclusive Society: Strategies for Tackling Poverty* (IPPR, London)

Ways to Work: A review of Public Transport Serving the Hattersley Estate (29 November 1996)

Waterfront conference (1996) *Personal Security and Transport* (conference papers)

Wenger, G C (1997) *Nurturing Networks in The Wealth and Poverty of Networks: Tackling Social Exclusion* (Demos, London)

West Sussex County Council (1999) Samplus project *West Sussex DRT, User Needs Analysis*

Young, M & Wilmott, P (1986) 2nd Ed, *Family and Kinship in East London* (Penguin Books Limited, Middlesex)

Appendix 1 Attributes of "adequate" public transport

"Affordability" refers to the extent to which the financial cost of journeys put an individual or household in the position of having to make sacrifices to travel or the extent to which they can afford to travel when they want to. For example, a family on benefit with a teenager who wished to remain in education after the statutory school leaving age, but who perhaps wanted to attend a course at a distance incurring high transport costs, might have to change their spending patterns quite radically. Somebody on a low income with a family, if they wished to travel regularly with the family, might find themselves unable to do so regularly unless other expenditure was curtailed.

"Availability" of transport is used to refer to route possibilities, timings and frequency. Whatever the purposes of an individual's journey, be it education, work, leisure, personal services, or another, her/his activities are constrained by the route and the time taken travelling. Even if an individual has a bus stop within 400 metres of their home (the most common measure of public transport accessibility) the amount of use it will be to any individual entirely depends on where he/she wants to go, how often, and how long the whole journey is going to take. Furthermore, a bus stop 400 metres away from home, particularly one

with no seats or shelter, or one which can only be reached by crossing a major traffic artery, may be of little use to a person with, for example, a weak heart or knees, heavy shopping, or young children.

Timings and frequency are included since if there is no service when a person wants to travel, there is no available transport.

"**Accessibility**" describes the ease with which all categories of passenger can use public transport. For example, buses with high steps are notoriously difficult to board, particularly if they are one-person operated and there is no assistance. They are also difficult to use for those carrying luggage or shopping or with young children. Accessibility is also sometimes used to describe the ease of accessing the bus stop or station, although sometimes these parts of the journey are referred to as part of the "public transport environment". If a walk is intimidating or dangerous, a bus stop at 200 metres distance may be perceived as inaccessible to a fit 14-year old boy because of the risk of mugging. Accessibility also includes ease of finding out about travel possibilities, i.e. the information function.

"**Acceptability**" is another quality that is sometimes lacked by public transport, whether because of the transport or because of the standards of the traveller. Even if a bus has all the first three qualities, potential travellers may be deterred by drivers attitudes and driving style, lack of waiting facilities, the state of the vehicles, other members of the travelling public (who may be offensive or feel threatening) and various other attributes.

Appendix 2 Summary of research methods used in each area

In all areas interviews and discussions were held with New Deal workers and others involved in the partnership, local authority officers, Councillors, teachers, librarians and a variety of other officials. Local activists were also contacted. They are not included in the list below, but their views are included as appropriate in the more detailed area descriptions available from the Mobility and Inclusion Unit. The total number of people spoken within the urban areas was about 1600, and about 630 in the rural areas.

I. Urban Areas

Birmingham

- Structured hall test/street interviews, using short questionnaire, in The Folds shopping centre and Hawkesley
- Three focus groups with parents at the Family Service Unit in The Folds area. This included mothers of young children, men, and parents with learning difficulties
- Questionnaire survey and discussion group at the local secondary school
- 50 Household interviews with approximately one third in each of the three estates

Bradford

- 50 Household interviews, divided between three areas
- Hall-test day based at the Bradford Foyer
- Group with Pakistani young people at MAPA (youth centre) and Hutson Street Community Centre
- Interviews with traders

- Short discussions with young people who lived at the Bradford Foyer
- Photographs and captions for the area taken by young people, to give their 'picture of transport'

Bristol

- On-street interviews and group discussions
- 50 household interviews, with the emphasis on the Dings (at the New Deal Co-ordinator's request)
- Focus group at Barton Hill Settlement
- Focus group at St. George's Community School
- Group in primary school
- (A hall test day was to have taken place for a fair that was being held at Barton Hill; unfortunately flooding in Central Bristol meant that the interviewers could not get there)

East Brighton

- Focus group with women in Moulsecoomb
- Discussion group with older people, Moulsecoomb
- The People's Launderette, Whitehawk
- On-street/bus stop interviews in Whitehawk Road and Moulsecoomb
- Discussion with community representatives
- 50 household interviews

Hackney

- Attendance at three of the four local area forums, walk-about with Area Forum members, discussion with Hoxton Trust
- Hall-test day in Hoxton
- 21 household interviews in the central and western parts of the area
- Focus group with Turkish (Kurdish) women
- Exercise with Crown and Manor Club (young people) and some non-attached youth taking photographs of transport in the area

Hull

- Attendance at CAB and other sessions at Community Association
- 50 household interviews
- Hall and on-street interviews
- Discussions with local shopkeepers and mini cab firm
- Focus group with people in their 20s and 30s (recruited in advance)

Leicester

- Group discussion with mothers of young children at the Women's Drop-in Centre
- Group discussion with older women at the Women's Drop-in Centre
- Group and individual discussions with unemployed men at the Working Men's Club
- Group discussion with young people at the Recreation Centre

- Group discussion with pupils at the local secondary school, prepared for by a short questionnaire
- 50 Household interviews, representing south/eastern part of the NDC area

Liverpool

- Attendance at 'New Kensington Deal' public consultation session
- Focus group with unemployed people
- Discussions with older people at Riverside Housing Association Sheltered Housing
- Interviews with local traders
- Pub interviews and discussion groups
- Short household interviews
- On-street discussions
- 50 Household Interviews in Area 1 and Area 3

Manchester

- 50 household interviews, 25 in Beswick and 25 in Openshaw
- A group discussion in Openshaw with unemployed males
- A mini group discussion with residents in another pub in Openshaw Village
- Hall-test day in Beswick held at the St. Brigid's Roman Catholic Primary School opposite the shopping precinct. This was intended for young parents with children, but was broadened out to include many types of people
- On-street short interviews in the shopping centre and market

Middlesbrough

- Focus group, mixed gender, ages 30-50
- 50 household interviews
- On-street interviews
- Summary of New Deal Household Survey results
- Visit and interviews at the Ayresome Millennium Partnership, which provides courses and support for a variety of groups including older people, younger people and families

Newcastle

- Unstructured on-street interviews (6 people, mixed ethnicity)
- Group discussion with 11 men, employed and unemployed
- Structured on-street interviews
- 50 household interviews

Newham

- Hall-test day in the 'Eastlea' part of the area. As in the event the area was not busy, the fieldworkers were used to undertake 11 household interviews, plus 42 hall-test interviews and mini-group discussions with

- a group of 8 young males aged around 14-16
- a group of two young men and two young women aged 14-19
- A market trader and a publican
- There are a number of pen-portraits based on shorter discussions with people intercepted on-street or at local businesses.
 - Depth interview with a representative of West Ham who had been involved in lobbying London Transport about the Route 276
 - Group at Portway Primary School in the Brooks Estate
 - Household interviews (48) in 4 areas

Norwich

- Attendance at General Drop-in day at Community Association
- Discussion with group of older people at Community Association
- Group discussion in secondary school
- Street discussions with young people (collected by young people distributing leaflets for the New Deal for Communities)
- 49 Household interviews
- Several meetings with New Deal co-ordinators and a local councillor

Nottingham

- Traders (via Alfreton Road and Hyson Green Trader's Association, as well as individual traders)
- Travel problems for the unemployed via Hyson Green Job Shop
- Journeys to Health Centres
- Local Mobility Index shops
- Route 69 and bus symbols (e.g. a red cross to signify a hospital route)
- An Asian Women's Group
- An on-street survey, during which we gave people cards on behalf of the NDC in case they had any action points

NOTE: There were no household interviews in Nottingham because of apparent survey fatigue.

Sandwell

- Hall-test day at the Lodge Road Community Centre (two Bangladeshi women who sit on the New Deal Steering group assisted with the hall test day. This was invaluable because their assistance was required to access Bangladeshi households, and to interpret during interviews).
- Youth consultation: short questionnaire and discussion group with pupils attending George Salter High School, conducted by a member of the New Deal Steering Group
- 25 household interviews in the western part of the area, conducted with the predominantly white population in the Hamblets Estate

II Rural Areas

Devon

- Attendance and discussions at High Moorlands Community Action Steering Group
- 12 interviews with concerned "authorities" etc and local businesses including taxi firms, and one interview in Bere Alston
- Focus group in Princetown: a combination of job-seekers, low income earners and people with disabilities (no old or young people.)
- Surveys on buses, Routes 82 and 98
- Hall-test day in Tavistock, with a focus group and short interviews (questionnaire-based) with people from inside and outside Tavistock
- 38 household questionnaires in Princetown and Tavistock
- Devon also provided a considerable amount of background information including reports from local transport partnerships (existing research on transport deficits) and reports from the County Council on access to education and quality of life

East of Doncaster

- Household Survey (50 - 10 in each of Misson, Wroot, Finningley, Rossington, Harworth)
- Hall Test Interview day in Harworth and one in Bawtry
- Focus group in Bawtry
- On-bus surveys, Route 190 and Route 192

South Shropshire

- Household interviews at 49 households divided between:
 - Cleobury Mortimer (inner and outer)
 - Highley (ex mining village, inner and outer)
 - Ditton Priors (village with small industrial estate, inner and outer)
- Hall Test day in Highley
- Focus group, men
- On-bus interviews on Routes 142, 125 and 132. The 132 is funded by Shropshire County Council with rural bus grant and takes people from Cleobury Mortimer to Bridgnorth for shopping on a Saturday. Both the other routes have some funding as Shropshire Bus, operated by Go Whittle and the Big Bus Company
- Discussions with traders in Cleobury Mortimer and Highley

West Sussex

- 50 household interviews in the villages and towns
- Hall Test day in Steyning
- Focus Group for young people
- Surveys on the Route 20 (questionnaires and interviews)
- Surveys on the Route 100 (questionnaires and interviews)
- A day talking to users of the mobile library (North-West area)
- Group discussion and interviews on Route 39A, the Tesco-sponsored bus from Wivelsfield to Burgess Hill
- Interviews in Health Centre

Appendix 3 A comparative analysis of journey characteristics (NTS)

Figure 1: Journeys per person per year 1996/98 (NTS)

Journeys per person per year 1996/98

Figure 2: Distance per person per year 1996/98 (NTS)

Distance per person per year 1996/1998 (NTS)

Figure 3: Distance per person per year, settlements below and above 25000 population

Distance per person per year, settlements below and above 25000 population

Figure 4: Distances travelled in settlements under 25000 population

Distances travelled in settlements under 25000 population

Figure 5: Distances travelled in settlements over 25000 population

Distances travelled in settlements over 25000 population

Figure 6: Distances per person per year by mobility and car ownership 1996/98 (NTS)

Distances per person per year by mobility and car ownership 1996/98 (NTS)

Figure 7: Journeys per person per year 1996/98 (NTS)

Journeys per person per year 1996/98 (NTS)

Figure 8: Distances per person per year 1996/98 (NTS)

Distances per person per year 1996/98 (NTS)

Appendix 4 Profile of Respondents

A Profile Of Questionnaire Respondents: Gender And Age

Gender, New Deal areas: the total number of respondents (questionnaire interviews) was 1127, of whom 458 were male and 669 female.

Figure 1: Age group, New Deal areas

Age group, New Deal areas

Gender, Rural areas: the total number of respondents (questionnaire interviews) was 359, of whom 137 were male and 222 female.

Figure 2: Age group rural areas

Age group rural areas

A Profile of Questionnaire Respondents: Employment Status and Ethnicity

Ethnicity, New Deal areas: 85% of questionnaire respondents were White, and 15 % from ethnic minority groups.

Figure 3: Employment status, New Deal areas

Employment status, New Deal areas

Ethnicity, Rural areas: 98% of questionnaire respondents were White, and 2% from ethnic minority groups.

Figure 4: Employment status, rural areas

Employment status, rural areas

A Profile of Questionnaire Respondents: Disabilities Affecting Travel, Household Car Ownership

Disability, New Deal areas: 17.6% had a disability affecting travel

Figure 5: Household car ownership, New Deal areas

Household car ownership, New Deal areas

Disability, Rural areas: 15% had a disability affecting travel

Figure 6: Household car ownership, rural areas

Household car ownership, rural areas

A Profile of Questionnaire Respondents: Mode and Ticket Type Normally Used

New Deal areas, ticket types: 16% had pensioner/disability passes, 73% normally bought single tickets, and the remaining 11% had a variety of daily, weekly, monthly or student/ unemployed passes.

Figure 7: Most frequently used mode, New Deal areas

Most frequently used mode, New Deal areas

Rural areas, ticket types: 10% had pensioner/disability passes, 84% normally bought single tickets, and the remaining 6% had a variety of daily, weekly, monthly or student/ unemployed passes.

Figure 8: Most frequently used mode, rural areas

Most frequently used mode, rural areas

A Profile of Questionnaire Respondents: Travel Problems.

New Deal areas: travel was a problem for some journeys for about 19% of respondents.

Rural areas: travel was a problem for some journeys for about 30% of respondents.

New Deal areas: about a fifth of respondents said that there were destinations that they wanted or needed to go to that they could not reach.

Rural areas: about a third of respondents said that there were destinations that they wanted or needed to go to that they could not reach.

A Profile of Questionnaire Respondents: Social Networks

New Deal areas: 30% of respondents had parents in the area, 17% had independent children, and 39% had other family in the area.

30% of respondents relied on family and neighbours, and 33% said they were relied upon. 30% said that neighbours helped by giving lifts.

Rural areas: 38% of respondents had parents in the area, 26% had independent children, and 36% had other family in the area.

41% of respondents relied on family and neighbours and 33% said they were relied upon. 50% said that neighbours helped by giving lifts.