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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

THE ROLE OF TRANSPORT IN SOCIAL EXCLUSION IN URBAN SCOTLAND

BACKGROUND

1.1 Social exclusion reflects the existence of barriers which make it difficult or impossible for people to participate fully in society (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998). Previous work had indicated a paucity of data on the link between transport and social exclusion, and that as a consequence the nature of this relationship had not been fully appreciated. In October 1999, the Transport Research Institute was commissioned by the Scottish Executive to explore the links between social exclusion and transport in urban Scotland. The overall purpose of the research was to provide a better understanding of the role that transport plays in social exclusion in urban Scotland, in order to identify appropriate strategies to improve accessibility to key destinations and to improve the quality of life for groups currently experiencing social exclusion.

MAIN FINDINGS

1.2 This research, which provides new empirical evidence based on detailed surveys in 3 urban areas of Scotland, found that:

- Women, the unemployed, elderly, people with health problems and those in low income groups are more likely to experience transport related social exclusion.
- Excluded groups are heavily reliant on walking, public transport and rely on lifts from family, friends and neighbours.
- Lower income groups (gross household incomes below £100-£149 per week) spend more on fares for public transport than those in higher income groups.
- Regular car access is strongly associated with a higher income level (gross household incomes above £100-£149 per week), home ownership (homes owned outright or being purchased with the help of a loan or mortgage) and (lower levels of public transport use).
- Reliance on lifts and irregular car access is responsible for an increase in average journey times to reach local facilities.
- The elderly and people with health problems were more likely to find it difficult to use buses, taxis and walk for at least 10 minutes.
- Two-thirds of respondents stated that the local bus service stop was less than 3 minutes walk away, although service frequencies were perceived to decline noticeably in the evenings and on Sundays.
- Strong local support networks were evidenced by a significant proportion (over 60%) stating that they could rely on friends and family in a variety of situations.
- Over 90% of people stated that they like living in their neighbourhood but those expressing a preference to move did so because of a poor local environment and desire to improve housing circumstances. A smaller proportion (5%) stated they would move to improve transport links and accessibility.
- Reduced fares and budget ticketing were used by relatively low numbers of people.
- High levels of awareness of community transport schemes but low levels of use was recorded in each area.
SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.3 The specific aims of the study were to:
° review existing empirical research on the contribution of transport to social exclusion
° examine the differential effects of transport 'disadvantage' on different groups in the population
° collect primary evidence on the nature of transport disadvantage in urban areas and to investigate its effects on exclusion
° identify and assess the available options for addressing the transport needs of socially excluded groups.

METHODOLOGY

Stage One: Review

1.4 The purpose of the first stage of the project was to establish the parameters of the study and was essentially qualitative in nature. The two components of this stage were:

(1) a literature review which identified the main parameters of exclusion affected by transport and included a review of transport initiatives designed specifically to address issues of social exclusion; and

(2) a series of 4 focus groups and 18 in-depth interviews were conducted with local residents of four urban locations within the Central Belt. These were used to identify the influence of (poor) transport in contributing to social exclusion in each of the selected areas. They also aimed to explore, as far as was possible, the problems experienced by different potentially disadvantaged groups such as those on low income, the long term unemployed, the elderly or young, women and single parents.

1.5 The purpose of the fieldwork was to identify key issues and to assist in the drafting of survey instruments to be used in the second stage. The data collected at this stage also assisted in the selection of three case studies for the second stage of the research.

Stage Two: Case Studies

1.6 The second stage of the research constituted the core of the research project and focused on three case study areas which were located in Leith (Edinburgh), Castlemilk (Glasgow) and Coatbridge (North Lanarkshire). The three areas were selected on the basis of their transport links and the levels of transport deprivation. The case study of each area involved three distinct stages which together aimed to address the objectives defined at the outset of the project. The three components were:

(1) a household survey which provided data on 552 households. The data was then used to quantitatively examine context-specific relationships, the experiences of different groups (in a local area context) and explore the nature of transport disadvantage in the different areas.
a Travel Diary study where 19 diaries were completed. The diary formed the basis for an in-depth interview schedule. The purpose of the travel diary study was to elicit information on people’s experience of barriers to travel. The qualitative data collected was intended to supplement that collected in the household survey in order to explore more fully the factors that either determine or contribute to transport disadvantage.

assessment of the transport provision made in each of the three areas was made in order to explore the differences between perceptions and actual transport provision. This stage involved the collection of data from transport operators and local authorities in the three case study areas.

Stage Three: Potential Solutions

1.7 The third stage proposed involved consultation with the key transport providers of the selected case study areas in order to explore potential solutions to problems identified in the previous two stages of the research project. An interview schedule was developed based on the findings of the household survey, with reference to the Local Transport Strategies published for each area and with reference to the potential solutions reviewed in the literature review.

1.8 Fifteen in-depth interviews were conducted with representatives, of the bus industry and local authorities, who had responsibility for services and strategies in each case study area. The organisations contacted for this stage of the work are listed in the Annex where a full account of the methodology used is provided.

STUDY FINDINGS

Stage One: Literature review, focus groups and interviews

1.9 The study found that, in addition to there being no common definition of social exclusion itself, there was also no common understanding of the dimensions and factors involved in the process of exclusion. Several dimensional frameworks were discussed in relation to transport. These frameworks recognise that the factors, which affect an individual’s – and thus a group’s – ability to participate in these dimensions is determined by a wide range of variables, including: the individual’s own characteristics (e.g. health or educational qualifications), events in the individual’s life (e.g. job loss), characteristics of the area he or she lives in (e.g. physical environment, transport links), and social, civil and political institutions of society (e.g. welfare state).

1.10 The literature review also found that, although the existence of a link between transport and social exclusion had been widely recognised, a paucity of data on the issue meant that the subtle relationship between transport and social exclusion could not be fully appreciated. The review found that it may also be that the effect of the transport exclusion mechanisms is peripheral when compared with non-transport factors associated with exclusion. The studies identified were, generally, either concerned with the area of activity from which people were excluded, or discussed the transport related mechanisms which created a problem.
1.11 The accounts presented during focus groups and interviews demonstrate that access to transport is a real concern for some people and that differential transport access does affect participation in what are considered to be the normal activities of citizens. For many, the existing transport system dictates the places that people can go. Clearly, it is possible to reach most destinations but it is the degree of difficulty experienced that affects whether people chose to take those journeys and consequently influences what activities people choose to do. Even where time budgets are not necessarily pressured, there are still concerns about punctuality and reliability of service. These are expressed more strongly when the weather is bad or when travellers are further restricted (for example, when they are accompanied by children). It is clear that transport does affect some individuals’ ability to participate in these ‘normal’ activities, specifically employment and labour-related activities such as job seeking and the attendance of interviews. There is also evidence that leisure activities are influenced by transport considerations. Many of the respondents chose to stay at home rather than undertake long or difficult journeys.

Stage Two: Household survey, travel diary, and assessment of transport provision

1.12 For each case study area, an assessment of transport provision was made to explore the differences between perceptions and actual transport provision. This involved the collection of timetable and route information from public transport operators and local authorities in each of the three case study areas.

1.13 The household survey provided information on the characteristics of respondents and their households (income, household composition, health, employment status), car access, public transport use, activity and travel patterns.

1.14 Those on lower incomes and in poor health were less likely to hold a driving licence. Men were more likely to have access to a car and women were found to be more likely to experience sporadic access to a car or no access at all. Respondents with a disability were less likely to have regular access to a car. The majority of respondents stated that if they had access to a car, this would not significantly change their activity patterns. Single person and single parent families were predominantly found in these lower income groups.

1.15 Walking dominates the share of trips for most activities in each area, with the exception of trips to the cinema, bus station, hospital and supermarket. For these trips, bus and car become extremely important as these activities tend to be located outwith the local neighbourhood. Data indicated, however, that the average time taken to visit basic services varies little when gender and mode of travel, employment status and mode of travel are examined. Car access, unsurprisingly, makes it quicker to access local services but reliance on lifts and occasional access to a car results in an increase in average travel time. Trips to out-of-town retail facilities are more likely to be made by those with regular access to a car. Lack of access to a car resulted in less visits to friends and relatives and evenings out for leisure purpose. Lower income groups were more likely to make frequent visits to grocery shops.

1.16 Access to bus stops and bus use was relatively easy; train usage in comparison did not feature as a major mode of transport in any of the case study areas. In each case study area, a larger proportion of respondents stated that they lived within three minutes of their nearest bus stop, compared to the Scottish Household Survey figure of 54.4%. Services running from these stops were perceived to be frequent for most of the week, but frequencies were
perceived to be much lower during the evenings and at weekends. In Coatbridge, fewer respondents stated that they used the bus everyday (5.5%) compared to Leith (33.5%) and Castlemilk (22.8%). Despite these patterns of public transport use, use of reduced fares, season tickets and travel passes were low, with the exception of Leith where larger proportions of public transport users were found to use a travel pass. Most respondents, however, felt that their use of public transport was principally restricted due to concerns about personal safety after dark (especially in Castlemilk and Coatbridge) and a lack of information about public transport.

1.17 Taxi and community transport usage was found to very low. A large proportion of respondents stated that they never or very rarely used taxis mainly because they are regarded as an expensive mode of transport. Regular taxi use was more marked in Coatbridge compared to the other areas.

1.18 The diaries provided a detailed account of the types of journeys made by the respondents. For the most part, these journeys were made on foot or by bus. The diary and interview data demonstrated that there were certain factors that influenced the propensity to travel, and also the nature of the travel undertaken. These varied from aspects of a journey that could be changed to improve the accessibility of transport, such as the information provided and the manner in which information is provided, to other factors which, although outwith the control of policy makers, for example bad weather (which was consistently mentioned as a barrier), the impact could be minimised through provision of (better) shelters and more efficient arrangements for interchange. The predominance of these issues becomes more apparent with reference to the specific experiences of the individuals interviewed. It is clear from this work that problems become insurmountable when the options available to an individual are limited for whatever reason, whether it is lack of income or physical capacity.

Stage Three: Interviews with transport providers and local authorities

1.19 These interviews focused primarily on experiential evidence of local authorities and operators in providing public transport in the three case study areas. On this basis, views on transport solutions were sought and provided by respondents on a range of transport solutions that could be applied to each case study area. Nonetheless, this information provided valuable insights into the problem and possibilities associated with the development of particular transport solutions in the selected case study areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1.20 The findings of this study have a number of implications for current policy. The main recommendations from this study for local and national transport authorities are:

Subsidies and concessions

1.21 Increased targeting of subsidies and concessions will:
° improve mobility of the transport disadvantaged
° contribute to the reduction in travel costs for those on low incomes, particularly when interchange is involved
° possibly generate more travel on public transport amongst the transport disadvantaged
° maintain particular transport links and meet special transport requirements
Public transport operations

1.22 Co-ordination and monitoring of public transport operations will:
° ensure desired levels of service to a specified standard
° provide controls over timetable information and its provision
° provide responsive public transport
° enhance the services provided by small operators and their methods of operation
° provide a basis for increased co-ordination of transport services
° enhance the status of adaptations to network infrastructure through the packaging of service developments and improvements

Community and specialised transport operations

1.23 Increased co-ordination of transport, by transport authorities, funded by the public and voluntary sector will:
° develop links between transport services provided by education, social work and community transport groups
° provide a network that operates on a transport need basis without duplicating the commercial network
° assist with the development of feeder services to commercial bus corridors
° provide an efficient way in which access to transport can be widened to previously excluded passengers
° provide transport links, that would not be commercially viable, for access to new employment opportunities

1.24 For specialised transport services the recommendations from this study are that targeted, demand responsive transport services can be provided through:
° subsidised and concessionary travel for taxis
° car schemes that can be provided either commercially or through the voluntary sector
° extended dial-a-bus schemes, where issues of efficiency and cost criteria can be met in light of available alternatives
° provision of service routes for those groups that place a high value on door to door travel, and importantly for all these services
° widened eligibility criteria to accommodate particular local needs

Fares and ticketing arrangements

1.25 There is a need for fares and ticketing arrangements that:
° are based on the objectives of both modal shift and enhanced accessibility to meet the social needs of targeted groups
° promote cross-subsidisation of travel on routes to ensure service continuity throughout the day
° are targeted on a route and geographical basis
° are affordable, for targeted groups with particular needs
° help to overcome patterns of financial exclusion
Provision of public transport in new developments

1.26 Transport and planning authorities should:
° promote the role of public transport in new developments
° provide specified facilities in discussion with operators to promote new services
° encourage new developments to areas that are well served by public transport
CHAPTER ONE      INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

1.1 In October 1999, the Transport Research Institute was commissioned by the Scottish Executive to explore the links between Social Exclusion and transport in urban Scotland.

1.2 Social exclusion reflects the existence of barriers which make it difficult or impossible for people to participate fully in society (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998). The factors identified as contributing to social exclusion include differentials in education and training opportunity and attainment, socio-economic circumstances, local environment, peer group and other normative influences, as well as access to information and physical accessibility to a wide range of opportunities including employment, shopping and recreation. It is important to note that there may be a difference between perceived access and a more objective measure of accessibility.

1.3 This project seeks to examine the relationship between social exclusion and transport and, in particular, the contribution that public transport could make to reducing levels of exclusion. This is a challenging piece of work and one that is important not only to transport policy, but to cross-sectoral policies reflecting the government’s ‘joined-up’ thinking found in current policy development.

1.4 It was envisaged that the findings would be of significance in informing debates surrounding social exclusion and the identification of potential transport solutions.

SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.5 The overall purpose of the research was to provide a better understanding of the role that transport plays in social exclusion in urban Scotland, in order to identify appropriate strategies to improve accessibility to key destinations and to improve the quality of life for groups currently experiencing social exclusion. The specific aims of the study were to:

° review existing empirical research on the contribution of transport to social exclusion
° examine the differential effects of transport 'disadvantage' on different groups in the population
° collect primary evidence on the nature of transport disadvantage in urban areas and to investigate its effects on exclusion
° identify and assess the available options for addressing the transport needs of socially excluded groups.

METHODOLOGY

1.6 The following section includes a summary of the methodology used. There is also a full description of the methodology and copies of the research tools used included in the Annex and appendices of the report.
1.7 A three stage approach was originally proposed for the research project and the methodology used in each of the stages is described below.

Stage One: Review

1.8 The purpose of the first stage of the project was to establish the parameters of the study and was essentially qualitative in nature. The two components of this stage were:

(1) a literature review which identified the main parameters of exclusion affected by transport and included a review of transport initiatives designed specifically to address issues of social exclusion. The review has been published simultaneously but separately to this report.

(2) a series of four focus groups and 18 in-depth interviews were conducted with local residents of four urban locations within the Central Belt. These were used to identify the influence of (poor) transport in contributing to social exclusion in each of the selected areas. They also aimed to explore, as far as was possible, the problems experienced by different potentially disadvantaged groups such as those on low income, the long term unemployed, the elderly or young, women and single parents.

1.9 The purpose of the fieldwork was to identify key issues and to assist in the drafting of survey instruments to be used in the second stage. The data collected at this stage also assisted in the selection of three case studies for the second stage of the research.

Stage Two: Case Studies

1.10 The second stage of the research constituted the core of the research project and focused on three case study areas which were located in Leith (Edinburgh), Castlemilk, (Glasgow) and Coatbridge (North Lanarkshire). The three areas were selected on the basis of their transport links and their socio-economic characteristics. The case study of each area involved three distinct stages which together aimed to address the objectives defined at the outset of the project – although mainly the second and third which are listed at 1.5. The three components of this stage were:

(1) a household survey which provided data on 552 households. This data was then used to quantitatively examine context-specific relationships, the experiences of different groups (in a local area context) and explore the nature of transport disadvantage in the different areas.

(2) a Travel Diary study where 19 diaries were completed. The diary formed the basis for an in-depth interview schedule. The purpose of the travel diary study was to elicit information on people’s experience of barriers to travel. The qualitative data collected was intended to supplement that collected in the household survey in order to explore more fully the factors that either determine or contribute to transport disadvantage.

(3) assessment of the transport provision made in each of the three areas was made in order to explore the differences between perceptions and actual transport provision. This stage involved the collection of data from transport operators and local authorities in the three case study areas.
Stage Three: Potential Solutions

1.11 The third stage involved consultation with the key transport providers of the selected case study areas in order to explore potential solutions to problems identified in the previous two stages of the research project.

1.12 An interview schedule was developed based on the findings of the household survey, with reference to the Local Transport Strategies published for each area and with reference to the potential solutions reviewed in the literature review.

1.13 Fifteen in-depth interviews were conducted with representatives of the bus industry and local authorities who had responsibility for services and strategies in each case study area. The organisations contacted for this stage of the work are listed in the Annex where a full account of the methodology used is provided.

STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

1.14 The structure of the report is as follows:

° Chapter 2 provides an overview of the findings of the first stage of the research. It reports first on the main findings of the literature review and then on the findings of the series of focus groups and in-depth interviews conducted.

° Chapter 3 documents the findings of the assessment of transport provision in each case study area. It also provides background reports and maps of each of the three case study areas.

° Chapter 4 presents the main findings of the quantitative analysis of the data collected in the household survey.

° Chapter 5 provides an account of the findings of the qualitative analysis of the travel diaries and in-depth interviews.

° Chapter 6 reviews the findings made at Stage Three of the project. It explores potential solutions to the transport issues identified throughout the different stages of the project and explores the relationship between social exclusion and transport in urban Scotland.

° Chapter 7 makes recommendations based on the main conclusions and findings of the project.

1.15 A detailed account of the methodology used is presented in the Annex provided at the end of the report. The four appendices contain all the research tools used and also some additional output from the quantitative analysis.
CHAPTER TWO  OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

2.1 The purpose of the first stage of the project was to establish the parameters of the study. A literature review and a series of in-depth interviews and focus groups were conducted at this stage to (1) identify the main parameters of exclusion affected by transport and review transport initiatives designed to address issues of social exclusion, and (2) identify the influence of (poor) transport links in (a) contributing to social exclusion in different areas and (b) impacting upon different potentially disadvantaged groups such as on low income, the long term unemployed, the elderly or young, women and single parents.

2.2 This section provides an overview of the key issues identified at Stage One. These influenced the development of the project and assisted in the drafting of survey instruments to be used in the later stages of the field work.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.3 The review of literature undertaken for this study incorporated what might be viewed as two different strands of literature. Namely, a review of the predominant thinking on ‘social exclusion’ and an exploration of the existing literature on transport-related exclusion.

Definitions of Social Exclusion

2.4 Despite the growing salience of the term ‘social exclusion’, there was little consensus or agreement found in the literature on its exact meaning or definition. There was agreement that social exclusion represents a conceptual shift from the traditional forms of explanation and should not be considered equivalent to older terms and definitions previously applied to individuals, groups and processes considered to exist and operate outside a certain social norm – such as poverty, deprivation and the underclass (Balla and Lapeyre, 1997; Lee and Murie, 1999). The distinctions made between social exclusion and these traditional forms of explanation are explored in the full review (Gaffron et al, 2000).

2.5 The absence of a commonly accepted definition of social exclusion might be considered problematic. But rather than suggesting that the concept is imprecise and thus not a useful analytical tool or basis for policy making, the thorough review of the literature suggests in fact the opposite. The processes and phenomena dealt with under the heading of social exclusion are so varied and complex that other terms, such as poverty, marginalisation or deprivation are in fact insufficient to cover the whole spectrum and that a fairly open definition is needed if the concept is not to be narrowed down so much as to become restrictive. Littlewood (1999) writes that one might well be tempted to jettison such a confusing term in the interests of clarity, but that would be like shutting one’s eyes in the futile hope that what can’t be seen isn’t there (p. 11). Alternatively, he suggests that it is better to stop seeking the ‘right’ or ‘best’ meaning as… on questions as socially and politically sensitive as poverty and exclusion, sociologists must first of all recognise the impossibility of finding exhaustive definitions. These concepts are relative, and vary according to time and circumstance. It is unreasonable to expect to find a fair and objective
definition, which is distinct from social debate, without falling into the trap of putting unclearly defined populations into clumsily defined categories (Littlewood, 1999; 4).

2.6 A working definition was needed to clarify the approach taken by this project. The definition put forward by Burchardt et al. (1999) seems useful for this purpose as firstly, it avoids terms such as poverty or unemployment which have been shown to be problematic and secondly, includes Atkinson’s idea of relativity (exclusion being relative to the normal activities of a society’s citizens). The idea of agency is implied because the definition does not state the causes of non-participation (the agents or agencies could thus be either the excluded or the groups or institutions, which are causing the exclusion). However, the definition lacks the idea of process and also fails to mention that it is not just individuals but also groups or even communities, who can be excluded. As these two are considered important for the purpose of this project, the working definition (adapted from Burchardt et al, 1999) employed in this investigation is as follows:

Social exclusion is a process, which causes individuals or groups, who are geographically resident in a society, not to participate in the normal activities of citizens in that society.

2.7 The idea of normal activities was recognised as requiring closer examination in addition to recognition that it was also necessary to look in more detail at the factors which are considered to be part of social exclusion.

Dimensions of Social Exclusion

2.8 The second section of the review explored dimensions of social exclusion and found that as there was no common definition of social exclusion itself, there was also no common definition of the dimensions and factors involved in it. But in both cases, the approaches taken by various authors, though different in detail, broadly overlap. The review found that in recent years, social policy research has become preoccupied with developing or defining indicators that can determine levels of social exclusion in order that they can be monitored over time and in order to assess how far the introduction of new policies impact upon these levels.

2.9 These dimensional frameworks were discussed in relation to transport. In their literature review on social exclusion conducted on behalf of the Scottish Office Central Research Unit, Lee & Murie (1999) identified eight areas under which social exclusion could be discussed and examined. These were: labour markets and employment; welfare markets and poverty traps; exclusion from financial circuits and public utilities; education; health; housing markets; neighbourhoods and social networks.

2.10 They went on to discuss current understanding of how these areas relate to social exclusion and which processes within them create elements of exclusion (for example the reluctance of employers to take on job applicants who had been unemployed for a long time). Although transport might be expected to play some part in most of these areas (getting people to and from work and establishing or maintaining connections between people and facilities and services, particularly those they do not find within easy distance of their homes) the authors only found restricted evidence for this, and only in connection with access to healthcare facilities. The only other mention of transport was in connection with
neighbourhoods and the problems which arise in rural areas through remoteness and long
distances from urban centres.

2.11 Burchardt et al. (1999) developed a dimensional framework, where their approach attempted to define more closely the areas of the 'normal' activities of citizens within a society. These dimensions were considered to be relevant to people in Britain in the 1990’s - such frameworks obviously vary depending on the society and time period examined – and were as follows:

° consumption activity – the ability to consume at least to a certain level the goods and services considered normal for the society
° savings activity – the ability to accumulate savings and pension entitlements and/or to own property, both as way of fulfilling individual and social aspirations (such as home ownership) and to provide security for periods outside the labour market
° production activity – the ability to engage in an economically and/or socially valued activity (including paid work, education, training, retirement over state pension age or looking after a family), which helps the individual to gain or maintain self-respect for being engaged in an activity valued by others and makes a direct or indirect economic contribution to society
° political activity – the ability to engage in some collective effort to improve or protect the immediate or wider social and physical environment (including voting, membership of political parties and or campaigning groups)
° social activity – the ability to engage in significant social interaction with family or friends and identifying with a cultural group or community (social isolation and denial of cultural rights are considered significant factors in social exclusion).

2.12 The factors, which affect an individual’s (and thus a group’s) ability to participate in these dimensions are determined by a wide range of variables, which the authors classify as follows:

° the individual’s own characteristics (e.g. health or educational qualifications)
° events in the individuals life (e.g. partnership breakdown or job loss)
° characteristics of the area he or she lives in (e.g. physical environment, transport links)
° social, civil and political institutions of society (e.g. racial discrimination, welfare state)

2.13 Clearly, both participation in the five dimensions outlined as well as the factors influencing it, are inter-linked. For example, participation in productive activity will influence participation in consumption activity or similarly, an individual’s health might be determined by the characteristics of the area in which he or she lives. The authors argue, though, that if it is the effects of social exclusion which are under investigation, rather than its causes, each dimension could be treated as a separate measure of social exclusion.

2.14 The aims of this study are to find out more about the reciprocal relationship between transport and social exclusion in terms of cause as well as effect. Assessing the impact of transport will thus require the identification of the types of activity from which a person is excluded, which of the determining factors is or are responsible for this exclusion and to what extent transport is implicated in these. Clearly such an approach would be circuitous and important detail may be lost.
2.15 The literature review therefore aimed to examine previous work which concentrated on the connection between transport and social exclusion in order to identify the approaches that have been taken to establish which links have already been examined and verified.

**Transport related dimensions of Social Exclusion**

2.16 The literature review found that although the existence of a link between transport and social exclusion had been widely recognised (Barry, 1998; Oppenheim, 1998; Callan et al., 1996; Pacione, 1995) an international conference on *Mobility and Social Implications* held in France concluded that there was a lack of clear and reliable data (Guidez, 1994). The review demonstrated that there had been little progress since that statement was made in 1994.

2.17 A recent study of transport and social exclusion in London (Church et al, 1999) concluded that the relative paucity of data on the issue meant that the subtle relationship between transport and social exclusion could not be fully appreciated. This work identified seven sources of exclusion and proposed three types of processes that influence this relationship between exclusion and transport. They were: (1) the nature of time-space organisation in households; (2) the nature of the transport system and (3) the nature of time-space organisation of the facilities and opportunities individuals are seeking to access. The nature of these will differ according to gender, age, cultural background, level of ability and economic circumstances.

2.18 The seven categories of exclusion connected to transport suggested by Church et al. are:

- **physical exclusion** (where physical barriers inhibit the accessibility of services which could be experienced by mothers with children, elderly or frail, those encumbered by heavy loads or those who do not speak the dominant language of the society)
- **geographical exclusion** (where poor transport provision and resulting inaccessibility can create exclusion not just in rural areas but also in areas on the urban fringe)
- **exclusion from facilities** (the distance of facilities – e.g. shopping, health, leisure, education – from people’s homes, especially from those with no car, make access difficult)
- **economic exclusion** (the high monetary or temporal costs of travel can prevent or limit access to facilities or jobs and thus income)
- **time-based exclusion** (refers to a situation where other demands on time such as caring restrict the time available for travel)
- **fear-based exclusion** (where worry, fear and even terror influence how public spaces and public transport are used, particularly by women, children and the elderly)
- **space exclusion** (where security and space management strategies can discourage socially excluded individuals from using public transport spaces)

2.19 The overlap between these categories was considered to be problematic and that it may be difficult to identify measures of these categories of exclusion that could be readily used in a household survey. The review also concluded, as Church et al (1999) did, that it may also be that the effect of the transport exclusion mechanisms is peripheral when compared with non-transport factors associated with exclusion.

2.20 Church et al (1999) also suggested five questions that need to be addressed by further research and the collation of appropriate data:
is it necessary to be mobile to be socially integrated?
how do the travel patterns of socially excluded people differ from those of others?
to what extent does the existing public transport network meet the needs of socially excludes people?
what are the factors that constrain the mobility of socially excluded people?
how important is the lack of mobility as a contributor to social exclusion relative to other factors?

2.21 These questions were accepted as a useful basis from which to approach any investigation on transport on social exclusion. However the review also attempted to address the clear need for the identification of a selection of indicators that reflect the processes linked to social exclusion and in particular, the role of transport in that exclusionary process. This review has shown that little work has been carried out in this area.

**Indicators of the transport dimension in Social Exclusion**

2.22 The review found that a set of indicators for social exclusion in general is required in order to identify groups and areas at which social inclusion policies should be targeted and to enable monitoring of any measures implemented. Also, as has been stated before, the concept of social exclusion does not merely embrace the existence, characteristics and changes in exclusion but also the processes which contribute to it (De Haan, 1999). For that reason it was argued that although the characteristics and processes of social exclusion are closely related, they might require different indicators and that a consultative approach should be adopted.

2.23 In reality, little work has been carried out in this area. Church et al. (1999) concluded that there are relatively few [social exclusion studies] which directly attempt to assess levels of transport or accessibility as part of their indicators (p.2) and that the justification of a choice of indicators for any project or policy will thus be problematic. This absence of reliable empirical data is reflected in the relative variability of sets of indicators of social exclusion, which a variety of agencies and organisations have compiled - although most of these do contain some element of transport.

2.24 The United Nations Human Development Report 1998 (UN, 1998) sets the goal of access for all to safe and low-cost transport services – essential for access to education, health services, employment, markets and community life.

2.25 At national government level, the Scottish Office Social Inclusion Strategy (Scottish Office, 1998) contains a section on transport (paragraphs 7.11-7.14) in which it is stated that the sustainability of a community will also depend on access to good transport links, particularly by bus, and particularly with sites where jobs are available. However, the Evaluation Framework Action Team of the Scottish Social Inclusion Network (established under the Social Inclusion Strategy) presented a report in 1999 in which it identified 48 indicators of social exclusion including % of working age people who are economically active, fear of selected crimes, rates of breastfeeding, rate of births to girls under age 16 and ‘adults who smoke. But only one of the 48 related to transport and this was the ‘% of households without a car’.

2.26 This corresponds with the DETR’s Index of Local Deprivation (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998:178) which currently uses indicators based on unemployment, income support
recipients, health, education and housing. Twelve of these are disaggregated to district level and another six to both ward and enumeration district level. The latter group includes 'households with no car'. Although this category was originally used as an indirect indicator of household income, it has subsequently become valid as a measure of household unity or interaction in terms of transport (Church et al. 1999) – albeit a somewhat crude one. The same indicator for poverty is used in the Scottish Area Deprivation Index (Duguid, 1995) and recent revisions of this index maintain it as a census based proxy (Gibb et al., 1998).

2.27 Obviously assessing areas purely according to the number of households without a car is meaningless if some measure is not also obtained about the alternatives available. Some socially disadvantaged areas may still be served relatively well by public transport or might be in a comparatively central location while others are less well connected.

2.28 A study in France used a set of indicators designed to give a better picture of the overall mobility levels in 400 disadvantaged urban areas (Guidez, 1994). In addition to car ownership, these included numbers of pedestrians, levels of mechanised mobility, levels of car mobility (not just ownership, thus accounting for the number of members of one household who can potentially use a car) and levels of public transport mobility. The indicators were analysed relating both to the conurbation as a whole, and the study areas in particular, to obtain a picture of relative differences in mobility. Unfortunately the source does not explain how exactly the different levels of mobility were measured but that suitable measurements can easily be formulated.

2.29 Church and his co-authors (1999) suggest that the development of indicators linked to GIS databases would present a further promising route to enabling researchers and policy makers to disaggregate data at unit postcode level (such a scheme is currently being piloted in the London Borough of Hackney). This would also allow better identification of the particular characteristics of deprivation in an area under review and thus better targeting of policies.

2.30 The scheme in Hackney uses the Index of Deprivation complimented by measures of social exclusion which were seen to be of particular importance locally: poverty, crime and public access to services. Church et al. (1999) suggest that a GIS based system should provide a locally based view of access mapping (by address) the location of facilities such as post offices, shops and transport infrastructure (bus stop, rail station) which would allow calculations of the average time required for travel to these locations from within the area investigated. A cumulative indicator could then identify the total time taken to access a specified range of services and facilities. This would allow the identification of localities suffering from access problems; the extent to which areas characterised as excluded through other indicators suffer from poor access to facilities and services; and could possibly also provide a means to assess the impact of transport measures implemented to address these access problems.

2.31 However, Church et al (1998) point out that area based indicators say nothing about the relative importance of transport and mobility for individuals or households suffering from or threatened by social exclusion. Individual and household data would thus also be required.

2.32 At a regional level Merseytravel have produced a Community Links Strategy (1998). This uses indicators, which overall are measures of sustainable transport (e.g. air quality at
bus & rail stations), but a group of indicators defined as measuring social sustainability of an area are as follows:

° proportion of households within 400 m of a bus stop
° proportion of households within 800 m of a railway station
° proportion of major facilities (including hospitals, retail parks, multiplex cinemas, city parks, recreation areas, major centres of employment) within 400 metres of a bus stop or 800 metres of a rail station
° proportion of rail stations which are fully accessible to wheelchair users
° proportion of buses which are fully accessible to less able members of society
° proportion of concessionary passes issued to and used annually by those eligible

2.33 These indicators could certainly help to provide some understanding of the level of transport related exclusion in an area but they would need to be compared to a baseline such as the corresponding data at city, regional or national level. It is also questionable whether these indicators would provide the most appropriate description of transport related exclusion, as for example the decision to record retail parks and multiplex cinemas rather than local surgeries, shops, cinemas and libraries seems surprising.

Evidence for the contribution of transport to social exclusion

2.34 In the review of literature providing evidence of the contribution of transport to social exclusion, the studies identified were, generally, either concerned with the area of activity from which people were excluded, or discussed the transport related mechanisms which created a problem. The evidence falling into these categories was examined in turn in the literature review undertaken. The former according to the categories suggested by Lee and Murie (1999) and the latter following those provided by Church and Frost (1999) – as they are listed above in sections 2.12 and 2.18 respectively.

2.35 The review listed evidence that indicated the relevance of these categories particularly the transport exclusion mechanisms provided by Church and Frost (1999).

Solutions

2.36 There is general agreement, despite the lack of empirical evidence, that transport disadvantage or deprivation can induce or exacerbate the conditions that lead to the exclusion of individuals or communities. The literature supports the assertion that there is a clear role for transport to facilitate access to the areas of social activity where participation is considered to be indicative of social inclusion. Much of the literature consulted focuses on exclusion from a particular area of activity (for example, employment, education, health services or social networks); it is important to consider what role transport plays in this exclusion. An increasing knowledge and awareness of the potential barriers has led to the development of policies and approaches designed to limit the impact of such barriers upon public transport usage. These initiatives are the subject of the following section where various studies will be considered in relation to the transport related mechanisms identified previously. The literature tends to be drawn from the special needs area of transport research and has to date not been brought into direct contact with debates surrounding social exclusion and transport.
Needs based transport

2.37 The review considered transport initiatives under the following headings. Under **needs based transport** it considered the role of services such as *dial-a-bus* or door-to-door services which have served client groups traditionally disadvantaged by transport. As a general service the system failed to generate a significant level of demand and proved too costly (DETR, 1999). However the system survived as a means of providing accessible transport for mobility impaired people where there were already expensive transport needs. The wide variation in the administration and operating characteristics of different schemes, primarily as a result of schemes being developed on a reactive basis without any coherent strategy, makes it difficult to compare and assess different scheme attributes (DETR, 1999). Some studies praise the efficiency of the 'dial a bus' service and indicate its improved quality and reliability with computer scheduling techniques (SERADAP, N.D.; Speller & Mitchell, 1975). However others cast a doubt on its efficiency as the most convenient mode of transport for the elderly and mobility impaired, suggesting it is too expensive to run and that it does not offer the flexibility and immediacy of services provided by taxis (Beuret, 1994).

Taxis

2.38 The role of **taxis** was also considered as a demand responsive service. Taxis and volunteer car drivers have traditionally provided what has been described as a *door-to-door* service. Initially voluntary car schemes were almost exclusively concerned with transporting people for social services, health and education purposes but in recent years have expanded into more shopping and leisure based trips (DETR, 1999). These schemes have been effective although funding and volunteer resources do dictate their availability which is restricted according to specific eligibility criteria (DETR, 1999). Some argue that taxis represent the most flexible door-to-door service available operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week (Beuret, 1994). However, although they overcome the shortcomings of a designated door-to-door service, they are more expensive and their design is not fully accessible to a range of different disabilities. For example, the accessibility of taxis has improved in recent years for wheel chair users; however the adaptation of taxis for wheel chair use does not necessarily make it more accessible to all people who are mobility impaired (Harbert, 1994). This raises questions on how appropriate policies are on the universal introduction of taxis compliant with wheel chair use. Some suggest private hire companies should be encouraged to adapt their vehicles for use by disabled people with the inclusions of features such as swivel chairs and grab handles in order to maximise access and use of taxis (Harbert, 1994).

Service routes

2.39 A third section explored the concept of **service routes** which originated in Sweden and has been implemented in different countries specific to the demands on their particular local transport systems (Mclary et al, 1993; Evans and Smyth, 1997). The service route concept places priority on bringing the bus service as close as possible to the residents (McLary et al., 1993). Routes are chosen on the basis of areas with a high proportion of people with mobility handicap (for example, in areas with a large elderly population) and the key destinations vary (residential homes, health centres, libraries, and post offices (Evans and Smyth, 1997). These schemes are generally considered to be a cost-effective and efficient means of promoting independent travel amongst the mobility impaired.
Co-ordinated services

2.40 The role of co-ordinated services was the subject of other studies which emphasised the benefits of the better management and co-ordination of specialised services with the regular transport service as an efficient and effective means of widening access for previously excluded passengers (SERADAP, nd.; Taylor, 1993). Taylor (1993) lists the benefits of better co-ordination as: a more fully accessible bus service; financial savings; improved quality; better bus service patronage; more professional tendering; centralised vehicle management; and normalisation. Advances in technical innovation have made such normalisation possible. For example, the use and integration of low floor buses (DETR, 1999a; Evans and Smyth, 1997; DETR, 1999b) within the existing public transport networks alongside the adaptation of the network infrastructure (Vaughan, nd.; Evans and Smyth, 1997) have ensured the feasibility of such an integrated transport policy. The combination of a hydraulic kneeling mechanism with improved internal features such as wider door ways and aisles have made it easier for passengers with physical disabilities or those laden with luggage to board and alight. The effectiveness of the introduction of low floor buses has been increased in some areas with the adaptation of network infrastructure such as creating bus boarders with raised platforms to give level access to buses and the upgrading of bus shelters (Vaughan, nd.). Other enhancements have included clearer marking of stopping positions, new high visibility bus stop signs (including time tables), the altering of kerb heights to reduce the slope of a deployed ramp and access to bus stops was assisted by restricting parking along the route and actively enforcing the regulations (York and Balcombe, 1997). McKee (1997) argues similar considerations and enhancements are necessary to improve the accessibility of the rail system to wheel chair users and the mobility impaired in general.

2.41 Often limitations or pressures on time dictate which mode of transport is used to travel. However the reliability of existing services and the duration of travel to a key destination may also dictate what a person chooses to do or not to do. One study evaluates a scheme introduced to improve bus services in terms of journey time and reliability in Salford, Manchester. The improvements introduced included sections of with-flow bus priority; changes to the layout of key junctions to give priority to buses; the creation of bus boarders with raised platforms to give level access to buses; the upgrading of bus shelters; and the introduction of low floor buses. Although such a scheme has other benefits in terms of increasing the physical accessibility of services, the fulfilment of this objective also reduces the overall journey time as passengers are able to board and alight easier and consequently quicker. The combined measures achieved improvements in overall journey times and improved the regularity and reliability of services. (Vaughan, nd).

Subsidies and concessions

2.42 Subsidies and concessions were another measure considered to increase access to transport. Scottish Association for Public Transport considers that one of the main priorities for increasing the accessibility of public transport is to reduce the cost (SAPT, 1998). Public transport subsidies arguably redistribute income to the less well-off and improve the mobility of the transport disadvantaged. These can either take the form of a general subsidy or a targeted subsidy. Their effectiveness has been the consideration of many studies. In a literature review of such studies, Starrs and Perrins (1989) consider whether subsidies redistribute income in a progressive manner and whether the mobility of transport disadvantaged groups is improved by the existence of public transport subsidies. While recognising the difficulties and problems of measurement and definition in general, the
studies reviewed appeared to agree that there is only limited evidence to suggest that the relatively immobile and the poor benefit from general transport subsidies. These groups were seen to benefit more from target subsidies such as concessions and no fare travel on public services.

2.43 Targeted subsidies exist in the form of concessionary fares or budget passes. Concessions are most often granted to the elderly, registered disabled and school children although policies vary between local transport providers. Budget passes are provided to the frequent traveller in the form of multi-journey passes or multi-modal passes. Specific small scale studies have analysed the relative effectiveness of different concessionary schemes (O'Reilly 1989; O'Reilly 1990; Bonsall and Dunkerley, 1997). There appears to be a general consensus that the research findings indicate that people with concessions travel either more often or further than similar people without concessions because the concession has made it cheaper for them to do so (O'Reilly 1989). Although concessions are considered to be an effective means of generating travel amongst groups of travel disadvantaged, it is clear that existing schemes often exclude groups of people who are often understood to be socially excluded. For example, the unemployed are seldom included in such schemes and the eligibility for disability concessions is often decided at the discretion of the local transport provider.

2.44 Where access and usage of transport is dictated by financial or economic constraints there is a considerable barrier to accessing facilities and opportunities. The recognition of this has informed the development of initiatives and schemes designed to increase the affordability and hence the accessibility of employment for former welfare recipients. Various US studies document community (FTA, 1999) or employment initiatives (Zhang & Dickson, nd; Newsom et al, 1993) which involve the pooling of resources. For example, the USA Access Coalition has facilitated increasing assistance from specific employers in St Louis, Missouri. These exist in the form of transit passes to new employees and the provision of a van service providing transport to and from work (FTA, 1999). Other studies evaluate the success of community initiatives in facilitating van pools (Zhang & Dickson, nd.), car sharing and ride sharing (anon) where public transport is unaffordable or unavailable.

2.45 Taxis are often considered to be a costly mode of travel. However the concept of a shared taxi scheme and the provision of taxi-cards are two methods of reducing the costs of travel by taxi. One study studied the viability of a shared taxi scheme and concluded that it would be possible to design a shared taxi scheme for Ipswich (Balcombe and Finch, 1990). Taxi-card schemes exist as a taxi subsidy system, funded by either the public transport authority or a local district council, and is usually limited to a certain number of trips a year. The taxi-cards are normally available to the disabled and have proven to be a cost-effective means for travel (Trench & Lister, 1994). Others argue that it is necessary to look at ways to increase the use of taxis in general as they are an economical mode of transport particularly where more than one person is travelling (Beuret, 1994). He argues there is a need to overcome the psychological barriers and perceptions (particularly of cost) that limit people's use of taxis (Beuret, 1994; Balcombe & Finch, 1990).

Non-transport solutions

2.46 Some work also considered the value of non-transport solutions to the pressures on time budgets. New communication technologies are often heralded as a medium designed to reduce the pressures on time use. Carter & Grieco (1998) suggest that new information
technologies can 'return' time lost under conventional arrangements to single mothers (p6) where women would be able access electronic brokerage systems on client and service availability. The example used is to change a health service appointment (Carter & Grieco, 1998). Other examples provided are the use of the internet to access resources providing information on travel timetables and routes allowing for better projection of time expenditure. One community pilot project, Interconnecting Digital Communities (Intercom) in Devon, has information sharing and dissemination as an explicit objective. The purpose of Intercom is to widen access to information on travel, distance learning, council services, tourism, childcare, jobs and small business support through community located PC’s connected to the County Council’s web-site (Anon, web). Although new technology is potentially useful, it in itself does not resolve issues about skills and labour market demand and supply; new technology is potentially useful as it offers another avenue through which opportunities arise to organisations and individuals.

Community initiatives

2.47 Many community initiatives have attempted to address the isolation of a community particularly when it has resulted from poor or insufficient links to resources and facilities. Better planning and the improvement of transport links can increase employment and social opportunities of (geographically) disadvantaged communities. For example, the pilot bus link scheme from Castlemilk, a peripheral estate characterised by high unemployment, to East Kilbride, an area with higher employment, has generated increased and better employment opportunities for Castlemilk residents (Blake-Stevenson, 1994; TAS Partnership, 1995). Similar community initiatives have increased social and economic opportunities for geographically disadvantaged communities in Liverpool and Merseyside (Mills, 1998; Mersey Travel, 1998). Clearly transport has a role in linking disadvantaged communities with areas of high employment and flourishing economic activity. Recognition of this role is evident in the American Job access and reverse commute initiative where inner city areas with poor employment opportunities are linked to suburbs with better employment through improved and varied transport systems (FTA, 1999). Similarly the 'Tracer (Transportation Corridor for Economic Renewal)' programme in Missouri focuses on investment opportunities in the Metrolink light rail corridor where the line runs through 18 miles of the urban core passing flourishing employment centres, older abandoned industrial zones and communities with extremely high unemployment (FTA, 1999).

FOCUS GROUPS AND IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

2.48 The focus groups and interviews were conducted in four different locations (apart from Leith) from the case study areas, chosen for their varying transport links. In section 2.3.1 the main issues for transport are explored in relation to the different areas and in the following section 2.3.2 the qualitative data collected in these areas is examined in relation to the seven categories of transport exclusion mechanisms offered by Church and Frost (1999). These issues that initially emerged from the analysis of the data demonstrated the relevance of the transport exclusion mechanisms identified in the literature review.
Locations: the main issues for transport

2.49 The series of focus groups and interviews drawn from a range of locations provide a snapshot of the main transport issues in each local area. These areas were:

- Easterhouse;
- Seafield in West Lothian;
- Wester Hailes in Edinburgh;
- Leith in Edinburgh

In general, the main mode of transport used by all participants, across the four communities, was the bus. Taxis were used occasionally, as a supplementary service. They were seen to be expensive, but useful in particular circumstances, for example, where a larger number of people made taxis economical or where time-constraints were an issue. Trains were rarely used by any participants; indeed, no one mentioned train travel before being prompted by the focus group moderator. The purpose of journeys was similar across the sample. It included the following range of activities: visiting the community centre, visiting family and friends, getting to the city centre (particularly those in Easterhouse), travel to work, taking children to school, regular shopping trips (particularly for those living in Seafield), and attending hospital appointments.

2.50 All four areas appeared to have similar transport issues from the perspective of the members of the local community interviewed. The main issues evident in the analysis, common to all four areas, centre on the need to get to areas that are not directly linked by the existing transport networks; the restrictions imposed by reduced services in the evenings and at weekends; the consideration of cost and affordability in determining the travel patterns of the respondents; and the concern over time use and the duration of essential journeys.

Easterhouse

2.51 In Easterhouse the predominance of bus use is evident from the focus groups and the interviews conducted. This was true of those who travelled regularly and of those who only travelled occasionally. In general, the area was seen by most participants to be well served with buses to the city centre. Although the participants did express a preference to use the buses, their use of them was not without problems and many referred to the lack of transport services to locations other than the city centre. Participants in Easterhouse appeared particularly frustrated that places which were very close by car, were difficult to access by bus.

2.52 The need for routes enabling people to move around the local area was voiced by many participants. There was an expressed need for a local bus service which gave access to facilities and enabled people to visit friends in the local area there should be a bus that goes to all the local places in Easterhouse. It’s a big area. There should be a bus that you can get. There was agreement that services within Easterhouse were unreliable and this deterred people from going out in the evening or at night, as they were reluctant to take the risk of being stranded and either having to walk home, which many felt was unsafe, or having to take a taxi which was considered to be too costly: if there were more buses that run about side streets ... circular buses or something that you could go and visit one another. But once you’re in at night, that’s you in. Unless we all go to one persons house, but it’s taxis we’ve got to get. The night and weekend services were considered inadequate. Participants
expressed feelings of being trapped or frustrated at their inability to get about: Easterhouse... it’s just like a concentration camp with nae fences on it. Because once you’re in here you cannae get out [on a Sunday].

2.53 This frustration was compounded by the lack of, or poor, information available on the bus services. One respondent referred to an incident when he was given wrong information by a bus driver on the time of the last bus back – which meant he had to walk home. There were many complaints within the focus groups and interviews that the bus routes are changed too much and that there is seldom sufficient warning when they do change - people are just confused now. The change in services was often perceived to be for the worse.

2.54 Despite the problems experienced by the participants, few considered the rail service an alternative option and it was seldom used by any of the participants. There appeared to be little knowledge of what train services operated from the local station and there was a reluctance to explore it as an option. The train station was considered to be too far away and inaccessible to be a viable option as you’d have to get a bus or a taxi to the train station. One participant suggested that a free service, like a bus or something [to the station] might increase its accessibility. However access to the local rail service was further complicated as the station was considered to be a no-go area for both men and women. The station was unstaffed, with a ticket machine, and was described as dark and dangerous.

2.55 Another prohibiting factor was the (perceived) cost of train fares. One woman described a trip she had made: ...it was like four pounds for me and two weans, a single. I said, another two pounds and I could have got a taxi (female)

2.56 In general, many of the respondents were content to remain within the immediate local area for socialising with friends and shopping. Whether these decisions were transport orientated or not is unclear.

Seafield

2.57 There was a greater sense of physical isolation in Seafield and the need to be mobile appeared to be more of an issue. The area has few local facilities and although served by bus links to Bathgate, Livingston and Edinburgh, these were not seen to be frequent enough, with services particularly sparse in the evenings and on Sundays. When asked about Sunday services, one participant responded that it was perhaps better to: forget it while another suggested another tactic would be to: walk it, or get a taxi.

2.58 Many of the participants were also frustrated that many of the destinations they needed to go to involved an indirect route by public transport. The need to change buses to get to destinations, which were geographically close, was also an issue, particularly as the destinations were often essential usually to get to work.

2.59 The participants in the focus groups were predominantly elderly whereas the interview participants were mostly young mothers. Consequently, there was a considerable difference in the experiences and needs of these residents of the Seafield area. The participants of the focus groups were inclined to use the bus as their main form of transport. The importance of bus links was clear, particularly in comments such as [I use the bus] to get out. Many emphasised the need for more direct routes and an extended service. The
inadequacies of the bus network was given as a reason by those interviewed who had recently opted to buy a car:

*I think if I never had a car, I would feel quite isolated if I never had it at all ... the area I live just now in Blackburn, most people in my street actually work... So I probably would feel quite isolated if I didn’t have any access to a car*

2.60 Some had recently purchased a car, whereas others were able to make use of a partner’s car on some days in a week. The comments made by this group of women were particularly revealing. They expressed appreciation of the activities that they could do or the ease with which they could do common day-to-day tasks:

*I really need the car if I’m wanting to get a lot done. If I need to go to the bank or things like that, I really need the car because I find that if I get the bus anywhere, it takes the whole day to do just a couple of things and that’s sort of like, it seems such a waste of the day to spend on *

2.61 The need for access to a car or for improvements in the public transport system were often voiced in connection to employment

*In the mornings, I think very early mornings, the bus service doesn’t start until after 7 on a regular basis and I have to be at work as I said before for 7.15 so I think that’s going to cause one of the biggest problems* (female)

*I work for a security firm in Edinburgh and we do security at Murrayfield Stadium and I do night shift there sometimes. And getting home from there when I’ve finished in the morning is just a nightmare. The first bus I can get is half past six from Edinburgh and I finish at 4 o’clock* (male)

2.62 Participants also felt restricted or limited in their leisure pursuits. The restricted night bus services meant that the transport options were limited to driving, getting a lift with someone or to use a taxi. Many considered this to be debilitating and were frustrated at the extra cost this would incur particularly as a night out also often involved paying for child care. One woman, who had access to a car, attended an evening class in another village which she could not have done if she had had to rely on public transport.

2.63 In general, there appeared to be a significant level of dissatisfaction with the transport system. Many of the participants had organised ways of getting round the obstacles they met. Two of the respondents’ husbands cycled to work in order to leave the car available for use during the day. Children also used bicycles to get to school. Many of the respondents from Seafield walked frequently and, in some cases, for long distances (up to thirty or forty minutes' walk) rather than waiting for the bus. This, however, became more problematic in the winter.

2.64 The closest train station is at Bathgate, with services to Edinburgh. These services were used by those who had no access to a car and by those who owned their own car as the service was considered to be fast, frequent and economical compared with driving to Edinburgh or catching the bus. However, those without access to a car commented on having to use a bus or taxi to get to the train station: *you really depend on public service to take you to Bathgate for the convenience of the train which is no any good* (female).
Wester Hailes

2.65 Five interviews were conducted with young, unemployed people from Wester Hailes. The travel experiences of these five people differed slightly but seemed to be mostly dictated by the money they had to spend on travel. In general, the bus was the main mode of transport used but was often restricted by economic constraints.

2.66 All of the respondents walked to many of their regular destinations. This was either to save on the fare or to make their journey easier. The choice to walk was often made to avoid the need to change buses or to avoid travelling by bus at all when it was difficult to board. One of the respondents was studying in full-time education as part of a government employment scheme. The study times required him to be at college for nine o’clock, but as he was not provided with any extra cash on top of his benefit he often had to make the half-hour walk to college.

2.67 Many of the concerns expressed were about the cost of travel, particularly in relation to the mounting costs of attending interviews and visiting job centres. Four of the participants referred to difficulties in attending interviews or job seeking and some suggested that reduced fares for the unemployed would make things considerably easier. The fifth respondent had recently had a baby and was still attending school. She was provided with a taxi to travel to school by the local education board. She appreciated the flexibility that this provided her with as she had experienced difficulty in boarding buses with the baby and pram. In most cases she had to ensure she either had someone with her on the bus or attempted to get a lift from a friend or family. This was debilitating as it hindered the times and the places that she could go.

2.68 None of the respondents appeared to feel particularly isolated and made reference to their use of facilities locally. These included the new cinema complex, the gym and local shops although they did seem to prefer to go up town in some cases. In general, they considered the buses to be good for access to the city centre but had had problems reaching other peripheral areas.

Leith

2.69 In Leith, although the focus group was very poorly attended due to bad weather, with only two participants, it was possible to gain an impression of the some of the issues for transport in the area. The main mode of transport was the bus and both the respondents agreed there were good links to the city centre. However they also expressed difficulty in reaching areas around the city.

2.70 The respondents also found the weekend services a problem: I’m surprised at how reduced the service on a Sunday. One man travelled by bus every week-day to work however found it too difficult to make the journey at weekends and tried to avoid working on Sundays.

2.71 Little reference was made to train use. Both of the respondents would only use a taxi where it was more economical to do so as they found them expensive.
Physical exclusion

2.72 Many of the people interviewed expressed difficulty with using transport when they had to travel with shopping or when they were accompanied by children. For those who had to travel with children this presented a real barrier - so much so, that one woman chose to stay at home on the days that she did not have access to a car. Another considered buying a car partly because of the problems she had experienced while travelling with her small children:

Yes, mainly Livingston is the main bus trip I would make and that’s usually, I think the buses are about every half hour but generally, I quite often have to wait about half an hour even although I go down on time for a bus, I’m having to wait about half an hour which is awkward in the winter. It’s not so bad in the summer but I think I’m going to find it more and more difficult having the two children rather than just one and having to do that. So I may consider actually getting a car so that I can have it for my own use (female, Seafield).

2.73 Similarly, transport considerations affected where people chose to shop and how much they chose to buy. Some chose to go more often for smaller amounts or to buy more but only when they could afford to get a taxi home. Other burdensome items also created discomfort for passengers such as having to take the laundry to the laundrette.

Geographical exclusion

2.74 In Easterhouse and Seafield many of the respondents said that they never went out at night because the [bus] service gets run down at night (male, Easterhouse). This effectively meant that people stayed at home at night as the local taxi service was the only remaining transport option. There was agreement that this was too costly and for that reason many opted to stay at home.

2.75 In the accounts given above there was also a considerable preoccupation with the need to get to places that were geographically close but were physically inaccessible through the existing transport networks. There were numerous accounts of this in Easterhouse, Seafield and Wester Hailes. In Seafield, some of the women had occasional access to cars which emphasised the difficulties they experienced at other times:

A lot of the time if we’ve not got the car I actually stay in a lot or just go to local shops and sometimes I get the bus through to Livingston and go to Livingston Shopping Centre but I don’t tend to go further afield on the bus other than Livingston. Sometimes, Bathgate and if I go to Bathgate, I would go to the Bathgate road which is a fair distance to walk to and then, because I know that there’s more buses go up that road to Bathgate (female, Seafield)

2.76 The impact of transport on employment was addressed by some participants. One described how his teenage daughter had had to give up a part-time job when the bus service was reduced over the winter. A part-time, shift worker himself, this participant found the buses worked well for getting to work most of the time. However, the lack of service on a Sunday meant he avoided working on Sundays if possible. When asked if he took transport into account when looking for work, he said: you just get the job and look at transport after that. One participant at the Seafield group worked for a security firm which had work at
locations around the Lothian area. He spoke of having to turn down several offers of work because of being unable to reach the location by bus, or get home at night. Another woman (from Seafield) felt restricted in her opportunities to take up part-time employment as she felt she needed to wait for access to the car (i.e. after her husband finished work) which would make it awkward to find hours to work.

Exclusion from facilities

2.77 Some participants described difficulties in seeing family, and in getting to the cinema. A cinema complex near Easterhouse was accessible by rail, but as was discussed earlier, the train was not used. Participants in Seafield were restricted from going to the cinema at night, as there were no late buses to return home, and taxi fares could be up to £30: *If you were going to the cinema at Coatbridge and you were watching a late film you wouldn’t get a bus home … it’d be about thirty pounds in a taxi* (male, Seafield).

2.78 In the past there were cinemas in Bathgate and Livingston and they shut both of them (male, Seafield) which means the closest cinemas are in Edinburgh, Coatbridge and Falkirk. Participants were also frustrated at having to get a bus to hire a video at the closest shop in Livingston. Some of the older participants no longer went to bingo because of the lack of services for the return journey.

2.79 There were similar experiences in Easterhouse, although another cinema, at Parkhead, was accessible by bus. However, many of the young people interviewed were reluctant to travel on the buses at night. In Wester Hailes the recent provision of a local cinema meant that most of the respondents could walk to the cinema; however some commented that they rarely could afford to go.

2.80 For some, the Sunday bus service made it difficult to travel to churches and cemeteries. A reduced service on Sundays made it difficult for one father to take his young children out:

> Sunday’s my day off, and I’ve got two small children. I’ve got four children - two small ones. I usually take them out on Sundays but the buses are terrible... it’s the time you wait for the bus. You’d get there eventually, but it’s the time you wait ... 45 minutes, 50 minutes sometimes (male, Leith).

2.81 The lack of services over the holiday period, and the increased price of taxis over this time was spoken of particularly strongly. This made it difficult and expensive to visit family: *public transport on Christmas Day and New Year’s Day ... just a joke* (female, Easterhouse); you’ve gotta get a taxi if you want to visit your family, *Christmas Day ... and it’s full fare* (female, Easterhouse).

2.82 One comment was particularly poignant by a respondent from Seafield who bemoaned the need to travel to a get to a bank:

> Blackburn, no it’s not even Blackburn anymore. It’s Bathgate or Livingston. We used to have one in Blackburn but they closed it. So you can just go in to get money. They’ve got an autoteller but that’s it. We don’t even have one here. So if you’ve no money for to get a bus in the first place, you’re really stuck (female, Seafield)
Economic exclusion

2.83 Cost was seen as an important factor in using transport, and it was the cost of taxis and trains that contributed to the dominance of bus as the main mode of travel. The group of parents had strong views on having to pay for children to travel to school. One mother said she paid £16 a week for her children to get to school, and there was a complaint that cheaper return tickets could not be used early, when children were getting to school: you can’t get a return … returns don’t start ’til half nine … so you don’t even get return tickets for school (female, Easterhouse). Children’s fares were seen to be expensive, in comparison with adults. The cost of short journeys was considered high in relation to longer distances.

2.84 The exact fare policy that operated on the buses was also perceived to be unfair - you had to pay extra if you did not have the right change, but if you were five pence short you were not allowed on the bus: If you haven’t got the right amount, you lose the fare (female, Easterhouse). Few participants appeared to regularly use a weekly or monthly travel card. One of the participants who did decided to purchase a monthly ticket dependent on the numbers of hours he was scheduled to work that month. Elderly participants used concessionary cards and there were two younger participants with concession cards due to disability.

2.85 In all of the areas, many of the young people opted to walk when they couldn’t afford to travel by bus. Four different unemployed participants suggested that there should be travel concessions for looking for work as they had found it difficult to get to interviews or to pursue job searches:

    I reckon for unemployed people, the bus fares should be a lot lower, if they can they should be able to bring the price down by about a good 20p or something so it’s like 50p or 70p but they should be able to give you a pass or something to say that you’re on benefit, obviously not for the people that get a lot of benefit money but like the people who don’t get that much, I think they could bring the prices down for everybody like (male, Wester Hailes)

2.86 Taxis were used occasionally. They were seen to be expensive but useful in particular circumstances: I’ll use a taxi if me and the wife and all the kids are together. It works out the same price anyway … a taxi’s a fiver for the lot of us (male, Leith). Whilst some participants mentioned the benefits of having a taxi card, others without a card found the cost prohibitive: I cannae afford a taxi. I’m a pensioner (male, Leith). At the focus groups themselves, there was some exchange between participants on how to obtain a taxi card and when it could be used.

Time-based exclusion

2.87 The concept of time-based exclusion outlines the difficulties pertaining to the organisation of childcare, and other caring commitments, while allowing adequate time to travel given transport network constraints. This was clearly an issue for the young mothers interviewed; however the importance of time use was also an issue for other people with time budgets that were less pressured.

    Our doctor is actually in Broxburn which is to us is quite a distance so if I need to take my son to Broxburn or that, I have to arrange a lift because trying to get a bus
and especially in emergency situations, if I need to get an appointment that morning, you have to have him up about 7 o’clock or something because, just trying to get a bus you’ve got to get one down to Livingston and then to Broxburn which takes about an hour, an hour and a half and it’s just a nightmare (female, Seafield)

2.88 Another respondent worked two jobs and usually used the bus to get to work. Her journey involved two stages as she had to change buses to get to Springburn from Easterhouse: Aye, but I had tae leave aboot an hoor early or something for the timing of the two buses. If she was working at night she preferred to travel by taxi: I’ll go in if it’s during the day on the bus but at night I’ll go by taxi’ because ‘just the buses take longer tae wait on. She would travel with colleagues, normally four, when she used a taxi to get to or from work.

2.89 Other respondents also expressed frustration at the length of time taken to travel to work or to attend interviews. Transport was a factor related to seeking work, both in terms of making job-seeking journeys, and in travelling to any work itself. Getting to interviews on time was a concern and if there was an alternative available, the people interviewed would prefer not to use public transport.

You can only plan one interview a day, by the time you take the transport thing into consideration. So it’s not been very… well it’s been really quite unsuccessful bus-wise. Sometimes it’s a case o’ trying to borrow a car rather than trying to take the public transport because you don’t know, you can’t rely on it (female, Seafield)

2.90 Other young people would attempt to get a lift to an interview or leave more than an hour in advance in order to ensure they got to their destination on time. One young woman from Easterhouse had left home over an hour before she needed to, in order to get to a job interview in the city centre. Her bus, however, was delayed on the journey and she was late. She said that she would rather not attend another interview in the city centre as it made her too nervous and she realised how difficult it would be to commute. There was consensus amongst those who were unemployed that having no access to a car limited their opportunities.

To get a job. Say, you start at 7, the bus is a wee bit late, you can only get there for 7. If you’ve got a car…(male, Wester Hailes)

2.91 The feeling that respondents had wasted their time or were prevented from making good use of their time contributed to a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the transport networks. Many of the respondents in Easterhouse stated a preference for the direct services to the city centre which used the motorway: Aye, straight on the motorway and straight off.(male, Easterhouse). The desire or need to make good use of time increased the desirability of having access to a car:

We actually get to spend time together at home as a family now rather than having to do all the things that we needed to do at night or at weekends. We actually get to do things we want to do now (female, Seafield on her rationale for buying a car)
Fear-based exclusion

2.92 Worry, fear and even terror influence how public spaces and public transport are used, especially by women, children and the elderly. There is evidence of this in the interviews where respondents stated they were reluctant to use services they did not consider to be safe. This was most apparent in the views of the Easterhouse respondents regarding their local train station. There was agreement between the participants of the focus groups and the interviews that the train station was out of bounds. The respondents agreed it was a no go area... even for males (male, Easterhouse). The respondents voiced concern over the location of the station and the physical condition of it as it was a dark area where the lights are all smashed (female, Easterhouse); if you were standing there yourself it would be quite frightening (male, Easterhouse).

2.93 Two of the young women interviewed in Easterhouse avoided walking anywhere alone at night – including to the bus stop. They would only catch the bus at night if they were accompanied to the bus stop or if they had someone to travel with. One of the women preferred not to go out at night at all. Another male respondent voiced fears of travelling home from the other side of Easterhouse as he had been left stranded before when buses had failed to stop and he had had to walk through unfamiliar territory.

2.94 Worry regarding the physical safety of public transport, particularly for those travelling with children, also influenced the use of transport:

> I mean buses I feel are quite unsafe for children in the first place without him kneeling or standing just to see out the window to keep him amused. There’s nothing there to keep their attention (female, Seafield)

Space exclusion

2.95 Security and space management strategies can discourage socially excluded individuals from using public transport spaces. Church et al. (1999) suggests that the nature of individual fear in public spaces would vary markedly according to social characteristics but would influence how public spaces and transport facilities were used by individuals. One woman avoided using buses although she could not pinpoint her actual fear:

> Well I think it’s just, I sort of get panic attacks actually, well no really panic, well yes mild panic attacks but I’m all right in the car (female, Seafield)

2.96 Another man was reluctant to use buses as he valued his privacy. Similar considerations influenced one woman who feared her children invaded the privacy and quiet of other passengers.

KEY FINDINGS

2.97 Together the literature review and the interviews conducted provided a more detailed understanding of the ways in which transport can be related to social exclusion.

2.98 One of the main objectives of the focus groups and interviews was to explore issues relating to social exclusion. The accounts presented above demonstrate that access to
transport is a real concern for people and that differential transport access does effect participation in what are considered to be the normal activities of citizens. For many the existing transport system dictates the places that people can go. Clearly it is possible to reach most destinations but it is the degree of difficulty experienced that affects whether people chose to take those journeys and consequently influences what activities people chose to do. Even where time budgets are not necessarily pressured there are still concerns about punctuality and reliability of services. These are expressed more strongly when the weather is bad or when travellers are further restricted, for example, when they are accompanied by children. It is clear that transport does affect some individuals’ ability to participate in these ‘normal’ activities - specifically, employment and labour-related activities such as job seeking and the attendance of interviews. There is also evidence that leisure activities are influenced by transport considerations. Many of the respondents choose to stay at home rather than undertake long or difficult journeys.

2.99 Throughout the interviews and focus groups there was a definite awareness of the limitations that transport imposed upon the participants’ day to day lives. Not surprisingly then, where necessary the participants had developed strategies to maximise their mobility or to minimise their need to be mobile. All had clear views delineating their transport needs. Many of the solutions offered concentrated on economic considerations, but within all of the areas there was also a demand for a better localised transport network. Technological solutions (such as the internet) which have been heralded as a potential solution to transport problems were a non-starter. There was little use and interest in the internet as a time-saving tool although there was little knowledge of the potential value of the internet. The solutions suggested were more traditional in nature, for example, delivery services or extended provision of low-floor buses.

2.100 The key findings from the focus groups and in-depth interviews were:

° there are definite barriers to transport use. These are clearly dependent on individual circumstances as much as on local area. The degree of the impact of barriers which are peculiar to a specific area is determined by the circumstances of each individual.
° travel patterns differ significantly. Some people feel the need to be able to travel more easily locally (to local amenities and friends) while others prefer to travel to other areas to use different facilities.
° few people considered other options that would reduce their need to travel. Of those who did have access to a telephone they seldom used it in place of making a journey. No-one made regular use of the internet.
° travel planning was ad hoc. Participants appeared to hold in their memories a vast amount of knowledge about transport and quoted bus numbers, times and routes throughout. When asked how they found out about buses (their main mode), the prime source of information seemed to be word of mouth and experience.

OVERVIEW

2.101 Together the components of stage one contributed to a clearer understanding of the factors that would need to be considered in the development of the research tools to be used in the second stage of the research project.
2.102 A number of recommendations emerged from the review of the literature with regard to future research directions. Social exclusion and the role of transport is recognised as an extremely complex problem with many (potential) constituent elements. Recognition was made that some of these elements may be transparent and easily identifiable while other aspects or components of exclusion may be harder to define, identify and difficult to operationalise in any empirical work.

2.103 The need to identify the areas of activity where transport could have an effect was considered necessary in light of the findings of the qualitative fieldwork and also in order to consider fully the working definition adopted for social exclusion. These activities were: labour markets and employment; welfare markets and poverty traps; exclusion from financial circuits and public utilities, education, health, housing markets, neighbourhoods and social networks.

2.104 Secondly, if transport has an effect in any of these activity areas, there was also a need to identify which transport related mechanisms of exclusion create this effect. Possible factors that should be examined were those that emerged from the data analysis which approximated the categories outlined by Church and Frost (1999):

- **physical**: where physical barriers are encountered by individuals in their use of public transport
- **economic**: where monetary constraints affect the use of existing transport facilities
- **Temporal**: individual time constraints and projected journey time limit usage of existing transport facilities
- **spatial**: where access to existing transport facilities is difficult due to their geographical location
- **psychological**: fear or stress relating to any stages of a journey which inhibits the propensity to travel

2.105 Research would also be required to take into account individual and group characteristics (e.g. gender, age, health, position within the household) that could potentially affect the ability of an individual to participate in the ‘normal activities’ of society. The examination of an individual’s characteristics would assist in understanding the three types of processes (in particular the first) linked to accessibility that were identified in the review. These processes were: the nature of time-space organisation in households; the nature of the transport system (both perceived and actual) in terms of cost, network accessibility, safety and public space; and the nature of time-space organisation of the facilities and opportunities individuals are seeking to access.

2.106 At this stage it was felt that it was important that the research places transport in this context in order to assess its relative contribution to social exclusion and the potential for transport based solutions to ameliorate or reduce exclusionary processes.

2.107 In fulfilling this objective the research aimed, as far as is possible, to address the research questions identified by Church and Frost (1999). These were:

- is it necessary to be mobile to be socially integrated?
- how do the travel patterns of socially excluded people differ from those of others?
- to what extent does the existing public transport network meet the needs of socially excluded people?
what are the factors that constrain the mobility of socially excluded people?
how important is the lack of mobility as a contributor to social exclusion relative to other factors?
CHAPTER THREE    CASE STUDY AREAS

INTRODUCTION

3.1 The three case study areas were selected as a result of the first phase of the research project. They were chosen partly for their differing urban locations – Leith as an urban district located close to a city centre with good bus links, Castlemilk, an estate located on the periphery of a city, and Coatbridge as a free standing town that has employment opportunities on the edge of the town; industrial parks that are more accessible by car, but inaccessible for those relying on public transport. Within these areas individual electoral wards were chosen (these are named below) for the purposes of the survey administration. The areas were also chosen as a result of their socio-economic characteristics related to measurements of social exclusion and deprivation. Comparisons of these characteristics with national data from the Scottish Household Survey are available in the Annex to this report (Scottish Executive, 1999). Maps of each of the areas are provided below (Figures 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3).

3.2 The results of the transport assessment are also presented. The objective of this component of the second stage of the project is to assess the current transport provision (for all modes) in each case study area in order to compare it with the perceived transport provision recorded in the household survey. The information includes a review of how the local authorities have set out to address ‘social inclusion’ priorities in their Local Transport Strategies as these are referred to later in the interviews undertaken as part of stage three of the project. However the information presented is only as comprehensive as the information available. Often there was no printed information available from the operators or travel information services. The difficulties encountered are listed in more detail in the description of the methodology provided in the Annex.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROVISION

Leith

3.3 Historically a port, Leith is situated to the North of Edinburgh city centre and is relatively well served by public transport routes. The ward selected for the purposes of the survey was Harbour which encompasses Warriston, Bonnington and is a part of what might be described as central Leith. The population in Harbour ward is 6,990 (this figure is based on a 1997 estimate using Health Board figures and housing completion data) (City of Edinburgh Council, 2000).

3.4 In the Edinburgh Local Plan (North East) the area is described as having three major concentrations of shopping with a significant comparison goods shopping content; two of which (Leith Walk, and Leith Central) fall within the case study area. These are supplemented by other groups of shops, predominantly convenience shops, which serve a local or neighbourhood need.

3.5 There are no local train services within Leith. In previous years, a remarkably extensive network of railways existed to serve the industries and port, and passenger lines included a major terminus at Leith Central. This no longer exists and there is no local rail
service available to the residents of Harbour, Leith. For this reason, residents of Leith questioned during the survey were not asked the section of questions on trains.

3.6 There is a range of bus routes operating in this area, mainly by Lothian Regional Transport (LRT) but also by FirstEdinburgh. In relation to the boundaries of the case study area, the majority of these services are concentrated on two main streets: Leith Walk and Great Junction Street. There is also a number of services available on Ferry Road. From the information available, it seems that a number of the services operate seven days a week from Leith Walk and Great Junction Street. In total there are 16 services identified which link Leith to various destinations city-wide – all of which operate seven days. Detailed description of these services are presented in Table 3.1 which is provided at the end of this chapter.

Figure 3.1 Harbour, Leith

3.7 Information is available on the range of routes occupying this area with a variety of destinations. The timetables produced by LRT are detailed on the route of the services and list all deviations. All of the timetables also provide a breakdown of the fare stages in relation to the route and information on saver tickets. These timetables are available from all the travel shops situated in the city centre at Hanover Street and Waverley Bridge. A 24-hour
telephone information line also exists, although it is not possible to have any information or timetables posted out. The city council also produces a comprehensive Travel Map which provides information on the routes of the bus and train services, contact information for all operators and accessible transport provision, information on the ticketing system and administration of concessionary schemes. This map was last published in November 1998 and is currently being updated. A travel telephone line is also provided and operates from Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 8.00pm.

3.8 The cost of bus fares is calculated on a stage basis where travelling 1-2 stages costs fifty pence, 3-8 stages costs eighty pence, 9-13 costs ninety pence; and a journey covering more than fourteen stages costs one pound. Children (aged 5 –15) travel any distance for 50 pence and OAP (holders of City of Edinburgh, East Lothian, and Midlothian concession passes) can travel any distance for thirty pence. ‘Daysaver’ tickets are also available which allow unlimited travel on all LRT buses. These cost £2.20 if bought before 9.30am and £1.50 if bought after 9.30am. Children's Daysaver tickets cost £1.50 (for 5-15 year-olds). For individual journey tickets methods of payment include cash (exact to the driver), tokens purchased from a travel centre, or the use of a ‘Ridacard’. LRT offer the ‘Ridacard’ as a travel card scheme which can be purchased for a week, four week or yearly period. These costs are detailed in Table 3.1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>4 Weeks</th>
<th>1 Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult</strong></td>
<td>£330</td>
<td>£30.50</td>
<td>£10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child</strong></td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>£18.00</td>
<td>£6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OAP</strong></td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£15.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 Bus concessions are available to the elderly (where eligibility is determined by being of pensionable age), and to children who are of school age (up to age 16 years).

3.10 There is a number of designated cycling routes (shared with bus priority lanes) that run through Central Leith, in addition to off-road tracks along disused railway land.

3.11 Several taxi and private hire car companies operate in Leith.

3.12 Several organisations were identified as providers of community transport within the Edinburgh city area. These included those organising statutory provision for the disabled, such as the Accessible Transport Department of Edinburgh City Council who administer concessions to the elderly and disabled in addition to the ‘taxi-card’ scheme.

3.13 The taxi-card scheme entitles the bearer to a £3.00 discount on taxi fares. The bearer is limited to 104 single journeys per year (equivalent to one return journey a week) although these can be used at any time (e.g. all within the first six months, if desired). Users must be registered disabled and unable to use public transport.

3.14 Handicabs operate 'Dial-a-Ride' which provides a door-to-door service for people with limited mobility who are unable to use ordinary buses. All vehicles are wheelchair accessible. The service operates seven days a week, but is restricted to those resident in Edinburgh or Lothians. All users must be registered with the organisation, although
registration is free. It costs £1.75 for the first three miles and £0.25 per mile thereafter. Journeys further afield may be more expensive.

3.15 Handicabs also operate 'Dial-a-Bus', a service which provides transport from a client’s home to local shopping centres. Again, this service is for people with limited mobility who are unable to use ordinary buses. The service operates in certain areas on certain days and places must be booked in advance. It costs £0.55 per mile.

3.16 Other community transport services identified included a library link bus which takes library users to and from their home to the local library. The service operates once every fortnight. The library also provides a delivery service for those users who cannot travel to the library. Both services are available to the elderly and mobility impaired. Lothian Community Transport provide the hire of vehicles to other community transport operators – vehicles are available on a self-drive basis or with a driver. This organisation also provides training advice and information to other voluntary service operators who run their own transport services, or those who are considering doing so. Some specialist care centres such as day centres and residential homes for the elderly or disabled also provide transport to their clients.

Castlemilk

3.17 Castlemilk is a large peripheral housing estate (and an electoral ward within itself), with a population of 18,000 (CUG, 2000), located to the south of Glasgow city. The Castlemilk ward itself has a population of 8,683 (Census, 1991). Transport links have been an issue of concern in relation to the accessibility of employment opportunities and shopping facilities in surrounding areas¹. In Castlemilk itself, there had previously been problems with access to decent shopping provision in the past and people depended on transport links to the nearest shopping area in Rutherglen. This has changed with the introduction of Kwiksave and the increased take up of small business units within the central shopping area. In previous studies of the area, access to employment opportunities has also been highlighted as an issue for concern and, subsequently, pilot transport initiatives have been introduced to improve the links between Castlemilk and East Kilbride.

3.18 This area, long characterised by deprivation, has been a priority area for public investment and regeneration for some time. The Castlemilk Partnership, as part of the New Life Urban Partnerships, was set up in 1988 to tackle problems associated with the high unemployment levels, the lack of essential facilities available, poor housing and derelict land, the high levels of crime and low education attainment that characterised the area.

3.19 There has never been a railway in Castlemilk itself. The closest railway stations are Croftfoot and Kingspark from where services operate mainly to Central Station in Glasgow city centre. Both train stations are accessible by bus services running into the city centre. These stations are on the Cathcart Circle which links Glasgow Central to different communities on the south side of Glasgow, namely Shawlands, Langside, Mount Florida, Muirend and Neilston. Services run on average every 20 to 30 minutes.

¹ The Castlemilk Umbrella Group was formed 11 years ago and is made up of community organisations and projects who represent a variety of interests and who deal with issues throughout Castlemilk. Cited here are transport issues identified by the group.
3.20 There is a number of bus services operating in the Castlemilk area which incorporate different routes throughout the case study area. These are provided in the main by FirstGlasgow, First Stop Travel and Dart Buses. The majority of these services operate seven days. An outline of these detailing the operator, the route, the frequency of the services and coverage is provided in the Annex to this report.

3.21 The information available to passengers is provided in printed timetables and details the routes of the bus, including a breakdown of the street names encompassed on the route. Leaflets also provide notification of any changes to the routes, some fare information and contact details for the FIRST customer service team and Strathclyde Passenger Transports information line.

3.22 On all bus services, fares can be paid direct to the driver (no change given). Reduced rates apply to juveniles between the ages of five and 16. Holders of concessionary travel cards can obtain concession travel at times stated on their travel cards. There is no information provided on the fare stages or costs of a specific journey in the timetables, although the following information was found on the number of concession passes or tickets offered by FirstGlasgow\(^2\) which apply to the services operating in the Castlemilk area and the Coatbridge area:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{° A ‘First Value’ ticket offers an off peak adult day return for £1.50 which is valid for travel city-wide, after 9.30am, Monday to Friday. The same ticket but for travel network-wide costs £1.90.} \\
\text{° The ‘Transfer 90’ ticket costs £1.30 and is valid for interchange within 90 minutes of boarding the first bus. The same conditions apply where the ticket can only be used off-peak, i.e. after 9.30am, Monday to Friday, and all day at weekends.} \\
\text{° The FirstGlasgow travel pass starts at £7.00 (dependent on zones) and allows unlimited travel, seven days per week, 24 hours per day.}
\end{align*}\]

3.33 There are no designated cycle routes provided in Castlemilk.

3.34 There is a number of taxi and private hire cars operating in the Castlemilk area. There is a taxi rank situated in the centre of Castlemilk outside the shopping centre.

3.35 Community transport provision is similar to that in Leith. Strathclyde Passenger Transport provide a Dial-a-Bus service to people with a mobility impairment who are unable to use public transport. The service costs £0.40 per single journey for concession card holders and £0.60 for non-concession card holders. There is an application procedure where an independent health assessor evaluates each case and the following restrictions apply:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{° journeys must be booked one day in advance. Bookings are taken from 9am to 11.45am, Monday to Friday. Bookings for Monday travel are made on a Friday.} \\
\text{° can only be used for journeys within Castlemilk} \\
\text{° cannot be used to attend hospital appointments}
\end{align*}\]

\(^2\) This information was taken from FirstGlasgow’s website at http://www.firstglasgow.co.uk
3.36 One local community group (Castlemilk Community Transport) provides hire of vehicles to groups and projects within the Castlemilk area – available with drivers or for self-drive. Vehicles must be booked in advance and there is no limit on time or distance. Vehicles are available all year round except Christmas (since all their drivers are volunteers).

3.37 It is possible that other local community groups, of which there are many based in Castlemilk, provide transport to their client groups. However, these are not included here as the assessment only serves to indicate the types of transport available.
Coatbridge

3.38 Coatbridge is situated nine miles east of Glasgow and is a former industrial town with a population of 43,617 (Census 1991). The area is considered to be served by ‘adequate’ transport links during the day. However, evening and Sunday services are thought to be poor. There is also some recognition that public transport services do not necessarily meet the shift patterns of local factories.

3.39 The wards of Kirkshaws and Old Monkland used in the survey are situated to the south of the main town and have a combined population of 10,043 (Census 1991). The boundaries of the electoral wards encompass different housing estates and an industrial estate. There are some small local grocery shops and a post office situated within the housing estates. The main shopping facilities, public library and other amenities, such as the health centre, are situated to the north of the area around the Main Street of Coatbridge. The area was chosen as it had been noted that it had particularly poor employment opportunities and poor transport links to surrounding areas, such as Livingston and edge of town industrial parks which have opportunities for employment.

3.40 South Coatbridge has been described as one of the largest single areas of multiple deprivation in North Lanarkshire; and consequently, has recently been designated as a Social Inclusion Partnership area. South Coatbridge is an area characterised by high levels of unemployment, with less employees in full-time work, very low numbers of self-employed and low numbers of students in further education. The area has a considerably higher than average number of lone parent families, increased levels of permanently sick and significantly higher than average proportion of people with long term illness. Very low owner occupation rates and significantly low levels of car ownership are also characteristic of the area (North Lanarkshire Council, 1996).

3.41 Coatbridge town is well served by rail links, although the nearest train stations to the case study area are Whifflet station situated to the North East of the area or Kirkwood station situated to the North West. Neither station is particularly accessible for the residents of the area although there is a bus link to Whifflet station. The main service operating on this line to Glasgow Central with stops at Carmyle, Mount Vernon, Baillieston, Bargeddie and Kirkwood.

3.42 The bus services operating in the Kirkshaws and Old Monkland area are provided by a variety of operators, some of whom provide only a single service often as a commuter link to Glasgow city centre. Many of the services identified mainly operated routes linking Coatbridge to surrounding towns such as Airdrie, Motherwell, Hamilton and Glasgow. The services operated by the smaller operators appear to target the individual communities (including Old Monkland) within the Coatbridge area. However, these services are limited, although valuable, in that they exist essentially to provide a service to those commuting to work in Glasgow on a nine to five basis. Information on these services is detailed in Table 3.4 at the end of this chapter.

---

3 This information was provided by North Lanarkshire Council and the details are taken from an internal document provided by the Council.
3.43 The information offered on the bus services was not consistent across operators and, although Strathclyde Passenger Transport provide a travel information line, the information offered centres on services linked to Glasgow city centre. It was therefore very difficult to obtain information on other services operating only within Coatbridge and the surrounding areas. The timetabling information documented in the study was provided by each individual operator, however, and not all of the operators had published information.

3.44 Similarly, with the cost of fares there is no consistent fare structure for the services operating in the case study area. The information provided by the smaller transport operators show cheaper fares. The fares for the services operated by FirstGlasgow are similar to those described in the above section on Castlemilk (a ‘First Value’ ticket offers an off peak adult day return for £1.50 which is valid for travel city-wide, after 9.30am, Monday to Friday. The same ticket but for travel network-wide costs £1.90), although an off-peak return fare within Lanarkshire is £1.50 and between Lanarkshire and Glasgow is £1.90.
3.45 There are no designated cycling routes within Kirkshaws and Old Monkland.

3.46 Local taxi services and private hire are available.

3.47 The Dial-a-Bus community transport scheme operated by SPT is also available on the same basis as that described in the section on Castlemilk. The service costs £0.40 per single journey for concession card holders and £0.60 for non-concession card holders. There is an application procedure where an independent health assessor evaluates each case and the following restrictions apply:

° journeys must be booked one day in advance. Bookings are taken from 9am to 11.45am, Monday to Friday. Bookings for Monday travel are made on a Friday.
° can only be used for journeys within Coatbridge
° cannot be used to attend hospital appointments

3.48 No other community transport schemes were identified.

3.49 The evidence presented in this section indicates that with the exception of Coatbridge that public transport networks are of a high quality and that a number of areas are accessible to the residents within the case study areas. These findings are considered in relation to those of the household survey.

SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND LOCAL TRANSPORT STRATEGIES

Edinburgh

3.50 The City of Edinburgh Council interim Local Transport Strategy (LTS) states that there is a close link between transport policy and social exclusion, and includes the elderly and the disabled as the most vulnerable to social exclusion. Other groups of people including poorer people, women, children, parents with young children and shoppers with heavy bags are listed as susceptible to experiencing forms of exclusion.

3.51 In Section 6.2.5 of the strategy, the City of Edinburgh Council defines social exclusion as resulting from the existence of barriers which make it difficult or impossible for people to participate fully in society. Recognition is made that access to facilities and services is the fundamental purpose of movement and therefore transport. Lack of access to facilities and services is an important facet of social exclusion. (38)

3.52 The LTS provides classification of what are termed as ‘internal’ and ‘external’ barriers leading to transport-related social exclusion. Internal barriers are presented as: non-access to car use, difficulty coping with traffic and difficulty accessing non-car transport (including walking and cycling as well as public transport). External barriers are presented as the: concentration of facilities and services, especially if the locations are hard to access by public transport, foot and cycle, cost of transport, detailed road design issues (e.g. lack of dropped kerbs), heavy and/or fast traffic, inaccessible vehicle design, infrequent public transport services and long distances from home to public transport services.

3.53 The distinction made between these barriers is elucidated through two examples given in the LTS. For example, we are asked to consider someone who cannot afford bus fares.
The ‘internal barrier’ explanation would be that the person is on a low income. The ‘external barrier’, however, is that fares are too expensive, or that the concessionary travel scheme provided is inadequate. Similarly, the document suggests it is more helpful to say that the reason a wheelchair user cannot use a bus is not because of their disability, but because the bus has a high floor, no ramp or lift, etc (CEC, 39). This section of the report adds that the distinction is helpful because, whilst it may be difficult or impossible to address internal barriers, it should be possible to re-organise systems and services to make them more inclusive (CEC, 39).

3.54 The LTS also states that the council has established a Transport and Social Exclusion Task Force with representatives from the Social Work Department, Education, City Development Departments and from the voluntary, disability and mental health sectors. This task force recently produced a report with a series of recommendations on how the LTS could seek to address the transport needs of the socially excluded or essentially promote social inclusion (CEC, 2000).

3.55 The explicit policy commitments made under the sub-heading of social exclusion are as follows:

1. Make a presumption that all new transport projects and infrastructure will have accessibility ‘built in’ from the outset. This approach will also be applied to all upgrades of existing systems, and, where applicable, to simple maintenance and renewal initiatives.
2. Maintain funding for those schemes which are specifically targeted at people with specific mobility needs, including bus and taxi concessions and Handicabs.

3.56 The Council offers commitment to various programmes in the short term, medium term and throughout the period of the strategy. These include:

**Short Term**
- investigate the role that people (staff or escorts) can play in reducing social exclusion, possibly through agencies such as WRVS, LCTS and the Social Work Department. These people would act as ‘travel trainers’, to help those who can for the first time use low floor buses, but who may lack the confidence to do so.
- expand the availability of the Dial-a-bus network
- investigate the following measures: Introducing shared taxi services, to reduce fares per passenger; ensuring that increases in taxi fares do not broadly exceed general inflation

**Medium Term**
- interest free loans for bus season tickets for those returning to the jobs market
- promoting season tickets to certain job seekers for limited periods

**Long Term**
- highlight the links between safer routes to school, better cycle and pedestrian facilities and improvements in children’s independent mobility/reductions in their level of social exclusion
- pursue the government’s White Paper commitment to carry out transport audits for all new public facilities, to minimise their impact on social exclusion
3.57 The interim LTS produced by the City of Edinburgh Council demonstrates considerable awareness of issues linking social exclusion to transport. The strategy outlined and policy commitments made contain pragmatic and realisable responses to some of the barriers identified in this project and in the review of transport use conducted by the Council itself.

**North Lanarkshire**

3.58 The North Lanarkshire Council interim strategy is laid out in a manner intended to generate discussion and participation. The strategy has three key aims; to promote a healthy society, an inclusive society and a prosperous society. An inclusive society is qualified as one where everyone has equal access to opportunities, facilities and resources and individuals participate in shaping the policies affecting them (NLC, 1999; 5). The council states that the achievement of an inclusive society must be measured on the ability of each one of us to fulfil our potential and satisfy our choices and aspirations (NLC, 1999; 5). Promoting such inclusion, North Lanarkshire Council suggests, requires action on both the physical environments in which our communities exist, and the processes by which these environments are shaped. Consequently, we will focus on the two key themes of ‘access for all’ and delivering ‘partnerships for participation’. These themes break down into the promotion of access on foot, access by bicycle, encouraging the use of bus and rail services, access for road users, traffic management, and involvement in decision making and co-ordinated action.

3.59 Under the headline ‘creating access for all’, the report suggests that barriers to access are amongst the most important detriments on community well-being and environmental quality. Creating a totally barrier free environment is unlikely to be a practical proposition as the needs of different groups will inevitably result in competition for resources and space. We can, however, focus on creating more equitable access giving preference to those of us who are most disadvantaged by the existing built environment and current land use and travel patterns. This must be promoted in balance with supporting the economic role of transport (NLC, 1999; 22).

3.60 The key objective is presented as the creation of an integrated walking, cycling and public transport network which can match the access advantages offered by the private car. Delivering this network meets the needs of the whole population, and supports the health and prosperity aims (22). The strategy outlines policies to increase access on foot and by bicycle and to improve services, vehicles and infrastructure in order to make public transport more appealing and accessible.

3.61 The strategy provides only some detail on the exact measures that would be deployed to fulfil the objectives and commitments it makes – presumably these will be further outlined in the full strategy scheduled for publication in October 2000. It does however outline the principles and policies that would inform the development of the full strategy. For example, under the heading ‘policies to deliver access on foot’, the strategy makes a commitment to delivering networks of safe pedestrian routes which enable children to walk to school, address joint use with cyclists, deliver effective access for all to public transport services, employment, shopping, recreation, health, and community facilities, provide for those with mobility or visual impairment, incorporating elements which remove, as far as possible, all barriers to movement. Although these are issues which are clearly linked to processes of transport exclusion, there is no definition or clarification of, for example, what ‘effective
access’ or ‘all barriers to movement’ entail. It is therefore difficult to evaluate what knowledge or understanding exists of the factors or processes that produce, or perpetuate, exclusion.

Glasgow


3.63 There is a considerable wealth of information included in these documents. However, it is difficult to identify a specific commitment to promoting inclusion as a policy objective and the means through which this could be achieved, although it could also be argued that such a commitment underlies the objectives stated by the council as a guide for the development of Council policy and services. These were also submitted to Strathclyde Passenger Transport's Authority’s Review on public transport. In summary these are:

To achieve high quality services:
° through the promotion of integration of rail, bus, underground and airport with walking and cycling to enhance the level of public transport provision to the city;
° by monitoring satisfaction of both users and people who do not use public transport and seek to meet emerging needs;
° develop services that meet the needs of all sections of the community.

To regenerate Glasgow’s economy and increase job opportunities and access to education and training
° by seeking to ensure that all households in the city have access to the principal locations of employment, education and training by affordable public transport

To tackle deprivation in Glasgow where a major concern for the Council is the large number of people in the City excluded from access to employment, education and training opportunities; and also to recreation, leisure, shopping, or cultural resources of the city
° by assessing the most important issue of access to people living in poverty
° by promoting affordable public transport for priority areas

To improve the quality of city life for all Glaswegians:
° seek to improve the quality and experience of travel by public transport
° investigate how design improvements can help meet the needs of people whose mobility may be limited

To fight discrimination and encourage a vibrant, multi-cultural Glasgow:
° involve members of representative bodies to help prepare an assessment of the public transport needs of the city’s different communities
° set out how SPT will seek to meet the special needs of each group
° ensure that in its own employment and in those of any contractor delivering a service on behalf of SPT proper equal opportunities employment practices are in place

To improve Glasgow’s environment and make it a safe and healthy place
° promote use of public transport as an alternative to the car in the city
° work with the Council to promote health by promoting walking and cycling as part of an integrated transport policy
° promote safety for passengers as a key concern with operators
° seek to reduce emissions from buses in the city

To be open and responsive by involving local people
° SPT should examine how it can promote public participation in the development of public transport services and, in particular, how it can seek the views of organisations representing different sections of the community

3.64 Although the term social exclusion (or inclusion) is not referenced explicitly, the strategic objectives outlined above clearly reflect a commitment to transport issues related to social inclusion.

3.65 Many of the objectives of the three Local Transport Strategies consulted fall in line with government guidance which echoes many of the commitments made in the integrated transport bill. There seems to be some consensus or agreement on how access could be improved. But there seems to be little analysis or commitment to understanding what ‘access’ or ‘accessibility’ means for all. Often there seems to be concentration upon the more tangible or less abstract manifestations of ‘inaccessibility’. For example, the commitment to more physically accessible vehicles. However, there is a need to be able to identify and assess the existence of barriers, their impact upon the accessibility of the transport system in order to aid a clearer understanding of the impact it has on accessibility of facilities and opportunities for people in society. Clearly, this impact is affected by the planning and land use policy of any given area while lack of choice in transport can exclude people from opportunities enjoyed by the majority of society.

3.66 This chapter aims to provide a contextual background to the following chapters which present the findings of the household survey, travel diary study and the interviews conducted with transport operators. From the information gathered, it is possible to see the differences between the case study areas in the public transport provision which support the reasons for their original selection.
CHAPTER FOUR    HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

4.1 The household survey was carried out in three different case study areas which are described in greater detail in Chapter 3. The purpose of this survey was to collect data that would be used to quantitatively examine context-specific relationships, the experiences of different groups in a (local area context) and to explore the nature of transport disadvantage in each area. The data from the household survey presents primary evidence on the nature of transport in urban areas – given the differences in the location of the three case study areas. It also contributes to an understanding, together with the data collected in the travel diary study, of the differential effects of transport disadvantage on different groups of people within society.

4.2 Each interview was undertaken with an adult member of each household. The questionnaire encompassed sections on the household, activities undertaken and travel, driving, motor vehicle usage, perceptions and usage of public transport, attitudes to taxis, walking and cycling, health and mobility, employment, education and training, income and expenditure, and perceptions of the local neighbourhood. The main findings of the analysis are presented below. Analysis was undertaken in relation to different attributes within the population such as gender, income, age, employment status and car access. This underpins the exploration of the differential effects of transport disadvantage or deprivation on different groups - which is linked to the groups of people who are traditionally associated with social exclusion (e.g. lower income, disabled, elderly).

4.3 The literature review reported in chapter 2 identified a range of factors that (might) affect an individual’s ability to participate in different activities. A wide range of variables were classified including the individual’s own characteristics (e.g. health or educational qualifications) and the characteristics of the area he or she lives in (e.g. physical environment, transport links) which were recorded in the questionnaire. These are reported in the initial sections of this chapter. The chapter finally discusses the travel behaviour and activity patterns of people in relation to different dimensions of social exclusion.

4.4 A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix 2A and a selection of the output tables from the statistical analysis is included in Appendix 4.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

4.5 A total sample of 552 respondents was drawn from the three case study areas. The 552 respondents were distributed evenly across the sample areas with approximately one third of the sample residing in each case study area.

4.6 The sample was drawn on a quota basis according to age, gender and car ownership levels in a bid to be representative of the population of each of the case study areas. The proportion of households within each case study area who had a ‘motor vehicle’ was higher than intended. This is less problematic than might appear in terms of being representative of the three populations. Firstly the 1991 census, on which the quota sample for each area was based, is outdated and the number of households who own a car is thought to have increased.
in each area since 1991. The quota was also based on a question in the survey that did not specifically refer to car ownership but also includes mopeds and motorcycles. The levels of car ownership may in fact therefore be lower than is indicated by the quota numbers. For this study a significant proportion of the sample in each area do not own a vehicle and experience differential levels of access to the car. In each area over half of the respondents were female.

4.7 In Leith 41.8% of the sample were male compared to 34.1% in Castlemilk and 36.8% in Coatbridge. Overall 62.4% of the sample was female. In Leith a larger proportion of the sample was found to be aged 16-30 than in the other two case study areas (27.3%) (Table 4.1). In Coatbridge a larger proportion of respondents were aged over 60 compared to the other two areas in this study.

Table 4.1 Age of respondents (%) by case study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>Case-study area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>Castlemilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 30</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 60</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOUSEHOLD DESCRIPTION

4.8 In the first section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to describe their household in terms of the number of inhabitants and the structure of their household.

Table 4.2 Household type and case study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household type</th>
<th>Case study area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>Castlemilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person living alone</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people living together as a couple</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single parent family</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple with dependent children</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another type group either related or unrelated</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 The majority of households (26.7%) in the study consisted of one person living alone. Twenty-four per cent of the sample consisted of households that can be described as two people living together, 9.5% of households described themselves as a single parent household, 20.1% as a couple with dependent children and 19.6% described themselves as another type of group (either related or unrelated) living together. In Leith, most respondents described their household as single person (34%) or as two people living together (26.6%) (Table 4.2).
4.10 In Castlemilk, 22.9% described their household as single person, 21.2% as a couple and 24.6% as a couple with dependent children. In Coatbridge, a similar pattern was found to exist, with the largest proportion accounting for a couple living together with no children (24.4%). The largest proportion of single parents resided within in Castlemilk (13.2%).

4.11 A significant relationship was found between household type and age, and gender. In the majority of single parent families, the respondent was found to be female and within the 30-40 age group. Most female respondents lived in single person households. Single person households were dominated by those aged 40-60 and over 60 (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 Household type and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household type</th>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>16-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person living alone</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people living together as a couple</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single parent family</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple with dependent children</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another type of group, either related or unrelated</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12 The majority of households (51.1%) stated that they normally lived in households with two adults. In comparison, 32.6% stated that only one adult lived in the household. Sixty two per cent of respondents also stated that they had no dependent children living in the household. Fifteen per cent and 13% of respondents stated their households had one and two dependent children (aged under 16 in their household) respectively. When the number of adults living in a household is disaggregated by area the pattern is similar again, although in Leith the higher number of single adult households is noticeable.

4.13 Leith and Coatbridge were found to have the largest proportions of households with no children (39.9% and 31% respectively). More households in Castlemilk stated they had two or three children (41.1% and 47.1%) than in Leith and Coatbridge.

HEALTH AND MOBILITY

4.14 In the questionnaire, respondents were asked to describe their health over the last twelve months. Eighty one per cent of the total respondents stated that their health had been good or fairly good. No significant differences were found between each of the case study areas with regard to stated health over the previous 12 months.

4.15 Despite good general health levels, significant minorities of those interviewed had specific problems. Proportions of those stating that they had health problems were highest for the response ‘problems or a disability connected with arms, legs, hands, feet, back or neck’ at 28.3% (n=156) and ‘chest/breathing problems, asthma, bronchitis’ at 21.4% (n=118). Problems associated with vision and hearing accounted for 12.7% and 10.7% respectively of the total number of respondents.
4.16 A large proportion of respondents stated that they could walk unaided for over half a mile (83.3%), while only 6.4% stated that they could walk unaided for less than 100 yards. There was a high proportion of respondents who stated that they experienced no difficulty in undertaking a range of activities. For example, 79.2% stated they had no problems ‘climbing stairs’ and 82.8% stated that they had no difficulty ‘walking for at least 10 minutes’. However, some respondents answered ‘yes’ that they did find difficulties in undertaking the actions described:

- 5.7% ‘always’ found difficulty in using a bus
- 5.1% ‘sometimes’ found difficulty in using a bus
- 1.8% ‘always’ had difficulty in using a taxi
- 3.1% ‘sometimes’ had difficulty in using a taxi
- 2.8% ‘always’ had difficulty using a train
- 3.2% ‘sometimes’ had difficulty using a car
- 10.6% ‘always’ had difficulty in walking for at least ten minutes
- 6.6% ‘sometimes’ had difficulty in walking for at least ten minutes
- 10.4% ‘always’ had difficulty in standing for at least ten minutes:
- 6.8% ‘sometimes’ had difficulty in standing for at least ten minutes

4.17 The analysis demonstrated a relationship between age and the difficulties encountered undertaking these activities. Older adults, as would be expected, experienced more problems compared to the younger age groups. No significant differences were found between case study areas and gender in the proportions of people who stated they had difficulty with managing these actions.

4.18 Those who were experiencing difficulties in mobility were examined in relation to the questions on transport use and travel. This analysis looked at the disabilities which received the highest proportions of respondents stating yes, these were ‘problems or a disability connected with arms, legs, hands, feet, back or neck’ and ‘chest/breathing problems, including asthma, bronchitis’. The analysis found that a high proportion of those who answered ‘yes’ to each of the potential restrictions provided in the survey had stated yes to the question of disability. For example, of those who felt ‘concerns about personal safety after dark’ 31.9% had problems or disability connected with arms, legs, hands, feet etc and 23.3% had chest/breathing problems. Similar proportions were found for the other statements where respondents stated ‘yes’ to feeling restricted by the lack of information, being unable to board vehicles easily or safely, and the cost of fares.

4.19 The most frequent mode of transport used by these respondents was comparable to the most frequent mode used by respondents overall: this was predominantly walking, although respondents most often used the bus to access the cinema, railway station and bus station. Car access was also comparable, although a higher percentage of these respondents answered that they had regular access to a car. For those who had a disability associated with arms, legs etc 29.9% had regular access to a car, 60.4% had access to lifts, and 9.7% had no access at all. For those with a chest/breathing problem 28.4% had regular access, 55.2% had access to lifts, 16.4 had no access at all.

4.20 Interestingly, also, a significant proportion of the respondents who had a disability answered ‘none’ to partaking in the series of activities listed in another question of the survey. These activities included: grocery shopping trips, town centre shopping trips,
collecting prescriptions and visiting friends. For example, 69.3% of those who had chest/breathing difficulties and 61.3% of those who had disability connected to arms, legs etc did not have an evening out for leisure purposes. There were similar figures for the other activities with the exception ‘grocery shopping trips’ which had a much lower proportion who stated ‘none’.

EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION AND TRAINING

4.21 Twenty three per cent of respondents stated that their employment status was full-time employed, 10.5% part-time employed, 27.7% retired and 6.4 % described themselves as unemployed and seeking work. The remaining categories were self-employed, looking after home or family, permanently retired, in full-time education, permanently sick or disabled and unable to work because of short-term illness or injury. These responses can be seen in Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1 Employment status

4.22 As can be seen from Table 4.4, of those who were employed full-time a higher proportion (45.7%) lived in Leith, however Leith also has a higher proportion of those unemployed and seeking work. A higher proportion (42.4%) of those who were permanently retired lived in Coatbridge. Coatbridge also had the smallest proportion (26.1%) of those who classified themselves as in full-time education. The majority of those who were looking after home or family resided in Castlemilk.

SHS found 4.1% self-employed, 29.2% full-time employed, 8.5% part-time employed, 6.8% looking after home/family, 17.3% permanently retired from work, 3.4% unemployed and seeking work, 15.7% at school, 3.5% in higher/further education, 0.3% in government work/training scheme, 3.9% permanently sick or disabled, 0.6% unable to work due to short-term illness, 6.1% pre-school and 0.7 other.
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Table 4.4  Employment status and case study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Case study area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leith Castlemilk Coatbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>41.2 35.3 23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>45.7 22.0 32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part-time</td>
<td>35.1 36.8 28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after the home or family</td>
<td>24.1 42.6 33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently retired from work</td>
<td>25.2 32.5 42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed and seeking work</td>
<td>42.9 28.6 28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In full-time education school</td>
<td>40.0 50.0 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In full-time education (further/higher)</td>
<td>43.5 30.4 26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently sick or disabled</td>
<td>34.0 42.6 23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to work because of short-term illness or injury</td>
<td>20.0 33.3 46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44.4 33.3 22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.5 32.5 33.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.23 Viewing employment in relation to gender also produced some interesting patterns. Figure 4.2 demonstrates the higher propensity (84.2%) for those employed part-time to be women. This was also the case for those looking after home or family where 90.7% were female. For those who were self-employed and those who were unemployed, the gender split was approximately even. A slightly higher proportion (56.7%) of those employed full-time were male, and of those permanently retired from work, more (64.7%) were female.

Figure 4.2  Employment status by gender

4.24 Overall, the journey to work consisted of only one stage (88.1%, n=170) indicating a reliance on modes that can access good and services directly in each case study area. Travel to work in each case study area was markedly different in several respects (Table 4.5). In Leith, driving to work was less important than taking the bus, whereas in the other two case study areas driving was as important or more so than taking the bus. This is especially the case in Coatbridge. In each area walking played a significant role.
### Table 4.5  Travel to work and case study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel to work</th>
<th>Leith</th>
<th>Castlemilk</th>
<th>Coatbridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>walking</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>driving (car/van)</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passenger (car/van)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicycle</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works bus</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordinary service bus</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taxi/minicab</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.25 Further analysis revealed a significant relationship between mode used to travel to work and household income level. As indicated earlier in this report driving becomes a more important mode of transport as income increases, whereas lower income groups are more likely to rely on the bus and less likely to walk to work (Table 4.6).

### Table 4.6  Household income and mode choice for travel to work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel to work</th>
<th>Household income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under £7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>driving (car/van)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passenger (car/van)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicycle</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works bus</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordinary service bus</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taxi/minicab</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rail</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.26 For those in employment (full, part-time and looking after family), 14.5% (n=46) stated that transport considerations had prevented them from looking for a job and 10.4% (n=33) had stated that transport considerations had prevented them accepting a job offer. 43.4% (n=20) stated that they had been continuously unemployed or not in paid work for over two years. Of this small number, the majority felt that transport considerations had prevented them from looking for work (n=10) and accepting a job (n=14). Travel to school/college/university was undertaken principally on foot (39.4%), bus (33.3%) and driving (15.2%). Again, small numbers responded to questions surrounding transport considerations and the lack of access to jobs and education. The largest number of responses were related to prevented from looking for a job (n=7) (Table 4.7).
Table 4.7 Transport considerations and failure to access jobs, education or training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport considerations……..</th>
<th>% stating yes employed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% stating yes unemployed, looking after family or unable to work</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% stating yes education or training scheme</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevented you from looking for a job</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevented you from accepting a job offer</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevented you from changing jobs</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required you to change your job</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required you to leave paid employment</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required you to work fewer hours</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevented you from taking up any form of education or training</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INCOME

4.27 In the questionnaire – where the corresponding weekly, monthly and annual income levels are displayed – respondents were asked to record their household income. A total of 462 provided an answer to the question (53 refused to answer the question and 37 entered ‘don’t know’ as their response).

4.28 Figure 4.3 illustrates the levels of household income across the entire sample of respondents and Table 4.8 shows the levels of household income alongside the case study area from which the respondent originated.
4.29 Table 4.8 presents household income disaggregated by case study area. The differences in levels of household income between the case study areas are demonstrated in this chart, where it is possible to see that Leith had the highest number of households in the smallest income brackets of ‘under £2,600’ and ‘£2,600 to 3,800’. However, Leith also had the highest number of respondents in the highest brackets of ‘£26,000 to 31,100’ and ‘£31,000 or more’. In Castlemilk, the levels of household income are concentrated in the lower levels (below £12,900), whereas for the other two case study areas there is a more even spread over the range of income levels.

Table 4.8 Household income by case study area, % of respondents in case study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household income</th>
<th>Leith</th>
<th>Castlemilk</th>
<th>Coatbridge</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under £2,600</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2,600-£3,800</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£3,900-£5,100</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5,200-£7,700</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£7,800-£10,300</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10,400-£12,900</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£13,000-£15,500</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15,600-£20,700</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20,800-£25,900</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£26,000-£31,100</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£31,200 or more</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.30 In the lowest income brackets (under £2,600; £2,600 – £3,800; £3,900 – £5,100; £5,200 – 7,700), the most frequent household type was ‘one person living alone’. However, there were also considerable numbers of ‘two people living together as a couple’ and ‘a single parent family’ within these income brackets (Table 4.9).
Table 4.9   Percentage of respondents by household type within household income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One person living alone</th>
<th>Two people living together as a couple</th>
<th>A single parent family</th>
<th>A couple with dependent children</th>
<th>Another type of group, related or unrelated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under £2,600</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2,600 – 3,800</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£3,900 – 5,100</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5,200 – 7,700</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£7,800 – 10,300</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10,400 – 12,900</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£13,000 – 15,500</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15,600 – 20,700</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20,800 – 25,900</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£26,000 – 31,100</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£31,200 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.31 Household income compared with the number of dependent children within a household also produced some interesting figures. Thirty eight per cent (n=3) of those who had an income under £2,600 had one dependent child and 9.8% (n=4) of those who had an income of £2,600-3,800 had two dependent children. In the higher income brackets, the majority had no dependent children: 52.5% of those who had an income over £31,200; 45.2% of those who had an income of £26,000 – 31,000 and 65.7% of those who had an income of £20,800 – 25,900. This may be related to age as many of those who were within the higher brackets were older and might have children who are not dependent.

4.32 The subsequent paragraphs show the household expenditure on various items in relation to the household income. The questionnaire asked respondents to record their last week's expenditure on various things including rent and mortgage payments, food and groceries, bills (telephone, electricity and gas), eating out or buying take-away food, leisure activities and hobbies, and on transport (including bus, rail and taxi fares in addition to petrol expenditure).

4.33 On rent and mortgage payments, the largest proportion (33%) of respondents spent nothing, 13.6% spent £40-50 and 10.7% spent £50-59. On food and groceries, the largest proportion (19.1%) of respondents spent £30-39 and 15% spent £40-49. On bills, 21% of people spent £10-19 and 19.9% spent £20-29. On eating out or buying take away food, the overwhelming majority spent very little, 41.2% spent nothing, 18.1% spent under £10 and 17.4% spent £10-19. This was similar to the spending on leisure activities where 34.9% of respondents spent nothing, 23.3% spent under £10 and 14.8 spent £10-19 (Table 4.10).
Table 4.10  Household spending on different items, % of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spending in a week</th>
<th>On rent and mortgage payments</th>
<th>On food and groceries</th>
<th>Bills – telephone, electricity and gas</th>
<th>Eating out or buying take-away food</th>
<th>Leisure activities, entertainment and hobbies</th>
<th>Transport – bus fares, rail fares, taxi fares and petrol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under £10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10-19</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20-29</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£30-39</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£40-49</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50-59</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£60-79</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£80-99</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100-119</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£120-139</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£140-159</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£160 or over</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.34 The spending on transport was a little higher, with 40% of respondents spending under £10 and 22.6% spending £10-19. Nine per cent of respondents spent nothing on transport. The figure below illustrates spending on transport within the different case study areas (figure 4.4).

Figure 4.4  Expenditure on transport within case study area

4.35 In addition to the questions on income, the questionnaire also asked the respondent's view on whether they had found themselves worrying about money during the last few weeks. In response to the question 'How often would you say you have been worried about
money during the last few weeks?’, 22.4% reported ‘almost all the time’ whereas 43.3% reported ‘never’.

4.36 Within the section on income and expenditure, respondents were also asked if they (or their partner) have a bank or building society account. Sixty one (11.7%) of those who responded said that they did not have a bank account. Of these 61 people, the majority lived in Castlemilk (29) and Coatbridge (23). They also had lower incomes - there was no-one who earned more than £12,900 who did not have a bank account.

HOUSING

4.37 The interviewers were instructed to classify the household accommodation into one of the following categories: a house or bungalow (detached or semi-detached), a house (terraced), a flat (tenement or four-in-a-block), a flat (high rise block) or as ‘other’.

4.38 Overall, ‘flat’ was the most frequent response with 55.6% of the total respondents inhabiting a tenement or four-in-block while an additional 10.9% inhabited a flat in a high rise block. Twenty four per cent of respondents lived in a terraced house compared to 9.4% who lived in a house or bungalow.

4.39 In Coatbridge, the highest proportion of respondents occupied a house, 22.5% lived in a detached or semi-detached house and 46.1% lived in a terraced house. These figures combined accounted for 68.6% of the respondents in Coatbridge whereas only 10.2% of the respondents in Leith and 22.1% of those in Castlemilk inhabited a house. In Leith the highest proportion of respondents (66.7%) inhabited a tenement or four-in-a-block flat. This was also the case in Castlemilk where 72.7% of respondents inhabited a flat. The occupation of high rise flats was most prevalent in Leith where 22.6% of the respondents lived in such accommodation as compared to 5.1% and 4.5% in Castlemilk and Coatbridge respectively. These differences are illustrated in Table 4.11 presented below.

4.40 In the household survey, 28.5% stated that they were buying their accommodation with the help of a mortgage or loan. Twenty four per cent stated that they rented from a local authority and 12.2% stated that they rented from a local housing association. Eight per cent of people stated that they rented from a private landlord and a further 8% stated that they lived rent free (this category included social security payments and rent free in a relative’s or friend’s property. When household accommodation is analysed by the tenure categories significant differences emerge.

---

5 The Scottish Household Survey respondents were asked to describe their household accommodation (HB1) – 62.5% described it as a house or bungalow, 36.7% described it as a flat (including four-in-a-block – and in HB2 if it is detached (30.1%), semi-detached (35.2%) and terraced (34.8%).

6 SHS found that 22.2% owned their accommodation outright, 37.9% were buying it with the help of a mortgage or loan, 0.7% were part rent/part buy, 37.5% were renting, and 1.2% living rent free.
Table 4.11 Household accommodation of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household accommodation</th>
<th>Case-study area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>Castlemilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a house or bungalow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Case-study area</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a house (terraced)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Case-study area</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a flat (tenement or 4-in-a-block)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Case-study area</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a flat (high-rise block)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Case-study area</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Case-study area</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.41 Significant differences between case study area by tenure category were also found to exist (Table 4.12). In Coatbridge 39.4% paid rent to a local authority compared to 12.8% in Leith and 20.6% in Castlemilk. Larger proportions in Leith and Castlemilk however paid rent to housing associations (11.2% and 22.2%) respectively compared to 3.3% in Coatbridge. Seventy five per cent of those paying rent to a private landlord resided in Leith. For those purchasing property with the help of a mortgage or loan the highest proportion resided in Leith (37.1%) although it was evenly spread with 32.1% in Coatbridge and 30.8% in Castlemilk.

Table 4.12 Tenure by case study area, % of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Case study area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>Castlemilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay rent – local authority</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay rent – housing association</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay rent – private landlord</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own it outright</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying it with the help of a mortgage or loan</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live here rent free</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.42 Tenure was found to have a significant impact on levels of access to a car. Regular car access is associated with home ownership – either where the home is owned outright by the respondent or where the home is being bought with the help of a mortgage or loan. A large proportion of respondents who are able to get a lift in a car when needed are living in rented local authority or housing association accommodation. Sporadic and irregular access to the car is also associated with these tenure groups (Table 4.13). Further analysis found no significant differences between household accommodation type and the level of car access.

Table 4.13 Tenure and Access to a Car, % of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Regular car access</th>
<th>Relying on lifts</th>
<th>No access at all</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pay rent - local authority</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pay rent - housing association</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pay rent - private landlord</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own it outright</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buying it with the help of a</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mortgage or loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live here rent free</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.43 Of those living rent free, the majority (50%) fell within the lowest age band at 16-30. The highest proportion of those buying their own home with the help of a loan or mortgage were with the 30-40 age bracket. Those who owned their property outright were more likely to be in the older age bracket of 60-70. For those paying rent either to a local authority or housing authority the proportions were evenly spread across the age brackets. Whereas a larger proportion (21%) of those paying rent to a private landlord were in the lowest age bracket of 16-30.

4.44 Fifty four per cent of all respondents answered no when asked if their accommodation had a secure place to leave a car. In Castlemilk, 61.5% of respondents stated that they did not have a safe place to leave a car compared to 45% in Coatbridge and 57% of respondents in Leith. A similar pattern emerged when respondents were asked if they had a secure place to leave a bike: 51.4% of respondents from Castlemilk and 39.9% of respondents from Leith stated they did not have a safe place to leave a bicycle. Overall 38% of respondents did not have a safe place to keep a bicycle.

HOUSEHOLD GOODS

4.45 Respondents were asked if they had certain goods within their household, including a deep freeze or fridge freezer, washing machine, telephone, personal computer, television, and a secure place to leave a car or bicycle. It was thought that these could have a potential impact upon their travel behaviour. For example, not having a fridge freezer within the household might mean having to go shopping more often, and not having a telephone may require a person to make more trips outside of the home to acquire information or to make contact with friends and family. In addition to this, some of these items have been used as an indicator of economic disadvantage (e.g. not having a telephone in the household).
4.46 Of the total number of respondents:

- 4.5% did not have a deep freeze or fridge freezer
- 3.5% did not have a washing machine
- 3.1% did not have a telephone
- 61.4% did not have a computer
- 2.2% did not have a television

4.47 Significant differences were found by case study area as to whether a household had a deep freeze or fridge freezer. Although in each case study area over 90% of households had a deep freeze, 56% of those who stated they had no deep freeze resided in Leith. Similar results were found when comparing Leith to other areas with regard to whether the household had access to a washing machine or not. Computer ownership levels were significantly higher in Leith. Computer ownership is also strongly influenced by age and gender differences. Of those who owned a computer, 26.7% were 16-30, 31% were 30-40, and 19% were 40-50 years old. Of those who answered that yes, they did own a computer, 55.7% were female. However, placed within the context of the entire sample, a wider proportion of the men interviewed owned a computer: 45.4% compared to 34.6% of women. Further analysis also revealed significant statistical relationships between age and internet access.

4.48 Respondents were asked if they ‘currently have access to e-mail or the internet either at home, work or at a convenient place nearby (such as the library or an internet café)’ and 41% stated that yes, they did have access. More people in Leith had access to the internet where 54.8% of those interviewed answered yes. Only 33.9% of those interviewed in Castlelimilk and 34.1% of those interviewed in Coatbridge stated that they currently had access to email or the internet. Internet access was found to be more prevalent amongst those respondents who stated that they rented from a private landlord, owned their accommodation outright, or who were buying their housing with the help of a mortgage or loan. Internet access by comparison was lower in the public rented sector.

4.49 Those who stated that they did not have access to the internet were also asked if they thought access to the internet would make a difference to their life or not. No significant differences by case study area or tenure were found in the pattern of responses as to whether the internet would make a difference to the respondent's life. The 27.4% (or 82 people) who answered that yes, they thought the internet would make a difference were then asked ‘in what way?’ they felt it would make a difference. Better access to information figured predominantly as a response in addition to references to: better or more opportunities for communicating with friends and relatives abroad, improving skills for employment and improving educational opportunities for children. There was also a considerable number of people who mentioned undertaking business and sales transactions from the ‘comfort of your own home’.

---

7 SHS found that 6.5% had no fridge freezer, 5.6% had no washing machine, 5.1% had no telephone, 70.2% had no computer. The SHS also asked whether the internet could be accessed from home where 55% of respondents answered no.
NEIGHBOURHOOD

4.50 Respondents were asked a series of questions about their neighbourhood and their feelings on living there. These included questions on how long they had lived in their neighbourhood: if they liked living in their neighbourhood; and, if they had a choice, whether or not they would remain in their neighbourhood. Respondents were then asked to mark on a scale of one to five how they felt about a series of statements about their neighbourhood.

4.51 An overwhelming majority of the respondents stated that they liked living in their neighbourhood (90%). Further analysis revealed no significant differences between case study areas. This high level of satisfaction with the quality of the neighbourhood is also reflected in the large proportions of the sample that stated that they would wish to ‘stay here’ (55.9%) or ‘move within their neighbourhood’ (14.9%). Nevertheless, 29.2% of all respondents stated, despite the overwhelming majority who stated they liked living in their neighbourhood, that they would ‘prefer to move to another area’.

4.52 The reasons given for preferring to move, either within their local area or to another area, were related either to the size or the nature of their house. For example, people wanted to move to a larger or smaller house, to a flat located on the ground floor, to a cheaper rent, to share with different people, or to a house with a garden. Many people also mentioned a wish to be closer to the city centre or to be able to access certain facilities more easily (namely a better library, better shops, university, or the workplace). Others expressed a wish to leave their local area as they felt it was bad or depressing. Table 4.14 shows the proportions citing health, personal reasons, improved housing/larger house, improve accessibility and poor environmental quality (including noise and neighbours) as reasons for leaving the neighbourhood. There is a difference between the case study areas in terms of these responses associated with preferring to move. In Castlemilk and Coatbridge respondents are more likely to move due noise, neighbours and poorer environmental quality whereas in Leith respondents have indicated that they would prefer to move to improved housing.

Table 4.14 Reason for preferring to move (%) by case study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for preferring to move</th>
<th>Case-study area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leith 91</td>
<td>Castlemilk 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transport links and accessibility</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor health</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise, neighbours, poor environment</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.53 In a separate question, respondents were asked to rate on a 5-point scale the degree to which they agreed with a range of statements. These were ‘The neighbourhood you live in….’:
4.54 Most items were scored favourably, but things for young people to do, facilities for children and facilities for parking were areas perceived more negatively. Table 4.15 provides further information on the proportions agreeing and disagreeing with these statements.

Table 4.15 ‘The neighbourhood you live in …’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighbourhood you live in…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is well maintained and tidy</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has good public transport</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has plenty of open space</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a safe area</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is quiet and not too noisy</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has friendly people</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has things for young people to do</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has good local shops</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has good leisure facilities</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has good local schools</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has good facilities for children</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has facilities for parking</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.55 Further analysis of these responses disaggregated by area reveals some interesting differences. Leith is regarded as less tidy and well maintained (37% of respondents disagreed), compared to Castlemilk and Coatbridge, where people agreed that their areas were tidy and well maintained (42.5% and 52.2% of respondents respectively). In Leith, a higher proportion of the respondents disagreed that their area had good facilities for children (31.3%) than agreed. In each of the areas, a higher proportion of people disagreed that their areas had things for young people to do than those who agreed. In all areas, a significant proportion of the sample felt their area had good public transport: 61.9% in Leith, 67.4% in Castlemilk and 76.7% in Coatbridge.

4.56 Following this question, respondents were asked if there were any facilities that they don’t have locally but would like to have. Responses ranged from better facilities for
children and young people, bigger or better shops and a cinema, to other leisure facilities, such as a decent pub, a tea shop, a bingo hall and a sports centre.

4.57 50.2% of respondents stated that most of their friends and relatives lived in a mixture of locations (i.e. another town or suburb, local neighbourhood while 36.1% stated that close friends and relatives lived in the local neighbourhood. 51.7% of respondents stated that they had up to four friends living within a mile of them. These local support networks also provided security in that substantial proportions of respondents stated that they could rely on friends and family to help them with a variety of situations, including:

° 60.6% of respondents stated that they would have someone to help them most or all of the time if they were confined to bed;
° 81.6% of respondents stated that they would have most or all of the time someone you could count on to listen to you when you needed to talk;
° 76.8% of respondents stated that they would have most or all of the time someone who could give them good advice in a crisis;
° 77.8% of respondents stated that they would have someone to take them to the doctors most or all of the time if they needed it;
° 73.3% of respondents stated they would have someone to help them with their chores if they were sick most or all of the time.

4.58 Further analysis of data revealed no significant differences between the location of local support networks and levels of car access, household income, age or health.

**CAR ACCESS**

4.59 The questionnaire included a number of questions on driving and vehicle use. First, respondents were asked to describe their circumstances regarding their driving licence status.

Of all respondents:

° 40.8% currently hold a full driving licence
° 12.3% currently hold a provisional driving licence
° 42.5% have never held a UK driving licence
° 1.1% are currently disqualified from driving
° 3.3% have had their licence suspended on medical grounds

4.60 A higher proportion of those who currently hold a full driving licence reside in Leith (38.1%) than in Castlemilk (26.5%) or Coatbridge (35.4%). Of those who have never held a UK driving licence, the proportions are spread equally across the case study areas: Leith (31%), Castlemilk (34.1%) and Coatbridge (34.9%). The most marked difference in those that have never held a driving licence is in gender - 77.8% are female. This is also the case for those who currently hold a provisional licence 70.1% are female.

---

8 These results can be compared to those of the Scottish Household Survey where: 63.4% currently hold a full driving licence (car or motorcycle), 6% currently hold a provisional licence, 0.2% currently disqualified from driving, 0.9% have their licence suspended on medical grounds and 29.5% have never held a UK driving licence.
4.61 Of those who currently hold a driving licence, the age is evenly spread across the age bands. The majority of those holding a provisional licence are in the younger age band (16-30), whereas the majority of those currently disqualified from driving (50%) and for those with their licence suspended on medical grounds (44.4%) are in the older age bands (60-70 and over 70).

4.62 As the income bands increased, the number of respondents who owned their own car increased – although it must also be noted there were respondents within each income bracket who owned their own car. Those who had access to a car through their employment were concentrated in the higher income brackets – in the main, those with a household income of £13,000 and above. Figure 4.5 shows clearly that lower income does have a relationship with driving. Those in lower incomes are more likely to have their licence suspended on medical grounds, it is possible that this is a proxy for those on lower incomes having poorer health. Those on lower incomes are less likely to have a full driving licence than those on higher incomes, and are more likely to have never held a UK driving licence.

**Figure 4.5  Driving licence status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household income</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under £7,700</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£7,800-15,500</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15,600 or more</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. currently hold a full driving licence
2. currently hold a provisional driving licence
3. never held a UK driving licence
4. currently disqualified from driving
5. licence suspended on medical grounds

4.63 Respondents who had ‘never held a UK driving licence’ were also asked the reasons for not learning to drive. Reasons given ranged from concerns over the cost of learning to drive, as well the cost of running a car, to psychological barriers such as not having the confidence to learn to drive. Others said they had never seen the need to learn as there was always someone else within the household who did drive. Some never felt the need as they preferred public transport or walking. Some simply were never interested in learning to drive.

4.64 Those who had a licence (i.e. those who currently hold a full driving licence and those who hold a provisional licence) were asked how often they drove. Figure 4.6 shows how often respondents who had a licence reported that they drove. The most notable differences between case study areas is the higher propensity for drivers within Coatbridge.

---

9 The Scottish Household Survey found that 69.7% drove everyday, 11.4% drove at least three times a week, 6.8% drove once or twice a week, 1.7% drove at least 2 or 3 times a week, 0.8% drove at least once a month, 2.7% drove less than once a month, and 6.8% drove never.
(49.1%) to drive every day. Whereas the highest proportion (33.7%) of respondents who never drive reside within Castlemilk.

Figure 4.6   Frequency of driving

4.65 Respondents were asked questions regarding their access to a vehicle. Overall, 55.6% of respondents said that they had a motor vehicle available for private use by them or their household. Of these respondents, the majority stated that they had only one vehicle available to them (67.8%), while one fifth (22.6%) stated that they had two vehicles available to them\(^\text{10}\). While these figures appear quite high, particularly considering the quotas established at the outset of the survey work, it is not possible to determine from this question what the motor vehicle is or who within the household has the use of the vehicle. However, more detail in the survey is available on the exact nature of a respondent's access to a car or van. Respondents were offered a series of statements that potentially described their (own) circumstances regarding their access to a car or van. Of all respondents:

\begin{itemize}
  \item 25.6% own their own car/van
  \item 2.6 have access to a car/van owned by their work, but which can be used for personal use
  \item 1.7% own their own motorcycle or moped
  \item 1.1% have access to a car/van owned by their work, but not available for their own personal use
  \item 4.6% answered ‘someone in my household owns a car/van which I can drive’
  \item 10.3% answered ‘someone in my household owns a car/van and provides me with lifts whenever I need them’
  \item 3.3% ‘someone in my household owns a car/van and provides me with lifts sometimes’
  \item 4.6% answered ‘a friend/neighbour/relative owns a car which I can drive’
\end{itemize}

\(^{10}\) These figures are not directly comparable to the Scottish Household Survey which asked a random sample of respondents in Scotland whether there were any motor vehicles normally available for use by members of the household: 63.6% answered ‘yes’. This proportion drops to 36% among very low income households and 52% in disadvantaged council estates. The number of motor vehicles available for use were recorded in the survey and are as follows: one - 67.8%, two – 27%, three- 4.2%, four – 0.7%. The quota sampling methods used in this study suppressed the number of car users. Further information on the study methodology is available in an annex of this report.
° 19.1% answered ‘a friend/neighbour/relative owns a car and provides me with lifts whenever I need them’
° 16.9% answered ‘a friend/neighbour/relative owns a car and provides me with lifts sometimes’
° 10.3% answered ‘I never have access to a car’

4.66 The figures of ownership of a car were higher in Coatbridge where 29% of respondents stated that they owned their own car or van, compared to Castlemilk (24.6%) and Leith (23.1%). In Leith, a higher proportion (14%) of respondents stated that they never have access to a car/van compared to 9.1% in Castlemilk and 7.7% in Coatbridge. Car use is least in Leith and most in Coatbridge.

4.67 These responses were then re-coded into three variables representative of ‘regular car access’ (i.e. owning their own vehicle), ‘sporadic access to a car’ (i.e. through lifts from friends, etc), and ‘no access at all’, and used to explore any relationships with independent variables such as gender, household income and age. This analysis showed a statistically significant relationship between gender and car access. Men were more likely to have regular access to a car than women. Women were more likely to rely on lifts or have no access at all. Similarly those on higher income (over £15,600) were more likely to have regular access to a car than those on lower incomes (under £7,700 and between £7,800-15,500) who were more likely to have no access at all and only some access through lifts from friends, respectively. Within age there was no clear pattern between age and car access. Differential car access and the frequency of activities undertaken is explored later in the report.

4.68 Respondents who did not own their own vehicle were then asked if they would change the frequency (within the categories of ‘yes – visit more’, ‘yes – visit less’, and ‘no – visit the same) with which they visited a number of places if they had access to their own car. These places included the supermarket, bank, sports/leisure centre, cinema, pub, library and church. In every case, for each place, the majority of respondents stated that they felt if they owned their own car the number of times they visited would stay the same.

4.69 Respondents who did own their own vehicle or had personal use of a car or van from work were asked a series of questions regarding their use. The majority (74.5%) of these respondents had had a car for over five years while 18.3% had a car for one to five years and 7.2% had a car for less than a year. The main reasons given for buying a car were ‘convenience’, a need for a car due to work, and in some cases because there was no alternative (i.e. inadequately served by the public transport network).

4.70 On average, these respondents drove 11,644 miles in a year and the average fuel expenditure for the past week was £21.99. The minimum spent (in the last week) was nothing and the maximum was £75.00. Further analysis indicates that household income was a significant determinant of fuel expenditure. For those respondents on incomes of up to £7,700 per year and £7,800 to £15,500 per year most spent up to £15 per week. Respondents on higher incomes were more likely to spend between £15-£30 per week and over £30 per week on fuel (Table 4.16).
Table 4.16 Annual Household Income and Fuel Expenditure per week, % of households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel expenditure per week</th>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to £7,700</td>
<td>£7,800-£15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to £15</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15-£30</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£30+</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.71 All respondents were asked whether or not they (or their partner) had sold or disposed of a vehicle without replacing it within the last five years. Twelve per cent of respondents answered that yes, they had disposed of a vehicle without replacing it. The majority (53.8%) of those respondents were from Leith and the main reasons given were that it was too costly or for other reasons that were not defined. The larger proportions of those respondents stating that they had disposed of a motor vehicle were aged 30-40 (25%) and 40-60 (34.4%).

ACTIVITY AND TRAVEL

4.72 The majority of the questions within the questionnaire were devoted to collating information on the respondents’ travel and use of different forms of transport. Analysis of this provides a detailed account of the travel behaviour of the respondents – this includes further analysis of the data in relation to different independent variables to explore any relationships which is discussed later in this chapter.

4.73 In the questionnaire, respondents were asked to record the mode of transport they used most frequently, the time it took them to travel and to classify the location of a number of key destinations. These destinations included the local shop, post office, bank, supermarket and a range of others. Respondents were also asked to list the frequency of which they undertook a number of activities (e.g. grocery shopping trips, evenings out for leisure purposes, attending educational classes) and the mode they used.

4.74 Walking dominates the share of trips for most types of activity in each area with the exception of trips to the cinema, bus station, hospital, and supermarket. For trips to the supermarket, bank, doctor, dentist, cinema, and to the hospital access to a car is important but less so than the bus. Travel by bicycle, motorbike, community transport and train accounts for very small proportions of the modal split for each journey and activity type and as it is less than 1% in all cases these modes have been excluded from the table below.

4.75 Table 4.17 provides a summary of the percentage of respondents using each mode to access a variety of destinations. It shows the predominance of walking for many of the journeys. Later in this chapter further description is provided of the findings made in relation to each of the case study areas. The lower levels of car dependence exhibited in this table conform with patterns of car access discussed earlier in the report.

4.76 From Table 4.17 it is possible to see that most common mode found is to walk. Further analysis demonstrates that there is no particular difference in this by gender, household income or by the case study areas. For example, in terms of the most frequent mode used to access each of these facilities compared with gender walking still predominates.
There are some differences in, for example, journeys to the cinema where the most frequent mode chosen by women is the bus whereas men choose ‘never use’ most frequently. Conversely, men choose ‘walk’ to the pub most often whereas women choose ‘never use’. For each case study area, the most frequent mode for most destinations is walking. Sports/leisure centre and cinema are the exceptions to this. For sports leisure centre ‘never use’ is chosen more frequently in Leith and Coatbridge and for cinema ‘bus’ is chosen more frequently in Leith and Castlemilk whereas ‘never use’ is the most frequent response by residents of Coatbridge. Further data on mode used to access facilities by area is available in Appendix 4 of this report.

Table 4.17 Percentage of respondents using mode to access facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Car (driver)</th>
<th>Car (passenger)</th>
<th>Taxi</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Never use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local shop</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports/leisure centre</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway station</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus station</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.77 Statistically significant relationships exist between this pattern of travel behaviour and the activity location. Respondents were asked to classify the location of each of the key destinations that they used as local neighbourhood, city centre, another suburb, or another town. The table below provides a summary of the location of the key destinations for the entire sample. It shows a predominance of many of the key destinations to be located within, what respondents classified as, the local neighbourhood (Table 4.18).

4.78 The analysis demonstrated a strong link between local neighbourhood and the pattern of mode choice in each case study area. In the local neighbourhood walking dominated the travel patterns within Leith and Castlemilk. In Coatbridge, compared to Leith and Castlemilk, the analysis showed a greater tendency of the respondents to use car and bus for local neighbourhood journeys. Also in Coatbridge, respondents more frequently accessed good and services in the city centre by these modes of transport. Disaggregated data by case study area are available in appendix 4 of this report.
Table 4.18  Percentage of respondents stating location of facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local neighbour</th>
<th>City Centre</th>
<th>Another suburb</th>
<th>Another town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local shop</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports/leisure centre</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway station</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus station</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government office</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.79  Journey time was strongly inter-related with mode choice and activity location. In terms of the distribution of journey times for each activity most trips made were under 10 minutes reflecting the dominance of travel within the local neighbourhood to access goods and services. The following table 4.19 documents the average time taken for the journeys to each destination.

Table 4.19  Average time taken to access facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average time taken (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local shop</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports/leisure centre</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway station</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus station</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government office</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.80 Identifying the average time taken to access different facilities in each case study area shows that the majority of the facilities are within a reasonable distance (in terms of time). The diagram below illustrates the time taken to reach each facility where the mean is illustrated alongside the standard deviation and the range of responses made. From this diagram\(^\text{\textsuperscript{11}}\) (Figure 4.7) it is possible to see where responses differ the most, for example, in the time taken to reach the hospital, cinema and bus station.

4.81 The average time taken to visit basic services varies little when examined in conjunction with gender and mode, or employment status and mode. For example, the average time taken to visit the local shop by car is 7.1 minutes for men and 5.7 minutes for women. By bus, it takes men on average 11.4 minutes and women 10.2 minutes. When walking, men reach the local shop a little quicker (4.8 minutes) than women who take 6.7 minutes on average. The differences in the average time taken to reach the local shop according to employment status does reveal some differences although these are small. Those who classed themselves as ‘sick or disabled’ took longer to travel by bus (15 minutes) to the local shop than the other groups who took 10 minutes on average. This was not always the case for other destinations – no clear pattern emerges. The pattern, however, remains that those who take the shortest time to reach the local shop, for example, are those who walk which might account for the reason that ‘walk’ is the most frequent mode used for most of the facilities accessed.

**Figure 4.7 Time taken to access facilities**

4.82 In general, the average time taken to travel to local facilities was longest for those travelling by bus, or car, and shortest for those walking.

4.83 The time taken to reach local facilities was also examined in relation to car access where it was observed that it was, not surprisingly, quicker for people to access services if they have regular access to a car, if they have occasional access to a car then their mean

\(^{\text{\textsuperscript{11}}}\) Note that all outliers and extremes have been excluded from this figure.
travel time increases. Interestingly though, those with no car access give a similar travel time as those with. Also those without car access give a less varied range of travel times, possibly as they use only their local facilities and can accurately estimate how long it takes to get there. Those who travel by car have a much broader spatial area to which they have access and consequently have a broader range of times to get there.

4.84 The data also allowed further analysis of how each destination or facility was accessed within the case study areas. For trips to local shops, schools, the post office and library a significantly large proportion of trips are made on foot in each case study area. This is reflected in the high proportion of trips made within the local neighbourhood for these activities and the low journey times. A significant proportion of journeys were found to last under 10 minutes. Trips to the bank, sports and leisure facilities, the supermarket, doctor, dentist and chemist in Leith and Castlemilk were found to be largely undertaken on foot, although a growing proportion of trips in these areas are made by bus and car to access these services. Coatbridge is significantly different to Leith and Castlemilk in that car use is higher for each of these activities. The higher car use levels are not only associated with trips to access the services outside the local neighbourhood but also within it. For access to the cinema and hospitals some stark contrasts were found between the three areas. In Leith and Castlemilk access to cinema facilities is more reliant on bus use whereas in Coatbridge the car is the more important mode. This is due to a larger proportion of trips being made outwith the neighbourhood to the city centre and another suburb or town. For access to hospital facilities the main form of transport is the bus and car.

**Frequency of trips**

4.85 Respondents were asked to record the number of times they had done a range of activities in the past week, in addition to stating the main mode that they used in undertaking these activities. A summary of the frequency of which these activities were undertaken is provided in Table 4.20.
Table 4.20  Frequency of activities undertaken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% of respondents undertaking an activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery shopping trips</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town centre shopping trips</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail park shopping trips</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting prescriptions</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting friends/relatives</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenings out for leisure purposes</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking children to and from school</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking children to other activities</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days out for leisure purposes</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary work/ duties</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended adult education</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.86  These activities were explored in relation to the mode used which was also recorded in this question. The analysis demonstrated a clear difference with those on a lower income using more variety of transport modes whilst those on higher incomes tend to use their cars. Analysis of the relationship shows that those on a lower income are far more likely to do their grocery shopping trips by foot, than those on a higher income who are more likely to drive to the shops by car. Those on low incomes are also less likely to use out of town retail parks whereas those on a higher income are more likely to drive to them by car. Those on low income are more likely to visit their friends and relatives by foot whereas those on higher incomes are more likely to drive there. The mode used may also have a relationship with the frequency with which people have undertaken the activities listed.

4.87  In the first column of Table 4.20, under ‘none’, particularly high proportions of the entire sample are evident. Town centre shopping trips and shopping trips to out of town retail stores were notable, although not the highest in terms of non use at 44.3% and 78.1%. Evenings out for leisure purposes (54.2%) and days out for leisure purposes (67.3%) were also particularly high.

4.88  The frequency of the activities undertaken was explored in relation to car access, gender and income – although previous analysis has demonstrated that car access (in addition to driving) may be related to gender and income.

4.89  The frequency of the activities undertaken appeared to be related to car access, in a way that might be expected or predicted. For example, those who made shopping trips to a retail park most frequently were those with access to a car who go more frequently, form highest proportion within once, 2/3 times, 4 or more times. Those with no access to a car did not go to a retail shopping park – 12.5% of those who had no access to a car went at all and then it was only once. This example might be expected as retail park are traditionally associated
with car users however similar patterns existed for other activities. In visiting friends and relatives, the percentage of those who answered ‘none’ was higher (52.7%) for those with no access to a car compared to 39.7% of those relying on lifts and 28.2% of those with regular access to a car who answered ‘none’. Those with access to a car generally visited more often and represented the highest proportion of those visiting friends and relatives ‘four or more times’ in the past week. The same pattern emerged in with those who had evenings out for leisure purposes – again, those with access to a car went out more often in the past week. They represented the highest proportion of those going out ‘once’ (24.6%), ‘2 to 3 times’ (44.1%), and ‘four or more times’ (47.8%). Again, those with no access to car had the highest percentage of respondents who answered ‘none’ to going out for leisure purposes.

4.90 The differences in gender are less marked. In visiting friends and relatives the proportions within each category of frequency were approximately equal. This is similar for those who had evenings out for leisure purposes - although a slightly higher proportion (57.7%) of women had no evenings out in the last week compared to 48.3% of men – and for those who had days out for leisure purposes. In the other trips made which are less leisure based, for example, taking children to school college, voluntary work/duties, attending adult education, the gender proportions are again similar.

4.91 The household income responses were re-coded into three categories (under £7,700, £7,800-15,500, and £15,600 or more) in order to analyse the relationships between income and other variables. In the activities undertaken the pattern that emerged was interesting. For example, for those making grocery shopping trips in the past week, for those earning under £7,700 the highest proportion (34.2%) made grocery shopping trips ‘4 or more times’ in the past week. Whereas for those earning £7,800-15,500 and for those £15,600 or more the highest proportions made trips 2 to 3 times a week. For town centre shopping trips the proportions making each number of trips was similar for all household income categories. The proportions were similar for each income category in the number of times that respondents visited friends and relatives – the most noticeable difference was in the higher proportions of those earning under £7,700 in making no visits and in making ‘4 or more visits’. In general, the relationships between activities and income were not statistically significant. This was only the case for days out for leisure purposes, evenings out for leisure purposes and grocery shopping trips where for example, those on a lower income were less likely to go out for the evening while those on higher income are more likely to go out.

Use of public transport

4.92 Respondents were asked a series of questions on public transport that related to aspects thought to potentially affect their usage of a particular mode. This included questions on bus and rail travel.

4.93 Respondents were asked to classify how long it took them to get to their (1) nearest bus stop and (2) the bus stop they used most often. Seventy two per cent of respondents stated that the nearest bus stop to where they lived was less than three minutes away and 23.6% stated that their bus stop was between three and six minutes’ walk away (Table 4.21). These figures are comparable to those documenting the time taken to reach the bus stop that respondents used most often: 61.1% stated that time taken by respondents to get to the bus stop most often used was less than three minutes’ walk away and 26.7% stated between three and six minutes’ walk away. There were little differences between the case study areas in the general pattern of responses although there was a higher proportion (74.7%) of respondents in
Coatbridge within three minutes walk of the bus stop they used most often\textsuperscript{12} (Table 4.22). Overall three per cent of all respondents stated that never used the bus when asked about the bus stop they use most often\textsuperscript{13}.

**Table 4.21  Time to nearest bus stop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to nearest bus stop</th>
<th>Case-study area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>Castlemilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than three minutes walk</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3 and 6 minutes walk</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to 10 minutes walk</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 minutes walk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.22  Time to bus stop used most often**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to bus stop used most often</th>
<th>Case-study area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>Castlemilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than three minutes walk</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3 and 6 minutes walk</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to 10 minutes walk</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 minutes walk</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use the bus</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{4.94} Respondents were also asked to state the number of services that ran from their nearest bus stop: 48.1% of respondents stated that they had up to 2 services running from their nearest bus stop. Respondents stated an average of 3.59 services (the standard deviation was 2.92). In addition to the number of services, respondents were asked to describe the frequency of the service that they use most often at different times of the day and were given the options of: at least one bus every ten minutes, a bus every 11-20 minutes, a bus every 21-30 minutes, a bus every 31-60 minutes, less frequent than one bus an hour, and no service. Table 4.23 shows the responses given in regarding the different times of day.

\textsuperscript{12} This appears to contradict the findings of the transport assessment carried out as part of stage two where the majority of services – few as they were – were concentrated on the main highway through Coatbridge town.

\textsuperscript{13} The Scottish Household Survey found that 54.4% of respondents lived within 3 minutes or less walk of their nearest bus stop. Thirty per cent with 4-6 minutes, 9.8% within 7-13 minutes walk, 4.6% had a walk of over fourteen minutes to their nearest bus stop.
Table 4.23 Frequency of local bus service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Frequency</th>
<th>% Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least one bus every 10 minutes</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bus every 11-20 minutes</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bus every 21-30 minutes</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bus every 31-60 minutes</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less frequent than one bus an hour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No service</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.95 Table 4.23 demonstrates the frequency which respondents perceived their local bus services to operate. The majority (39.3%) of respondents stated that the bus service/route that they used most often ran ‘at least one bus every ten minutes’ during the day Monday to Friday. A larger proportion of respondents in Castlemilk (47.0%) saw their service operating at least one very ten minutes than Leith (32.4%) and Coatbridge (39.4%). However, more people in Leith (59.5%) stated there was a bus every 11-20 minutes than respondents in Castlemilk (38.6%) and Coatbridge (38.1%). In the evenings (Monday-Friday) the majority of respondents stated there was one bus every 21-30 minutes. This mirrored the results within Castlemilk and Leith although in Coatbridge an overwhelming majority (73%) stated there was no service. A bus every 11-21 minutes was the most common response (37.5%) regarding Saturday across the whole sample however within each case study area ‘at least one bus every ten minutes’ was the most common response in Castlemilk and Coatbridge. On a Sunday ‘a bus every 31-60 minutes’ (29.5%) or ‘no service’ (20.3%) were more common responses. Although within Castlemilk (34.8%) and Leith (40%) the majority of respondents chose the response ‘a bus every 21-30 minutes’. In Coatbridge, 60.3% stated there was no service on a Sunday. Tables showing this analysis are available in Appendix 4 of this report.

Figure 4.8 Frequency of use of local bus service
4.96 Following these questions respondents were asked to state how often they use the local bus service. The results are illustrated in Figure 4.8 which shows 20.7% of respondents who stated that they used the bus every day and 14.2% who said they used the local bus service almost everyday. These proportions were higher in Leith and Castlemilk where 33.5% and 22.8% of respondents stated they used the bus every day. In Coatbridge, only 5.5% stated that they used the bus everyday. A higher proportion (28%) of respondents in Coatbridge stated that they never used the bus compared to Leith (6.4%) and Castlemilk (9.4%). These differences are illustrated in Table 4.24.

Table 4.24 Frequency of use of local bus service within case study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use the local bus service?</th>
<th>Case-study area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>Castlemilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every day</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almost every day</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 3 times a week</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a week</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a fortnight</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a month</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very rarely</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.97 Further analysis also revealed significant differences between car access and frequency of bus use. Regular car access clearly resulted in lower levels of bus use or no use of local services. 11.6% of respondents who stated that they has regular car access also stated that they used the bus everyday compared to 32.1% who used the bus regularly but who had no access at all to a car (Table 4.25).

Table 4.25 Car access and frequency of bus use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use the local bus service?</th>
<th>Car access</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular car access</td>
<td>Relying on lifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every day</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almost every day</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 3 times a week</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a week</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a fortnight</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a month</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very rarely</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.98 Disaggregations of perceived service frequency by case study area indicates that in Leith there is a perception that the service is less frequent during weekdays than in the other case study areas. Evening services in particular in Coatbridge are perceived as being less frequent – 73% of respondents stated that there was no service available. In Leith and Castlemilk, large proportions of respondents stated that services were perceived as running every 21-30 minutes in the evenings. A similar pattern emerges for Sunday services when
the three areas are compared. On Saturdays, local bus services are perceived to be at higher service levels in Castlemilk and Coatbridge (see Appendix 4).

4.99 Despite the frequency with which the respondents used their local bus service – 20.7% stated every day and 14.2% almost every day – the proportion (19.2%) of the total respondents who used a season ticket or travel pass was smaller. The highest proportion (48.9%) of those who did hold a season ticket or travel pass were from Leith. This equated to a quarter of the respondents residing in Leith being in possession of a travel pass from Leith compared to 20.4% in Castlemilk and 9.6% in Coatbridge.

4.100 Those who answered yes to the question ‘Do you pay reduced fares?’ were then asked how much the pass costs and what period of time it covered. The average cost of the season ticket/travel pass was found to be £38.12 (standard deviation £71.56) and tended to more often cover either a four week period (29.8%) or a calendar month (15.5%). Twenty three percent of respondents stated that their season ticket covered a year. There were some differences in length of time that the travel passes covered for the largest proportions of respondents within each case study areas. A year was the most common period for travel pass holders in Leith (38.1%). In Castlemilk, four weeks was more common, with 39.4% of respondents holding a travel pass which covered that period. In Coatbridge, (77.8%) stated ‘other’ as the most common response. Since those who specified 'other' were not asked to detail what period this was, it is difficult to establish what period of time that might be, although it is possible to surmise from the information collected during the transport assessment.

4.101 Thirty three per cent of respondents stated that they were entitled to reduced bus fares because of their age or personal circumstances. However although it is difficult to determine the reasons for their eligibility for reduced fares there are some indications that the overwhelming majority are eligible because of their age. Forty four per cent of those eligible for reduced fares were aged over 70 and another 40% were within the 60 – 70 age bracket. It is also possible that a small proportion of those eligible due to disability as 15.9% of those who answered yes were under the age of 60. Comparison of those eligible for disability benefits revealed that 1.3% received Disability Working Allowance, 9.0% received Disability Living Allowance Care Component, 8.4% received Disability Living Allowance Mobility Component and 8.4% received Incapacity Benefit. Although there is likely to be some crossover between those in receipt of benefit, it is clearly an indication that a proportion of those eligible for reduced bus fares are, due to disability.

4.102 All respondents were asked to record how much they spend on bus fares in a typical week. The average spend on bus fares per week for all respondents was £3.79 (standard deviation £5.98). In Leith, the average bus fare was higher than in the other two areas: £4.86 (standard deviation £8.91) compared to £3.59 (standard deviation £3.62) in Castlemilk and £2.73 (standard deviation £2.90) for Coatbridge. Figure 4.9 gives an indication of the distribution of expenditure on bus fares in each case study area.
Income levels were found to have a significant impact on the amount spent on bus fares. A greater proportion of respondents on lower incomes were also more likely to spend more on bus travel (Table 4.26).

Table 4.26  Bus expenditure per week and household income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus expenditure per week</th>
<th>Household income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under £7,700</td>
<td>£7,800-15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than £2-40</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over £2-40</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents (including those who had answered that they never used the bus) were asked to mark on a 5-point scale their attitude to a series of statements on the bus service. Table 4.27 provides a summary of the results. The statements that respondents disagreed with most strongly were there is protection against the weather while waiting (39.6%); facilities at bus stops are satisfactory (32.2%); finding out about routes and times of services is easy (25.9%) and the buses are clean (21%). Similar attitudes were expressed in the interviews undertaken as part of the travel diary study and are discussed in Chapter 5.
## Table 4.27 Perception of local bus service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally, when you use the bus…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buses are on time</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buses are frequent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buses are fast</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buses are comfortable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buses are clean</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buses are safe</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting on and off buses is easy</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ticketing arrangements are simple</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is protection against the weather while waiting</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities at bus stops are satisfactory</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing buses is convenient</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing buses is safe</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding out about routes and times of services is easy</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kinds of people who travel on buses are well behaved</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fares are cheap</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fares are good value</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It takes you directly to destinations you want to go</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.105 Comparative analysis of these results with the frequency of bus use shows that those who use the bus least often are more inclined to ‘disagree’ or ‘disagree strongly’ with statements such as ‘the buses are on time’, ‘the buses are frequent’, ‘finding out about routes and times of services is easy’ and ‘the ticketing arrangements are simple’ than those who use the bus frequently. However, those who use the buses frequently were more inclined to ‘disagree’ or ‘disagree strongly’ with the statements ‘getting on and off buses is easy’ and ‘there is protection against the weather while waiting’. Although for the latter statement there were high proportions of respondents within each category who disagreed or disagreed strongly. When the mean response scores are disaggregated by area (here the lowest mean score indicates a higher level of agreement with the statement in Table 4.28). In Coatbridge, local bus services were perceived to be more frequent and faster, fares were also felt to cheap and offer value for money. In Castlemilk and Coatbridge, finding out about routes and the times of services was felt to be less easy. In Castlemilk, ticketing arrangements were thought to be more simple.
Table 4.28 Perception of local bus services (mean response\(^{14}\)) in each study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generally, when you use the bus…</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Leith</th>
<th>Castlemilk</th>
<th>Coatbridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The buses are on time</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buses are frequent</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buses are fast</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buses are comfortable</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buses are clean</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buses are safe</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting on and off buses is easy</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ticketing arrangements are simple</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is protection against the weather while waiting</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities at bus stops are satisfactory</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing buses is convenient</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing buses is safe</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding out about routes and times of services is easy</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kinds of people who travel on buses are well behaved</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fares are cheap</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fares are good value</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It takes you directly to destinations you want to go</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.106 The most frequently used methods of accessing bus service timetable information were at the bus stop (24.3%), from the travel centre run by the operator (27.4%); from the bus station (15.9%), or telephone help line (19.2%). Respondents accessed information about the buses (e.g. timetable) least often from the driver (9.1%), from information displayed on the bus (6.0%); from the internet (0.2%); from friends and relatives (8.5%), library (1.6%) and local shop (1.8%).

**Travel by local train service**

4.107 Respondents were also asked a series of questions on their use of local rail services. This section of questions was not asked of respondents in Leith as it was felt that they were inappropriate as residents of Leith had no access to a local rail network. However, bearing this in mind, it becomes more pertinent that train usage is so low.

4.108 Trains were used infrequently: 26.9% of respondents stated that they used them very rarely and 49.2% never (Figure 4.10).

\(^{14}\) This refers to the average response score on a five point scale where agreement strongly with a statement represents 1 and a strong disagreement represents 5. Those means in the table closer to 1 therefore are in a higher level agreement than those closer to 5.
4.109 Of those using trains 31.3% stated that used reduced rail fares. Again, those who answered 'yes', that they were eligible for reduced rail fares (either due to personal circumstances or age), were concentrated in the older age bands with 42.9% aged 60-70 years old and 30.9% aged over 70 years. However, there was also a significant proportion who were under pensionable age (26.8%), the highest proportion (8.9%) of which were concentrated in the 30-40 age band. Exploration of the data from this question revealed a high proportion of those eligible for reduced fares to also be in receipt of disability benefit in its varying forms. For example, 93% of those who answered yes were also in receipt of incapacity and similarly 98% were in receipt of Disability Working Allowance.

4.110 Only 13.4% stated they used a rail season ticket and a considerable proportion (35.7%) of those stated that it was a zone card which allowed them travel on buses, trains and the underground.

4.111 The average rail fare expenditure in a typical week was £2.24 (standard deviation £7.42).

4.112 All respondents, including those who had previously answered that they never used the local rail service, were asked to estimate how frequent they thought the rail service or route that they would use most often was. This question was asked in an attempt to gauge the perceptions and attitudes of respondents who were both familiar with the service and those who were not accustomed to using it.
Table 4.29  Frequency of local travel service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least one</td>
<td>A train</td>
<td>A train</td>
<td>A train</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>train every</td>
<td>every</td>
<td>every</td>
<td>every</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>31-60</td>
<td>than one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minutes</td>
<td>minutes</td>
<td>minutes</td>
<td>train an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the day</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mondays – Fridays)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenings</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mondays – Fridays)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.30  Perception of local service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, when you use the train…</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trains are on time</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trains are frequent</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trains are fast</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trains are comfortable</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trains are clean</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting on and off trains is easy</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ticketing arrangements are simple</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is protection against the weather while waiting</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities at stations are satisfactory</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing trains is convenient</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing trains is safe</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding out about routes and times of services is easy</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kinds of people who travel on public transport are well behaved</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fares are cheap</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fares are good value</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It takes you directly to destinations you want to go</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.113 It is also interesting to explore the responses made to E14, where respondents classified their use of trains in terms of frequency (Table 4.29), in relation to the respondents stated attitude or perception of different features of the service. Respondents were asked (E22) to rate their view, on a 5-point scale, regarding a series of statements about the train service (Table 4.30).
4.114 The statements regarding the train service appear not to evoke strong attitudes – the majority of respondents chose ‘neither agree nor disagree’ as a response to most of the statements. The highest proportions of those who disagreed, which were relatively low compared to the bus services, facilities at stations are satisfactory (14.4%), the fares are good value (11.7%), and the fares are cheap (11.0%). Only 9.1% of people disagreed with ‘finding out about routes and timetables is easy’ compared to 25.9% of bus users.

4.115 Respondents were also asked where they found out information about trains. The highest proportion of respondents found out information from the station (26.6%) or from a telephone help line (15.9%).

**Restrictions in use of public transport**

4.116 Respondents were asked if they felt their travel by public transport was restricted by any (number) of the following reasons. The percentages of respondents answering yes to these are listed below:

- 7.4% because of concerns about personal safety during the day
- 44.4% because of concerns about personal safety after dark
- 18.5% due to the cost of fares
- 32.4% due to lack of information about public transport
- 16.9% felt they were unable to board vehicles easily or safely
- 21.4% felt they had difficulty in travelling with prams or buggies
- 29.4% due to the times of services
- 30.2% due to the routes served
- 17.5% because of the lack of facilities for children
- 25.5% due to the reliability of services

4.117 Restrictions on public transport travel was found to differ little in terms of car availability. None of these concerns were found to be statistically significantly at the 95% level (Table 4.31).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns about personal safety during the day</th>
<th>Regular car access</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>11.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about personal safety after dark</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of fares</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information about public transport</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being unable to board vehicles easily and safely</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in travelling with prams and buggies</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The times of services</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The routes served</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lack of facilities for children</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of services</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.118 Examination of the responses made to these statements in relation to gender, income and age reveal some interesting differences. The gender division (43.1% male, 56.4% female) for those who felt ‘concerned about personal safety during the day’ was not as
marked as it was for those who felt ‘concerned about personal safety after dark’ where overwhelmingly (74.1%) those who answered ‘yes’ were female. Income and age had little bearing on those who answered yes to the latter of these statements. However, those who answered ‘yes’ to having ‘concerns about personal safety during the day’ were mainly (59.4%) in the lower income brackets (under £7,700) compared to the other two income brackets. (£7,800- 15,500 - 28.1%; £15,500 or more – 12.5%). These respondents were also more likely to be younger (16-30).

4.119 Those who felt restricted in their use of public transport by the cost of fares were concentrated in the age-bands below 60 years old. Of those who answered ‘yes’, only 5.3% and 6.4% were in the 60-70 and 70 plus age-bands. Their eligibility for concessionary fares may explain. Interestingly, there were no marked differences when these responses were compared with income.

4.120 There was a large proportion (32.4%) of the entire sample who felt restricted due to the lack of information about public transport; there was no relationship with the gender, income or age of these respondents.

4.121 ‘Being unable to board vehicles easily or safely’ was more likely to be a restriction for women (81.1%) and for those on a lower income (50%). This was similar to those who answered that ‘difficulty in travelling with prams or buggies’ was a restriction as, again, 72.1% were women. They were concentrated in the younger age-bands, i.e. under 40. This mirrored the responses to ‘the lack of facilities for children’.

4.122 ‘The routes served’ was more a problem for those on a higher income (40.3%) perhaps because they are likely to travel further to work or to be accustomed to using different facilities (those on higher income were more likely to have access to a car).

4.123 In terms of the differences between case study areas, there are a few features of this analysis of interest. Of those who answered ‘yes’ to feeling restricted by the ‘cost of fares’, 45.4% were in Castlemilk, compared with 21.6% in Coatbridge and 33% in Leith. The proportions of those who felt restricted by concerns for their personal safety after dark were higher in Coatbridge (37.5%) and Castlemilk (35.3%) than in Leith (27.2%). Interestingly, there were no differences by case study area in those who felt restricted by the lack of information in their use of transport despite the findings of the transport audit – where it appeared that there was more comprehensive information of an accessible nature found in the Leith area. The ‘times of services’ were a problem for a higher proportion of the people in Leith (41.8%) than in Castlemilk (30.1%) and Coatbridge (28.1%). The reliability of the services was more of an issue for respondents in Leith where 40.6% answered ‘yes’ compared to 34.8% in Castlemilk and 24.6% in Coatbridge. With reference to ‘the routes served’, the highest proportion of people who felt restricted resided within Castlemilk (38.6%), with 36.1% in Leith and 25.3% in Coatbridge.

**Taxi use**

4.124 Figure 4.10 shows how often respondents use taxis. There was quite a large proportion of respondents who never (8.0%) or very rarely (27%) used taxis. However, there were also notable proportions of respondents who used a taxi once a week (18.6%) or two to three times a week (18.4%). There were some marked differences in taxi usage between the case study areas. Of the respondents who used taxis every day, the overwhelming majority
(72.2%) were from Coatbridge. This was also the case for those using taxis almost every day, where 63.6% of respondents resided in Coatbridge. In general, taxi usage was higher for those living in Castlemilk and Coatbridge compared to Leith – which is illustrated in Figure 4.11.

**Figure 4.11  Frequency of taxi use**

![Frequency of taxi use](image1)

**Figure 4.12  Frequency of taxi use within case study area**

![Frequency of taxi use within case study area](image2)

4.125 Respondents who answered very rarely or never to question F1 were then asked why they used taxis as seldom as they did while respondents who did use taxis were asked their reasons for doing so. The main reasons given for not using taxis were that they were regarded as being an expensive form of transport (16.1%), because there were other public transport alternatives available (6.7%) or because respondents had access to a car (12%). Conversely, the main reasons why respondents did use taxis because it offered a fast (16.3%), convenient (38.4%) service that was direct (17%). People also used taxis to avoid drink driving (18.5%), if there was no other public transport alternative available (22.3%) and if they had a heavy load (12.9%).

4.126 Those who used taxis frequently (‘every day’, ‘almost every day’ or ‘two or three times a week’) were more likely to be younger (under 30), whereas the older respondents (in
the 60-70 age bracket and those over 70) used taxis less frequently. A higher percentage of those on a lower income (under £7,700) used taxis ‘every day’, ‘almost every day’ and ‘two or three times a week’ than those on a higher income.

4.127 Taxi cards which entitle the user to reduced taxi fares were used by 5.1% of respondents. The majority of these respondents were from Leith (53.6%) compared to 17.9% in Castlemilk and 28.6% in Coatbridge. These users were concentrated in the 30-40 age band (28.5%) and in the 70 plus age band (32.1%).

Community transport

4.128 The majority (61.7%) of respondents were aware of community transport schemes (such as dial-a-ride, shopping buses and social work buses) operating in their area, but of these only 4.8% (n=11) stated that they had used a community transport scheme. The highest proportion (33.8%) of those who were aware of community transport schemes were permanently retired from work. A higher proportion of respondents in Coatbridge (86.2%) and Castlemilk (57.1%) were aware of such schemes than in Leith (26.1%).

4.129 Of the eleven respondents who used a community transport scheme, five (45.5%) of these respondents stated that they used the service very rarely. The others were spread evenly across the categories of ‘every day’, ‘two or three times a week’, ‘once a week’, ‘once a fortnight’, and ‘once a month’. There was no relationship between age and use of community transport. The main purpose of their use of community transport was for shopping. None of the respondents used community transport to travel to work or education.

4.130 Of those who used community transport schemes, 27.3% answered that they could walk unaided for ‘less than a hundred yards’ to question H2 within the section on health and mobility.

4.131 Usage of community transport was highest in Coatbridge.

Walking and cycling

Figure 4.13 Frequency of journeys involving walking
4.132 In the earlier sections of this chapter, it is evident that walking represents a significant mode of transport for many of the respondents in this survey. Respondents were asked how often they made journeys involving walking – and how many journeys they made which involved cycling. These responses are shown in Figures 4.13 and 4.14 respectively.

**Figure 4.14 Frequency of journeys involving cycling**

4.133 Tables 4.32 and 4.33 give an indication of the impact that differences in car access have on levels of cycling and walking. Analysis revealed no significant difference between levels of walking and levels of car access, whereas evidence indicates that car access does explain levels of cycling activity. No access at all to a car does account for higher levels of cycle use.

**Table 4.32 Car access and frequency of journeys involving walking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of journeys involving walking</th>
<th>Car access</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular car access</td>
<td>Relying on lifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every day</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almost every day</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 3 times a week</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a week</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a fortnight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very rarely</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.33 Car access and frequency of journeys involving cycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of journeys involving cycling</th>
<th>Car access</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular car access</td>
<td>Relying on lifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every day</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almost every day</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 3 times a week</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a week</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a fortnight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a month</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very rarely</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.134 As is evident in the graphs, an overwhelming majority of respondents made journeys which involved walking every day (60.8%), whereas the majority of respondents never (79%) made journeys which involved cycling. Only a very small proportion of respondents answered never (4.4%) to making journeys which involved walking. They were predominantly women and unable to walk less than a hundred yards unaided. For those who did walk places the main reasons they said they walked are because they enjoy it (31.3%), because the journeys are short distances (44.4%) and to keep fit and healthy (39.3%). This was similar to the main reasons given by cyclists whose main reason for choosing to cycle was because they liked it (8.2%) or to keep fit and healthy (9.2%).

4.135 Respondents who answered never, either to making journeys which involved walking or cycling, were then asked for the reasons. The main reasons given as to why respondents never walked were ‘due to disability’ or for ‘health reasons’. Respondents who did not cycle perceived it as dangerous or risky, were not interested in cycling or did not for health reasons.

CONCLUSIONS

4.136 The data collected in the household survey produced a myriad of information on the travel behaviour and attitudes towards different modes of transport for respondents in the different case study areas. Taking the different dimensions of social exclusion identified by Church and Frost (1999) this section of the report identifies those groups that are more likely, from the evidence presented in this chapter, to experience transport disadvantage and as a consequence transport related social exclusion.

Physical exclusion

4.137 This dimension of exclusion relates to physical barriers that inhibit accessibility to services. Data from the household survey indicates that physical barriers impact to a higher degree on the elderly and people with health problems. Significant difficulties were experienced where travel involved walking and standing for at least 10 minutes. Reported difficulties were also found when using taxis and boarding buses. Disabled people, especially those with chest/breathing difficulties and a disability connected with the arms and legs, also experienced physical exclusion. No differences between the location of local
support networks and age or health were found. Respondents across all categories indicated that they could rely on friends and family to help them in a variety of situations.

4.138 Lower levels of car access were found to exist amongst the elderly and disabled. Many have had their licence suspended on health grounds or are disqualified from driving.

**Geographical exclusion**

4.139 Poor transport provision and resulting inaccessibility can create patterns of exclusion. Geographical exclusion may be felt to a greater degree by residents in localities on the edge of a city/town or a free standing town where access to a car is non–existent or where a reliance is based on lifts. In Coatbridge, a free standing town where bus services are relatively poor compared to the other two case study areas, there is a greater reliance on the car even for making trips within the neighbourhood. Evidence also indicates a greater diversity of activity patterns and mode choice in this area.

4.140 The study found that women are less likely to have held a driving licence, both full and provisional, and are as a result more likely to use local bus services and rely on lifts. Reliance on lifts in a car is also a feature of travel for those with health problems and this may be a more workable solution for meeting individual mobility needs where local support networks are in place, i.e. in circumstances where it is relatively easier to obtain lifts in the car from friends and family. Men were more likely to have regular car access whereas women are more likely to have no access at all to a car.

4.141 Tenure has a significant impact on access to a car. Respondents who pay rent in the public and private housing sector are less likely to have access to a car at all. It may, therefore, also be the case that lack of access to a car and lower income can geographically restrict housing choices. A significant proportion of respondents in the survey, in each study area, stated that they would like to move to improve their housing circumstances, but also because of a combination of noise, neighbours and the poor environment.

4.142 For those in employment, a small proportion of respondents had stated that transport considerations had prevented them from accepting a job offer. This was also the case for those seeking work and in full-time education. In Leith and Castlemilk, a greater proportion of respondents stated that they would move to improve transport links and accessibility.

**Exclusion from facilities**

4.143 Exclusion from facilities can occur where the distance of facilities from people’s homes, especially for those without a car, can make access difficult. Evidence indicates that low income groups and women are more likely to suffer from this dimension of exclusion where access to facilities is made easier by car use. For trips within the neighbourhood, evidence from the survey indicates that walking is a dominant mode of transport, although there are circumstances where travel by car accounts for a higher share of trips even within the neighbourhood. Car use rises for trips to out of town retail facilities, hospital, bank and doctor. There are, however, high levels of public transport use for these activities as well, but travel times are lower for those who can access the car.

4.144 Respondents without a car tended to go less frequently to retail shopping park facilities and on trips to visit friends. Differences by gender are less marked on these trips.
Lower income groups are, however, more likely to make regular grocery trips, whereas those on higher incomes made less trips per week.

4.145 The analysis demonstrated a strong link between local neighbourhood and the pattern of mode choice in each case study area. Respondents chose ‘local neighbourhood’ as the most frequent response for location of key facilities that they accessed. Journey time was inter-related with mode choice and location. In the local neighbourhood, walking dominated travel patterns within Leith and Castlemilk. In Coatbridge, compared to Leith and Castlemilk, the analysis showed a greater tendency of the respondents to use car and bus for local neighbourhood journeys. Also in Coatbridge, respondents accessed goods and services in the city centre by these modes. This fits with the findings regarding car use and ownership where the highest proportion of licence holders driving everyday resided within Coatbridge. Coatbridge also had the highest proportion of car ownership compared with the other two case study areas. Castlemilk had the highest proportion of respondents who never drive, and Leith had the highest proportion of licence holders but the lowest proportion of respondents who drive regularly.

**Economic exclusion**

4.146 Economic exclusion refers to the high monetary or temporal costs of travel that can prevent or limit access to facilities or jobs and thus income. Car use is strongly associated with higher income levels, whereas lower income groups are more reliant on public transport and on lifts. Public transport use and reliance on lifts were generally found to result in longer journey times. A greater proportion of those on lower incomes pay over £2.40 for bus fares than those on higher incomes. This means that, relative to other income groups, people in lower income groups can pay more for their public transport in terms of their income and also have larger travel times when accessing the same range of goods and services by those in higher income groups. Fuel expenditure on cars is, as would be expected, higher amongst higher income groups.

4.147 Single parent families and single person households were found to account for a significant proportion of those within lower income groups. It is these groups that are likely to feel the adverse consequences of reliance on public transport the most. In this survey, nearly a quarter of respondents stated that they were worried about money almost all the time. There was little evidence of those on lower incomes paying reduced fares or making use of season tickets.

**Time based exclusion**

4.148 There was little evidence from the household survey on time based exclusion. Nonetheless, evidence on time taken to access facilities, especially for those journeys outwith the neighbourhood and to facilities in relatively remote locations such as hospitals and out of town shopping facilities, indicated that time spent travelling is higher especially for those trips made by bus. It is therefore clear that bus users - who are more likely to be people on lower incomes, women, the disabled and the elderly - are spending longer to access particular goods and services, especially those outside their local neighbourhood.

4.149 Access to a car makes journey times lower but at the same time gives more flexibility in terms of the choice of location at which to access particular goods and services.
The perception of bus service frequency corresponds with the view that reliance on public transport makes it more difficult to access particular facilities especially during weekday evenings and on Sundays. Access to bus stops was high with a significant proportion in each case study area stating that the bus stop that was used most often was within a six minute walk (over 80% in each case study area). Access to the bus stop is, however, problematic for the elderly and those with a disability. Taxis were not widely used by the elderly but tended to be used more frequently by those on higher incomes and in younger age groups.

Fear and space based exclusion

Fear based exclusion refers to circumstances where worry, fear and even terror influence how public spaces and public transport are used, and space exclusion refers to situations where security and space management strategies can discourage socially excluded individuals from using public transport spaces. Analysis has revealed a significant link between disability and concerns about personal safety after dark. There was also limited evidence from the survey that concerns about personal safety and the quality of the local neighbourhood were contributory factors in reasons why respondents wanted to move from the area. There was little other evidence from this survey to suggest that the way public space and public transport services are managed contributes to fear and space exclusion. This does not necessarily mean that these are not important aspects of social exclusion in these case study areas but may be indicative of avoidance strategies and coping behaviour.
CHAPTER FIVE   TRAVEL DIARY AND INTERVIEW STUDY

INTRODUCTION

5.1 Transport disadvantage impacts to a greater extent on particular groups. The household survey analysis, reported in chapter 4, revealed that the elderly, people with health problems, women, the unemployed and those on low incomes experience higher levels of transport disadvantage. Across the different dimensions of social exclusion, as originally identified by Church et al. (1999), these groups feature disproportionately as disadvantaged when compared to those travel experiences of men, those on higher incomes and with regular car access. Comparisons with data from the Scottish Household Survey and National Travel Survey indicate clearly that these excluded groups identified, in the three areas selected in this study, are heavily reliant on walking and public transport to access goods and services\textsuperscript{15}. The next phase of the work, reported in this chapter, consisted of a travel diary study and follow up in-depth interview.

5.2 The purpose of the travel diary phase was to elicit more information of people’s experience of barriers to travel and the factors that contribute to transport disadvantage. The sample for this work was selected from household survey respondents who had limited or no access to a car. For this study 19 diaries and follow up interview were completed. This included 5 sick or disabled people, 3 unemployed people and those seeking work, 4 people who were permanently retired, 5 respondents who stated that they looking after the home and family, and 1 unemployed person. Further information on the selection process is provided in the Annex on study methodology at the end of this report. An open-response diary (see Appendix 2) was used and respondents were asked to complete it for one weekday which was arranged at the convenience of the respondent. Respondents were asked to record the time and place where each journey started, details of the travel (i.e. the mode used and the duration of the journey) and the time and place where the journey ended. The participants were asked to record each stage of the journey on a separate line. The in-depth interview was conducted within two or three days of the completion of the diary and upon the journeys made (see Appendix 2). The objective of the interview was to elicit information on people’s experience of barriers to travel.

5.3 The following chapter is divided into three sections which explore the nature of the travel undertaken, the problems encountered by respondents in their journeys, and the relationship between the respondents’ opportunities - employment and otherwise.

NATURE OF TRAVEL

5.4 The diaries provide a detailed account of the types of journeys made by the respondents. For the most part, these journeys were made on foot or by bus. None of the respondents travelled regularly by train, mostly since it was not viable as a result of their locale or for the purpose of their journeys. The reasons given for their chosen mode of travel varied but in general were oriented by consideration of cost and convenience. Many of the respondents, particularly those on very low incomes, opted to walk long distances in order to

\textsuperscript{15} Selected data from the Scottish Household Survey and National Travel Survey is included in the annex to this report.
save on the fare incurred on the same journey by bus. One of the respondents used his bicycle at all times as it was cheaper and he considered it faster and a more convenient mode of transport than the alternatives on offer.

5.5 The nature of the purpose of the journeys ranged from trips of a more essential nature (such as trips to the doctor, school, supermarket, bank, post office to collect benefits) to less essential trips such as visiting friends and family, walking or cycling for enjoyment, going to the theatre, and passing the time in non-grocery shops.

Activity focus around the house and neighbourhood

5.6 Some of the respondents expressed a reluctance to go out or contentment at remaining in the house. Three respondents, all of whom fell within the category 'sick or disabled', in particular suggested they had little need to travel and preferred to remain within their homes. From the interviews, it is unclear how far this attitude was influenced by the difficulties they had encountered in their travel. Two of these respondents expressed a preference for using taxis, although one of them found them too expensive and therefore used them rarely. The third respondent suggested his preference to remain at home or in the immediate vicinity of his home (i.e. at the play park across the road with his children) was for health reasons rather than the inaccessibility of public transport. He felt that the local taxis were cheap enough to use if he needed to and felt that the local bus service, which operated within the housing scheme, allowed him to get about easily when he wanted or needed to. When asked if he felt his travel was restricted for any reason he responded, Apart from my health, that's about all.

5.7 Few of the respondents ventured out of their immediate locale on the day that they filled in the diaries. This was a point that was focused on in the interviews where the respondent was asked to discuss how typical their travel was for that day. For those that travelled outside of their local neighbourhood it was for a specific purpose, for example one woman had to make a trip outside of Castlemilk to pick up a copy of her son’s birth certificate. Another man made a journey from Leith to another part of the city to return a purchase for a friend. He would not normally travel by bus or outside of the Leith area; quite often, he says, he would spend his time at home or visiting family close by. Another retired woman made a trip from Castlemilk to another suburb in the city in order to visit her daughter and grandchildren. This was a journey she made with her husband twice a week, sometimes more frequently depending on the weather. They always travelled to Maryhill as they were entitled to concessionary travel whereas her daughter who was sick, although able, could not afford to travel to visit her parents. This woman had purchased an annual travel pass which cost £80.00 and entitled her to travel on bus journeys for five pence each time irrespective of distance. Another retired woman in Castlemilk had bought the same pass, although paid for it monthly at £7.00, after seeing an advertisement by the operators. Both considered it to be of good value and felt that they were inclined to travel more as it only cost five pence.

5.8 Of those interviewed who reported their main (economic) activity as looking after the home or family, their travel was very much linked to the tasks associated with this role. There were similarities between the respondents, although their circumstances did differ between single parenthood, providing a childminding role as a grandparent and looking after the children but as part of a cohabiting couple. Of the three respondents who classified themselves as a single parent family, the cost of travel seemed to be a significant issue. They were also affected by other factors which influenced their propensity to travel. One
respondent from Castlemilk, who mostly travelled within the local neighbourhood, would walk, quite long distances, to give her son the opportunity to cycle with her. Another respondent who lived in Leith and had a new-born baby was reluctant to travel by bus because she found the other passengers obtrusive and the drivers unhelpful:

No, people just glare at you. Glare at you and stare at you... They just totally blank you and if you do try with a pram and stuff, you get everyone going, phew like that when you try and collapse it down and pile it into the baggage thing and the bus driver drives off as you still haven’t sat down holding the baby... So I said, if I’m going to do a bus journey then I’ll fit in as many things as possible so that I only have the one bus journey to do.

5.9 She was also restricted in her travel in that she felt the need to be able to return to her home quickly to attend to the baby’s needs. She mentioned how long the journeys took and feeling frustrated if she caught a bus where the drivers changed. This respondent always carried her child in a papoose in order to make it easier to board vehicles and also because she found it difficult to move around the busy streets in her local area with a pram. She was unsure how she would manage to overcome these difficulties when the baby became too heavy to carry.

Mode choices

5.10 Although the volume of travel differed between these respondents (those looking after home or family), primarily the travel took place in the vicinity of their homes and mostly on foot. The travel made was time-consuming and subject to the needs of the children. Similar sentiments were expressed by one woman who had two children of her own and looked after her sister’s young baby. She would walk her daughter to school in the morning while her partner took care of the other children. Later in the day it took her twice as long to make the same journey to pick her daughter up with the other two children. She said in the interview that normally she would have gone into the city centre in the afternoon, while her daughter is at school, but chose not to as it was too much hassle with the baby. She also said that in general she felt restricted in how far she could travel when she is alone with the children and finds it too much trouble to travel with two children. When she did make the trip into town she would always wait for a low-floor bus although there were other more frequent services operating on that route. In the interview, she also mentioned the desirability of learning to drive and owning a car which she considered would make things easier for her with the children. Her desire to drive was also influenced by her want to pursue employment opportunities outside of Castlemilk.

5.11 Another woman who worked part-time, three days a week, found travelling by bus with her children unproblematic. In her diary, this woman recorded five journeys which she made, four of which involved a series of stages and interchanges. Two of these were her return journey to work and two a return journey to a party with her son, aged five. As she was accustomed to making the journey to work she didn’t have a problem with changing buses and opted to do so as she thought it was often quicker. She made no distinction between the journey made alone and the one made with her son. She did, however, refer to previous experiences she had had when the children were younger when she was asked specifically if she found it difficult to travel with the children.
5.12 The unemployed people interviewed appeared to travel quite a lot to visit family and friends or to simply pass the time. All of these respondents were male. Two of them lived with their partners and young families and the third lived at home with his mother. None of the three regularly undertook any of the household tasks such as the weekly grocery shopping or much of the child care responsibilities: in general, these appear to be more stressful journeys which might suggest why these respondents' found their experiences of travel less problematic. Two of the respondents regularly travelled by bicycle and all three would walk to a number of their destinations. One of the respondents interviewed opted to make a 50-minute journey on foot rather than take two buses and pay two fares. He said that he would rather walk as the weather was actually good that day. If it had been pouring down with rain, I would get two buses. Another of the respondents made eight journeys by bicycle on the day that he filled out the diary all of which were to visit friends or family. He preferred to travel by bicycle partly because he felt it was easier than using the buses but partly because it was cheaper.

5.13 Cycling was also preferred by the full-time student interviewed as she felt it was a faster and more convenient mode of travel than the buses. She tried to avoid catching a bus wherever possible and opted to cycle to college Because it takes me 40 minutes, em, and at least I enjoy it. I stay for one hour in the bus and being in the traffic and all that. I'd rather cycle for a shorter time as well. She also made a number of journeys on foot on the day that she filled out the diary although, she said, normally she would have made more. However she was under pressure to complete work for her college course so she did not go for a swim or visit her boyfriend which she normally would have done.

5.14 The diaries provide detail of the different journeys made in a day which contributes to the information gathered in the survey. The diary and interview data provides information on the reasons why a mode of travel is chosen, the reasons why a journey is made and potential journeys that are not made, and in-depth detail on the experiences of the journeys that are undertaken.

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

5.15 From the previous section it is clear that there are different factors which influence people in their decision to travel and not to travel. The aim here is to extend the analysis of the data to encompass understanding of what obstructs people in their travel in order to explore what obstacles exist (and for whom), but also to identify if, and in what ways, people have been able to overcome the obstacles that they have encountered.

5.16 The diary and interview data demonstrated that there were certain factors that influenced the propensity to travel and also the nature of the travel undertaken. These varied from aspects of a journey that could be changed to improve the accessibility of transport, such as the information provided and the manner in which information is provided, to other factors which, although outwith the control of policy makers, for example bad weather (which was consistently mentioned as a barrier), the impact could be minimised through provision of (better) shelters and more efficient arrangements for interchange. The predominance of these issues becomes more apparent with reference to the specific experiences of the individuals interviewed.
Inadequate travel information

5.17 One male respondent, who travelled mainly on foot or by taxi, had made one return journey by bus on the day he filled out his travel diary. This journey involved three stages, a walk to the bus stop, a 10-minute bus journey, followed by a two-minute wait and another 10-minute bus journey. On the return journey, he decided to walk the initial chain of the journey which took 20 minutes and then he took the bus from the second point in his original journey. However, as he was unsure of the route of the bus, he asked the driver on boarding and was put off by the driver’s response:

The only thing that hacked me off was the attitude of the bus driver on the bus coming back down Easter Road. That’s a new bus route so I wasn’t sure where it went after it left the bottom of Easter Road. Didn’t know if it turned right along the Links or where it went and I asked him where it went after the bottom of Easter Road. He says, Tollcross (an area at the other side of town). I thought it was just a bit unnecessary like, you know. He must have realised what I meant was what way would you, like if you come to Leith or if you go somewhere else, you know.

5.18 The same respondent had said earlier in the interview about another journey that he makes often: It’s just easier to jump on a taxi than it is to, because I am not sure of, the buses have changed, the bus route has changed... I’m no’ quite sure of the buses so I just jump on a taxi. These experiences were not uncommon amongst the 19 respondents interviewed, and a total of 13 referred to the lack of information or the nature of the information provided as problematic. It was problematic either because the information provided was inaccurate or insufficient.

5.19 One respondent had frequently waited for a bus to make her journey home at night but had consistently encountered problems:

I like to go out on Victoria Street, and then I usually try to come back before 11 or half 11 because I know there are two or three buses that come here and they just never come. You just kind of wait for 50 minutes, they never come, so I don’t know what’s wrong because they do say that’s whether it’s the Tuesday, Saturday or Sunday, there is a bus at 11 or at 11.30 but either they came... or they just don’t come so I don’t know what’s wrong about it because I went to the shop and they said that they should come. So I’m not sure what’s wrong there... I didn’t go to complain. I just thought they had the wrong timetable on the bus stop or maybe me. I just didn’t know how to read or something but, em, the bus was meant to come and it never came. I didn’t really want to know the reasons I just wanted to know and I know now and I can just stay out longer. Stay out longer and just take a taxi home.

5.20 Although this had been problematic for her in the first instance, she had changed her habits. She stayed out longer and took a taxi home. But what we don’t know is if the extra cost of the taxi journey home would influence how often she went out in a week? In the questionnaire, she stated her annual income as between £1500 and £3900, her corresponding weekly income being £75 to £99 a week. The majority of her weekly income was spent on rent and food, while under £10 was spent on leisure activities, entertainment and hobbies, with £10 to £19 spent on transport.
5.21 This respondent had no qualms about pursuing the information she needed to make a decision about her travel. Another elderly respondent mentioned experiencing difficulties in obtaining the information she needed to travel. After stating that there was no information at her local bus stop and referring to some instances where she had found the bus drivers unhelpful, she was asked if she would use a telephone line to get the information she needed. She said she would be more likely to go to the travel centres although she had done so previously and found the service advisers unapproachable: *They’re not helpful either. They tell you, ‘There’re leaflets. There’re leaflets. Take the leaflets’.* Previously in the interview she had said she would just take her chances and wait for the right bus to come along, but in this instance she said she had waited and then decided not to go: *I didn’t go because I didn’t know what, I see no bus….*

5.22 The issue of inadequate information provision was particularly apparent amongst the respondents resident in Leith where recent changes had been made to the city bus network. Respondents complained of the delay in updating the information at the bus stops and the amount of time that it takes to become familiar with the changes in routes and times. They indicated a need for information to be provided in advance of the network changes, but also the need to ensure that the information is updated quickly in order to minimise the disruption and discomfort experienced by passengers. Often the route changes in themselves were problematic for people interviewed. This appeared to be the case in Castlemilk where many of the respondents made reference to the reduction in services running to Rutherglen and to East Kilbride, and of the withdrawal of a service that had previously connected the different parts of the estate. Similarly, in Coatbridge, many of the respondents felt there was lack of consideration given to the residents with the alteration of services; there was concern over a recent rumour that the local bus service within the neighbourhood was to be cut.

**Lack of shelter**

5.23 The weather in itself was a factor that influenced people’s decisions to travel, particularly the elderly or those travelling with children. However, the inadequacy of the bus services and/or the lack of shelter provided for waiting appeared to exacerbate the concerns. One elderly woman, resident in Castlemilk, made a regular trip to the other side of the city centre to visit her daughter and grandchildren. However, when the weather was bad, she was less eager to make the trip as …*it depends. In the summer time I go more when the weather’s good. In the winter time, we just make it once, maybe twice.* When asked why, if it was too cold, she answered, *it’s a nuisance because the buses, you can’t depend on the buses.* So perhaps, it was less the weather that influenced her decision than the reliability of the buses. From the data gathered, it is clear that there are potential means by which the weather can be minimised as a factor which influences/restricts people in their travel. Many of the respondents in Castlemilk spoke of the recent removal of bus shelters in their local area. One young, unemployed man thinks it is a problem that there are fewer bus shelters and added that *if it is raining I probably wouldn’t be going anywhere.* Another woman, who was looking after her family, added that it was something that would influence her decision to travel because *sometimes you are soaking by the time a bus comes.*

5.24 Another elderly respondent found it stressful to travel in the rain for different reasons partly because of the lack of shelter provided at her local bus stop but also because she had to circumvent the water in the road before boarding the bus. These experiences were part of a general dissatisfaction that she felt with the local bus service which was based on her experiences of the drivers and their reluctance to lower the bus for her to board: *You get one
driver out of ten that’s nice and maybe will lower the bus. If there’s a pram going off, the bus is lowered but out there [at her stop] it’s never lowered and he doesn’t even go in close [to the pavement]. She felt the driver stopped in the road for no reason as there were no obstructions and that this made it difficult to board the bus if it’s raining like a river runs along there because the drains are all blocked and you have to step over the water or step on to it to get on.

Vehicle design

5.25 This woman had consistently encountered problems with the low-floor buses as she felt the drivers did not lower them often enough:

I have problems getting on them as because I have a knee replacement and they will not lower it, it annoys me very much. They’re alright for prams but for the like of elderly people… They won’t lower the bus for you. I hurt my knee coming off in the town because he stopped in the middle of Union Street because there were too many cars… Probably wasn’t his fault but he should have lowered the bus, I mean, that’s what these buses are supposed to be for, for comfort, but I don’t think they’re comfortable.

5.26 She also found difficulty in moving within the bus since the front section of the vehicle was divided from the latter section by two steps. However this was not the case for another woman, who also had problems with walking:

I do find now that some of the bus steps are higher than others. You know, I walk with a stick and you find that you’re reaching a bit further than normally, you know, to get off the bus but otherwise no. The bus drivers are very good. They come as near into the pavement as possible for you.

5.27 To some degree, boarding vehicles seemed to be an issue for the elderly people interviewed and for those who were travelling with children. Access to the bus stance also appeared to be an issue for these respondents, as some made mention of the difficulties in crossing the road to get to the bus stop. This was more of an issue for some rather than others. Two of the women interviewed referred to instances when drivers had been aware that they were crossing to catch the bus and had waited for them. In one case a driver had crossed the road to assist one of the women to cross:

No, it doesn’t up there, it doesn’t but the traffic seems to slow down because it’s got a bad corner and the traffic slows down quite a bit, you know. One or two of the bus drivers have got off the bus and taken me across the road. They’re quite good.

5.28 This was particularly poignant as this woman had previously been knocked down while trying to cross the road to catch a bus. However, while there is clearly a need to address these issues, it must be by alternative means than a driver’s altruism. How far such practices affect the efficiency of the service, and therefore the needs of the other passengers, is also an issue that must be considered.
Journey times

5.29 Few of the respondents interviewed had restricted time budgets; in general, they were pretty flexible in the times and days they could decide to undertake necessary tasks. However, the time taken to travel remained an issue as people felt frustrated by the amount of time it took to reach their destinations, particularly when they were geographically close. There also seemed to be a sentiment that the waiting period and the actual journey time were perceived as ‘wasting’ time. In particular, two of the respondents from Leith, one young full-time female student and the other a young unemployed male, were reluctant to travel by bus as they felt it was quicker and cheaper to walk or to cycle. Both of these respondents regularly cycled quite long distances, although they expressed different attitudes to cycling in traffic. Both tried to take routes that avoided the road and traffic, but when this wasn’t possible, the young woman would be less inclined to cycle whereas the young man considered it only to be less enjoyable.

Reliability of services

5.30 The operating times of services was an issue that was raised, particularly in relation to reduced evening or weekend services. In Coatbridge, reference was made by all of the respondents interviewed to the fact that the local service ended at six o’clock. These respondents felt frustrated by this as it meant they could not participate in activities such as visiting friends/relatives or going to the cinema. The reliability of services also contributed to a feeling of frustration for some of the respondents as it was difficult to estimate the period of time needed to travel, or whether or not the transport could be depended on. One elderly male respondent, from Leith, always opted to walk on a Sunday as he considered the bus service too unreliable, particularly if he had to make a connection in the city centre. Another female student decided not to use the buses late at night as she had found them undependable and therefore opted to get a taxi.

Fares

5.31 The price of fares and the perceived value of them were also issues that were raised by most of the respondents. In general, the respondents found the fares to be expensive and could identify which operators offered cheaper fares. Those who were least concerned by the price of the fares had either purchased a season ticket or had a travel pass which entitled them to reduced fares. These were also the respondents who appeared to travel most, namely the elderly respondents interviewed and the working woman interviewed. Of the three unemployed respondents, there was an agreement between the two men who used the buses regularly that in general the fares cost too much. However, they also referred to the good value that a ‘day saver’ offered. One of the respondents, from Coatbridge, was particularly impressed by the cost of a cheap day return to Glasgow which he said cost £1.40 and consequently went at least once a week: just to break the week. The third respondent within this group travelled by bicycle most often and appeared to over-estimate the price of bus tickets.

MISSED OPPORTUNITIES

5.32 In the household questionnaire, respondents were asked if (in the past year), transport considerations ever prevented or required them from making various decisions regarding
work. That is, prevented them from looking for a job, prevented them from accepting a job that had been offered, prevented them from changing jobs, prevented them from taking up any form of education or training, required them to change jobs, required them to leave full-time paid employment or required them to work fewer hours.

5.33 Retired respondents did not answer this question, as it was felt that the question would be inapplicable in most cases, but of the 15 diary respondents who did answer the question:

- four answered yes to transport considerations preventing them from looking for a job
- four answered yes to transport considerations preventing them from accepting a job that they had been offered
- three felt they were prevented from changing jobs because of transport considerations
- two required to leave paid employment because of transport considerations
- one person answered that they felt they had been prevented from taking up any form of education or training

5.34 In the interviews conducted with the respondents, some reiterated the difficulties they had encountered in their travel to work or their attendance of interviews.

Inaccessible activities

5.35 The respondents were explicitly asked whether or not they felt their travel was restricted in any way but were not asked if they felt limited in the activities that they could do. However, the issues explored in the interviews encouraged respondents to make clear references to instances when they had been unable to do something they wanted to. These ranged from employment to leisure activities. It is difficult to assess how much impact this had upon people’s perceptions of their opportunities as many of the respondents appeared to accept their situation with comments such as *you get used to it* and *what can you do?*

5.36 One woman whose father had previously lived with her and her young son said that she had felt more restricted in her travel since her father had died as he had owned a car and provided them with lifts whenever they needed them. This was partly because certain places were inaccessible by bus but also because she had to be home in time for her son coming out of school: *I can’t go to all the different shopping centres...* [before when her father was available to drive] *I could go while he was at school, you know what I mean, and be back in time and all that for [him ] coming out [of school] but, no, I can’t go now. I just need to stick to around here or [go] into Rutherglen.* When asked if she found that acceptable she replied: *I get used to it. No other option.*

5.37 Another young unemployed man who lived in Coatbridge spoke of the difficulty he found in finding a job that he could travel to easily. In the past, he had encountered problems with travelling to work with two different jobs he had previously. The first of these had required the workers to organise a bus as it was not possible to reach the factory by public transport. For the second job, he had to take a bus which got him there 50 minutes before he had to start; if he took the next bus he arrived ten minutes late for work. He felt that the employers should take transport into consideration when organising the shift system:

*I think some companies don’t take into allowance that when people are going to start work, they’re going to come in the buses and they don’t look at the timetable and say,*
oh 20 of our workers are going to be late by five minutes because the buses aren’t right. So why no’ open five minutes late?

5.38 This man was unemployed when he was interviewed and was reluctant to look for, or take, employment that was not in the immediate local area or on a main bus route.

5.39 A young woman who was unemployed, and looking after her family, also felt restricted in the employment opportunities available to her. She lived in Castlemilk and considered that she would have to travel further afield to access employment suitable for her. She maintained that this would not be possible by public transport and hoped that she might afford to learn to drive and own a car in order to fulfil her aspirations. She felt that owning a car would also make things easier for her with her two children. Another woman who lived in Castlemilk felt that, due to the cost of her child care needs based on the hours she would need to work plus the travelling time, it would be pointless to take up employment outwith the local area: … because you’re talking about £30 for after care, you know; for a full week, that’s how if I could get something local it would be a lot better. So we’ll just have to see what comes up.

5.40 Other mothers interviewed also felt restricted in what they could do with their children as they were more inclined to use the low-floor buses which did not operate on all routes. This was the case in Coatbridge, Castlemilk and Leith.

Public transport service changes

5.41 Many of the respondents mentioned services that had been withdrawn which affected the places they could reach. These were specific types of shops or other suburbs where they had previously enjoyed passing the time or exploring. One woman who generally preferred to remain indoors spoke of a nursery that she had used to go to but now could not reach by bus. There was nowhere else in her local area that she could get things for her garden which meant she would have to travel into the city centre. This was a journey that she did not like to make and would do maybe once every couple of months.

5.42 Another elderly respondent, who had difficulty in walking up hills or steep stairs, was restricted in the places that she could reach as she could only catch buses from certain points. She had developed a complex strategy which involved catching different buses and a series of interchanges to get to the places that she needed to. This took considerable time and was exhausting for her, particularly on her return journey when she would be laden with shopping or books from the library. This affected the activities that she could do when she got home as, she said, often she was exhausted after going out.

5.43 In Castlemilk, one of the elderly respondents interviewed felt that there was very little for her to do in her local area: No, nothing, and there’s supposed to be, I mean, they used to have whist drives and things like that that I liked but that’s done away with. Yet, another respondent, also resident in Castlemilk although on the other side of the scheme, felt there was ‘everything’ available: There’s the library, there’s the swimming bath, there’s the sports places up here and everything… You can get it all up there, it’s lovely. She either walked to the ‘centre’ of Castlemilk or took a bus which took five minutes. These two experiences show the importance of understanding the different perceptions of accessibility and opportunities; and also the importance of understanding how far these perceptions are affected by transport provision.
KEY FINDINGS

5.44 The purpose of the travel diaries and interviews conducted is to provide further insight than that achieved in the quantitative analysis of the data collected in the household survey.

5.45 The purpose of the overall analysis and review of the information obtained during all of the stages of the project is to identify and assess potential changes in transport provision that could help to meet the needs of the residents and directly impact on social exclusion. These initiatives would focus upon improving accessibility to key destinations and improving quality of life for the residents.

5.46 Issues that have emerged from the heavy reliance on public transport has indicated that any initiatives need to:

° promote wider consultation with the general public prior to the revision or reduction of services in order to assess the needs of the residents in any particular area
° provide accurate information on all services and routes. The information provided should be clear and easily accessible from a number of points including on the bus or train, at the stances and stations, and from telephone information lines. Another possibility that could be considered is inclusion of timetables for the main bus routes in local free papers that are widely distributed to homes on a weekly basis.
° provide adequate shelter at all bus stops or waiting areas
° consider the extension of concession schemes – to include the unemployed or those on very low income
° identify key destinations to be considered in the planning and alteration of service routes
° improved cycling infrastructure

5.47 It is clear that some of these issues have been identified in previous research and are not restricted to those considered to be the transport disadvantaged. However, these problems become insurmountable when the options available to an individual are limited for whatever reason, whether it is lack of income or physical capacity. This is evident in the experiences recorded in the travel diaries and in-depth interviews where people have limited opportunities and are subject to disadvantage as a result of the problems encountered in their use of transport.
CHAPTER SIX  EXCLUSION, THE PUBLIC TRANSPORT NETWORK AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSPORT SOLUTIONS

INTRODUCTION

6.1 This section presents data collected from interviews with local authorities and public transport operators in the three case study areas: Leith, Harbour Ward; Castlemilk; and, Coatbridge, Kirkshaws and Old Monklands. Attitudes towards the public transport network, exclusion and the development of transport solutions are reported on. The development of transport solutions is then reviewed in light of evidence presented earlier in this report.

6.2 Interviews were conducted with local authorities and transport operators to gain insights into the problems experienced in each area associated with public transport provision and the development of solutions to the transport needs and problems of the socially excluded and the identification and assessment of potential transport solutions in consultation with key service providers. An interview schedule (see Appendix 3) was developed on the basis of findings of the analysis from each stage of the study but in particular the major issues that emerged from the analysis of the household survey data. Attention was also given to past transport initiatives that were reviewed and reported on in the literature review in addition to reviewing the individual council transport policy documents of each case study area.

6.3 These interviews primarily focused on experiential evidence of local authorities and operators in providing public transport in the three case study areas. On this basis views on transport solutions were sought and provided by respondents on a range of transport solutions but these were presented in a general way that could in reality be applied to each case study area. Many of those interviewed in the study tended to focus on the main issues that had been identified in earlier phases of the project. There are a number of reasons for this. Firstly, that operators work within a competitive environment and so therefore any discussion about solutions and current operations would tend to be at a general level in most cases. Secondly, that of the local authorities interviewed in this study it is clear that the development of new policy solutions to dealing with the transport needs of the socially excluded are at an early stage. Thirdly, that many discussions were also related to a number of policy options that were under discussion in the context of the Transport Bill. This problems in terms of identifying solutions to the link between transport and social exclusion also reflects a wider problem that in the current operational environment it is very difficult to target resources geographically or at particular groups and potentially even more difficult to justify the targeting of those resources at the expense of other areas and groups whose experiences of the transport system may be similar. Despite this it is clear from the evidence presented in the earlier sections of this report that transport disadvantage or deprivation can induce or exacerbate the conditions that lead to the exclusion of individuals and communities.

HARBOUR, LEITH

6.4 The data for Leith, Harbour Ward, revealed a number of problems for residents in the area. Principally these were the feeling of isolation from other areas of the city, restricted services at the week ends which often made public transport unsuitable in terms of accessing
jobs due the nature of the shift pattern, time taken to travel principally due to traffic congestion, cost and the physical inaccessibility of vehicles

**Views of the network**

6.5 In the Leith area both operators and the local authority viewed the density of the bus network as being of a high standard compared to other areas in the city. They however recognised that the changing nature of local economies (i.e. shift patterns, location and nature of work) made it difficult for the bus network to cope with new demands. The operators’ view is that historically the fares in Edinburgh have been low and are regarded by the industry to have kept pace with inflation and risen at a lower rate than the price of petrol. There are no interventions in the Leith area by the local authority due to this view and because other areas in the city were perceived to have a greater need for subsidised bus links. The local authority do not target service geographically or by sections in the community. The basic approach was described thus: *the actions we take are generalised and focus on the proximity to the network as a whole so that in terms of broad brush the commercial network in Leith is such that we do not …intervene at all in that particular part of the city* (City of Edinburgh Council). There is, however, recognition by both operators and the local authority that for some sections of the community the network could never be dense enough (especially for the elderly of infirm). Operators’ views of the constraints faced in the area are principally viewed in terms of rising levels of car ownership and parking problems that can in turn affect service reliability. Flexi-time was cited by one operator as having a negative impact on services because this made it difficult to gauge the demand for services. In Leith this was not regarded as a problem.

6.6 There was a feeling expressed by the local authority that there may possibly be some real exclusion in areas where car ownership in the majority of the population is fairly high and where, as a result, you have inadequate commercial networks:

> As a result you have very sparse commercial networks but where you have for example, an elderly population component who, because of that situation, don’t have the frequent or close public transport system and I think for example of a great swathe of sort of inner Edinburgh you know you think of the sort of Marchmont, Sciennes, Grange area where the social exclusion is probably on the basis of age and inability to drive and not, the commercial network being somewhat sparser than it used to be. Most of our SIPS have quite reasonable bus services but I mean there are pockets I mean one thinks for example Calder’s housing area out on Calder Road where because of geography it’s at the end of a network……within the scheme itself I suspect there’s at the very least, a feeling of exclusion when the bus operators withdraw (City of Edinburgh Council).

6.7 The commercial provision of services does, however, cause problems for example at weekends and particularly on Sundays when levels of patronage are low. Operators look for on average a 15% rate of return on their investment on commercial routes but this can be reduced to around 10% on subsidised services. This concern for an adequate return on investment has resulted in a re-focusing of activity on major corridors so that services can be run at a higher frequency, yet there is also recognition by operators of the benefits of cross-subsidisation through their network in terms of different patronage levels on routes. The focus on corridors is viewed as an essential step in order to increase their business. The consequences of this activity for areas within the city generally and Leith are recognised.
Operators in Edinburgh agree that public transport cannot serve every area and that there is a need to pick out corridors, although it is also recognised that there are problems in selecting the main corridors with the highest number of passengers. FirstEdinburgh, for example, have consolidated routes in the city centre onto five routes in the city that have Greenways: *There are some communities that have lost …lost bus services as a result. LRT have done something slightly similar in the sort of ongoing programme of what they see as network improvements but marginally profitable communities lose out. I mean it’s actually very unpredictable I think and again this is a consequence of the fact that it’s done on a commercial basis rather than some sort of public needs planning* (City of Edinburgh Council). Lothian Buses and FirstBus are, however, making significant steps towards having fully accessible bus fleets, although these do not have to be in place until 2017 with the introduction of new regulations following implementation of the Disability Discrimination Act.

### 6.8 Adjustments to routes

Adjustments to routes had recently been made by Lothian Buses as a result of major new developments in the Port of Leith. This was principally in the form of new low floor bus service serving Ocean Terminal and the Scottish Executive. As a representative from Lothian Buses put it:

> I suppose one of the principal very recent developments in the port area is changes to our service 22 which was just in March of this year because it is the first instance in the urban network of our introduction of a style of operation which is not uncommon elsewhere…… we are seeing some encouraging reaction to that from people, the premise being that with a very high frequency service you obviate the need for a detailed timetable. People don’t worry too much about what the timetable is because they know whenever they arrive at the stop there’ll be another bus there in five minutes. Obviously operating at these high frequencies requires more vehicles to be allocated to the service from the traditional pattern, I think that can lead to some consolidation so that there are other parts of the network where links are broken or resources are withdrawn or reallocated (Lothian Buses).

### 6.9 As a result of this process

As a result of this process, when the network is changed, there was recognition that areas would lose out but that there would be more winners than losers at the end of the adjustment to a route. A similar restructuring of routes has been undertaken by FirstEdinburgh who operate a number of services that come into the city centre and then access to other areas is made through interchange on to other services. The paradox is currently that levels of service enjoyed by the more affluent areas is invariably dependent on the application of commercial surpluses which are made in low income areas. It’s simply the nature of business. So that’s why the specific targeting of services in low income areas is not something that receives a great deal of attention because to be perfectly honest they are the most commercially buoyant and viable parts of the network (Lothian Buses). The modal share enjoyed by bus operators in Edinburgh also makes it easier for bus companies to maintain networks.

### 6.10 A substantial proportion of income

A substantial proportion of income for operators is from commercial passengers. The contribution in terms of route support is very small. An area of concern is the fall in the numbers of concessionary trips, partly due the fact that new cohorts of older people are more likely to drive. Lothian Buses, in an attempt to counter this trend, have begun to offer their commercial fares at a significantly discounted price to those eligible for concessionary travel (this includes offering an extra month or two months on the annual ticket which is available
to concessionary passengers). FirstEdinburgh operate a special fare after 9.30am (70p), as well as a weekly and monthly Travel Club ticket. This offers unlimited access across their network for those periods. They also give change which their competitors do not do. FirstEdinburgh indicated that take up of their Travel Club tickets is 20% lower in Leith than in other areas of the city. Purchase of these tickets can be made on bus, at the post office and their central Edinburgh office in St. Andrew Square. The take up for Travel Club tickets is larger outside the city where people are not travelling on a regular basis.

6.11 The provision of timetable information is the responsibility of operators. Lothian Buses provide free leaflets for every service and also customised timetables for each bus stop in the network. Difficulties surrounding the provision of travel information on their new corridors was acknowledged by FirstEdinburgh who were now seeking to produce travel information on a corridor by corridor basis. Each of the operators also have dedicated travel information telephone systems and service changes are advertised. First Edinburgh have experimented with providing travel information surgeries at libraries on the south side of Edinburgh but this has not been undertaken in Leith.

The development of solutions

6.12 The City of Edinburgh Council works closely with the Social Inclusion Partnership areas in the city and has taken an innovative step to assessing the problem of social exclusion and transport through the establishment of a Transport Task Force. The Task Force has contributed to the development of the local transport strategy (LTS) for the city. The LTS was felt by the local authority to broadly reflect the transport priorities for the city despite the perception that may be held by particular groups that there may not be much on social exclusion contained within the document.

6.13 The Task Force is a grouping consisting of representatives from several departments in the City Council (including Education, City Development, Social Work and other external agencies representing the disabled) and essentially stemmed from a community care background. The grouping does not involve the unemployed or other groups who would consider themselves as excluded and has focused on issues associated with older people and people with disabilities but has also looked at other areas of exclusion. The Task Force has recently produced a report that recognises the broader transport needs of particular users and seeks to pursue a greater integration of transport services provided by education, social work and community transport provided by community groups. The ultimate goal is to develop in a more planned and programmed way as an adjunct to the conventional bus network, possibly a dial-a-bus type service with flexible routing.

6.14 Support is provided by the local authority for dial-a-bus, community transport and transport services provided by education and social work departments of the local authority. An emerging view, but not necessarily a shared one, for community transport in Leith is the need for a strategy that addresses all community transport for the city as one respondent indicated: There are social car schemes that operate in the city, they tend to be located either with churches or particular voluntary organisations and particular client groups. They have a network of car schemes and there’s no sort of strategy of delivering social car schemes in the city but they are very sort of isolated and ad hoc and I don’t have a list of them, I don’t even know where they all are, I mean I know of a few…. and the same with mini bus operators in the community voluntary sector there’s not sort of centralised list so I don’t actually know you know how many there are, so that’s our view of how we provide
community transport (Lothian Community Transport Services). LCTS have also started to look at providing feeder services for bus route corridors in rural areas of Midlothian. There are also possibilities that this model of transport provision could be extended into urban areas but no discussion on this has yet taken place.

6.15 To date, the feeling within the local authority was that more effort had been put into linking the location of crossing facilities with bus stops, looking at interchange facilities and identifying a programme of bus boarders around the city. The recent Public Transport Fund bid by the City had included an element of bus boarder work in Leith to enable people to gain access more easily to low floor vehicles. The local authority did not target investment into transport infrastructure where particular forms of social exclusion was known to exist. The view was expressed that:

..there are undoubtedly some sectors of the community that one might assume to be excluded that perhaps we don’t put a lot of, at least haven’t to date put a lot of effort into and they’re the sort of sectors of the community, for example unemployed… We don’t for example have a targeted sort of list of census districts where sort of exclusions are a particular issue and then gone geographically and tied it down, although again our public transport fund bid for the first time has looked at the whole issue of social exclusion and has targeted the design of the bid in particular to link jobs with the south Edinburgh areas where unemployment is particularly high and it builds on the work that we’ve done on social exclusion in Edinburgh … we haven’t been at it long enough to have a sort of clear set of strategies that we adopt each time so we are sort of developing that and I think the trigger for that is very much the sort of social exclusion work that we did for the Interim LTS (City of Edinburgh Council).

6.16 A list of criteria does exist for assisting the decision-making process for tendered services, but it was found that the criteria could be applied to justify almost any type of decision for a tendered route. The indications are also that decisions to offer tendered routes can also be influenced by the amount of political and public pressure that is brought to bear in particular circumstances. Most subsidised services however are on the basis of providing bus travel for the elderly to shops, social facilities and hospitals. The journey to work does not feature significantly in decisions for tendered services.

6.17 Ticketing initiatives were seen to be an extremely important area of activity, but the current emphasis is clearly geared towards modal shift. Concessionary travel, although an important part of a commercial operator's business, is declining in terms of trips and is also currently constrained in terms of the classes of people that use it (i.e. women over 60, men over 65 and disabled people). FirstEdinburgh and Lothian Buses had worked together to establish Transfare, a scheme that allowed passengers with one operator’s season ticket to actually use a service run by the other operator. An inter-ticketing scheme has also been put forward by the South of Scotland Transport Partnership. The emphasis within the scheme is modal shift, although potentially it is anticipated that it could have an impact on travel by the socially excluded. Targeted cross-subsidisation was identified as an area that the local authority would be interested to pursue to help ensure adequate service levels on routes at particular times during the day or to help underpin the development of new routes. Yet it was also recognised that it is very difficult to specify a basis on which interventions should occur on tendered routes for example: ....should we support those services which very few people are travelling on and obviously the sort of cost per journey ends up being quite a lot. On the
other hand you might argue that we should pay for those services on which more people want
to travel but then those are the ones that maybe the bus company, should be doing
commercially so I think it’s quite difficult how you intervene...(City of Edinburgh Council).
There is clearly scope within new ticketing arrangements for targeted cross-subsidisation to
be discussed on a geographical or route basis.

6.18 Quality Partnerships were viewed as a way in which public transport services could
be developed and targeted. Indeed one operator felt that more thought could be put into the
‘pump-priming’ of services, possibly as part of a Quality Partnership to assist with the
development of new service. Quality Partnerships are viewed favourably by the industry but
there was general feeling that it had to be a real partnership with the local authority playing a
central role. Operators however felt that approval mechanisms for Quality Partnership
agreements are cumbersome.

6.19 Quality Contracts, it was felt, could be made more attractive to local authorities if
they could specify every aspect of the service, although it was felt that there were too many
barriers to implementation and that a 21 month period between going into the tender process
and actually implementing a Quality Contract was seen by the local authority as being too
long. The view of operators in Edinburgh is that these will ruin the industry. One operator
commented that franchising creates a situation that is time specific in terms of the length of
the franchise. From the operators’ view this places additional costs on the operation of the
service because they will need to recover the cost of the operation over the franchise period.
The local authority did view the Quality Contract as a way in which a local authority could
specify the requirement for a network to be established and because bus routes in Edinburgh
are quite profitable that a degree of cross-subsidisation could be possible.

6.20 Intervention of some kind was seen by the local authority as desirable given current
experiences of market operation: I think the lesson is that left to its own devices the market
will concentrate on those high, those corridors that are seen as high volume passengers and
will leave the other areas relatively un-served and again it goes back to the comment about
quality contracts (City of Edinburgh Council). One operator stated that they had a strong
view about historical network effects in a commercial environment and that if a slightly
different approach were taken then there would possibly be a smaller network: I mean every
day a hundred and fifty or two hundred thousand depend on us to get them to work, to get
them to school, to get them home again and we can not just take a blank map and start
drawing straight lines all over it and expect that to be 1) deliverable in any kind of sensible
timeframe or 2) viewed as a big step forward by most existing users because there is a
dialogue going on. Not only do we make commercial choices about what the revenue
maximising network will be although we don’t go for a revenue maximising network here in
this company because if we did the network would be significantly smaller but the network
which balances adequate revenue and market share with maximising ridership (Lothian
Buses).

6.21 There was evidence that the local authority were beginning to discuss internally ways
in which the gaps in commercial service operation could be filled geographically and at
particular times of day but there was also a desire not to duplicate those services that were
already in existence:

You know there’s no point at all in having you know organisations with, in my view,
organisations with mini- buses you know plodding the same sort of corridor that
mainstream buses are, particularly if over a period you’ve moved to truly accessibly mainstream public transport you can actually get to you know. There will always be a core of people for whom you have to make special provision and that’s given constrained budgets, is where we should be targeting. Duplication isn’t, simply isn’t in anybody’s interest and there is a substantial amount that remains to be done…but again we’ve been thinking about that lately to try and fill the gaps geographically or at quiet times of day or for those people who can’t use mainstream public transport or at least need help to get to mainstream public transport. So our sort of basic philosophy I guess would always be make sure that the sort of first stab that you end up with as mainstream public …then make sure that you target those areas and sections of the community that you need to in order to fill where there will inevitably be…. (City of Edinburgh Council)

6.22 Community transport was recognised as having an important role to play but no coherent strategy was in place in terms of the relationship with the LTS. The City of Edinburgh Council are currently discussing the possibility of devising a community transport strategy that ‘nests’ within the Local Transport Strategy. There is though currently no vehicle for forming links with the voluntary sector. Certainly this view was taken by a representative of the community transport sector in Edinburgh:

The big issue for us in terms of Edinburgh is that there's no strategy in place for the development or the provision of community transport services. There’s no understanding as to how or why the council supports different initiatives at different levels in different places. There are community groups that are funded to one level and other community groups a mile or two away that are funded to a different level providing perhaps different services and there’s no understanding in the council as to how or why that’s happened and what we’re trying to get is a clear understanding that if the council’s going to buy into the voluntary transport sector it knows how it does it, why it does it and where it’s going with that development (Lothian Community Transport Services).

6.23 More involvement by the community transport sector was viewed positively in principle by operators but there was a concern expressed about the amount of funding that would be required to get new initiatives started.

6.24 The service route concept is an idea that has been considered by the Council a number of times. This is typically a service that would operate at off-peak times and although relatively slow compared to conventional forms of public transport service would offer a personalised service that could be targeted at neighbourhood communities, health centres and sheltered housing blocks. Specifically it would be aimed at people who placed a high value on door to door travel. This concept had been discussed when the Council extended the dial-a-bus service, the idea being to widen the eligibility criteria in terms of social exclusion. The taxi-card scheme (discounted taxi travel) is another way in which door to door transport could be provided to other excluded groups as long as the eligibility criteria were widened to other groups beyond people with disabilities. Other specialised transport services had not been discussed in the context of social exclusion. The car club concept, for example, is currently only offered in relatively wealthy parts of the city (Marchmont, Sciennes, Bruntsfield and Merchiston) due to higher levels of car ownership.
6.25 Land-use planning is regarded as extremely important in terms, not only of the provision of community facilities, but also in terms of the location of new employment and retail centres that could be easily served by public transport. Operators and the local authority all cited the important role of land use planning. Operators also viewed more favourably those developments such as new housing schemes and new industrial estates where bus facilities had been incorporated into the development. FirstEdinburgh also indicated that it had become involved in planning inquiries but these had mainly been for retail areas in these situations where developers build in facilities. These arrangements however do not tend to stipulate levels of service.

CASTLEMILK

6.26 In Castlemilk the main issues were associated with difficulties moving around within the local area. Some respondents had stated that they were reluctant to walk either due to the weather or due to poor perceptions of personal safety and young mothers had stated that they found it difficult to board the buses. A number of problems with public transport had also been identified, including problems with the reliability and timing of services especially in terms of meeting work shift patterns, poor provision of bus shelters, lack of information about services and the physical inaccessibility of services.

Views of the network

6.27 The area itself, along with other peripheral estates, is recognised as an area of low car ownership. The areas are viewed as being particularly important in terms of public transport patronage. The view expressed both by the local authority and operators was that the area is well served by public transport but that public transport could not provide a door to door service. FirstGlasgow and Strathclyde Passenger Transport were not aware of any particular issues or problems in the area, but there was recognition that particularly unusual time or link requirements would always be a problem. The changing location and pattern of work for Castlemilk residents was identified as a particular issue by the Castlemilk Economic Development Agency. As a result, a subsidised route supported by SPT was operated between Castlemilk and East Kilbride, an important employment area for Castlemilk residents.

6.28 The emphasis in Glasgow City Council’s strategy is based on encouraging public transport and modal shift. The link between social exclusion and transport per se is seen as an adjunct to the main policy goal of modal shift. A number of areas are identified as impinging on social exclusion; for example healthy transport including the reduction of pollution and road danger and to the need to encourage the use of roads for all users including cyclists and pedestrians. Both policy objectives are not viewed as being incompatible. Public transport use is encouraged particularly for commuting and this policy is directed more towards those areas in the city where the more economically active sections of the population live. The Council is actively pursuing Quality Bus Corridors as part of this

---

16 The Castlemilk Economic Development Agency (CEDA) originally established under the New Life for Urban Scotland Partnership has now developed independently of the Partnership. CEDA has developed a whole range of service beyond a job training function but has now moved into the development of other services associated with social inclusion and the voluntary sector. The organisation has identified a range of barriers to accessing jobs and employment opportunities these included both child care and transport to areas where job opportunities lay.
strategy although some communities and retailers felt that they were detrimental to the provision of local shopping facilities. The City Council is unable to do anything about the levels of service on offer but can make services more efficient through the implementation of particular traffic management schemes. Issues surrounding public transport provision were passed on to SPT. A representative of the council stated: At the same time we would like to think that the improvements we are making are generally of use so that people in the peripheral estates who are coming in by bus will get the benefit of it as well. The planned bus corridors will link into these areas. We have a more direct role to play in bus transport less so for rail (Glasgow City Council). The Council has also opened up the bus lanes to taxis in recognition of their important role in the peripheral estates. Support of services to these areas is addressed by SPT who are responsible for filling these gaps but the level of support is dictated by the amount of funding available. In the SPT area 90% of services are commercially operated. The City Council had recently undertaken a survey of households in the City and had found that concerns about public transport service frequency and ticketing were the biggest concerns.

6.29 FirstGlasgow, Stagecoach and First Stop Travel (a smaller operator) are currently in competition for passengers in Castlemilk. A tendered service is operated by DART, funded by SPT, with a contribution from the Castlemilk Economic Development Agency. First Glasgow recently reviewed services in the Glasgow area in an attempt to stabilise their customer base and reverse downward trends in patronage. Once a solid platform has been established, it is their intention to then provide new public transport initiatives. As an operator they would argue that they are investing man hours and vehicles in retaining reliability rather than increasing frequency. The operator identified the patterns of demand in terms of major links to the City Centre, the East End and other links across the city to the North. The operator stated: the links across the city are not demand based but tend to be more based on operational efficiency. Castlemilk unusually for this company tends to have its city services, its services that served the city centre, terminating in the city centre. Most other areas of the city actually had a history of cross-city operation. More recently the destination for these - St.Enoch Square - closed and that has also prompted the cross city provision (First Glasgow). Links going back three or four years were reviewed following competition from Stagecoach. Stagecoach provided high frequency links (every 10 minutes) on the best city routes, one of them being a route coming into the city from Castlemilk. First Glasgow responded by moving to a ‘like for like’ service and refocused activity on major corridors.

6.30 The introduction of the Overground has meant that Castlemilk was served by both the 5 and 75, both Overground services. Both are low floor services and between them provide a 5 minute service frequency between Castlemilk and the City Centre: Essentially the decision that had been taken was that there was a natural loop within Castlemilk and that service 75 and 5 could between them provide a five minute link into the City Centre using that loop and every second journey would follow a route that would be deemed to be more direct and every other journey would follow a route via the Victoria Infirmary and Victoria Road (First Glasgow). The 75 is a competitive service and has a lower fare structure. This is the fastest service and therefore the cheapest. Passengers have been found to favour this service because it is cheap and direct. Other services such as the 74 provide other links but survive as a result of the core city business. The 37 and 46 provide links into the East side of city (37 goes to Milton and 46 to Easterhouse). The 46 is every half hour and the 37 every 15 minutes and these service frequencies reflect the lower demand for these services on the other side of the city centre. The principle is essentially to protect current business: ....rather than use all
of your strengths to cover for weaknesses, build on your strengths and have a solid platform that when it comes to dealing with the weaker services it creates a more solid core so you are building the strengths out....In Castlemilk it was probably more straight forward than most places because they already had 2 or 3 high frequency services and it was just a matter of consolidating on those. Other niche markets...are probably best dealt with as a second network (First Glasgow). The Overground network is non-subsidised, although there is some income from student travel passes. Off-peak services are provided as a result of the high levels of usage throughout the day. Timetable information is provided for each service but the distribution of timetable information is very difficult. Information at stops is going through an improvement and is recognised as a very difficult exercise due to service changes and vandalism.

6.31 First Stop Travel operate two commercial services in Castlemilk – the 134 and 234 (134 Govan to Castlemilk via Castlemilk Drive and 234 Govan, Crowfoot to Castlemilk). The 134 is a 15 minute service to Menock Road where the service separates to a half service on the Menock Road. The 234 is a half hour service. Buses run from 7.50am out of Castlemilk. The last bus out of Castlemilk is 7pm. The services is targeted at a variety of users. The perception of this operator was that: the area was poorly serviced prior to us operating the service. Since then First Glasgow has increased its service and its reliability. They are our competitors on the road. The operator recognised problems with timetable information and had worked with a local community group to get timetable information out through a local newspaper. The two services are profitable with patronage being very stable. As a smaller operator they felt that they would like to operate a more frequent service but currently don’t operate in the evening due to the low numbers of passengers. Concerns were voiced about competition with other larger operators who could further refocus activity on the main corridors at higher frequencies leaving smaller operators to operate in the schemes: the fear is that we will be left with the small pieces and the larger operators are left with the more lucrative parts of the service and would not be viable (First Stop Travel).

6.32 A subsidised route is provided by SPT for part of the day for a service (service 95) linking East Kilbride and Castlemilk. The service was originally supported by Glasgow Development Agency and now Castlemilk Economic Development Agency. The service is currently operated by DART. Problems had been experienced with service due to the changing pattern of use as people’s working lives become established:

The initial stages did appear to be meeting a lot of the aims and carrying a lot of passengers between Castlemilk and East Kilbride whereas as East Kilbride began to grow and there was a kind of diversity in the shift operating times it meant that the bus was becoming increasingly irrelevant....What we’ve done is we’ve tried, when the bus was originally established the people who were using it the bus was relevant for and as these people established their working life they would then go and get cars or make their own arrangements to get to work from other people within their office or factory or whatever so the people who were using the bus changed and the needs changed so what we’ve had to do is constantly monitor the service.... (Castlemilk Economic Development Agency).

6.33 The subsidy to run the service has been reduced from £35,000 at the start of the service’s operation to a subsidy level of around £1,200. The current operator DART (a small operator) indicated that they had hoped to build up the service commercially but that the route was proving difficult to operate commercially due to gaps in the timetable:
We’ve done it with one or two other services that we had a subsidy. When the subsidy ran out we were able to retain most of it commercially. This one doesn’t show a lot of signs of life, it’s an unusual timetable. It was an early morning journey for workers, 7.20am to Castlemilk, the next bus is after nine so whether it’s because there’s a bus missing at that sort of back of eight time or not I don’t know but overall the usage is even by tendered standards, low…I mean you would tend to think that the process ought to be that the subsidies to some extent pump priming and that once the service is there for a while and the bus service is notoriously slow to build up custom but once it’s there for a while the level of usage will grow to the extent that either no subsidy or less of a subsidy’s required and in the case of this one then there’s no sign of any sort of increase in demand particularly (DART).

6.34 The operator commented that the service seemed to carry shoppers and pensioners although it had been designed for employment reasons. There was anecdotal evidence to suggest that once workers became established in work that they switched to private cars. The gaps in timetable and lack of publicity surrounding timetable information were cited as problematic, despite them operating a telephone information service: I think we would like to see a more comprehensive timetable to start with even though you’re being paid for whatever you’re doing and if there’s gaps it’s reflected in the price just in simplicity particularly non-bus users or non-users of that service knowing what it does it’s a comprehensive timetable to start with. It’s not well publicised in truth by either us or the PTE or CEDA and that’s not just sort of advertising, it’s employers knowing that there’s a bus link to Castlemilk and it can offer journeys at these times, people in Castlemilk knowing that they can get to these parts of East Kilbride when they’re considering job options (DART). Nevertheless, although it was felt that there were undoubtedly opportunities, there were problems for small operators: For a small operator the costs are almost certainly too high. On the one hand you’ve got to run the investment to get the service up, on the other you’re probably seen as being predatory and competing against the established operator regardless of the differences in the product so you’ve got the risk of a competitive reaction from them and put those two together and it’s just not worth it (DART).

The development of solutions

6.35 A strong preference was expressed for Quality Partnerships by Glasgow City Council but more regulation was favoured by SPT. The problems associated with Quality Partnerships as currently specified were that they do not cover timetabling, service frequency and route. Quality Contracts were viewed more favourably by SPT as a form of franchising but it was felt that the procedures associated with implementation were very cumbersome, for example the requirement for Ministerial approval. Smaller operators may also be excluded from Quality Partnerships due to the relatively high administration and set up costs involved in negotiating a partnership with a local authority. Franchising would also cause problems for small operators but …you would probably find that people like FirstGlasgow would, the deeper the pocket they have the more they can throw about (through cross-subsidisation of routes) we see it now. They come in with the big muscle on it and start slapping us about (First Stop Travel).

6.36 CEDA took a view with Partnerships that they should be viewed as a way in which local authorities with transport operators could identify new market opportunities as new employment opportunities are established. There was a recognition that there was a need to
respond effectively to changes in the local economy and new job opportunities was an important factor in terms of being able to change timetables and frequencies in a way that would enhance the contribution that public transport could make:

*I think if it was easier to change the times of the routes or the times that the bus actually runs that would really help..... as new opportunities come up. For example we had an employer who won a significant contract and were looking for quite an influx of labour, I think it was about fifty or sixty new members of staff. Now had we been able to change the times quickly to fit in with that we might have been able to fill half if not all of the jobs.... I feel that the transport has to act just as quickly because without it basically the clients can’t get the work (Castlemilk Economic Development Agency).*

6.37 A community transport organisation in Castlemilk had tried to establish services and discussions with CEDA had been held, but a problem with recruiting enough volunteer drivers was identified. A respondent stated: *It’s difficult to get the people to run something that’s going to be effective or efficient or to meet the same sort of standards of buses as they are, but we are discussing with community transport about arranging things but as yet nothing has really come out (Castlemilk Economic Development Agency).*  Subsidised taxis had been looked at to help people access jobs in East Kilbride but it had been concluded that the costs would be too high and that it would be very difficult to ‘police’ how they were used: *Taxis were too expensive. We’ve looked at the cost of the taxis and we felt, there was a point when the likes of we said well perhaps we could subsidise taxis but we were going to, we were only dealing with three or four passengers on the buses at the time that we were looking at this, and the cost was something like six pounds for a taxi between here and East Kilbride, how much of that would we decide to subsidise, how do we police that in terms of making sure that that run goes on and that if the run does go on how do we know the figures of people that are. There’s also the issue of taxis. When I spoke to the Passenger Transport fellow he said there was incidents where underground trains go off and there’s maybe four or five people travelling on between two stations, they put on a taxi and all of a sudden it goes up to sixteen, seventeen people turning up for taxis, people who would not have otherwise bothered if it appeared on their doorstep and I felt perhaps that might have been the case here...* (Castlemilk Economic Development Agency). Financial exclusion was an important issue identified by Castlemilk Economic Development Agency. Loans to assist with the purchase of motor vehicles to help with travel to work were potentially problematic in terms of the banking sectors’ concerns over repayments. For residents who had just started work the Agency were currently able to pay for their Zone Card and they would be reimbursed when the recipient had received their first pay cheque. Other options had been investigated such as car pooling but this had not been taken any further. CEDA were exploring the development of links with employers who run workers’ buses.

**KIRKSHAWS AND OLD MONKLAND, COATBRIDGE**

6.38 The data collected for this study area indicated that restricted public transport services meant that people found it difficult to attend leisure facilities. Public transport services also did not coincide with shift patterns for some workers and many found the services costly. Access to travel information for the area was difficult and respondents found it difficult to access surrounding areas such as Cumbernauld. This case study area had the highest levels of car use and this seems to be symptomatic of poor bus services (see para 6.44).
Views of the network

6.39 The local authority for the area, North Lanarkshire Council, although concerned with modal shift and the Road Traffic Reduction Act in terms of encouraging public transport use in its area, also recognised the importance of public transport for those households who have no car or very limited access to the car. Social exclusion had received attention in the Local Transport Strategy for the area and this had involved developing partnerships within the Council (education and social work), SPT, and the local enterprise company.

6.40 The Council indicated that the main problems facing the area are due to the dispersal of activities. The population in the area is spread over seven large towns and many smaller local communities and the result is that: There’s no single urban centre that anyone wants to go to and a lot of the public transport network reflects the kind of West of Scotland dominance of Glasgow and this kind of greater conurbation there. There’s links between our larger settlements, the kind of Bellshill, Motherwell, Coatbridge, Airdrie, but there’s very few links from the smaller villages in, that form part of an integrated network. The bus operators the ... type thing but the larger operators are focussing on main corridors which don’t serve the bulk of the population. Smaller operators have been asked to kind of fill in the gaps from the smaller villages and outlying housing areas but in terms of ticketing and timetabling and information the whole system’s very fragmented (North Lanarkshire Council). The SPT provide subsidised services for the area accounting for approximately £900,000 of subsidy; this accounts for approximately 30% of the total budget available for subsidised transport in the SPT area, but this does not meet all needs and provides: a patchwork of bus services in Lanarkshire which is no way the ideal and their hands (SPT) are tied in the same way our hands are tied in trying to change that, given the way the commercial bus operators are allowed to work and the kind of lack of legislative tools we’ve got to address that and the lack of a budget as well a subsidised bus budget is very limited (North Lanarkshire Council).

6.41 Lanarkshire is viewed as an extremely competitive market by operators, more so than the city market. It has many operators providing many local links. Minibus operators provide links locally and to the city and absorb some of the demand at main periods during the day. These services typically run from 8a.m. to 6pm on Mondays to Saturdays. FirstGlasgow have recently introduced a network similar to the Overground in order to identify the strong demand areas and tie these together in a fashion that will encourage those customers to stay and new customers to come in. At the minute the area has three longer 10 minute services backed up by a few 15 minute links. Because the complexity of the network had to be reduced, some of the links as a result of running fewer routes were broken; this was seen as way of continuing the quality of service set against the type of competition over the main sections that we were facing... some of the best core business at the best core times is being competed for very strongly and the expectation is that as the old incumbent that the people who are there at night and who are there on Sunday are us, but these are not supported, these still have to be paid for from the element of the stronger parts of the day and the stronger elements of these routes (FirstGlasgow). It was noted that the issue in the evening is possibly associated with fact that there are lots of small operators on the street prior to this time, but then they stop running at 6pm. FirstGlasgow operate two services in Coatbridge that run from the early morning to late evening (the 201 from 5.30am to 11pm Monday to Saturday and 9am to 11pm on Sundays and the Glasgow service 6am to 11pm Monday to Saturdays and 8am to 10.30pm Sundays. These services typically run at a 10 minute daytime frequency and a half hour frequency in the evening. The operator also stated that they run frequent and direct links from most other North Lanarkshire towns and
Coatbridge. Interchange is possible but many trips are direct and there is a strong preference for direct bus service, although it was recognised that links with Cumbernauld were difficult. The view taken by SPT was that in Coatbridge the bus network was integrated but the large operators had effectively ‘walked away’ from the area and, combined with the closure of the Airdrie bus garage, had resulted in the current situation. The small operators were viewed as a problem in terms of lack of timetabling and reliability and this was compounded by the lack of resources that the Traffic Commissioners have to monitor operator behaviour:

*The bus operators like the flexibility you know to cut services that forty-two days’ notice gives them, they like being unanswerable to anybody except the traffic commissioner. As long as they don’t do anything really bizarrely stupid, the traffic commissioner will tend not to do a great deal, it’s the facts you know, it’s unfortunately the facts, it’s the commercial bus world and it was disappointing you know, the Ministers in Scotland made their comment that the bus operators should realise their social obligations you know in terms of quality partnership and I think if you ask a local authority officer or an SPT officer what social obligations the bus operators have got they’d say very few if any and the bottom line budget-wise, that’s what the bus operator’s looking for* (North Lanarkshire Council).

6.42 In Coatbridge there was a particular problem of bus services running along a corridor from Airdrie to Coatbridge and then on to Glasgow which made it very difficult for people in Coatbridge to access new employment centres at EuroCentral and the Bellshill Industrial Park. Car use was seen by many as the only viable mode of transport to access these new employment centres. The problem of public transport trying to meet new shift patterns was noted as a particular problem for residents in Coatbridge:

*We’re moving away from the traditional manufacturing to modern manufacturing and assembly and information technology type stuff so your shift patterns are changing from very big workforces coming out you know a morning shift and an evening shift to three or four shifts a day, it makes it more difficult. There are, well, a few things we’re trying to do. The SPT in their kind of public transport role are looking at, they’ve done a project in South Lanarkshire in terms of the rural transport trying to link school bus services, community transport, the dial-a-bus and such, the idea of getting the services to perform different roles so that you can make the best use of the budget. The next rural transport study they’re going to do is in North Lanarkshire* (North Lanarkshire Council).

6.43 The local authority was very keen for the role of community transport to be developed in delivering services within the area. This would involve breaking down the barriers between community transport, school transport and subsidised services.

6.44 The local authority essentially viewed the focus of activity on corridors as market failure. An example provided was the Airdrie to Coatbridge corridor where all services are provided by one large operator. Services to the corridor are provided by other operators. As a result people from areas not on the corridor will have to change and pay two bus fares: *If they can afford a car they’ve got a car in a lot of cases particularly in the smaller villages where a car’s essential, you are looking at the elderly folk, the children, unemployed folks, people going to hospital and, such the ones who can’t actually drive and they’re now required to spend a lot more time, a lot more money taking a bus. It’s not a good way ahead*
(North Lanarkshire Council). The local authority shared SPT concerns about ticketing arrangements and travel information in the area.

6.45 FirstGlasgow revealed that the company were currently finalising behavioural undertakings with the Office of Fair Trading following the purchase of Strathclyde Buses in 1996. The behavioural undertakings mean that the company cannot increase fares at a level greater than the Retail Price Index. FirstGlasgow indicated that any fare increase has a negative elasticity, in other words for the company to stand still it actually has to grow patronage at the same rate as that negative elasticity. FirstGlasgow has also moved towards simplifying fare structures as well as simplifying the network. This has resulted in the introduction of an off-peak return in the city area of £1.50 against a standard fare of £1.00 (approximately). Also introduced a transfer ticket (£1.30) entitles the user to board two buses within 90 minutes prior to that any two journeys paid two single fares. The new ticketing represents a fares saving and sales of the ticket are increasing (equivalent to 30% discount). The company also have a weekly, 4-weekly, 10-weekly and annual ticket. This originally operated on a complex zonal basis but this has now been redesigned to include the city area, and then areas beyond on a £7.00, £9.00, and £11.00 basis (dependent on the number of zones that are crossed). For this process it was admitted that to some extent there were winners and losers (First Glasgow). In Lanarkshire there is the additional benefit of an £11.00 ticket being available for £10.00. The scheme has been designed to encourage patronage and has resulted in a shift from a 5-6% passenger loss to a 1-2% growth.

The development of solutions

6.46 The local authority for the area are continuing to look at the role of community transport. This would involve breaking down the barriers between community transport, school transport and subsidised services. The level of subsidy available for services was viewed as problematic in the sense that it had created a patchwork of services. The SPT and local authority are both in favour of more regulation to counter the competitive behaviour of operators.

6.47 Quality partnerships were viewed favourably by the bus industry but North Lanarkshire Council and the SPT felt that it can only work if operators continue to meet their commitments and there was a perception that little could be done in terms of policing these agreements. A form of franchising was the favoured option: They can’t deliver a level of certainty that a quality contract or some form of franchising would allow, and I mean the rail services are franchised, the bus services in London are franchised, it can work and we’re required to jump through dozens of hoops over a space of maybe seven years just to come up with a quality contract. No, that’s not the best way forwards is a fair way to say it (North Lanarkshire Council). There was also concern about how it could be judged that a Partnership had failed. As in other areas there was some concern expressed about the cumbersome nature of the procedures that were potentially required to establish a Quality Contract:

Then you’ve got the process by which they’ve got to set up a contract. And speaking to the folks in SPT it’ll take you two years from start to finish to go from, we need to set up a contract to being in a position to deliver the contract and that’s two years wherein your non-working commercially operated bus services are still running after the three years for the partnership, perhaps being allowed to run its time plus the lead-up time for the partnership, a year/two years so you are running seven years of not
6.48 Franchising was seen by the local authority and SPT as extremely desirable method of providing public transport services. The local authority representative discussed a potentially viable option in the form of an area based franchising operation consisting of nested operations in different areas of operation: It's complex but I think if it's done fairly a bus operator gets ten money-making routes on the understanding they provide fifteen social routes to a minimum level (North Lanarkshire Council). The minimum level would be a specified standard. The perception was that a franchised operation would overcome many difficulties: I think its FirstBus and the Overground they’re developing the corridors, that’s a partnership and SPT signed up to it very soon after it was launched. There were complaints that the buses on the Overground corridor had been taken away from the peripheral housing schemes in Glasgow, services had been cut there to provide the new Overground services, SPT was left having to find a hole in its subsidised bus budget to put these back in. A franchise could have avoided that (North Lanarkshire Council).

6.49 SPT, the local authority and operators agreed that the design and location of new residential areas and industrial estates were considered to be an extremely important issue if public transport use was to be encouraged and operators were to be encouraged into housing schemes. There was a clear need for developers to build in as many advantages as possible: growing a bus service is extremely difficult from scratch as you put all your costs up front and in that circumstance revenue has to follow very quickly. Changing people’s habits is really the great challenge (FirstGlasgow). Taxis were identified as a flexible mode of transport but their role in terms of meeting transport policy objectives had not really been developed in North Lanarkshire.

CONCLUSIONS – THE DEVELOPMENT OF POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

6.50 This section of the report has presented information gathered from interviews with operators and local authorities on attitudes towards the public transport network, exclusion and the development of transport solutions. Evidence presented suggests that with the exception of Coatbridge, public transport networks are of a high quality and profitable for commercial operators. Nonetheless the surveys show that walking was the most frequent mode of transport but their role in terms of meeting transport policy objectives had not really been developed in North Lanarkshire.

6.51 The analysis demonstrated a strong link between local neighbourhood and the pattern of mode choice in each case study area. Respondents chose ‘local neighbourhood’ as the most frequent response for location of key facilities that they accessed. Journey time was inter-related with mode choice and location. In the local neighbourhood, walking dominated travel patterns within Leith and Castlemilk. In Coatbridge, compared to Leith and Castlemilk, the analysis showed a greater tendency of the respondents to use car and bus for local neighbourhood journeys. Also in Coatbridge, respondents accessed goods and services in the city centre by these modes. This fits with the findings regarding car use and ownership where the highest proportion of licence holders driving everyday resided within Coatbridge. Coatbridge also had the highest proportion of car ownership compared with the other two case study areas. Castlemilk had the highest proportion of respondents who never drive and
Leith had the highest proportion of licence holders but the lowest proportion of respondents who drive regularly.

6.52 Train use was low for each of the case study areas studied. Bus use was high for the entire sample. However there were some differences between the case study areas. Regular bus use was higher in Leith and Castlemilk than in Coatbridge. Conversely, a higher proportion of respondents in Coatbridge stated that they never used the bus compared to Castlemilk and Leith. Taxi usage was higher for those living in Castlemilk and Coatbridge compared to Leith.

6.53 The interviews primarily focused on experiential evidence of local authorities and operators in providing public transport in the three case study areas. On this basis views on transport solutions were sought and provided by respondents on a range of transport solutions but these were presented in a general way that could in reality not be applied to each case study area. Nonetheless this information provides valuable insights into the problem and possibilities associated with the development of particular transport solutions in the selected case study areas. This sections reviews and identifies these solutions. Chapter 7 of this report sets out recommendations based on this evidence and the evidence presented in preceding sections of this report.

6.54 The main solutions identified through these interviews included:

° targeting of subsidies and concessions
° franchising of commercial operations
° co-ordination of community transport services
° enhanced commercial ticketing agreements
° specialised transport services
° public transport provision in new developments

**Targeting of subsidies and concessions**

6.55 Public transport subsidies arguably can redistribute income to the less well off and improve the mobility of the transport disadvantaged. The view emerging from evidence collected in this study is that subsidies in the form of tendered services have an important role to play in maintaining particular public transport links and meeting special requirements. It is clear, however, that more could be done in terms of developing criteria to help underpin decisions made to intervene. A clear problem is that decisions to offer tendered routes in particular areas can be influenced by the amount of political and public pressure brought to bear. There was, however, recognition of the problems associated with developing mechanisms aimed to improve the targeting of route support. It is clear that this issue needs to addressed within the context of future proposals for enhanced ticketing arrangements between operators so that targeted cross-subsidisation can occur on particular routes and/or commercial routes. It may be possible for subsidies and concessions to be used in a similar way. Targeted cross-subsidisation was identified as an area that transport authorities would be interested to pursue in order to help ensure adequate service levels on routes at particular times during the day or to help underpin the development of new routes. Yet it was also recognised that it is very difficult to specify a basis on which interventions should occur on tendered routes. For example, should support be provided to fund services when very few people are travelling where the cost per journey is high?
6.56 The current use of subsidies and concessions reflects a wider problem in that it is very
difficult to target resources geographically or at particular groups in the current operational
environment and potentially even more difficult to justify the targeting of those resources at
the expense of other areas and groups whose experiences of the transport system may be
similar. In Edinburgh, for example, most subsidised services are on the basis of providing
bus travel for the elderly to shops, social facilities and hospitals. The journey to work does
not feature significantly in decisions for tendered services.

6.57 Concessionary travel is constrained in terms of the classes of people that can use it.
There is clearly scope for concessionary travel, if monitored appropriately, to be widened to
other groups where access to affordable public transport is an issue.

Franchising of public transport operations

6.58 The transport authorities interviewed in this study favoured some form of franchising
in situations (a) where market failure or the commercial behaviour of operators had resulted
in the withdrawal of services, and/or (b) for all services to ensure that routes could not be
changed and adjusted at short notice and that timetabling information, service frequency and
fares were controlled. During the course of the interviews, evidence of operators not
producing up to date timetable information was found. In all case study areas, evidence of
the withdrawal of services and a re-organisation of the commercial routes of operators was
identified. Operators, however, felt that franchising would place additional costs on the
operation of a service because they would need to recover the cost of the operation over the
franchise period.

6.59 Intervention to ensure that the continued concentration of commercial services on
corridors did not leave significant network gaps was identified as a particular instance in
which franchising could be used. It was also clear from discussions based around Quality
Partnerships and Quality Contracts that there was a need for a new approach. Although
operators and local authorities were largely in favour of quality partnerships, there was a
recognition that they would only work if an operator continued to provide the desired level of
service. This was matched by a desire from the transport authorities for some degree of
control over fares and service frequency. Small operators on the other hand felt that they
were excluded from Quality Partnership discussions because there were relatively high
administrative and set-up costs associated with Quality Partnerships

6.60 For franchising to work, there was the recognition that it had to be flexible, not
administratively cumbersome and that it provided a mechanism for new market opportunities
to be identified. In particular there was also a recognition that there was a need to respond
effectively to changes in the local economy. New job opportunities was an important factor
in terms of being able to change timetables and frequencies in a way that would enhance the
contribution that public transport could make to the journey to work.

Co-ordination of community transport operations

6.61 There is a growing recognition of the broader transport needs of particular users and
of the need for local authorities to pursue a greater integration of publicly-funded transport
services provided by education, social work and community transport provided by
community groups. This development is seen primarily as an adjunct to the conventional bus
network. However this idea seems to be at a very formative stage in the public and voluntary
sector. There are however examples of community transport providers seeking to develop feeder services onto bus route corridors and local authorities starting to discuss how gaps in commercial operation can be filled, although there is a strong desire not duplicate those services that are already in existence. Community transport was recognised as having an important role to play but no coherent strategy was in place in terms of the relationship with the LTS objectives in any local authority area. The further development and co-ordination of community transport operations would require the breaking down of barriers between community transport, school transport and subsidised services.

**Specialised transport services**

6.62 Subsidised taxis had been considered to help people access jobs in East Kilbride but it had been concluded that the costs would be too high and that it would be very difficult to ‘police’ how they were used. The taxi-card scheme (discounted taxi travel) is another way in which door to door transport could be provided to other excluded groups as long as the eligibility criteria were widened to other groups beyond people with disabilities. In Castlemilk other options had been investigated such as car pooling but this had not been taken any further. In Edinburgh the car club concept for example is currently only offered in relatively wealthy parts of the city (Marchmont, Sciennes, Bruntsfield and Merchiston). In Castlemilk links were also being explored with employers who run workers’ buses.

6.63 The City of Edinburgh Council had considered the service route concept a number of times. This is typically a service that would operate at off-peak times and although relatively slow compared to conventional forms of public transport service would offer a personalised service that could be targeted at neighbourhood communities, health centres and sheltered housing blocks. Specifically it would be aimed at people who placed a high value on door to door travel. This concept had been discussed when the Council extended the dial-a-bus service, the idea being to widen the eligibility criteria in terms of social exclusion.

6.64 Financial exclusion was an important issue identified by Castlemilk Economic Development Agency. Loans to assist with the purchase of motor vehicles to help with travel to work were potentially problematic in terms of the banking sectors’ concerns over repayments. For residents who had just started work, the Agency was currently able to pay for their Zone Card and they would be reimbursed when the recipient had received their first pay cheque.

**Enhanced commercial ticketing arrangements**

6.65 Ticketing initiatives were felt to be an extremely important area of activity but the current emphasis is clearly geared towards modal shift. There are examples of operators working together to allow season ticket holders to use services run by another operator. An inter-ticketing scheme has also been put forward by the South of Scotland Transport Partnership. The emphasis within the scheme is modal shift although potentially it is anticipated that it could have an impact on travel by the socially excluded. There is clearly scope within new ticketing arrangements for targeted cross-subsidisation to be discussed on a geographical or route basis.
Public transport provision in new developments

6.66 Land-use planning is regarded as extremely important in terms, not only of the provision of community facilities, but also in terms of the location of new employment and retail centres that could be easily served by public transport. Operators and the local authority all cited the important role of land use planning. Operators also viewed more favourably those developments such as new housing schemes and new industrial estates where bus facilities had been incorporated into the development. Public transport provision in new developments is essential if new developments, particularly those located at edge of town or out of town locations, are to be accessible to excluded groups who are more reliant on public transport. The interviews revealed instances where little thought had been put into public transport accessibility at new developments.
CHAPTER SEVEN CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

7.1 Social exclusion reflects the existence of barriers which make it difficult or impossible for people to participate fully in society (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998). The factors identified as contributing to social exclusion have included differentials in education and training opportunity and attainment, socio-economic circumstances, local environment, peer group and other normative influences, as well as access to information and physical accessibility to a wide range of opportunities including employment, shopping and recreation.

7.2 This study has examined the nature of the relationship between social exclusion and transport and, in particular, the contribution that public transport could make to reducing levels of exclusion. The study consisted of three stages. Stage one consisted of a literature review (Gaffron, Hine and Mitchell, 2000), focus groups and interviews. Stage two consisted of three elements: (1) a household survey which provided data on 552 households. The data was then used to quantitatively examine context-specific relationships, the experiences of different groups (in a local area context) and explore the nature of transport disadvantage in the different areas; (2) Travel Diary study where 19 diaries were completed. The diary formed the basis for an in-depth interview schedule. The qualitative data collected was collected to supplement information in the household survey in order to explore more fully the factors that either determine or contribute to transport disadvantage; (3) an assessment of the transport provision made in each of the three areas was made in order to explore the differences between perceptions and actual transport provision. Stage three consisted of interviews with the key transport providers in the selected case study areas in order to explore potential solutions to problems identified in the previous two stages of the research project. Following an overview of the key findings from this work, the report makes a number of recommendations in terms of that contribution.

TRANSPORT RELATED DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

7.3 Despite the growing salience of the term ‘social exclusion’, there was little consensus or agreement found in the literature on its exact meaning or definition. There was, however, agreement that social exclusion represents a conceptual shift from the traditional forms of explanation and should not be considered equivalent to older terms and definitions previously applied to individuals, groups and processes considered to exist and operate outside a certain social norm – such as poverty, deprivation and the underclass (Balla and Lapeyre, 1997; Lee and Murie, 1999). The distinctions made between social exclusion and these traditional forms of explanation are explored more fully in the literature review (Gaffron, Hine and Mitchell, 2000).

7.4 Several dimensional framework were discussed in relation to transport and social exclusion. These frameworks recognise that the factors, which affect an individual’s – and thus a group’s – ability to participate in these dimensions is determined by a wide range of variables, which the authors classify as follows:

° the individual’s own characteristics (e.g. health or educational qualifications)
° events in the individual's life (e.g. partnership breakdown or job loss)
characteristics of the area he or she lives in (e.g. physical environment, transport links)

social, civil and political institutions of society (e.g. racial discrimination, welfare state)

7.5 The literature review found that, although the existence of a link between transport and social exclusion had been widely recognised (Barry, 1998; Oppenheim, 1998; Callan et al., 1996; Pacione, 1995), a paucity of data on the issue meant that the subtle relationship between transport and social exclusion could not be fully appreciated (Church et al, 1999). Nonetheless, Church et al. (1999) identified seven sources of exclusion and proposed three types of processes that influence the relationship between exclusion and transport. They were: (1) the nature of time-space organisation in households, (2) the nature of the transport system, and (3) the nature of time-space organisation of the facilities and opportunities individuals are seeking to access. The nature of these will differ according to gender, age, cultural background, level of ability and economic circumstances.

7.6 The seven categories of exclusion connected to transport suggested by Church et al. are:

- physical exclusion (where physical barriers inhibit the accessibility of services which could be experienced by mothers with children, the elderly or frail, those encumbered by heavy loads or those who do not speak the dominant language of the society)

- geographical exclusion (where poor transport provision and resulting inaccessibility can create exclusion not just in rural areas but also in areas on the urban fringe)

- exclusion from facilities (the distance of facilities – e.g. shopping, health, leisure, education – from people’s homes, especially from those with no car, make access difficult)

- economic exclusion (the high monetary or temporal costs of travel can prevent or limit access to facilities or jobs and thus income)

- time-based exclusion (refers to a situation where other demands on time, such as caring, restrict the time available for travel)

- fear-based exclusion (where worry, fear and even terror influence how public spaces and public transport are used, particularly by women, children and the elderly)

- space exclusion (where security and space management strategies can discourage socially excluded individuals from using public transport spaces)

KEY FINDINGS

7.7 Together, the literature review and the interviews, conducted as part of stage one, provided a more detailed understanding of the ways in which transport can be related to social exclusion. The accounts presented demonstrate that access to transport is a real concern for some people and that differential transport access does affect participation in what are considered to be the normal activities of citizens. For many, the existing transport system dictates the places that people can go. Clearly, it is possible to reach most
destinations but it is the degree of difficulty experienced that affects whether people choose to take those journeys and consequently influences what activities people choose to do. Even where time budgets are not necessarily pressured, there are still concerns about punctuality and reliability of services. These are expressed more strongly when the weather is bad or when travellers are further restricted (for example, when they are accompanied by children). It is clear that transport does affect some individuals’ ability to participate in these ‘normal’ activities, specifically employment and labour-related activities such as job seeking and the attendance of interviews. There is also evidence that leisure activities are influenced by transport considerations. Many of the respondents chose to stay at home rather than undertake long or difficult journeys.

7.8 Throughout the interviews and focus groups there was a definite awareness of the limitations that transport imposed upon the participants’ day-to-day lives. Not surprisingly, then, where necessary the participants had developed strategies to maximise their mobility or to minimise their need to be mobile. All had clear views delineating their transport needs. Many of the solutions offered concentrated on economic considerations, but within all of the areas there was also a demand for a better localised transport network. Technological solutions (such as the internet) which have been heralded as a potential solution to transport problems were a non-starter. There was little use and interest in the internet as a time-saving tool, although there was also little knowledge of the potential value of the internet. The solutions suggested were more traditional in nature (for example, delivery services or extended provision of low-floor buses).

7.9 The key findings from the focus groups and in-depth interviews were that:

- there are definite barriers to transport use. These are clearly dependent on individual circumstances as much as on local area. The degree of the impact of barriers which are peculiar to a specific area is determined by the circumstances of each individual.

- travel patterns differ significantly. Some people feel the need to be able to travel more easily locally (to local amenities and friends) while others prefer to travel to other areas to use different facilities.

- few people considered other options that would reduce their need to travel. Of those who did have access to a telephone, they seldom used it in place of making a journey. No one made regular use of the internet.

- travel planning was ad hoc. Participants appeared to hold in their memories a vast amount of knowledge about transport and quoted bus numbers, times and routes throughout. When asked how they found out about buses (their main mode), the prime source of information seemed to be word-of-mouth and experience.

7.10 The literature supports the assertion that there is a clear role for transport to facilitate access to the areas of social activity where participation is considered to be indicative of social inclusion. An increasing knowledge and awareness of the potential barriers has led to the development of policies and approaches designed to limit the impact of such barriers upon public transport usage. The review considered a wide range of these initiatives including:
The data collected in the household survey, in stage two, produced a myriad of information on the travel behaviour and attitudes towards different modes of transport for respondents in the different case study areas. The data suggests that the majority of the sample was ‘mobile’ to the extent that they did access facilities relatively frequently within their local neighbourhood.

On the extent to which the existing public transport network meets the needs of (socially excluded) people and on the factors that constrain the mobility of the (socially excluded) people appear to differ, if only slightly, from area to area and from person to person. While few people appeared to never use public transport, those who did encountered difficulties. The minimisation of these difficulties may increase levels of usage of public transport as well as the distance that people can or are willing to travel. For example, from the data, walking emerges as the most frequent mode used to make journeys to a number of key destinations. However, it is not possible to tell if people preferred to walk or if they felt it was the only option available to them. Could they or would they choose to take a bus or train elsewhere for the same purpose or activity? Clearly, this example illustrates how difficult it is to answer conclusively such questions as which factors constrain mobility of the socially excluded? It is only possible to surmise from the frequency of which a mode is used, the restrictions which have been stated, and the differences that emerge between the case study areas which are different in location and transport provision.

The travel diary study provided a detailed account of the types of journeys made by the respondents. For the most part, these journeys were made on foot or by bus. The diary and interview data demonstrated that there were certain factors that influenced the propensity to travel and also the nature of the travel undertaken. These varied from aspects of a journey that could be changed to improve the accessibility of transport, such as the information provided and the manner in which information is provided, to other factors which, although outwith the control of policy makers, for example bad weather (which was consistently mentioned as a barrier), the impact could be minimised through provision of (better) shelters and more efficient arrangements for interchange.

The respondents were explicitly asked whether or not they felt their travel was restricted in any way, but were not asked if they felt limited in the activities that they could do. However, the issues explored in the interviews encouraged respondents to make clear references to instances when they had been unable to do something they wanted to. These ranged from employment to leisure activities. It is difficult to assess how much impact this had upon people’s perceptions of their opportunities as many of the respondents appeared to accept their situation with comments such as *you get used to it* and *what can you do?*

Issues that have emerged from the analysis of the qualitative data which could be included in such initiatives are:

- needs-based transport
- the role of taxis
- service routes
- co-ordinated services
- subsidies and concessions
- non-transport solutions
- community initiatives
° the need for wider consultation with the general public prior to the revision or reduction of services in order to assess the needs of the residents in any particular area
° provision of accurate information on all services and routes. The information provided should be clear and easily accessible from a number of points including on the bus or train, at the stances and stations, and from telephone information lines. Another possibility that could be considered is inclusion of timetables for the main bus routes in local free papers that are widely distributed to homes on a weekly basis.
° provision of adequate shelter at all bus stops or waiting areas
° consideration of the extension of concession schemes – to include the unemployed or those on very low income
° access to identified key destinations to be considered in the planning and alteration of service routes
° improved cycling infrastructure

7.16 It is clear that some of these issues have been identified in previous research and are not restricted to those considered to be the transport disadvantaged. However, these problems become insurmountable when the options available to an individual are limited for whatever reason, whether it is lack of income or physical capacity. This is evident in the experiences recorded in the travel diaries and in-depth interviews where people have limited opportunities and are subject to disadvantage as a result of the problems encountered in their use of transport.

7.17 Interviews with transport providers focused primarily on experiential evidence of local authorities and operators in providing public transport in the three case study areas. On this basis, views on transport solutions were sought and provided by respondents on a range of transport solutions but these were presented in a general way that could, in reality, be applied to each case study area. Nonetheless, this information provides valuable insights into the problem and possibilities associated with the development of particular transport solutions in the selected case study areas. The main solutions identified through these interviews include:

° targeting of subsidies and concessions
° co-ordination and monitoring of public transport services
° co-ordination of community and specialised transport operations
° enhanced commercial ticketing agreements
° provision for public transport in new developments
° provision of cycling and pedestrian infrastructure

RECOMMENDATIONS

7.18 The findings of this study have a number of implications for current policy. There is general agreement, despite the lack of empirical evidence, that transport disadvantage or deprivation can induce or exacerbate the conditions that lead to the ‘exclusion’ of individuals or communities.

7.19 The literature supports the assertion that there is a clear role for transport to facilitate access to the areas of social activity where participation is considered to be indicative of social inclusion. Recommendations are made in the following areas:
Subsidies and concessions

7.20 This study found limited use of reduced fare schemes by respondents in the household survey. Further analysis also indicated that for those on lower incomes a greater proportion spend over £2.40 on their fares in a typical week when compared with other higher income groups. The increased targeting of subsidies and concessions in favour of transport disadvantaged groups, such as those on low incomes, requires the development of clear criteria and mechanisms to underpin those decisions to intervene. Targeted subsidies exist in the form of concessionary fares or budget passes. Concessions are most often granted to the elderly, registered disabled and school children, although policies vary between local transport providers. Budget passes are provided to the frequent traveller in the form of multi-journey passes or multi-modal passes. There is clearly scope for concessionary travel, if monitored appropriately, to be widened to other groups other than the elderly and disabled, where access to affordable public transport is an issue. The use of subsidies and concessions in this way will:

- improve mobility of the transport disadvantaged
- contribute to the reduction in travel costs for those on low incomes, particularly when interchange is involved
- possibly generate more travel on public transport amongst the transport disadvantaged
- maintain particular transport links and meet special transport requirements

7.21 The current use of subsidies and concessions, however, reflects a wider problem that in the current operational environment it is very difficult for local authorities to target resources geographically or at particular groups, and potentially even more difficult to justify the targeting of those resources at the expense of other areas and groups whose experiences of the transport system may be similar. This also raises the issue that transport operators should tackle the issue of fares for lower income groups.

7.22 The view emerging from evidence collected in this study is that subsidies in the form of tendered services have an important role to play in maintaining particular public transport links and meeting special requirements. It is clear, however, that more could be done in terms of developing criteria to help underpin decisions made to intervene. A clear problem is that decisions to offer tendered routes in particular areas can be influenced by the amount of political and public pressure brought to bear. There was, however recognition of the problems associated with developing mechanisms aimed to improve the targeting of route support. It is clear that this issue needs to addressed within context of future proposals for enhanced ticketing arrangements between operators so that targeted cross-subsidisation can occur on particular routes and/or commercial routes.

Public transport services

7.23 Evidence from this study indicates that there is a clear need to co-ordinate and monitor services so that poor transport provision and the resultant inaccessibility, that can create social exclusion, are minimised. This responsibility should fall equally on transport operators and local authorities. The household survey conducted as part of this study provided evidence of geographical exclusion and exclusion from facilities when reliance is placed on the public transport system. Women, the elderly, disabled and those on low incomes are more likely to suffer from a reduction in opportunities to access goods and
services where access by the public transport system is weak (in terms of longer journey
times, and isolated destinations that are not well served by public transport). Co-ordination
and better management will:

° ensure desired levels of service
° provide responsive public transport
° enhance the services provided by small operators and their methods of operation
° enhance the status of adaptations to network infrastructure through the packaging of
  service developments and improvements

7.24 Studies have emphasised the role of co-ordinated services in terms of the better
management and co-ordination of specialised services with the regular transport service as an
efficient and effective means of widening access for previously excluded passengers. The
benefits of better co-ordination are a more fully accessible bus services, financial savings,
 improved quality, better bus service patronage, more professional tendering, centralised
vehicle management, and normalisation.

7.25 During the course of the interviews with transport providers, evidence of operators
not producing up-to-date timetable information was found. In all case study areas, evidence
of the withdrawal of services and a re-organisation of the commercial routes of operators was
also identified. More monitoring of these trends and an evaluation of their impact is required.
In particular, there was also a recognition that there was a need to respond effectively to
changes in the local economy. New job opportunities were an important factor in terms of
the ability to change timetables and frequencies in a way that would enhance the contribution
that public transport could make to the journey to work.

Community and specialised transport operations

7.26 There is a growing recognition of the broader transport needs of particular users and
of the need for local authorities to pursue a greater integration of publicly funded transport
services provided by education, social work and community transport provided by
community groups and specialist transport providers. Data from the household survey
indicated that although there was an awareness of community transport schemes in the
locality respondents were unable to use these schemes, principally due to eligibility criteria in
place.

Co-ordination of community transport

7.27 The further development and co-ordination of community transport operations would
require the breaking down of barriers between community transport, school transport and
subsidised services. Increased co-ordination of transport by transport authorities, funded by
the public and voluntary sector, will:

° develop links between transport services provided by education, social work and
  community transport groups
° provide a network that operates on a transport need basis without duplicating the
  commercial network
° assist with the development of feeder services to commercial bus corridors
° provide an efficient way in which access to transport can be widened to previously
  excluded passengers
provide transport links, that would not be commercially viable, for access to new employment opportunities

**Specialised transport services**

7.28 Evidence from this study points to a need for a closer examination of specialised transport services. The provision of specialised services relates to a number of areas and improvements. The recommendations from this study are that targeted, demand responsive transport services can be provided through:

- subsidised and concessionary travel for taxis
- car schemes that can be provided either commercially or through the voluntary sector
- extended dial-a-bus schemes, where issues of efficiency and cost criteria can be met in light of available alternatives
- provision of service routes for those groups that place a high value on door to door travel, and importantly for all these services
- widened eligibility criteria to accommodate particular local needs

7.29 Taxis are often considered to be a costly mode of travel. However, the concept of a shared taxi scheme and the provision of taxi-cards are two methods of reducing the costs of travel by taxi. Subsidised taxis had been looked at to help people access jobs in East Kilbride, but it had been concluded that the costs would be too high and that it would be very difficult to ‘police’ how they were used. The taxi-card scheme (discounted taxi travel) is another way in which door-to-door transport could be provided to other excluded groups as long as the eligibility criteria were widened to other groups beyond people with disabilities. In Castlemilk, other options such as car pooling had been investigated, but this had not been taken any further. In Edinburgh, the car club concept, for example, is currently only offered in relatively wealthy parts of the city (Marchmont, Sciennes, Bruntsfield and Merchiston). In Castlemilk, links were also being explored with employers who run workers' buses.

7.30 The service route concept places priority on bringing the bus service as close as possible to the residents. These schemes are generally considered to be a cost-effective and efficient means of promoting independent travel amongst the mobility impaired. Typically, a service route would operate at off-peak times and, although relatively slow compared to conventional forms of public transport, would offer a personalised service that could be targeted at neighbourhood communities, health centres and sheltered housing blocks. This could be aimed at people who placed a high value on door-to-door travel.

**Fares and ticketing arrangements**

7.31 There are examples of operators working together to allow ticket holders to use services run by another operator. These are currently, however, few and far between. In addition, concessionary travel (although an important part of a commercial operator’s business) is also currently constrained in terms of the classes of people that can use it. There is a need for fares and ticketing arrangements which:

- are based on the objectives of both modal shift and enhanced accessibility to meet the social needs of targeted groups
- promote cross-subsidisation of travel on routes to ensure service continuity throughout the day
7.32 Financial exclusion was an important issue identified by Castlemilk Economic Development Agency. Loans to assist with the purchase of motor vehicles to help with travel to work were potentially problematic in terms of the banking sector's concerns over repayments. For residents who had just started work the Agency were currently able to pay for their Zone Card and they would be reimbursed when the recipient had received their first pay cheque. The household survey also identified that a large proportion of bus users on low incomes tended to pay more on fares in a typical week than those on higher incomes.

Provision of public transport in new developments

7.33 Land-use planning is regarded as extremely important in terms, not only of the provision of community facilities, but also in terms of the location of new employment and retail centres that could be easily served by public transport. Operators and the local authorities all cited the important role of land-use planning. Operators also viewed more favourably those developments such as new housing schemes and new industrial estates where bus facilities had been incorporated into the development. Transport and planning authorities should:

° promote the role of public transport in new developments
° provide specified facilities in discussion with operators to promote new services
° encourage new developments to areas that are well served by public transport

Provision of cycling and pedestrian infrastructure

7.34 Walking was found to be a very significant mode of transport in each case study area. Further analysis revealed a strong link between local neighbourhood and mode choice. Walking accounted for a significant share of journeys within the local neighbourhood for many different trip purposes (for example 74% of journeys to the local shop). Cycling on the other hand accounted for less than 2% of journeys to all types of activities. Cycling and walking are viewed favourably where the distances are small and because they are both seen as healthy activities. In Leith and Castlemilk respondents commented on the need to move to improve their transport links and accessibility – investment in cycling and walking infrastructure will help to promote patterns of sustainable transport use. Provision of cycling and walking infrastructure will:

• protect the role that walking plays in terms of mode share in local neighbourhoods and encourage walking activity
• enhance the status of cycling and encourage a growth in mode share
• promote healthy lifestyles in poor neighbourhoods
• improve accessibility and environmental quality and contribute to improved perceptions of safety

Non-transport solutions

7.35 This area requires further research in order to evaluate fully the potential for ICT in assisting with the provision of targeted services for particular social groups. Some work also
considered the value of non-transport solutions to the pressures on time budgets. New communication technologies are often heralded as a medium designed to reduce the pressures on time use. Examples provided are the use of the internet to access resources providing information on travel timetables and routes allowing for better projection of time expenditure. Although new technology is potentially useful, it in itself does not resolve issues about skills and labour market demand and supply; new technology is potentially useful as it offers another avenue through which opportunities arise to organisations and individuals.
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