SOCIAL IMPACTS AND SOCIAL EQUITY ISSUES IN TRANSPORT WORKSHOP SERIES

Workshop 3 Report:
Housing and Sustainable Communities

August 28th, 2011

Prepared by Laura Lane and Anne Power

Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion

Department of Housing and Communities

London School of Economics

Report Contents

Acknowledgements

1. Overview of the Workshop Series

Social issues form an important element of the transport policy challenge, but have been much less well explored and articulated than areas such as the economy and the environment. The social sciences have collectively carried out a wide range of research into social impacts and social equity, from a variety of different perspectives. Take up of this work in transport policy and research has been limited and patchy, however. Hence the priority under this theme is to expose and synthesise this diversity of work, and consider its applicability to contemporary policy and practice, by holding a series of linked Research into Practice events. Each one will have a different focus and be led by a different institution, with the overall project being led by Dr Karen Lucas at the TSU.

1.1 Aims and objectives

The overall aim of the series is to promote interdisciplinary collaboration and capacity building to better equip researchers, policymakers and practitioners to address the social challenges in transport now and in the future within the UK context. It will draw on state-of-the-art research and best practices across a wide range of disciplines both here and abroad, to identify gaps in knowledge and the appropriate methodologies and evidence base for addressing these.

1.2 The full programme of Events

1. Framing Event - University of Oxford, 14-15 September 2010
2. Employment and Training Workshop - Warwick University, 2 December 2010
3. Transport and Health Workshop - 17-18 March 2011
4. Housing and Sustainable Communities Workshop - London School of Economics, 21 June 2011
5. **Rural Connectivity Workshop - Aberdeen University, 3-4 October 2011**
6. **Final Dissemination Event - central London, 2 November 2011**

1.3 Research Outputs

Slides of all the workshop presentations and reports for the series can be found on the UKTRC website **www.uktrc.ac.uk**

1.4 This scope of this report

This report concerns the third workshop. The report and an accompanying policy briefing note are the two main outputs from workshop 3: housing and Sustainable Communities.

2.   Workshop 3: Housing and Sustainable Communities

Workshop Three was held within the Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE) at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) on Tuesday 21st June 2011. Workshop participants came from a wide range of academic disciplines and policy areas and included representatives of local government, central government departments and NGOs.

2.1 Key aims and objectives

Workshop Three took a predominantly urban focus and aimed to build on the considerable research of Professor Power and colleagues at the LSE in relation to low income communities and urban areas both in the UK and abroad. It considered the accessibility impacts and transport needs of different populations within major urban renewal project areas and how transport could be better integrated into urban planning and regeneration. It also focused on the role of space in cities and urban areas and more sustainable forms of transport including public transport, cycling and walking.

The workshop was designed to explore:
1. Inequality and the impact on disadvantaged communities of concentrated poverty
2. Urban research related to poorer communities – international perspective
3. Transport and accessibility problems as they affect:
   - Employment opportunities
   - Local environments
   - Energy and transport costs
   - Local service quality

4. Integrating lower income communities into the wider city
   - The role of public transport
   - The role of social space and traffic taming
   - The value of compact cities and density – the balance between mobility, choice and sustainability

2.2 List of Speakers

- Dr Ruth Lupton (Deputy Director, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE) *The impact on poor areas of poverty and social problems*
- Professor Anne Power (Professor of Social Policy, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE) *Learning from weak market cities, how poor areas develop at the margin*
- Philipp Rode (Executive Director, LSE Cities) *International perspectives on disadvantage - inequality in transport accessibility in Sao Paulo, Istanbul and Mumbai*
- Tony Travers (Director, LSE London) *Paying for public transport – local transport authorities facing funding cuts and rising energy costs*

- Ben Plowden (Director – Better Routes and Places, Transport for London) *What Transport for London is doing to improve connectivity in lower income parts of London*
- Sarah Leeming (Active Travel Coordinator, Sustrans) *Active Travel Project: Luton*
- Mark Hackett (Forum for Alternative Belfast) *Disconnected City: Belfast*
- Dr Andrea Colantonio (Research Officer, LSE Cities / Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE) *Social Sustainability and Transport: Barcelona*

2.3 Workshop Outputs

A workshop report, this policy briefing note and slides of all the workshop presentations can be downloaded from the UKTRC website: http://www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/research/uktrcse/. The project will also produce a final report in December 2011 and a Special Issue of the Journal of Transport Geography in early 2012.

3.   Researching the Issues

The workshop was designed to bring together delegates from academic, policy and practice backgrounds. The presentations were designed to showcase different disciplinary perspectives with presenters from backgrounds in social policy, architecture, health, geography, urban policy and cities, and governance but all focused on how transport impacts upon and is impacted by housing and communities. Most participants did not have a primary focus on transport but were selected as having interesting perspectives to add to the debates around transport and social impacts and social equity issues.

3.1 Ruth Lupton *The impact on poor areas of poverty and social problems*

Ruth set the scene for the day and provided some key information on the context of disadvantaged communities in the UK, mainly in England. Disadvantaged communities are a predominantly urban problem – with 98% of the most deprived 10% of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) in England in urban areas. Disadvantaged communities have both intrinsic features (location, economic history and stock) which underpin concentrated disadvantage, and acquired features (population composition, services).

Ruth presented four main types of urban neighbourhood:

1. Inner urban – industrial workers housing e.g. Hackney in London
2. Inner urban – formerly more affluent – inner suburbs / inner neighbourhoods with more original stock e.g. area of Birmingham in the West Midlands
3. Outer urban overspill / expansion / growth e.g. Knowsley in Merseyside
4. Small industrial town e.g. Redcar in the North East

It is difficult to generalise disadvantaged communities as they vary enormously in location, housing type, density, connectivity, services, ethnic composition, social capital etc. It has long recognised in policy that solutions should be based on local knowledge and locally owned.

Most people in disadvantaged areas are on low income with median income in the most deprived tenth of areas at £281, compared with £396 for England as a whole, and £533 in the least deprived tenth of areas. Also median hourly wages are 40% less in the poorest 10th than richest 10th of areas. There are also issues for some with low quality employment. However, this is not the case everywhere and only 38% of people living in the poorest 10% of areas are classified as income deprived.

There are a number of environmental and social issues that impact upon disadvantaged communities:

- Physical environment
- Private sector services
- Public sector services
- Sense of power, control and inclusion
- Social organisation
- Social order

The intrinsic features mentioned above often underpin concentrated deprivation. People with the fewest resources are generally concentrated in neighbourhoods with the fewest resources. As a result people often have more to cope with (both personally and in the area) and there are often more challenges to taking up services and opportunities.

"Those who report experiencing a higher level of street level incivilities or suffering from the absence of goods also report higher levels of anxiety, depression, poor health and smoking. 23% of those who report a high incidence of street level incivilities say they feel sad or depressed very or fairly often, compared with 13% of those with a low incidence."

"Further, those who report a higher level of street level incivilities or the absence of goods are also less trustful of others, more resigned about the difficulties of their area, and report more fear of crime. Whereas 80% of those who report a low level of street level incivilities say they feel safe walking in their neighbourhood during the day, only 46% of those who report a high level of incivilities say they feel safe." (Environment Group Research Findings No.25/2005 Public Attitudes and Environmental Justice in Scotland)

Because of the urban nature of most disadvantaged communities, they are ostensibly well connected. Friends of the Earth did a detailed mapping of transport and social exclusion in Bradford in 2001. They showed:

- All disadvantaged areas had bus routes, but some very circuitous
- Most areas of low car ownership had bus routes, but some didn't

Furthermore, there is on-going LSE/Warwick research on employment in low income areas showing different levels of labour market connectivity for poor neighbourhoods within cities. Analysis needs to be done area by area and we need a better understanding of what makes people travel – why people make the journeys they do.

Traffic is a major concern in low income areas as children are more likely to play out and therefore deal with the problems of joy riding and speeding. As a result, children in deprived wards are more likely to be pedestrian casualties than those in less deprived areas.

Accessibility goes beyond cost and availability to include issues related to housing density, safety, limited travel horizons, health, children and cultural restrictions – so increasing connectivity requires knowledge of local issues.

Poor quality public and private services in low income areas may increase the need to travel e.g. schools, healthcare, local shops. Poorer people also more likely to draw on specialist services such as hospitals. We need to develop our understanding of the impact of poverty on the journeys that people make as well as the means of making those journeys.

Ruth highlighted some key issues in the study of poor areas and transport and wider accessibility during her concluding remarks:

- Low income neighbourhoods are typically urban – transport / accessibility issues may be greater for low income individuals outside these areas or for small rural pockets of deprivation.
- There are tensions between accessibility, strategy and environment and these tensions are more acute in deprived areas than in more affluent neighbourhoods.
- Accessibility is a complex issue that goes beyond existence of provision.

Finally, Ruth also suggested some areas that need further attention:

- Issues are localised – is there a lack of close local analysis – what is the role of Neighbourhood Transport Audits?
- We need to understand how poverty makes people travel as well as how it stops them – how can we make neighbourhoods simultaneously more accessible and safer?

3.2 Anne Power *Learning from weak market cities, how poor areas develop at the margin*

In the second presentation of the day, Professor Anne Power introduced evidence from the LSE's Weak Market Cities study. Originally covering 7 and now 10, ex-industrial cities across Europe the project seeks to find out about the urban, regional, national and international problems and potential of weak market cities in Europe. The research aims to understand both the causes of decline and poor competitiveness and the drivers of recovery and regeneration of weak market cities. The basic framework of the project is around sustainable development, to integrate economic, social and environmental imperatives in the regeneration of cities.

In all of the cities, there are two clear forms of urban development and settlement - inner city and outer edge. Anne highlighted the differences between inner-city areas and outer areas:

- Inner city = old, mixed use, multi-racial, accessible, for example: Gröpelingen in Bremen, Burngreave in Sheffield, Tarantaize in Saint-Étienne.
- Outer-edge = modern, brutalist, breaking with urban form, unpopular, lacking key infrastructure, cut off, for example: Osterholz-Tenever in Bremen, Grunau in Leipzig, Quartier Sud Est in Saint-Étienne.

All ten cities across Europe shared the experience of collapse in their major industrial base – a common pattern across Europe and the United States from the 1970s onwards. This deindustrialisation undermined the rationale for mass housing and created stranded communities as well as concentrating many forms of deprivation together.

There have been various attempts at rescue programmes across Europe involving innovative responses in outer and inner areas, introducing neighbourhood renewal, demolition of areas – large scale and scalpel demolition - new neighbourhood management structures, community services and social enterprises. Despite this long process of reinvestment over the past two decades there remain on-going problems of poverty and inequality and challenges around ghettoization versus gentrification.

There are obvious outcomes from these responses and reinvestment processes for example: visible impacts, innovative innovations, more social spaces e.g. Soziale Stadt in Germany, Grands Projets de Ville in France, and Neighbourhood Renewal in England. However, the task is unfinished. These kinds of interventions need constant attention particularly with the new imperatives of energy saving, community stability and integration, improvements of public realm, connectivity and accessibility, production versus consumption.

The study has uncovered former industrial cities that thrived on energy but are now suffering from the many consequences of this industrial past: pollution, contamination, empty sites etc, but they are proving successful at reinventing themselves and may offer a new lower impact pathway for other cities.

The inner cities particularly show signs of recovery achieved through the revaluing of city spaces, and existing neighbourhoods, dense mixed neighbourhoods and communities, revitalisation of public transport and shops, easy access to core city, and the scope for emerging new enterprises.

On the other hand, outer estates across Europe and beyond continue to struggle. Their physical structures are hard to adapt and it is difficult to soften open areas. There are

physical barriers to new enterprises or job opportunities and linkages to the core city remain tenuous but intensive. Intensive on-site management helps and stronger community links encourage social stability. Transport improvements do help and outer cities can be gradually incorporated as opposition to city sprawl means that distances are shrinking.

There are clear lessons from the experience of weak market cities across Europe: we should avoid building large areas of housing outside of the core city as well as avoid producing monolithic and mono-tenure estates; outer estates can be saved with the help of vital infrastructure including transport; we need to increase density in existing urban areas, reclaim / reuse existing buildings, and follow urban design principles of density, mixed use, public space, people-friendly not car-friendly.

3.3 Philipp Rode *International perspectives on disadvantage - inequality in transport accessibility in Sao Paulo, Istanbul and Mumbai*

Philipp presented new work carried out within LSE Cities on Sao Paulo, Istanbul and Mumbai on disadvantage and inequality in accessibility to transport. The patterns in these cities – Sao Paulo, Istanbul and Mumbai – appear to be the polar opposite of those in the UK.

Philipp began by providing some basic facts about the three cities:

- Sao Paulo – 19.2 million population, $12,021 GDP per capita, 0.61 income inequality
- Istanbul – 12.7 million population, $12,856 GDP per capita, 0.43 income inequality
- Mumbai – 19.3 million population, $1,871 GDP per capita, 0.35 income inequality

Philipp's presentation showed residential density in the three cities as spatial form.

Rail transport infrastructure and modal split of transport forms – about how people move about in the different cities. For example, the few railway lines in Mumbai move more people each day than all of the London Underground and in Sao Paulo the bus is the main form of public transport. Also in Sao Paulo there are 7 million cars which Philipp noted was influenced by post war US managed development. Istanbul however is more of a mixed bag in terms of the modal split of transport forms.

In Mumbai the rail system is very successful but it could be argued possibly too successful because it is very overcrowded.

Philipp made reference to the key research question of the LSE Cities work – to which extend are disadvantaged groups in the three cities also exposed to lower accessibility levels?

Household Surveys across metropolitan regions were commissioned by LSE Cities and conducted by IPOS MORI covering key urban policy areas. The transport section of the surveys included mobility patterns and various attitudes towards transport policy. Of particular relevance to this study were:

Main daily trip information

- trip duration
- modal shares

General information

- access to car
- travel time to various services

The research uses a new exploratory tool examining patterns of accessibility and mobility in relation to socio-economic status, tenure type, employment status, gender, location-related.

Philipp identified 8 key dimensions of accessibility:

- Cost
- Time
- Reliability
- Service frequency
- Physical comfort
- Safety
- Security
- Convenience

In Sao Paulo the less educated live the furthest away from the core city centre, unemployment is higher in remote areas and there is a high concentration of unemployed people in these areas. In Sao Paulo there is declining accessibility for poorer populations

There are problems in using public transport for accessing jobs for families who earn less than 3 minimum wages a month in the Sao Paulo Metropolitan Region according to a survey carried out in July 2003. According to this survey over half of those sampled identified paying the fare as a problem (52%), with the long wait (low frequency) following at 36% and distant bus stops at 27%. One fifth of those sampled (20%) said there was no transportation available.

There is polycentricity in Mumbai and Istanbul but not in Sao Paulo and Istanbul appears to have a rather successful form of urban development.

Philipp concluded by suggesting that transport accessibility is about urban form.

3.4 Tony Travers Paying *for public transport – local transport authorities facing funding cuts and rising energy costs*

Public transport is funded from central grants, council tax (and other local revenues) and fares. Governance is complex, being split between the Department for Transport, Network Rail, Train Operating Companies, Local Authorities, Transport for London, PTEs / ITAs, bus companies, Scotland and Wales. Transport for London is the most powerful transport institution in England.

Tony provided figures on the expenditure and income on buses and railways 2009-10 (GB)

	Spending	**Grant**	**Fares** (all in £billions)
Buses	5.3	2.5	2.8
Railways	11.0	4.0	7.0

Railways bring in a large amount of fare income.

Britain attempts to sustain a "European-style" public transport system but with less subsidy. Fares are generally higher than in other comparable countries In Britain we have a complex

and fragmented public transport sector and transport occupies a position of relatively low political priority.

In the 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review there were major reductions to revenue and capital expenditure on public transport. Consequences include:

- less investment in new assets,
- lower subsidies and higher fares,
- lower service levels especially in rural areas,
- crowding

The Comprehensive Spending Review numbers were set with inflation lower than now and expected to fall. Higher inflation will however lead to sharper reductions in real terms spending, energy costs may be rising significantly in the medium-to-long term and there may be some shift to public transport from cars.

Local Transport Authorities – Councils are responsible for metropolitan public transport – rail and buses, bus subsidies, concessionary fares, local roads, planning, environmental provision. This range of responsibilities means that Councils have a capacity to work across services to deliver wider objectives. They are therefore capable of looking across the board with transport, planning and environmental provision working well alongside more general social and civic responsibilities e.g. ensuring a decent environment, effective land use, clean air, tackling social disadvantage, lobbying for a skilled workforce, transport services to link people to jobs (especially important from metropolitan suburban areas to city centres).

There is a clear need for local government to sustain good public transport services despite spending reductions including efficiencies, fare rises, concessions.

There is also a wider need to think more creatively about carless households in poorly served areas with possible solutions including: car sharing, taxis, quality information about bus services, low-cost high-volume services where possible.

Tony concluded with the following points:

- Public transport is less important to policy-makers than the NHS, schools, benefits, the police, and defence.
- There is not much of a lobby for transport apart from the transport industry which is not always helpful
- There is a need to articulate the particular needs of households to councillors and the government
- Access to work is key and while transport connectivity and access are necessary – they are not sufficient by themselves.

3.5 Ben Plowden *What Transport for London is doing to improve connectivity in lower income parts of London*

Ben began by discussing the role of Transport for London (TfL) as a Strategic Transport Authority and the huge amount of influence it has. One aspect of their work is giving money to boroughs in London to improve their transport offer.

Ben explained that he had previously worked at Living Streets. Living Streets is the national charity that stands up for pedestrians, working to create safe, attractive and enjoyable

streets, where people want to walk. The charity works with professionals and politicians to make sure every community can enjoy vibrant streets and public spaces.

Ben introduced a piece of work by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation on young people and territoriality in British cities (Kintrea et al, 2008). The negative impacts of territorial behaviour included: constrained mobility, problems with access to amenities, and the risk of violent assault and criminalisation.

The provision and availability of transport helps to provide access but there are other factors that determine whether or not people will make use of them.

Ben identified the need to reduce mobility of those with high levels of mobility and very good access to employment and education (i.e. those with choice who can travel) because of the impact of travel upon climate change; while at the same time increasing the mobility of those with low mobility and limited access to work and education.

In London the Mayor's Transport Strategy Goals are:

- Support economic development and population growth
- Enhance the quality of life for all Londoners
- Improve the safety and security of all Londoners
- Improve transport opportunities for all Londoners
- Reduce transport's contribution to climate change and improve its resilience
- Support delivery of the London 2012 Olympic an Paralympic Games and its legacy

By 2031, London's population is forecast to grow by 1.3 million and employment is forecast to increase by 750,000 jobs.

In order to improve opportunities in London we need to consider the following elements:

- Who – demography?
- Where – geography?
- When – chronology?
- What – practicality = infrastructure, operations and information?

The average cyclist in London is a 25-40 year old white male professional in a well-paid job – two thirds of all cyclists are men and one third women.

There is a big potential opportunity in and around outer London town centres where cycling is currently less prevalent. TfL is involved in a scheme called Biking Boroughs where a number of London boroughs including Bromley, Croydon, Hillingdon and Kingston will receive extra support and expertise from Transport for London (TfL) in a bid to encourage greater numbers of cyclists in their areas.

Cycling in general not seen as a lower-income activity and the psychology of people's transport is important.

Ben included a map in his presentation that highlighted the differences between Access to Opportunities and Services (ATOS) and Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTAL)

http://www.etcproceedings.org/paper/measuring-the-accessibility-of-opportunities-and-services-in-dense-urban-envir

Access to Opportunities and Services (ATOS) *is an indicator measuring access to essential services and employment by public transport and/or walking. It has been developed by TfL*

and is currently being tested with a sample of local authorities in London. ATOS measure the level of access to employment, education, health services, quality food shopping, and open spaces.

*Currently accessibility in London is measured using **PTALs (Public Transport Accessibility Levels**). The PTAL score is a detailed measure of access to the public transport network and is particularly suited to local area studies. PTALs combine walk time to the public transport network with service wait time at the stop/station for any location in London.*

However PTALs only consider access to the network - they do not take into account:

· the speed or utility of services;

· crowding, including the ability to board services; or,

· ease of interchange.

*In other words PTALs do not consider where public transport goes or consider the opportunities and services that people will want to reach. **The ATOS measure aims to resolve this issue and provide a more complete indicator of accessibility.***

3.6 Sarah Leeming *How can lower income communities be better integrated to the wider city? The role of public transport, cycling and walking*

Sarah provided case study evidence of the Sustrans Active Travel Project in Luton which ran between January 2008 and April 2011. The project was Big Lottery funded with match funding from NHS Luton. Luton is a very contained town which has recently moved towards building upwards with new high rise development.

As in other areas of the country, the most disadvantaged in Luton have the worst health. Deprivation in Luton – Luton is home to 194,000 people – less than two thirds are White British (64.9%), the highest concentration of BME groups are located within the identified deprived wards – Challney, Biscot, High Town, Dallow, Farley.

Sustrans have experience of working with hard-to-reach groups including:

- BME groups
- Disabled
- Low income groups
- Women
- Older people
- Overweight / obese
- Mental Health

Sarah talked about the role of soft measures in contract to large-scale infrastructure investments such as new cycle ways. Examples of these soft measures introduced in Luton included:

- Bike Loan Scheme – Sustrans is responsible for recycling bikes which are repaired and safety checked and then loaned out. The bikes are donated or collected from tips and Sustrans commission local bike shops to carry out the repair and safety checking work. The aim of the scheme is to make bikes more accessible. Linked in with this Sustrans also offers cycle training and loan bikes for young people.
- Women on Wheels cycle training

- Weekly health walk for parents – 20 walk leader volunteers
- MEND and Alive and Kicking – child weight management and cycle training on loan bikes. Luton has the 2nd highest level of childhood obesity in the country.
- Step by Step – adult weight management
- Activate Fitbug – 6 month programme looking at weight, BMU, blood pressure
- 10 Week Active Travel Challenge
- Suggested accessibility improvements

Project Outcomes

- Total participants engaged since 2008 = c. 8000
- Individual bike loans = 1100 +
- School bike loans = c. 200 Bikes facilitating cycle training
- Participants in cycling activities = 1000 +
- Participants in walking activities = 600 +
- Employees motivated to do more cycling = 250 +
- Employees motivated to do more walking = 550 +
- Participants on long term programmes = 120+ - this is a modal shift
- Local volunteers = 20. These volunteers are vital because there is only a team of 3 people (including Sarah)

There is a Sustrans Research and Monitoring Team in Newcastle – Active Travel Project Follow Up Report published 2010.

- Of the 307 respondents 106 (35%) had reduced the distance they travel by car by at least 1-5 miles per day and 47% of new journeys being taken by bike have replaced trips previously taken by car.
- Of the 101 respondents who took part in the bike loan scheme nine of them had never ridden a bike before
- 59 (58%) had not cycled in the last five years or longer before loaning the bike
- 70 respondents (69%) said they would not have cycled if they did not have access to a Sustrans Loan Bike.
- Half of the 44 respondents that participated in cycle skills training said that it had increased the amount they cycle
- Of the 130 guided health walk respondents, 98 (78%) said that they had been motivated to walk more
- 299 respondents (97%) said they will continue to walk/cycle in the future

Activate Fitbug

- 2 x 6 months cohorts, recruiting 48 participants from Step by Step
- Individuals actively travelling five or more days per week increased from 15% to 44%.
- Overall participants lost weight. The average difference in weight for participants over the course of the project was 1.5Kg less.

10 Week Active Travel Challenge

- 5 cohorts recruiting around 80 employees from 12 organisations
- Individuals actively travelling five of more days per week increased from 17% to 42% (Oct 2009 cohort results - similar results for other cohorts)
- Overall participants lost weight, lowered their BMI and blood pressure.

3.7 Mark Hackett *How can lower income communities be better integrated to the wider city? The role of community space versus traffic, sustainable transport, density and community infrastructure*

Mark started by setting out, with the use of multi-level maps, that roads, and industrial sites, divide people in Belfast. For reasons linked to the Troubles there is also a "ring of steel" around the central part of the city. In fact all Northern Irish towns have 'de-densified' recently, with Belfast losing 200,000 people.

Politically Belfast City Council has few powers in comparison with the central authorities, responsible for bins, burials and baths not planning, housing or regeneration. Central authority also tends to be organised in silos, highly influenced by politics and political issues.

Maps of vacant industrial and residential buildings show clear patterns of problematic space due to population reduction and industrial decline, which have been exacerbated by the imprudent road developments in the past. There is a thriving centre with a mix of university, commercial and private sector activity, but the general pattern is for workers there to commute in from the suburban areas through the poor areas in decline round the centre. These poor areas have been subject to renewal programmes – for example Shankill has been rebuilt twice – but there was a clear problem due to the "peace wall" which divided some of these communities from others – shown vividly by pictures of multiple examples of dead-end, closed off streets within divided areas, where there was now no connection between the communities, even if the dividing walls were to be removed – the result of renovation which neglected traditional street forms and walking routes. There was also a legacy of fear which deterred people from walking around areas.

The major motorway and dual carriageway development in Belfast has also been problematic. Three motorways converge in the north of the city, but do not actually connect properly. There is a need for a new strategic plan for traffic, but the current proposals would have a devastating effect in further severing the communities of North Belfast from the employment and other opportunities in the city centre.

Alongside this, some of the major road widening schemes have driven divisions between communities and Mark illustrated on example of the Westlink / Divis street intersection development – previously lacking all links between the bordering communities. Considerable and difficult work had been done to create links and shared community space, not helped by a difficult planning authority and lack of support generally from government locally. Nevertheless this had succeeded in creating a greened, linked, set of routes and shared spaces. This was part of the aim of the Forum for Alternative Belfast to ensure the social impact of roads was fully taken into account in planning.

3.8 Andrea Colantonio *How can lower income communities be better integrated to the wider city? The role of community space versus traffic, sustainable transport, density and community infrastructure*

Andrea set out how transport had an impact across the main areas of sustainable development using an example of a dense social housing estate (La Mina) in Barcelona which had multiple problems of poverty, unemployment, social tensions, and isolation.

Andrea identified the key themes and domains in social sustainability as:

Traditional

- Basic needs, including Housing
- Education and skills
- Equity
- Employment
- Human rights
- Poverty
- Social justice

Emerging

- Demographic change (ageing and international migration)
- Empowerment, Participation and Access
- Identity, Sense of Place and Culture
- Health and Safety
- Social mixing and cohesion
- Social Capital
- Wellbeing, Happiness and Quality of life

Andrea also noted the multi-dimensional impacts of transport on social domains as:

- Empowerment, Participation and Access
- Identity, Sense of Place and Culture
- Health and Safety
- Social mixing and cohesion
- Social Capital
- Wellbeing, Happiness and Quality of life
- Education and skills
- Employment

Steps in La Mina had been taken to address firstly the sense of imprisonment within this estate by opening up the physical spaces much more to the outside world, improving the links to the surrounding areas, taking down the barriers and walls that isolated the estate. This had proved worthwhile but not sufficient.

Second, therefore, attempts had been made to bring new people into the area, which some regarded as gentrification but was aimed at creating a better social mix.

More generally there was a contrast between on the one hand the need to create small scale community spaces which would serve specific and very local purposes, developed by the local community, with on the other the need to tackle the wider underlying and large scale problems of planning, funding, geographic constraints, and housing improvement which were fundamental to improvements.

In conclusion, Andrea noted the following lessons:

- Transport projects have multiple social impacts
- Potential social impacts should be taken into account at planning stages
- Impacts should be assessed from a sustainability perspective
    - integration
    - principles-driven rather than target oriented
    - environmental and economic trade offs

- acknowledgment of uncertainty and complexity

Discussion indicated agreement on the importance of the isolation and transportation issues in the development of social and work patterns. The analysis of Belfast was welcomed for its extensive multi-layered mapping which superimposed roads, demography, vacancy, type of use, and political issues in highly informative ways. Within large cities like London it was still possible for members of some communities to feel intimidated and deterred from mixing despite the available transport links, while in rural areas the forced isolation which was becoming more pronounced due to transportation cuts was tending to make a range of problems such as drug abuse and low skills worse – young people could no longer attend training or leisure activities and only the drug pushers could afford to tour the isolated areas and sell drugs.

Key points from final Panel Session

Ben Plowden

- The **links between rising income and distance travelled** are difficult to break
- There are two dimensions: *functional* outcomes and *meaning*
- Being in other places broadens the mind so what are the outcomes from moving around as people do?
- There are **functional and cultural benefits** of travel achieved in other ways.
- **Low income communities rely more on local goods and services**, and rely more on walking and public transport. This is in fact what we should all aim to be but in reality those with choice don't do these things and others aspire to be like them.

Tony Travers

- Brilliant idea to have a seminar like this as it forced people who think about transport and people who think about social policy to look at other areas. People who drive transport forward are generally men interested in big new gleaming objects and big architecture "big boys' toys". Whereas social policy is often dominated by women who are interested in families, children and social failure. People who do either one are polar opposites.
- Embed some cross-pollination so that **more consideration is given to transport planning to deliver on more social objectives**.
- **Linking people to jobs** is absolutely vital
- Idea of **aspiration and cultural desires**

Mark Hackett

- Transport has pulled Belfast apart
- Negative impact of roads desire in Belfast and other places. Once **undone, places are difficult to stitch back together again**
- There is a blind spot in the way we treat the car and how we want to live
- There is inertia **about physical form**. There was no brave new world as we have **not been very good at building cities in the 20th century**.
- **How do you force (naturally) people to cycle and walk more**? Should be an organic and self-correcting system

Philipp Rode

- Impressed by charts showing ATOS – access to opportunity and space – as these are outside and beyond just the transportation sphere. It is striking that this measure has remained relatively static, suggests it is only going to change marginally.
- Compared with PTAL levels **ATOS is much more socially just,** for example East London is more accessible than suggested by just transport alone
- There is enormous **lock-in and accessibility problems** through the built form
- **Functional and cultural meanings** of transport.

4. Discussion of policy and practice issues

This section of the report brings together the key policy and practice issues that emerged during the day.

4.1 Themes for research and policy

We have identified ten key themes relevant to research and policy:

4.1.1 Link between deprived communities and accessibility - localised issues

It is difficult to generalise issues in low-income areas and deprived communities and it is also difficult therefore to generalise the transport accessibility issues affecting them. Issues are localised and vary across different communities and neighbourhoods. Local issues need to be deal with at a local level but is there a lack of close local analysis, for example in the form of Neighbourhood Transport Audits.

4.1.2 The meaning of accessibility in the context of deprived communities

As discussed throughout the UKTRC seminar series on social impacts and social equity issues accessibility goes beyond simply cost and availability. Particularly in deprived communities the provision and availability of transport helps to provide access but other factors determine whether or not people will make use of them. Again, greater knowledge of local issues will be invaluable here.

4.1.3 Poverty and transport

We need to understand how poverty makes people travel as well as how it prevents them from travelling in order to make neighbourhoods simultaneously more accessible and safer. Many deprived communities are served by poor quality services which may increase the need to travel in order to access schools, healthcare and shops.

4.1.4 Learning from experience of the built form and urban environments

There are many lessons to be learned from studies of deprived urban environments, central to which is a move away from building housing as monolithic, mono-tenure, car-dependent estates and housing developments outside of core city centres. We should focus instead on the vital infrastructure necessary for successful neighbourhoods and communities: transport, density, the reclamation and reuse of existing residential and commercial buildings, the strong principles of urban design.

4.1.5 The role of public transport in challenging economic circumstances

In the challenging economic circumstances we are now in there is a clear need for local government to sustain good public transport despite the wide-ranging spending reductions. Local Authorities have a role to play in working across their range of services to deliver wider objectives for example, transport, planning and environmental provision alongside more general social and civic responsibilities such as ensuring a decent environment, effective land use, clean air, tackling social disadvantage, lobbying for a skilled workforce, and transport services to link people to jobs.

4.1.6 Creative solutions for transport

There is also a need to think creatively about carless households in poorly served areas. People in low income / deprived areas are often more reliant on walking and public transport, there should be attention on creative solutions including car sharing, taxis, the

provision of quality information about bus services, and low-cost high-volume services where possible. In order to provide these more creative solutions, we should enable the articulation of the particular needs of households to councillors and to the government.

4.1.7 Mobility and accessibility for those who need it

The link between rising incomes and distance travelled is well known and clear. We should encourage those with mobility and good access to travel less e.g. fewer flights for holidays, enabling the shift from private car to public transport where possible, while simultaneously increasing mobility and accessibility for those who lack mobility and access to opportunities such as education and employment.

4.1.8 Contrast between big, infrastructure projects and smaller scale soft measures

There was much discussion on the role of big infrastructure projects along smaller scale soft measures, particularly in the context of localism. We questioned how do the big projects get decided upon and funded? Who decides? What opportunities do the public have to influence this?

There should be greater understanding of and focus on meeting local needs – localism could offer an opportunity for local communities to think about their needs. We also need to consider how to make community plans / neighbourhood audits more strategic and influential.

4.1.9 What can be used in the UK from continental experiences?

Much evidence during the workshop came from outside the UK and there was discussion of what the UK could learn from continental experiences. For example, the role of centralized car-parking spaces in European cities, car clubs and car-sharing. The location of the car can be a potentially powerful policy lever, by centralising parking in communities, the car can be located as close to people's homes as the next bus stop.

5.1.10 How to promote the new goals for transport in the context of localism?

In order to promote the new goals for transport in the context of localism there needs to be a combination of smarter growth and investment in existing and new infrastructure.

4.2 Gaps in knowledge

There was not specific discussion during the workshop on gaps in knowledge but discussion covered a number of gaps including:

- The need to look at cultures of living as well as mobility, cultures of housing and mobility – subtleties around different living patterns.
- More work on and discussion of visionary examples of housing and transport in the future

4.3 Future Priorities

The following five future priorities have been identified based on the presentations at the workshop and discussion throughout the day:

1. There is a clear need for local government to sustain good public transport despite spending reductions in the form of efficiencies, fare rises, concessions.

2. We need to think creatively about carless households in poorly served areas such as ideas including car sharing, taxis, provision of quality information about bus services, and low-cost high-volume services where possible.

3. It is very important to link those who think about transport with those who think about social policy. There is a need to embed some cross-pollination so that more consideration is given to transport planning to deliver on more social objectives.

4. We need to encourage those with mobility and good access to travel less e.g. less flights for holidays, shift from private car to public transport where possible while simultaneously increasing mobility for those who lack mobility and access to opportunities including education and employment.

5. We also need a combination of smarter growth and investment in infrastructure in areas.

5.   Further information

Slides of the presentations from the Framing event and from this Workshop can be downloaded from the UKTRC website at www.uktrc.ac.uk

If you are interested in finding out more about the topics covered at this workshop relating to employment, education and training issues with regard to transport and social exclusion please contact Laura Lane at l.lane@lse.ac.uk

For further details of the workshop series and general queries about the programme please contact Karen Lucas at karen.lucas@ouce.ac.uk

6.   References

Centre for the Research of Social Policy (CRSP) (2009) *Presentation of interim findings from evaluation of accessibility planning in the UK* 20th November, 2009. Department of Transport Offices, Marsham Street, London WC1

Centre for Transport and Society (CTS) (2009) *Literature Review: the Treatment of Social and Distributional Impacts in Appraisal and Evaluation* Report to the Department of Transport by CTS, University of the West of England http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/scienceresearch/social/socialdistributionalimpact/sdi1.pdf

Colantonio, A. and Dixon, T. (2010) Urban *regeneration and social sustainability: best practice from European cities*. Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell

Commission for Rural Communities (2010) *State of the Countryside Report*, http://ruralcommunities.gov.uk/2010/07/06/state-of-the-countryside-2010/

Environment Group Research Findings (2005) No.25/2005 *Public Attitudes and Environmental Justice in Scotland* http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/77843/0018454.pdf

Grayling, T., Hallam, K., Graham, D., Anderson, R., Glaister, S. (2002) *Streets Ahead: Safe and liveable streets for children*, London: ippr

Kintrea, K. et al (2008) *Young people and territoriality in British cities*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Local Transport Today (2010) 'Spending cuts force councils to retrench to core transport activities' Issue 550 23rd July, 2010

Lupton, R. (2003) *Poverty Street: the dynamics of neighbourhood decline and renewal. CASE studies on poverty, place & policy*. Policy Press, Bristol

Department for Communities and Local Government (2008) *Transforming Places; Changing Lives: A Framework for Regeneration* http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/regeneration/pdf/896104.pdf

Department for Transport (2008) *Delivering a Sustainable Transport System (DaSTs)* http://www.dft.gov.uk/about/strategy/transportstrategy/dasts/dastsreport.pdf

Department for Transport (2010) *National Travel Survey reports for 2009.* http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/statistics/datatablespublications/nts/

Social Exclusion Unit (2003) *Making the Connections: Final report on Transport and Social Exclusion* London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Power, A., Plöger, J. and Winkler, A. (2010) *Phoenix Cities: the fall and rise of great industrial cities.* Bristol: Policy Press

Websites:

Living Streets: http://www.livingstreets.org.uk/

Sustrans: http://www.sustrans.org.uk/

http://www.etcproceedings.org/paper/measuring-the-accessibility-of-opportunities-and-services-in-dense-urban-envir

Appendix 1: Workshop Programme

PROGRAMME

Location: LRB 505, 5th floor Lionel Robbins Building (Entrance via Portugal Street)

9.30am	Arrival and coffee
10.00	Introductions and Welcome – **Anne Power** and **Karen Lucas**

Session 1: Inequality and the impact on disadvantaged communities of concentrated poverty

10.15 – 10.35	**Ruth Lupton** (Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE) *The impact on poor areas of poverty and social problems*
10.35 – 10.55	**Anne Power** (Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE) *Learning from weak market cities, how poor areas develop at the margin*
10.55 – 11.15	Questions and Discussion
11.15 – 11.30	Break and refreshments

Session 2: Transport, connectivity and accessibility in urban areas

11.30 – 11.50	**Philipp Rode** (LSE Cities) *International perspectives on disadvantage - inequality in transport accessibility in Sao Paulo, Istanbul and Mumbai*
11.50 – 12.10	**Tony Travers** (LSE London) *Paying for public transport – local transport authorities facing funding cuts and rising energy costs*
12.10 – 12.30	**Ben Plowden** (Transport for London) *What Transport for London is doing to improve connectivity in lower income parts of London*
12.30 – 1.00	Questions and Discussion
1.00 – 2.00	Lunch, STICERD Kitchen Area

Session 3: Breakout workshops – How can lower income communities be better integrated to the wider city?

2.00 – 3.15	*Group 1: The role of public transport, cycling and walking (Facilitator: Karen Lucas)*

  - **Ben Plowden** (Transport for London)
  - **Sarah Leeming** (Sustrans)

Group 2: The role of community space versus traffic, sustainable transport, density and community infrastructure (Facilitator: Bert Provan)

  - **Mark Hackett** (Forum for Alternative Belfast)
  - **Andrea Colantonio** (LSE Cities / CASE)

3.15 – 3.30	Break and refreshments
3.30 – 4.00	Feedback from workshops, discussion and 3 top ideas
4.00– 4.30	Panel discussion: *where next for transport in low income communities*?

4.30   Round up comments – **Karen Lucas**

4.35pm   End

Appendix 2: List of participants

Name	Position	Organisation
Omomayowa Alabi	Enforcement Officer	Environment and Neighbourhood Services, Brent Council
Peter Bassett	Director Planning and Strategy	Thurrock Thames Gateway Development Corporation
Mark Beecroft	Lecturer in Transport Studies	Centre for Transport Research, University of Aberdeen
Karin Bosveld	Senior Social Researcher	Child Poverty Unit (DFE/DWP/HMT)
Joseph Clease	Areas Analysis Team Leader	DWP
Andrea Colantonio	Research Officer	LSE Cities / CASE
Helen Davies	Senior Regeneration & Planning Officer	Centro
Jonathan Davis	Director	The Transition Studio
Mark Hackett	Co-Founder	Forum for Alternative Belfast
Richard Hebditch	Campaigns Director	Campaign for Better Transport
Vernon Herbert	Director	Healthy Urban Development Unit
Eileen Herden	Student	LSE
Peter Jones	Professor	Centre for Transport Studies UCL
Tim Jones	Research Fellow	Transport Studies Unit, University of Oxford
Laura Lane	Research and Projects Officer	LSE Housing and Communities / CASE
Sarah Leeming	Active Travel Coordinator – Luton	Sustrans
Neil Lindsey	Director European Team	CPR Regeneration

Karen Lucas	Senior Research Fellow	Transport Studies Unit, University of Oxford
Ruth Lupton	Senior Research Fellow	Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion
Lucy Mahoney	D.Phil. Candidate in Geography and the Environment	University of Oxford
Ronald McQuaid	Professor and Director	Employment Research Unit, Edinburgh Napier University
Melody Mew	Route to Independence Manager	Enham
Paul Morrissey	Senior Programme Director	Thames Gateway London Partnership
Jeremy Pine	Planning Policy/DC Liaison Officer	Uttlesford District Council
Ben Plowden	Director, Better Routes and Places	Transport for London
Anne Power	Professor of Social Policy	LSE Housing and Communities / CASE
Bert Provan	Visitor	Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE
Philipp Rode	Executive Director	LSE Cities
Julian Sanchez	Programme & Policy Manager	Thames Gateway London Partnership
Noel Smith	Director	Centre for Research in Social Policy (CRSP) Loughborough University
John Smith	Access Plan Co-ordinator	Merseytravel
Tony Travers	Director	LSE London
Nicola Waterman	Strategy Adviser	Portsmouth City Council
Zach Wilcox	Economic Researcher	Centre for Cities

6.   References