



**AUNT-SUE**

# Accessibility Indicators and the Reduction of Transport-related Social Exclusion

**Juliet Solomon**  
*TRaC, LondonMet*

**Helena Titheridge**  
*CTS, UCL*

# Benchmarking and Aunt Sue.

- An attempt to arrive at a way of determining which transport changes would change levels of social exclusion.
- Benchmarks (minimum standards) are needed to determine as precisely as possible what does exclude in a way which is able to be modelled for use in AMELIA.

# The accessibility connection – why is it important to...

- People from areas of multiple deprivation
- Older people
- Young people
- Those on low incomes
- The unemployed, job-seekers
- Members of ethnic minority groups
- Single parent families
- People with disabilities inhibiting travel

# Determining “inclusive” journeys

- Where to?
- Do only “essential” journeys count?
- What are the transport aspirations of deprived groups?
- What are the barriers to desired journeys?
- How important is the time factor?

# What excludes?

- Is it:
  - Journey time OR
  - Frequency of journey possibility
  - Price of journey
  - Conditions of travel
  - Possibility of getting to transport
  - Possibility of boarding vehicle

# DfT Accessibility Planning Indicators

- % of a) pupils of compulsory school age; b) pupils of compulsory school age in receipt of free school meals **within 15 and 30 minutes** of a primary school and **20 and 40 minutes** of a secondary school by public transport
- % of 16-19 year olds within **30 and 60 minutes** of a further education establishment by public transport
- % of a) people of working age (16-74); b) people in receipt of Jobseekers' allowance **within 20 and 40 minutes** of work by public transport
- % of a) households b) households without access to a car within **30 and 60 minutes** of a hospital by public transport
- % of a) households b) households without access to a car within **15 and 30 minutes** of a GP by public transport
- % of a) households; b) households without access to a car within **15 and 30 minutes** of a major centre by public transport

# AUNT-SUE, NTS analysis

- Used to establish current journey patterns in the following “transport socially excluded” groups:
  - people with limited car access
  - young people, older people
  - lone parent families
  - part-time workers
  - people in low-income households
  - people with travel difficulties
- Used 1998-2001 data
  - covering approx. 30,000 individuals and 600,000 trips

# Trips per person per year by purpose for older people

	Aged 65+	Aged 65-74	Aged 75+	UK mean
Work & Education	24	37	6	275
Shopping & Personal Business	412	462	345	309
Leisure & Social	297	356	217	313
Escort	44	61	21	129
Other	1	2	1	2
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>779</i>	<i>918</i>	<i>591</i>	<i>1029</i>

Source: NTS 1998-2001

## Focus groups research:

### London, Hertfordshire, Liverpool, Rotherham

- Found that there were minimum numbers of trips required for particular purposes, times not specified varied a great deal; the principal deterrent was not time but physical accessibility. Could time be a proxy for this?

# Desired journeys, older people

- No problems with “essential” journeys, e.g. shops etc.
- Deficit in social and leisure possibilities
- Visits to friends and relatives, leisure, entertainment and sport were additional journeys that people would like to make

# Older people's minimum requirement

Activity	Number of journeys required
Food shopping	Twice a week
Comparison shopping	Twice a month
Social or recreational activity	Twice a week
Holiday	Twice a year
Structured daytime activity appropriate to need	2-10 times a week
Post Office	Twice a week
Medical trip or visit	Twice a month

# Lone parents

- Analysis of NTS data
- Focus groups and interviews in London, Liverpool and Brighton.
- Extremely different expectations; the situations of all seemed very different.
- Problem of trip chains
- Attempts to establish minimum overall times

# Journey and journey purpose priorities

- **i) Trips and purposes**
- Very different priorities from older people
- At odds with the Government's stated priorities (the enabling of work).
- The ability to socialise is crucial
- Occupies similar time-space and fulfils many of the same functions as work

# Which journeys matter – lone parents?

- Nurseries, crèches, mother and toddler groups, parks (particularly at the weekend), and children's playgrounds
- It is clear from our analysis of the NTS data, that children of lone parents undertake less organised social and leisure activities than their counterparts in two parent families (266 trips per year as opposed to 291), although the reasons for this may include cost and childcare as well as travel and time.

# Benchmarking starting point

- Those in lone parent families should be able to travel to meet friends and family, formally or informally, on most days.
- For this journey purpose the benchmark could take the form:  
“..can participate in a social activity at least daily”.

# Escort trips

- Benchmarks start with “...ability to get the child/ren to their activity (e.g. school, nursery, social activities) at least x times per week”.
- This allows for the possibility of using school buses, walking buses, etc. as a substitute for the parent’s escort duties.
- How many escort trips?
- Depends on the numbers and ages of the children in the family.

# Suggested benchmarks for lone parents - time

Journey purpose	Suggested weekly minimum standard	“reasonable” maximum weekly travel time (urban, non-car users)
Work and Education	6 (part time work, 3 return trips)	2 hours
Shopping and Personal Business	6	1 hour
Leisure and Social	6	1.5 hours
Escort education	10 (daily am and pm)	4.5 hours
Other escort	3	(included above)
<b>Total</b>		<b>9 hours</b>

# Problems with validating benchmarks

- Diplomatic problems with singling out “lone parent” parents in e.g. nursery setting
- So very time-consuming
- Problems of excluding car owners (very few) from discussions
- Non-appearance of many
- Very different perspectives (e.g. stoical v. desperate)

# Conclusions

- Methodology can be used to establish benchmarks for different groups
- Benchmarks are likely to be context/location specific
- Our benchmarks could be used as starting point for Local Authorities wishing to establish their own standards
- Problem of “hard to reach” groups
- Legal/political issues with setting “minimum standards”

**www.aunt-sue.info**

Juliet Solomon – [juliet.solomon@londonmet.ac.uk](mailto:juliet.solomon@londonmet.ac.uk)

Helena Titheridge - [h.titheridge@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:h.titheridge@ucl.ac.uk)