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Summary

Transport has a key role to play in helping overcome spatial mismatches between the places where lower skilled people live and where the jobs they seek are located. Connecting people to employment sites has been a key aim of past travel-to-work initiatives from which three main lessons have emerged. Transport initiatives tend to be most effective in linking people to jobs when: they are designed with the needs of different individuals and places in mind; they integrate and assist individuals in the use of existing transport provision; and when they work alongside initiatives in other policy areas.

In the majority of cases transport solutions alone will not suffice in helping individuals into employment. Other factors, such as skills and demand in the local economy, matter. However, transport policy can be a viable means of achieving positive employment outcomes and should be seen as part of any policy mix aimed at helping individuals access jobs. It also has a role to play in enabling economic growth and creating new jobs.

Because places differ, the role transport plays and the appropriateness of specific interventions vary – making devolution of transport powers and budgets ever more important. This report examines how transport can improve access to work in four case study areas: the wider Milton Keynes area; South Hampshire; Greater Manchester and the Sheffield City Region, and identifies four stylised types of spatial area.

• The wider Milton Keynes area represents a Type 1 area – a relatively strong economy with little spatial mismatch between where lower skilled people live and where job opportunities are located. The role of transport in Type 1 areas is primarily about supporting further economic growth. This means improving an area’s external connectivity, helping firms access supply chains and markets further afield; facilitating future city expansion; and strengthening firms’ access to skilled labour.

Economic expansion in Type 1 areas is likely to lead to increased levels of traffic and the challenge will be to ensure economic growth is not hindered by rising levels of congestion. More localised levels of spatial mismatch may also need to be addressed in these areas, although this is generally less of an issue.

• South Hampshire represents a Type 2 area – a relatively strong economy, but with much higher levels of spatial mismatch. The role of transport within Type 2 areas is primarily about linking people to existing centres of employment by improving the internal connectivity of the area; creating better integration of existing transport services; and plugging any potential gaps that may exist in public transport provision. At the same time better coordination across planning and transport policies to ensure future employment sites are accessible will be crucial if levels of spatial mismatch are to be reduced and future employment growth is to be sustainable.
• Whilst none of our case study areas fall into the third category, some of the UK’s “New Towns” including Telford may potentially be classified as Type 3 – a comparatively weak economy with little spatial mismatch. The role of transport in such areas is primarily about widening individuals’ spatial horizons by improving external connectivity through better public transport integration, and by assisting job seekers with travel costs and personal travel support. Over the medium to longer term initiatives across other policy areas, particularly focused on skills development and enabling economic growth (where this is realistic) will be important.

• Both Greater Manchester and the Sheffield City Region represent Type 4 areas – comparatively weaker economies (against the national average) with higher levels of spatial mismatch. The Sheffield City Region has more pronounced characteristics than Greater Manchester. Within Type 4 areas transport needs to: enable further economic growth (where this is realistic); help link residents to existing concentrations of employment; and widen individuals’ horizons to help them access jobs further afield. Policy makers within these areas need to identify policies which cut across all three of these roles and prioritise which may be more important for their area.

Policy recommendations

Recommendation 1: Different Government departments, tiers of government and local authorities need to collaborate in order to reduce worklessness and facilitate access to jobs. Transport is one amongst many factors influencing access to work. For transport to play its full role in supporting job creation and access to jobs for the lower skilled, policy and practice needs to continue to adapt, as do the ways in which Departments assess different options to achieve their goals. This has implications for the way the Department for Transport and Department for Work and Pensions work, the way individual local authorities operate across policy areas and collaborate with neighbouring local authorities. The recently appointed Minister for Cities has a key role to play here.

Recommendation 2: Cities and the Department for Transport should work together to devolve further transport powers and funding to allow cities to respond more flexibly to their area’s transport needs. The role of transport in facilitating access to work varies between places. Cities need the powers and funding to enable them to respond to their distinctive circumstances.

Recommendation 3: The Department for Transport should work with local transport authorities to support better integration of local transport provision to facilitate access to work. Better integration of public transport services (ticketing, timetabling and marketing) has an important role in making local transport provision less disjointed and fragmented, facilitating access to work. Three years have passed since the Local Transport Bill became an Act of Parliament, local transport authorities now need to be supported in implementing its provisions to deliver more integrated public transport. Over the longer term, major cities should aim to move towards a Transport for London-style model of governance.
**Recommendation 4:** Partners, including employment support providers and local transport authorities, should consider mechanisms to make public transport more affordable for job seekers and individuals on low incomes. In many of our cities public transport is prohibitively expensive for individuals on low incomes. Making public transport more affordable for job seekers and those on lower incomes will be key to ensuring Welfare to Work policies, such as the Work Programme, are successful in areas with slack labour demand where people will need to travel further afield to access jobs.

“**Making public transport more affordable for job seekers and those on lower incomes will also be key to ensuring Welfare to Work policies, such as the Work Programme, are successful**”
“The location of jobs in the UK is changing, posing a range of challenges for policy makers and their delivery partners aiming to reduce inequalities and tackle worklessness”

1. Introduction

The location of jobs in the UK is changing, posing a range of challenges for policy makers and their delivery partners aiming to reduce inequalities and tackle worklessness. Addressing these challenges in a constrained public spending environment requires innovative thinking and collaboration, underpinned by an understanding of how transport policy can be most effective.

The geography of employment across Great Britain is changing, with a marked shift in the spatial division of labour over time. Across the UK two-thirds of working age people now live in areas where there are fewer jobs than people.1 Over the past 20 years higher skilled jobs have increasingly concentrated within city centres. At the same time, more than 60 percent of UK cities experienced an incremental shift of lower skilled jobs out of their city centres and into their hinterlands. This has led to increasing levels of spatial mismatch between where lower skilled people live and where the job opportunities they are looking to access are located.2

The changing geography of jobs has been supported by changes in the way we travel. Across the UK increased levels of car ownership have led to a significant rise in overall distance travelled and the development of out-of-town retail, business and industrial parks. Over the last 50 years, the distance travelled by car increased more than ten-fold (Figure 1). In 2009, 85 percent of distance travelled was by car; eight percent by rail; five percent by bus; and just one percent by bicycle.3

Figure 1: Distance travelled by major modes of transport (all journeys) (Great Britain), 1952 to 2009

The dispersal of lower skilled employment is likely to continue as a trend in UK cities and city regions. The Government’s recently published draft National Planning Policy Framework proposes to pare back the previous Government’s town-centre first policy to cover only retail and leisure uses. This makes it easier to locate offices in edge or out of town locations.4

There are also plans to allow applicants to change existing commercial use classes (B use classes), which include office, storage and industrial uses, to residential use classes without formal planning permission. Centrally located land classified as housing is usually more valuable than commercial land. This policy change, therefore, risks encouraging land owners to push employment further out, potentially resulting in more out-commuting from city centres.5 At the same time the current economic climate means cities may accept any form of development rather than restricting developments to those that are accessible by public transport.6 These factors combined mean that the spatial mismatch between where people live and where job opportunities are located is likely to persist, particularly at the lower end of the labour market.

Transport has a key role to play in helping overcome spatial mismatches by connecting people to employment locations. However, transport is only one amongst a number of different factors, including skills, childcare, employer recruitment practices and demand for labour, that influence individuals’ access to work (see Figure 2).

To be most effective, policy makers need to better understand the role transport plays in facilitating access to work within this web of inter-related factors. The current spending environment means getting maximum return on any investment is of key importance. This will help ensure resources are used effectively within a context of constrained local authority budgets, including a 29 percent cut to Department for Transport local transport funding outside London by 2013/14 (compared to the 2010/11 baseline).

Source: Centre for Cities, 2011

---

4. See www.regen.net
6. Stakeholder interviews
There is an opportunity now to get the principles right and deliver more joined up and effective transport policy as we head into the next Spending Review, Network Rail’s corresponding rail planning period (Control Period 5) and the final stages of the Competition Commission’s investigation into the supply of local bus services.\(^7\)

This report explores the role of transport in overcoming barriers to work in UK cities and city regions. Using a combination of desk-based research, interviews and roundtables with stakeholders in the case study areas, expert interviews and quantitative analysis, it looks at past policy initiatives and the different roles of transport in relation to access to work. It also examines the role transport plays in helping residents in economically deprived areas access work through four case studies – the wider Milton Keynes area, South Hampshire, Greater Manchester and the Sheffield City Region. The report also draws out lessons from the four case study areas for other areas across the UK and summarises key policy recommendations.

2. The role of transport in improving access to jobs

Transport is a vital component in the effective functioning of cities. It links companies to suppliers and markets, and people to jobs. Transport’s role in helping to overcome economic exclusion has been well recognised in policy cycles and is outlined in the Social Exclusion Unit’s seminal 2003 report *Making the Connections: Transport and Social Exclusion* and the Passenger Transport Executive Group’s (PTEG) 2010 update on the report *Transport & Social Inclusion: Have we made the connections in our cities?* What is less clear is which transport policy interventions are most effective in helping facilitate access to jobs.

This section looks at what past travel-to-work initiatives have done, what we can learn from them and what this means for improving access to jobs through transport policy.

**Past policy initiatives**

A number of transport policy initiatives in the UK and internationally have attempted to increase individuals’ access to work over the past decade. Initiatives have ranged from providing different modes of transport, such as scooters, bicycles and cars, to discounted or free travel cards and the provision of new public transport services. Many initiatives also include an element of travel planning and support. Specific examples include the Passenger Transport Executive (PTE) led WorkWise schemes; Wheels to Work schemes run by local authorities; local authority subsidised bus services; and help with travel costs as part of regeneration programmes such as the New Deal for Communities.

The most common measures taken to increase access to work among the unemployed have been to improve bus services, or to lower the cost of vehicle ownership and obtaining a license. Analysis by Lucas and Tyler suggests fixed route services, such as a new bus service, are usually the most effective in terms of cost per passenger trip. Car purchase loan schemes and driving lessons are usually the most effective for improving employment prospects. However, even amongst the two types of policy response costs per passenger trip can vary (see Table 1).

Many of these travel-to-work initiatives have been relatively short term and small scale and evaluations of them are reflective of this. Evidence of their impact on employment outcomes is at best mixed. Estimates in a recent study of the employment uptake as a result of intervention across four UK projects ranged from 0.6 percent to 67 percent. Amongst them, employment uptake was highest for a fixed route service (the Trevithick Urban Link) between rural settlements and a new industrial site in Cornwall, with services timetabled to cover workers’ shift patterns.

---

9. Wheels to Work provides moped loans, bicycles, vouchers for public transport and taxi travel and travel information. The Workwise programmes provided free travel passes for jobseekers and travel advice within Jobcentres.
11. Percentage of people surveyed who said that they were able to get a job as a result of the service.
“Effective transport policy solutions vary for different individuals and the contexts they live in”

Table 1: Cost per passenger trip by case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>Name (Country)</th>
<th>Cost per passenger trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed route bus (FR)</td>
<td>Braunstone Bus (UK)</td>
<td>1.57€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>San Diego RC Services (USA)</td>
<td>1.78€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly FR</td>
<td>RATP North Services (France)</td>
<td>3.30€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Yolo County Route 215 (USA)</td>
<td>3.35€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR &amp; demand responsive (DR) buses</td>
<td>Wirral Joblink (UK)</td>
<td>14.44€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR &amp; vehicle loan</td>
<td>Contra Costa Child Transportation (USA)</td>
<td>18.89€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR &amp; vehicle loan</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Shuttle (USA)</td>
<td>23.07€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR &amp; vehicle loan</td>
<td>Contra Costa Ride to Success (USA)</td>
<td>23.86€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>ATAD – Minibus (France)</td>
<td>35.90€</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: For further information on these schemes see Lucas K, Tyler S, Cervero R & Orfeuil J (2006) Moving from welfare to work: the role of transport, FIA Foundation
Note: Costs here relate to costs per passenger trip, not per work trip. However, the majority of initiatives surveyed were put into place with the aim of increasing access to employment – meaning the share of work trips amongst passenger trips is likely to be relatively high.

Despite these constraints there are three key lessons we can learn from past policy initiatives:

1. Transport initiatives need to be designed with the needs of different individuals and places in mind;
2. Initiatives that integrate and assist individuals in the use of existing transport provision can be effective in linking people to jobs;
3. Schemes also need to work alongside initiatives in other policy areas.

Lesson 1: Transport policies need to be designed with the needs of different individuals and places in mind

Effective transport policy solutions vary for different individuals and the contexts they live in. The most successful are those that link the right people to the right jobs locally. This has implications for the types of transport used; the mechanisms used to ensure travel is affordable; which employment sites to link participants to; and service patterns and timetabling.

Modes of transport vary amongst income groups (Figure 3). As with other groups, the main mode of transport for people on lower incomes is the car. Yet lower income groups are more dependent on public transport (in particular, the bus) as car ownership levels are lower: 43 percent of people living in households in the lowest real income group have no access to a car or van compared to eight percent of people living in households in the highest real income group. Over two-thirds of Jobseekers Allowance claimants have no access to their own car or cannot drive.

13. These findings are based on an extensive review of UK and international case studies, three roundtables held in Manchester, Sheffield and Southampton and stakeholder interviews.
14. Stakeholder interview
15. Source: Department for Transport (2009) National Travel Survey
“Buying and maintaining a car can be expensive, especially for those at the lower end of the labour market”

Some modes of transport are generally more affordable than others. But over time some modes of transport are becoming more expensive relative to others. Buying and maintaining a car can be expensive, especially for those at the lower end of the labour market - making local bus services an important mode of transport. However as Figure 4 shows, fares on public transport have increased relative to the cost of owning and operating a vehicle. They have also increased at a faster rate than wages at both the bottom and the top ends of the labour market.

Figure 3: Travel by income group and main mode of transport (Great Britain), 2009

Source: Department for Transport (2009) National Travel Survey

Figure 4: Changes in the cost of transport by mode, wages and retail price index (1999 = 100) (Great Britain), 1999 to 2009


17. Cost includes purchase of motor vehicle, petrol and oil, tax and insurance
Travel distances tend to be more limited for people living in more deprived areas. The cost of transport relative to available wages\(^\text{18}\) means it is often unlikely people in low income groups will travel further than 10 miles per day (Figure 5). One in four job seekers state their job search area is inhibited by the cost of travel to interviews.\(^\text{19}\) A 2002 study found that 10 percent of people living in deprived areas have been offered a job in the 12 months prior to the survey period and turned it down because of transport problems.\(^\text{20}\) The potential for lower skilled workers to reduce their travel costs through home or tele-working is also limited.

Deprived areas contain a disproportionate number of groups that have lower travel horizons, meaning individuals living in these areas may be less willing to travel outside of a narrow geographic area. For example, long-term unemployed individuals may be less confident in travelling longer distances. This means initiatives linking people to employment sites located within their travel horizon, or those that reduce the cost of travel, usually tend to be more successful.

![Figure 5: Travel distance per year by income group (Great Britain), 2009](source: Department for Transport (2009) National Travel Survey)

Effective transport provision needs to take account of the work patterns amongst lower wage, lower skilled workers. Many lower skilled workers have to travel as part of their job within working hours (care workers travelling to clients’ homes, for example), hold down a number of part-time jobs or work shifts. Many work on temporary contracts and in jobs with a high turnover.\(^\text{21}\)

---

\(^{18}\) This can be a combination of wages and benefits.


\(^{20}\) Department for Transport (2002) Accessibility to local services and facilities.

\(^{21}\) Rates of involuntary part-time and temporary work have risen by over 40 percent due to the recession. Source: Labour Force Survey, 2011.
In addition to this, lower skilled jobs continue to disperse.\textsuperscript{22} These factors pose a number of challenges for the sustainable and stable long term provision of public transport, such as fluctuating levels of demand and adapting transport provision to changing shift patterns.

**Place-based factors also need to be taken into consideration.** For example a cost-effective urban transport intervention will look different from a rural transport scheme (e.g. demand responsive transport is more appropriate in a rural rather than urban context). An intervention in an area with a high crime rate will look different to an initiative in an otherwise relatively wealthy area,\textsuperscript{23} where confidence to travel is less of an issue.

**Lesson 2: Initiatives that integrate and assist individuals in the use of existing transport provision can be effective in linking people to jobs**

Deregulation of local bus services outside London in 1986 and the privatisation of the national rail network in the mid 1990s effectively led to a two-tier system of public transport across the UK. London now has a public transport system that is well integrated across different modes, a single ticketing system and integrated timetabling. Outside London achieving this level of integration has traditionally been more difficult, although some authorities have made significant steps towards more integrated public transport systems. For example Transport for Greater Manchester has started to take on more strategic functions (Table A in the Annex summarises the roles and responsibilities of different transport authorities).

The 2008 Local Transport Act gave transport authorities\textsuperscript{24} the powers to move back towards a more regulated system of public transport provision. However, integration through re-regulation can be complex to implement, both legally and technically. Very few transport authorities have taken up the provisions in the Act. No transport authority has yet introduced a Quality Contract\textsuperscript{25} and only a small number have introduced the enhanced statutory Bus Quality Partnerships the Act allows.\textsuperscript{26} However, a number of authorities have formed voluntary partnerships – the introduction of which was made easier by the Act.\textsuperscript{27}

**Better public transport integration can be an effective means to help link people to work.** Integration within and between different modes of transport, integration of transport service patterns, timetables, marketing materials and ticketing systems has three main effects on users.

First, integration can increase users’ knowledge of existing transport services (e.g. through a single network map), encouraging them to make journeys they thought impossible before. Merseyside’s integrated journey planner, for example,

\textsuperscript{22} Tochtermann L & Clayton N (201 1) Moving on up, moving on out? London: Centre for Cities
\textsuperscript{23} For example car clubs tend to be less effective in high crime areas, due to a high chance of break-ins.
\textsuperscript{24} These are upper tier local authorities, unitary authorities and the Integrated Transport Authorities in the five former metropolitan authorities outside London.
\textsuperscript{25} Bus Quality Contracts are in effect the franchising of a network of services.
\textsuperscript{26} Bus Quality Partnerships represent an agreement between the local transport authority and bus service operators: the authority commits to improving the quality of infrastructure (e.g. bus priority lanes), the operators commit to providing an agreed quality of service. This can include timings, frequencies and maximum fares.
\textsuperscript{27} Voluntary bus partnerships are similar to bus quality partnerships, but they are non-binding informal agreements. For further information on these, see: www.buspartnership.com
allows users to plan journeys by local bus, train or ferry. Second, it can make using public transport quicker (e.g. because interchanges are timed better), potentially expanding the pool of employment opportunities an individual can access. Greater Manchester’s planned cross-city bus, for example, avoids commuters travelling from the north to the south of the city region having to change in the city-centre. Finally, by offering cross-provider tickets it has the potential to reduce travel cost, again potentially increasing individuals’ job search areas at a given income level.

Transport integration is likely to become more important in future travel-to-work initiatives, as subsidising commercially unviable services becomes increasingly unaffordable for local authorities across the country. This will allow local authorities to make the best out of the existing provision of public transport and compensate for planned cuts. The provision of new public transport services still has a role to play in linking people to jobs. However, in most cases these services are expensive to provide and will require ongoing subsidies. Demand-responsive community travel, for example, has very high per capita subsidies and normally requires ERDF funding to cover the costs. Joblink buses and tailored transport services in Liverpool and North Wales have been successful in linking people to jobs but these initiatives are expensive to subsidise. This means if new sources of financing these services cannot be found, we are likely to see less of them over the course of the next years.

Lesson 3: Transport initiatives need to work alongside those in other policy areas

The most important lesson from past transport initiatives is that, if run in isolation, they are less likely to be successful. Transport is a means to improve employment outcomes, but it is most effective as part of a wider policy mix. Access to work is influenced by a number of different inter-related factors (see Figure 1) and in the majority of cases, where transport does act as a barrier, worklessness cannot be tackled through a simple transport policy solution alone. Spatial mobility is affected by a wide range of factors: travel costs relative to an individual’s expected wage, their work aspirations more generally, and a lack of awareness of job opportunities beyond a narrow geography. The latter may be related to an individual’s social networks or to the advertisement of jobs. While it is commonly accepted that worklessness is best addressed holistically, transport policy often tends to be pursued in isolation.

The case of accessibility planning illustrates this. Following the Social Exclusion Unit’s 2003 report, the government issued guidance on accessibility planning to local authorities whereby transport planners were encouraged to work with land use planners and other service providers such as the NHS and the Learning and Skills Councils to make sure jobs were accessible. However, no funding was dedicated to this and many transport authorities saw accessibility planning as an additional reporting requirement rather than a tool to inform their planning policy. A notable

28. See: www.merseyrail.org/journey/
29. Stakeholder interviews
31. Note that some local authorities are planning cuts of up to 80 percent of their subsidised services. See Campaign for Better Transport (www.bettertransport.org.uk) for further information.
32. Stakeholder interviews
exception is Greater London where Public Transport Accessibility Levels have been used to inform the London Plan. Overall the guidance had little influence, even in those areas where transport authorities applied the guidance meticulously. This was noted in a recent report by PTEG which called for a clearer sense from the Department for Transport on the role of accessibility planning.

Box 1: The right business in the right place: ABC location policy in the Netherlands

The Netherlands introduced an ABC location policy back in 1989. The policy sought to match the mobility needs of business with the accessibility of locations to ensure “the right business is in the right place”. Reducing commuting, increasing the use of public transport and decreasing car usage were key goals.

The ABC policy is made up of three main elements:

• Land is first classified as either type A, B or C. Type A is highly accessible by public transport but not by car, type B is reasonably accessible by public transport and car and type C is mainly accessible by car. Access to car parking is restricted in A and B locations because they are relatively accessible by public transport. Places not included in these three categories are relatively inaccessible by both public transport and car (and defined as type R).

• Mobility profiles are developed for groups of similar companies based on factors such as employment density and dependency on the transport of goods.

• Accessibility and mobility profiles are then used to influence land-use planning helping ensure that, for example, land next to motorways is used for distributional activities.

Successes of the ABC policy include the development of the areas around the central stations in The Hague and Rotterdam. Yet the effects on mobility are mixed, indicating a need to ensure the ABC policy is part of a wider mix of initiatives – improving public transport and car parking policies, for instance. In subsequent national planning documents the ABC policy was broadened out to focus not just on mobility but also on spatial quality, economic development and accessibility.

In addition, the lack of understanding of the potential impacts of transport in addressing worklessness results in other organisations and agencies working in silos, with limited coordination. The value of these services is therefore not easily articulated across other policy areas.

34. Stakeholder interviews; for more detail on why accessibility planning has been less effective see also: PTEG (2010) Transport and Social Exclusion: Have we made the connections in our cities?; London Plan available at www.london.gov.uk/thelondonplan/
35. PTEG (2010) Transport and Social Exclusion: Have we made the connections in our cities?
Similarly, advisors in Jobcentres are often only familiar with public transport in their immediate area: when job opportunities further afield are advertised advisers, often do not know exactly where these jobs are or how clients can access them. In addition, no data is recorded on where clients take up work when they leave benefits making it difficult to assess the role of transport in linking jobseekers to work.

The three roles of transport

Past transport initiatives aiming to facilitate access to work have focused predominantly on linking people to jobs. This section briefly introduces this and two other roles, and sets out what transport policy interventions can be pursued within the context of each.

Role 1: Transport enables economic growth thereby stimulating labour market demand

Transport is an enabler of economic growth. It links firms to markets and suppliers and it defines the labour market they can draw on. Businesses see poor connectivity as a constraint on their future growth over and above a number of other factors; nearly a third of businesses would like to see better transport links with other cities and around a quarter would like to see improvements to public transport. One study estimates that reducing travel times by 10 percent can increase economic productivity by between 0.4 percent and 1.1 percent. Research has also demonstrated that connectivity – proximity to motorways, ports and airports – is a significant part of the explanation behind the variation in firms’ productivity. By underpinning economic growth, transport can help create new job opportunities.

Role 2: Transport links people to existing concentrations of jobs

Transport also increases access to jobs by linking people to existing concentrations of jobs. For example, South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority’s recent successful bid for funding from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund aims to link deprived areas of Barnsley to employment at online retailer Asos. Similarly, Manchester’s Woodhouse Park Project provided discount travel tickets and travel planning advice to help link residents of the Wythenshawe estates to employment opportunities at the nearby hospital.

Role 3: Transport widens travel horizons increasing job search areas

Transport can also potentially help widen existing job search areas – something that can be critical in areas where job opportunities are relatively sparse. There is scope for initiatives to address individual travel behaviour and help link people to jobs further afield through smaller scale and low cost measures, such as better provision of information about existing services or cycling training in schools. A study conducted in 1986 in Birmingham helped develop this understanding.

---

37. Stakeholder interviews  
38. Stakeholder interviews  
42. Ekosgen (2011) Final Assessment of the Woodhouse Park Community Travel Pilot Project. A report to Manchester City Council  
“Transport widens travel horizons increasing job search areas”

Figure 6: Possible transport policy interventions and relevant funding streams for implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand side</th>
<th>Supply side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role 1: Transport as an enabler of economic growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Role 2: Transport as a link to existing employment opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening supply chains and access to markets:</td>
<td>Improving existing provision:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• new or improved national and international rail links</td>
<td>• improving timetabling (e.g. by spreading services more evenly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• increasing national road network capacity and addressing congestion</td>
<td>• increasing speeds and frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• improving international links by air (e.g. increasing flight frequencies, a wider choice of destinations and improved airport access)</td>
<td>• improving the quality of services (e.g. reducing fear of crime, increasing reliability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening access to skilled labour:</td>
<td>Integrating existing provision:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• new or improved city regional and sub-regional rail and road network capacity</td>
<td>• hard integration (routes, tickets, timetabling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating city expansion:</td>
<td>Plugging gaps in services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• new infrastructure required for physical city expansion</td>
<td>• increasing the number of destinations served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provision of new public transport routes, subsidised bus services or community transport and park and ride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Widening horizons using existing services:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reducing the cost of travel / help with affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reducing journey times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• soft integration (e.g. providing better information, travel maps across a wider geographic area and real time passenger information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Widening horizons through personal support:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provision of cycle training (e.g. through school Bikeability schemes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• offering accompanied travel and personal support with travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provision of travel planning (e.g. Workwise travel planner in Jobcentre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding and implementation mechanisms</strong></td>
<td><strong>Higher end of the labour market</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Infrastructure Levy (depending on local authority and size of development)</td>
<td>• Local government grants for subsidised services (variable depending on local authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 106 (depending on size of development)</td>
<td>• Local Transport Plan funding (variable depending on local authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Growth Fund (£1.4bn up to 2014)</td>
<td>• Local Sustainable Transport Fund (£560m up to 2014/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Network Rail (over £34bn in 2009 / 10 prices between 2009-2014)</td>
<td>• Urban Challenge Fund (consultation on fund closed in June, but size of fund not yet announced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highways Agency (2011 / 12 budget £4.2bn)</td>
<td>• Local Sustainable Transport Fund (£500m up to 2014/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Urban Challenge Fund (consultation on fund closed in June, but size of fund not yet announced)</td>
<td>• Work Programme Providers (variable, dependent on provider)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tax Increment Financing (currently only possible in Enterprise Zones)</td>
<td>• Department for Work and Pensions and Jobcentre Plus (Travel to Interview scheme now closed; Flexible Support Fund includes travel costs for some claimants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutional investment</td>
<td>• Transport operators (variable, depending on operator)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own representation
It concluded that job search patterns of school leavers were influenced to a greater extent by knowledge of the city and perceptions of travel than the real accessibility of locations within a city.44 Expanding travel-to-learn horizons early on in life also has a potential role to play in expanding travel-to-work horizons later on in life.45

Figure 6 sets out options for interventions within the context of these three roles alongside the associated funding and implementation mechanisms. On the left hand side of the diagram are initiatives more relevant to economic growth and increasing labour market demand, and people on higher wages. On the right hand side are initiatives that support increases in labour market supply and may also be more appropriate for people on lower wages or out of work.

The relative importance of transport’s three roles in improving access to jobs will vary according to local circumstance. In an area with slack labour demand but growth potential, enabling economic growth (and stimulating demand) may take priority over supply-side interventions, such as linking people to jobs. Section 3 applies this framework and further examines the role of transport in four case study areas: the wider Milton Keynes area, South Hampshire, Greater Manchester and the Sheffield City Region.

“Expanding travel-to-learn horizons early on in life also has a potential role to play in expanding travel-to-work horizons later on in life”

3. Understanding the role of transport in different areas

This section examines the role of transport in enabling access to work in four different case study areas across the UK: the wider Milton Keynes area, South Hampshire, Greater Manchester and the Sheffield City Region, focusing in particular on deprived areas within these city regions.

Within each of the four case study areas we first review the area’s overall economic performance, its spatial pattern of development and the role of transport in supporting economic development and job creation. We then focus on areas of deprivation within each case study area and the role of transport in improving individuals’ access to jobs. Using the framework developed in Section 2 on the three roles transport plays in enabling access to work, practical policy recommendations for local transport policy makers and their partners are identified.

Wider Milton Keynes area case study

The M1 corridor around Milton Keynes is a highly car-dependent area that performs well above the national average economically. Due to its economic history, spatial mismatches between where people live and work are less pronounced than in our other case study areas. The primary role of transport is to support continued economic growth in the area. It also has a role to play in facilitating access to work, particularly in communities outside the area’s three main cities.

Economic overview

The wider Milton Keynes area represents a subset of the “South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership area” and includes the following local authority areas: Aylesbury Vale, Bedford, Luton, Mid Bedfordshire, Milton Keynes, Northampton, South Bedfordshire, South Northamptonshire and Wellingborough. This area is almost equidistant from Birmingham and London and is well linked by the M1, A5 and A6 and the West Coast and Midland Mainline rail lines connecting the area to London and further North. The area has relatively good north-south links, but east-west links towards Cambridge and Oxford are less well developed. The proposed east-west rail link connecting Oxford and Aylesbury with Milton Keynes and Bedford may change this somewhat if the project gets approval.

Economically, the wider Milton Keynes area is performing well, both in comparison to the national average and the other case study areas. Economic growth and employment within the area is centred on three main interconnected urban areas – Luton, Milton Keynes and Northampton (see Figure 7a). Milton Keynes has the largest share of the area’s overall employment (22.3 percent).

46. These four areas were chosen based on geographic location, economic strength and the type of city region.
47. This area was defined based on 2004 commuting flow data from the Annual Population Survey. As is always the case with geographical definitions they fit some places better than others. Luton, for example, clearly also has strong links to London. This is considered as far as is possible in the analysis.
48. Mid and South Bedfordshire became Central Bedfordshire Unitary Authority in 2009. For the purpose of this study we use the pre-2009 local authority district areas to drill down to a more disaggregated spatial level.
50. For further information on the proposed east-west link between Oxford and Bedford see www.eastwestrail.org.uk
with employment largely based around Milton Keynes Central. Northampton has a slightly smaller employment base (19.6 percent) located in the city centre and the university, a number of industrial estates and Northampton General Hospital in the south of the local authority area. Luton has a smaller share of employment (13.3 percent) concentrated around the town centre and the airport.

Growth is set to continue in Milton Keynes, Northampton and Luton as the areas all plan both to grow their employment base and add further housing. Aylesbury (proxied here by using Aylesbury Vale local authority area) and Bedford, two of the towns in the area, contribute a respective 10.9 percent and 11.1 percent to the area’s overall employment. This means there is no one dominant urban area within the case study area (Figure 7a displays settlements and employment in the area).

Pattern of spatial development

The current pattern of development in the area has been heavily influenced by the area’s history and the rapid, mainly car-based growth of the two designated “New Towns”, Northampton and Milton Keynes, in the 1960s. This means the majority of employment sites are located within the area’s most densely populated settlements. Employment in Milton Keynes is not as concentrated as in other city centres across the UK due to the town’s grid road layout. The low density of development in Milton Keynes is likely to affect those with low travel horizons and without access to a car in particular. As a result, spatial mismatch occurs at a more localised level compared to our other case study areas, where spatial mismatch is more extensive (see for example the Sheffield City Region case study).

Transport and economic growth

Due to its geographic location parts of the wider Milton Keynes area have strong economic links with London. North-south links within the area tend to be much stronger than east-west links. The three main urban areas have developed along one of London’s main transport arteries – the M1 motorway and the West Coast and Midland Mainline. Proximity to London has been an important driver of economic growth in the area and it continues to be an important source of employment opportunities to the area’s residents. London’s draw is reflected in the fact that self-containment is much lower in the South of the Milton Keynes case study area (Aylesbury Vale, Luton, South Bedfordshire) than in the North (Northampton, South Northamptonshire), with a considerable number of higher skilled residents commuting to London.

52. NOMIS 2011, Annual Business Inquiry, employee analysis, 2008 data
53. Milton Keynes was designated a “New Town” in 1967 and created around the existing settlements of Bletchley, Wolverton and Stony Stratford. Northampton was designation a “New Town” in 1968.
54. The area where lower and higher skilled jobs are most segregated is Northampton, where lower level service sector jobs are concentrated along the boundary with South Northamptonshire, while higher level service sector jobs are located in the North of the local authority
Reflecting the current transport infrastructure in the area, east-west commuting linkages are considerably weaker than north-south links between the three major cities and into London along the M1 and rail lines. East-west links exist between Oxford and Aylesbury Vale. Commuting links to the wider Cambridge area, however, are far less strong.57

The economic success of the area means that key transport links are starting to clog up. Peak-time congestion is already an issue on key corridors, such as the M1, and is likely to increase in and around the area’s main cities as these expand further over the next decades. The Local Transport Plans for Northampton, Luton and Milton Keynes all state that the cities’ current infrastructure will struggle to accommodate the additional growth in car-based travel predicted by the planned housing and employment growth. The cities are already implementing measures to plan for this future growth in traffic volumes58, but reducing congestion will remain a priority for transport policy in order to facilitate future economic growth.

High car dependency and risk of congestion is exacerbated by the limited rail connectivity between the area’s main cities and towns. Improving rail and other public transport services, where this is economically feasible, could therefore have a role to play in alleviating congestion and supporting further economic growth.

Travel by rail between the area’s cities and towns is often indirect and travel times are slow compared to the car. Part of this is due to the dominance of London, meaning links into the capital naturally tend to be much better than east-west links. It is also due to the relatively small size of some of the settlements within the MK case study area, making the provision of good rail links less feasible economically.59 Yet even on links into London rail can struggle to compete with the car. For example it is quicker to drive from Leighton Buzzard, in the South Bedfordshire local authority area, to Milton Keynes than to make the same journey by train.60

There are quicker, less high frequency inter-urban bus services that compete with local bus operators and attempt to fill gaps in the system. However, tickets for these are usually more expensive than those of local bus operators.61 Improving public transport services in the area, where this is economically feasible, therefore has a role to play in alleviating congestion and supporting further economic growth.

57. The above uses commuting data from the 2004 Annual Population Survey
59. That is why travelling from Aylesbury to Luton, its nearest employment centre to the east, by rail is relatively complicated and involves a trip via London and a Tube journey.
60. Car travel times sourced from Google Maps and rail travel times from www.thetrainline.com
61. www.traveline.info and www.nationalexpress.co.uk
Figure 7a: The geography of employment and deprivation in the wider Milton Keynes area

Dunstable (to Luton)
- IMD: 4% (10%)
- Job density: 0.63
- < NVQ2: 38.3%
- Train: not applicable
- Bus: T: 31 min F: 6 C: £3.80
- Car: T: 15 min AT: 1.66 mpm

Northampton
- IMD: 21% (33%)
- Job density: 0.96
- < NVQ2: 34.0%
- Car: AT: 2.94 mpm

Luton
- IMD: 25% (40%)
- Job density: 0.75
- < NVQ2: 38.2%
- Car: AT: 2.94 mpm

Key
- Key urban areas
- Neighbourhoods in most deprived 30%

Employees, 2008
- 5,001 - 10,000
- 10,001 - 15,000
- 15,001 - 30,000
- ≥30,000

Notes: IMD = percentage of LSOAs in top 20% most deprived LSOAs in England (figures in brackets refer to those displayed on map); Job density = number of jobs per working age resident; <NVQ2 = proportion of working age residents qualified below NVQ2; T = journey time; F = frequency (number of services per hour weekdays 8am-9am); C = cost (peak adult return rail / day ticket (bus)); AT = average vehicle journey time (miles per min). IMD, Job Density and NVQ figures relate to respective local authority districts.

Figure 7b: The geography of higher and lower skilled employment in the wider Milton Keynes area

Lower skilled jobs

Milton Keynes
- IMD: 13% (17%)
- Job density: 0.94
- < NVQ2: 27.6%
- Car: AT: 1.78 mpm

Wellingborough (to Northampton)
- IMD: 21% (32%)
- Job density: 0.71
- < NVQ2: 38.9%
- Train: T: 2 hr 5 min F: 2 C: £14.90
- Bus: T: 59 min F: 3 C: £10.30
- Car: T: 26 min AT: 2.04 mpm

Bedford (to MK)
- IMD: 11% (22%)
- Job density: 0.76
- < NVQ2: 25.8%
- Train: T: 2 hr 19 min F: 2 C: £51.10
- Bus: T: 1 hr 11 F: 1 C: £8.00
- Car: T: 44 min AT: not available

Aylesbury (to MK)
- IMD: 6% (5%)
- Job density: 0.74
- < NVQ2: 17.5%
- Train: T: 2 hr 19 min F: 2 C: £61.10
- Bus: T: 1 hr 11 F: 1 C: £8.00
- Car: T: 44 min AT: not available

Central Bedfordshire

Key
- Key urban areas
- Neighbourhoods in most deprived 30%

Employees, 2008
- 1,001 - 5,000
- 5,001 - 10,000
- ≥10,001

Notes: Lower skilled jobs refer to level 1 occupations (SIC 4-digit industries classified by average occupational and NVQ levels) and higher skilled jobs refer to level 4 occupations. See Annex for further detail.

Access to employment from economically deprived areas

The geography of deprivation within the wider Milton Keynes area is predominantly influenced by the location of social housing in the area’s cities and towns. Pockets of deprivation exist in Luton, Northampton, Milton Keynes, Wellingborough, Bedford and Aylesbury. There is also a degree of rural deprivation, particularly in the east of the area. Overall, levels of deprivation are lower than in the two northern case study areas, Greater Manchester and the Sheffield City Region.

The majority of employment deprived residents within the wider Milton Keynes area live in the three cities (Northampton, central Milton Keynes and Luton), in close proximity to employment sites, suggesting transport may be less important in facilitating access to work. In this respect, the Milton Keynes case study area differs from our northern case study areas, where deprived areas are more isolated from employment opportunities. Overall this suggests that other factors influencing access to work may be more important than transport compared to the other three case study areas.

Yet the low density of development within Milton Keynes itself makes access to employment for those without cars difficult. While areas of deprivation and employment sites are co-located, the low density of employment in Milton Keynes Central limits individuals’ ability to walk to work. With low levels of car ownership amongst deprived communities in Milton Keynes, employment may not be easily accessible to low income individuals. Milton Keynes local authority is working with transport operators to improve the bus network in the city. The “Milton Keynes Star” bus network currently serves key radial routes and is in the process of being extended. Many of the estates suffer from accessibility issues as they are not yet well served by public transport.

In Luton levels of spatial mismatch are not as pronounced but other factors, such as fear of crime, impact on the level of public transport use. The city has experienced an 18 percent decrease in bus patronage over last decade and the majority of those working at Luton Airport commute on their own by car. Luton Borough Council aims to reverse these trends through measures to boost confidence in using public transport.

Deprived areas within Bedford, Wellingborough and Aylesbury Vale are more isolated from the area’s major employment sites and transport plays an important role in facilitating access to work in these areas. Yet, because of the low density of the area as a whole, good-quality public transport provision to employment in the nearest city is not always financially viable. Public transport use across the wider Milton Keynes area is therefore low, and has been decreasing in a number of the area’s towns and cities – potentially a reflection of the quality of service bus companies are able to provide in a less dense area and low demand due to high levels of car ownership.

---

62. Own analysis using CLG, Live Table 100, Dwelling stock: Number of dwellings by tenure and district, England, 2010 data
63. CLG (2011), Indices of Multiple Deprivation, 2010 data
65. Luton Borough Council (2011) Luton Local Transport Plan 2011-2026
66. These include improved street lighting, the introduction of real time passenger information and secure rail stations. See: Luton Borough Council (2011) Luton Local Transport Plan 2011-2026
67. Note that Milton Keynes is the exception to this – which has had success in increasing bus patronage based on its “Milton Keynes Star” radial routes. See Milton Keynes Council (2011) A Transport Vision and Strategy for Milton Keynes. Local Transport Plan 3 – 2011 to 2031
Public transport in the area can be very expensive and journey times are higher than average from the areas surrounding the three urban hubs. Travel times by bus in most cases are considerably longer than by car. Between the area’s smaller towns and cities travel times by bus are often higher than the average commuting time of 45 minutes (travel times amongst lower skilled workers are usually lower). In addition to this, travel can be very expensive compared to other areas. Bus passes covering a wider geographic area, including the nearest economic centre, cost £90 per month in Bedford and £85 per month in Wellingborough. They are also expensive in Aylesbury, a rural location where public transport provision less feasible. Bus services are generally more affordable within the major urban areas.68

Public transport provision across the area is also disjointed with a lack of coordination between routes and tickets across different transport providers. Bus services, for example, are operated by three different providers (Stagecoach, Arriva and National Express). This makes it more difficult to plan journeys; they take longer and are more costly. Overall this is likely to decrease individuals’ willingness to travel (see Section 2 on spatial horizons). Disjointed provision of public transport services across the wider area is set to continue – for example, Milton Keynes is currently planning to introduce integrated ticketing in parallel to Northampton’s drive to introduce smartcards.69

Policy recommendations

Within the wider Milton Keynes area transport’s most important role in facilitating access to jobs is supporting continued economic growth within the area. Transport also has a role to play in linking residents of the area’s smaller towns to the three economic centres in the area.

Supporting continued economic growth in the major urban areas of Milton Keynes, Northampton and Luton:

• The local authorities of Milton Keynes, Luton, Northamptonshire should work with the Highways Agency, the Department for Transport and Network Rail to devise measures to reduce congestion on the M1 and crowding on the rail links into London. More specifically, Network Rail should implement its proposal to lengthen trains between Northampton and London Euston on the West Coast Main Line to reduce crowding during the two peaks.70

• The local authority transport teams in Luton, Milton Keynes and Northamptonshire should devise measures to reduce congestion within the area’s three cities. Appropriate measures will vary in each of the three cities, but are likely to include the use of traffic management systems to smooth traffic flows, workplace travel planning and ensuring public transport provides an attractive alternative to travel by car.

68. Ticket prices were retrieved through www.travelline.info and individual bus operators’ websites. 69. Milton Keynes Council (2011) A Transport Vision and Strategy for Milton Keynes. Local Transport Plan 3 – 2011 to 2031; and Northamptonshire County Council (2011) Northamptonshire’s Interim Third Local Transport Plan 2011/12 70. This proposal is expected to reduce the number of standing passengers by 2,500 for the two peaks. See: Network Rail (2011) West Coast Main Line Route Utilisation Study, July 2011
Linking people to existing employment opportunities in the wider Milton Keynes area:

- The local authorities of Milton Keynes, Wellingborough, Aylesbury Vale and Bedford71 should work with car club operators to increase their use. They should also consider creating a website encouraging car sharing that helps match commuters without a car to those with a car;

- Milton Keynes local authority should continue working with local bus operators to expand the city’s public transport network beyond the core radial routes of the “Milton Keynes star” to link residents of the city’s estates to local employment opportunities (and reduce congestion as the city grows).

- Northampton Borough Council may want to consider adopting a planning policy similar to the models used in London or the Netherlands, and work with Northamptonshire County Council to ensure future development sites are less dispersed and more accessible by public transport (see also section 4).

- Luton Borough Council should work with local bus operators and the airport to improve public transport links to the airport as a centre of employment. The council should also continue to develop plans to make public transport safer and be perceived as such. Measures could include improved street lighting, working with train operators and Network Rail to make rail stations in the area safer and working with bus operators to increase the use of CCTV.

Widening spatial horizons of people living in the most deprived areas:

- Local authorities within the area should work with bus operators to ensure tickets cover nearby employment centres, reducing the cost of travel from the area’s smaller towns to major economic centres. Where this proves difficult authorities may consider coordinating the provision of bus services across a wider area either through bus quality partnerships or contracts (see also section 4).

- The local authorities in the area should also work with bus operators to improve public transport journey times (e.g. through dedicated bus lanes).

- Public transport operators should consider producing consolidated public transport maps and creating a “public transport app”. Local authorities within the area can support such soft integration – for example by including integrated ticketing maps in correspondence with local residents, giving operators free-of-charge marketing opportunities.

71. These local authorities cover areas where public transport options are less viable or do not exist yet.
South Hampshire Case Study

South Hampshire encompasses the cities of Southampton and Portsmouth and their hinterlands. It covers the area along the South Coast to the west of Brighton and the east of Bournemouth and has good links to London via the M3, A3 and two mainline railway lines. South Hampshire has a relatively strong economy but is characterised by spatial mismatch between where residents live and work at both the higher and lower end of the labour market. Transport policy in the area needs to help overcome this mismatch. It also needs to widen the horizons of residents living in the area’s more deprived neighbourhoods to help them access jobs further afield.

Economic overview

South Hampshire is relatively affluent and its economic performance is above the national average. Yet economic growth rates in South Hampshire are low compared to the Greater South East as a whole and it is highly dependent on the public sector as an employer. The area was relatively sheltered from the recent recession by the public sector but is likely to be disproportionately affected by public sector cuts – those areas with a large number employed in the defence sector are already starting to feel the brunt. This has implications for the role of transport in facilitating access to work, with good transport links potentially becoming more important in residential areas particularly affected by public sector job cuts.

Spatial pattern of development

Southampton and Portsmouth are the two main employment centres within the wider area. Key employment sites for the area are the town centre and port of Southampton; the Naval Base and port of Portsmouth; and the north east of Portsmouth local authority area, where Drayton and Highbury College are located. Southampton and Portsmouth account for 16.5 percent and 15 percent of total employment in South Hampshire respectively. There is also employment within the town centres of Eastleigh, Winchester, Fareham and Havant (see Figure 8a). The fact that there are multiple employment sites within South Hampshire, located along a linear coastline, makes effective public transport provision more complex.

Past planning policy within South Hampshire has encouraged car-based, out-of-town development along the M27 presenting challenges for the effective provision of public transport services. Employment growth in South Hampshire over the past decade has been strongest in the rural fringe and urban boroughs. In contrast, the two cities have experienced a small fall in employment.

---

72. Our geographic definition of South Hampshire includes the unitary authorities of Portsmouth, Southampton, the Isle of Wight and the Hampshire County Council districts of Eastleigh, East Hampshire, Fareham, Gosport, Havant, the New Forest, Test Valley and Winchester. These are the local authority areas included in the recently created Solent Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). Most of the Solent LEP area already has good working relationships through the 2003 established Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) which fully covered the geography of six of the above local authorities and partly covered the geography of four of the above local authorities. The New Forest has recently left PUSH.
74. The News (17 August 2011) “Anger as ministers rule out a rethink on defence” and stakeholder interview
75. NOMIS 2011, Annual Business Inquiry, employee analysis, 2008 data
76. Other, more local centres of employment include, amongst others, Romsey, Totton and Waterlooville.
As a result, areas of high job density are now spread out in pockets along the coast rather than being contained within a single core (as is the case in, for example, Manchester). Significant employment sites outside the cities include Southampton Science Park, Solent Business and Segensworth Industrial Park (Figure 8a depicts major town and out-of-town employment sites in South Hampshire). These car-based developments across the area present significant challenges for the provision of public transport services.

The residential locations of high and low skilled individuals in comparison to the location of employment means there are spatial mismatches across all skills levels making transport key in linking people to employment opportunities.

Higher skilled service sector employment tends to be concentrated in the area’s cities and town centres, while many higher skilled residents live outside the cities. Lower skilled, entry-level service and manufacturing employment, on the other hand, is more spread out along the M27 corridor - while many lower skilled residents continue to live within the cities, where a large share of the area’s social housing is located. Figure 8b illustrates the contrast between the location of higher and lower skilled employment in the area. This has led to a spatial mismatch across all skills levels in the labour market, making transport key in helping link people to employment opportunities. This mismatch is likely to present a significant barrier to lower income individuals who often do not have access to a car.

Partners are already seeking to reverse these mismatches and are prioritising economic growth in the two cities. Through the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire the area has agreed a “cities first” policy concentrating further development in the two cities. In light of historical trends and future development plans, however, employment in the area is likely to continue to disperse. The majority of strategic employment sites identified lie outside the two cities – including a Greenfield “Strategic Development Area” located north of Fareham and the “Strategic Employment Zone” in Eastleigh. This may increase the drift of employment opportunities out of the two main urban centres to their hinterlands and further increase car dependence, but is contingent to some extent upon the transport strategies implemented as part of those developments.

Transport and economic growth

As the two economic cores, the cities provide employment for neighbouring areas. Interaction between the two cities, however, is limited. Within the area, the two economic centres, Southampton and Portsmouth each draw in commuters from their immediate hinterland. Portsmouth has strong

---

78. 23 percent of housing stock in Southampton and 19 percent of housing stock in Portsmouth is social housing. Own analysis using CLG, Live Table 100, Dwelling stock: Number of dwellings by tenure and district, England, 2010 data
79. Note that the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) does not include the Isle of Wight and only includes parts of the geographic area of the districts of Test Valley, Winchester, East Hampshire and the New Forest. The New Forest has recently left PUSH, but was still included within these estimates.
81. For further information on the Strategic Development Area, see: www.push.gov.uk/work/housing-and-planning/strategic_development_areas_sdas.htm
links with Gosport, East Hampshire and Havant. Southampton has strong links with Winchester, Test Valley and the New Forest. Eastleigh and Fareham, located between the two cities, look both ways – albeit each has slightly stronger links with the city located within its immediate proximity. Commuting flows between the two cities, which are well linked by the M27, are weaker than might be expected given that the two cities are only 32 km apart. The two cities themselves have links to other areas within the Greater South East, including: London, areas along the M3 and A3 corridor (Basingstoke, Rushmoor, Guildford, Waverley) and, to a lesser extent, along the coastline (Chichester, Bournemouth and Poole).

The quality of transport infrastructure in the area is likely to impact on the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire’s ambitions to support jobs growth in Southampton and Portsmouth. South Hampshire is heavily car dependent, with 74 percent of all journeys made by car. However, there has been relatively little expansion in capacity to deal with increased usage, and traffic on the M27 now regularly exceeds capacity. Demand is expected to continue to grow, with a 24 percent increase in car journeys by 2036, potentially leading to a rise in levels of congestion. This puts further economic expansion at risk. For example, the North Fareham Strategic Development Area, which is now being progressed by Fareham Borough Council, was originally being put on hold due to the Highway Agency’s concern about the likely impact on the M27.

The railway line between Southampton and Portsmouth serves a number of the employment sites in the area. While usage of Southampton Central and Portsmouth stations has increased over the past five years, rail use across South Hampshire as a whole appears to be underdeveloped. Rail journeys between Southampton and Portsmouth can take between 45 and 60 minutes (and there is no direct rail link during peak hours) meaning that it is often quicker to travel between the two hubs by car. This is reflected in overall rail usage figures – within the PUSH region only four percent of journeys take place via rail.

Congestion and slow rail speeds are likely to impact on the cities’ ability to drive economic growth in the wider area. To better assess the impact of any new developments on the area’s transport infrastructure Transport for South Hampshire, a partnership of the three transport authorities in the South Hampshire area, has now developed a land use transport interaction model. Overall, public transport is likely to play an increasingly important role in accommodating economic growth within South Hampshire.

83. Transport for South Hampshire (2008) Towards Delivery. Transport for South Hampshire Statement Data from 1999-2003 Transport Surveys. Note that this data refers to the PUSH definition of South Hampshire which is smaller than the definition of South Hampshire used here.
84. Email correspondence with Transport for South Hampshire
85. Stakeholder interviews
86. Statistics from Hampshire County Council
87. Transport for South Hampshire (2008) Towards Delivery. Transport for South Hampshire Statement Data from 1999-2003 Transport Surveys. Data from 1999-2003 Transport Surveys. Note that this data refers to the PUSH definition of South Hampshire which is smaller than the definition of South Hampshire used here.
88. These are the unitary authorities of Southampton, Portsmouth and Hampshire County Council. Transport for South Hampshire covers the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire area.
89. Roundtable held by Centre for Cities in Southampton on 23 June 2011
Figure 8a: The geography of employment and deprivation in South Hampshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winner (to Southampton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMD: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density: 0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; NVQ2: 38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train: 14 min F: 3 C: £6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus: 42 min F: 2 C: £6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car: 29 min AT: 1.93 mpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southampton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMD: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density: 0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; NVQ2: 29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train: 28 min F: 3 C: £5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus: 3 hr 3 min F: 3 C: £6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car: 22 min AT: 1.93 mpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romsey (to Southampton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMD: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density: 0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; NVQ2: 23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train: 14 min F: 3 C: £3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus: 42 min F: 2 C: £6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car: 19 min AT: 1.93 mpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastleigh (to Southampton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMD: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density: 0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; NVQ2: 23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train: 14 min F: 3 C: £3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus: 42 min F: 2 C: £6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car: 19 min AT: 1.93 mpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brockenhurst (to Southampton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMD: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density: 0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; NVQ2: 30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train: 1 hr 1 min F: 2 C: £7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus: 26 mins F: 3 C: £8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car: 30 min AT: 1.93 mpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portsmouth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMD: 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density: 0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; NVQ2: 30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train: 1 hr 1 min F: 1 C: £13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus: 1 hr 31 min F: 1 C: £13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car: 27 min AT: 1.93 mpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petersfield (to Portsmouth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMD: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density: 0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; NVQ2: 17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train: 37 min F: 3 C: £7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus: 1 hr 31 min F: 1 C: £13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car: 27 min AT: 1.93 mpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fareham (to Portsmouth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMD: 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density: 0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; NVQ2: 34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train: 19 mins F: 5 C: £4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus: 52 mins F: 6 C: £5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car: 17 min AT: 1.93 mpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Havant (to Portsmouth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMD: 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density: 0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; NVQ2: 35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train: not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus: 1 hr 41 min F: 1 C: £5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car: 25 min AT: 1.93 mpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gosport (to Portsmouth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMD: 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density: 0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; NVQ2: 31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train: not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus: 1 hr 41 min F: 1 C: £5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car: 25 min AT: 1.93 mpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isle of Wight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMD: 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density: 0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; NVQ2: 31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train: not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus: 1 hr 41 min F: 1 C: £5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car: 25 min AT: 1.93 mpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key
- Key urban areas
- Neighbourhoods in most deprived 20%

Employees, 2008
- 5,001 - 10,000
- 10,001 - 15,000
- 15,001 - 30,000
- ≥30,001

Notes: IMD = percentage of LSOAs in top 20% most deprived LSOAs in England (figures in brackets refer to those displayed on map); Job density = number of jobs per working age resident; <NVQ2 = proportion of working age residents qualified below NVQ2; T = journey time; F = frequency (number of services per hour weekdays 8am-9am); C = cost (peak adult return (rail) / day ticket (bus)); AT = average vehicle journey time (miles per min). IMD, Job Density and NVQ figures relate to respective local authority districts.

Figure 8b: The geography of higher and lower skilled employment in South Hampshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower skilled jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher skilled jobs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,001 - 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥10,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Lower skilled jobs refer to level 1 occupations (SIC 4-digit industries classified by average occupational and NVQ levels) and higher skilled jobs refer to level 4 occupations. See Annex for further detail.

Access to employment from economically deprived areas

Pockets of high unemployment and deprivation still exist within the relatively affluent area of South Hampshire. These pockets are mostly contained in or near the area’s city centres and correlate closely with areas with high concentrations of social housing stock in the local authorities.90 There are pockets of high unemployment and deprivation in close proximity to employment sites within the cities of Portsmouth and Southampton, and also in the town centres of Havant and Gosport. As a result, spatial mismatch is evident at a more localised level within the two cities. Within Portsmouth, for example, some residents living in the northern parts of the district struggle to access jobs in the commercial and retail area in the south.91 Lower skilled individuals living in the two cities are likely to find it more difficult to access jobs as employment disperses out of the city centres.

Deprived communities in Havant and Gosport are more isolated from job opportunities making good transport links an important factor in employment accessibility. Havant and Gosport both have major employment sites located within their boundaries but overall have fewer jobs than people across the skills spectrum.92 Gosport also has the lowest job density within the wider area. The number of working age residents is more than double the number of jobs located in the district.93 The recent designation of the former HMS Daedalus site in Gosport as an Enterprise Zone should help increase labour market demand.94 Residents living in Gosport and Havant are therefore currently more dependent on job opportunities created elsewhere in the South Hampshire area, particularly Portsmouth and Fareham. As a result, good transport links are more important for deprived communities in Havant and Gosport in accessing employment opportunities than for deprived communities within Portsmouth and Southampton. A Bus Rapid Transit scheme is currently being built to improve access to jobs in Fareham from Gosport and there are plans to expand the system to cover, amongst other places, Havant and Portsmouth.95

Overall, the current fragmented public transport network is likely to pose a considerable hindrance to low-income people who are less likely to have access to a car in accessing work. There are at least six different bus operators covering South Hampshire in addition to operators across other modes of transport, including ferries, and there is a lack of integration between them. There are currently no cross-operator single or return tickets available to commuters covering all modes of transport,96 meaning users need to purchase multiple tickets for a single journey, increasing cost and perceived inconvenience. Transport for South Hampshire aims to address this and is currently working with the South Hampshire Bus Operator Association on a full business case for £18 million Department for Transport funding

90. Own analysis using CLG, Live Table 100, Dwelling stock: Number of dwellings by tenure and district, England, 2010 data
91. Stakeholder interview
92. For further information on this analysis of “job balances” please see: Tochtermann L & Clayton N (2011) Moving on up, moving on out? Overcoming the jobs-skills mismatch. London: Centre for Cities
93. NOMIS 2011, Job density, 2009 data
94. The News (17 August 2011) “Gosport’s HMS Daedalus site to become an Enterprise Zone”
95. For further information on the Bus Rapid Transit Scheme see www3.hants.gov.uk/ftsh/bus-rapid-transit/brt-overview.htm
96. Note that a recent exception to this is the combined Gosport Ferry and First ticket, which can be used along a number of routes. See: www.gosportferry.co.uk In addition to this the “Solent Travel Card” exists, which is a daily bus travel card, covering the area covered by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire. At £7.00 for a daily ticket the card if however much more costly than comparable daily tickets by single operators. See: www.solent-travelcard.org.uk
from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund to develop inter-operator smart-card tickets for buses and ferries in the area. There are plans to later extend these to rail travel. There is also a lack of information about transport inter-linkages. One of the bus operators in the area, for example, has a total of four different network maps covering the area. Lack of integration can make public transport costly and difficult to use – decreasing individuals’ willingness to travel and ability to access to work.

Across South Hampshire journey times by bus are often not competitive in comparison to car and, to a lesser extent, rail travel, further reducing the already low travel-to-work horizons of those at the lower end of the labour market. The difference between bus and car journey times in parts of South Hampshire can be significant. The eight mile bus journey from Havant to the neighbouring employment centre Portsmouth, for example, takes around 52 minutes by bus but just 17 minutes by car and 19 minutes by rail. Low levels of integration mean journeys involving cross-operator bus travel or travel across different modes of transport can take longer, further reducing individual job search areas. For example, the ten mile journey by bus from Havant to nearby employment sites in Fareham (overall a net importer of labour) takes just over an hour and involves changing between bus services run by different operators. The same journey takes 16 minutes by car or rail.

The fact that bus travel can be lengthy, complicated and inconvenient is reflected in usage of the bus network, which has declined in recent years in both Southampton and Portsmouth. Considerable spare capacity can be found on existing routes into Portsmouth in East South Hampshire. Bus services are also more limited outside normal working hours (9am to 5pm), which may be a particular issue in certain parts of South Hampshire where employees work shifts. Given the dispersed nature of employment in South Hampshire and the relatively low travel horizons of those on lower incomes, better integrating public transport and reducing travel times will be key in overcoming spatial mismatches and helping facilitate job access.

Affordability of public transport services is also likely to be an issue for many living in the more deprived parts of South Hampshire. In Havant a monthly bus pass covering employment sites within Havant and in nearby Portsmouth and Fareham equates to 16 percent of average monthly earnings amongst workers in the lowest wage bracket (10th percentile full-time and part-time earnings). This compares to 10 percent in London and just 7 percent in Southampton.

Policy recommendations

In South Hampshire the most important role of transport is linking people to existing concentrations of employment and overcoming spatial mismatches between the location of jobs and residents. Transport also has a role to play in widening spatial horizons, particularly in deprived communities in Gosport and Havant.

97. Email correspondence Transport for South Hampshire
98. Travel times were extracted from Google maps, www.nationalrail.co.uk and www.traveline.info
99. Change in bus trips per head between 2004 and 2009 (own calculation). Data from NOMIS 2011, Mid year population estimates and Department for Transport 2011, National Indicator 177, 2004/05 to 2008/09 data
101. www.traveline.info; bus operator websites; NOMIS 2011, Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, residents analysis, 2010 data
Overcoming spatial mismatches and linking people to existing employment opportunities:

- Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH) should work with local authorities and the Department for Transport to secure funding for the next phases of the planned Bus Rapid Transit Scheme and ensure the scheme is being prioritised in local funding allocations. It is essential that the scheme serves key employment sites along the M27 motorway as it is being implemented.

- TfSH should work with local public transport operators to integrate the provision of public transport services in a way that reduces travel times. This could include offering operators the provision of dedicated bus lanes as an incentive to better integrate services.

- Network Rail should work with TfSH to re-examine the potential for increasing speeds on the rail line between Southampton and Portsmouth. This could include the construction of additional track to allow for overtaking on the existing line or faster non-stop morning commuter services to selected centres of employment.102

Widening the spatial horizons of people living in the most deprived parts of South Hampshire:

- TfSH should examine the possibility of reduced tickets – particularly for the new Bus Rapid Transit scheme – for jobseekers and those at the lower end of the labour market, working with Work Programme providers and Jobcentre Plus in the area.

- TfSH should work with the South Hampshire Bus Operator Association to ensure its plans for cross-modal ticket integration through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund bid lead to overall reduced travel costs.

- Public transport operators in the area should produce integrated network maps and advertise jointly. Local authorities within the area can support such soft integration – for example by including integrated network maps in correspondence with local residents giving operators free-of-charge marketing opportunities.

In addition to this transport has a role to play in supporting the continued economic growth of Southampton and Portsmouth:

- TfSH should work with the Highways Agency and local transport operators to develop innovative solutions that help reduce congestion along the M27 corridor, including better utilisation of the local rail network and the extension of the Bus Rapid Transit scheme as set out above.

- Together with Network Rail and the Highways Agency, TfSH should also closely monitor congestion and crowding on the M3 and A3 and rail links into London to ensure the area’s good connectivity to London is maintained over the longer term.

102. Note that this may have adverse effects on the speed of other services.
Greater Manchester has good links to the south and London through the West Coast Mainline and M6 motorway and east-west to Liverpool and Leeds via the M62. Levels of spatial mismatch in Greater Manchester exist between areas of employment growth in the core and south of the city region and the more isolated population settlements, predominantly in the north of the city region. Transport policy within the area needs to support the continued growth of Greater Manchester’s economy in order to create more job opportunities, at the same time ensuring job opportunities are accessible from the city region’s more isolated neighbourhoods.

Economic overview

Greater Manchester is a key economic hub for the North and has experienced strong growth over the last decade. It is now a key location for productive, innovative businesses in the North. Economic productivity is higher than neighbouring areas, such as Leeds or Sheffield, yet below the national average and that of the two southern case study areas.

Greater Manchester is a mono-centric city region with the majority of jobs concentrated in the core of the city region (see Figure 9a). The core spans Manchester city centre, the Oxford Road Corridor and neighbouring areas of Salford and Trafford including Salford Quays and MediaCityUK, and Trafford Park. Manchester local authority alone accounted for 27 percent of jobs in the city region in 2009, rising to 47 percent when Trafford and Salford are included. Jobs requiring higher level skills are predominantly concentrated in the core and south of the city region reflecting its economic strength and ability to attract high value businesses (see Figure 9b). As a result, the core employment centre has a strong commuter draw from across the city region and beyond. The dominance of the core looks set to continue with future employment and housing growth focused in the core, as well as in the south of Greater Manchester.

There are also a number of smaller employment centres dispersed orbitally around the core of the city region. These include: town centres like Bolton and Stockport; out-of-town locations like the Kingsway Business Park in Rochdale; Middlebrook in Bolton; Ashton Moss in Tameside; and Wigan South Central. The airport is another significant employer offering around 19,000 jobs in the south of Manchester local authority. Airport City, an Enterprise Zone, will be located adjacent to the airport and is forecast to create around 7,000 jobs. While lower skilled jobs can also be found in the core of the city region, they are generally more dispersed than higher skilled jobs and can be found in these smaller employment centres spread across Greater Manchester’s peripheral local authorities (see Figure 9b).

103. Greater Manchester comprises the ten local authorities of Bolton, Bury, Oldham, Rochdale, Trafford, Tameside, Stockport, Salford, Manchester and Wigan
104. Greater Manchester is defined here as a monocentric city region because travel-to-work flows are predominantly into the core from surrounding areas due to its role as the main employment centre. Source: Northern Way (2009) City Relationships: Economic linkages in Northern city regions. Manchester City Region. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Northern Way. Smaller concentrations of jobs can be found elsewhere in the city region (in the key town centres, for instance) and this has led Greater Manchester to be classified elsewhere as a polycentric city region.
105. NOMIS, Business Register and Employment Survey (BRES) 2009
106. See www.manchesterairport.co.uk/manweb.nsf/Content/Facts-OnePageAtAGlance
107. See www.manchesterairport.co.uk/manweb.nsf/Content/airportcitystart
The Greater Manchester Combined Authority is currently preparing a spatial framework for the city region. This will provide a set of clear spatial priorities focusing on areas like the economy, infrastructure, housing and climate change to underpin the Greater Manchester Strategy which is the city region’s economic strategy.108

Transport and economic growth

Greater Manchester has an extensive public transport network which facilitates movements into the core of the city region and supports labour market flexibility. One million commuting trips are made every weekday morning within Greater Manchester and the majority of movements are into the Manchester local authority area.109 These are facilitated by the extensive rail, Metrolink, road and bus networks. The Metrolink is currently undergoing significant expansion and will link Manchester city centre with Oldham and Rochdale, Ashton-under-Lyne, East Didsbury and the airport increasing passenger numbers from 55,000 per day to 90,000.110

Future economic growth may be hindered by internal connectivity issues including congestion and over-crowding on the public transport network.

Although the number of morning peak commutes by car into the city centre fell by 15 percent over the last decade, road miles on motorways have increased and congestion has become a problem on some motorways, key radials into the city centre and on the inner ring road.111 This could negatively impact on economic growth: a study in 2008 found that, over the next 15 years, one in seven potential new jobs in Greater Manchester would be at risk if congestion was not tackled.112

With regards to other modes of transport, positively 70 percent of morning peak commutes into the city centre are made by public transport, walking or cycling. There is however limited spare public transport capacity into Manchester city centre. The rail network for instance, because of its popularity, suffers from overcrowding and there is limited spare capacity on a number of routes.113

Given that employment in the core is forecast to increase by 50,000 over the next 10 years leading to 30 percent more inbound trips each day,114 the need to create additional capacity on Greater Manchester’s transport network is clear. Positively, the extension of the Metrolink will deliver additional capacity on the public transport network and help ease congestion by taking an estimated five million car journeys off the road each year.115

Excellent external connectivity will support future economic growth in Greater Manchester because it increases businesses access to markets

---

108. See www.agma.gov.uk/commissions1/planning_housing_commission/our-work/investment-and-spatial-planning-framework/
109. In addition, 140,000 commuting trips are made into the city region and 100,000 trips out of the city region. Source: GMCA & Transport for Greater Manchester (2011) Greater Manchester’s Third Local Transport Plan 2011/12 – 2015/16 (LTP3)
110. An additional line running to Port Salford from Pomona and a second city crossing are planned subject to funding and approval. Source: Commission for the New Economy (2011) Greater Manchester Local Economic Assessment Place. See www.neweconomymanchester.com/stories/1424
111. In 2009/10 the average person journey time in Greater Manchester was 4 minutes 45 seconds per mile compared to the average for England’s ten largest urban areas of 3 minutes 57 seconds (Source: Department for Transport).
113. Transport for Greater Manchester (2011) Greater Manchester’s Third Local Transport Plan 2011/12 – 2015/16 (LTP3)
114. LTP3
115. LTP3
and supply chains and widens the pool of highly skilled labour they can draw on. Currently, around 140,000 people commute into the city region from elsewhere each weekday morning.\textsuperscript{116} This means firms in Greater Manchester can access talent from a wider pool of labour that includes Macclesfield (now part of the new unitary authority, Cheshire East) in the south and Warrington in the west – ultimately making them more competitive.\textsuperscript{117}

Yet Manchester’s motorway links with other city regions can suffer from congestion. The latest congestion data from the Department for Transport, for example, shows that junctions six to 12 on the M62 which links Greater Manchester and Liverpool had the 29\textsuperscript{th} highest total delay in minutes out of 190 national routes.\textsuperscript{118} In addition to this, journey times by rail are also relatively slow from nearby cities like Leeds and Liverpool and spare capacity can be an issue. For example it takes an hour to travel the 44 miles from Manchester city centre to Leeds and around three quarters of an hour to travel the 34 miles to Liverpool although the electrification of the Manchester-Liverpool line will reduce journey times between these two destinations.\textsuperscript{119}

The proposals around the Northern Hub aim to improve inter-city connectivity in the north increasing rail speed and frequency on routes between places like Manchester, Leeds and Liverpool. The Northern Hub also has the potential to improve rail connectivity within Greater Manchester – helping those living in the north of the conurbation access employment opportunities in the core and south of the city region. An assessment by KPMG estimates that the Northern Hub package could generate around £2.1 billion of GVA (Gross Value Added) across the north in 2021 and create up to 23,000 jobs.\textsuperscript{120}

Compared to current journey times to Leeds and Liverpool, the journey time by rail from Manchester to London is much quicker – it takes only about two hours to travel the 200 miles to the capital.\textsuperscript{121} The proposed high-speed rail link will reduce journey times even further, strengthening Manchester’s economic competitiveness.

Access to employment from economically deprived areas

Areas of worklessness and low employment density are primarily concentrated in the north of Greater Manchester. Deprivation is relatively high in the neighbourhoods immediately surrounding Oldham, Rochdale, Bolton and Ashton-under-Lyne (Tameside) and Wigan. All of these areas have struggled to restructure following the decline of the cotton, textile and mining industries. At least 30 percent of neighbourhoods within these areas now fall into the 20 percent most deprived neighbourhoods in England.\textsuperscript{122}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{116} GMCA & Transport for Greater Manchester (2011) Greater Manchester’s Third Local Transport Plan 2011/12 - 2015/16 (LTP3)
  \item \textsuperscript{117} Census 2001, own analysis
  \item \textsuperscript{118} Department for Transport, March 2011 data
  \item \textsuperscript{119} National Rail and AA Route Planner. Electrification of routes from Huyton to Wigan and Manchester to Blackpool via Preston has also been announced.
  \item \textsuperscript{120} Greater Manchester Integrated Transport Authority Report for Resolution (19 March 2010); Network Rail (2010) The Northern Hub: Transforming rail in the North, Network Rail: London
  \item \textsuperscript{121} AA Route Planner and National Rail
  \item \textsuperscript{122} CLG Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2010, own analysis. Neighbourhoods refer to Lower Layer Super Output Areas (LSOA). Please note, Figures 9a and 9b only include LSOAs in the top 10 percent most deprived LSOAs for presentation reasons.
\end{itemize}
Figure 9a: The geography of employment and deprivation in Greater Manchester
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Notes: IMD = percentage of LSOAs in top 20% most deprived LSOAs in England (figures in brackets refer to those displayed on map); Job density = number of jobs per working age residents; < NVQ2 = proportion of working age residents qualified below NVQ2; T = journey time; F = frequency (number of services per hour weekdays 8am-9pm); C = cost (peak adult return rail) / (day ticket (bus)); AT = average vehicle journey time (miles per min); IMD, Job Density and NVD figures relate to respective local authority districts.

Figure 9b: The geography of higher and lower skilled employment in Greater Manchester
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Notes: Lower skilled jobs refers to level 1 occupations (SIC 4-digit industries classified by average occupational and NVD levels) and higher skilled jobs refer to level 4 occupations. See Annex for further detail.

The employment-rich local authorities of Manchester and Salford also contain pockets of high deprivation and worklessness. Yet these areas are relatively close to job opportunities in the core.\textsuperscript{123} Factors other than transport are therefore likely to be more immediate barriers to access to work (see Figure 2). Given this, our focus in this case study is on the role of transport in improving access to employment from the five relatively deprived northern local authorities above.

**Towns in the north of Greater Manchester are, and are likely to continue to be, relatively isolated from employment opportunities in the core and south of the city region.** Future economic growth in Greater Manchester is set to concentrate in the core and south of the city region, further strengthening these areas’ role as employment centres for the city region. At the same time it is predicted that the five relatively deprived northern local authorities will take comparatively longer to recover from recession. Peak pre-recession employment levels will not be reached until 2020 in Bolton, 2028 in Wigan and at least 2032 in Oldham, Rochdale and Tameside.\textsuperscript{124} Given this, ensuring access to employment opportunities in the core of the city region is paramount.\textsuperscript{125} Transport has an important role to play in this.

**Travelling by bus is the most affordable mode of transport for those on a low income.** Greater Manchester has an extensive bus network which offers services into the core from surrounding towns. In terms of affordability, it costs £4.20 to travel by bus from Rochdale into Manchester city centre and the 15 mile journey takes about an hour. The equivalent journey by train is quicker at 22 minutes but slightly more costly at £6.70. Metrolink tickets are also more costly than the bus – to travel from Altrincham (Trafford) to Manchester city centre (nine miles) costs £5.60 on the Metrolink compared to £3.90 on the bus.\textsuperscript{126}

Some towns in Greater Manchester’s northern local authorities are less well connected to job opportunities in the core and south of the city region. Greater Manchester’s high population density means that public transport provision is relatively good compared to our other three case study areas, however some towns are relatively isolated. Wigan’s second major town of Leigh, for example, despite being a large residential area has no major railway or motorway connections. To reach job opportunities in the city centre by public transport involves a bus ride to Atherton (north of Leigh towards Bolton) and then a train journey to the city centre taking 50 minutes to an hour.\textsuperscript{127} The journey time by car is quicker at just under half an hour (albeit congestion means that in reality this journey may take longer).\textsuperscript{128} The Manchester Independent Economic Review (MIER) also found that Oldham and Rochdale suffer from a restricted local transport offer into the core.\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{123} Although Wythenshawe, a relatively deprived neighbourhood in the very south of Greater Manchester, is distant from the core it is relatively close to employment opportunities at Manchester Airport and in the south of the city region.

\textsuperscript{124} Commission for the New Economy (2011) Greater Manchester Local Economic Assessment: Introduction and Context

\textsuperscript{125} While Greater Manchester is a key provider of employment opportunities, some local authorities also look outside of the city region. Wigan, for example, also looks to Warrington.

\textsuperscript{126} Bus tickets are adult day tickets. Train and Metrolink tickets are adult peak returns. Source: Traveline, AA Route Planner, Metrolink, National Rail, First Group and Arriva North West.

\textsuperscript{127} Traveline

\textsuperscript{128} AA Route Planner. Average journey time on locally managed A roads (weekday morning peak time) in Wigan and Manchester local authorities was 3.1 and 3.9 minutes per mile respectively, higher than the England average (2.5 minutes per mile). Source: Department for Transport, quarter ending February 2011.

\textsuperscript{129} MIER (2009) Sustainable Communities
The construction of a Leigh-Salford-Manchester guided busway and the extension of the Metrolink to Oldham, Rochdale and Ashton-under-Lyne will change this and provide better access to employment across the city region. However, although quick, the Metrolink is likely to be more expensive than the bus.\textsuperscript{130} This could create challenges for those at the lower end of the labour market on lower wages living in the north of the conurbation, who are already facing higher prices for bus services than those living in the south. Approaches like those adopted by the Future Jobs Fund and the Woodhouse Park project where discounts on travel tickets were offered to clients attending employment or interviews could help address affordability issues.\textsuperscript{131}

More widely, travel times into the core, and particularly the city centre, by bus from some town centres are lengthy compared to other modes of public transport. It takes around an hour, for instance, to reach the city centre by bus from Bolton and Rochdale. Longer journey times by bus may be due in part to high levels of congestion in Greater Manchester. The average peak weekday vehicle journey time on key routes in Greater Manchester in 2009/10 was four minutes 15 seconds per mile compared to an average of three minutes 25 seconds across 10 urban areas.\textsuperscript{132} Greater Manchester’s Quality Bus Corridors (QBC) programme has helped to tackle this by delivering improvements like priority bus lanes on key strategic routes across the conurbation aiming to reduce journey times and ultimately increase bus patronage.\textsuperscript{133}

Accessibility by public transport to job opportunities within the core to the west of Manchester city centre in Trafford and Salford is relatively limited. The Local Transport Plan 3 highlights the lack of orbital public transport links north-south providing a direct service to job opportunities at places like MediaCityUK and Salford Quays. Bus services to places like Trafford Park where jobs are relatively dispersed are also noted as either lengthy or infrequent and users can face difficulties even when using multiple modes of transport. To reach Trafford Park from Ashton-under-Lyne for example would take over an hour by bus alone and just under an hour when travelling by train, Metrolink and bus.\textsuperscript{134} The recently announced higher frequency bus link between Manchester city centre and Trafford Park will help improve connectivity to job opportunities in this area.\textsuperscript{135} Transport links within Trafford Park itself are also underdeveloped, although proposals to extend the Metrolink to Port Salford through Trafford Park would help address this. Metroshuttle buses which transport people around Manchester city centre and Bolton and Stockport town centres could be another option to help improve connectivity within Trafford Park.\textsuperscript{136}

\textbf{Although Greater Manchester has a relatively good public transport system, provision is somewhat fragmented:} there are three main modes of public transport each offering different combinations of routes which are provided by multiple operators.

\textsuperscript{130} An adult day bus ticket allowing travel from Bury to Manchester city centre costs £4.20 whereas a Metrolink peak adult return ticket from Bury to Manchester city centre costs £5.20. Source: Metrolink and First Group. 
\textsuperscript{132} Department for Transport, 2011, Road Congestion Statistics, Table CGNOJ02, 2009/10 data 
\textsuperscript{133} See www.tfgm.com/buses/quality_bus_corridors.cfm 
\textsuperscript{134} Traveline 
\textsuperscript{135} See www.tfgm.com/tfgm_news.cfm?news_id=9007629?submenuheader=3 
\textsuperscript{136} See www.tfgm.com/buses/metroshuttle.cfm
On the bus network the result is that few bus operators run services which cross the city centre. The proposed Cross City Bus package however, will help improve cross city centre bus services by linking three major bus corridors from the north, west and south of the city region to provide a city centre through service.137

This lack of integration of services has implications for the cost of using public transport, impacting disproportionately on jobseekers and those on lower wages. The fact that routes to employment centres which cross through the core of the conurbation are often divided into a number of legs operated by different providers makes travel more inconvenient and has cost implications. Passengers have to buy multiple single tickets from different operators, making travel less affordable.

While Greater Manchester has the System One integrated ticketing system, this is not well suited to the needs of those at the lower end of the labour market. For example an adult peak time daily bus ticket allowing multi-operator travel costs £5.40 – around 22 percent to 31 percent higher than a single operator peak time adult day ticket. In addition to this, no integrated daily tickets including peak travel by rail or Metrolink are available. Weekly or monthly tickets are often unaffordable for those on low wages – and less suitable for individuals working part-time or on temporary contracts. Further, the Metrolink is not fully integrated into System One as travel is limited to the city centre Metrolink network only.138

Transport for Greater Manchester has aspirations to improve System One139 and to introduce a comprehensive public transport smart-ticketing system and a bid has been put forward to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund to support this.140 An agreement has also been reached with most bus operators to move towards three fare bands on most services by 2014.141 Progress towards better integrating existing services will be particularly important in helping increased access to work for those at the lower end of the labour market.

Policy recommendations

In Greater Manchester transport has an important role to play in continuing to support economic growth in the conurbation to provide jobs for not only the city region’s residents but also for those living in other locations. Overcoming spatial mismatches to better link people in the more deprived and isolated northern local authorities with job opportunities in the core and south of the city region is important.143

Continue to support the growth of Greater Manchester as a centre for high value, high skill employment:

- Transport for Greater Manchester should continue to work with Network Rail and the Highways Agency to improve journey times via road and rail to other

137. GMCA & Transport for Greater Manchester (2011) Greater Manchester’s Third Local Transport Plan 2011/12 - 2015/16 (LTP3)
138. www.systemonetravelcards.co.uk/
139. System One (Manchester Travel Cards Limited) is co-owned by Greater Manchester’s private bus, rail and tram operators and Transport for Greater Manchester
141. GMCA & Transport for Greater Manchester (2011) Greater Manchester’s Third Local Transport Plan 2011/12 - 2015/16 (LTP3)
142. These are Bolton, Oldham, Rochdale, Tameside and Wigan
143. TfGM (2011) Local Sustainable Transport Fund – Large Project Bid
city regions like Leeds and Liverpool to support access for business to skilled workers and supply chains.

- The Department for Transport should consider funding the currently unfunded elements of Network Rail’s proposed Northern Hub package of investments to improve Greater Manchester’s external connectivity.

- The Highways Agency should continue to take forward options to increase capacity on key motorways through, for example, their Managed Motorways approach (which utilises techniques like lane-specific signals and driver information signs to control traffic flows) and hard shoulder running.144

Continue linking people to job opportunities in Greater Manchester:

- Accessibility must be a key consideration for the Combined Authority, and in particular the Planning and Housing Commission, when developing the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework, especially if a new framework for assessing employment sites is adopted.145

- When assessing the viability of elements of the Northern Hub not currently funded, the Department for Transport should pay particular attention to improving connectivity between the five more deprived northern local authorities and Greater Manchester’s core. This would mean, for example, prioritising improvements on the Rochdale/Calder Valley line and the Atherton line to Wigan.

- Transport for Greater Manchester should continue to prioritise access by public transport to employment sites in the core including those to the west in Salford and Trafford. This could include: continuing to lobby the Department for Transport and Treasury for funding for the Cross City Bus Corridor and considering the introduction of a Metroshuttle bus to improve connectivity within Trafford Park.

Encourage people to widen their travel horizons and use the relatively good transport network to access jobs in the core:

- Transport for Greater Manchester should work with transport operators to create and offer dedicated travel planning training for contractors and sub-contractors of the recently gone live Work Programme and for Jobcentre Plus staff delivering services to clients, complementing the city region’s Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) bid.

- Transport for Greater Manchester should also work with Work Programme providers and sub-contractors as well as transport operators to assess the feasibility of reduced fares for the unemployed and those at the lower end of the labour market, as set out in the LSTF bid.

- In the short-term, Transport for Greater Manchester should work with the other co-owners of System One146 to improve the affordability of tickets, fully integrate the Metrolink and make sure the system is simple to use.

144. See: www.highways.gov.uk/news/25754.aspx
146. System One (Greater Manchester Travelcards Limited) is co-owned by Greater Manchester’s private bus, rail and tram operators and Transport for Greater Manchester.
In the medium-term, partners should continue to seek to align public transport fares into a set number of bands. Ultimately, in the long-term Transport for Greater Manchester should continue to lead work towards the introduction of a smart-ticketing system which also includes a “top-up” system, supporting low income workers.

• Transport for Greater Manchester should work with bus operators to widen the Quality Bus Corridors programme to continue reducing average journey times in Manchester local authority and decrease bus times from the five relatively deprived northern local authorities into the core.

**Sheffield City Region Case Study**

The Sheffield City Region spans South Yorkshire and northern parts of the East Midlands. It has major road links and is on Midland and East Coast mainlines. The city region is characterised by spatial mismatch between the area’s key employment sites and the area’s relatively dispersed population. Transport policy in the area needs to facilitate continued economic growth and help overcome spatial mismatches. It also needs to widen the horizons of many of the residents living in areas of high deprivation to help them access jobs further afield.

**Economic overview**

**Sheffield City Region’s (SCR) economy has continued to diversify, but still under-performs relative to other city regions.**[^147] The city region – spanning South Yorkshire and northern parts of the East Midlands – is located on the Midland and East Coast mainlines with access to TransPennine services and has major road links to the north, south and east of the city region.[^148] SCR has continued to diversify away from its historic roots as a major centre for coal, steel and manufacturing and over the last ten years has seen above average growth in the service sector and in economic output.

Yet overall the economy lags behind other parts of the country and the private sector was hit particularly hard during the recession. This has led to a significant jobs deficit[^149] across the city region as a whole limiting job opportunities accessible to residents. Supporting the continued economic growth of the city region is a shared priority amongst partners locally and the primary goal of the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy.[^150]

**Sheffield has the highest growth potential within the city region as a hub for high skill, innovative business and attracts a large number of in-commuters.** The city is the largest employment centre in SCR with a concentration of high value, high skill service sectors, including finance and business services (Figure 10a). Doncaster (a major transport hub) and Chesterfield (an administrative centre) are also important sources of employment within the city region, but are smaller and tend to provide lower skill, lower wage jobs in comparison with Sheffield.

---


[^148]: Strategic highway links include: M1, A1, M18 and M180

[^149]: Sheffield City Region has a negative jobs balance – there are fewer jobs than people across the city region as a whole. See Tochtermann L & Clayton N (2011) *Moving on up, moving on out?*, London: Centre for Cities for further details.

[^150]: Sheffield City Region (2011) *Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2011-2026*
In comparison to other UK core cities and our other case studies, however, Sheffield has a less dynamic business base and there is a large amount of vacant and derelict land relative to other cities in England.\(^\text{151}\)

So whilst Sheffield has a net in-flow of workers, the city’s pull is not as strong as Manchester and Leeds and SCR as a whole is a net exporter of labour.

**Spatial pattern of development**

**Across the city region population and employment sites are relatively dispersed – a legacy of area’s economic history.** SCR’s economic history means there are a number of towns (particularly former mining towns) dispersed across the city region. Population density across SCR as whole is significantly lower than in other functional economic areas in the UK, in part a reflection of the rural nature of large areas within the city region.\(^\text{152}\)

On the employment side, there is a trend for high skilled businesses to locate in the major employment centres – in Sheffield city centre in particular. Lower skilled jobs in both the service and production industries in contrast tend to be more dispersed (Figure 10b). These jobs have moved out of the traditional towns and city centres to out-of-town sites (distribution centres, business and manufacturing parks) such as the those located along the M18 in Doncaster or along Manvers Way in the Dearne Valley. As a result travel patterns are increasingly complex and scattered throughout the Sheffield City Region and the city region has been characterised as only weakly mono-centric.\(^\text{152}\)

**Transport and economic growth**

The spatial pattern of development in the Sheffield City Region makes providing public transport that will support the city region’s economy complex. Rail links connect most, but not all, towns and cities within the SCR; a tram system operates within Sheffield (with six park and ride schemes to widen accessibility); and there is an extensive road network. Yet 80 percent of businesses in Sheffield state they have experienced direct negative impacts as a result of deficiencies in the city region’s transport infrastructure.\(^\text{153}\) Across the wider Yorkshire region businesses have stated that current transport provision inhibits inward investment and their own ability to grow.\(^\text{154}\) Businesses are likely to be negatively affected by rising congestion and poor quality public transport links in parts of the city region.

Limited opportunities to increase road capacity means achieving modal shift will be important to avoid congestion. Using average vehicle times as a proxy for congestion Sheffield City Region compares favourably to other Integrated Transport Authority areas, although the total distance travelled by car has risen annually by 10.4 percent compared to eight percent nationally.\(^\text{155}\) If this trend continues this may lead to increased congestion in the city region further reducing

---

151. ONS Neighbourhood Statistics (2011) Vacant and derelict land and buildings per capita
Figure 10a: The geography of employment and deprivation in the Sheffield City Region
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- Train: T: 24 min F: 4 C: £5.60
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Figure 10b: The geography of higher and lower skilled employment in the Sheffield City Region

Key
- Key urban areas
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Notes: IMD = percentage of LSOAs in top 20% most deprived LSOAs in England (figures in brackets refer to those displayed on map); Job density = number of jobs per working age resident; < NVQ2 = proportion of working age residents qualified below NVQ2; T = journey time; F = frequency (number of services per hour weekdays 8am-9pm); C = cost (peak adult return (rail) / day ticket (bus)); AT = average vehicle journey time (miles per min). IMD, Job Density and NVQ figures relate to respective local authority districts.

the accessibility of jobs and businesses access to skilled labour – and limiting the city region’s growth potential. Congestion is likely to be a particular issue in the city of Sheffield as the major employment hub – average journey times by road have increased over the last year and currently stand above the national average.\textsuperscript{156} Increasing use of public transport can help prevent rising levels of congestion, yet at present it only accounts for 13 percent of all commuting trips within SCR.\textsuperscript{157}

The South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE), in addition to a number of existing initiatives, has submitted a bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund for funding to support a range of improvements to public transport services.\textsuperscript{158}

Both internal and external connectivity are critical to the continued growth of Sheffield City Region. Rail travel in the city region has increased but over-crowding is an issue on some lines, particularly those where skilled workers commute into the city centre including the Chesterfield-Dronfield-Sheffield line. Poor punctuality and slow rail journey times – within the city region and to other cities including London and Manchester – result from low line speeds on the Midland Mainline, as well as conflicts between different rail users (freight and express trains for example).\textsuperscript{159} The proposed Northern Hub scheme includes plans to increase the frequency and speed of rail services between Manchester and Sheffield.\textsuperscript{160} Previous evidence has demonstrated that improved TransPennine connectivity is likely to generate benefits to the Northern economy as a whole.\textsuperscript{161}

Access to employment from economically deprived areas

Deprivation in the SCR is more concentrated in the north than south. Towns and villages in the north tend to be more isolated from major employment sites. The largest areas\textsuperscript{162} of economic deprivation within the city region are found in Barnsley local authority (Barnsley Town, Hoyland, Wombwell, Wath, Goldthorpe and Penistone), Rotherham local authority (Maltby and Dinnington) and Doncaster local authority (Muxborough, Thorne and Adwick) in South Yorkshire. High levels of deprivation are also found in Bolsover local authority (Shirebrook), Chesterfield local authority (Staveley) and Bassetlaw local authority (Worksop) in North Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire (see Figure 10a). Many of these areas – ranked as some of the most deprived in the UK – are amongst those most likely to suffer the most severe and longest recessions in the UK.\textsuperscript{163} These areas have low job densities and are relatively isolated from areas of economic opportunity. Improving residents’ access to key employment sites beyond their local area is therefore necessary in order to tackle worklessness, and transport has a key role to play in this.

People living in deprived areas without access to private transport are reliant on a limited bus network. Car ownership is generally low in the most economically deprived parts of the city region. Car access is lowest in Barnsley – one

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{156} Department for Transport (2011) Road Congestion Statistics
\item \textsuperscript{157} South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (2011) Sheffield City Region Transport Plan: Evidence Base
\item \textsuperscript{158} See www.sytp.org.uk/implementation.aspx for further information.
\item \textsuperscript{159} South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (2011) Sheffield City Region Transport Plan: Evidence Base Document 2: Networks
\item \textsuperscript{160} Network Rail (2010) The Northern Hub: Transforming rail in the North, London: Network Rail
\item \textsuperscript{161} Northern Way (2009) TransPennine Connectivity Study, Newcastle-upon-Tyne: The Northern Way
\item \textsuperscript{162} Based on population numbers; NOMIS 2011, Mid-year population estimates, (2011) data
\item \textsuperscript{163} ONS, Labour Force Survey and Claimant Count 2011
\end{itemize}
of the few areas within the UK to have seen an increase in bus patronage over recent years. However, while relatively good bus links exist within Barnsley services are more limited to employment sites elsewhere in the city region. For example, there are only two services per hour to Sheffield and there is only one service per hour to Rotherham and Doncaster. The general frequency of buses serving Barnsley is also low compared to Sheffield: only 13 percent of households are within 400m of a bus stop that is served by more than 10 buses per hour compared to 41 percent in Sheffield.\(^{164}\)

Across the city region as a whole, buses can be unreliable and journey times long: bus journey times are on average two times slower than rail. In addition, bus frequencies are lower where there is no rail link between inter-urban areas.\(^{165}\) In general there is a greater level of satisfaction with tram and train services compared to the bus.\(^{166}\) South Yorkshire partners are in the process of submitting a bid to the Department for Transport for a Bus Rapid Transit scheme from Rotherham to Sheffield.\(^{167}\) The scheme will potentially help overcome the divides created by the M1 within Rotherham local authority and better connect people more economically deprived areas to employment opportunities.

Many public transport services are not commercially viable given the dispersed pattern of homes and employment sites within the Sheffield City Region. Access to employment opportunities within the Dearne Valley from surrounding towns via public transport is limited due to the dispersal of sites along major strategic roads. Many workers in the Dearne Valley are forced to travel by car because of shift work in the Dearne Valley and the timetabling of public transport services.\(^{168}\) In response the Manvers Shuttle opened in 2000 funded through Objective One and local employers and colleges offering more frequent, subsidised travel to employees and students.\(^{169}\) More recently, there has been a reduction in service frequency by some operators, and services have been withdrawn on the Barnsley-Deanne-Doncaster, Doncaster-Worksop and Sheffield-Matlock corridors.\(^{170}\) As a result, the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE) supported services currently comprise 22 percent of the public transport network in the SCR.\(^{171}\) This level of support will be increasingly difficult to maintain as reductions to funding are made – potentially making these dispersed employment sites even less accessible to workers and job seekers.

Coupled with a reduction in services there has been a substantial increase in the cost of bus services in SCR. There has been a 143 percent increase in bus fares between 1996/97 and 2009/10 in SCR.\(^{172}\) By way of comparison, average workplace earnings in the lowest wage group in Sheffield have increased by 57.6 percent.\(^{173}\)

---

\(^{164}\) South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (2011) Sheffield City Region Transport Plan 2011-2026: Evidence Base: Networks
\(^{165}\) South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (2011) Sheffield City Region Transport Plan: Evidence Base Document 2: Networks
\(^{166}\) South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (2011) Sheffield City Region Transport Plan: Evidence Base Document 6: Enhancing Social Inclusion and Health
\(^{167}\) Further information available at www.sy-busrapidtransit.co.uk/default.asp?pageid=1&groupid=1
\(^{168}\) Jones P & Paskins J (2008) Identifying the Accessibility Problems of Disadvantaged Groups & Generating Solutions, Centre for Transport Studies, UCL
\(^{169}\) See PTEG (2005) Public transport and social inclusion: a good practice guide for further information
\(^{170}\) SYPTE (2011) South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan
\(^{171}\) SYPTE (2011) South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan
\(^{172}\) South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (2011) Sheffield City Region Transport Plan 2011-2026: Evidence Base: Networks
\(^{173}\) Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (2011) 10th Percentile Average Weekly Workplace Earnings
Bus fares increased disproportionately as a result of deregulation nationally – at the same time the number of bus services decreased. There has been a shift from bus to rail use as the price gap between the two modes narrows.

While buses remain an important mode of transport for people on lower incomes, a number of the city region’s more deprived towns are served by rail links originally built due to the bulk freight requirements of the coal and steel industries within the SCR. There are 45 stations within SCR linking many of the towns together. While there is overcrowding on lines serving areas in the south of the city region, rail services in the north are often under-utilised. This could be partly explained by the price comparison of rail to bus fares in areas of high unemployment and low average wages: a single rail journey from Barnsley to Sheffield costs £5.40 at peak times, whereas the same journey by bus would cost a maximum of £2.65.

There are also gaps in the rail service: Rotherham station is not on the main line between Leeds and Sheffield, Bolsover has no rail link and the Barnsley-Doncaster line has closed. Other smaller towns, such as Maltby and Dinnington in Rotherham local authority, are not linked by rail.

Perceived value for money on both train and bus services is low, with around 40 to 50 percent of people satisfied with value for money. Very few people take advantage of the cost savings that can be achieved through lower priced season tickets with the majority of people buying single or return tickets. Cross operator and area tickets are also unaffordable for many people on lower incomes. The SYPTE plan to continue to develop flexible integrated multi-modal ticketing alongside the “Yorcard” smart ticketing system for West and South Yorkshire which should make travel more affordable in future.

Less than 50 percent of people in the majority of districts are very or fairly satisfied with the level of public transport information. With only five percent of people using the internet to access information, and a strong reliance on printed material, access to up-to-date comprehensive travel information continues to be an issue for many people within the SCR. Lack of transport information is likely to impact on individual’s job search areas. Widening the travel horizons of job seekers is likely to be particularly important in areas where traditionally workers could walk to work.

Policy recommendations

Transport policy in the Sheffield City Region needs to facilitate continued economic growth and help connect people to jobs. It also needs to widen the horizons of many of the residents living in areas of high deprivation to help them access jobs further afield. Local transport authorities are actively seeking to improve transport provision and increase usage within the city region but recognise the need to work across policy areas to ensure employment is more sustainable over longer term. As such, they are actively seeking to influence land-use planning processes to ensure future development sites are accessible.

175. South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (2011) *Sheffield City Region Transport Plan: Evidence Base Document 6: Enhancing Social Inclusion and Health*
177. Sheffield City Region (2011) *Sheffield City Region Local Transport Strategy 2011-26*
Supporting Sheffield to realise its economic potential and drive growth in the wider city region:

- South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE) should work with Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils, as well as national agencies, to address congestion and over-capacity on services from the south to ensure businesses based in Sheffield can access high skilled labour. This should include working with rail operators to increase the frequency of services on the Chesterfield-Dronfield-Sheffield corridor.

- SYPTE, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils should continue working with Network Rail and rail operators to improve the City Region’s external connectivity. Partners should continue to press for improvements to existing rail routes, through the Northern Hub proposals and the electrification of the Midland Mainline.

Linking people up to key employment sites within the Sheffield City Region:

- The South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan partnership should continue to develop and implement plans on the Bus Rapid Transit schemes to improve the speed of bus connections between major employment and population sites.

- SYPTE should work with rail operators to investigate solutions to address the under-utilisation of rail services in the north of the city region.

- Local transport authorities in SCR should continue to investigate potential funding mechanisms for less commercially viable routes, working with operators, employers and public sector institutions, to ensure the public transport system effectively connects people to employment sites.

- Local transport authorities in SCR should consider introducing bus quality contracts in order to better integrate the existing public transport system.

Widening spatial horizons of people living in areas of high deprivation and inter-generational workless:

- Local transport authorities in SCR should continue to work with rail and bus operators to address the affordability of all modes of transport for low income individuals, either through further ticket integration or alternative forms of subsidisation. On the latter, the SYPTE should also work with local Work Programme providers, other employment support providers and major employers to investigate how their funding support can deliver mutually beneficial outcomes.

- Public transport operators in the area should produce comprehensive travel maps and make them available at major transport interchanges and other key public sites. Coverage should extend beyond South Yorkshire to include all areas within the city region.

178. The South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Partnership comprises the South Yorkshire local authorities and the South Yorkshire PTE.
• Local transport authorities in SCR should work with employment support providers to deliver personal support including travel planning and travel assistance to widen the travel horizons of residents in some of the most deprived parts of the city region.

Characterisation of employment accessibility

Economic histories and land use policies have led to varying degrees of spatial mismatch across each of the four case study areas impacting on individuals’ physical access to employment opportunities. The variation in the economic performance – and consequent demand for labour – in each of the case study areas also impacts on individuals’ ability to access employment. As discussed in Section 2, transport has a role to play in both linking people to jobs (either those nearby or those further afield) and in enabling economic growth. These two roles are intrinsically linked.

Figure 11 summarises employment accessibility in each of the four case study areas according to its relative economic performance and the level of spatial mismatch within the area. It highlights that there are four different types of city region: strong economic areas with little spatial mismatch (Type 1); strong economic areas with spatial mismatch (Type 2); weak economic areas with little spatial mismatch (Type 3); and weak economic areas with spatial mismatch (Type 4). The role of transport in each of these four types of areas as well as the viability of solutions varies. The characteristics of each of the four types of areas and the role transport plays within these areas in facilitating access to jobs is summarised below.

Figure 11: Characterisation of employment accessibility in the four case study areas (stylised representation of relative ranking)

Source: Own representation

“Economic histories and land use policies have led to varying degrees of spatial mismatch across each of the four case study areas”
**Type 1: Less dispersed, stronger economic areas**

Type 1 city regions are characterised as relatively strong economies with little spatial mismatch. The role of transport in these areas is primarily to support further economic growth. This means improving external connectivity and access to supply chains and markets, facilitating future city expansion and strengthening access to skilled labour. (For a more detailed list of possible transport policy interventions in these areas see Role 1: Transport as an enabler of economic growth in Figure 6).

Amongst our four case study areas the wider Milton Keynes area is an example of a Type 1 city region. Due to its relatively strong economic base and comparatively low levels of spatial mismatch, employment accessibility in the area is comparatively high – and levels of deprivation and worklessness are lower. This is partly due to the fact that Milton Keynes is a “New Town” meaning it was designed as a relatively self-contained city and does not have to contend with the same legacy issues that some older cities still struggle with.

As with all cities well positioned to drive the private sector recovery, transport infrastructure in the wider Milton Keynes area will need to expand and develop in ways that support the effective functioning of labour markets, business networks and supply chains. Economic expansion will lead to increased levels of traffic and the challenge will be to ensure growth is not hindered by rising levels of congestion. More localised levels of spatial mismatch, such as the reduced employment access from the estates within Milton Keynes, also need to be addressed. Ensuring residents can access affordable, reliable transport is important here.

Other examples of Type 1 areas may include Warrington and Crawley, both also former New Towns.

**Type 2: Dispersed, stronger economic areas**

Type 2 city regions are characterised as relatively strong economies with more dispersed development. Transport’s role within these areas is primarily about linking people to existing centres of employment. This means improving the internal connectivity of the area, better integration of existing transport services, as well as plugging gaps in service provision. (For a more detailed list of possible transport policy interventions in these areas see Role 2: Transport as a link to existing employment opportunities in Figure 6).

Amongst our four case study areas South Hampshire is an example of a Type 2 city region. It has a relatively strong economic base, yet spatial mismatch is significantly more pronounced in comparison to Milton Keynes. Part of this is due to the area’s economic history and the planning policies pursued over past decades, leading to the emergence of many out-of-town centres of employment.

In South Hampshire transport policies ensuring residents have good access to existing employment opportunities therefore need to take precedent. Improving public transport speeds and frequencies (on bus and rail), as well as integrating
tickets, is likely to have a positive impact. At the same time, coordination across planning and transport policies to ensure future employment sites are easily accessible will be crucial if levels of spatial mismatch are to be reduced and future employment growth is to be sustainable. The “Cities First” policy pursued by partners in South Hampshire represents a start in making jobs more accessible, especially for those without car access. It will need to be complemented by the expansion of public transport to existing out-of-town employment sites, for example through further stages of the area’s planned Bus Rapid Transit scheme.

Other examples of Type 2 city regions may include Cambridge.

**Type 3: Less dispersed, weaker economic areas**

Type 3 city regions are characterised as comparatively weak economies with little spatial mismatch. Transport’s role within such areas over the short term is primarily about widening individuals’ spatial horizons, helping them access jobs further afield. This means improving external connectivity through better public transport integration, cost reductions and personal travel support. (For a more detailed list of possible transport policy interventions in these areas see Role 3 in Figure 6).

None of the case studies presented in this report can be characterised as having both low levels of spatial mismatch and weak economies. Extended analysis would potentially lead to the characterisation of some of the UK’s other “New Towns” within this third group, however. Levels of spatial mismatch are likely to be lower in general with these areas as New Town policy specifically sought to integrate communities and employment. Telford may potentially fall into the third category as a New Town with a relatively weak economy leading to low labour market demand and high levels of worklessness.

In the short term, transport policy in these areas needs to focus on connecting residents to employment opportunities further afield, either by improving physical connections or by widening spatial horizons. Over the medium to longer term initiatives across other policy areas, particularly focused on skills development, will be important. Less than a quarter of residents in Telford have degree level qualifications compared to the national average of 31 percent.

In addition, the car-based development of these areas may become problematic in terms of affordability as fuel prices rise over the longer term. This means a focus on transport’s potential to support economic growth needs to be pursued in parallel to helping residents access job opportunities elsewhere.

Another example of a type 3 city may include Hastings.

---

180. NOMIS, 2011, Annual Population Survey residents analysis, 2010
Type 4: Dispersed, weaker economic areas

Type 4 city regions are characterised as comparatively weak economies with higher levels of spatial mismatch. Transport’s role within such areas is threefold. It needs to enable further economic growth (where this is realistic), help link residents to existing concentrations of employment and also widen individuals’ horizons to help them access jobs further afield. Essentially, policy makers will need to identify policies that cut across all three of transport’s roles identified in Section 2 and prioritise which of these roles are more important within their area.

Amongst our four case study areas two areas fall within the Type 4 category. Both Greater Manchester and the Sheffield City Region can be characterised as having higher levels of spatial mismatch and underperforming economies – although to varying degrees. Spatial patterns within these areas can be attributed to the areas’ economic history and development through the industrial era.

Transport policies in both city regions need to prioritise firms’ accessibility of skilled labour and supply chains in order to attract new businesses and to enable indigenous businesses to grow. This means continuing to improve external connectivity, as well as managing levels of congestion. As Manchester and Sheffield grow and continue to dominate within their city regions as employment centres, improving access to them from areas in the wider city regions, particularly more economically deprived areas, is crucial in order to avoid rising levels of inequality. Widening spatial horizons will be more critical in some areas than in others in order to improve individuals’ access to employment, particularly those areas with a history in the traditional industries where workers could walk to work. In such areas, transport initiatives aimed at increasing employment accessibility are unlikely to be sufficient without the up-skilling of individuals.

Where possible, areas such as Greater Manchester and the Sheffield City Region, should ensure that new developments and relocations take place in areas accessible by public transport. This is likely to lead to stronger employment sustainability over the longer term. Whilst transport has a key role to play in connecting people with employment sites, the viability of transport solutions can be limited if spatial dispersal is more extreme – as is the case in Sheffield City Region. Here it is important to also consider the role of housing (and social housing amongst more disadvantaged residents) in increasing individuals’ mobility.

Other examples of type 4 city regions may include Tyne and Wear.

The findings from the four case study areas have implications for public policy both at the national and local levels. These are detailed in the next section, in which we also conclude.
4. Conclusions and policy recommendations

Conclusions

The success of city centres in attracting high value employment, the legacy of past planning policy, changes in the way we travel and the emerging emphasis of current planning reforms mean spatial mismatches at the lower end of the labour market are likely to persist. In the majority of cases transport solutions alone will not suffice in helping individuals into employment. Other factors, such as skills and demand in the local economy, also matter.

As part of a holistic approach, transport policy can facilitate access to jobs and overcome spatial mismatches, linking people to employment opportunities. It also has a role to play in enabling economic growth and creating new employment opportunities.

Past travel-to-work programmes teach us three lessons about which policy initiatives tend to be more successful. Unsurprisingly, these are the initiatives that work alongside other policies and interventions, such as help with writing a CV. Successful initiatives were also those that made best use of existing transport provision and were designed with the needs of different individuals and places in mind.

Because places differ, the role transport plays and the appropriateness of specific transport policy interventions vary. This makes the devolution of transport powers and budgets ever more important. Through comparative in-depth analysis of four case study areas (the wider Milton Keynes area, South Hampshire, Greater Manchester and the Sheffield City Region) this report identifies four stylised typologies based on the areas’ economic performance and level of spatial mismatch between where people live and where the jobs they are looking to access are located. These typologies provide a guide to the transport interventions (ranging from new rail lines to integrated ticketing) which may be most appropriate in different contexts across the UK’s city regions.

Policy recommendations

Two key themes emerge from this study. First, the need for more joined up and effective transport policy, both within transport as well as across other policy areas. Second, the need for more local powers and funding to give cities the flexibility to respond to their distinctive challenges. As we head into the next Spending Review and Network Rail’s corresponding rail planning period (“Control Period 5”) there is the opportunity to deliver a more joined up approach and effective local transport policies. This report makes four overarching policy recommendations with practical actions for implementation.

Recommendation 1: Different Government departments, tiers of government and local authorities need to collaborate in order to reduce worklessness and facilitate access to jobs. Transport is one amongst many factors influencing access to work. This means a more joined up approach is required amongst local transport authorities, planning authorities, Local Enterprise
Partnerships, transport operators and agencies, Housing Associations, Jobcentres, Work Programme providers and businesses. Embedding a more collaborative approach to policy making will take time. To get there we will need to continue to adapt current ways of working and ways in which departments assess different options to achieve their goals. This has implications for the way the Department for Transport, the Department for Work and Pensions and other departments work and the way individual local authorities operate across policy areas and collaborate with neighbouring local authorities. The recently appointed Minister for Cities has a key role to play here.

**Action:** The Department for Transport should work with the Department for Work and Pensions and other departments where appropriate to amend its New Approach to Transport Appraisal (NATA) to more effectively capture transport’s wider economic impacts. Transport can be a means to achieve better employment outcomes, but these wider benefits of transport schemes need to be better captured in standard transport appraisals and the decisions that result.

**Action:** The Department for Work and Pensions should use transport as a tool to improve employment outcomes and address worklessness. Similarly, Jobcentre Plus and Work Programme providers should work more closely with local transport authorities and transport operators. This could include providing comprehensive travel training for all Jobcentre Plus travel advisors or following the WorkWise models pioneered through the PTEs. In the longer term recording where those that move off benefits take up jobs will improve understanding of differences in individual’s spatial horizons and help tailor employment support.

**Action:** Cities need to improve integration between their transport and land-use planning departments and make better use of accessibility planning. Integration between these two policy areas is likely to be most effective at the functional economic area and should therefore extend across local authority boundaries. It also needs to include key transport stakeholders, including Network Rail and the Highways Agency. Local authorities may consider using the accessibility guidance already issued, a model similar to London’s planning according to Public Transport Accessibility Levels or the Netherland’s ABC planning policy.

**Action:** The Minister for Cities should work with individual cities to support them in devising and piloting ways of better integrating policy making aimed at addressing worklessness. Pooling budgets at city levels is one way to achieving this. As community budgets are rolled out nationwide, there is the opportunity to consider how the remit of community-based budgets might be widened beyond the focus to cover all local public service expenditure, as previously tested in the Total Place pilots.

**Recommendation 2:** Cities and the Department for Transport should work together to devolve further transport powers and funding to cities to allow them to respond more flexibly to their area’s transport needs. The role of transport in facilitating access to work varies between different areas. Yet local transport authorities have relatively limited power and flexibility over transport budgets within their area (see Figure 6).
• **Action:** The Department for Transport should devolve funding for sub-national major projects (those over £5 million) to the appropriate spatial level and give transport authorities more flexibility about whether to use existing funding streams for capital or revenue projects. This should be implemented during the next Spending Review. This would allow growth areas, such as Milton Keynes, to invest in the new and existing infrastructure required for city expansion (e.g. bus, road and light rail) – while other areas can use funding to finance better transport links to existing centres of employment. In addition to this, as Network Rail establishes greater flexibility in decision making regarding operations, maintenance and renewals at regional level, there is opportunity to work more closely with local stakeholders to realise the full benefits of this devolution. This process may provide useful lessons for the Highways Agency’s governance review.

• **Action:** Cities should continue to investigate how best to use future revenue streams to finance transport schemes. Funding for capital and revenue transport projects over the course of the next Spending Review will be limited. Cities need to investigate how emerging funding mechanisms – including the New Homes Bonus, business rate retention and the Community Infrastructure Levy – can be used either individually or collectively to fund transport schemes. Local authorities may also consider alternative mechanisms, including asking for contributions to local bus service provision over and above Section 106 from employers that want to locate in out-of-town locations. As part of this, government departments should also consider giving local transport authorities control over the bus farebox, allowing them to borrow against future revenue streams.

**Recommendation 3:** The Department for Transport should work with local transport authorities to support better integration of local transport provision to facilitate access to work. Better integration of public transport services (ticketing, timetabling and marketing) has an important role in making local transport provision less disjointed and fragmented, facilitating access to work. 

Three years have passed since the Local Transport Bill became an Act of Parliament, giving local authorities powers to improve the quality of local transport. But very few of its provisions have been taken up by local transport authorities.

• **Action:** The Department for Transport should review how it could better support local transport authorities in the uptake of the provisions of the Local Transport Act. Support may include assisting local transport authorities in overcoming legal and technical barriers to improve bus networks. Such a review could follow-on from the ongoing Competition Commission inquiry into local bus services, which is due to report interim findings in September 2011. It is also an opportunity to investigate how other modes of transport, such as local rail services and ferries, could be better integrated with local bus services.

• **Action:** Local transport authorities should use the provisions of the Local Transport Act to re-regulate the provision of bus services in order to better integrate existing public transport networks. Through the provisions of the

---

181. Revenue funding projects refer to those that require continuous funding.
Local Transport Act local transport authorities have the power to make the provision of bus services more effective either through the introduction of Bus Quality Partnerships or Bus Quality Contracts.182

• **Action:** Major cities should follow the lead of Transport for Greater Manchester and aim to move towards a Transport for London-style model of governance. A more integrated public transport network could allow partners to cross-subsidise commercial services with more unprofitable ones and would allow for better integration of local transport provision across services and modes.

**Recommendation 4:** Partners, including employment support providers and local transport authorities, should consider mechanisms to make public transport more affordable for job seekers and individuals on low incomes where cost is a prohibitive barrier to employment. In many of our cities public transport is prohibitively expensive for job seekers and individuals on low incomes and not an attractive alternative to the car. This reduces transport’s ability to link people to jobs and to widen travel horizons, helping people take up employment opportunities further afield.

Making public transport more affordable for job seekers and those on lower incomes will increase overall demand for public transport services and operator revenue. It will also be key to ensuring Welfare to Work policies, such as the Work Programme, are successful in areas with slack labour demand where people will need to travel further afield to access jobs. Yet any attempt to increase the affordability of public transport will require serious consideration of the feasibility of potential approaches, particularly in an environment of constrained expenditure.

• **Action:** Work Programme providers and Jobcentre Plus should consider assisting clients with travel costs where affordability issues act as a serious barrier to employment access. Work Programme providers and Jobcentre Plus should work with local transport operators to design reduced tickets for jobseekers and those on low wages. An example here is the approach taken by Transport for Greater Manchester which negotiated public transport discounts with operators as part of the Future Jobs Fund. Work Programme providers and Jobcentre Plus could also offer assistance with travel costs in the first month of employment to overcome the gap between benefits and payment of the first wage in a new job.

• **Action:** Local transport authorities should negotiate discounted fares with bus and rail operators for underutilised services. It may be possible to negotiate the introduction or extension of discounted fares for passengers travelling on underutilised routes or off-peak services. One recent intervention, for example, resulted in Southern Rail extending discounted rail fares to Seaford in addition to other parts of East Sussex.183

---

182. Bus Quality Contracts are in effect the franchising of a network of services which can be designed by cities. Bus Quality Partnerships represent an agreement between the local transport authority and bus service operators: the authority commits to improving the quality of infrastructure (e.g. bus priority lanes), the operators commit to providing an agreed quality of service. This can include timings, frequencies and maximum fares.
183. [www.sussexexpress.co.uk/news/local/rail_firm_cuts_prices_1_957262](http://www.sussexexpress.co.uk/news/local/rail_firm_cuts_prices_1_957262)
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City Collaboration

This is the second report in the City Collaboration research strand, which examines how policy can help improve the economic fortunes of individuals living in more economically deprived areas by strengthening links to neighbouring cities and towns. The first paper examined the changing geography and nature of lower skilled employment, and differences in the supply and demand for jobs across the UK and in individuals' travel-to-work patterns.

This paper takes a more detailed look at transport policies and their potential role in helping overcome barriers to work, focusing on four case study areas: the wider Milton Keynes area, South Hampshire, Greater Manchester and the Sheffield City Region.