

# Safety: Security

## 1.1 Background

The decision to travel by public transport is determined by a number of significant factors relating to the personal situation; and time, cost, accessibility, knowledge of the journey and service frequency / punctuality. These are generally seen as the main factors which contribute towards the decision to travel by a particular mode.

To a lesser but just as important degree is personal security which to some members of society (i.e. elderly and lone females especially those travelling late night / early morning), crime and the fear of crime can be the main reason for not using public transport.

The Department for Transport (DfT) state;

*“Considering the number of journeys made on public transport in the UK - some six billion journeys are made by bus, coach or rail each year - actual incidences of crime against other passengers are extremely rare. And this is borne out in surveys whereby two-thirds of respondents felt that the level of security on public transport was either 'good' or 'very good', ... however, the same survey found that 11.5% more journeys would be made on public transport if passengers felt they were more secure”*

*Secure for the entire journey*

Concern for personal security is not necessarily confined to the time spent on board the train or bus - people often report this is the safest part of their journey. Instead, it might be the apprehension felt whilst waiting on the platform or bus stop, the environment that surrounds a station or reservations about hiring an unlicensed taxi or minicab.

It is not just the fear of direct personal assault but also the discomfort and intimidation felt when witnessing anti-social behaviour, criminal damage and graffiti.

Strategies or plans may therefore affect the level of security for public transport passengers. The aim of this sub-objective is therefore to reflect both changes in security and the likely numbers of users affected.

## 1.2 WebTAG Assessment

Under WebTAG Unit 3.7.1, this is assessed in terms of both freight and passenger interchanges, however for the purpose of this assessment the freight assessment is deemed unnecessary.

The aim of the passenger interchange assessment is to identify in broad terms the extent to which particular indicators would change following implementation of a particular strategy or plan together with the number of passengers affected.

The first stage is to assess the level on each indicator both prior to and following the strategy or plan. This involves the assessment relating to the scheme relating to the following factors:

PASSENGER INDICATOR	CONSIDERATION WITHIN SCHEME
Site perimeters, entrances and exits	The provision of signs and facilities to identify the extent of the scheme infrastructure. This aims to incorporate bus lane markings and entry and exit to on-street stops and P&R sites.
Formal surveillance	The provision of new or modifications to existing CCTV systems within the network in order to monitor key areas of the network. This includes any on-board CCTV systems.
Informal surveillance	The use of materials to improve the physical visibility of passengers using the network. Consideration will be made to the locations of indirect facilities which contribute towards improving passenger safety and security.
Landscaping	The provision of effective landscaping to enhance the visibility and improve the potential safety for passengers.
Lighting and visibility	The availability of effective lighting to enhance the passenger areas. Key consideration includes on-street stops.
Emergency call	The provision of emergency help points and public telephones at on-street stops and P&R sites.

This is then followed by a qualitative description of the ways in which passenger interchange would be improved by the strategy or plan in the study area.

### 1.3 Approximate Number of Users Affected

<b>Preferred Option</b>	<p><b>2016:</b> Approximately 7.63mn user boarding's per annum</p> <p><b>2031:</b> Approximately 9.46mn user boarding's per annum</p> <p><b>NB:</b></p> <p><i>This relates solely to the NGT development which is deemed to be mutually exclusive from current services.</i></p>
<b>Next Best Option</b>	<p><b>2016:</b> Approximately 5.75mn user boarding's per annum</p> <p><b>2031:</b> Approximately 7.18mn user boarding's per annum</p> <p><b>NB:</b></p> <p><i>This incorporates High Quality improvements to vehicles, service corridor, infrastructure and priority measures with the main base utilising current service network.</i></p>
<b>Low Cost Option</b>	<p><b>2016:</b> Approximately 0.44mn user boarding's per annum</p> <p><b>2031:</b> Approximately 0.58mn user boarding's per annum</p> <p><b>NB:</b></p> <p><i>This incorporates limited improvements to service corridor, infrastructure and priority measures with the main base utilising current service network.</i></p>

## ASSUMPTIONS

- No data is available for Weekends and Early AM / Late PM journeys
- Annualisation factors used and supplied by SDG:
  - A AM & PM Peak Time – 551
  - A IP Peak Time – 2001
- Trip Data supplied from SDG (07/10/09 – NGT Forecasting) and supplied as boarding figures which have been used in the assessment. It is assumed that users are assumed to make 2 trips (equivalent to 2 boardings) and where trips in AM Peak return in PM Peak and IP period incorporates return trips. Although this is simplified no further assessment has been possible and therefore boardings have been used instead of users. In reality; trips would not be as balanced across the time periods with some users making 1 single trip while others returning between time periods.

## 1.4 Reference Sources

- Mott MacDonald (2008), NGT Route Development: DF1 Option Review & Appraisal, 236834/RPT03 Rev. B
- Mott MacDonald (2009), NGT Project Preferred Route, Drawing nos. 236834/PRF/001 and 236834/PRF/002.
- Mott MacDonald (2009), NGT Project Next Best Alternative (NBA), Drawing nos. 236834/NB/001 and 236834/NB/002.
- Mott MacDonald (2009), NGT Project Low Cost Alternative (LCA), Drawing nos. 236834/LC/001 and 236834/LC/002.
- Mott MacDonald (2009), NGT Technical Development Plans:
  - Drawing nos. 236834/CH/BASE/001 to 007
  - Drawing nos. 236834/N/BASE/001 to 020
  - Drawing nos. 236834/N/ BASE/P&R/001 & 002
  - Drawing nos. 236834/N/BASE/022 to 030
  - Drawing nos. 236834/S/BASE/001 to 011
  - Drawing nos. 236834/S/BASE/P&R/001
  - Drawing nos. 236834/E/BASE/001 to 05
- Google Earth.

## 1.5 Security Worksheet 1: Preferred Route

FACTOR	DEVELOPMENT	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE	WITHOUT SCHEME	WITH SCHEME
Site perimeters, entrances and exits	<p>The preferred option would incorporate the newly developed NGT network in which consideration of impact on the passenger should be identified.</p> <p>The route will run on its own dedicated lane (or on some sections with other bus services) for the majority of the routes which will be segregated from other traffic, and will be easily identifiable through effective landscaping, and other on-street furniture. The overall design of the proposals will incorporate facilities to assist the passenger such as tactile paving, key entry and exit points with ease of access to NGT vehicles.</p>	LOW	POOR	HIGH
Formal surveillance	The design of the scheme will incorporate CCTV covering the main dwell areas for passengers and take into account key areas requiring surveillance coverage.	HIGH	POOR	HIGH
Informal surveillance	The design of the proposed scheme aims to ensure that all materials used provide a safe and secure environment for users of the scheme.	MEDIUM	MODERATE	HIGH
Landscaping	Landscaping will be incorporated where necessary to ensure that it complements the environment and provides a safe and secure image to passengers.	MEDIUM	MODERATE	HIGH
Lighting and visibility	Effective lighting aims to be developed at all stops to provide a safe environment for passengers. It is proposed that such lighting will complement the use of CCTV within the system to maintain passenger security.	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH
Emergency call	The proposed scheme aims to incorporate a number of features which contribute towards the safety of passengers. Safety at on-street stops and at the P&R sites will be maintained through a number of measures including the addition of help points at strategic locations at each stop.	HIGH	POOR	HIGH

Summary assessment score:

**LARGE POSITIVE**

Qualitative comments:

The development of the scheme will build on the current best practice for transport systems and incorporate many features which aim to provide a safe and secure environment for the passenger.

The level of such facilities will vary depending upon the respective environment but the preferred scheme will aim to provide the most effective level of security possible.

## 1.6 Security Worksheet 2: Next Best Alternative

FACTOR	DEVELOPMENT	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE	WITHOUT SCHEME	WITH SCHEME
Site perimeters, entrances and exits	The scheme aims to make use of current bus priority measure and these will be improved (i.e. signing) where necessary in order to provide greater awareness to the public.	LOW	POOR	MODERATE
Formal surveillance	Improvements will be made to existing CCTV systems where necessary in order to improve coverage.	HIGH	POOR	MODERATE
Informal surveillance	Where developments are undertaken to the network, these will be implemented effectively and utilising materials to encourage security and safety.	MEDIUM	MODERATE	MODERATE
Landscaping	Improvements will be made to landscaping where necessary	MEDIUM	MODERATE	MODERATE
Lighting and visibility	Improvements will be made to existing lighting where necessary	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE
Emergency call	Additional help points will be incorporated into any stop improvements where deemed necessary.	HIGH	POOR	MODERATE

Summary assessment score:

**MODERATE POSITIVE**

Qualitative comments:

The Next Best Alternative offering single articulated hybrid buses and significant upgrades to the provision of bus lanes and priority on certain routes is deemed to be better than the current situation but assessed to be less than preferred option in respect to improving passenger security.

Landscaping and surveillance will be implemented at sites deemed to offer a significant benefit to the public but it is assumed that such measures will be at a lesser degree than the preferred option and will generally improve on current provision rather than developing totally new systems i.e. improving current CCTV systems.

## 1.7 Security Worksheet 3: Low Cost Alternative

FACTOR	DEVELOPMENT	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE	WITHOUT SCHEME	WITH SCHEME
Site perimeters, entrances and exits	The low cost option aims to make best use of the current transport facilities with only minimal localised widening within the existing carriageway limits to improve bus lanes where necessary.	LOW	POOR	POOR
Formal surveillance	It is envisaged that there will be no major improvement to the CCTV system within this option. However slight improvements may be made where significant benefits are identified.	HIGH	POOR	POOR
Informal surveillance	Where developments are undertaken to the network, these will be implemented considering existing infrastructure and contribute towards improving passenger safety and security where possible.	MEDIUM	MODERATE	MODERATE
Landscaping	The option focuses mainly on developing bus priority schemes and as such it is envisaged that the overall need for landscaping will be kept to a minimum. Where there is a requirement such as at the P&R sites, then any designs will aim to incorporate landscaping features which complement passenger safety needs.	MEDIUM	MODERATE	MODERATE
Lighting and visibility	Improvements will be made to existing lighting where necessary	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE
Emergency call	It is envisaged that any upgrades to public transport facilities are unlikely to incorporate help points as part of the Quality Partnership agreement and overall network wide improvement programme.	HIGH	POOR	POOR

Summary assessment score:

SLIGHT POSITIVE

Qualitative comments:

The Low Cost Alternative offering single articulated diesel buses with localised improvements is deemed to be better than the current situation but assessed to be less than the next best option in respect to its overall effectiveness in improving passenger safety.

It is proposed that there will be minimal developments in respect to CCTV coverage or landscaping, with the main emphasis being related to localised developments (or improvements) where required. This option will focus on current transport links and facilities and where these are failing to meet current standards then improvements will be considered.