

APPENDIX I: SUMMARY OF PROGRESS SINCE THE 20TH REPORT

Introduction

The tables contained in this Appendix form the basis of the analysis of policy developments and their effectiveness since the publication of the Commission's 20th Report in 1997. There are six tables, one for each of the main chapters in 20th Report. In order to analyse the development of policy since 1997, it was necessary to scrutinise the text of the Report in order to extract the particular areas of concern to the Commission, as the Commission itself brought out no recommendations from its discussion. These issues are listed in the first column of the Tables in this Appendix, including a reference to the corresponding paragraph numbers in the 20th Report.

An analysis of policy documents was subsequently undertaken in order to identify whether there had been a strategic Government response in any of the Commission's areas of concern. This response is given in the second column of the Tables and the two principal documents used for this purpose were the Integrated Transport White Paper¹ (**ITWP**) and the Government's response to the Commission's 20th Report² (**GR20R**). Note that a separate section in the text of the main report highlights the main areas in which the Devolved Administrations in Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland have taken a policy stance which is distinct from that of the England/UK administration.

The final column of each of the Tables is an assessment of the policy developments which have taken place since 1997 based on a range of other sources, including policy documents, European and UK legislation, central government guidance, studies, reports, and specialist media coverage. In assessing progress (which has inevitably been a qualitative exercise and a matter of judgement in many cases), we have benefited from the information, advice and opinions of a number of government officials and stakeholders. The key conclusions of this analysis are discussed in Section 5 of the main report.

¹ *A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone – The Government's White Paper on the Future of Transport* DETR, July 1998

² *Government Response to the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution's Twentieth Report: Transport and the Environment – Developments Since 1994* Her Majesty's Government, Cm 4066, October 1998

Table AI-1

CHAPTER 2: Vehicles and fuel technology, as they affect emissions of carbon dioxide and other substances Objectives and targets of 18 th report to which actions described in this Chapter would principally contribute: Objective B: Targets B1, B2; Objective F: Targets F1, F2 and F3		
Issues raised in RCEP's 20 th report	Strategic government response	Assessment
(2.6ff) Continuing need for precautionary action to improve air quality, especially regarding particulates and NOx.	GR20R Emphasises that Air Quality Strategy (AQS) includes health-based standards for these pollutants, to be met by 2005.	<p><u>COMEAP (1998)</u>: Estimate of 24,000 deaths pa</p> <p><u>NAQS (2000)</u>: Objectives set for NO_x and PM₁₀ to be achieved by the end of 2004. NO_x objectives were derived from EPAQS, and PM₁₀ objectives from AQDD.</p> <p><u>Proposals for revisions of NAQS 2000 objectives for particles</u>: New objectives proposed for PM₁₀ to be achieved by the end of 2010. Derived from COMEAP recommendations. Maximum annual limit value - three different values; higher for London and lower for Scotland.</p> <p>In response to Public accounts Committee (2002) Martin Williams of DEFRA confirmed that greater efforts were being made to understand the numbers of deaths.</p>
(2.19ff) Further developments in air quality standards, including ecosystem-based standards	GR20R Forum endorsed this proposal, reflecting adoption of daughter Directive in June 1998.	<p><u>NAQS (1998)</u>: Does not mention the effect of air pollution on vegetation and ecosystems.</p> <p><u>Review of 1998 NAQS (1999)</u>: Involves strategy against the effect of air pollution on vegetation and ecosystems.</p> <p><u>NAQS (2000)</u>: Sets ecosystem-based objectives for NO_x, SO₂ and ozone, in compliance with AQDD.</p>
(2.24) Support for Air Quality Forum, to ensure that NAQS is regularly monitored and reviewed. This should include nature conservation bodies and some with knowledge of UNECE's work programme on the natural environment.	GR20R Proposals announced in February 1998. Govt will ensure that it includes at least one member with detailed knowledge of UNECE's work on the natural environment.	Regular circulation of papers to a wide range of stakeholders: However it is a forum for the 'exchange of ideas and information', not necessarily for monitoring and review of NAQS.
(2.25) Notes that N1 vehicle test cycle does not take account of the range of ambient temperatures across EU.	Directive 98/69 included an amendment to cold start measurement procedures.	Directive 2001/100 extended cold start requirements to larger vans and cars.
(2.27) Supports principle of indicative	Mandatory limits for 2005 (Euro IV)	Air quality modelling undertaken for DEFRA indicates that the Euro

limits for 2005; (2.28) notes the much laxer stage III NOx standard proposed for diesel than petrol.	eventually agreed (98/69) – much laxer standard for NOx from diesel light duty vehicles remained for Euro III and IV (at least 3 times petrol standard).	III standards would create a significant improvement in annual mean NOx concentration; Euro IV less so .
(2.29ff) Notes the lax sulphur in fuels standard proposed for 2000; (2.31) welcomes duty differential in favour of ULSD, but advocates it be raised above 1p/litre. (2.32) Supports Council's indicative sulphur standards of 50ppm for 2005, and (2.33) cutting benzene limit in 2000 from 2% to 1% and banning leaded petrol.	Leaded petrol banned (by European Directive – 98/70) from 2000 and standards for benzene and sulphur made mandatory for 2005. HMG has introduced incentives to encourage use of ULSD and ULSP (ie max 50ppm sulphur).	ULSD is now universal. ULSP has been the standard grade of unleaded petrol on the UK's forecourts since mid-2001. (European) Proposals to reduce sulphur levels further from 2009 currently in the legislative process.
(2.39) Justifiable to set separate and challenging CO ₂ emissions target for UK transport.	GR20R Possible savings from transport sector to be assessed in context of UK Climate Change Programme.	<u>UK Climate Change Programme (2001)</u> : No overall road traffic target has been set. Government's approach is to tackle rising emissions through a wide variety of policies and measures. Possible savings from transport assessed.
(2.48) Concerns over vehicle speeds and developments in speed camera use.	GR20R Govt wishes to see more efficient use of speed cameras and will review arrangements. It 'will combat the idea that many road traffic offences – speeding in particular – do not really matter'.	<u>Road Safety Strategy (2000)</u> : Safer speeds is one of the main themes. Action plan for safer speeds. Camera use increased. In December 2001, Transport minister John Spellar announced that speed camera partnerships can use money collected from fines to fund more enforcement. Police services allowed to recycle revenues. Lower speed limits and use of speed cameras are now subject of public and media opposition and restrictions on new camera deployments - to be based on safety criteria.
(2.50) Encourages improved I/M regime, and UK roadside testing initiatives.	GR20R Roadside testing trials in 7 pilot areas.	Roadside testing trials undertaken. Problems of funding, and of lack of powers to stop vehicles. Recent publication of response to 2000 consultation on roadside emissions testing. The Road Traffic (Vehicle Emissions)(Fixed Penalty)(England) Regulations 2002 will give fixed penalty powers to English local authorities within air quality management areas, and £4m is being made available for schemes in 2002, which will help to fund police support, enforcement, etc.
(2.54) Scrappage scheme unlikely to be a cost-effective way to improve air quality	GR20R Government agrees.	
(2.55) Graduated VED: Commission favours graduation on fuel economy	GR20R Will introduce graduated VED for light vehicles. VED	VED graduated according to CO ₂ emissions for new cars, but with separate provision for diesels – ie effectively by fuel economy.

rather than regulated pollutant emissions standard. (2.56) Recommends that it be steeply graduated, and extended to existing cars and to LGVs. (2.58) Incentives also needed for heavy diesels.	reductions will also give an incentives for cleaner trucks and buses from 1999. New HGV VED rate system to reflect track costs through axle weight.	Not steeply graduated; not fully extended to existing cars or LGVs. HGV VED scheme to be simplified; steep graduation to discourage 5-axle articulated trucks significantly reduced after fuel crisis.
(2.58) Supported a fuel-consumption basis for company cars.	GR20R Taxation arrangements under review. Free fuel charges to be increased by 20% per year to 2002/3.	As of April 2000, tax is CO ₂ based and steeply graduated, with separate provision for diesels – ie effectively by fuel economy Mileage bands abolished. Inland Revenue currently consulting on free fuel allowances.
(2.62ff) Reiterates need for a precautionary approach to ‘dieselisation’ of the car fleet, and more stringent stage III limits than those proposed.	GR20R Government will pursue a higher rate of diesel duty to reflect emissions.	UK Treasury retained precautionary approach to diesel by establishing a high rate of fuel duty, and separate treatment of diesels in both VED and company car systems. Diesel limits still less stringent (see above)
(2.65) Diesel should be taxed at a higher rate than unleaded petrol, but with a significant differential for cleaner forms of diesel.	GR20R Diesel duty had been raised to 1p/litre above that on petrol.	Increase in diesel duty differential to 3p/litre achieved almost total switch to ULSD in early 2001. Diesel (ULSD) duty was then decreased in 2001 budget by the same amount, while duty on ULSP was also reduced. The reductions to encourage the use of ultra low sulphur fuels has resulted in the differential being eliminated, so the fuel duty rate for both of these grades is now the same.
(2.69ff) Supported the use of CNG or LPG in heavy duty fleets vehicles. Notes changes in duty on mineral gases, and announcement of second phase of the Powershift programme.	GR20R Fuel duty on gases had been significantly reduced, and this differential with diesel would be maintained.	Powershift programme and duty reductions encouraged increased take-up of LPG and CNG; but mainly for LPG in light duty vehicles. High costs limiting take-up of CNG in heavy duty vehicles.
(2.73ff) Alternative fuel sources to mineral oils will be needed. Developments are likely to involve hybrids, and possibly fuel cells.	GR20R Being taken forward by CVTF, and Foresight Vehicle Initiative. Also DTI Advanced Fuel Cell Programme.	CVTF did not reach clear conclusions or set strategic priorities. Currently <i>Powering Future Vehicles</i> consultation focuses on strategic priorities.
(2.86ff) Need for a package of measures to reduce CO ₂ emissions, including technology change, demand management, and promotion of alternative modes.	GR20R Refers to a range of measures included in the WP. Notes that fuel duty escalator has been effective, and that new VED system will also help.	See above and Chapter 4.
(2.99)UK government should press for stringent mandatory stage IV emission limits; sulphur content of petrol and diesel should be reduced as rapidly as possible to 50ppm.	GR20R UK Presidency was successful in pressing for an early resolution to ‘Auto-Oil’ directives on light vehicle emission standards and fuel quality, and initiating work on HGV standards and first daughter Directive of air quality framework Directive.	UK government particularly successful in pressing for more stringent stage IV limits for HGVs under Directive 1999/96. Stage IV limits for light vehicles and 50ppm sulphur limits mandatory from 2005. Duty differentials have secured complete switch to ULSD and ULSP. (European) proposals to reduce sulphur levels even further are under negotiation.

<p>(2.100) Calls for greater attention to improving vehicle fuel economy, and to support Community legislation for a phased increase in motor fuel prices across the EU.</p>	<p>GR20R Govt continues to press for increases in the minimum rates in other EU states. Govt is fully committed to the EU strategy to achieve 120g/km no later than 2010.</p>	<p>Primarily reliant on voluntary agreement with motor manufacturers, plus graduated VED and company car taxation. UK has been late in implementing fuel economy labelling requirements, and has taken a minimalist approach. UK is lagging behind most other Member States in reducing carbon dioxide from new cars, and may not be on target for 140 g/km in 2008 (see Appendix II). The development of a Directive that would have increased minimum rates of duty for motor fuels across the EU has been stalled.</p>
<p>(2.101) Calls for a concerted campaign to change public attitudes to cars and to foster greater awareness of environmental performance.</p>	<p>GR20R WP should offer greater choice of modes. Govt will fund national publicity campaign. Raising public awareness also an aim of the Cleaner Vehicles Task Force (CVTF).</p>	<p>CVTF published an analysis of the environmental performance of vehicles, but this was not widely distributed. Government publicity campaign ‘Are you doing your bit?’ included limited focus on transport behaviour. See also chapter 4.</p>

Table AI-2

CHAPTER 3: Noise from road and rail vehicles Objectives and targets of 18 th report to which actions described in this Chapter would principally contribute: Objective H: Targets H1, H2		
Issues raised in RCEP's 20 th Report	Strategic Government Response	Follow-up
(3.1) No evidence that problem of noise is diminishing, and people may be becoming more sensitive to it	ITWP HMG agrees with this. Sets out a framework to address these problems: study to sample incidence of noise; assessment of attitudes towards noise (both to be completed by 2001) in England and Wales GR20R Points to the studies to develop a fuller understanding of the problems arising from transport noise: (in addition to the studies mentioned in ITWP) Noise map in Birmingham; further work on noise and health funded by three year DETR/DoH programme	Report on production of noise maps of the city of Birmingham published in February 2000. Noise maps to be made of other areas in the UK by summer 2004 ³ . Consultation paper on a proposed National Ambient Noise Strategy published by DEFRA in November 2001. Updated versions of the National Noise Incidence and National Noise Attitude Surveys are to be published in May 2002 for the entire UK as opposed to England and Wales as had originally been intended. Focus on noise mapping and monitoring in new research projects. Establishment of National Noise Reference Centre as a new research project for 2000-01 by the Environment Protection Group.
(3.23) Recommendation that grants for noise insulation and compensation for loss of property value resulting from noise has not been acted upon, but a review of the costs was in progress	GR20R Review in progress in 1997	Noise consultation: Implies that no amendments have since been made.
(3.29) Conclude that exposure to noise remains a serious problem and welcome EC action in this respect	GR20R Proposed Directive on ambient noise; proposed Directive on tyre noise; addressing of rail noise as part of interoperability.	Text of proposed Directive on ambient noise recently agreed; Directive on tyre noise approved. UK consultation reflects requirements of proposed ambient noise Directive but does not refer to it.
(3.29) Believe that technical developments have been made in relation to quieter track and rolling stock and implied that these should be considered when expanding the network	GR20R Quieter track and rolling stock is being put in place; and noise barriers help in other locations; new rail projects will have noise mitigation measures designed in from the beginning; HMG will work with the European Commission on development of noise standards for freight wagons and high speed trains.	Noise consultation stated that the DTLR was working with the European Commission to develop possible type testing and standards for railway rolling stock and vehicles. However, there continues to be discussion at the European level on whether noise should be included in standards for interoperability for high speed and conventional trains.

³ 'Two-year project to map noise levels' *Independent*, 4 March 2002

<p>(3.13) Many different environmental factors, including noise, should be taken into account when choosing a road surface</p>	<p>GR20R HMG accepts EU (then proposed) Directive on noise from tyres and will address relationship between speed, emissions, noise and safety as part of the review of speed policy. Planned to develop and publish, after consultation, Guide to Best Practice to operators on minimising noise from commercial vehicles.</p>	<p>Directive agreed. Noise consultation: domestic Code of Practice to limit noise caused by rattling of empty lorries published by DETR. Research on tyre noise in progress.</p>
<p>(3.23) Recommendation that grants for noise insulation and compensation for loss of property value resulting from noise has not been acted upon, but a review of the costs was in progress</p>	<p>GR20R Review in progress in 1997</p>	<p>Grants for insulation no longer have a limit, as they did in 1997, and Government advises that ‘reasonable costs’ of installing secondary glazing should be paid. There is no longer any maximum distance from the transport infrastructure that is the source of the noise within which a property must be located before loss of value can be assessed and compensation paid.</p>
<p>(3.30) As soon as safety, durability and efficacy of quieter road surfaces is established, a policy should be adopted to require roads carrying heavy traffic to use these surfaces</p>	<p>GR20R HMG will continue to develop quieter surfaces and will, in future, ensure that the most appropriate noise reducing surfaces shall be used. The use of quieter road surfaces will be specified as a matter of course on contracts for new roads or improving existing ones.</p> <p>New approach to appraising trunk road developments (NATA) includes environmental criteria.</p>	<p>Noise consultation: Highways Agency is committed to increasing use of quieter surfaces; annual budget of £5 million for noise mitigation on trunk roads; use of quieter surfaces on the strategic road network so that these will be installed on 60% by 2010.</p> <p>NATA and LTPs require noise to be taken into account in trunk road appraisal and local transport strategies.</p>
<p>(3.31) Technical measures to make rail and road quieter should be adopted as soon as possible in pursuit of the targets of the 18th report</p>	<p>GR20R HMG acknowledges arguments in favour of clear noise targets – as a result of ongoing research and work at the EU level, HMG will make an informed decisions as to whether targets would be appropriate and, if so, at what level they should be set.</p>	<p>Work in progress. No results yet.</p>

Table A1-3

<p>CHAPTER 4: Use of passenger transport modes other than the car Objectives and targets of 18th report to which actions described in this Chapter would principally contribute: Objective C: Targets C1, C2,C3; Objective D: Target D1</p>		
Issues raised in RCEP's 20 th report	Strategic government response	Follow-up
<p>Car Dependence</p>		
<p>(4.3) Remain committed to the belief in the value of setting national targets for modal share, and the need for specific objectives and quantitative targets instead</p>	<p>ITWP National targets for road reduction debated in the Parliament. Advice to be taken from CfIT. Local/regional targets necessary taking national targets as a benchmark. Indicators to be published to measure progress and to put national targets: First report on 'Transport Trends' published including key indicators.</p>	<p><u>Road Traffic Reduction (National Targets) Act 1998</u>: Became law in July 1998. The duty of setting and publishing targets for road traffic reduction in England, Wales and Scotland given to the Secretary of State. <u>CfIT advice on national targets (November 1999)</u>: Advised that a national top-down target for traffic or congestion would have a number of limitations and be ineffective at local level. Recommended to recognise national-level benchmarks derived by aggregating the local benchmark profiles. <u>Tackling Congestion and Pollution (January 2000)</u>: Government's report on the Act and as a response to CfIT advice. Agreed with CfIT on not setting a national road reduction target, but still included the national level of road traffic as a useful broad indicator. Proposed further dialogue with stakeholders. Further advice expected from CfIT on the value of setting benchmark profiles to derive targets for 2010. CfIT's advice on deriving national-level benchmarks from local benchmark profiles not accepted. Focused more on possible scenarios for the effectiveness of measures proposed in ITWP.</p> <p>Local authorities have established road traffic and other related targets in their LTPs.</p>
<p>(4.7) Involvement of local authorities to publicity campaigns in order to change attitudes towards car travel</p>	<p>GR20R and ITWP HMG welcomes campaigns by local initiatives and independent groups, but funds national campaigns only. Local authorities' action considered to be given additional weight and impetus through Government-funded campaigns at national level. ITWP Refers to TravelWise as a logo under which most local authority campaigns are branded.</p>	<p><u>Guidance on Full Local Transport Plans</u>: Guidance is given for local authorities in developing campaigns.</p> <p>Campaigns at national level such as 'Are you doing your bit?' include a transport element.</p> <p>Local campaigns going on as a part of TravelWise initiative. Based on private funds.</p>

	<p>Waits for the results of two EU-funded projects, INPHORMM and CAMPARIE to help developing an understanding of the effectiveness of local awareness campaigns</p>	<p>INPHORMM project completed in February 1999. Limited amount of findings related to local campaigns only.</p> <p>CAMPARIE project completed in January 1999. Final report published by EC in January 2000. Included strategies to better implement campaigns, and gave recommendations and guidelines for different types of campaigns.</p>
<p>(4.8) Increasing the number of car clubs - to see if the pilot car club in Edinburgh is successful</p>	<p>ITWP Refers to Edinburgh pilot car club</p>	<p><u>Edinburgh City Car Club</u>: Launched in March 1999, with the support of DETR, the City of Edinburgh Council and the Scottish Office (now the Scottish Executive). Expanded to 19 additional locations in the City in April 2000. Operated by Budget. Its operation monitored by a research group - their monitoring and evaluation report was published in 2001. Scheme was closed by Budget in March 2001. Resumed operations in late October 2001 run by Smart Moves. Active at the moment with a limited number of cars.</p> <p>Small number of car clubs followed Edinburgh in other areas. Active ones in: Bath, Bristol, Cranfield University Campus, Leeds and Oxford. Car clubs under development in: London Boroughs of Southwark, Sutton, Hillingdon and Ealing and Wiltshire. A number of car-free or car-limited housing developments are now underway, some associated with car clubs.</p>
<p>(4.9) Enforcement of laws to support drink-driving campaigns</p>	<p>ITWP Consultation (February 1998) includes possible measures to improve enforcement and education, and views on whether legal blood alcohol limit should be reduced from 80 mg/100 ml to 50. Research results included to support the stricter limit. Conclusions are expected to be announced by late 1998.</p>	<p>Responses published in April 1998. Majority agreed with 50 mg/100ml limit. Opposition came from Brewers and Licensed Retailers Association (BLRA).</p> <p><u>April 2000</u>: New proposals by EC for harmonisation of the blood alcohol level throughout EU. Government decided to wait for the results before making any change. No significant progress in EC level action. Government works with BLRA. Emphasis put on 'drinking and driving campaigns' and determination of risk groups.</p>
<p>Targeting Regular Journeys</p>		

<i>Journeys to and from work</i>		
<p>(4.11) More could be done to encourage employers to provide for alternatives to the private car and make arrangements for car-pooling and car-sharing</p>	<p>ITWP Green commuter plans suggested for major employers. Government involved only in guidance and in research to prepare good practice guides.</p> <p>Local authorities supported to take up green transport plans (GTPs) through partnerships with business and wider community.</p> <p>Local/regional public discounts proposed for organisations committing to a GTP and appointing a staff travel co-ordinator.</p> <p>Government departments and agencies to take the lead: “All headquarters buildings and main buildings occupied by Executive Agencies and Government Offices for the Regions should have GTPs by March 1999 and all other key buildings by March 2000”</p> <p>Hospitals also expected to take the lead in GTPs</p>	<p>Guides prepared with the support of the Government. A recent research project for DTLR carried out by Transport2000. A Good Practice Guide to be published in 2002 in the light of 20 travel plan case studies.</p> <p>GTPs successful in public sector. Results of a Government survey in February 2001: More than half of local authorities, hospitals and higher education organisations have a travel plan in place or in process of development. Target for Government offices not met completely, but more than 1000 government buildings have deployed GTPs. However, an external evaluation of the effectiveness of government GTPs recently suggested that the schemes in action are not as effective or as comprehensive as expected.</p> <p>Relatively little success with private sector commuter plans. According to the same survey, the percentage of businesses with GTPs is 7%. TravelWise and Transport2000 working with business in developing GTPs. TravelWise also has local business networks.</p>
<p>(4.13) Teleworking merits further attention in the context of reducing commuter and other business-related travel</p>	<p>ITWP Supports teleworking pointing out disadvantages: can give rise to social and regulatory issues; advantages can be offset by increase in car travel from home; can encourage movement out of town into countryside. Focus to be on efforts for communicating best practice and on encouraging local authorities to support teleworking</p>	<p>Government carries on research in the area. Does not actively support teleworking but takes it as an option. Guides to Green Transport Plans also mention teleworking as a good option.</p> <p>However very little evidence on degree of takeup or its effects.</p>
<i>Journeys to and from school</i>		

<p>(4.16) The need for more forceful measures to discourage the number of cars being used to take children to school</p>	<p>GR20R and ITWP Propose that Government policies will help reduce the need for car travel to schools. Governmental initiatives to be developed: Healthy School Initiatives; School Travel Advisory Group; business support to school transport initiatives; national public awareness campaigns including school journeys. Responsibilities given to local authorities: Funding ‘safe routes to schools’ projects and campaigns, especially SusTrans. Partnerships with schools, parents and teachers. Possible measures advised by the Government for local authorities include: escort schemes, before and after school clubs, adjustments to the school day, improvements to local transport services, traffic management and school facilities for cycling. Legislation to be brought forward to strengthen the powers of school crossing patrol officers, including flexible hours for the availability of patrols by local authorities tailored to local needs.</p>	<p>School Travel Advisory Group (STAG) – established in December 1998. Reported to Ministers at the end of 1999. Introduced the aim of returning to the level of mid-1980s in walking, cycling and bus use for school journeys by 2010: at national level this equates to 80% for primary pupils and 90% for secondary. The work of STAG welcomed by the Government. Measures proposed by the 18th Report and more are included in STAG’s and also in Government’s road safety strategy’s (2000) action plans. ‘School Travel Plans’ widely applied. Health Improvement Programmes and Healthy Schools Programme are active. However, the effects of these measures in practice have not been very significant yet in terms of their impact on traffic levels.</p>
<p>(4.17) Use of school buses in appropriate areas as in the US model</p>	<p>GR20R Considers experiences in other countries but opposes the idea of direct comparison. Points out differences in education and transport systems, social and geographical context. Local education authorities’ statutory duty to provide free home-to-school transport considered to be enough.</p>	<p>The first scheme to pilot US-style yellow school buses was very recently launched in mid-February 2002 in West Yorkshire by transport minister Sally Keeble. The Government is more flexible with other private schemes for the use of school buses. In December 2001, the Government has approved Surrey County Council’s £16 million school bus plans to be funded under the Private Finance Initiative. The school travel system, on the other hand, still depends primarily on free home-to-school journey on public transport.</p>
<p><i>Journeys for shopping</i></p>		

(4.18) More innovative measures need to be considered to reduce the amount of personal travel	ITWP Focus given to partnerships between local authorities and major retailers in their areas. Measures to be funded by the private sector. Proposed measures include secure pedal cycle parking; bus shelters and timetable information; funding bus priority measures on the surrounding network; and providing bus services for customers and staff.	Bus services are not generally made available by major retailers. Rural bus services in some areas extended to shopping centres. Voluntary measures to be taken by retailers do not seem to be working. No sign of partnerships although Guidance on Full Local Transport Plans (2000) stated that evidence of partnerships in LTPs would be checked by the Government. Car use is still the major mode of transport used for shopping. Walking is the second option since most shopping trips are short-/mid-distance. Use of local buses or other means of public transport is not very common. See below on revision of PPG13.
(4.19ff) Searching for the potential for home delivery and its relative impact on the volume of travel; encouraging of distance shopping if it is more sustainable - more research necessary	ITWP Sees it as an alternative measure. Expects an evaluation of impacts of such measures on the targets set in LTPs in order to improve local public transport.	Home delivery, especially via internet, is becoming common today, but retailers work on their own initiative. The Government or local authorities generally do not have measures to increase home delivery. Little research has been done to understand wider impacts of home delivery.
<i>Travel for recreation and leisure</i>		
(4.21) Providing safe and late night public transport services to and from out-of-town leisure facilities	ITWP Does not directly mention public transport services to leisure facilities. Relevant issue mentioned was reduction of crime. Measures proposed: personal security at bus stops (CCTV), design and layout of bus stations and their operation); paying for secure transport (marketing schemes such as ‘two for the price of one’)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Guideline for Public Transport Operators, July 1998</u>: Gives guidelines for operators in providing personal security in their operators; no special study or action on personal security after this. • Night/late night bus services provided by some bus operators and leisure centres are included in night bus service routes in some areas as a result of Rural Transport Partnerships.
(4.22) Dealing with the problems caused by the lack of adequate transport provision to rural areas and by the damage to sensitive areas as a result of access to countryside for recreation	ITWP Refers to Countryside Commission’s (now Countryside Agency) demonstration projects and support for local highway authorities. Highlights the necessity of local traffic management schemes: LTPs are expected to include countryside traffic strategies. Countryside Traffic Measures Group (set up in 1997) considered to spur innovation in rural traffic management. A Rural Traffic Advisory Service planned to be set up by the Countryside Commission by late 1998 with the responsibility to organise local	Main work is carried out by the Countryside Agency, a statutory body established by the merger of the Countryside Commission and the Rural Development Commission. ‘Quiet Roads’ and ‘Greenways’ initiatives are active. Funding is supplied to local authorities through Rural Transport Partnership Scheme and Rural Transport Development Fund of the Government, and relatively small Parish Transport Grant by the Countryside Agency. New modal bus services have been established, but these have not had a significant effect on modal share.

	<p>groups and seminars. Mentions 'Quiet Roads' and 'Greenways' initiatives: To be financed by local authorities through funding for LTPs</p>	<p>Guidance on Full Local Transport Plans (March 2000) included countryside traffic management strategies. Research by the Countryside Traffic Measures Group to be used in rural traffic management. The best practice guide has not been published. Rural Traffic Advisory Service was not established. Much more emphasis has recently been given to rural bus services by DTLR. Rural Quality Partnerships are encouraged. These are usually measures to decrease car use by residents of rural areas. There are no specific measures for countryside recreation apart from the Countryside Agency's initiatives although these measures have direct effect on travel for recreation.</p>
--	--	---

Cycling		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of National Cycling Strategy (NCS) by local authorities: setting own targets, establishing networks of cycle routes with convenience and safety-separate cycle lanes by the side of busy roads; providing secure storage areas-through agreement with building owners and operators or through planning permissions (4.27) • Achieving the targets identified by NCS (national target of doubling the amount of cycling within six years (1996-2002)) and similarly by the 18th Report (4.24) • Monitoring the implementation of these targets by the central government (4.29) • Reductions in speed of other traffic in urban areas and of measures to reduce pollution from vehicles as preconditions for safe and pleasant cycling (4.26) • Provision of networks of quality cycle routes approximating to the standards found in continental cities (4.26) • Provision of employers, colleges and schools of secure cycling facilities and showering facilities (4.26) • Secure cycle parks at shopping centres, bus and railway stations and other key points (4.26) 	<p>GR20R and ITWP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that cycling promotion policies need to be mesh with those on road safety • Adopted the targets of the NCS, and set a further target of doubling 2002 figures by 2012. Implementation to be overseen by proposed National Cycling Forum. Guidance to be published for highway authorities to set and monitor targets • Local authorities to include cycling strategy in LTPs; undertake ‘cycle reviews’ and ‘cycle audits’; more cycle facilities on existing roads; changes in junctions and roundabouts – priority to cyclists; speed measures; cycle lanes; consider cycling facilities in local planning. • Revision of speed policy; wider application of speed restraint by local authorities; media campaigns; funding of local authorities for ‘20mph zones’; funding for new speed/red light cameras; placement of speed cameras at road works on motorways and trunk roads. • Continue to help develop National Cycle Network (NCN) with SusTrans. Cycle crossings at agreed locations in the national road network also to be provided by the Government • Agrees that secure cycling facilities and showering facilities at places of employment and study are important – no measures suggested • Agrees that secure cycle parks in public areas is an essential part of Integrated Transport policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Guidance on Full LTPs</u> requires local cycling strategies (LCSs) in LTPs (model example in NCS), to include targets and a clear statement of actions. Also includes criteria for assessing the cycling elements of LTPs. The Institution of Highways and Transportation has published Cycle Audit and Cycle Review Guidelines. - <u>Road Safety Strategy (2000)</u> includes action plan for ‘cycling safely’ which emphasises practical cycle training for children and the use of cycle helmets. Also includes a review of speed policy and an action plan for safer speeds. In relation to cycling, it recommends a roads hierarchy to be developed in conjunction with local authorities. LTPs are to address traffic and speed management at local level. - Over 6,000 miles of NCN now open and development is continuing. <p>CTC welcomes the introduction of LTPs and the inclusion of LCSs within these. It argues that the ITWP was also a positive step, although the 10 year plan still focused rather too much on road building, but it did at least underline the need for integration. However, the delivery of policies on cycling has not been good. More guidance is needed on the inclusion of cycling in LTPs – the incorporation of cycling audit and review methodology would be helpful. CTC stresses need for a more sophisticated policy to bring about modal shift, as emphasis on cyclists protecting themselves, rather than slowing other modes to protect cyclists, will not encourage cycling. Greater focus on training needed. Public transport cycling facilities varied – decline of facilities on long-distance rail of particular concern.</p>

<p>(4.30) Regulations against noise and emissions from motorcycles, mopeds and scooters (based on the assumption that there is no information to indicate that these vehicles have an environmental advantage over cars)</p>	<p>ITWP Suggests that mopeds and small motorcycles may produce benefits if they substitute for car use but not if people switch from walking, cycling and public transport. Needs further research. Proposes to set an advisory group for the role of motorcycling in Integrated Transport Policy.</p>	<p>The Government's Advisory Group on Motorcycling (AGM) was established in May 1999 as proposed by ITWP. Since then, it has set up Task Forces to examine environmental and fiscal issues, statistics, research, vehicle safety and security, integration and traffic management. <u>Interim Report of AGM (May 2001)</u>: supports the idea that 'powered two wheelers' (PTWs) have an important place in an integrated transport strategy. As for the environmental impacts of these vehicles, advice was taken from the Environmental and Fiscal Task Force within AGM. The outputs are said to be "informative" rather than "prescriptive", therefore no clear recommendations were given for future action. Points out that new tests are necessary in measuring the real air pollution effects and fuel consumption characteristics of PTWs. New emission standards recently adopted for the EU. Debate on fiscal incentives for early introduction of new EU standards. Noise is still a problem despite controls. AGM research ongoing. Government action is based on the assumption that PTWs have potential benefits over cars and are more space efficient in terms of parking and congestion. This view reflected in guidance for full LTPs and the 10-year plan. More emphasis is given to safety issues.</p>
--	---	---

Walking		
<p>(4.32) Measures to increase walking to be set by local authorities: The need for surveys, targets and strategies on walking at local level</p> <p>(4.34) Hope that work on walking (e.g. establishment of working groups to prepare a national strategy and good practice guides) would be carried forward energetically</p>	<p>ITWP States that strategies are being prepared by HMG, local authorities and other organisations. Refers to campaigns such as ‘Active for Life’ by HEA. Expects local authorities to give more priority to walking, reflecting Government proposals for ‘streets for people’: relocating road space for pedestrians; more direct and convenient routes for walking; improving footpath maintenance and cleanliness; reducing waiting times at traffic signals; dealing with traffic; traffic calming measures; planning powers. Strategies for walking are expected to be included in LTPs.</p> <p>See Section ‘<i>Journeys to and from school</i>’ for road safety issues</p>	<p>Discussion document <u>Developing a Strategy for Walking</u> (1997); but Government shied away from producing a strategy, as they were fearful of the likely media reaction. Draft strategy was turned into guidance and published as <u>Encouraging Walking: Advice to local authorities</u> in March 2000. It advised that Local Walking Strategies (LWSs) be included in LTPs, and that local targets be set. National target not adopted despite advisory group recommending a national target to halt the downward trend by 2003; increase to one third the proportion of journeys where walking is the main mode by 2008; and increase the average distance walked to 250 miles per person per year by 2008.</p> <p><u>Guidance on Full LTPs</u> set out main elements of an LWS and proposed a number of measures including: Vehicle Restricted Areas, Clear Zones, Home Zones. A £30 million challenge fund established (April 2001) to accelerate the growth of Home Zone programme (8 pilot projects). Developments in revised PPGs have been positive for walking, eg <u>PPG3 and 13</u>.</p> <p>In the transport section of the then DETR, walking policies were not subsequently actively taken forward. However developments in other parts of government, eg concern over obesity, urban White Paper, launch of Cabinet Office’s Neighbourhood Renewal and Social Exclusion Units, as well as Joseph Rowntree research that identified poor local environment as a major factor in affecting quality of life, effectively highlighted the need to improve the walking environment. HoC Select Committee report (July 2001) argued that there has been insufficient progress by Government in taking forward its proposals. Government responded (November 2001) that it would revise <i>Encouraging Walking</i> to include a national strategy, but still does not support a national target.</p>

Buses		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need radical changes in policies towards the bus industry (4.36) • Commission believes that deregulation has had largely negative effects, but supports expansion of the London model to other metropolitan areas in the UK (4.49) • It is necessary to enable institutions, including local authorities, to intervene to ensure that bus services function in an integrated system (4.49, from 8.29) • Investment needed in new vehicles that are comfortable, accessible and meet Euro III emissions standards (4.44) • Operators need to focus more on customers and customer care (4.44) • Traffic management measures and other infrastructure needed (to be put in place by local authorities) to improve bus journey times (4.47) • To be effective (in non-metropolitan areas), the quality partnership approach will need regulation and local authorities will also require stronger powers, e.g. in obtaining information about services (4.51) • New solutions should be able to replace subsidies apart from sparsely populated rural areas (4.52) 	<p>ITWP HMG accepts problems ('bus wars', confusion over changing service patterns, lack of public information, lack of comfort, reliability and easy access): "Deregulation has not broken the spiral of decline in local bus use". Proposes to build a framework which retains competition but provides for intervention where there is evidence that this is needed in the public interest. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competition Bill, which will improve ability of competition authorities to deal with anti-competitive agreements and abuses of dominant position • Quality Partnerships, which aim to give local authorities greater influence over the provision of bus services and their marketing, will be put on a statutory basis. Possibility also to introduce Quality Contracts where QPs insufficient. Highlights the need for rural Quality Partnerships as well as urban ones. • LTPs to integrate local transport and include bus strategies, setting out policies on bus lanes and other priority measures • Financial support: fuel duty rebate (£270m), direct subsidy from local authorities (£230m), and concessionary fares (£400m) • CfIT to be asked to advise on how to secure best value in the longer term from the public subsidy invested in the bus industry in support of government's wider aims • Work with industry to improve image of buses, including design etc • Guidance on information and timetabling 	<p>The <u>Competition Act</u> was published in November 1998; the <u>Transport Act</u> in December 2000. The latter set out the requirements that local authorities develop <i>Local Transport Plans</i>, which are to include a bus strategy, and put <i>Quality Partnerships</i> and the stricter <i>Quality Contracts</i> on a statutory footing. Quality Partnerships between local authorities and operators consist of the authority providing infrastructure, while the operator commits itself in turn to providing a particular standard of service when it uses that infrastructure. A Quality Contract should effectively be used as a last resort as it enables local authorities to determine the services levels appropriate to a particular area and only allow services that meet these levels.</p> <p><u>Guidance on Full LTPs (March, 2000)</u> was published to set out how local authorities could use LTPs to integrate and improve transport at the local level, including the criteria against which bus strategies are to be measured.</p> <p>The 10 year plan foresees £28.3 billion of investment in local transport, which includes bus infrastructure, over the period of the plan.</p> <p>There is now a widespread view that Quality Partnerships have not been effective as local authorities have no powers to compel operators to comply, and similarly, there is no enforcement of local authorities' commitments. Further, there are still relatively few examples of Partnerships that have delivered in terms of increasing priority measures for buses outside of London. For those that do exist, there is inadequate enforcement of bus priorities. Effectively the strategic policies are now arguably in place, but the delivery is lacking. Quality Contracts are not seen as a useful tool by users or local authorities, due to the length of time that has to pass before they can be introduced.</p>

Rail		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested in ability of Railtrack’s investment programme to increase the capacity of the railway system (4.67ff) • Railtrack’s plans for the installation of transmission signalling – doubt about suitability of such signalling for a complex rail network (4.68) • Concerned that train operating companies might not invest to attract more passengers because of the relatively short terms of the contracts, which have no guarantee of renewal (4.69) • Concerned about the difficulty in obtaining agreement on and funding for projects to enhance the network (4.70) • Labour manifesto: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Establishing more effective and accountable regulation by the Rail Regulator (4.71) – Establishing a new rail authority, combining functions previously carried out by the Franchising Director and DoT (4.71) – Ensuring the public subsidy serves the public interest (4.71) • There is a need for higher investment than planned both in terms of rolling stock and the enhancement of the infrastructure (4.71) 	<p>Actions being taken to improve the situation on the railways, include (ITWP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Railtrack is evaluating pinch-points and estimates that its programme for solving these congestion problems could be complete by 2006 • Enhancement of Rail Regulator’s (RR) duties to have regard to statutory guidance from the Secretary of State on his broad policy objectives for the railway system • RR’s (then) forthcoming review of Railtrack’s access charges from 2001 onwards • Competition Bill provide substantial protection against abuse of power by leasing companies • Assessment of Railtrack’s investment plans • Two new schemes set up to help with funding: Rail Passenger Partnership Scheme and Infrastructure Investment Fund • Setting up of the Strategic Railway Authority established taking over duties of the Franchising Director and some of the RR’s • SRA to be made responsible for offering guarantees to existing franchisees proposing to invest in new rolling stock that any subsequent franchisee would be required to take over the lease for that stock • Longer term franchises were introduced by the SRA, and some still exist, however, shorter-term contracts have again become the norm 	<p>The Strategic Rail Authority (SRA), brought into being by the Transport Act 2000, has been made responsible for deciding the quality and capacity of the improvements needed to the network, which it will procure through train operators or Railtrack. The Transport Act laid a duty on the Rail Regulator to facilitate the SRA’s strategies, but apart from that the Rail Regulator has been left to pursue its other functions, including setting the level and structure of track access charges and ensuring that Railtrack does not abuse its monopoly position. A Rail Modernisation Fund has been set up, worth £7 billion over the next 10 years, to allow the formulation of a long-term investment plan. There is also a commitment to offer longer-term franchises in return for commitments to improve services.</p> <p>The 10 Year Plan foresees £52 billion of investment in the railway system over the period of the plan, a third of which is expected to come from public funds. The SRA’s strategy, which was published in January 2002, updated the 10 year plan in relation to the railways. Since 1997, the quality of rolling stock has improved significantly and infrastructure is improving, but not as quickly</p> <p>In October 2001, the Government succeeded in a bid to have Railtrack put into administration after the company’s board had approached the Government for more funds. The company is likely to be replaced by a not-for-profit organisation, which the Government believes will be more suited to delivering the public interest obligations of the railways.</p>

Other urban transport systems		
<p>(4.53) Hope that the arrangements arrived at to increase resources for the London Underground will enable an upgrade, especially signalling, and extension of the system</p>	<p>GR20R and ITWP Propose public-private partnership for LUL whilst retaining a publicly owned and publicly accountable network. LUL given the responsibility to continue operating the network and to invite bids from contractors. Plans to address long-standing under-investment. Also points at immediate investment needs. GLA to be established to take lead responsibility (through TfL and together with the LU operating company) for planning the future development of the network, including promoting proposals for new lines and extensions, and to ensure that LU is properly integrated with the other transport modes</p>	<p><u>February 2002:</u> The Board of London Transport made a decision to give its in-principle approval to funding worth £16bn to London's Tube. This decision was taken following a value for money assessment of the contracts tendered by bidders wishing to enter into a PPP with LUL . Essential investment is expected from the bidders. Debate has been going on around PPPs. Current proposals for PPP for the Underground are opposed by many groups including the Mayor of London. The Government proposes to transfer the LUL to Transport for London, an executive arm of GLA which is responsible for most transport in London, once PPP contracts are signed. (See Chapter 7 for details of GLA)</p>
<p>(4.55) Future light rail systems may be more promising if they use a combination of existing railway lines and street running</p>	<p>ITWP Advises local authorities wishing to develop light rail systems to use revenues from new congestion charging schemes or parking levies as a source of funding, or can develop public-private partnerships. However, it also states that funding for light rail systems from capital expenditure to transport should not be a priority - authorities need to demonstrate that they represent good value for money, form an essential part of a local Integrated Transport Strategy and objectives of the strategy cannot be met otherwise.</p>	<p><u>Guidance on Full LTPs (March, 2000):</u> Also suggested that funding for light rail systems should not be a priority for local authorities. Refers to new appraisal mechanisms through NATA (New Approach to Appraisal). <u>Transport 2010: The Ten Year Plan (July 2000):</u> The Government changed its approach towards the use of light rail systems and set a target towards at least doubling the number of journeys made by light rail and delivering up to 25 new light rail lines. Currently six light rail systems in operation in England. The number of passenger journeys has increased by 27% between 1999-2001. This increase was welcomed by the Government. Many other plans have been approved by the Government through economic appraisal using NATA.</p>

<p>(4.55) Guided buses seem to have considerable potential provided that they can offer sufficiently fast and uncongested journeys</p> <p>(4.56) Guided buses as an alternative to light rail systems. Have advantages and potential</p>	<p>GR20R Agrees with RCEP. No policy measures to introduce guided buses.</p>	<p><u>Transport 2010: The Ten Year Plan (July 2000):</u> The Government supports the idea that guided buses offer many of the advantages of light rail at lower capital costs. However, no guidance has been given to local authorities on investing in guided buses. Few systems currently in operation, and few other proposals have been approved by the Government. Governmental research on the benefits of guided buses over light rail systems is limited. A monitoring study for the Leeds guided bus system, which completed in late 1998, suggested that increase in patronage figures given by operators (and quoted by the Government) are higher than actual ones. Other research claimed that the construction costs of light rail might be nearer than assumed to the cost of guided buses, and the operating costs are lower.</p>
<p>(4.57) Computerised systems of small public transport vehicles: funding is being sought for the ULTRA Project for a prototype in Bristol</p> <p>(4.58) Consideration of innovations in technology and marketing in public transport policies</p>	<p>ITWP States government policy as using the most appropriate and cost-effective technology for each task and to encourage pilot trials of newer technologies or systems that show special promise. Emphasises private sector's role in bring technology into market. Government's role seen as to remove institutional and other technical barriers to the use of technologies, and to identify and assess all implications of technology (safety, environmental , social and financial). Proposes support and funding by the Government. Also focuses on partnerships.</p>	<p>Many initiatives and partnerships in action to undertake research and to develop new technologies. Basic governmental funding for research on the future of transport and on future vehicles is via Foresight Vehicle Initiative's LINK programmes. Guidance on Full LTPs also covers Intelligent Transport Systems The ULTRA project run by the University of Bristol is still at research stage, but a demonstration system is planned to be built soon in the Bristol area, and progress is being made. There is no direct governmental funding to the project. Research grants and industrial backing are used for the funding of research and development stages, and the construction stage is to be wholly funded by the industry.</p>

Quality of the public transport system		
<p><i>Essential requirements</i> (4.73ff)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Connections of services: Bus and rail timetables to enable connections without delays; guarantees against cancellations and delays; integration of taxis into the system by pre-booking facilities – Physical provisions for connections: Ability to change routes in comfort and safety; provisions for cycles on trains; clear signing; less dependence on stairs; reconstruction of some stations – Clear, up-to-date and easily accessible information about timetables and fares on all modes of transport at the time and place. Access by telephone/internet – Through ticketing: single ticket for a whole journey, even for combinations of different modes of transport services provided by different operators • Special provision for those with reduced mobility: dial-a-ride services; easy access to vehicles – no steps, low floors; clearer signing and improved lay-out at interchanges (4.75) • Enable institutions to intervene to ensure that rail services function in an integrated system (4.76, from 8.29) • Further legislation that facilitates the strategic development of the railway system should also ensure that it contributes to an integrated public transport system (4.78-4.79, from 8.32) • Legislative and institutional arrangements to deliver an integrated transport system, are lacking, particularly outside of London (4.79) 	<p>GR20R Government agrees on the benefits of integrating public transport and where improvements are needed. Proposed measures to address these (as set out in the ITWP) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance on application of the prohibitions in the Competition Bill not to deter co-operation between bus and train operators • Further research to update guidance on interchange, and identify best practice and good design, including pedestrian and cyclist access • Collaboration with local authorities, public transport operators and other bodies to help establish acceptable methods for carrying cycles on buses and coaches • Wider availability and provision of information on timetables, route planning and fares, and a national public transport info system by 2000, available over the phone, internet etc • Develop existing guidance on passenger information • Rail Regulator to closely monitor rail through-ticketing arrangements • Encourage local authorities to introduce facilities for safer and easier mobility for disabled and elderly people: fully accessible pedestrian crossings, incorporate tactile features and audible signals • Major transport role to the new Greater London Authority (GLA), headed by a directly elected Mayor; transport strategy implemented through a new executive body Transport for London. 	<p>While some leeway is allowed in timetables for possible delays, contractual arrangements tend not to encourage waiting for connecting services for fear of incurring penalties.</p> <p>Physical provisions for connections are improving slowly, as is the provision of information. Public Transport Information 2000 received funding from the Government and has been a positive development, but information at bus stops generally remains poor. Special provision for those with reduced mobility has also improved, eg all new buses are now low floored; SRA and Rail Regulator have a duty to consider needs of disabled and elderly. Through ticketing has been retained for rail services and there has been some progress towards multi-modal through ticketing outside London.</p> <p>General requirement for local authorities to integrate local transport in their LTPs and Quality Partnerships and Contracts can be used to secure these. LTPs and Quality Partnerships and Contracts can also be used to improve accessibility of both vehicles and interchanges and to set out requirements in relation to provision of information.</p> <p>It is the SRA's role to ensure that the rail system functions in an integrated fashion.</p>

Table A1-4

CHAPTER 5: Freight Transport Objectives and targets of 18 th report to which actions described in this Chapter would principally contribute: Objective D: Targets D2, D3		
Issues raised in RCEP's 20 th report	Strategic government response	Follow-up
(5.2) 'Ensuring that heavy goods vehicles bear their environmental costs at the margin will be an important factor in achieving the requisite modal shift'.	See chapter 6	
(5.6) Wider adoption of initiatives to reduce distances over which goods are transported is desirable.	No explicit mention in GR20R apart from general discussion of making the sector more sustainable.	Little official action, though some industry initiatives. Sustain and Transport 2000, through its Wisemoves project, have been looking at the food industry and there are a number of initiatives from supermarkets to reduce CO ₂ emissions from their distribution systems. Sustain are in the process of completing some work on local food initiatives ⁴ . Wisemoves is to be extended to other commodities as the project develops ⁵ .
(5.7) Increase share of waterborne freight	GR20R Extend freight grant scheme to include coastal and short sea shipping; freight grant rules will be examined with a view to encouraging more inland water freight; encourage greater use of inland waterways where practical and economic (paras 77 and 78; also in freight strategy ⁶).	See Appendix 2 (target D3); see FFG funding below White Paper followed by a shipping paper <i>British Shipping: Charting a New Course</i> intended to reverse the decline in shipping. Various initiatives, including EU initiatives on short sea shipping.
(5.8) Increase freight share to rail; EWS, the UK's major rail freight company, has objective of tripling rail freight's market share in 10 years (5.10)	GR20R Generally emphasises desire to promote rail, eg through Strategic Rail Authority, and strengthened powers for Rail Regulator.	See Appendix 2 (target D2); see FFG funding below Government set a target for an 80 per cent increase in rail freight between 2000 and 2010 in its 10 year plan; EWS has subsequently revised its objective to be in line with that of the Government ⁷ .
(5.14, 5.15) Better integration with road freight needed, including intermodal freight facilities.	GR20R HMG is committed to look at the potential that intermodal freight terminals could make to increasing rail freight's market share (para 77)	SRA has been looking at this and there have been a number of developments, eg London International Freight Exchange.
(5.16) Railtrack should be discouraged from disposing of disused rail freight facilities.	GR20R Local authorities will be expected to consider/protect opportunities for rail connections to existing and future industrial sites (para 76)	SRA has instigated a Property Advisory Group to advise on its own land disposal policies; Rail Regulator has introduced a new condition whereby it reviews Railtrack's land disposal. PPG12 states that local authorities should promote opportunities for freight generating development to be served by rail by, where

⁴ Personal communication, Sustain, March 2002

⁵ <http://www.transport2000.org.uk/>

⁶ *Sustainable Distribution: a Strategy* DETR, 1999

⁷ Personal communication with EWS, March 2002

		appropriate, protecting realistic opportunities for rail connections.
(5.17, 5.18) Government should review and possibly increase resources available through FFG	GR20R Notes that grants have already more than doubled and will extend scheme to cover coastal shipping (paras 75 and 78).	This happened.
(5.19) Government should help to promote piggyback if it proves justified on economic and environmental grounds.	GR20R HMG is committed into look at the potential that piggy-back style operations could make to increasing rail freight's market share (para 77)	Every new or rebuilt rail-related structure in the UK, eg a bridge, is constructed to a continental style loading gauge, which will allow for the transport of piggyback style trains. However, there are no plans to upgrade the entire network, although the grades on routes to the ports and other primary routes are being enhanced to enable the transportation of larger containers ⁸ .
(5.20) Freight should be given priority in Channel Tunnel if capacity issues arise.	No mention of this in GR20R or DETR, Sustainable Distribution Strategy	SRA is to produce a capacity allocation strategy. Currently there are severe problems of delays and cancellations owing to stowaways seeking to enter the UK illegally.
(5.22ff) Argues that 44t lorries should remain restricted as to use and road type	GR20R HMG considered a compulsory scheme to confine heavier vehicles (including those of 44t if the CfIT were to recommend these) to a particular network in the course of the preparation of the WP but decided not to make it compulsory instead to develop quality partnerships between the industry and local authorities to reconcile the need for access with environmental and social considerations (para 84). LTPs will also have a role to play in this respect (para 85).	Now generally allowed on basis of draft CfIT report. However CfIT's final report stated that: 'CfIT agreed to produce final advice once account could be taken of the SRA's rail freight strategy. CfIT recommended that the Government should not permit the introduction of 44 tonne lorries until it had been able to act on the recommendations of the CfIT report. However, the Government decided to introduce them from Feb 2001. CfIT is therefore reviewing the situation to see how far the recommendations in its original report have been met.' ⁹
(5.24) More consideration should be given to breaking down loads for distribution.	GR20R HMG agrees that there may be scope for reducing the number of lorry and van movements by drawing lessons from the 'City logistics' systems, as well as learning from Europe (para 86).	Little progress has been made. There have been doubts as to whether this idea would actually be more environmentally efficient. Further, inserting an additional transshipment stage into existing distribution patterns adds cost and other difficulties. Some work is ongoing; but specific interest in the idea of breaking down loads for local distribution has been largely subsumed within a broader emphasis on 'sustainable freight distribution'.

⁸ Personal communication, SRA, March 2002

⁹ *Final Report on Permitting the Use of 44 tonne Lorries for General Use in the UK* Commission for Integrated Transport, February 2002

Table A1-5

CHAPTER 6: Making the best use of roads		
Issues raised in RCEP's 20th report	Strategic government response	Follow-up
(6.4) Advocates substantial real increases in fuel duty	Pursue annual increases in fuel duty of at least 6% above inflation ¹⁰ .	The fuel duty escalator continued at 6 per cent per annum above the rate of inflation until this was suspended in the 2000 budget, when there were no real terms increases. Fuel crisis led to a reversal of policy for diesel in Budget 2001, as the duty on ULSD (used virtually everywhere by then) was cut. Temporary cut of 2p for standard unleaded petrol until 14 June 2001, so as to bring this in line with ULSP (also cut by 2p) to ensure that those without access to the latter were not disadvantaged ¹¹ .
(6.5) Fuel duty and VED should be further differentiated to reflect environmental performance.	Done.	see Chapter 2.
(6.8) Early attention to company car taxation system to remove distortions	Done.	see Chapter 2.
(6.11, 6.12) More strategic approach to trunk road network management, with new construction confined to cases where this represented the best practicable environmental option (BPEO).	GR20R New planning arrangements will bring trunk roads into the regional planning framework; give higher priority to maintaining existing roads before building new ones; consider trunk roads as part of overall transport system with local roads and other modal networks (paras 116-118; also trunk roads paper ¹²).	Initial moratorium on new roads and strategic roads review; but subsequent revisions have led to a gradual return to roadbuilding. Some elements of a BPEO approach can be discerned, eg in the New Approach to Assessment (NATA), multi-modal studies, etc. However, the concept of BPEO has not been taken up in the transport sector.
(6.18, 6.19) Motorway tolling should not be applied unless other measures were taken to avoid diversion of vehicles onto other roads.	GR20R Agreed with this and pilot schemes will be designed with this in mind (para 144).	See below.
(6.21) HGV VED rates are substantially below the level required to cover all external costs, or even costs of road damage.	GR20R A review of the system of VED rates for lorries has been announced to ensure that the environmental damage they cause is reflected in their VED rates (para 17).	VED rates further reduced as a result of fuel crisis in autumn 2000.
(6.23) A <i>vignette</i> system should be introduced on UK roads.	GR20R Effectively dismisses the introduction of a vignette system as it would 'add very little' to existing	Vignette system under consideration in wake of fuel crisis, but current consultation appears to favour a

¹⁰ *Sustainable Distribution: a Strategy* DETR, March 1999

¹¹ http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/budget/budget_2001/budget_report/bud_bud01_repchap6.cfm

¹² *A New Deal for Trunk Roads* DETR, July 1998

	fiscal incentives provided by fuel duty (para 87).	move to a full electronic road pricing system for HGVs, differentiated by size and axle configuration, and possibly also by Euro emissions class.
(6.26 – 6.29) Better management of road space and intersections required, to increase shares given to environmentally benign modes.		See Chapter 4
(6.33) Road pricing appears to be a valuable instrument for reducing congestion and traffic levels in individual cities or towns. (6.36) Local authorities should be given the necessary powers as soon as possible.	Transport Act of 2000 introduced legislation to enable local authorities to introduce congestion charging.	The Mayor of London has given the go ahead for a cordon charge to be introduced in the capital. Durham City Council has also submitted plans for congestion charging to the Secretary of State. Bristol and Derbyshire (for part of the Peak District National Park) are also actively considering schemes, whereas up to 35 authorities expressed an interest in either congestion charging or workplace parking levies in their LTPs ¹³ .
(6.37) Technical standards for electronic road pricing equipment should be common across Europe, and national governments and the European Commission should give a high priority to the development of standards.	Standards for interoperability of technologies could be set at the national or European level ¹⁴ . The appropriate national authority may approve standards for equipment installed in relation to such charging operations (Transport Act, Section 176(2)).	EU Member States are required by Article 11(3) of Directive 1999/62/EC (the Eurovignette Directive) to cooperate in establishing electronic road pricing systems. An initiative known as CARDME is in operation, but is focussed more on traditional motorway charging schemes than a more general charging system, for example. CEN is also developing standards for electronic road pricing systems.
(6.38, 6.39) Parking controls can provide a simple and effective means of controlling urban traffic, but controls over private non-residential parking would be needed.	Transport Act of 2000 introduced legislation to enable local authorities to introduce workplace parking levies.	Nottingham City Council is the most advanced in terms of developing a workplace parking levy, whereas other local authorities, which had expressed an interest, such as Chester, Cambridge and Reading, are taking things more slowly ¹⁵ .
(6.40) Alternatively, the income tax system could be used to tax the private benefit of parking provided by employers; but currently this is not taxed, giving a perverse incentive because employer assistance with public transport costs is taxed.	See above	Little progress on taxation of parking benefit; some anomalies removed by removing tax from cycling and other benefits.

¹³ Personal communication with DTLR, March 2002

¹⁴ *Breaking the Logjam: The Government's consultation on fighting traffic congestion and pollution through road user and workplace parking charges* DETR, December 1998, para3.29

¹⁵ Personal communication with DTLR, March 2002

Table A1-6

CHAPTER 7: Planning for an integrated transport systemObjectives and targets of 18th report to which actions described in this Chapter would principally contribute:

Objective A

Issues raised in RCEP's 20 th report	Strategic government response	Follow-up
(7.1) Formation of DETR recognition of need for closer relationship between transport and land use policies		Formation of DTLR in 2001 from the non-environmental parts of the DETR left planning and transport within the same department, although air quality, noise etc, has moved.
Key land use issues		

	<p>GR20R (paras 94 to 96) HMG will build on process begun by PPG13 and ensure that the right framework is in place to deliver integrated transport at the local level. In England, PPGs on transport (PPG13), development plans and housing will be revised, as will similar guidance in S/W/NI. The revised PPG13 will increase the emphasis on providing access by other modes.</p> <p>GR20R (para 98) ‘The Government has announced measures to modernise the planning system. These include more explicit national policy statements on the need for projects of national importance such as airports and the criteria for site selection and changes in public inquiry procedures. The Government remains committed to the plan-led system of development. This provides the essential framework for rational and consistent planning decisions, and plays a vital role in promoting development and growth which respects the environment. But if the plan-led system is to work there must be plans which cover all parts of the country and an effective system to keep those plans up to date.’</p>	<p><u>Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport (March 2001)</u>: The revised PPG13 gave high priority to the role of land use planning in delivering the integrated transport strategy as defined by ITWP. Focused on integration between planning and transport, and gave clear guidelines to local authorities for providing access by other modes.</p> <p>However, proposed changes to planning system as set out in the recent planning green paper appears to indicate a change in direction compared to the commitment to a plan-led system.</p>
--	--	---

<p>(7.9) In rural areas, transport policies should be based on the following measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved provision of subsidised public transport where that can be justified in terms of the numbers of users • Innovative approaches such as community buses or taxis where a conventional bus service would not be viable • Increasing the extent to which essential services such as food stores, primary schools and post offices are available in villages • Promoting the options of working from home or telecottages in villages in order to remove the need for long daily journeys to work 	<p>GR20R (paras 125-132) Measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Rural Bus Partnership Fund (£45 million) to provide new and additional bus services in the most rural areas and a ‘bus challenge’ to promote innovative local authority measures; – Rural Transport Partnership scheme (£5 million) to support schemes that reduce rural isolation and social exclusion through enhancing access – Targeting enhanced Fuel Duty Rebate to support rural services – Allow local authorities to release rural land for affordable housing – Rate relief scheme for village shops and allowing local authorities to extend this to other businesses – Presumption against closure of rural schools and development of IT to increase viability of these – Supports teleworking 	<p>In 1998 the Government announced three strands of funding: the Rural Bus Subsidy Grant for standard services; the Rural Bus Challenge to encourage local authorities to come up with innovative public transport solutions and the Rural Transport Partnership administered by the Countryside Agency which provided funding to assess rural transport needs and the development of solutions, including community transport schemes. In 2001, the funding of each of these initiatives was increased to £44 million, £20 million and £4 million, respectively and the Parish Transport Fund worth £5 million was set up to enable parishes to address local transport problems such as setting up car clubs. The Rural Transport Partnership in particular has also helped to address social exclusion resulting from a lack of access to transport. The Rural White Paper¹⁶ set out a range of measures to address the problems of rural areas, including the retention of local facilities. The Countryside Agency welcomes the increased funding, but feels that the increase in the number of services in rural areas has not been developed in the most efficient manner. To date Quality Partnerships have not really been developed for rural areas and there are no Quality Contracts¹⁷.</p>
<p><i>In relation to planning for the growth in the number of households:</i></p>		
<p>(7.11) Welcomed DoE aspirational target to build 60% of housing on previously used sites.</p>	<p>GR20R (para 108) The statement <i>Planning for the Communities of the Future</i> proposed the 60% target, which will vary from region to region, so HMG is going to ask that regional targets be set in the next round of renewed RPGs.</p>	<p>Half of the revised RPGs which have been published since 1997 have adopted 60% target for their regions (for the South East, this was in the region outside of London where the rate is already 80%). Two (East of England and the South West) only adopted targets of 50%, while the West Midlands set a target of 66%, although this RPG is currently being revised again.</p>
<p>(7.13) A more proactive role in planning for the projected increase in the number of households is required to maximise use of previously developed land and to ensure that all new development achieves a sustainable integration between land use and transport</p>	<p>GR20R (paras 106-107) HMG firmly committed to mixed development and, as well as revising PPG13 (transport), it will revise PPG3 (Housing) to give clearer advice on the location of housing with a view to avoiding unnecessary reliance on the car.</p>	<p><u>Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing (March 2000)</u>: Local planning authorities are expected to create more sustainable patterns of development by building in ways which exploit and deliver accessibility by public transport to jobs, education and health facilities, shopping, leisure and local services. Guidance is given on ‘linking development with public transport’ and promoting mixed-use development’. Proposals for development should be supported by a transport assessment as set out in PPG13.</p>
<p><i>(7.15) In relation to the promotion of urban regeneration, the commission hopes that serious consideration will be given to the following proposals from the Round Table on Sustainable Development:</i></p>		
<p>Local authorities should play a more proactive role in strategies for urban revitalisation</p>	<p>Not addressed in response to 20th report.</p>	

¹⁶ *Our Countryside: The Future – A Fair Deal for Rural England* DEFRA, November 2000

¹⁷ Personal communication, Countryside Agency, March 2002

Urban White Papers should be prepared for each part of the UK		
Economic instruments should be used to make greenfield sites less attractive to developers than brownfield sites	<p>Not addressed in response to 20th report, but on Treasury's website¹⁸ the following measures are set out to help regenerate Britain's towns and cities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a stamp duty exemption for property transactions in Britain's disadvantaged areas; • a cut in VAT to 5% to encourage renovation and conversion of existing property; • 100% capital allowances for creating flats over shops; and • 150% accelerated tax credits to help clean-up contaminated land. 	It is too early to identify whether these measures are having the desired effect.
<i>(7.27) In relation to the integration of transport and land use planning, action is needed to:</i>		
Put in place institutional arrangements that enable transport and land use planning to be considered together at all levels, including national, regional, sub-regional and local	GR20R (para 93) RPGs will incorporate regional transport strategies; (para 102) Cooperation of industry and local government is also necessary and HMG will not hesitate to use its powers of intervention where there are proposals to undermine the integrated transport policy.	Development of regional transport strategies is still in early stages. Need to identify state of play to date and ascertain the quality of the strategies to date.
Ensure that institutional arrangements allow for greater consistency of treatment, eg in parking control and standards	GR20R (para 93) RPGs will incorporate regional transport strategies; (para 97) Development plan policies for parking will be expected to support HMG's policies on location of development.	The revised PPG13 reinforces the message that parking policies should complement planning policies on the location of development, and should be coordinated with parking controls and charging set out in the local transport plan.
Ensure that changes in land use policy are more speedily reflected in structure and local plans	GR20R (para 99) A revision of PPG12 (development plans) will set out the new approach for producing plans more quickly.	<u>Planning Policy Guidance Note 12: Development Plans (January 2000)</u> : Stresses the importance of the issue. Includes detailed guidance on changes in local plans and UDP procedures introduced by the Government for helping local authorities to reduce the time taken in plan adoption.
Harmonise the coverage and time-scales of transport and land use planning practices		
<i>(7.30) In relation to air quality management</i>		
Local authorities must take into account the longer-term prospects	GR20R (para 109) The National Air Quality Strategy addresses longer-term issues, including targets, relating to air quality. A key tool for delivering these targets is the system of Local Air Quality Management, which includes the need for local authorities to develop action plans where there is a risk that targets might not be met.	See Table AI-1

¹⁸ http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/topics/environment/topics_environment_index.cfm?

New machinery at the local level		
(4.78) Primary focus for creating an integrated transport system should be at the local level, though with an appropriate recognition of the regional level.	GR20R (para 88-92) HMG agrees with the first statement, so it has made Local Transport Plans, which will be framed by the RPG, the centrepiece of its integrated approach to transport policy in England. Separate arrangements are in place in S/W/NI. These plans will cover all modes and in bidding for funds from central government, local authorities will have to show that the projects fit the objectives of the plan and that they have considered alternatives to major new construction. They will cover a five-year period and local authorities will have to submit an annual progress check to the DTLR.	The creation of LTPs is seen as a positive step in shifting the focus of local transport away from roads to a more integrated approach linked to funding. Their introduction has been welcomed by local authorities, as they are broader and more inclusive than the previous TPPs. The requirement that LTPs should contain a bus strategy has also been seen as a positive development ¹⁹ . The development of LTPs is at an early stage, so their impact has yet to work through the system, however, there is some concern that they will still not be successful in delivering a more integrated transport system.
(7.23, 7.24) Concern that TPPs continue to be dominated by spending on roads.		
(7.34) County councils and unitary authorities should be placed under a statutory duty of assessing the transport system in their area and planning on a long-term basis for the integration of an integrated transport system.		
(7.35) Integrated plans should also cover regulation and management of private road transport		
(7.36) Preparation of long-term transport policies must proceed simultaneously with the preparation of structure and local plans in any given area.	GR20R (paras 104-105) RPGs, which will now include a transport strategy, should set out a framework for the next 20 years. LTPs should be more detailed than the development plan and look to the longer term, beyond their five year remit, to identify how future targets will be met.	The revised PPG12 says that it is ideal that the development plan and transport plan are developed in parallel, but acknowledges that this is not always possible. However, it underlines that it is important to ensure that the planning and the transport strategies are consistent and integrated with each other. LTPs and RTSs aim to look at longer time horizons and are supposed to be integrated, therefore a longer term approach to transport should be the result. However, the proposals in the planning Green Paper to reform the existing development plan system could potentially undermine the integration of transport and land use at the local level.
<i>Separate transport authorities</i>		
(7.38) PTAs/PTEs should take over the traffic management responsibilities of local authorities.	GR20R (para 112) HMG believes PTA/Es play an important role in delivering an integrated transport system, but that changing their responsibilities could weaken the link between transport and land use. Further it considers that the powers of county councils and unitary authorities outside of metropolitan areas are sufficient to enable the necessary cooperation on transport and land use.	
(7.39) The case for additional PTAs/PTEs should be examined.		

¹⁹ Personal communication, Local Government Association, March 2002

<i>Regional planning</i>		
<p>(7.43) Firmer and more specific coordination of transport and land use policies at regional level is an essential precondition for an integrated transport policy, which applies to all modes of transport.</p>	<p>GR20R (paras 113-114) Planning conferences working with RGOs and RDAs will have responsibility for developing RPGs, which will include a regional transport strategy (RTS). Consistency with this strategy will be an important factor in the approval of LTPs. Planning conferences working with Regional Chambers will be responsible for the long-term development of the regional strategies.</p>	<p>The development of regional transport strategies within the regional planning framework is a potentially a positive step in integrating transport and land use policies at a regional level. To date four of the eight RPGs have been amended and include an RTS, while another, that of East Anglia, contains some of the relevant principles, as it was being revised as national government policy was developing. The other three RPGs are currently under revision. As the first RPG with a complete RTS was finalised barely a year ago (the one for the South East was published in March 2001), it is too early to say whether the RTSs are having the desired effect on the development of local transport policy. However, it is possible that they may suffer from the relative political weakness of the regions in England.</p>

London		
(7.46) The Government's proposals for London provide a big step forward compared to the previous arrangements.	GR20R (paras 133-136) The creation of the GLA and the role of Mayor will enable the London's transport to be treated in an integrated fashion. The Mayor will produce an integrated transport strategy for the city, and responsibility for underground, bus and strategic roads will be brought together under the responsibility of Transport for London. Responsibility for taxi licensing will also be brought within this framework.	The GLA is made up of a directly elected Mayor (the Mayor of London) and a separately elected Assembly (London Assembly). It assumed its many responsibilities, including transport, in July 2000. The Mayor has an executive role and makes decisions on behalf of GLA and the Assembly, while the Assembly is a scrutinising body, checking the Mayor's activities and decisions and approving his budget. The Mayor produces the Integrated Transport Strategy for London and also sets the budgets for the GLA and Transport for London (TfL), which is an executive arm of the GLA reporting to the Mayor. It is responsible for managing London Buses, Croydon Tramlink, and the Docklands Light Railway, and most other transport activities in London. It is also responsible for delivering the Mayor's Transport Strategy. The Government proposes to transfer London Underground Ltd (LUL) to TfL once the PPP contracts are signed (see Chapter 4 for details).
(7.46) Concerned at the lack of clarity with respect to the responsibility for taxi licensing.		
(7.46) Concerned that the proposals would not achieve the close relationship required between land use and transport.		
Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland		
(7.47 to 7.49)	See discussion in main text.	
Financing an integrated transport system		
(7.50) Essential to harness private funding to consistent and coherent strategies with clear objectives. (Also 8.49) A 10-year investment programme needed to develop alternative modes and so provide the essential basis for cumulative change	GR20R (paras 140-141) An extra £1.8 billion over 10 years has been allocated to local transport, bus services, road maintenance and railways. Partnerships with the private sector will see an increase in the amount of private money invested in transport. The abolition of the annual spending round to a three year spending plan will give greater certainty to plan and manage programmes.	
(7.51) If motorway tolls are introduced, not that the RCEP supports them, they should be regarded as a source of funding for the maintenance and operation of the motorway system.	GR20R (para 144) HMG will consider how best the revenues of each pilot charging scheme can be used to provide other benefits locally.	
(7.52) Local authorities should be allowed to use the revenue from road pricing and new forms of parking charge as an additional source of funding for non-car modes.	GR20R (paras 148 and 152) HMG will introduce legislation to allow local authorities to introduce congestion charging and workplace parking charges and will require that the revenue proceeds will improve transport choice locally.	See Chapter 2