UK transport policy – a shift toward a green agenda?

Neil Chadwick   **Liz Ampt**
Steer Davies Gleave   *Steer Davies Gleave*

Abstract:

In the UK, the last ten years have seen a sea change in both transport policy and the way transport infrastructure and services are provided.

In policy terms the "predict and provide" approach to planning increases in road capacity has been abandoned. The traditional direction of policy has changed, challenged by a Green Paper of the last Conservative Government and now formulated in the Labour Government's recent White Paper.

Transport infrastructure and service provision is now largely in the hands of the private sector: the bus industry has been privatized and deregulated and the process of rail franchising complete. Private finance is used widely for both road and public transport schemes.

The paper briefly reviews this policy shift and examines how local and central government are responding to the new agenda in terms of their policies and programmes. Important questions are raised regarding the ability of the private sector to facilitate government policy in a cost-effective way.

Finally, we examine a key question: can the transport planning profession deliver techniques appropriate to the new agenda?

Contact author:

Neil Chadwick
Steer Davies Gleave
32 Upper Ground
LONDON SE19PD UK

Telephone: + 44 171 919 8500   Fax: + 44 171 827 9850
Email: chadwn@sdg.co.uk

Introduction

The last ten years have seen a sea change in both transport policy and the way transport infrastructure and services are provided in the UK.

In policy terms the "predict and provide" approach to planning increases in road capacity has been abandoned. The traditional direction of policy has changed, with the focus turning away from a road construction led approach to the recognition that traffic growth cannot be catered for indefinitely and a perhaps belated recognition of the role of public transport.

The way transport infrastructure and services are provided has also changed: the bus industry has been deregulated and privatised and the process of rail privatisation was completed in the last year of the Conservative government. Private finance is widely used for both road and public transport schemes.

This paper reviews how policy has shifted over the last ten years and examines how local and central government are responding to the new agenda in terms of their policies and programmes. The new agenda poses new demands on the transport planning profession, the paper concludes by considering whether the profession is currently in a position to deliver techniques appropriate to this new agenda.

Transport Policy – Ten Years of Change

Predict and Provide

In 1989 the Conservative government published the White Paper *Roads to Prosperity* (DoT, 1989a). The White Paper had one dominant theme: road traffic is a reflection of a growing and vibrant economy and the way to cater for increased demand for road travel is through the construction of new roads and upgrading of existing ones. The White Paper expressed the government's view that public transport had little to offer in helping to alleviate congestion and that new technology applied to traffic management would help address some of the worst problems but would do little to cater for the forecast growth. Restraint through increased motoring taxation was also rejected. New National Road Traffic Forecasts (DoT, 1989b) published simultaneously with the White Paper projected that between 1988 and 2025 traffic would grow by between 83% and 142%: the government's response was a £6bn programme of road construction and upgrading.

The roads programme was justified in the White Paper in that it would meet three key objectives:

- it would assist economic growth by reducing transport costs;
- it would improve the environment by removing through traffic from unsuitable roads in towns and villages, and
- it would enhance road safety.

The impact of the roads programme on the environment and economy was subject to detailed scrutiny in the following years.

The Environment and Sustainability

The roads programme fitted uncomfortably with the government's developing environmental policy. The 1990 environment White Paper *This Common Inheritance* committed government to the principle that sustainability should underpin development of policy and actions that impact on the environment. The process of environmental impact assessment for major transport infrastructure had already been established, but the criticism of the Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment (SACTRA, 1992) resonated with the concerns of the environmental lobby and public at large, namely that the environmental impact of roads schemes was neither being treated in a comprehensive manner nor early enough in the planning process. There was concern that a full environmental appraisal was undertaken only once the decision to pursue a scheme through the planning process was undertaken. This environmental assessment compared a narrow set of alternative road alignments and assessed their impact on the local environment. There was no process of assessment of the environmental impact of the wider programme or the cumulative impact of a number of related schemes. In particular SACTRA recommended that:

- "appropriate environmental assessments must underlie every stage in the hierarchy of decisions, from the making of national and regional policy downwards"(§16.03)
- "environmental assessment on a scheme by scheme basis alone will not take account of all effects. There is a need for strategic level of assessment"(§16.08)
- "an appraisal structure must be devised which will be adequate in geographical extent and timescale" (§16.11)
- "the statutory environmental statements produced on publication of the finally preferred scheme need to be considerably expanded and refined" (§16.25)

Government did not accept all the criticisms of SACTRA. Formal strategic environmental assessment still does not form a part of the planning process although this can be said to be partly due to methodological difficulties as Steer Davies Gleave (1996) has shown. The methods for scheme environmental assessment were updated though. Interestingly, SACTRA also expressed the concerns that new roads may actually generate new traffic, a subject that the committee returned in their 1994 report.

It was not just the environmental impact of the planned road construction that was causing concern both to the transport planning profession and general public. The consequence of application of the 1989 NRTF was projections of growing congestion in Britain's major towns and cities. A number of integrated transportation planning studies were undertaken in the early 1990s. By using multi-criteria assessment frameworks that moved away from a single cost benefit based decision rules that to that time had underpinned the appraisal of transport proposals, the studies identified significant erosion of urban quality of life in a do-minimum situation. Road based solutions, whilst having good cost benefit results, did little to alleviate the worsening quality of life. Whilst the strategies which were derived by these studies contained often significant

elements of road construction, they were largely reliant on public transport to cater for the anticipated increase in personal travel to city centres in a way that was felt was both environmentally and economically sustainable. Even if not part of central government policy, the promotion of public transport alternatives to road construction and traffic growth was becoming an important part of local government's policies and programmes. However, local government spending has been tightly constrained for many years and many plans have not seen fruition due to lack of funding.

SACTRA and The Royal Commission

Two key documents were published in 1994 which further undermined the predict and provide policy. In October 1994 the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution (RCEP) reported on their review of transport and the environment and in December SACTRA reported on their investigation of road construction and traffic generation.

The SACTRA report *Trunk Roads and the Generation of Traffic* (SACTRA, 1994) concluded that it was possible for the provision of extra capacity to induce extra traffic and so the capacity of the road network as a whole influences traffic growth. They also concluded that travel time savings brought about by road improvements are used for further travel. Overall SACTRA concluded that induced traffic can and does occur and probably quite extensively so. Whilst the economic cost benefit appraisal of road schemes was based on the fixed matrix approach there was the likelihood that for a significant number of schemes the economic benefit was being overstated. Again, as with the 1992 report, government did not accept all SACTRA's conclusions and recommendations; one of the reasons for this being the difficulty in gathering tangible evidence on the spatial scale and magnitude of induced traffic. However, appraisal methods have been refined in response to SACTRA's findings.

The RCEP's report *Transport and the Environment* (RCEP, 1994) analysed in detail the inter-relationships between transport and a widely defined environment. The RCEP defined the environment not only to the traditional elements covered by the environmental statement, but also as encompassing the quality of life. The Commission identified a number of respects in which the present use of vehicles, the manufacturing of vehicles and the construction of new transport infrastructure are in conflict with the government's accepted aim of sustainability. They concluded from their analysis that "unrelenting growth in transport has become possibly the greatest environmental threat facing the UK and one of the greatest obstacles to achieving sustainable development" (§1.2).

The Commission established a set of *Objectives* that would have to be met if the UK was to attain an environmentally sustainable transport system (as noted, their definition included ensuring quality of life as well as safe guarding natural assets, flora and fauna, and the built environment). They concluded that a radical programme was needed if the environmental targets were to be met. At the core of their analysis was the proposition that road traffic growth (both cars and lorries) would have to be restricted in the future. Improved vehicle technology, with cleaner engine and exhaust technology, they

concluded, is not enough to attain their defined objectives for a sustainable transport system

To support their objectives, the Commission set a series of targets, some of which defined future mode shares for transport both in terms of numbers of journeys by each mode and in terms of the volume of movement defined by passenger-kilometres and tonne-kilometres The Commission's Objectives and Targets are reproduced in Box 1. However, whilst making 110 recommendations to help achieve the targets the Commission conceded that they had not investigated whether their targets were mutually consistent, whether they would deliver the required results in terms of the level of containment of environmental impacts and what kind of changes in respect of public transport and freight would be needed to achieve them.

A report prepared in 1995 for Transport 2000[1] (Steer Davies Gleave, 1995), explored these issues and concluded the Commission's targets on emissions could be met provided:

- road traffic could be constrained to grow at no more than 10% per annum. This rate is around half of the low 1989 NRTF, and
- public transport and rail/water freight is able to attract the higher shares of the market identified in the Commission's targets.

The report identified that if increased market share by public transport did not occur then to achieve the Commission's Objectives it would be necessary either to increase the level of restraint on car use further than the Commission envisaged or that there would be adverse affect on social and economic activity levels. The logical consequence of this is that if the Commission's environmental targets are to be reached, increased use of public transport is a necessary condition for sustaining economic growth and social activity

The Great Debate

By the end of 1994 there was growing public opposition to the roads programme. SACTRA had demonstrated that the planning that underpinned the justification of the roads programme in the 1989 White Paper did not take full account of environmental impact and that the cost benefit analysis was more than likely to overstate the economic benefits. The Royal Commission had shown that the forecast increase in traffic was environmentally unsustainable. In response to the growing criticism of their transport policy, government launched in 1995 a transport "debate", inviting submissions from interested parties and the public (DoT, 1995)

---

[1]   Transport 2000 is a transport and environmental pressure group which encourages and sponsors informed debate on transport policy in the UK. Their recent research has been funded by organisations including London Transport, the Association of Train Operating Companies, Railtrack, Sainsbury Family Charitable Trust, Rail Freight Group and Eurotunnel

By 1996 government's *volte face* was complete. The increasing concern about the environmental impact of road construction and traffic *per se*, and the sheer cost of the roads programme resulted in the realisation that it was no longer possible to cater for growth in the demand for travel through road construction alone. The 1996 Green Paper (DoT, 1996) was published as the government's response to the debate over the direction of transport policy. In the Green Paper government stated "keeping pace with increasing demand for road space simply by building roads is not a realistic option, either environmentally or financially" (§11.67). But, whilst accepting the end of the predict and provide policy, the Green Paper was by definition a discussion of alternatives rather than a statement of new policy. Government, however, did say in the Green Paper what it did not wish to do: government was reluctant to commit itself to restraint, whilst accepting the need for action to moderate the growth in demand for road travel. The idea of national traffic targets as suggested by the Royal Commission as a device to help formulate restraint policies was, for the time being, rejected. As expected from the government that had privatised the air, bus and rail transport systems, it saw the future of investment in public transport as lying with the private sector, but argued, as in the 1989 White Paper, that the effect of investment in public transport on alleviating congestion would be limited.

The net result of the 1996 Green Paper was to place transport policy in a sort of limbo: it was accepted that an extensive roads programme was not a feasible way forward, but the Green Paper fell short of recommending what was needed as an alternative. Spending on roads was curtailed but there was no corresponding uplift in investment in alternative modes. Indeed, as Steer Davies Gleave (1997) showed, whilst public transport spending was moderately greater in the late 1990s than a decade before (because of the construction of the Jubilee Line Extension in London and cost associated with rail privatisation) absolute levels and per capita spending were still way below the levels experienced in other European Union states. At the time the Green Paper was published government's future plans were for a £2bn reduction in overall spending on transport provision over a five-year period.

The Labour Government

In May 1997 Labour was elected. Their manifesto committed government to develop an integrated transport policy. It may have been expected that after 18 years in opposition Labour would have formulated a coherent approach which could have been implemented quickly. Their first action, however, was to initiate a fundamental review of transport policy (DETR, 1997) as preparation for the production of a White Paper. The consultation paper concluded with 27 questions to which responses were invited to assist government in the development of their approach (see Box 2). The response to the consultation was said to be almost overwhelming, perhaps helping explain the delayed publication of the White Paper. The government also took the novel step of appointing a group of advisors, external to the DETR, to work directly with senior civil servants and Ministers. Ensuring that the strategy engenders widespread support appears to be a key theme of the government's approach; another factor which may help explain the delayed White Paper publication.

The consultation document did herald a different view to transport policy though. The role and need for public transport to help alleviate congestion and provide a real alternative to car travel was recognised. Whilst accepting that public transport provision would remain largely in private hands, a new and more interventionist approach to regulation was heralded. The Government also accepted the need to promote greater awareness of transport throughout society so that people start to take personal responsibility for their transport actions. The importance of considering the land-use and transport interaction was also emphasised. However, the constraint on public funds continued to be stressed.

Prompted by what they saw as a worsening of transport's impact on the environment, the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution returned to the subject of transport and the environment (RCEP, 1998). They welcomed the new government's commitment to developing an integrated policy, but were concerned that since the publication of their 1994 report:

- road traffic had started to increase again following the recession;
- contrary to expectations, there was evidence of rising concentrations of nitrogen dioxide;
- there had been a small reduction in average fuel consumption of new cars but other factors are offsetting that;
- the use of public transport had not fallen further, but neither had it started to reverse earlier decline;
- the proportion of freight carried by rail and water had fallen further;
- there was further evidence of decline of walking and cycling.

Essentially their message was that four years of inaction since their 1994 report had resulted in a worsening of the impact of transport on the environment

A New Policy Direction

The policy challenge is to develop an approach which will limit the growth of private car use whilst maintaining economic growth. Research for Transport 2000 showed that:

- the effectiveness of policy measures designed to moderate the growth of private car use will be dependent on demonstrating that realistic alternatives exist;
- whilst increased walk/cycle use will be an important part of any forward policy mix, it will be to public transport that the majority of travel in terms of person-kilometres will have to switch;
- public transport can attract car users if it designed to do so.

In an era where it is deemed undesirable to cater for increased car travel the requirement for public transport changes. In the past it was to provide a back-up facility for those who couldn't use a car; now the aim is to provide accessibility for all to accommodate the growth in demand that cannot be met through former growth in private car use. As has already been noted the provision of a quality public transport system becomes a

necessity to facilitate the continuing increasing demand for travel as a result of economic growth.

Improved public transport is needed to cater for the increasing demand for *travel*. However, the role of walking and cycling in providing an alternative for a significant number of *trips* should not be forgotten. A reduction in the rate of growth of travel will help address *inter alia* regional and global environmental impacts (e.g. CO_2 emissions) and congestion on the trunk road. Many of the trips made in towns are short, and whilst not making a significant contribution to total travel, they contribute to local environmental problems such as kerb side pollution, noise, severance and local congestion. The importance of policies to encourage walking and cycling was recognised in the current government's pre White Paper consultation and can be expected one of the planks of the new policy platform.

The UK Round Table on Sustainable Development (1997) has identified five barriers that have to be overcome to attain a quality public transport system:

- *information before the journey*, information on bus services is seen as particularly inaccessible;
- *information during the journey*, information is needed on how and where to make connections and when the connecting service is to arrive;
- *time*, services must be co-ordinated and reliable;
- *physical inconvenience and personal safety*, there must be access for the mobility impaired. Interchanges should provide shelter from the weather and ensure personal security;
- *cost*, multi-leg journeys must be affordable, not incurring a cost penalty everytime there is a change of mode.

From this it can be seen that public transport has to have a number of attributes, some of which it is currently perceived to lack to a substantial degree, if it is to offer a generalised alternative to car. The measures necessary to put right weaknesses in the current services require making good the "network deficiency" engendered by a privatised and fragmented public transport industry. Furthermore, the shortfalls and opportunities for improvement will require substantial levels of investment of various types, with only some elements generating a commercial return. Given the scale of private/public sector funding that will be needed, it will be important for government to prioritise its expenditure on areas which will maximise its return, including return against environmental objectives.

As well as overcoming the existing barriers to use, a quality public transport system needs to also cater for the need of three types of trip maker to be successful:

i. people who currently use the public transport system for as many trips as possible ("willing users"). Improving public transport will make life better for them, but will not change usage. However, improving public transport will also contribute to halting the drift towards car ownership and use;

ii   people who are basically willing to use public transport but who know too little
       about it, for whom it is too slow/indirect or who believe it is difficult to use
       ("willing non-users"). Improving public transport and related perceptions and
       knowledge is likely to lead to greater use for this group.

iii. people who are currently unwilling to use public transport ("unwilling non-users").
       Improving components of public transport will have little or no impact on their use
       or perception. What is required is a twin track approach of restraint and education,
       with public transport providing the alternative to travelling by car.

Understanding the required attributes of a quality public transport system and the
different segments of the population that have to be addressed is key to planning for its
implementation. Traditional transport models and evaluation techniques have focussed
on assessing aspects of the transport system that can easily be measured such as
increasing levels of service, the impact of fares changes or new services and routes
altogether. All of these things can be encompassed in convenient modelling
formulations, usually driven by some measure of "generalised cost" and then be subject
to cost benefit analysis. In the UK practice is that all of these models take future traffic
growth as an exogenous input

Improvements of physical infrastructure and service levels and quality in general act to
retain existing willing users, but this is only one of the three categories of trip maker to
be addressed. Willing non-users are going to be swayed not just by network
improvements but by information and marketing. Unwilling non-users need to be
swayed by restraint policies combined with amplification of awareness and behavioural
change programmes such as TravelWise or Travel Blending (see Ampt 1997).
Conventional transport modelling and evaluation techniques deal well with the actions
that improve public transport for willing users, but not with those which are focussed on
willing non-users and unwilling non-users. Furthermore, conventional models tend to be
segmented by such measures as car ownership or availability, not by people's attitudes
to alternatives.

Car travel is and will remain the dominant mode of transport in the UK. Its continuing
growth at historic trends has been shown to be unsustainable. The policy platform to
develop a sustainable transport system needs to have five key elements:

* an improved quality public transport system which will provide the means for
  catering for the increasing demand for travel;
* a recognition of the need for measures to promote walk and cycling which will
  create alternatives to car travel for the many short trips, especially those in towns;
* a policy of restraint of car travel, but this must be done in combination with
  improved public transport;
* travel behavioural and awareness campaigns which inform the unwilling public
  transport users of the availability of alternatives and the environmental and
  economic consequences of their use of the car;
* the pursuit of a land-use policy which seeks to encourage and promote
  developments which are suited to be served by public transport and walk/cycle.

The challenge for the transport planning profession is to develop techniques which address the subtleties of the required policy blend. The challenge is three-fold. Transport modellers need to develop techniques which address adequately responses to restraint mechanisms such as trip suppression, trip re-timing, re-distribution or trip chaining. It is true that models exist to address all of these aspects, but they are expensive and time consuming both in terms of data and development. The second part of the challenge is to develop evaluation techniques which encompass the social and environmental benefits associated with a new policy direction rather than just simple economic benefits currently used for evaluating road and public transport schemes. Finally the third challenge is perhaps the hardest; a profession which has traditionally developed 'hard' infrastructure solutions now needs to change its thinking and look towards the contribution of 'soft' measures which are designed explicitly to influence behaviour. However, as the Royal Commission has shown, there is not opportunity for 'paralysis through analysis' – the time for action is now.

Conclusion

There has been a change in the direction of transport policy in the UK. The Conservative government abandoned its road construction led policy and the election of the Labour government seems to have brought a belated recognition of the role of public transport. In all this time though there has been the continued degradation of the environment due to continuing traffic growth over and above what is environmentally sustainable. The latest forecasts of long term traffic growth (DoT, 1997) are lower than the 1989 forecasts, but still beyond that which is the RCEP has defined as sustainable.

Arguably, inappropriate transport planning techniques that resulted in the understating of the environmental impact of new roads and an overstating of their economic benefit prolonged the primacy of the roads programme. Indeed the Interim Report from SACTRA (1998) on their latest investigation, this time on transport investment and economic growth, casts doubt on whether in a mature economy and developed network, investment in roads promotes a net gain in the economy at all.

A quality public transport system has been identified as one of the prerequisites for constraining the growth of car travel without severely impacting on economic growth. This provides new challenges for the transport planning profession. Setting aside the concerns expressed by Goodwin (1997) on the appropriateness of the equilibrium framework for modelling *per se*, it is clear that conventional modelling approaches do not allow the impact of the full range of measures underpinning a quality public transport system to be addressed. Moreover, they are poor at assessing the switch to walk/cycle and the impact of behavioural change measures.

The challenge for the transport planning profession is to develop solutions which can be implemented quickly, but with the confidence that they will contribute to the goal of environmental sustainability.

BOX 1:	RCEP OBJECTIVES AND TARGETS	Categorisation
A:	**To ensure that an effective transport policy at all levels of government is integrated with land use policy and gives priority to minimising the need for transport and increasing the proportions of trips made by environmentally less damaging modes.**	facilitating
B:	**To achieve standards of air quality that will prevent damage to human health and the environment.**	air pollutants
B1:	To achieve full compliance by 2005 with World Health Organization (WHO) health-based air quality guidelines for transport-related pollutants.	
B2:	To establish in appropriate areas by 2005 local air quality standards based on the critical levels required to protect sensitive ecosystems.	
C:	**To improve the quality of life, particularly in towns and cities, by reducing the dominance of cars and lorries and providing alternative means of access.**	facilitating
C1:	To reduce the proportion of urban journeys undertaken by car from 50% in the London area to 45% by 2000 and 35% by 2020, and from 65% in other urban areas to 60% by 2000 and 50% by 2020	
C2:	To increase cycle use to 10% of all urban journeys by 2005, compared to 2.5% now, and seek further increases thereafter on the basis of targets to set by the government.	
C3:	To reduce pedestrian deaths from 2.2 per 100,000 population to not more than 1.5 per 100,000 population by 2000, and cyclist deaths from 4.1 per 100 million kilometres cycled to not more than 2 per 100 million kilometres cycled by the same date.	
D:	**To increase the proportions of personal travel and freight transport by environmentally less damaging modes and to make the best use of existing infrastructure.**	
D1:	To increase the proportion of passenger-kilometres carried by public transport from 12% in 1993 to 20% by 2005 and 30% by 2020.	
D2:	To increase the proportion of tonne-kilometres carried by rail from 6.5% in 1993 to 10% by 2000 and 20% by 2010.	
D3:	To increase the proportion of tonne-kilometres carried by water from 25% in 1993 to 30% by 2000, and at least maintain that share thereafter.	
E:	**To halt any loss of land to transport infrastructure in areas of conservation, cultural, scenic or amenity value unless the use of land for that purpose has been shown to be the best practicable environmental option.**	environment
F:	**To reduce carbon dioxide emissions from transport.**	air pollutants
F1:	To reduce emissions of carbon dioxide from surface transport in 2020 to no more than 80% of the 1990 level.	
F2:	To limit emissions of carbon dioxide from surface transport in 2000 to the 1990 level.	
F3:	To increase the average fuel efficiency of new cars sold in the UK by 40% between 1990 and 2005, that of new light goods vehicles by 20% and that of new heavy duty vehicles by 10%.	
G:	**To reduce substantially the demands which transport infrastructure and the vehicle industry place on non-renewable materials.**	environment
G1:	To increase the proportion by weight of scrapped vehicles which is recycled, or used for energy generation, from 77% at present to 85% by 2002 and 95% by 2015.	
G2:	To increase the proportion of vehicles tyres recycled, or used for energy generation, from less than a third at present to 90% by 2015	
G3:	To double the proportion of recycled material used in road construction and reconstruction by 2005, and double it again by 2015	
H:	**To reduce noise nuisance from transport.**	
H1:	To reduce daytime exposure to road and rail nose to not more than 65 $dBL_{Ae1\ 16h}$ at the external walls of housing.	
H2:	To reduce night-time exposure to road and rail nose to not more than 59 $dBL_{Ae1\ 8h}$ at the external walls of housing.	

BOX 2: THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT'S 27 QUESTIONS

1. Are the aims we have set ourselves the right ones?
2. What balance should there be between "sticks" and "carrots" to achieve our aims? Can we conclude that neither works without the other?
3. Recognising that funding available from the public purse is strictly limited, how best do you think our transport systems could be improved?
4. To what extent should we be looking at the potential for restraining use of the car, van or lorry? How would any such restraints operate, and what would the effect be on personal mobility or national and regional competitiveness?
5. What roles should be played by pricing, fiscal policies, and regulation to achieve our aims?
6. What can we do to reduce peoples' need to travel?
7. Would transport policy be enhanced by adopting a range of transport "targets", against which to assess progress? If so, what form should they take? Should they be national, regional or local?
8. Should Government develop new funding mechanisms or income streams for transport? If so, what form should they take?
9. Which aspects of public transport do you think it is most important to improve in order to persuade more people to leave their cars at home and use public transport instead?
10. What practical measures would bring about more use of less environmentally damaging forms of freight transport such as railways, inland waterways and coastal shipping? Could the Government's freight grants scheme be improved further, and if so how?
11. How can the contribution of ports and airports to regional and national competitiveness be enhanced without detriment to environmental objectives?
12. How can we actively encourage more environmentally-friendly vehicles and fuels, the development of less environmentally damaging technologies and innovations which reduce the need to travel?
13. How can we integrate land use planning and transport more effectively, with a more strategic approach, so as to cut unnecessary journeys?
14. How can we ensure, for example through the taxation systems, that the priced faced by transport users more accurately reflect the wider environmental and social costs?
15. What is the appropriate role of national, regional and local levels for the provision and regulation of transport? What role should be played by passenger transport authorities or executives, or by voluntary co-ordinating bodies such as planning conferences?
16. What changes might be needed to the ways local authorities receive capital funding for transport, to encourage the development of integrated transport policies at the local level?
17. Is there, as suggested in the previous Government's paper "Transport The Way Forward", a role for making greater use of economic instruments to influence how people choose to travel, such as increasing the price of public parking, possibly taxing companies' car parking provision, and charging for the use of roads? How should the receipts from such sources be used?
18. What should be the role of urban traffic management measures?
19. How can we achieve economic growth which is less road traffic intensive, while still taking account of the role of national, regional and local transport policies in promoting national and regional competitiveness?
20. In circumstances where demand exceeds road capacity at certain times, what priority might be given to scarce road space and how might that be delivered? It has sometimes been suggested that priority should be given to emergency vehicles; buses, coaches and taxis; goods vehicles; and disabled motorists – are these the right priorities?
21. How can we best take account of the differing accessibility needs of urban and rural communities?
22. How can we increase the awareness of transport users about the consequences of their choices?
23. How can we best ensure a high standard of safety across all modes?
24. How can we ensure that policies designed to establish environmentally sustainable transport systems are compatible with the Government's wider aims for social inclusion?
25. How can we best promote the transport needs of disabled people?
26. How can we best take account of the transport and accessibility needs of all sectors of society, including the young and the elderly?
27. What should the role of transport be in delivering the national air quality strategy, reductions in acidifying pollutants and our climate change commitments?

Annex: UK Government and its advisers

DETR	The Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, created by the Labour government after the May 1997 election by merging the DoE and DoT, the DETR brings environmental and transport policy into one department for the first time since 1976.
DoE	The Department of the Environment. Established in 1970, the DoE was the government department responsible for the natural environment, environmental resources, housing, construction and local government (including spending).
DoT	The Department of Transport, created in 1976 the DoT was responsible for government policy and spending on all modes of transport as well safety issues. By the time of its merger with the DoE much of the Department's work has been developed to executive agencies (e.g. the Highways Agency) or regulatory offices (e.g. Office of the Rail Regulator)
RCEP	The Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, a standing committee tasked with advising government on environmental issues, either at the bequest of government or on their own initiative
SACTRA	The Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment, a panel of independent experts who at the bequest of government advise on issues relating to the methodology for appraisal of road schemes.

References

Ampt E S (1997) Reducing Car Travel Through Travel Blending *Proc European Transport Forum Seminar C Policy, Planning and Sustainability* London:PTRC

Department of Environment (1990) *Cm 1200, This Common Inheritance, Britain's Environmental Strategy* London: HMSO

Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions (1997) *Developing an Integrated Transport Policy* London: The Stationery Office

Department of Transport (1989a) *Cm 693, Roads for Prosperity* London: HMSO

Department of Transport (1989b) *National Road Traffic Forecasts* London: HMSO

Department of Transport (1995) *Transport: The Way Ahead* Speeches by Dr Brian Mawhinney MP, Secretary of State for Transport London: HMSO

Department of Transport (1996) *Cm 3234, Transport The Way Forward* London: HMSO

Department of Transport (1997) *National Road Traffic Forecasts* London: The Stationery Office

Goodwin P B (1997) *The End of Equilibrium* London: ESRC Transport Studies Unit

Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution (1994) *Cm 2674, Eighteenth Report, Transport and the Environment* London: HMSO

Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution (1997) *Cm 3752, Twentieth Report, Transport and the Environment – Developments since 1994* London: The Stationery Office

SACTRA (1992) *Assessing the Environmental Impact of Road Schemes* London: HMSO

SACTRA (1994) *Trunk Roads and the Generation of Traffic* London: HMSO

SACTRA (1988) *Transport Investment Intensity and Economic Growth* London: The Stationery Office

Steer Davies Gleave (1995) *Alternatives to Traffic Growth – The Role of Public Transport and the Future for Freight* London: Transport 2000

Steer Davies Gleave (1996) *State of the Art on Strategic Environmental Assessment for Transport Infrastructure* Brussels: European Commission

Steer Davies Gleave (1997) *The Case for Quality Public Transport* London: Transport 2000

UK Round Table on Sustainable Development (1997) *Making Connections* London: The Stationery Office.

h\fergud\report\12153df.