

# Transport Planning Society

<b>Meeting Date</b>	13 July 2021
<b>Report Title</b>	Chair's Report
<b>For Decision or for Information?</b>	For information
<b>Decision Sought</b>	N/A
<b>Report Summary</b>	This report summarises the activity of the chair since the last board meeting.

## **Activity by the Chair since 6 May 2021**

In the period since the last board meeting I have mainly focused on finalising the new business manager arrangement following Andy's decision to step down, and getting to grips with the Transport Planning Day campaign for this year. Both of these activities are to be reported on elsewhere in agenda.

Other issues/events I have been involved with wholly or partly with a TPS chair's hat on are summarised below.

### **06/05 TPS Evening Lecture – Politics of protest**

Immediately after the last board, I chaired a hugely entertaining session with Steve Melia, Meghan Sharkey, Ersilia Verlinghieri and Sarah Berry discussing politics of protest in transport. Really interesting insights in how (and how not) to bring communities along with us in addressing the challenges the industry faces across four very different speakers. My thanks to the event team in setting that up.

### **17/05 Meeting with CIHT decarbonisation and follow up**

Following my initial meeting with Sue Percy, I had a follow up with Andrew Crudginton from CIHT to discuss their decarbonisation plan. We agreed that there was a lot of material out there already and any new contribution to the debate for the Institution needed to come at the subject from a useful new angle. A follow up meeting is planned for later in July.

## **June '21 LTT article on S106/viewpoint**

I was invited by LTT to comment on an article on the potential transport impacts of scrapping section 106 agreements as part of the Government's proposed planning reforms. [Scraping Section 106 is 'step into the unknown' \(transportextra.com\)](https://transportextra.com).

I also penned a viewpoint article for the magazine, based on my first chair's message around the need to innovate in how we engage communities. [Innovation in transport isn't just about installing new tech \(transportextra.com\)](https://transportextra.com)

## **27/05 PDS Mentor training**

I attended the PDS mentors training delivered by Christine Crossley, our PDS manager. This was a really excellent session which covered the PDS scheme in depth. Christine delivered an exceptionally well prepared presentation, in an appropriate level of detail and at a pace that was conducive to all participants being able to effectively engage with the details of the scheme. I'd strongly encourage all TPS board members to consider becoming mentor for their organisations and potentially (paid!) assessors for the scheme. If interested, speak to Keith.

## **9/06 LoTAG@UDL session on morale and staff wellbeing**

I was chairing this session on behalf of London Technical Advisors Group (LoTAG), however I also discussed ways in which institutions like TPS can help support staff wellbeing (with my chair's hat on). I noted the need to sort out funding arrangements as the short timescales for applying for and spending money are often the root causes of much practitioner stress. I also talked about the need to shine a public light on some of those wider transport planning issues that residents and network users fail to grasp the nuance of (e.g. induced demand etc), that lack of awareness sometimes driving much of the opposition. Finally we discussed the new LoTAG PDS scheme, noting in particular how important it is to have mentors you can turn to when things get tough.

## **19/05 – LGA webinar on stakeholder engagement**

I attended this webinar to launch new guidance on stakeholder engagement in an emergency on behalf of TPS. I used the opportunity to offer some feedback on behalf of practitioners, and in particular the need for strong and consistent political support for some of the difficult changes to road space allocation. Further details here: [Stakeholder engagement in an emergency: Lessons from low-traffic neighbourhoods | Local Government Association](https://www.localgovernmentassociation.org.uk)

## **23/06 ICE Transport & Mobility Community Advisory Panel**

As reported at last board, ICE have recently reorganised the structure of their various committees into Community Advisory Panels. TPS, as one of ICE's 'specialist knowledge societies' was invited to participate in the Transport and Mobility panel, chaired by Rand Watkins of Atkins.

The second session of the panel focussed on what the priorities should be for ICE activity in transport and mobility in the coming year. It was good to see lots in there relevant to TPS, including decarbonisation, demand management (active travel promotion), stakeholder engagement and appraisal reform. Further detail to come soon. I should also be attending a workshop later in July on ICE State of the Nation 2021: How civil engineering can enable low carbon?

## **24/05 RTPI meeting**

I met with RTPI Chief Executive Victoria Hills and their new transport lead Harry Steele. We discussed a range of issues (including Victoria's own reflections as a previous chair of TPS!). A key area of concern was around planning reform and ensuring that Local Authorities retain appropriate control of development locations in order to ensure that sustainable transport options are realistic for new sites and delivered before occupation wherever possible. The future of s106 was a key shared concern in this respect.

## **06/07/2021 LGTAG National Strategic Transport Board – Planning White Paper Review**

I chaired this session on behalf of LGTAG but much of the content was relevant to TPS. A range of concerns around the planning white paper were aired by institutions and local authorities (including Lynda Addison picking up TPS and CIHT concerns). A key outcome was a decision to write as a collective to Huw Merriman and the transport select committee to suggest a parliamentary investigation into the transport implications of planning reforms.

## **CIHT Active travel Implementation Advisory Group**

This group did not meet as planned in June, the next meeting is scheduled for later in July.

## **02/07 Walking and Cycling APPG – update from evidence**

I attended Walking and Cycling APPG and provided evidence on behalf of TPS. Further detail in Attachment A to this report and here: [All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group | Reaching our active travel potential - All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group \(allpartycycling.org\)](#). My thanks to the policy group and in particular Lucy for help with this. It has been requested that this be turned into a formal submission from TPS.

## **05/07 BBC Radio 4 – PM Interview on congestion.**

Myself and Lucy were interviewed by Russell Newlove from the BBC for a website and radio article on congestion and why building new roads, or switching everyone to electric cars, was not necessarily the optimal solution for our transport network (or the planet, our economy or our health!). I really enjoyed the interview and was aided by the preparation of some excellent notes from Nick Sanderson at JFG which I've appended as Attachment 2 to the end of this report for interest.

## **22 June 2021 Report from Stephen Bennet from Transport for the South East Board**

### **NB: Stephen Bennett attends this on my behalf**

The main items at this meeting were a discussion on the Bus Back Better strategy, a discussion on the Williams-Shapps Plan for Rail, an update on their Future Mobility study, and other updates on TfSE work.

Key points from Stephen:

- The local authority and bus operators fairly positive about BBB, but concerns remain around long term funding certainty and challenges of serving low-density rural areas. Everyone agreed there is a role for TfSE in influencing government, setting direction of travel on infrastructure (where money spent), support move to more seamless travel, facilitating collaboration between stakeholders, helping LAs with things too big to deliver, e.g. integrated ticketing
- Role for STBs and LTAs in Plan for Rail 'not completely clear yet', there is potential for a new strategic partnership in London and SE with GBR, TfL, LAs and businesses. TfSE generally positive about the changes. Network Rail emphasised that GBR aim is for 'small central body and strong regional devolved administrations'. Operators also positive, SWR said they are already restructuring their business alongside NR
- TfSE Future Mobility Strategy complete, covers a range of future mobility interventions (not any single technology), looking at best tailoring different interventions for different areas within the region using area and people typologies and developing 'bundles' of interventions for different places, Strategic Plan includes Action plan to deliver and Monitoring and evaluation framework, TfSE may then lead funding bids to DfT.
- Ongoing studies to complete by March 2022. Next major output is Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) which starts Oct 2021 ongoing into 2022.

Stephen is happy to answer queries or take comments from anyone on the Board on this.

Subsequently, TPS has approached TfSE to arrange a regional event on sub-national transport planning and in particular its role in decarbonisation.

## **05/07 Universities Transport Study Group Conference**

I attended the business planning session alongside Rod of LTT to discuss opportunities to work more collaboratively. There was some enthusiasm for more regional TP Day events at key universities (notably Southampton). Jonathan Flower also noted the need to progress the masters survey, which I noted was really valuable to understand the pipeline of transport planners joining the industry, particularly from an EDI perspective.

### **07/07 TPM – Award Ceremony**

At the 2021 TPM conference I awarded best paper by a young professional (Lauren James, Sustrans) and Transport Planner of the Year – our very own Stephen Bennett!

### **Update on TPS Advisory Council**

Following the last board I continued to work with Stephen Bennet on the proposal for a TPS Chairs advisory council. As a consequence of work required to finalise the business manager proposal there was insufficient capacity to take this forward at the time and it was agreed to defer to the autumn.

### **Contracts for TPS staff**

The tender for the new business manager was issued and assessed by the officer group. Strong bids received but it was a unanimous conclusion that Jo Field Group provided the strongest response to the request for quote and has duly been appointed. Jo will be at the meeting to introduce herself to those who don't know her and take any questions on the new arrangement. The new contract for the Skills Director position is with Keith for comment, with a view for finalising this in the summer.

Mark Frost, TPS Chair

July 2021

## Attachment A – draft evidence to Walking and Cycling APPG

### 1. Given that most “on the ground” delivery will fall to local government whilst funding and oversight will lie at the centre, how can CWIS 2 provide successful mechanisms to manage this?

#### a) Universal Sustainable 5-10 year funding settlement – Active Travel RIS for LAs

Providing sufficient guaranteed funding, with certainty over a long enough period to allow local authorities, and their supply chains, to grow their capacity to deliver active travel schemes. This is the single most important thing government can do to support this agenda.

We must avoid perpetuating boom and bust funding rounds that absorb huge amounts of resource and officer capacity in both councils and the DfT - and end up delivering outcomes benefitting relatively few people and often at a cost/intervention that is impossible for authorities who don't win bids to really benefit from any learnings.

The atmosphere doesn't care if the CO2 is being produced in a Brighton or Bognor, Halifax or Hackney. All areas need resources to help decarbonise and efforts should be taken to ensure a certain level of universality of provision to do this. It's not tenable to say that no action will be taken on this agenda in area x simply because there was a lack of capacity to make a compelling bid by a particular (likely under-resourced) council at that particular time. This is the practical outcome of the current arrangement though.

It is likely that there may be diminishing returns from investing in a handful of locations repeatedly. In some authorities where action on this agenda may have been minimal to date, positive engagement could lead to significant gains in a relatively short space of time and very cost effectively.

To draw an analogy with education, schools that require improvement get significant attention from their LA and DfE to help support them on that journey, recognising that every child matters. In transport, LAs that are struggling on this agenda are too often left in their ruts and receive very little help to improve and build capacity. 'Outstanding' authorities benefit time and time again for large slugs of cash that help them achieve ever greater successes – successes that can then seem ever more difficult to replicate in less successful authorities.

Some supporters of active travel schemes too often see such authorities as lost causes who have no capacity or appetite to challenge the status quo. The reality is that such authorities more often than not simply reflect the attitudes of the majority of their constituents in their decisions and prioritisation of road space. They need to be carefully supported to help bring them on this journey, not castigated as pariahs or

dinosaurs. The delivery of good quality public realm and active travel infrastructure can help win arguments for the cause for many years to come – many authorities simply haven't had a chance to demonstrate that to their residents and so have no positive local examples to point to. Local examples will always carry more weight in local decision making than national case studies so it's really important that every authority has a standard bearer scheme for this agenda to point to.

In terms of the nuts and bolt of this, a good approach to build on may be the system of indicative allocations put forward under the Active Travel Fund programme. In this system the funding at set level is effectively earmarked for LAs (using a formula) on the basis that they put forward programmes of work that are compliant with the relevant funding framework.

Whilst there is some suggestion that the assessment of the first couple of tranche of bids was unnecessarily stringent – with some good schemes not being funded for sometimes unclear reasons, it is undeniably a more efficient way of working than having an open uncapped bidding round where there is huge wasted effort to overbid in the hope that some funding is secured. This was how TfL ran their first 'streetspace' programme and that produced massive over-bidding with consequent wasted effort on all sides.

A similar approach has been used for highway asset maintenance for many years (which can be topped up if authorities demonstrate particularly efficient behaviours that aligns with DfT policy, judged via a resource-lite self assessment process). It has also been used for integrated transport block funding associated with Local Transport Plans and TfL LIP funding for boroughs. It demonstrates trust, provides space for local flexibility and allows for robust and sustainable supply chains to develop to efficiently deliver an ambitious pipeline of schemes. Checks and balances are retained in that the funding must be used in compliance with the overarching plan or strategy, and must comply with relevant guidance (e.g. LTN1/20).

Giving a realistic ceiling for local authorities to build an annual programme around is therefore a great start, but the approach that should be taken is for a RIS for LAs - a minimum 5 year or even better indicative 10 year settlement, 2<sup>nd</sup> tranche awards perhaps linked to performance in the first half. Annual settlements are highly sub-optimal (though better than London's recent 10 day settlement I guess...).

b) Take a pipeline approach to major schemes

It is recognised that separate specific funding pots for the very largest interventions may be necessary. Dispersing all money via formula may not allow for the most significant

barriers to be tackled. This was the approach taken by TfL's liveable neighbourhoods, or the DfT's Local Major schemes.

Rather than having discrete bidding rounds though, these funding streams should take a pipeline approach so that authorities are continually developing ideas and bringing them forward for consideration for funding, rather than having to stop start around arbitrary deadlines (e.g. as proposed in the mini-hollands').

The presumption should be that transformational infrastructure that delivers on active travel outcomes will receive funding – so undue effort is not spent examining the strategic case for each project. The focus should be on welcoming the ambition shown by the local authority and working collaboratively with them to ensure it delivers the best possible quality scheme.

LEPs may have a useful role to play here – particularly cross boundary cooperation where there isn't combined authority in place. They have been engaged in delivering active travel schemes to date, sometimes to a surprising degree. Giving them more support to coordinate in this space may be helpful and this could be fed into the current review.

The LCWIP process has generally been well received, the hope being that these would help support an ambitious bid from the Department to the treasury for a long term funding settlement to make these plans a reality. This approach has much to commend it, and is also the model used in respect to the new bus strategy. LCWIPs could benefit from additional funding to progress the costings of interventions beyond concept design to more detailed feasibility. Costs of schemes can vary by a factor of 100% or more depending on the impact on statutory utilities. Too often that is not defined at bid stage and so leads to cost and implementation overruns.

Supporting the development of local expertise from appropriate emphasis on training and capacity, alongside the continuing development and provision of high quality guidance is the next highest priority. LTN1/20 is a great start. In general there is huge enthusiasm in the sector for the agenda, however for some, the development of a proactive focus away from catering for motorised vehicles will represent a departure from the way they have worked previously.

Public support – government messaging is really important in helping to win local arguments about space allocation. This needs to be strong, persuasive and, more importantly than anything else perhaps, consistent. Council's need to know that government is ambitious in this space and has their back on this agenda. Some of the recent experience with LTNs is worrying in this regard, however the broad mood music from DfT around gear change, and bus strategy is undeniably positive.



## 2. How should targets be set and what form (e.g. input, output, outcome) should they take?

Professor Phil Godwin reflected on this recently when the secretary of state for transport announced: “We want 50 per cent of all journeys in towns and cities to be cycled or walked by 2030.”

- In round terms, conurbations and large cities had average shares of walking and cycling of 30 per cent, public transport trips of 15 per cent, car 54 per cent.
- Smaller towns and cities had walking and cycling shares of 29 per cent, public transport only 5 per cent, and car 63 per cent.
- London had walking and cycling of 35 per cent, public transport 27 per cent, and car 25 per cent.
- It follows that to reach the targets, in each year until 2030 about three per cent of car trips in towns and cities would need to be transferred to walking and cycling.

Whilst Phil was pretty bullish about this, the challenge is herculean to say the least. In London, walking and cycling mode shares have stayed pretty static over last decade. Cycling has grown the most from 2% in 2010 all the way to....2.5% in 2019. That bald statistic hides lots of interesting local variations, however even if it is underestimating the numbers significantly it is still a huge jump to get us to 50% in 9.5 years. For other areas even more so.

Targets are therefore useful to highlight the scale of the challenge and check credibility of the actions plans that are developed to achieve them - and of course there is the old adage about if you reach for the stars you may make the moon....

To be plausible though we really need both national *and* local targets. Tools such as the propensity for cycling toolkit would be a valuable place to start in developing local targets. TfL also looked at potentially walkable trips and this could be replicated nationally. TfL used models like this to help develop appropriate local targets for each borough in the last round of LIP, an approach that was widely (though not universally) supported.

It has been calculated that to meet carbon emission reduction cycling mode share needs to grow from 2% to 8%. This is another way of looking at the setting of targets but some care needs to be taken to the applicability of a universal target to individual LAs.

It could be that a traffic reduction target may also be worth revisiting. More motor traffic means less walking and cycling, particularly among those groups who do not like mixing with traffic. We have seen during lockdowns that as traffic reduces, people emerge onto their streets to walk and cycle.

### **A note on scheme evaluation**

To date, local authority evaluations have measured cycling using methods such as automatic traffic counters and A.I. camera sensors. These methods can, however, only capture total numbers of bicycles, providing little or no information as to the type of people or bicycles involved. From an equity perspective this is unfortunate. Most low-cycling settings have hitherto seen cycling disproportionately undertaken by adult men, whereas in high-cycling settings cycling is much more equal by age and gender. Examining cyclist diversity can therefore be valuable in assessing how far new measures are making cycling more inclusive. It may also deepen understanding as to how and why cycling is changing at a given site.<sup>1</sup>

We need rigorous, accessible, national data for child travel to school or other child travel with a much more research on children and how they negotiate streets (side roads, pedestrians refuges).

**3. What can be done to support transport/highway authorities that may not have a strong record in promoting walking and cycling?**

**&**

**4. Local authorities and other bodies will need significant capacity and skills to spend the funding allocations required to meet the Government's targets (or any new ones). If they lack the capacity and/or skills, what can be done to assist them?**

- Provide training to all transport officers and portfolio holders responsible for transport or the environment on the new cycle design guidance LTN 1/20, including London boroughs who vary enormously in competency and ambition.
- Increase the awareness of authority's liability and responsibility to remove/reduce road danger, enable walking and cycling and provide clean air to their residents (as they must clean water).
- Increase the awareness of their duty to ensure those with protected characteristics under the Equality Act – who are most likely to benefit from less traffic and they tend to make shorter 'cyclable' trips.
- Ensure any new roads spending enables walking and cycling – the government's current proposed spending on roads undermines the message of CWIS.

---

<sup>1</sup> Anna Goodman, Claire McDonald, Anthony A. Lavery The value of measuring cycling diversity as well as cycling volume: a case study from South London. June 2021.

- Ultimately, if the authority is struggling, (failing to increase active travel or reduce motor traffic) then government should provide additional support and assistance, as government would in if an authority fails in other areas (such as NHS trusts, or schools).
- Increase awareness that EVs are not a panacea and should not be viewed as 'the solution'
- Support much, much greater sense of urgency. Over the last 20 years cycle use in the UK has hovered at less than 2% of all trips. We must start building for pedestrian and cycle traffic and cutting motor traffic at a pace and scale not yet seen. As noted above, in London cycling mode share was 1.2% in 2000 rising to 2.4% in 2019. If cycling levels continue to rise at that rate, it will take over 500 years to reach the levels of cycling now seen in cities such as Amsterdam (where cycling mode share is 36%).
- We need a tool like ActDev but for existing roads which model traffic reduction and space reallocation. This tool should account for traffic displacement/evaporation, air pollution, physical activity benefits, as well as age, gender considerations so that the model produces an equitable outcome (not just about adult commuters, but trips to school, the park, shops etc)
- For younger transport practitioners coming through the system, there needs to be a re-shaping of highways engineering and transport planning courses with involvement from Institutes (ICE, CIHT, TPS etc) and academics.
- For current generation of transport planners, the institutes should ensure compulsory top-up traffic reduction, cycle and walking design training (as GPs and medics have to do to retain their right to practice medicine) for people to retain their 'CEng' or other post-nominals.

**5. What should be the role of Active Travel England and what resources will it need to fulfil this role?**

- It should be involved in reviewing local transport plans/5 year plan of schemes, all major cycle schemes and crucially this must include reviewing traffic reduction schemes on neighbourhoods (or we will continue to fail people making short, local trips). TPS thinks there is particular need for support around land use planning for major developments to ensure cycling is locked in, and ATE should be able to block schemes that don't maximise this outcome in the same way HE can in terms of impact on the road network.
- To be plausible and relevant it should have regional or even local ambassadors/commissioners who can assist over time in driving up quality and raising ambition for this agenda in individual LAs.

- In general though it should be a Critical friend more than enforcement inspector. Cycling England was a good model to follow.

**6. What should CWIS 2 funding be spent on – i.e. what programmes or initiatives should be funded?**

- Certainly a role for behaviour change campaigns, Look at SUVs, they make very little sense but marketing has sold them to us as an aspirational choice.
- However studies suggest that revenue schemes on their own won't achieve change – there needs to be the environment in place that makes this behaviour attractive. Removing traffic, and/or providing segregation is therefore key. Experiments are a good way to proceed here, but come at a resource cost. Given the need to bring community along with you that may be unavoidable. Speed reduction is important but also unlikely to enough on its own to change behaviour.

**7. Are there funding models or mechanisms that can give delivery agencies the necessary confidence to act without limiting unacceptably central government's room for manoeuvre?**

See answer above.

**8. What else do DfT and other government departments need to be doing in order to maximise the impact of CWIS 2?**

Planning important too, ensuring there is very strong links between planning frameworks and transport. Very little mention of the role that transport plays in shaping land use in the new white paper for example, albeit the NPPF has been strengthened slightly in this regard.

A key concern is the need to tackle car ownership – this opens up co-modality opportunities that allow more space for cycling as a mode choice. Shared mobility hubs are an agenda worth pursuing, but we need to get people to opt in from their own self-interest for example by making it far more cost effective to sign up to a travel wallet than use your own car.

Highway Code must ensure priority to those on foot or cycle, and responsibility is with those driving / who cause most harm.

**In summary**

Put in place frameworks of high quality guidance, set expectations high and get money to the frontline as quickly as possible and provide it year after year at a consistent level. Support LAs, don't bash them. Help bring people along with the conversation and praise ambitious schemes.

## Attachment 2 – Speaking Notes for BBC Interview

TPS Media Brief  
JFG Comms 2/07/2021

### **Russell Newlove, Journalist, BBC World Service**

07754 886872

#### **Topic**

- *how the road network can't cope with the amount of cars and government policy still being laser focused on car use*
- *the points it outlined in the State of the Nation last year.*

#### **About Transport Planning Society**

The Transport Planning Society (TPS) is the professional association for Transport Planners in the UK and Republic of Ireland. We represent 1,600 individual members and 38 businesses in the profession.

#### **TOP LINE**

Transport planners want to see more focus and investment on planning for people.

If you plan for traffic, you get traffic, if you plan for people, you get great places.

#### **1. Why building new roads isn't always the answer, explaining induced demand in a way that is accessible by a lay audience.**

- Before we even factor in the climate emergency, we know that for the developed parts of the world, new or wider roads aren't effective at improving journeys
- When roads are widened or new ones are built, they quickly fill up with traffic
- The analogy us transport planners like is that it is "digging a ditch in a bog — it fills up as fast as you dig"
- Why? Journeys can get a bit faster, and we quickly figure this out and so more people are attracted on to the road. The result is just more traffic and congestion that is the same or worse
- What's more, new housing or businesses then get built along these roads, drawing more journeys on to them making the problem worse
- We have known this for a long time and the government's *own analysis* shows more roads leads to more traffic – they last published a report on it in 2018 <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Department for Transport (2018) Latest Evidence On Induced Travel Demand: An Evidence Review

- Lewis Mumford observed this in 1955 and to paraphrase made the point that it is like “loosening your belt when you’re supposed to be on a diet.” It might make you feel better in the short term but does nothing to address the problem.
- That’s why in our State of Nations report released last year, we said, very simply:
  - “transport projects which increase carbon emissions must be withdrawn and funding for low and zero carbon transport projects increased and made longer term and more flexible.
  - It’s not inconceivable that we may return to building roads in the future in some locations, however we shouldn’t do that if there is any credible
  - The cost of using public transport should be reduced.”<sup>3</sup>
  - TPS also has a long standing position in support of road user charging, which evidence suggests could support the existing network to cope without costly upgrades, in a way that is cost neutral against the current system.
- If you plan for traffic, you get traffic, if you plan for people, you get great places!

## 2. If building new roads isn’t the right approach for government to be taking, what is?

- To reach net zero, we need to rapidly reduce motor traffic.
  - Experts tell us we need to see 20 to 60% reduction in motor traffic by 2030.<sup>4</sup>
- We also know that most journeys made in the UK are very short.
  - 68% of trips in England are five miles or less
- So big roads aren’t the answer we maybe thought they were in the 1950s
- Our view is that we need a fairer and more environmentally-friendly transport system.
- So our professions talks about **Avoid-Shift-Improve**:
  1. **Avoid** meaning policies, town planning and infrastructure which result in less travel, for example, working from home or ordering goods online, delivered by electric

---

<sup>3</sup> Transport Planning Society (2020) State of the Nations Report

<sup>4</sup> Transport for Quality of Life & Friends of the Earth (2018)

bikes or vans, or the congestion charge and low emissions zones that discourage driving

2. **Shift** means more people shifting from car journeys by themselves to walking and cycling and public transport, which has ramifications for how we design our cities, price and fund and expand public transport
3. And thirdly, **improve** meaning where those essential journeys that need to travel by motor-vehicle we try and reduce the emissions from them as much as possible, through electrification
  - this includes a big role for e-bikes which really expand how far you can reasonably cycle and how much you can put on a cargo-bike

### 3. Views on electric cars – are they a solution or part of an ongoing problem?

- Transport Planners are realists, and we know we do still need cars, vans, lorries for lots of reasons
- Whether that's moving furniture, a big shop or transporting freight or for remote and rural communities that absolutely rely on their cars
- Electric vehicles are important
  - Carbon Brief found that, the "lifetime emissions per kilometre" of driving a small hatchback (Nissan Leaf) EV were about *three times* lower than for the average conventional car
- Electric mobility only really makes sense in environmental terms where people are doing relatively high mileage – so areas where there is little viable alternative to a private trip make sense. There is also less issues with charging as most people will have access to off-street charging facilities.
- But there are two problems with keeping the status quo just with electric vehicles
- First, they are not 'zero emission' as there are emissions associated with their manufacturing and the materials that go into them
  - Carbon Brief found that, the "lifetime emissions per kilometre" of driving a small hatchback (Nissan Leaf) EV were about one-third of the average conventional car
- there is also still the issue of air pollution (particulates) given off from the wearing down of tyres and breaks, which is increasingly a problem in our cities and towns. It also depends on where the energy comes from, so they will only be green when the Grid is entirely green. So that's the emissions side

- Secondly, they are still vehicles, which means roads, congestion and traffic danger. An electric traffic jam is still a traffic jam, an electric car hitting a child on the street is still a tragedy we should avoid
- We need to be creating a places for people, not just traffic and create a transport system that means people make the best choice for each journey
- Unfortunately, for a lot of us, our choices are still too limited to just the car
- the Transport Planning profession is vital to provide the evidence, assessment, and expert advice to decision-makers, so they are much better informed as to the impacts of their transport investment decisions, which often go against the government's own policies on decarbonisation

### **Misc. Stats.**

"IPPR analysis of the sixth carbon budget shows that the Climate Change Committee's preferred approach to decarbonisation could lead to:

- an 11 per cent rise in traffic between 2021 and 2050
- a 28 per cent increase in car ownership, rising from 34 million cars owned today to 43.6 million in 2050."
- Emissions from public transport (rail and bus) account for just 5%
- Over half of our domestic transport emissions are from cars (56%)
- Vans 15%
- Lorries 16%

### **Other Questions to consider**

- **What is the TPS position on road pricing or fuel duty?**
- **Won't it penalise small businesses and deprived people?**
- **What about diesel buses?**
- **Will people still use public transport after coronavirus?**
- **Do you think the Williams-Shapps white paper on rail reform will help?**