

# Transport Planning Society

<b>Meeting Date</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> March 2019
<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 my main activities since the last Board meeting and other key issues.

## Introduction

The last two years have passed very fast and I find it difficult to believe that I have been Chair for two years. A lot seems to have happened! As always this report summarises the main events and activities I have been involved in but I am happy to expand on any. Further to the last report, Isabelle Clement, Director of Wheels for Wellbeing, has now joined the Policy Group and attended her first meeting.

## Activities

We have at last finalised the documentation for the submission of the request for Chartership of the TPP to the Privy Council. It was submitted at the end of February and we are waiting to hear the final outcome. Given there were no objections to the informal submission last year no problems are anticipated but the Privy Council may be a little pre-occupied! Keith and I attended a TPP Partnership Management meeting on the 29th January at CIHT. A key item on the agenda other than the CTPP was the budget for 2019. Given the desire of CIHT to ensure full cost recovery on the TPP/CTPP a substantial review of the budget has been initiated. This will have substantial financial implications for the TPS next year, and probably for the participants in respect of fees, however we agreed that this year the budget for 2018 will be rolled forward but plus inflation. This ties in with our agreed budget for this year. It was also agreed that the TPS should work on full cost recovery and Keith as Director of Skills has initiated this analysis. It will be essential that the Treasurer, together with the Director of Skills, are party to the forthcoming budget discussions, with possibly also the Company Secretary and Chair at times, given the particular complications for the Society as we move towards a new basis for employing the skills team and the consequential different costs involved.

It is clear that the TPS is facing significant financial challenges over the next few years: the TPP costs, the increased SLA with the ICE, the move towards employing staff, and the desire to maintain and increase our profile via the Transport Planning Day Campaign to name but some. It will be critically important that there is time applied by TPS over the next few months to address these issues and determine the appropriate way forward.

I attended an MHCLG conference in Birmingham on Better Design on the 13/14th February. This was the second event of its kind organised by MHCLG. As reported last year, transport was not part of the first event but I raised the gap with the Chief Planner. This year transport did feature as part of a number of the presentations and I led a workshop on transport, standing in for the Chief Executive of CIHT, speaking about the Advice on Better planning, better places, better transport, that CIHT/TPS/RTPI and others are producing. Also speaking was Phil Jones on Manual for Streets and a representative from the National Infrastructure Commission on integrating infrastructure and planning. Both the Secretary for State and the Minister for Housing and Planning, Kit Malthouse MP, should have been speaking at the event but Brexit took over. However Kit Malthouse did a recorded speech – but no mention of transport. I have subsequently written to him in my role as Chair of TPS, in a joint letter with CIHT, giving comments on this issue and seeking a meeting (see attached). As yet I have received no reply.

Whilst at this event I also spoke to the lead on the design guidance from the MHCLG and those working on the NPPG. Meetings have been arranged with both parties to take place in the next few weeks to further discussions. The Chair of the new Government Commission on Design and Beauty was also there as were a number of the Commissioners. As a result I have been invited to give evidence to the Commission and attend a meeting. The latter was whilst I was in Tanzania but I am to receive another invite. We do seem to be making some progress!

Further to conversations with DfT, they have taken up the issues of the spilt and confusion in local government responsibilities for highways, transport and planning. DfT consulted us with their draft analysis which I circulated to those in local government and thanks for your contributions. As they also sought CIHT views we determined that a joint input would be helpful and this is attached in Appendix 2. If we can simplify this and ensure that all county councils do understand their transport responsibilities, as well as highways, and that planning authorities effectively engage with them, new developments could hopefully improve in respect of sustainable transport provision.

Linked to these discussions there is considerable debate about the failure of some professionals in both the public and private sector to ensure they utilise the most up to date methodologies. Both the DfT and MHCLG are concerned about these issues especially as they are updating various aspects of methodologies and guidance. It will be crucial that all professionals are encouraged if not required as part of their Code of Conduct to keep up to date and not use withdrawn guidance e.g. DC32!

Continuing with the external theme, the joint work on Advice on the integration of planning and transport is coming to a conclusion and should be published shortly. Presentations have already been made about it at the Birmingham MHCLG event, to the network of Transport for New Homes and to the CIHT Annual Conference which I understand went down well. I will also be giving presentations on it at the 3rd Annual Public Health & Sustainable Transport Summit later this month in Bristol, at the TPM and at a Landor Conference on Transport and Housing in April. Work is currently underway on looking at sustainability indicators that may be included. In addition, the

Foundation for Integrated Transport and Transport for New Homes are preparing both a Charter and a checklist that could be used by their members and others. If possible it is intended to refer to this in the Advice.

The work on the indicators has led to discussions with the DfT on metrics and indicators as they are currently re-looking at this. Again a meeting has been organised to discuss this with them. This conversation took place at the launch of the KPMG report on “Integrating the planning and delivery of sustainable transport with new housing” on the 18th February. This report echoes and underlines many of the points we are making. This work was commissioned by Greener Journeys for the Transport Knowledge Hub and meetings with them are being organised.

As a result of attending the 20th anniversary of ITP Ltd in London, discussions took place about devising a video or some other visual medium. Between Adrian Davis and myself we have prepared an initial draft brief and will be having discussions with Jon Parker and colleagues to try and move this forward. I hope this could be ready in time to link to the TPD this year. Steve has prepared a report on the TPD so I will not comment further.

We have had three approaches for action by very different parties seeking TPS involvement. A company called I-sensing has approached us to become involved in advising on the development of new software to support transport planning. A member of the team came and gave a presentation to the last Policy Group which was very interesting. Clare Woodcock can report on the further action taken post the meeting. I have also been approached via Stephen Joseph in connection with the University of Hertfordshire developing a new course on transport planning. I have proposed that a meeting be held with them and the Director of Skills together with myself to discuss the ideas but have yet to have a date. I was also requested to be party to a survey that ICE is undertaking on communities of practice which I did. I have yet to pursue this further but have given Steve Bennett, as the new chair, as the contact in future.

Public Health England have recently published some quality standards in respect of transport and, following conversations with Martin Wedderburn, TPS has agreed to endorse them.

As is clear from the above much of the activity since the last meeting has been in connection with external parties, however, work is on-going within the Policy Group to look at the possibility of some research to support the work of the TPS and TPD. Draft briefs are in preparation through members of the group. It is evident from the publicity success of the Transport for New Homes research that this could be very useful in raising our profile.

The other focus internally has been following through on the staffing issues discussed at the last Board meeting led by Kate Morris. I have also had a “handover” meeting with Steve and the forthcoming Chair which reflects a lot of the above but also the outstanding issues below.

### **Looking ahead**

Preparing this report has reinforced for me how much the Society is doing and how much it is seeking to do. I do not think this is going to significantly change in the forthcoming year especially if the Society is to continue to increase its profile nationally, regionally and retain/recruit more members, and develop our skills work as agreed at the recent brainstorming event. The new Chair

will have his “work cut out” and will need a lot of support from the Board and wider membership. I am very grateful for all the substantial support I have received and thank you all very much.

I do not intend to go into detail about the future as this is now over to Steve but the key areas I think will dominate the next 12 months are:

*Internally focused*

- Reviewing the budget and any consequential changes in fees taking into account the SLA and C/TPP financial requirements in the future
- Continuing the agreed move of the skills team to “employed” status and all the consequences of that for the management of the Society
- The research into the structure and future governance of the TPS including reinforcing its capacity as agreed at the brainstorming meeting
- Retaining and recruiting more members and increasing regional activity
- Marketing the CTPP
- Reviewing the Code of Conduct and what needs to happen to ensure members abide by its requirements

*Externally focused*

- Driving the transport planning day campaign forward and all its activities
- Developing continually the profile nationally of the TPS and the role of transport planning including working with Government and politician’s on the various current work streams
- Partnering in concluding and marketing of the joint Advice on Better planning, better transport, better places so that it impacts on the quality of actions in the field
- Members speaking at various events across the country including regionally to support our members
- Promoting the CTPP
- Continuing to review and develop our “skills” offer and ensure it is fit for purpose.

As mentioned in my last Chair’s report, 2019 looks to be a very exciting but very challenging year. I think there are real opportunities to influence Government around the issues we believe are fundamental and also more broadly across society and professions. We have a very good basis on which to move forward. However, if the TPS is to deliver on its objectives and its forward planning strategy it needs more resources at its disposal.

A key action for all those officers of the Board is to ensure an effective handover to the new officers. Can I please ask all post holders who are leaving to ensure that the new incumbents have clear briefing note on all the processes and actions required, and when, together with copies of all the key documentation. Hopefully we can start building up a dossier of such papers to pass on to future Board members to ease the transition. I wish the new Chair, Stephen Bennett, David Connelly as Treasurer (Laura is moving to the regional representative lead) and Kate Morris as Company Secretary all the very best of luck for the future and also the new Board. I would also like to thank all those Board members departing today for all their hard work in their roles on the Board.

Lynda Addison  
15<sup>th</sup> March 2019



e: [lynda@lynda-addison.co.uk](mailto:lynda@lynda-addison.co.uk)

e: [Sue.Percy@ciht.org.uk](mailto:Sue.Percy@ciht.org.uk)

[www.tps.org.uk](http://www.tps.org.uk)

[www.ciht.org.uk](http://www.ciht.org.uk)

28 February 2019

Kit Malthouse  
Minister of State for Housing  
Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

Dear Minister

We are writing to you on behalf of the Transport Planning Society and the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation.

We have heard you speak at two events this year which have both focused on the need to build more homes but also to radically improve the quality of the places that are being created. Both the TPS and the CIHT would strongly endorse that desire and welcome your statements on this. The two events were the TCPA Annual Conference and the recent Better Design for Better Places conference in Birmingham.

A key issue for us is the importance of ensuring that not only are buildings and places designed more aesthetically but that quality places for people need to be built on strong transport networks for walking, cycling and public transport which should be integrated into their design from the start. This latter point often gets missed, but is crucial in delivering quality places.

This is demonstrated clearly in the recent publication Transport for New Homes by the Foundation for Integrated Transport which highlights that many developments are not currently designed or built in this way. This means that few effective walking and cycling routes are planned, together with a lack of public transport so people are unable to use an "active travel" means to access services with all of the well-known consequences of this. The poor appearance of these places, which are car-dominated, was clearly made at the Birmingham event but the connection to therefore planning and designing transport differently was not.

To help improve this situation CIHT and the TPS in collaboration with other organisations including the RTPi are currently working on our own Advice on how to remedy this. We hope that you and other Ministers will be able to support this

message to reinforce the change in practice as well as the forthcoming NPPF Guidance to make explicit this requirement.

Once we have published the Advice we would welcome a meeting with you as we believe we have a practical tool to support your desire to improve the quality of places.

Yours faithfully

Lynda Addison  
Chair TPS

Sue Percy  
CEO, CIHT

## APPENDIX 2

### Local Authority transport and planning functions relevant to the integration of housing and transport

Function	Which level of Gov?	Powers/duties	Reported issues
Transport authorities	Combined Authorities, County, Unitary, Greater London (TfL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Local Transport Act 2008</u> s9 - Must produce local transport plans (LTPs) and must consult Highways Authorities, Traffic Authorities and Districts if a County</li> <li>• <u>Local Transport Act 2008</u> s99 - Power to promote wellbeing</li> <li>• <u>GLA Act 1999</u> s142 - The Mayor shall prepare and publish a document to be known as the transport strategy (Boroughs should prepare Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) )</li> <li>• <u>Local Transport Act 2000</u> s108 – LTAs must develop policies for and implement the promotion and encouragement of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport to, from and within their area.</li> <li>• <u>Bus Services Act 2017</u> - Mayoral Combined Authorities have automatic access to bus franchising powers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport planning capacity</li> <li>• LTPs mostly used to bid via the Council's portfolio, which is useful in potentially heated budget discussions. However, they are not necessarily acting as the spatial planning tool that is needed.</li> <li>• LTPs are not consistently updated as per legislation: other matters can take priority.</li> <li>• LTPs generally do not include sustainability indices which enable monitoring of whether programmes and plans are improving communities to become more sustainable</li> <li>• Insufficient incentives to achieve more sustainable development and transport programmes or sanctions to act as a spur to better approaches. Requires an incentive akin to Planning Delivery Fund to kick start new approach.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Bus Services Act 2017</u> – Grants powers under the 2017 Act to enter into two types of partnership agreement with local bus operators.</li> <li>• <u>Concessionary Bus Travel Act 2007/ GLA Act 1999</u> - Concessionary travel duties for CTAs</li> <li>• <u>Disability Discrimination Act 1995</u> s19-21E</li> <li>• <u>Road Traffic Act 1991</u></li> <li>• <u>Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistency between LTPs and local plans.</li> <li>• No guidance on LTPs since 2009, which is assumed to be contributing to the inconsistency with current cross-Gov policy and deprioritisation within TAs.</li> <li>• The weak evidence base for transport interventions reported to be contributing to LPA's difficulties in negotiating s106 agreements.</li> <li>• TAs not listed as a statutory consultee for planning i.e. in NPPF (HAs are)</li> <li>• Government funded agencies such as the NHS Hospital Trusts, Free Schools and Academies do not appear to seek advice from local transport authorities on site selection considerations at the outset of planning new developments</li> <li>• Local Transport Authorities can be very reluctant to use CPO powers to achieve sustainable schemes as opposed to Highway Schemes. Also knowledge and experience in this area very limited at local authority level.</li> <li>• Lack of funding and funding certainty</li> <li>• Evidence shows significant and growing shortfall in government funding for concessionary travel provision, especially in London and</li> </ul>
--	--	---	--

			<p>metropolitan authority areas where demand is greatest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earlier and better engagement with local authorities on public transport provision and planning new services and routes is required from TAs and operators.</li> </ul>
Local highway authorities	Combined Authorities, County, Unitary, London Boroughs, TfL, Metropolitan Districts (now granted borough status), District Councils (with delegated authority)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Highways Act 1980</u> s41 – Duty to maintain highways maintainable at public expense.</li> <li>• <u>Highways Act 1980</u> s38 - Power of highway authorities to adopt by agreement</li> <li>• <u>Highways Act 1980</u> s278 – Agreements as to execution of works</li> <li>• <u>Highways Act 1980</u> s?? – Road safety obligation</li> <li>• <u>Town and Country Planning Act 1990</u> s106 - Planning obligations</li> <li>• <u>Traffic Management Act 2004</u> - Maintain and plan highway infrastructure – road surfaces, footways, cycleways, signs, markings, columns, bollards, drains etc.</li> <li>• <u>Traffic Management Act 2004</u> s16 - Network Management Duty</li> <li>• Maintenance of infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some HAs using old guidance (DB32) and therefore limiting ambition in local plans</li> <li>• Updating TfL and Local authority design guidance</li> <li>• LTA and highway authority not always joined up. LTA can be ‘pro-bus’ but not the HA.</li> <li>• Can be difficult for LTA to bring all HA’s on board for pro-bus measures – powers can rest at several levels in its area (e.g. county council, borough council, MDC)</li> <li>• TROs are issued though a burdensome process and developers report it seeming like an additional planning process</li> <li>• Act as Statutory Consultee on planning applications</li> <li>• Local authorities need more say and powers in relation to speed enforcement, particularly for lower</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental responsibilities e.g. cleansing, litter, fly tipping, obstruction, graffiti and of course air quality management – Electric Vehicles, Congestion Charging, Low emission zones etc.</li> <li>• Receive Highways Maintenance funding from DfT, with additional funding e.g. for potholes.</li> <li>• In Combined Authority areas, Key Route Networks in the process of being established (in West Midlands this is statutory) – highways powers exercised jointly between CA and metropolitan districts.</li> <li>• TfL Route Network similar to KRN but roads are full responsibility of TfL.</li> <li>• Issue Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) to impose new speed limits or parking restrictions needed for developments.</li> <li>• Issue Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) in London for all moving traffic and waiting and loading.</li> <li>• Highway licensing activity – skips, scaffolds, hoarding, parking suspensions etc.</li> <li>• Streetworks management – Permit Schemes, noticing, Lane Rental – planning, approval and enforcement</li> <li>• Temporary Traffic Management and permanent stopping up</li> </ul>	<p>speed limits and 20mph zones. London Councils leading work on this this year, considering the case for full or part decriminalisation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full or half-width utility reinstatements – even when completed well and to the legally specified standard, utility company (often for new housing or commercial developments) reinstatements weaken a flexible or rigid pavement (road) structure and shorten its life. This inevitably leads to public local authorities picking up the bill for damage caused by private utilities. Tougher rules needed to ensure full or half width reconstruction or surfacing in certain locations.</li> <li>• There is increasing pressure on local authorities to provide electric vehicle charging infrastructure on already crowded streets and footways. New housing (and commercial) developments must provide adequate on and off-street EV charging infrastructure. Space planning and grid supply should be considered from the outset.</li> <li>• LAs need more powers to tackle and control disruptive innovations such as dockless bikes and scooters etc. Current powers are limited to by laws and traffic orders.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic signals and UTC</li> <li>• Off street and on street parking management/provision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAs need more powers to tackle on-street advertising being implemented under PDR for telephone kiosks (although recent appeal court decision may help with this).</li> <li>• Better evidence-based guidance on car clubs needed and better provision in non-city centre developments.</li> <li>• Lack of funding and funding certainty for highway improvement and maintenance – devolution of Vehicle Excise Duty (VED) needed to ensure LAs have sufficient funding to address rapid deterioration of highway assets.</li> <li>• Different for London. No maintenance block funding and no more revenue support for TfL and boroughs.</li> </ul>
Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs)	Combined Authorities, Counties, Unitaries and Districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>National Planning Policy Framework</u> s9 - Local plans and developments should be developed in accordance with “Promoting Sustainable Transport”</li> <li>• There are no statutory duties on LAs to prepare LCWIPs.</li> <li>• London Mayor’s Transport Strategy daughter documents for cycling, walking, freight etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a clear link between LCWIPs and other strategic planning documents such as Local Transport Plans or local cycling and walking strategies.</li> <li>• Consideration should also be given to incorporating LCWIPs into Supplementary Planning Documents where this would build on the policies in the Local Plan.</li> </ul>

Planning, car parking, taxi licensing, public realm	District Councils, Metropolitan Districts and London Boroughs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Town and Country Planning Act 1990</u></li> <li>• <u>Planning Act 2008</u></li> <li>• <u>Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974</u> - Some London specific legislation around planning policy requirements for parking</li> <li>• <u>Crime and Disorder Act 1998</u> s17 - Duty to consider crime and disorder implications specifically includes TfL as well as local and joint authorities</li> <li>• Local Plan production</li> <li>• London Plan – Borough LDFs</li> <li>• Development Management</li> <li>• Construction logistics plans</li> <li>• Traffic management plans for planning approvals</li> <li>• Work place parking levy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Split of responsibilities makes it difficult to promote public realm/walking/streetscape schemes because the highway authority is responsible for the highway itself, but the planning authority is responsible for the public realm. (<i>Some comment that they haven't come across this as a particular problem. Highway materials and traffic signs are permitted under the GDO but permission for sculptures, fountains etc do require planning permission and local planning considerations should apply.</i>)</li> <li>• PINS may not be examining transport in a way which promotes good integration. KTN report touches on this.</li> <li>• Pro-bus measures (e.g. integrated bus stops within a development) rarely forms part of the planning permission process.</li> <li>• s.106 funding also needs to be more pro-bus – often used just for car-related highway improvements.</li> <li>• All too frequently, a Local Planning Authority's housing requirement and need to promote economic re-</li> </ul>
---	---	--	---

			<p>generation/growth will eclipse any meaningful debate about location of development from a sustainable transport point of view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reinstatement of local authorities ability to enforce parking with CCTV needed to ensure compliance.</li> <li>• LAs should have more powers to limit/cap private hire and taxi vehicle licences.</li> <li>• New powers needed to licence and control the hiring of other shared transport such as dockless bikes.</li> <li>• Amendment of traffic order regulations needed to remove outdated advertising requirements for parking and traffic controls that cost LAs millions and to ensure information is digitised and shared in an open consistent data format. This will deliver efficiencies and pave the way for a more connected and autonomous future.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---