

# Local Action for a Low Traffic Future

**Local Transport Plans:  
A guide for councillors  
and campaigners**

**LOW  
TRAFFIC  
FUTURE**

**Our vision is a world with  
clean air, safe streets,  
vibrant communities, a  
stable climate and healthy  
natural environment for  
future generations**

For more, visit our website



# INTRODUCTION

## Why we need a Low Traffic Future

A low traffic future is one in which children can play in the streets, where neighbours can socialise, and young and old alike can get out and about easily, without needing to drive everywhere.

It is a world with cleaner air, safer streets, excellent public transport networks, great walking and cycling provision. It would be good for our health and that of our streets and communities, our economy and our environment.

Compare this with the costs of the UK's current 'High Traffic Present':

- *Congestion*: This is estimated to cost the UK economy [£30 billion a year](#).
- *Air pollution*: Pollution is estimated to hasten [between 28,000 and 36,000 deaths annually](#) in the UK, at an economic cost of [£20bn or more](#). The UK Government has [lost three court cases](#) over its failure to keep pollution within legal limits.
- *Noise pollution*: The [estimated health, societal, amenity and lost productivity costs of noise](#) in England add up to around £14-20bn annually.
- *Road danger*: The cost of [road deaths and injuries in Britain in 2018](#) was estimated to be [£35bn](#).
- *Physical inactivity*: [Inactivity-related ill health](#) costs the UK around [£7.4bn](#) annually.
- *Greenhouse gas emissions*. Transport is now the largest emitting sector of the UK economy, with pre-pandemic emissions levels in 2019 being only 5% below those in 1990. Most of this consists of CO2 emissions from road transport. Increases in road traffic (and particularly van traffic), and increases in vehicle size, have offset the benefits of more fuel-efficient engines.

## Local Transport Plans: background

The UK Government plans to revive the Local Transport Plan (LTP) process, under which councils in England (excluding London) will be required to set out plans to improve provision for walking, cycling and public transport, and to set Quantified Carbon Reduction (QCR) targets. It is therefore an excellent opportunity for them to set out their ambitions to bring about a Low Traffic Future, and for local advocates to help influence their policies and spending plans.

The LTP system was initially put in place in 1999/2000, under powers contained in the [Transport Act 2000](#). The idea was to require transport authorities in England (e.g. county councils, unitary authorities or, more recently, the combined authorities which have been set up mainly in England's larger conurbations) to set out a long-term vision for transport in their area, together with a multi-year programme of local transport improvements. The Department for Transport (DfT) would then allocate multi-year (initially 5-year) funding settlements to each authority, depending on the quality of its LTP.

However the system fell into neglect after 2010, when DfT announced that local authorities were free to submit LTPs whenever they wished to (rather than on a fixed 5-year cycle), and that their funding settlements would no longer depend on these. DfT has not updated its guidance on LTPs since 2009. Instead, councils have been forced to seek funding, often through competitive bidding processes, from short-term funding streams such as the Future High Streets Fund, Housing

Infrastructure Fund or Transforming Cities Fund. This has not given councils the long-term certainty they need to develop coherent local transport plans and scheme programmes.

So DfT's announcement (in its 2021 [Transport Decarbonisation Plan](#)) that it planned to revive the LTP process was widely welcomed by environmental campaigners and local authorities alike.

DfT has since indicated that LTPs will need to include:

- Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs);
- Bus Service Improvement Plans (BSIPs);
- Vehicle charging infrastructure plans and
- Targets for Quantified Carbon Reductions (QCRs) - DfT plans to issue separate guidance on setting these.

Crucially, DfT will once again use the quality of an authority's LTP as the main mechanism for deciding what funding it allocates to each authority for local transport improvements. So transport authorities (i.e. county councils, some city councils and combined authorities in larger metropolitan areas) need to have good plans for cycling and walking networks and for bus improvements, together with ambitious carbon reduction targets, in order to secure funding for the whole of their transport programmes.

LTPs are therefore a crucial opportunity to press councils in England to set out their plans for a Low Traffic Future.

## Solutions: an overview

There is no single 'silver bullet' for achieving a low traffic future. However, at the local level, it will involve investing in high-quality provision for [walking, cycling and safe streets](#) - including measures such as 20mph schemes, school streets and low traffic neighbourhoods - as well as by working to improve [public, shared and community transport](#) (i.e. not only rail, 'metro', [bus and coach services](#), but also [car-pooling, ride-sharing, public cycle hire schemes, dial-a-ride and similar schemes](#)). It will also involve managing travel demand by ensuring that new housing and other developments are located and designed to make it easy to travel to and from them without depending on private cars.

Sustainable transport improvements can be funded partly by rebalancing transport spending away from new road schemes that won't be needed in a low traffic future, and partly from some form of [road user charging](#). Charging schemes should aim not only to reduce road traffic demand directly, but also indirectly by funding improvements to walking, cycling and public transport, thereby reducing our dependence on cars, vans and lorries. Public support for the principle of road user charging has [grown markedly](#) since 2007, though it remains important to ensure that charging schemes are [fair and seen to be fair](#).

There is a strong case for national government to lead on creating a national framework for road user charging, particularly for reducing the climate impacts of car-dependence. However local authorities could also propose local road user charging schemes, aimed primarily at tackling urban issues such as congestion and pollution.

As for [freight transport](#), the primary goal should be to enable as much [long-distance freight](#) as possible to be shifted onto freight trains. This should be combined with a range of solutions to improve [urban logistics](#) (i.e. delivering goods to and within town and city centres), including trans-shipment facilities and increased use of cargo-bikes.

# ACTIVE TRAVEL AND SAFE STREETS

A key measure for creating a low traffic future is to redesign our roads, streets and junctions to be people-friendly places, where children can play, neighbours can socialise, people of all ages and abilities can get around safely and easily by walking, wheeling and cycling, and where high-streets and street-life can thrive without being choked by exhaust fumes.

[N.B. 'Wheeling' includes the use of any mobility aid which can legally be used on the footway, i.e. the pavement].

However, as well as creating good facilities specifically for active travel, councils also need to look at ways to reduce through traffic and/or the speed of traffic, whether in urban centres, residential neighbourhoods or rural lanes. Taken together, these measures should create comprehensive networks of routes for walking and cycling that should be set out in each local authority's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs - see the Department for Transport's [guidance on LCWIPs](#)), and incorporated into their Local Transport Plans.

Councils also need to consider the importance of good road and path maintenance, and the [positive promotion of walking and cycling](#), particularly among the groups who could most benefit from the physical activity but who are least likely to take up active travel without encouragement and support.

## Walking and wheeling

Walking networks in towns need to connect people safely and conveniently from their homes to nearby schools, shops and other key facilities – for more, see [local cycling and walking network plans](#).

Pavements need to be wide enough, well-maintained and clear of clutter. Features such as waymarking, seats, street trees and planters are essential for enabling people to navigate, for older people to rest, to reduce pollution and create safe and attractive places where people want to spend time. However they need to be placed where they will not obstruct wheelchair users or create hazards for visually impaired people. Tactile paving is vital for visually impaired people to know where they can walk safely.

Road crossings need to be located and designed to maximise the convenience of using them. Crossing-points across more minor side-roads should be designed to visually reinforce the new Highway Code rules which give priority to pedestrians and cycle users going straight ahead over vehicles turning into and out of those side roads. Signalised pedestrian crossings need to provide plenty of crossing time for pedestrians, allowing older and disabled people also to use them without danger or stress. For the fastest and/or busiest roads, bridges or tunnels are needed. These should be step-free and with gradients and diversions minimised, to make it as easy as possible for disabled people to use them. Where tunnels are provided, they should be wide and straight to provide natural light and good visibility right through the tunnel wherever possible.



### Further information

*Official guidance:* The UK Department for Transport (DfT) has yet to produce a guide to designing infrastructure for walking, to complement its Cycling Infrastructure Design guidance (see below). In its absence, the most useful sources of guidance for England are the two volumes of the Manual for Streets guidance (see [volume 1](#) - n.b. [volume 2](#) is not available online, and both volumes are expected to be replaced soon by an updated version), DfT's guidance on developing [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans \(LCWIPs\)](#) - n.b. this covers the planning of cycling and walking networks, as distinct from specific routes or infrastructure features) and its statutory guidance (i.e. guidance which local authorities are legally obliged to follow under the Traffic Management Act 2004) on [reallocating roadspace to support active travel](#) (though this too is due to be revised). Other useful sources include the Welsh Government's [Active Travel Act guidance](#) and any locally applicable guidance (such as Transport for London's [Planning for Walking Toolkit](#)).

*Unofficial guidance:* See Living Streets's online briefing on [inclusive pedestrian design](#).

## Cycling

Cycling networks, like walking networks, need to be safe, direct, coherent, comfortable and attractive – see [local cycling and walking network plans](#).

Cycle facilities along fast or busy main roads should be physically protected from motor traffic: the faster and busier the traffic, the greater the level of protection that is needed (but see also the section on [safe streets and lanes](#) for solutions where protection is not needed). Cycles should also be kept separate from pedestrians, unless there is plenty of space and/or usage is light (e.g. on a path next to an inter-urban road), allowing both groups to mix safely and without stress.

[Safe and secure cycle parking](#) should be provided in new residential developments and at key destinations such as schools, shops, workplaces, public transport stations and interchanges, and other public facilities. In addition to cycle parking, public transport services should make provision for cycling to and from stations and interchanges, with space on trains, trams and longer-distance bus or coach services, and cycle reservation systems on any train services where seats can also be reserved. See also the shared transport section for more on the important role of [cycle hire schemes](#).

National and local government should support the use of [non-standard pedal cycles](#), such as child trailers and cargo-bikes (whether for households or businesses), trikes and hand-cycles (these can be crucial mobility aids for the many people who find walking difficult but who can cycle), and electrically assisted pedal cycles (or 'e-bikes'). [Dutch evidence](#) shows that the average journey on an e-bike is about 60% longer than on a conventional bicycle. E-bikes can therefore substantially increase cycling's contribution to tackling climate change, enabling people to replace car-use for longer or hillier journeys in rural areas, as well as enabling older, less healthy or disabled people to take up cycling who might otherwise find it difficult or impossible.

Cyclists also need good signing and waymarking.

### Further information

*Official guidance:* When planning cycle and walking networks in England, the relevant guidance is the Department for Transport's [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan \(LCWIP\) guidance](#). When it comes to planning specific cycle routes or other infrastructure features (e.g. cycle parking), the key

reference in England and in Northern Ireland is the Department for Transport's [Cycling Infrastructure Design guidance](#) (Local Transport Note LTN 1/20). Other applicable guidance includes National Highways's [Designing for Cycle Traffic](#) (which applies to England's trunk roads and motorways, including their junctions and crossings), the Welsh Government's [Active Travel Act guidance](#), (n.b. this also covers network planning), the Scottish Government's [Cycling by Design guidance](#), and any relevant local guidance (such as Transport for London's [London Cycling Infrastructure Design Guidance](#)).

*Unofficial guidance:* See Cycling UK's [Space for Cycling guide](#) and the [Guide to Inclusive Cycling](#) from Wheels for Wellbeing.

## Safe urban streets and rural lanes

The majority of roads and streets in built-up areas should be subject to 20mph speed limits, with similar reductions (e.g. to no more than 40mph for quieter rural lanes). Exceptions can be made for faster and busier main roads, though these should be provided with separate cycle facilities. There is a mistaken view that 20mph limits should be concentrated around school gates. However this simply reinforces the idea that children will normally be driven to school and that they only need to get safely from their parents' car to the school gate. Instead, we need 20mph schemes to keep children safe near their homes and throughout their walking and cycling journeys, whether to school or to visit friends or anywhere else. For more information, see the [20sPlentyForUs website](#).

The [Welsh Government](#) and [Senedd](#) (i.e. the Welsh parliament) have approved plans to make 20mph the 'default' speed limit for built-up streets in Wales by 2023 – allowing exceptions as above - acting on feedback from a [Public Health Wales evidence review](#), a [Task Force Report](#) and [extensive consultation](#). The Low Traffic Future Alliance urges the governments for England and Scotland to follow suit.

Other solutions can involve creating various forms of vehicle restriction in town or city centres or in residential neighbourhoods. Town or city centre schemes typically involve using traffic restrictions to create pedestrianised or pedestrian-priority areas, normally with cycle access and possibly also with bus, taxi and/or delivery access, at least at some times of the day.

In residential areas though, the approach normally involves introducing traffic-filters which cut off rat-runs, while maintaining access for walking, wheeling and cycling, giving them an advantage for local trips. This type of scheme has recently come to be known as a [Low Traffic Neighbourhood](#) (LTN), though it is [not a new technique](#). Overall, LTNs have been shown to [improve road safety, increase walking and cycling and reduce car use for local journeys](#). They have generally attracted [high public support](#), both in principle and in practice after they have been introduced, despite the efforts of vocal minorities to derail their introduction in recent years. However they need careful design and [good consultation](#) to ensure local community support, and [wider measures](#) may also be needed to ensure they reduce traffic overall.

[School Streets](#) are another option for reducing local traffic pressures and creating more child-friendly street environments, particularly around primary schools. These schemes prohibit driving at school arrival and drop-off times on selected local streets. Exemptions can be made for local residents and businesses. School Streets tend to cover very minor roads and a more limited area than LTNs, though the two types of measures can also be combined. School Streets are generally easier to implement and are more popular initially than LTNs. [Monitoring](#) has shown these schemes do also reduce traffic.

[Traffic calming features](#) (such as road humps and speed cushions) and/or zonal speed camera systems can reduce speeds and improve safety (see [review of evidence](#)), and may be useful where the layout of a street (or a street network) does not naturally keep most drivers' speeds down to around 20mph. Still, it is generally preferable to design streets to feel like safe, people-friendly places, with attractive surfacing and street furniture (e.g. seating and planters) which enable and welcome people of all ages and abilities to walk, cycle and wheel safely and easily.

Surrey County Council plans a pilot programme of [lowering the speed limits](#) on a network of rural lanes from 60mph to 30 or in some cases 20mph. This approach could be combined with the design features employed by the [Quiet Lanes schemes in Norfolk and Kent](#) and/or with the use of average speed cameras.

### Further information

*Official guidance:* See DfT's statutory guidance on [reallocating roadspace to support active travel](#) and its statutory guidance on [Setting local speed limits](#) (n.b. both documents are due to be revised). The Welsh Government has published [several documents](#) relating to its plans to make 20mph the 'default' speed limit for built-up areas in Wales.

*Unofficial guidance:* See the guides to creating Low Traffic Neighbourhoods from the charities [Possible](#), [Sustrans](#), and from [Living Streets and the London Cycling Campaign](#). CPRE produces a guide to [Quiet Lanes](#); the School Streets Initiative has a collection of [useful resources on creating School Streets](#); while 20sPlentyForUs provides [information and advice on 20mph limits](#).

## Local cycling and walking network plans

The UK Government has encouraged local authorities in England (outside London) to draw up [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans \(LCWIPs\)](#), while Welsh authorities are legally required to adopt Active Travel Network Maps (ATNMs), in accordance with the Welsh Government's [Active Travel Act design guidance](#). However the principles, and the steps needed to create a LCWIP or an ATNM, are similar:

- Define the geographical area to be covered (including any cross-boundary issues).
- Identify the most important start and end-points of journeys (e.g. residential areas, schools and colleges, employment locations, shopping areas, healthcare, public transport and other facilities) that need to be connected by safe, convenient and direct walking and cycling routes.
- Prioritise the corridors with the greatest potential to unlock increased cycling and walking if provision is improved – the [Propensity to Cycle Tool](#) can assist with this.
- Identify the actual route alignments where walking and/or cycling conditions can be improved most cost-effectively to maximise the increases in walking and/or cycling.
- Consult and seek support for the route proposals (including from neighbouring authorities etc where cross-boundary issues arise, as well as from the wider public), adapting them as required in the light of feedback received.

However councils need to do more to integrate the planning and funding of LCWIPs (or ATNMs in Wales) and [Rights of Way Improvement Plans \(RoWIPs\)](#). LCWIPs and ATNMs are widely seen as being mainly for day-to-day walking and cycling in urban areas, while rights of way are often seen as being for recreational walking (and, to a more limited extent, cycling and horse-riding) in rural areas. Yet this distinction is not, and should not be, hard and fast. On the contrary, joining up the planning and funding of these networks would make it easier, for instance, for children to walk or cycle from

outlying villages to schools in nearby towns, or for families in those towns to get out for recreational walks or bike rides without feeling the need to jump in the car to get there.

#### Further information

*Official guidance:* The key sources for planning walking and cycling networks (as distinct from specific routes or other infrastructure features) are DfT's [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan \(LCWIP\) guidance](#) and its statutory guidance on [reallocating roadspace to support active travel](#) - or the [Active Travel Act guidance](#) in Wales. N.B. The DfT-backed [Propensity to Cycle Tool](#) is a very useful resource for prioritising the links in a proposed local cycle network in England or Wales. Finally, there is Government [guidance on preparing Rights of Way Improvement Plans \(RoWiPs\)](#).

*Unofficial guidance:* See also the guidance on rights of way and RoWiPs from the [Ramblers](#) and [Cycling UK](#).

## **'E-scooters and other 'micro-mobility vehicles'**

Electrically-assisted scooters (or 'e-scooters') have become popular in recent years. However at present, the only e-scooters that may be ridden on UK roads are publicly hired e-scooters, as part of a UK Government trial to assess whether to legalise them and, if so, how. Privately-owned scooters may only legally be ridden on private land with the landowner's permission.

The UK Government plans to create a new category of 'micro-mobility vehicles', that would include e-scooters and other light motor-vehicles, whose power and weight limits will be low enough to permit them to be ridden under similar laws to those applying to pedal cycles. The alliance urges that these vehicles should be regulated in a way that seeks to maximise their potential benefits for reducing car traffic, while minimising the safety risks to their riders and other people - and especially to more vulnerable pedestrians - and to the health benefits of walking and cycling.

#### Further information:

*Official guidance:* DfT's [guidance on e-scooter trials](#) applies in England, Scotland and Wales.

## **Road and path maintenance**

Poorly-maintained roads are the bane of drivers' lives. But pedestrians, cyclists and people with disabilities are far more seriously affected by poor maintenance than drivers. Potholes, obstructions and trip-hazards can cause serious and even fatal injuries, while poor winter maintenance can trap older and disabled people indoors, unable to get to the shops for fear of a dangerous fall.

Yet road maintenance budgets are [increasingly skewed](#) towards maintaining motorways, trunk roads and other A-roads. That is despite [evidence](#) that funding cuts to minor road maintenance have significantly higher economic costs than those affecting trunk road maintenance. This is probably because walking and cycling account for a greater proportion of the traffic on minor roads, while pedestrians and cyclists' maintenance claims are much more likely to involve serious injuries, not just property damage. The average maintenance-related legal claim made by cyclists is [13 times higher](#) than those made by drivers.



Councils therefore need to give greater priority to inspecting and maintaining minor-roads and off-road paths, including winter maintenance and vegetation clearance of off-road paths and tracks. From a cycling perspective, they also need to focus more on the area of the road nearest the kerb, on potholes which run parallel to (rather than across) the line of cyclists' travel, on hills (where they will be travelling at higher speeds) and on junctions (where cyclists will be turning and watching out for other vehicles' movements rather than the road surface).

Further information:

*Official guidance:* [Well Managed Highway Infrastructure](#), produced by the UK Roads Liaison Group (UKRLG), applies throughout the UK.

*Unofficial guidance:* For a cycling perspective, see Cycling UK's [briefing on Highway maintenance](#).

## Inclusive access

A key consideration in all aspects of road and street planning and design is the need to consider the needs of children, older people and people with mobility, sensory or cognitive difficulties that make it difficult or dangerous for them to walk or cycle independently. The need for inclusive design is recognised in official walking and cycling infrastructure guidance, though the principle is often overlooked in practice.

In general, infrastructure that is designed for wheelchair access will also ensure access by all forms of pedal cycle (including children's trailers and cargo-bikes, as well as non-standard pedal cycles that are often used as mobility aids). However, there is a tension between the preference of wheelchair users for level surfaces and those of visually-impaired people for kerbs to provide protection and aid navigation. It is therefore vital that schemes are well designed and that tactile surfacing is correctly installed.

Further information:

*Official guidance:* See DfT's [Inclusive mobility guide](#).

*Unofficial guidance:* See Living Streets's online briefing on [inclusive pedestrian design](#) and Wheels for Wellbeing's [Guide to Inclusive Cycling](#).

## Behaviour change programmes to boost walking and cycling

Besides creating a safe and attractive environment for walking, wheeling and cycling, councils should also provide opportunities to try out walking and cycling, so as to remove the non-physical 'barriers' which prevent people from doing so. This is particularly important for groups such as women, people from minority ethnic backgrounds, health patients, older or disabled people. People from these groups are particularly prone to thinking that "cycling and walking aren't for people like me", yet they are exactly the people whose health, wealth and well-being has most to gain from discovering the joys of walking and cycling!

The Government-baked [Bikeability](#) cycle training programme has been designed for adults and teenagers as well as younger children, taking people from learning basic balance and control skills (level 1) through to being able to handle busy roads and junctions (level 3).

Cycle training and other ‘behaviour change’ opportunities should be made available not just in primary schools but also in secondary schools and colleges, cycle-friendly workplaces and in a range of community settings. Women, health patients, people with disabilities, and people from ethnic minority groups (especially women and teenage girls) are much more likely to take up cycling if they do so among peers. This has been well demonstrated by Cycling UK’s [Big Bike Revival](#), [Cycling for Health](#) and other social prescribing or [community outreach programmes](#), and by Glasgow’s Bikes for All programme (which offers heavily discounted access for those on lower incomes to the city’s cycle hire scheme). These programmes have all attracted significant participation from these under-represented groups. Living Streets’s programmes for [diverse communities](#) and [older people](#), and the Ramblers’ [Wellbeing Walks](#) programmes have similarly impressive results in terms of boosting walking among less active groups.

#### Further information:

*Official guidance:* See DfT’s [webpage on behaviour change projects](#).

*Unofficial guidance:* Living Streets runs various [programmes to promote walking](#), notably its [WOW programme](#) to promote walking to school, as well as its [workplace](#) and [communities](#) programmes. Cycling UK provides briefings on the case for and benefits of [behaviour change projects](#) generally and [cycle training](#) specifically, while the Bikeability Trust provides a range of resources on [delivering cycle training](#) for people of different ages and abilities. [Sustrans’ behaviour change programmes](#) mainly focus on promoting cycling to school, while [Modeshift Stars](#) also runs programmes to promote active and sustainable travel for schools and colleges, workplaces and local communities.

## **PUBLIC, SHARED AND COMMUNITY TRANSPORT**

Improving the service provided by Britain’s public transport networks needs to be central to any plan for a Low Traffic Future. So too is the promotion of various forms of shared and community transport, including car-clubs, ride-sharing schemes, community transport services and public cycle hire schemes.

Yet at present, public transport in Britain is expensive, unreliable and poorly co-ordinated, mainly due to a combination of underfunding, fragmentation and organisational failures. The viability of public transport has also been seriously undermined by Government messaging around the covid pandemic.

Volunteer-run community transport services often fill vital gaps in the conventional public transport network, and can be vital particularly for older and/or disabled people to maintain their independence, access services and participate in their communities. However they are often neglected in planning local transport services.

So far in the UK, public cycle-hire is mostly still limited to a few larger towns and cities (and often just to their central areas), while car-clubs and ride-sharing are still seen as niche activities rather than as normal options.

To maximise the benefits of public, shared and community transport, local authorities should aim to:

- Support the expansion of [rail](#) and 'metro' networks (n.b the term 'metro' encompasses underground, light rail and tram networks) and new or upgraded stations.
- Similarly, support more frequent and reliable [bus and coach services](#), e.g. by improving bus priority in urban areas and by boosting the coverage and frequency of rural services. Rural buses are a lifeline for rural communities: without them, people who are unable to drive (including young and older people, people with some disabilities and those who simply cannot afford to run a car) face social and economic isolation, unable to reach schools, colleges or work-places other than by relying on lifts and taxis.
- Improve public transport within National Parks and other protected landscapes, as well as for travelling to them. People will feel much more inclined to leave the car at home when going on weekend breaks or holidays if they feel they can get around without a car when they get there.
- Support community transport services - many of them volunteer-run - such as school or hospital transport schemes, dial-a-ride schemes and similar services, including those aimed primarily at older and/or disabled people.
- Positively promote [shared transport](#), e.g. car clubs in residential areas or ride-sharing for people travelling the same workplaces or business parks.
- Support the growth of [public cycle hire schemes](#), as well as targeted opportunities for people to try cargo-bikes and non-standard pedal cycles, including those with electric assistance
- Promote better [integration](#) of all of the above, including coordinated timetabling and ticketing, online 'mobility as a service' (MaaS) platforms, 'mobility hubs' and active travel.

## Rail and 'metro' services

Our rail networks suffer from:

- High fares, together with a lack of transparency about what discounted fares are available, and inflexible season ticket rules that do not reflect that, for many people, the regular commute is now a thing of the past.
- Overcrowding, particularly at peak times – meaning that the passengers paying the highest fares often get the worst service.
- A lack of integration (including with bus and other services), e.g. due to poorly coordinated timetables.
- Old, uncomfortable and dirty trains on non-electric lines.
- Cancellations and delays – often due to failures of the rail infrastructure itself (e.g. maintenance, signalling or power failures).
- Poor customer service, including a lack of staff at stations and poor information when things go wrong.
- A lack of provision for cycle users and disabled people – although wheelchair spaces on trains are now standard, many stations lack step-free access and tactile paving, and it can be hard to access mobility support, especially if problems arise (e.g. if a connecting train is delayed). Pedestrian and cycle access to stations is often poor, while cycle parking and cycle spaces on trains are often inadequate and/or poorly designed.

Many of these problems (e.g. high fares, overcrowding and, in the case of underground networks, poor disabled access) also affect our metro networks.

It is to be hoped that the Government's [Rail White Paper](#) (also known as the Shapps-Williams reforms) will address at least some of these problems when it is enacted as part of the long-awaited Transport Bill. Meanwhile local authorities can play a role by:

- Supporting the opening of new or revived rail lines and stations;
- Supporting access and accessibility improvements to stations (e.g. for walking, wheeling, or shared transport) and station accessibility (for disabled people, whatever their mode of transport)
- Promoting [integration](#) with other public and shared transport modes, e.g. by creating mobility hubs, improving the coordination of timetables and ticketing arrangements, and integrating rail travel with local bike share schemes.

Urban ‘metro’ systems can carry significant numbers of passengers at peak times, on routes which are fixed and therefore easy to visualise and remember. Light rail systems can make use of suburban rail lines, increasing the frequency of services but connecting them to routes which run on-street through the hearts of the cities they serve. The permanence of the investment in a tram system can lend prestige to a city, while the arrangement of tracks and platforms is very space-efficient and offers excellent disabled access. For more, see [this report](#) from the Urban Transport Group.

However, trams and light rail systems have high installation costs, can be disruptive when they fail, their routes cannot be varied or extended easily and, if not designed carefully, the tram-rails themselves can create safety hazards for cycle users. There are debates about whether their service quality can be achieved more cost-effectively, safely and flexibly by opting for some form of [guided bus system](#), including those where the bus is guided by [white lines](#) or [magnetic wiring](#) rather than by a [separate kerb](#).

#### Further information:

*Unofficial guidance:* The Rail Delivery Group (RDG, representing the rail industry)) has a toolkit and other publications to support the development of [Station Travel Plans](#), to facilitate access to and from stations primarily by non-car means. The Government-backed Cycle Rail Working Group has published a [Cycle Rail Toolkit](#).

## Buses and coaches

Buses are an essential lifeline for many rural communities especially for people who cannot or do not drive, whether because they are too young, have a disability or simply cannot afford to run a car. Yet many people have lost bus services which they depended on to reach schools or colleges, employment or training, and other key facilities. Many villages have a bus service that runs less than once a day (i.e. on certain days of the week only), or no bus service at all. CPRE, the countryside charity, has published [research on ‘transport deserts’](#), finding that 56% of small rural towns now fit their definition of a ‘transport desert’ or are at risk of doing so.

Buses, like train services, have been badly hit by the pandemic. The Government published its National Bus Strategy, [Bus Back Better](#), in 2021. It promised £3bn to support lower fares, more frequent services, improved bus priority and support for zero-emissions buses. However, local authority bids to the fund totalled £10bn, and it turned out that only £1.6bn would be available: £0.5bn for mayoral combined authorities (as part of their [City Regional Sustainable Transport Settlements](#) (CRSTS) funding, and £1.08bn for [Bus Service Improvement Plans](#) (BSIPs) submitted by just 31 other authorities. It meant that 60% of councils who applied for BSIP funding had received nothing, while even those who did receive funding only received an average of 24% of what they had bid for. For more, see the Campaign for Better Transport’s report [Funding local bus services in England](#).

Despite the lack of funding, DfT officials continue to urge councils to develop ambitious BSIPs - not least to strengthen their own ability to secure increased funding from the Treasury in future. Its BSIP guidance urges councils to consider ways to make bus services more frequent, faster and more reliable, cheaper, more comprehensive, easier to understand, easier to use and better integrated.

Meanwhile CPRE, the countryside charity, has called for England to follow the Swiss model of providing a [minimum of an hourly bus service](#) from 6am till midnight, for every village above a certain population size (e.g. 300 inhabitants in the Zurich and Bern regions). CPRE estimates that this would cost £2.7bn annually but would provide huge benefits in terms of boosting education, training and employment opportunities, saving parents time from fulfilling escort duties or the costs of hiring taxis, while also reducing the congestion, pollution and greenhouse gas emissions associated with car travel.

There is also significant potential to improve the quality of coach services, by creating [coachway interchanges](#) at edge-of-town sites (typically next to the motorway network), where intercity coaches can connect with rapid public transport (preferably rail-based) connections into city centres.

Further information:

*Official guidance:* The Government has issued [guidance on Bus Service Improvement Plans](#).

*Unofficial guidance:* See the countryside charity CPRE's [Every Village Every Hour report](#), and the Campaign for Better Transport's report [Funding local bus services in England](#).

## Community transport services

Community transport schemes encompass a wide range of services, run on a not-for-profit basis, with many of them provided by volunteers. They can include school or hospital transport, and dial-a-ride and similar services aimed particularly at meeting the needs of older and/or disabled people. They are often vital to enable people to stay independent, participate in their local communities or access public services, education or employment. Most are demand-responsive but some operate on fixed routes, filling in gaps in conventional public transport services. For more, see the [Community Transport Association's website](#).

As well as supporting these services, local authorities need to play a role in improving the coordination of conventional public transport, school transport and community transport services. This is not straightforward, as school buses and community transport services are often supported by a separate local authority department from that which supports conventional public transport.

Further information:

*Unofficial guidance:* The Community Transport Association (CTA-UK) produces a range of [resources](#) on funding, setting-up, funding and managing community transport schemes.



# Car clubs, peer-to-peer car sharing and ride sharing

[Car clubs](#), [peer-to-peer car sharing](#) and [ride sharing schemes](#) are all ways in which people can have use of a car when required, without needing to own one.

Traditional car sharing schemes are similar to straightforward car rental, though the cars are usually available from parking bays in residential areas rather than from a car rental depot. Still, the car normally needs to be returned 'back to base', i.e. to the place where it was picked up.

Variants of this model are emerging, with larger car club operators now able to offer one-way journeys, though so far this is more common in Germany than the UK. Another option is peer-to-peer lending, where individuals offer to rent out their cars to other individuals, rather like an AirBnB for cars.

Ride-sharing is another form of peer-to-peer collaboration, but involves individuals giving lifts to other individuals, brokered by sites such as [Getaround](#), [Hiyacar](#), [Karshare](#) and [Turo](#). It differs from ride-hailing apps like Uber, in that the drivers are not seeking to make a living from providing this service, they are simply offering a lift while making a journey for which they would be driving anyway. Another ride-sharing company, [Liftshare](#) also sets up ride-sharing schemes based on workplaces or business parks, e.g. at engineering firm [Arup](#)'s business campus in the West Midlands.

## Further information:

*Unofficial guidance:* Shared transport charity CoMoUK's [Community Carshare Handbook](#) provides advice on setting up car sharing clubs. CoMoUK also provides a [listing](#) of accredited car club operators, peer-to-peer car sharing platforms and local or regional car clubs.

# Cycle hire (or 'bikeshare') schemes

Cycle hire (or 'bikeshare') can take the following distinct forms:

- Cycle hire based on designated hire and drop-off locations, in which cycles can be unlocked by registering payment) either at docking stations or from marked areas (where users can park their bike without additional charge or penalty at the end of a ride).
- Free-floating (or 'dockless') cycle hire, where the bikeshare operator allows cycles to be picked up and dropped off at any location within their operating zone.
- Hub-based cycle hire, where bikes are hired and returned to staffed locations, e.g. at train stations or at recreational destinations (e.g. in or near national parks). Cycles usually have to be returned to the location where they were collected, though some operators have networks of hire locations, enabling cycles to be hired at one location and dropped off at another (similar to larger car-hire schemes).
- Workplace-based pool bikes.
- Cycle loan schemes, often run by social enterprises and/or based at community locations, where, cycles can be loaned out on a 'try before you buy' basis.

The shared transport charity CoMoUK shows the [bikeshare schemes and operators](#) active in the UK.

For all of these options, the pedal cycles themselves can either be conventional or electrically-assisted cycles, and may include non-standard cycles that can be used as mobility aids (e.g. tricycles, regular tandems, side-by-side tandems or hand-cycles).

Evidence from London, Paris and many other European and American cities highlights the potential for bikeshare schemes to act as catalysts for creating a local cycling culture, with successful schemes attracting 6 or more rides per bike per day. Among the positive findings in a [CoMoUK survey](#), half of UK bikeshare users were taking up cycling after a period of not doing so, including 6% who had never cycled before.

However the arrival in the UK, and equally sudden departure, of a wave of venture capital-backed dockless cycle hire operators in 2017-18 showed that viable bikeshare schemes need at least some initial public capital investment to get established, while additional revenue support may be needed to keep them running, particularly in more deprived areas. This investment is likely to be well justified though, given the [evidence of bikeshare's wide-ranging benefits](#).

#### Further information:

*Unofficial guidance:* CoMoUK provides various [advice notes for councils and others on bikeshare schemes](#), as well as a [map and listing of existing bikeshare schemes and operators](#) that are active in the UK.

## **Integration: coordinated timetabling, through ticketing, 'Mobility as a Service', mobility hubs and active travel**

Rail operators and transport authorities (e.g. combined metropolitan authorities, county and most city councils) need to work more closely together to improve the coordination of rail and bus timetables, though transport authorities also need greater powers to achieve this where voluntary agreements cannot be reached. It is hoped that the Government's [plans to restructure Britain's railways](#) could open up [opportunities for improvements](#).

Similarly, there is a need to simplify and integrate ticketing and payment schemes for public and shared transport. The [Urban Transport Group](#) (UTG) and [EU](#) have produced evidence showing that integrated ticketing can substantially increase public transport patronage, as well as increasing revenues, improving passenger satisfaction, speeding up boarding times, reducing fraud and operational costs and, crucially, reducing car use. The West of England Combined Authority is actively seeking to [improve integrated ticketing](#) in and around Bristol, Bath and the surrounding region.

One opportunity to integrate payment is the development of [Mobility as a Service \(MaaS\) platforms](#). MaaS is effectively a digital platform which enables users to see the full range of options for the journey they wish to make, and then make a single on-demand payment for whatever option they choose. This can include public or shared transport (including cycle hire) as well as taxis and ride-hailing options. It can help users find sustainable transport options in real time. Trials (e.g. in the West Midlands and Greater Manchester) have [shown](#) that MaaS is popular but that better coordination and (probably) regulation is needed to maximise its effectiveness.

[Mobility hubs](#) are locations where sustainable and/or shared transport services can be accessed in close physical proximity, e.g. where people can interchange between public transport (including park and ride), shared cars, cycle parking and bikeshare services - see evidence of their benefits.

Finally, it is vital to improve the integration of public transport services with active travel (i.e. walking, wheeling or cycling). This involves not only providing step-free pedestrian and cycle access to, from and within stations, but also providing better facilities and customer service for those wishing to use

public transport in combination with cycling and/or the use of a mobility aid (bearing in mind that, for some disabled cycle users, a pedal cycle is a mobility aid). Hence there is a need to improve cycle parking and hire facilities at stations, to provide well-designed cycle and wheelchair spaces on trains and other public transport vehicles, to put in place user-friendly ticketing and cycle reservation systems, and to provide useful practical information (e.g. on step-free access or where to board a train with a pedal cycle).

Further information:

*Official guidance:* DfT has issued a [Code of Practice for Mobility as a Service platforms](#).

*Unofficial guidance:* the Urban Mobility Partnership publishes a [Practical guide to Mobility as a Service](#) from, and CoMoUK's [Mobility hubs guidance](#). The Rail Delivery Group provides guidance on [Station Travel Plans](#) (which seek to improve the integration of rail and other services) and a [Cycle-Rail Toolkit](#).

## MANAGING TRAVEL DEMAND

Besides ensuring good provision for non-car alternatives (walking, wheeling and cycling, public, shared and community transport), there are two other main mechanisms for managing travel demand. The first is reducing the need to travel, e.g. through planning policies and/or investing in digital connectivity. while the second is to reduce demand for private motorised travel, through some form of pricing mechanism.

### Planning policies and urban design

The need travel (especially by car, van or lorry) can be reduced through planning policies which:

- Locate housing and other developments in locations where public transport can meet a significant proportion of the travel demand generated by the development;
- Ensure that there is good provision for walking, wheeling and cycling (including cycle parking), and for public, shared and community transport within the development, and connecting it with other important destinations in the surrounding area; and
- Seek to achieve high residential densities, concentrating residential and other developments in urban areas, while limiting the amount of land given over to road-space and car-parking. An oversupply of car parking and road-space not only creates soulless places (e.g. limiting the amount of space for social encounters, for play and for nature) but also by increasing the distances that have to be walked and cycled and the safety and attractiveness of travel by these modes. Conversely, high density development makes it easier for people to walk and cycle, while also enhancing the viability (and hence the pricing, frequency etc) of public transport services.

Yet, as shown by [research from Transport for New Homes](#), the last several decades have seen too many residential and other developments being permitted on green-field sites rather than in urban areas, with little or no public transport and with very poor provision for walking, wheeling or cycling.

Developments should:

- Be focussed in locations which have good public transport provision, or where that provision can easily be secured.
- Be located and designed to support active travel, with safe and attractive walking and cycling provision both within the development and connecting it to other destinations in the surrounding area. Roads and streets should either have a design speed of no more than 20mph or should include high-quality protected cycle provision.
- Aim to create 20 minute neighbourhoods, where key destinations (e.g. schools, healthcare and public transport provision) and green open spaces are reachable within a short walk or cycle ride from people's homes.
- Limit the amount of provision for car parking, while incorporating ample quantities of secure, well-designed and conveniently-located cycle parking;
- Incorporate provision for shared mobility, including spaces for mobility hubs, car-sharing cars and bikeshare schemes.

Local authorities should be empowered to secure developer contributions for any sustainable transport provision that may be needed to achieve these aims. Equally, they should be given a clear mandate to reject development proposals that are likely to become car-dependent.

## Digital accessibility

A combination of technological advance and the experience of covid has increased our reliance on digital connectivity and our ability to fulfil many aspects of our lives without needing to travel. However the benefits of digital connectivity are not evenly distributed, with some of the most car-dependent locations also being those with the poorest digital connectivity. Improving digital connectivity, particularly in more remote rural areas, may help reduce the need for some longer-distance car, van and rail journeys. See [discussion of the impacts of digital accessibility](#).

## Vehicle scrappage schemes

Local authorities seeking to reduce pollution from internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles - e.g. through Clean Air Zones and similar schemes - should also incentivise vehicle owners to scrap older or dirtier vehicles and replace them with cleaner alternatives. However, rather than simply offering cash to buy a new vehicle, we urge that these schemes should offer 'mobility credits', which can instead be used for public or shared transport (e.g. to buy a season ticket or a subscription to a car-share or bike-share scheme) and/or to purchase pedal cycles (including electrically-assisted cargo-bikes or other non-standard machines), following the examples set by the [French Government](#) and by [Transport for the West Midlands](#).

## Pricing for using roads or parking space

There is a complementary 'chicken-and-egg' relationship between improving public, shared and community transport and active travel, while deterring the use of private cars through some form of pricing. Pricing can relate to the use of road-space (either in general or at particularly busy times and places), or parking space, or motor vehicles, or fuel.

These types of pricing mechanisms can provide much of the funding needed to improve public transport and active travel. However they are also needed to deter unnecessary driving, so as to make space available for those walking, cycling and public transport improvements.

Using the funding from these pricing schemes to improve the alternatives is vital if the pricing schemes themselves are to be seen to be fair, with people seeing the money being used to make it easier for them to get around without depending on private cars.

[Polling by Ipsos](#) found that public support for pricing for urban road-space has gone up from 33% in 2007 to 62% in 2020. It is higher among captains of industry, and rises higher still if the revenues are used to improve public transport, to tackle air pollution or greenhouse gas emissions, and if the taxes are higher on more polluting vehicles. Conversely, support falls if the revenues are returned to drivers in the form of reduced road taxes. [Research by Campaign for Better Transport](#) found a clear majority supported road pricing more generally (49% in favour compared with 19% against), echoing earlier [findings from the Social Marketing Foundation](#). Both reports reinforce the point that road pricing schemes need to be fair.

There is a good case for national government to provide a national framework for road pricing, not least to address the climate impacts of road transport. Meanwhile local authorities can develop more localised schemes to tackle the (predominantly urban) impacts of congestion and pollution, using the proceeds to fund local transport improvements (e.g. walking and cycling provision, as well as improving local bus and metro services). The Greater Cambridge Partnership's [Sustainable Travel Zone proposals](#) - which combine local road user charging with walking, cycling and bus service improvements covering a wide area around (as well as within) Cambridge - look set to be a model of best practice.

## RURAL TRANSPORT

The solutions advocated in previous sections of this guide all apply to both urban and rural areas. However there is a common perception that they only really work in urban areas.

It is of course true that they are harder to apply in rural areas. The journeys people make in rural areas are typically longer (making it less likely that they can be walked or cycled), while the lower levels of travel demand make it harder to provide public, shared and community transport services that are both convenient and cost-effective. It is therefore harder for rural residents to get by without a car. However the lack of alternatives obviously creates real problems for children and young people in rural communities, as well as those on low incomes and those (especially older people) who are prevented from driving by health conditions or disabilities.

Yet it is particularly important to reduce car use for longer journeys, given that around 30% of greenhouse emissions from cars arise from just 3% of car trips<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, successful schemes do exist, as was demonstrated in a series of roundtable discussions held by the University of Hertfordshire's Smart Mobility Unit in 2020. The [report of these roundtables](#) identified a number of

---

<sup>1</sup> Adeel, M, Wadud Z and Anable J 2020. *An exploratory analysis of long distance travel by English residents within Great Britain*, presented at the 99th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, January, Washington DC (not available online).



solutions, and examples of good practice, for tackling car-dependence in the 'peri-urban' areas around smaller towns, as well as in more remote rural areas, not least those which are popular as recreational and holiday destinations:

- Integration of public transport: the '[One Public Transport System for Cornwall](#)', run by Cornwall Council, was cited as an example of good practice, as was the Intalink partnership in Hertfordshire;
- '[Total transport](#)': ensuring better coordination of transport services commissioned by different public bodies (e.g. public transport, school transport, patient transport and community transport schemes);
- [Demand-responsive transport](#) (DRT): where public transport services can operate on flexible routes, allowing users to summon a bus by altering its route (within reason) to pick them up or drop them off at a convenient location. An example is the [ArrivaClick service](#) operating in Liverpool, Leicester, Watford and Ebbsfleet.

Meanwhile the charity CoMoUK's website cites [several case-studies](#) of car-sharing schemes operating in small towns or rural areas.

There is a particularly strong case for improving public transport provision in National Parks and other protected landscapes. If visitors to these areas feel they can get around within these areas without needing a car, they are also likely to use public transport for the (probably much longer) journey to get there in the first place. In doing so, they are helping to reduce the congestion, pollution and visual intrusion that reduces the quality of the environment they are there to enjoy. For instance, [prohibiting on-road car parking](#) on the Llanberis Pass in Snowdonia while providing [park-and-ride buses](#) to get there has created a much better experience for those wishing to climb Snowden from the pass.

In terms of promoting walking and (particularly) cycling, it is worth reiterating our earlier point about the need for better integration between the planning and funding for Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) and Rights of Way Improvement Plans (RoWIPs). LCWIPs are generally perceived to be about 'purposeful' walking and cycling in urban areas, with RoWIPs being about recreational walking, cycling and horseriding in rural areas.

Yet this distinction should not be hard and fast. On the contrary, if walking and cycling networks are to enable people to make the switch from car journeys in smaller towns - e.g. for children in outlying villages to walk or cycle to school in nearby towns - those networks need to overcome people's fears of walking and cycling on the 60mph rural single-carriageway A and B roads which link those towns to other towns, settlements and key destinations nearby. This will either involve providing segregated cycle tracks alongside those roads, or providing an alternative route using the rights of way network. A route alignment that is separate from the road network may well be safer and pleasanter. but it needs to be sufficiently direct, well surfaced and lit for use in all weathers at all times of year.

It therefore makes sense for councils to ensure that their LCWIP and RoWIP networks are well integrated, and to seek opportunities to use LCWIP funding to improve the surfacing and lighting of those sections of the Rights of Way network which also have potential for 'purposeful' walking and cycling journeys (n.b. these will generally be the sections closer to towns).

# FREIGHT

A concern often raised about plans to reduce traffic in towns and cities is the question “what about goods deliveries”?

Freight transport is obviously vital for delivering goods to shops, homes and businesses. Yet our over-reliance on heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) for freight transport is seriously harmful:

- Safety: In the 5 years pre-Covid, HGVs accounted for only [3.5% of motor-vehicle mileage](#) on Britain’s road network (excluding motorways), yet they were involved in [13% of pedestrian fatalities and 17% of cyclist fatalities](#). The injuries resulting from being hit by a lorry are much more likely to be fatal than those involving other vehicles.
- Road maintenance: the damage caused by a vehicle [increases exponentially with its weight](#), meaning that a 44-tonne lorry does [136,000 times more damage](#) to a road than a typical small car. Lorries are also much more likely to over-run kerbs and pavements, and to damage verges on rural roads and lanes.
- Emissions: lorries are [responsible for](#) 17% of greenhouse gas emissions from road transport and 21% of nitrogen dioxide emissions, even though they account for just 5% of road traffic mileage (including motorways).

In recent years, a decline in the GB population’s annual average car mileage has been offset by an increase in van mileage, with the result that road traffic overall continues to grow. This is to a large extent driven by the [growth in home deliveries](#), a trend which accelerated during the pandemic.

So how can we reduce these problems while still delivering the goods?.

## Inter-urban freight

Part of the answer is to get more of our goods delivered by rail. Rail is obviously well suited to carrying heavy or bulky goods and could take a lot of lorries off our motorways.

Improved collaboration and data-sharing within the logistics industry could also help to reduce the c30% of GB HGV mileage where the [lorry runs empty](#).

In time, the use of self-driving lorries on motorways may soon contribute to reductions in the costs and the environmental and safety impacts of road freight for journeys that cannot be made by rail.

## Urban logistics, including cargo bikes

Meanwhile, local authorities can support the transfer of freight to rail by supporting the creation of new railfreight terminals, both at the origin and destination ends of potential railfreight journeys. They should also look into supporting [urban logistics hubs](#), where large lorries can transfer their loads onto smaller urban delivery vehicles, including cargo bikes, for delivery to shops and other destinations within urban areas. This would reduce the safety risks of large lorries in urban areas, not

to mention the road maintenance damage and indeed their requirements for wide-cornered junctions, which impede efforts to slow motor vehicles and enable pedestrians to cross at junctions.

The [EU-funded Cycle Logistics project](#) found that 51% of urban freight journeys could be undertaken by cargo bike. More recent [research by the Active Travel Academy](#), commissioned by the charity Possible, found that cargo bikes made urban deliveries around 60% faster than vans (delivering 10 parcels per hour, compared with 6 per hour for vans), as well as reducing congestion, road danger, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.