

**Annex 2:** Summary of text answers (barriers)

*"The comparison of options aimed at different objectives remains problematic, despite NATA"*

National and local government objectives predetermine strategic options (e.g. demand management), and there is not a huge choice of strategies within national policies. Government objectives were felt to lack clarity, and the specification of alternative strategies for appraisal was difficult. It may not be clear which policy instruments to use to reduce problems as part of a strategy. This is a function of knowledge/experience/monitoring of what does, and does not, work. There may be also be a lack of internal conviction towards certain types of schemes, e.g. cycle schemes or bus lanes, and the balance between using hard schemes and soft measures may be poorly defined and understood.

*"Funding is heavily rationed"*

The unavailability of revenue funding for ongoing scheme operation continues to be a major constraint on strategy and scheme selection. This applies to many innovative transport schemes for which capital funding for implementation is available. This makes it harder to adopt balanced strategies using a carrot (public transport provision) and stick (demand management) approach. The unavailability of revenue funding also affected the maintenance of infrastructure and assets. Some of the innovative funding options are out of reach for local transport planners and local authorities, and some are not present even in Government policy at this time. There is inflexibility to convert capital (LTP) funds to cover revenue deficits. Phasing and long-term planning is compromised by uncertainties caused by short-term (e.g. annualised) capital funding settlements and the uncertainties over the likelihood, level, and availability of funds.

*"The Government's own capacity for integration is lacking"*

If national policy is not properly co-ordinated, it makes it almost impossible to do so at the local level. The ODPM appears not to understand the importance of strategic transport improvements, focusing only on transport investment close to development areas. The ODPM and DfT have a problem resolving whether transport is leading land-use or following it; conflicting advice makes long-term planning particularly difficult. The treasury should work out what priority transport should be, and the primacy between the ODPM and DfT should be made clearer.

*"Transport sits in the middle at the local level, responding rather than leading!"*

Transport is not often considered in the delivery of council services (e.g. education, social services) or other sectors (e.g. health). This is reflected in the setting of poorly co-ordinated and conflicting objectives in local authorities, although each is set with the best intent. There are difficulties in raising the "corporate" profile of the LTP across all departments.

*"There are split responsibilities for LTP development and delivery within the local authority"*

Strategy develops within the planning department as staff lack the technical competency to specify schemes/projects. The scheme ideas that come back from the implementation side (i.e. engineering department) do not fit the strategy - they are compromised or opposed to it. The barriers between levels of delivery that do exist are usually ones of organisational responsibility or funding.

*"Issues commonly arise where external organisations are involved or needed to implement a project"*

Responsibilities for implementation are shared between many delivery agencies (e.g. LTP authority, Highways Agency, Strategic Rail Authority (SRA), bus companies, local planning authorities, and other executive government agencies). The SRA pays insufficient attention to expanding the capacity of rail networks, and seems unconcerned about the effects of their policies on other modes of transport. Influencing the decision-making of private sector public transport operators can be very difficult. There is a lack of control over many key policy instruments and the local authority relies upon others for their implementation. There are insufficient contact points and resources to develop effective scheme or strategy partnerships with health providers.

**Annex 2**

*"There is a lack of in-house, political commitment to transport schemes"*

The pro- vs. anti-car position is always a political football in councils with a narrow electoral majority. Barriers may be apparent due to a lack of direction or political will on controversial policy instruments, e.g. road user charging or bus priorities. Politicians do not want to make difficult, long-term decisions in case they are around to account for them!! Short-term decisions are made between senior management/Members and the local Bus Company without reference to transport planning or the overall strategy.

*"The lack of resources is restricting the technical abilities to deliver transport strategies and schemes"*

A lack of resources often compromises the level of accuracy of modelling. Monitoring walking and cycling (key sustainable modes) draws massively on finite enumerator resources. Limited resources and inexperienced staff are contributing to poor forward planning at both the strategy and scheme level, and there is insufficient time to develop/appraise options properly.

*"Technical factors are causing problems in delivery"*

The ability of strategic models to reflect small-scale policy interventions is very limited. Little appraisal is carried out on smaller schemes, so their effects cannot be predicted are undocumented. The proliferation of indicators is the biggest problem we face. We need a clearer relationship to transport policy/intervention indicators and outcomes. There is inadequate data for modal split, and tools are unable to adequately reflect behavioural changes.

*"The Government's delivery framework is causing us problems"*

The rigidity of DfT objectives reduces the scope to prepare an effective, shared set of local objectives for transport. The ODPM also has unfamiliar criteria for transport officers to respond to. We have often been instructed not to deal directly with central Government departments by our Government Office for the Region - this makes the process too remote and third at hand. The policy levers are generally outside the control of regional or local bodies. Land-use is the subject of Government interference and local compromises.