Call for Evidence: Joined Up Journeys (Achieving and Measuring Transport Integration)[1]

Questions

1. a. What are the key features that make a transport system feel joined up to the user?

The primary feature that makes a transport system feel joined up to the user is the ability, no matter where you live, to get from a to b via affordable public transport, within a practical time period, with a range of options based on the distance to be travelled.

This means the facility, where necessary, to transfer from active travel, community transport or public service buses to trains (and back again), preferably using the same ticket or travel card scheme. Where other transport options are essential (such as private taxis in rural areas), fees should be at a pre-agreed rate and travel cards should be useable, with the provider being reimbursed by the transport authority.

A joined up transport system would also introduce comprehensive school bus services nationwide, as traffic counts reveal the huge increase in congestion at peak periods during school term time compared with the figures for school holidays. School transport should be free to use and safe to travel on (perhaps with security staff, where necessary) to encourage parents to leave the car at home. Home to school transport should include options such as cycling buses[2] and other examples[3] from elsewhere in Europe.

There are some particular needs for specific users, for example:

- shift workers need services that operate day and night (transport authorities should work with both public and private sector employers to provide the necessary services, subsidised by businesses where appropriate)
- commercial organisations should be encouraged to provide bus services from transport hubs directly to employment areas (again subsidised by those businesses)
- a loan scheme for e-bikes and cargo bikes may be an alternative to the car for those who struggle to find local public transport services that meet their needs
- passengers with mobility challenges need the ability to transfer seamlessly between services, with support where necessary
- active travel users will need effective options for transportation of cycles on their longer journeys
- rural communities may need alternatives to 'commercial' bus services, such as community transport, 'dial a ride' schemes and other innovative options such as those provided in Yorkshire[4]
- long distance business commuters need the opportunity to work productively as they travel (table space, internet connectivity and plug sockets), without multiple service changes (timely connections are essential).

---

[1] https://committees.parliament.uk/work/9258/joinedup-journeys-achieving-and-measuring-transport-integration/
[2] https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=416977876100728
[3] https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=1279612920112467
[4] https://www.golocal-northyorks.community/services-available/

Park and ride services may also be necessary, but the focus should be on significantly reducing the number of private cars on our roads, particularly where they are transporting just one person. Incentivising car share schemes as an alternative to traditional car ownership should be part of the plan to achieve integrated transport options.

In general, services need to be affordable, clean and safe for travellers to be an attractive alternative to the personal car. Service frequency, reliability (of both the road surfaces and the vehicles) and effective customer service are also essential.

b. How would 'integrated' transport look different to current services and networks?

Genuinely integrated transport services would make it easy to leave the private car at home, particularly for short, local journeys. Integrated transport services would also ease the stress and mental/physical health implications of terrifying travel (particularly that which is caused by aggressive, inexperienced or incompetent drivers, violent or hostile fellow passengers or inflexible cycle path users).

Sadly, the scenario set out (at 1a) above is not generally available in the UK today. Even low-cost/high return options appear to have been disregarded in favour of increasing the number of road miles travelled. Current services are still based on the premise that road building generates economic growth and eases congestion, despite this hypothesis being discredited over 30 years ago[5].

Only London offers what could be described as a genuinely integrated transport network today. Citizens in all other regions are exposed to second class services (and, in some areas, no bus services at all), leaving many in transport isolation and/or necessitating households to have access to more than one car.

Integrated transport services and networks would, as an initial step, make a 'London style' transport system available in all regions and would make it possible for families to (easily and affordably) access education, leisure and work without having to use a car.

2. What stops effective integration happening now, and how can these barriers be overcome?

We welcome the Transport Committee's intention to consider the kinds of changes needed to make genuinely 'integrated' transport a reality. The government's focus on increasing the number of road miles travelled means that public funding is not available for lower cost, higher value/higher return sustainable passenger and freight transport options, including comprehensive nationwide school bus services, community transport options and opportunities to make public transport the attractive option (affordable/free bus services, safe, clean, frequent, and reliable, with high geographical coverage).

This continued focus on road building is a very expensive option for the public purse, with some costs to be incurred not typically being considered when proposals are approved. Road building/ expansion causes soaring air, noise, light, vibration and water pollution, escalating carbon emissions and increased accidents/incidents. These outcomes add pressure to scarce public funds, as well as consuming the capacity of limited public sector resources. Given the added impact on the ongoing health and wellbeing of citizens, this huge barrier should be removed via policies that mandate (rather than recommend) a focus on sustainable integrated passenger and freight transport options.

[5] https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/TR010044-001678-sactra-1994-trunk-roads-traffic-report-unlocked.pdf

Lack of effective government policy is key barrier to integration. The NPPF[6], for example, has a whole section (page 31) on Promoting Sustainable Transport but Local Planning Authorities and developers can cherry pick which policies will be adhered to. There appears to be no expectation that planners consider the NPPF to be mandated rules, national policy and guidance can be 'interpreted'! Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that "*In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that: a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised* ……"

Many developments nationwide are not adhering to this principle. One example of this is a recent allocation within the Greater Manchester Spatial Plan called New Carrington, which will see 5,000 homes and 350,000 m2 warehousing built on and around a 335 hectare peat moss. Although there is a former railway line running through the allocation area and the land is adjacent to the Manchester Ship Canal, the only **committed** funding in the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy[7] is for a new road (Carrington Relief Road, page 84). Other more sustainable options are 'potentials', 'possibles', or 'maybes'. Bus services have been withdrawn in the area, which is currently considered by the local authority to be "*poorly served*" by public transport (paragraph 3.6, page 303). Many residents do not believe the road will be beneficial (in fact, it will induce yet more traffic into the area, causing congestion, escalating pollution and increased carbon emissions). Repeated resident requests, over many years, to prioritise the reopening of the former railway line with public transport services have not been actioned. Yet, despite being a clearly unsustainable development, the allocation was approved by the planning inspectorate.

Another example is Welborne, an urban extension north of Fareham, for 6,000 homes, built very close to a former train station on the Eastleigh to Fareham Line. Known as Knowle Halt, the station was closed in 1964, but the site remains accessible and on a working line. The new development should have been contingent on reopening the station to service the new centre of the development, including shops, services and schools. Instead, all the efforts and funding have gone into a new junction to take cars onto the, already at capacity, M27.

Another barrier to effective integration is the involvement of private industry, which drives up costs and reduces services for the consumer, with journeys that are 'unprofitable' being withdrawn. This has been recognised by the government[8], which confirmed that "*approximately 300 million miles of bus services operating outside London were slashed from 2010 to 2024*". Other regions are planning to follow the Greater Manchester example to bring buses back under public sector control, which will, hopefully, reverse the trend in bus service extinction.

Given the strategic intent is to reduce travel by unsustainable modes, other barriers to effective integration include:

- Lack of incentives to encourage long distance UK travel by train (including significant reductions in fares) rather than by car or via internal flights
- Lack of incentives to promote carpooling and car share schemes as an alternative to traditional car ownership

---

6 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/67aafe8f3b41f783cca46251/NPPF_December_2024.pdf

7 https://downloads.ctfassets.net/nv7y93idf4jq/5Y95swfmf42WVZozNA4fE/84092928376473c507ec000098b18c35/Delivery_Plan_2021-2026_Jan_2021_Final.pdf

8 https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-protects-thousands-of-miles-of-bus-services-from-being-scrapped

- Lack of funding to reduce transport inequalities in less affluent areas, such as providing and promoting financial support for the loan or hire of cycles, e-bikes and cargo bikes, and for season tickets, making jobs, education and/or training a real possibility, even in more isolated areas
- Lack of consideration of technology advances, such as autonomous/driverless vehicles.

3. What kinds of interventions and policy decisions are needed to provide joined-up transport, including in areas beyond transport such as planning?

Given the barriers mentioned above, public funding should be urgently refocused on public transport, active travel and sustainable freight transport. Schemes to build new or expanded roads should be cancelled unless there is a clear business case that demonstrates value for public money and a cost benefit ratio that exceeds the public transport alternatives. Once integrated transport options are widely available, motor vehicle travel should be discouraged by the introduction of more road charging, increased road taxes and higher petrol duties. Use of sustainable transport options should be encouraged by incentives, including free travel on buses, tax relief and other inducements.

The choice of location of any new development is critical. It is the key determinant of whether a planning approval will, or will not, lead to effective integrated public transport.

With this in mind, the organisation Transport for New Homes should be a mandatory statutory consultee for all major developments, with their recommendations[9] adopted and their checklist[10] fully followed.

Every Local Authority should be required to develop a plan (by 2030) for integrated transport services, with a mandated aim to reduce road-based transport. This plan should be monitored for effectiveness and achievement of key goals. Local Authorities and citizens should be incentivised to reduce private car use, this should include funding for initiatives such as the cycling buses mentioned above, car sharing options, and the introduction of community transport, for example.

The London model of integrated transport should be implemented in each region, with a clear target date for initiatives such as ‘Oyster’ type travel payment cards to be introduced. Simple ticketing that covers integrated transport (all modes) at a maximum day rate charge, based on distance travelled, should be introduced nationwide

In more rural areas different models of integration will be needed because of the distances that may be involved. A plan for the development of those models should be prioritised and in place within 2 years of the Committee determining its next steps.

As mentioned above, government policy is not effective if criteria can be cherry-picked. Sustainable transport should be the priority, with new or expanded roads being the exception and only approved if detailed and comprehensive evidence confirms that other, more sustainable, options bring a lower cost benefit return.

A recent report from the Royal College of Physicians (RCP)[11] highlights that 30,000 people are dying annually of air pollution, costing the NHS and the economy £500m every week. The RCP is calling for action from the UK government and successfully introducing integrated transport nationwide would address a number of their concerns.

---

[9] https://www.transportfornewhomes.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/What-is-being-built-in-2025-In-search-of-the-station.pdf

[10] https://www.transportfornewhomes.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/checklist.pdf

[11] https://www.rcp.ac.uk/news-and-media/news-and-opinion/air-pollution-linked-to-30-000-uk-deaths-in-2025-and-costs-the-economy-and-nhs-billions-warns-royal-college-of-physicians/

The Vision Zero safety strategy should be implemented nationwide by 2030, with Authorities being monitored on the number of accidents and incidents in their areas. In relation to public transport, training for staff is essential and must not be minimised. The recent incident in Greater Manchester, which saw 20 passengers injured when the driver of a double-decker bus crashed into a canal bridge[12], is a clear example of the importance of ensuring staff training is adequate and effective (a similar incident happened just two years previously).

It should be noted that the term integrated transport should also be applied to freight, for which there should be clear incentives to reduce HGV journeys and increase the transportation of goods by rail services, waterways, pipeline or even by drones, as far as is possible. Such incentives may include tax breaks, as rail freight, for example, delivers huge levels of economic and social benefits to the UK annually. Network Rail reports[13] that each "*tonne of freight transported by rail produces 76% fewer carbon emissions compared with road*", and that a freight train can carry as much as 110 lorries (meaning an increase in rail freight would reduce Britain's carbon footprint and cut traffic jams, too).

4. How should transport integration and its benefits be measured and evaluated—including the impact on economic growth, decarbonisation and the Government's other 'missions'?

All decisions, appraisals, and evaluations should be fully evidence based and should be made based on knowledge of all the impacts of a proposal (including those related to the environment or health), for its expected entire life cycle, including all factors which will affect the public purse. There should be sufficient data available for decision-makers and communities to understand the implications of the options for transport integration (sustainable and unsustainable), showing the comparative benefits/disadvantages, across all data categories (safety, convenience, pollution and carbon impacts, cost, environmental harms, health and wellbeing, journey time, etc).

The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for transport integration and its benefits should include an overall assessment of the value for public money (return on investment) and the public benefit of any transport integration proposal. This will be derived from analysis of a range of more detailed data sources, such as those discussed below. This, alongside the government's proposals for more transparency with Green Book compliant business cases, will enable benchmarking of transport integration initiatives (improving accountability and providing opportunities for lessons learned).

The Committee should investigate the economic and social benefits of public transport investment compared to increasing the number of road miles travelled. There are studies which demonstrate the value of active/public transport to the economy, such as this one[14] launched by the Confederation of Passenger Transport (September 2024), which highlights the economic value of bus services to Britain and its regions. Such an assessment should consider the relative cost benefits of different transport integration options. This short document[15] from the Transport Action Network highlights the benefits of public transport. In comparison, the table at page 6 of this report[16] (also from the Transport Action Network) shows the very poor returns expected from road related projects. With schemes such as the A66 upgrade offering a return of just £0.92 for each £1 spent, there is clear evidence that investment in public transport offers a better return for public money.

---

[12] https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c1lj31l6rm1o
[13] https://www.networkrail.co.uk/stories/railway-day-freight-cuts-emissions-across-britain/
[14] https://www.transportforthenorth.com/blogs/economicvaluesofbus/.
[15] https://transportactionnetwork.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Handout-Benefits-of-public-transport-formatted.pdf
[16] https://transportactionnetwork.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/TAN-Report-iPDF.pdf

The IPPR also asserts that "*investment in new road building, over other forms of transport investment, does not deliver good value for money, help meet Labour's missions, deliver the emissions savings needed to reach net zero, or safeguard nature*"[17]. Their article recommends that the funds spent on new roads are redirected "*towards renewing our existing road network, public transport and active travel*". It argues that such investments would "*have the potential to unlock economic growth while supporting the health, opportunity, and safer streets missions, alongside decarbonisation targets*".

In terms of social benefits, public health assessments suggest that road schemes benefit the 'well-off' in our society, leaving those who are less affluent with the drawbacks of exposure to air, noise, light, vibration and water pollution without any advantages (many cannot afford a car, yet are exposed to pollutants by those who drive through their neighbourhoods).

The government's Public Health briefing to promote active travel (May 2016)[18] asserted that "*it has been estimated that half of the UK's £10bn cost per annum of air pollution comes from road transport*" and that "*Disadvantaged areas also tend to have a higher density of main roads, leading to poorer air quality, higher noise levels and higher collision rates*". Health inequalities are further exacerbated because "*residents of deprived communities tend to travel less than the better off but feel the impact of other people's travel. In short, increasing car dependency has led to increasing unfairness*". Public and active travel initiatives favour the 'less well-off' in our society.

It will be recognised that some measures will be qualitative (soft data), rather than quantitative (hard data). Qualitative data may, for example, include the wellbeing of those impacted by transport-related incidents (discussed further below), including the personal safety perceptions of passengers. Qualitative data may also include the impact of the proposal on specialist staff across the public sector, and their ability to support the initiative (given capacity, workload and the availability of expertise/experience).

The Committee should also request regular information from local authorities to confirm their progress in relation to reducing the number of motor vehicles on their roads. This is likely to be a mix of soft and hard data and should confirm the justification for any infringement of government policy to secure modal shift through increased integrated sustainable transport.

Quantitative data for transport integration would include detailed estimates, alongside actuals, that assess both the outputs (number of journeys, number of travellers, for example) and the outcomes (reduction in motor vehicle traffic, increase in public transport passengers, reduction in pollution, reduction in carbon emissions, impact on natural capital assets, etc).

The consequences of increasing traffic on pollution should be monitored at a very local level. The government should install more monitoring stations to identify the level of air, noise, light vibration and water pollution suffered by communities. The results (hard/quantitative data) should be publicly reported, and analysis should be undertaken by independent experts to increase confidence in the data outputs. This data will be invaluable when proposing future initiatives to accelerate the reduction of motor vehicle traffic to the public (providing genuine evidence of the benefits). The resulting data will also enable more accuracy and confidence when incorporating the full cost of pollutants and carbon emissions into comparative assessments of integrated transport options.

[17] https://www.ippr.org/articles/making-every-pound-count

[18] https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/523460/Working_Together_to_Promote_Active_Travel_A_briefing_for_local_authorities.pdf

That comparative data is essential. When comparing the transport integration options, all the costs and benefits to the public purse should be considered and measured, including the costs that are expected to be incurred by the emergency services (fire service, primary and secondary healthcare services) and other parts of the public sector (based on past trends). Assessing the anticipated ongoing impact of transport-related incidents (such as collisions on our roads or assaults on public transport) on the mental and physical health of travellers, their productivity and the ongoing effect on their day to day lives, is also a critical factor to be taken into account when considering integrated transport options.

Another initiative that can bring safety benefits, is the introduction of Congestion/Air Quality Improvement zones. This article[19], highlights a study by the University of Lancaster, which found that "*the London Congestion Charge resulted in "meaningful" reductions in traffic volumes, and also "substantial" and "significant" reductions in road accidents and deaths*". The same article also highlights Vision Zero[20], which is a strategy to eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries, while increasing safe, healthy, equitable mobility for all.

More needs to be done to improve safety-related KPIs and to support decision-makers in their understanding of the potential pathways to achieving Vision Zero. It is recognised that public transport is generally safer per passenger mile than travelling in private vehicles. Fewer motor vehicles on our roads reduces the potential for collisions and other incidents. The Transport Action Network commissioned this report[21] which concludes that the cost of the A66 upgrade (£1.5billion) would pay for 60% of the road safety measures identified by the Road Safety Foundation for the whole of the UK. Given the low return on investment for this road (mentioned above), we do not believe there has been sufficient scrutiny on the alternative options to ensure the best value for public money will be secured. The measures to be recommended by the Committee should support the scrutiny of public sector spend.

Measuring the real costs of private sector involvement in the provision of transport services should also be examined by the Committee. KPIs that measure how drivers/service users are impacted should be introduced. This could include sample monitoring of road charges and fares, and, in relation to public sector spend, measuring the effectiveness of both contracts and services.

For service users, private sector involvement can increase the cost to travel. As an example, a return ticket for a train service mid-week between Northallerton and York costs a user with a senior rail card approximately £10 to travel on trains only provided by Transpennine Express. To travel on any train, the same journey costs approximately £20. Given the service user is making the exact same journey via the exact same mode, the fare should be standard, whichever service supplier is used.

The Committee should also measure and monitor the relative costs of different modes of travel, using sampling and other techniques. As an example, this media report[22] highlights that a lady from Cornwall flew to Malaga to pick up a new car in Crewe as it was a cheaper than getting a train up to Manchester. This clearly demonstrates that current priorities are resulting in poor outcomes for the environment. Train travel should be the 'go to' option for long journeys. It must be made more affordable as quickly as possible.

---

[19] https://transportactionnetwork.org.uk/healthy-travel-choices-can-improve-road-safety/
[20] https://visionzeronetwork.org/about/what-is-vision-zero/
[21] https://transportactionnetwork.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/TAN-A66-Report-web.pdf
[22] https://www.cornwalllive.com/news/cornwall-news/mum-flies-malaga-back-pick-9894129?int_source=nba

Government policy should require that any documentation related to integrated transport must comply with the Green Claims Code[23] principles, which require that claims made in relation to environmental impacts:

- must be truthful and accurate
- must be clear and unambiguous
- must not omit or hide important relevant information
- comparisons must be fair and meaningful
- must consider the full life cycle of the product or service
- must be substantiated.

5. a. How should the cost of interventions needed to deliver transport integration be assessed and appraised?

As mentioned above, all the costs related to a specific transport integration initiative need to be assessed and appraised to determine the public benefit of a proposal (including environmental and emergency services implications).

Comparative data, clearly showing how different options perform (both financially and from an outcomes perspective), should be available for decision-makers and communities to scrutinise.

Whilst it is anticipated that the cost of any transport integration intervention should fully comply with the Treasury's Green Book requirements, there have been criticisms[24] that the Green Book currently favours London and the Southeast, with other regions remaining the 'poor relation'.

One example of this is the HS2 initiative, which is going ahead in the south but has been cancelled for the north. As mentioned in this article[25], it can be argued that, in the south, HS2 duplicates railways that are already fast, electrified and requiring vast lengths of expensive new tunnels, resulting in an extremely low Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR). By comparison, in the North, HS2 would have been replacing slow diesel railways, crossing much cheaper land, with less demand for expensive tunnels, generating a much higher BCR.

Clearly, future decision-making should ensure the evaluation of the relative benefits must be able to recognise the wider benefits of transport investment, (social, regeneration, connectivity, pollution, health, decarbonisation, etc), alongside the financial/economic case.

To achieve this, a full and detailed business case should be produced for each transport integration intervention, covering all the anticipated impacts of the scheme.

The business case should clearly outline how much is expected to be funded by the public sector (including costs that may be incurred by, for example, the emergency services, as discussed above), and how much private sector investment is anticipated. This should be compared to estimates of where and when the benefits accrue.

---

[23] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/green-claims-code-making-environmental-claims/environmental-claims-on-goods-and-services

[24] https://democracy.transportforthenorth.com/documents/s10505/Appendix%202%20Letter%20to%20HMT.pdf

[25] https://tomforth.co.uk/northerntransport/

b. Will proposed changes to methodology in the Treasury's 'Green Book', including the introduction of 'place-based business cases', change this?

We await further information about the changes to be introduced in 2026. We welcome the confirmation that "*place-based business cases will be based on robust analysis and research*" and hope that the social cost-benefit analysis becomes a commitment (rather than a maybe), alongside the other categories of data mentioned in our responses to questions above.

Whilst, in theory we are supportive of place-based business cases, we are concerned that the government's policy paper[26] does not mention the input of local communities in their determination. As it is expected that "*Place-based business cases will set out the strategy and analysis for a set of proposals in a particular place*", it is essential that local citizens are involved in both setting the objectives and in determining how they are achieved. The example provided above (New Carrington) in our response to question 2 demonstrates that local and regional authorities may prioritise transport interventions that do not meet the needs of the local population. The proposed taskforce should reach out for community input.

If communities are to be involved in the development of place-based business cases, they will be a useful tool for determining specific transport intervention projects. If they are 'done to' communities, rather than 'done with' communities, they will not be a benefit. Other challenges may include genuine partnership working, particularly in areas that need a number of different interventions (regeneration areas, for example) and the interaction between different government departments and levels (local, regional, mayoral, national).

We also welcome the proposals to publish full and summary business cases, which, as mentioned above, will enable benchmarking opportunities and support increased scrutiny for decision-makers and communities, ensuring public funding drives public benefits (not private sector profits and dividend payments). Given the multi-million pound investments of public money in transport interventions, a proportionate level of scrutiny should be applied to fully understand all the implications.

In addition to the introduction of 'place based business cases', the government's proposed changes include simplifying the guidance, which will support the limited public sector resources (reducing the need for external consultant support in the creation of Green Book compliant business cases). Training is also proposed but authorities may also need to recruit additional staff.

6. a. Will integration in itself deliver other benefits such as wider transport options in more places, and behaviour changes such as mode shift?

Integrated transport will only deliver benefits such as modal shift if there is a shift in policy and public funding to mandating genuinely sustainable transport. Otherwise, as mentioned above, vast amounts of public money will be consumed by very expensive, unsustainable road schemes.

Integrated transport will bring opportunities to deliver numerous associated benefits, including lower costs to the consumer (through integrated ticketing and fares), improved accessibility and enhanced environmental sustainability (including reduced pollution and carbon emissions).

[26] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/green-book-review-2025-findings-and-actions/green-book-review-2025-findings-and-actions

Whilst reducing travel time is frequently mentioned as a key benefit to road schemes, increased productivity will be achieved through ensuring the whole workforce is able to access affordable, frequent and reliable public transport services. This will also attract the levels of business investment into regeneration areas as access to the wider employee talent pool becomes available.

b. What other impacts could it have?

Sustainable transport options will, as mentioned above, also reduce social exclusion and improve quality of life, health and wellbeing, with reduced travel stress, improved access to amenities, education, and employment and reduced risk of accidents/incidents.

Transport integration can also optimise the use of resources, from specialist staffing in the public sector to carpooling schemes for communities. This will not only lead to greater efficiency and effectiveness (particularly cost effectiveness), integrated transport initiatives have the potential to cultivate greater collaboration and coordination among stakeholders providing and using the services.

7. a. What is needed to ensure that integration is inclusive and meets the diverse needs of transport users?

The most essential prerequisite to ensure that integration is inclusive and meets the diverse needs of transport users is the extensive involvement of citizen stakeholders. The users themselves - not elected representatives. This can be achieved through a variety of means, including citizen panels, which will increase the trust and confidence of the public in the initiative being considered.

Citizen panels provide a platform for residents to voice their opinions, influence decision-making, and help shape policies that directly affect their lives. Their involvement in transport integration is, therefore, crucial.

In addition to enabling increased and active participation, citizen panels should be constituted to ensure a wide range of voices are heard, including those from marginalised or underrepresented groups, such as those who need to be involved to create better outcomes for accessibility.

Citizen panels can lead to improved service delivery, better informed decision making and positive relationships between different groups of stakeholders. Alongside democratic decision-making, they are a useful tool to ensure there is accountability and transparency in the process and that the integrated transport strategy is responsive to local needs.

b. Will integration necessarily lead to better outcomes for accessibility?

Only if there is sufficient involvement of appropriate stakeholders. This can include the citizen panels mentioned above but also direct involvement of individuals and support groups throughout all phases of a project.

The costs of infrastructure to support improved accessibility must be included in the costs of a scheme. Ramps, for example, accessible platforms, clear signage and applying technological solutions are all essential minimums.

Users and their representatives may identify other priority needs, such as passenger assistance programmes, and/or specialised transport services aimed at door-to-door transportation for individuals with mobility impairments (particularly those who cannot use conventional public transport).

8. Will the meaning of integration vary across different kinds of areas and for different kinds of journeys? (such as rural and suburban areas, and inter-city journeys)?

As mentioned at the start of our response, we define integrated transport as the ability for the user, no matter where they live, to get from a to b via affordable public transport, within a practical time period, with a range of options based on the distance to be travelled.

Whilst there may be different solutions or different transport mediums in different areas or for shorter/longer journeys, all users (urban/rural, business/pleasure, able-bodied/mobility impaired) should be able to access affordable, clean, safe, reliable and frequent services.

For short, hyper-local journeys, whether rural or urban, active travel should be encouraged. For longer but still local journeys, bus services should be the practical option, even in rural areas.

For long distance travel, including inter-city journeys, affordable train services should be the preferred option.

Whilst rural areas currently have very limited public transport options, the aim should be to improve services significantly to reduce reliance on the private car. Carpooling and car sharing should be actively encouraged through incentives such as tax relief, loan schemes and other financial inducements.

Those in rural areas should not be penalised by higher charges for journeys that would be considered to be local in urban areas. Journeys to access healthcare, employment or education should not be more costly for rural users, they are already disadvantaged by distance and longer travel times.

It is recognised that connectivity between services may be more challenging in rural areas. This should be addressed by other options, such as the ability to commission a private taxi or a community bus service, through the same ticketing scheme to ensure uptake of services is maximised.

9. a. What lessons can be drawn from attempts to integrate transport elsewhere in the UK and around the world?

As mentioned above, London is the only example of genuinely integrated transport in the UK. This model should be replicated across other urban conurbations as quickly as possible, taking advantage of the many lessons learned over the past decades.

Greater Manchester has recently taken back control of its bus network and has shared some of their early lessons learned in this report.[27]

[27] https://democracy.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/documents/s38345/GMCA%2020250627%20Delivering%20Better%20Bus%20Services%20for%20Greater%20Manchester%20-%20Appendix.pdf

There are many studies that highlight the lessons learned from specific initiatives, such as this Transport for the North review of Demand Responsive Transport[28].

At an international level, the World Economic Forum has produced a number of articles, including how innovative technologies (such as blockchain) can be used to support integrated transport initiatives[29] and the Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation (CIHT) recently launched a new article which includes a range of global case studies exploring the integration of sustainable transport modes[30].

In general, some of the common lessons learned include:

- Early and inclusive stakeholder engagement
- Clear and simple ticketing, with fare caps operating across all modes
- Coordinated transfers, schedules and routes, to minimise connection delays
- Prioritise accessibility
- Integrate transport and land use planning.

b. What examples should the Government seek to emulate?

There are a number of examples set out in our responses to the previous questions, including the cycling buses and other examples in our response to question 1 and the international examples included in the CIHT document cited in response to question 9a (which cover France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Singapore and Switzerland).

As safety is a core consideration, Vision Zero (mentioned above) should be implemented nationwide. Public transport is considered to be the safest way to travel and safety case studies such as Transport for London's approach[31] should be reviewed alongside other examples.

Alternative options for rural areas, such as North Yorkshire's Demand Responsive Transport, along with community transport schemes and door-to-door services, including a pilot on demand bus service in the Ripon area[32], alongside other examples, like the pre-bookable, on demand bus service in North East Lincolnshire[33], should be examined in more detail.

North Yorkshire also has a specific service for Medical Non-Emergency Patient Transport[34]. The provision of services to help patients get to and from hospital appointments should be considered a key pillar in the overarching integrated transport proposals.

---

[28] https://transportforthenorth.com/wp-content/uploads/Demand-Responsive-Transport-Lessons-Learnt-1.0-.pdf
[29] https://www.weforum.org/stories/2016/12/goodbye-car-ownership-hello-clean-air-this-is-the-future-of-transport/
[30] https://www.ciht.org.uk/media/c10pknff/sustainable-transport-integration.pdf
[31] https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/bus-safety-data#:~:text=Buses%20are%20the%20safest%20way,injured%20when%20travelling%20in%20London.
[32] https://edemocracy.northyorks.gov.uk/documents/s19396/Item%2010%20-%20Report%20-%20YorBus%20End%20of%20Pilot%20Project.pdf
[33] https://www.nelincs.gov.uk/streets-travel-and-parking/travel-and-public-transport/phone-n-ride/
[34] https://northyorkshireccg.nhs.uk/your-health-and-local-services/patient-transport/

Other international examples include Germany, which is known for its extensive and reliable rail coverage and Japan's high speed 'bullet train' (Shinkansen) is considered to be incredibly punctual, clean and efficient.

In 2020, Luxembourg became the first country to make all public transport (buses, trams, and trains) free to use by anyone. In 2022, Malta made its public transport free on most routes (for residents). These are both examples the government should examine closely.

About the Community Planning Alliance

The Community Planning Alliance is a national umbrella group for over 700 communities, all are campaigning against inappropriate development in their areas, and all disagree that decisions are being made in the 'public interest'. We have extensive knowledge and experience of the planning system, and our aims include seeking increased community participation, better environmental protections and the right homes and infrastructure in the right places.