

## **Roundtable 4 – POLITICS & LOCAL DELIVERY**

**Chair: Professor Greg Marsden, Institute of Transport Studies**

**Chair's introduction:**

**The scale of the climate challenge provides an impetus to more radical approaches to improving local transport. There are no futures which meet our climate obligations which do not also require reducing the amount we travel by car. However, the scale and pace of change is such that this cannot simply be 'done' to citizens by nudging choices.**

**The participants in our workshop on politics and local delivery suggested that we need to bring citizens into the decision-making process. For the kinds of changes we need to see happen there needs to be more politics, not less. This is being made much more difficult by the lack of clarity from Ministers in England that cutting car travel is part of the necessary pathway. Whilst this makes the doorstep discussions more difficult, there are many reasons why people support changing our towns and city environments such as safety, air pollution and noise and many areas are pressing on.**

**There are, however, limits to what can be done locally. The levels of funding on offer coupled with the short-term competitions for accessing the funding are totally inadequate to deal with the emergency. Whilst pooling resources is on the cards for the next round of Local Transport Plans the quantum of funding is a big issue. Strategies that are unfunded and potentially unfundable will undermine the credibility of local politicians seeking to provide the kinds of step change that make the prospect of giving up some use of the car palatable.**

**It is important to recognise that there is not a mandate for action on the climate everywhere. However, time and again our participants told us of the quiet majority who backed change. The need to reach out and ensure that a truly diverse set of voices define what is possible cannot be underestimated. That might usefully apply to decision-makers too.**

---

This discussion explored the question from the perspective of delivery at the local level, and crucially the politics involved in making those tough decisions. How can we make change happen? How can local politicians take that electorates with them? What more support is needed, political or otherwise, from central government?

### **Political perspective: London Borough**

The discussion heard a presentation from a councillor for a London borough who delivered a series of politically challenging interventions since 2013 to radically change the way the people move around the borough.

The borough was successful in bidding for money from the then Mayor of London (and now Prime Minister) to get more people cycling, but it soon became apparent that it was actually

about active travel in a broader sense. “Cyclists and pedestrians have far more in common than perhaps some people believe.”

The council started to “rectify the narrative that suggested that cyclists were evil and the pedestrians were being mown down by cyclists at a rate of thousands of people a day”.

“Actually it was motorists that were killing people, directly or indirectly, because of the way it was stifling delivering active travel into people's daily lives. And if you put active travel into your daily life you are going to live longer, you are going to be more healthy, a whole range of benefits.” This speaks more broadly to the need to avoid false culture wars.

Low traffic neighbourhoods were introduced. “We are big champions of those because unless you are taking out the through traffic, which has boomed through residential neighbourhoods because of technology our phones and sat-navs, you are never going to encourage more people out of their cars to do those short journeys. I think that is just a simple fact now.

“As long as you leave your residential roads open to through traffic you are not going to get more people walking and cycling or micro-scooting to and from school everyday, to the local shops, to the town centre etc.”

“So we are big champions of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods as a way of rectifying something that should never have happened in the first place.”

The council also included long sections of segregated cycle track and made them as direct as possible. A huge amount of cycle infrastructure was introduced, including 600 cycle hangers on residential streets. Cycle training and cycle hire was provided, including a large fleet of cargo bikes of all shapes and sizes for all families and businesses.

“It has been difficult, but I didn't come into politics to maintain the status quo. I came into local politics to actually make a difference, because I believe you can at a council level.

“I think we have to accept that potentially, politically you could end up being sacrificed by the electorate if they don't like what you are doing. But doing the right thing has to be at the forefront of what we do and that's why we have stuck to our guns with regard to our Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and our interventions deprioritise motorists' needs in favour of active travellers' need.

“It's difficult. It's always challenging but it's worth the fight because you see the benefits.”

These benefits include seeing small children cycling to school, improvements in air quality, community cohesion, thriving local town centres, and a real uplift in cleanliness and the general standard of the street scene.

While the council stuck to its guns in the face of big demonstrations, there is inconsistency in the wider policy message from central government.

“Cuts to Fuel Duty that hasn't even been raised in 12 years sends out really, really poor messages around this agenda. I would have thought cuts to bus fares would have been a lot better, cuts to rail fares would have been a lot better. Bigger investment into active travel would have been better.”

**Political perspective: City Council A**

A councillor at a city council in England, which lies within a Combined Authority, spoke of the challenges of tackling car dependency. The surrounding unitaries, for example, are the polar opposites politically and have very different approaches. One of them provides a lot of free car parking and has very wide roads, which results in challenges at a regional level.

“In terms of demand management we need the Government to lead on this. The Government is kind of doing that by the back door by the Department for Transport. But publicly what it is doing is the opposite of what the Department for Transport is doing, which is the usual trick really in the relationship with the local and central government – if it's not politically popular let the councils do it while ‘we’ look popular in Westminster.”

The big challenge the city faces is retrofitting carbon neutrality onto historic and sometimes poorly designed settings. The city has a green ethos, but Green Party voters in the centre want active travel while Labour voters on the edge of the city want fast and reliable public transport links. The latter is very difficult because of the challenge of retrofitting infrastructure within the narrow streets of the historic centre.

The city needs to establish strategic corridors to ensure swift access but this is often is not popular with Green voters because they have “more of a village mentality than a science-based environmental approach”.

Yet new public transport infrastructure is essential if the city is to have a carbon-neutral transport system.

“We absolutely have to get a better bus system or something else. We are not going to get to carbon neutrality just by turning cars into electric cars.

“So there is a strange conflict between the sort of village green people and your scientific planning type mentality, which is what we feel we need to adopt in order to get those corridors in.”

### **Political perspective: City Council B**

A second city council perspective was offered. A councillor explained that the city is finely balanced, with the ruling party maintaining a thin majority of members.

The council declared a climate emergency in 2019 with the aspiration for the entire city to be net zero by 2030. That's a long way ahead of central government (2050) and the wider region's Combined Authority (2038).

“Achieving that will need a lot of work by the city council, a lot of work by the residents of the city, but also an incredible amount of work by other partners, such as the transport authority, the government and various others. I think that is where we gauge ourselves mostly. We are requesting for as many people as possible to help with the mandate the people ... gave us on that.”

The council recently set out its transport strategy, and it's a huge shift from where the city was seen as being 30 years ago.

“The headline fact of that is that we want to be the city where you don't need a car. We've always had an aspiration where walking and cycling were the first choice for short journeys, but I think this is us being very clear that that means you don't need a car at this point. It's not that

you decide to leave your car at home, it's that we actively want you to not have one in the first place.”

Another important part of the plan is that everyone should have an affordable carbon zero choice in how they travel, regardless of where they live in the city.

Across the city 30% of households have no access to a car and in many areas it's 50% or higher.

As well as the transition to net zero, there is a social justice argument for this policy. When you look at the health inequalities in the city there is a 10-year life expectancy gap between the wealthier and the inner city and the more affluent outlying areas. The cars that are coming from the city's suburbs and rural areas, which are the areas with the highest carbon emissions, are driving through those inner city areas and affecting what happens there.

A major issue is that there is reticence about introducing restrictive measures without the alternatives being in place, but many of the alternatives are outside of the council's control – especially within the short timeframe between now and 2030.

“It's those opportunities for alternatives that I think are our real struggle at the moment. We are seen as being a restrictive council that are reducing car use. But for the person on the street, they can't understand why we are not increasing buses, increasing trains, increasing the other things that we here well know we don't have control of.

Another issue that is outside of the council's control are the policies pursued by neighbouring authorities. “We have many people who start their journeys in another authority and many of those authorities may be on different trajectories to us.”

A final thing piece of the transport jigsaw is outside of the council's control is the motorways that slice through the city.

Despite the lack of controls, the city's transport strategy sets ambitious targets. It aims to double rail usage and more than double bus patronage (on pre-pandemic levels), and it aims to quadruple the level of cycling and increase walking by one third. And there's a target to decrease car mileage by 30%.

However, it's still not enough. “When you add up all of that we are very clear in the transport strategy, it doesn't meet net zero in terms of transport ... it gets a 43% reduction in carbon emissions.”

The council is therefore consulting on congestion charging and a workplace parking levy as a way of bridging the gap between what the strategy can deliver and its own 2030 net zero target.

### **Political perspective: Shire County**

A final political perspective came from the leader of an English shire council. It's a politically diverse council that covers a very rural area and wraps around a city like a doughnut. It has over 100 villages and is in the process of building three new towns.

Carbon emissions in the country are 25% higher than the national average, and that's because of transport. There was a desire among citizens for change, but it is not always matched by willingness to change their own behaviours.

“Our experience is that everybody wants a new railway or an off-road bus route until it runs close to their homes. And everyone wants more buses but very few people will leave the

comfort of their cars to use them. Everyone wants congestion to be reduced and air quality to be improved until they find out that road closures and congestion charging are the only ways to achieve that. And everyone wants more cycling and walking but they won't give up their road space and their car parks.

“So, in a nutshell, our experience is that NIMBYism is actually the biggest barrier that we face when trying to drive mobile shift to sustainable transport and zero carbon living.”

The council's most powerful tool is its local plan. It is doing a joint local plan with the city it surrounds and the aspiration is for this to be “the greenest local plan in the country”. Climate and Environment are the overarching principle and overarching priority.

The current administration inherited a local plan with 39,000 houses in it and has had to add a further 11,600 to that. However, only 4% of these additional homes are in rural locations, and that's only in the villages with main line rail stations. The rest are either in or around the city or the new towns, because they will have the best in sustainable transport.

One of these developments has potential to be a car-free community. “I think we won't achieve that, but I think what we can achieve is somewhere where car ownership is not only optional but actually is undesirable.”

“If we can actually make car ownership undesirable, because we are not going to build homes with garages and multiple car parking spaces, we even put the car parking outside, but there's lots of opportunities for a Zipcars, there will be a railway and so on.

“So I think local planning is the biggest tool we have because we are providing the carrots as well as the sticks. We are providing really exciting living for people. A lot of this is going to be edgy, urban living, which we haven't really seen in a place like this before.”

With a cost of living crisis looming, there is a further opportunity to promote this kind of development.

“We have been talking for some time about the health and well-being benefits of sustainable travel, but we now have to start talking about the cost of living benefits as well.

“So by having the local plan where all the housing is close to where people work, where they are educated, where they get their leisure, where they get their healthcare, that then starts having a direct impact on their budgets.

“By building houses that are built to the highest energy efficiency standards they are not giving all their money to the utility companies either.

“It starts actually improving people's cost of living because suddenly they don't need to own cars, they are in houses that are energy efficient to run, and it's a whole sort of package.

“I think more and more we are going to have to be talking about the finance of living.

In conclusion: “We have to think about ways that we can improve people's cost of living as well as improving the environment as well as improving their health and well-being. They are all inexplicably linked. My ambition is that we create places through our local plan where the car is not king.”

### **The power of positive visions**

Responding to the political perspectives, one contributor said: "It's great to see creations of positive visions. I think this is something that has to be part of our discussion. When we are just talking about things like demand management or taking things away without creating that alternative positive vision I think it just generates a very negative reaction."

Another asked: "How can we get better sharing of our experiences? We've heard some great stuff today but is there a case study library that we can access so that we can take that back out to local authorities?"

### **The importance of a mandate**

One contributor said: "I think this agenda is going to get even more difficult because we are being asked to do even more reallocation of road space, not just a cycling and walking, but to buses. We have to make space for e-scooters and EV charging too. It's going to get even more challenging. How important is it to have that mandate?"

Another said: "How can we get the voices of people who actually think it would be a good idea to have less car use heard? When you have been trying to do things where there voices who were in favour of reducing traffic, and how can those be given more weight? Are there other ways in which we can help organise those who support lower carbon transport?"

Responding to these points, the Shire County leader said that it takes one and a half hours to drive from her area into the city for 9am. The solution for this is likely to be the introduction of some form of congestion charging.

"Interestingly, we ran a citizen's assembly. That was a carefully selected group of people, wide backgrounds. That gave us the evidence of support for the outcomes, and actually the means to get to those outcomes.

"The problem is that we all risk committing political suicide by being ambitious and doing things like this, but we have to do what's right, not what's easy.

"But if you run a citizen's assembly it provides the evidence for you to say, 'the political opposition might think that congestion charging is something from Satan but actually the people are quite happy with it, they are prepared to do it because they understand that congestion charging provides the revenue stream to provide the buses, which will allow them to get out of their cars and free up some of their income'."

City Council B meanwhile achieved a "very clear mandate" through a climate jury.

"A number of people were selected from all backgrounds ... and from all trains of thought on climate. They came up with some really good suggestions and we are really happy they did.

"So, for instance, when they were looking at transport from all the evidence they saw they recommended public ownership of transport ... The solution wasn't just make the buses more reliable or increase routes. It was that it needs to be under public control so that it can be used as a tool in this battle against the climate emergency.

"When the emergency active travel fund came out we did a Commonplace consultation as a quick way of gathering views across the city, and 69% of contributors to that said they supported measures to reduce traffic on residential streets permanently. Therefore, that is my mandate. That's fine. I'm happy with that."

It's meanwhile important to make sure that consultations reach those people who don't normally make their voices heard.

"We did a consultation on one scheme, an online consultation and then knocking on doors. The online consultation came up with 42% positive or neutral. This was for an Active Travel Neighbourhood scheme, same as a Low Traffic Neighbourhood. The doorstep came out as 80% positive or neutral on that scheme.

"You go to a local ward member and they are very happy to deliver an 80% positive or neutral scheme in their area. Doing the same consultation on an online format came up with 42% and that's when you are having difficult conversations with ward members."

A consultation on another Active Travel Neighbourhood mainly attracted negative responses prior to its implementation. "It was predominantly men as with most highway and transport consultations we end up with."

However, at the end of the 12-month trial the response was 63% positive. "I think that's the only consultation I have seen in transport where we had more women than men ... I am certain that changed the outcome.

"So it's around getting the right respondents as well as just getting right responses, and I think we have been a bit lazy in transport consultations before. We talk about groups like seldom heard. They are only seldom heard if we are not listening. That's the difficulty, making sure you have got a wide range."

What value should a council ever place on a consultation with a huge gender imbalance? "Some are 70% men, 30% women, and the views are quite often very different because the journeys that typically men and women take in this country are very different."

The other city councillor said: "If you want to do politically challenging things, the best thing you can do is win a thumping majority at the election. Things like the workplace parking levy, Nottingham has done that. Leicester is now looking at that. Somewhere like [our city] will find that almost anything controversial like that takes more than one electoral cycle - with all the legal work and consultation, the other party is going to play games with it."

The London Borough councillor offered a different view on assemblies: "I'm not a massive fan of climate assemblies. In some respects I think that is attempting to dilute the leadership role that we are elected to take forward.

"We have to make some difficult decisions, and if some councils are still not charging for residents parking permits, still not introducing 20mph zones, if councils still don't have the powers to enforce speeding in some parts of the country ... If some of those basic things aren't in place then we are never actually going to move forward on this."

### **Test first, consult later**

One contributor argued: "The traditional model of pre-consultation before a road space reallocation doesn't work. It is very broken."

To illustrate this point, a poem by Bertolt Brecht was cited:

*When it's a notion  
When it's still vague*

*It is praised.  
When it looms big  
When plans are in motion  
Objections are raised*

“We have got extremely strong alignment over the need to reduce traffic. Everybody wants to reduce traffic ... There is incredibly strong alignment, consistently. It's well over 80% of populations at every level of geography say there is too much traffic, traffic should be reduced. That's to do with road danger, it's to do with air quality, it's to do with the pleasantness of the place that you live. Incredibly, incredibly strong alignment.

“And then as you approach what needs to actually happen about it suddenly public support for what you are proposing to do craters. But a lot of that is a perception and this is the really critical part. After you've done the thing public support climbs back up again, and nobody ever wants this stuff reversed.”

“We knocked on hundreds of doors of households that live on streets with historic modal filters, modal filters that have been there for many years, and well over 80% of people said, 'God no, I would not want this modal filter removed'. You've got low single-digit percentage of people saying, 'Yes, take it away'. Nobody ever wants this stuff to go back.”

London's Congestion Charge and Nottingham's Workplace Parking Levy were each cited as examples of controversial schemes that are now accepted by the local populations. But measures like this are unlikely to attract majority support at the outset.

“You can be confident that these things are popular in the long run because the truth is that testing public attitudes towards a proposal for radical change is a very, very poor guide to public preferences ... And so how do you best represent your constituents' interests in that scenario where they are very bad at knowing what they actually want collectively, or certainly knowing and expressing it? That pre-consultation model just doesn't work.

Work by the Local Government Association looking at the mistakes made around the introduction of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods was cited.

“There is in fact majority support for road space reallocation. Almost every time, that's what you'll find. It's just that the support is soft, and proposals for change don't mobilise people. They don't want it enough. They will not show up to your consultation. The people who show up are angry over 55-year-old men who don't want the change. They are the only people you will hear from and they will then dominate the discourse.

“They will dominate the discourse on social media if you log on. Those are the only voices that you hear, but partly because if it comes self-fulfilling. Nobody wants to wade into that toxic conversation. People back out.

“People who were in two minds start to think that it is unworkable, because it seems like it is wildly unpopular. All of that is just incredibly misleading.”

Instead of consultations, local authorities were advised to do representative polling of their populations and deliberative stuff like climate assemblies and climate juries.

In conclusion: “Test the stuff then consult people a year later, and do it at the start of the electoral cycle.”

## **Funding**

A number of contributors spoke of the importance of funding. The National Bus Strategy for England was cited as an example where the available funding failed to match the scale of ambition from local authorities.

“Funding is fundamentally undermining the ability of people to deliver on the carrots.”

An example from one city was offered of a strategic cycling and walking corridor that could have probably been completed in one year. Funding constraints mean that it will have to be delivered over three years, delaying the benefits.

“So setting aside all the other problems, without adequate funding, without sort of long term commitments from government that people can start going down a route and know they will be able to deliver the project across the conurbation, it's going to be incredibly hard to deliver those carrots to persuade people that we want to change and we've got to restrict the car on other levels. To me that is a fundamental element of this.

“And as we have seen with the way that central government has taken money from improving the buses, for example, and used it for Covid short-term support, we are in quite a difficult position with the Treasury not wanting to spend more money. How do we get around that?”

Another contributor said: “If central government is obviously so scared of talking about behaviour change and wants to give way to local authorities on this, surely local authorities can together go back to central government and say, 'okay we will take the hit for you, but fund us properly'.

“Not competitive funding pots like the Bus Service Improvement Plan, not piecemeal funding. Reallocate some funding from road building towards bus services, towards active travel and fund us properly to deliver on this. And that way we can afford to reduce parking spaces, replacing our parking income and so on.”

Another agreed: “I think we are in a ridiculous situation where we have an ongoing cycle of beauty pageants where local authorities are forced to apply for small amounts of money.

“Some local authorities are equipped to bid, some aren't. And it's all judged often by DfT officials on a short-term basis, whereas other things, like a national road building programme, that have a long-term settlement.”

Commenting on funding competitions, a local authority officer spoke of the “half sad, half happy” feeling when new bid competition comes out. “It's all hands to the pump, you rush from one thing to another, you tend to be taking risks.”

Their council currently has three major schemes over £50m. “That is frightening our finance partners anyway. So then to rush and put together a new bid and make sure you have got the costs right, that you are not taking on more risk, is really difficult. It puts a lot of pressure on authorities to take that risk on themselves and be ready, and not necessarily do best work under those circumstances.

“To give politicians the most confidence, the most time for consultation about that, longer-term settlements over a longer plan, and the ability to manage that, would really make a big difference to us.”

A reality check is meanwhile required between some of the policy messages that are coming out of central government and the baseline that authorities are starting from.

"If you take *Bus Back Better* [the National Bus Strategy for England] or the LTN 1/20 notes [on cycle infrastructure design], it's actually very difficult to implement those ... Particularly our rural bus network. It's on its knees. This isn't about 'when am I going to get fancy EV vehicles, when am I going to have Wi-Fi on every bus?'. This is about, 'is there a bus?'"

Another suggested that the focus on funding competitions were skewing priorities: "Everyone is so desperate for funding that if you win the challenge fund bid then you are delighted. But climate strategy in a number of places that we are researching at the moment is essentially what projects can you get funded, not what needs to be done. That's a real challenge."

"The point we are coming up to in Local Transport Plan 4 where everyone is going to be bidding for the next five years' worth of funding is going to be a key pinch-point with the government. Is it going to put the resources in, or are we going to end up where we are with [a scenario like] Bus Service Improvement Plans where there is seven times the amount of demand for stuff to be done than there is money available?"

Another echoed the concerns about inadequate funding: "We've heard a lot about all sorts of initiatives from local authorities all of which are helpful, but I suggest at the current levels of funding, or anything like the current levels of funding, are hardly going to move the dial in relation to the [UK Government's carbon reduction] targets on the timescale that is required ... So, I think sadly a lot of what has been said about local authority initiatives it's just unrealistic in relation to carbon targets, whatever the merits of the actions."

### **Mixed messages from central government**

Whatever local mandates have been achieved it don't make everything easy, especially when there are mixed messages from government.

One city councillor: "In many times being me has been a very lonely place to be. I am going to community forums in areas of the city where they are not sure why we're making these measures and how we are making them.

"I then receive a letter from the Transport Minister telling me to be bold and brave. Unfortunately, they haven't heard that message from the Minister for Transport, telling them that they need to be bold and brave, or from the Prime Minister, shall we say. That's the real struggle.

"Quite often I have been delivering schemes on behalf of the government, many of whose aims I do not necessarily agree with being in a different party and looking after a different area. But the message that that is where it has come from has not been clear.

"There has been a lot of 'get out of jail free' cards given to Members of Parliament around the country who could then denounce measures that their own Ministers were asking for."

The London Borough councillor agreed. "In theory we have a Transport Secretary of State that is very keen on active travel, but actually we don't. We have Andrew Gilligan, the Prime Minister's transport advisor, who is very, very keen in this space. And we have a Treasury that would rather cut Fuel Duty that has not been raised in 12 years.

"I can't get over the hypocrisy of this. They would rather do that than actually invest and fund active travel solutions, particularly through our towns and cities across the country, that could be easily making a difference very, very quickly. Because we know what now works, we don't have to go out looking for examples. We know what works."

Another cited the example of Great Manchester's plans for a Clean Air Zone as an example of a lack of a consistent approach from central government: "We see central government ... saying to authorities across the country, including Greater Manchester, you have got to put in a Clean Air Zone. And then Boris Johnson saying the Clean Air Zone is a total nonsense, it needs to be stopped. So how can local authorities plan going forward?"

Another said: "People are saying that demand management, that message has to be led by Government. Unfortunately they heard abundant evidence on this and I can tell you the civil servants, it's not in dispute, the civil servants at the DfT understand very well demand management is required, but we have discovered where the edge of Conservative political ideology will take us to when it comes to this stuff and demand management is absolutely verboten ... So don't hold your breath. We are not going to get leadership from government on that issue."

Another spoke of the need to hold the government to account on the delivery of its pledges: "If you look at the Levelling Up White Paper there are 12 missions that the Government has set out. One of those is mission 3: 'By 2030, local public transport connectivity across the country will be significantly closer to the standards of London, with improved services, simpler fares and integrated ticketing.' There are a couple of others about healthy life expectancy.

"So why don't we collectively hold government to account on those missions because that would be a really good case to make for consistency of policy and continuity of funding in the future."

### **Civil society can support politicians**

One campaigner spoke about the role that civil society can play in supporting brave politicians.

When Boris Johnson stood for re-election as Mayor of London in 2012 he had been "absolutely resolute was all you had to do was put down blue paint on the road and that would be enough to create safe space for cycling". The alternative of segregated cycle lanes and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods weren't needed.

But campaigners successfully exploited the intense political competition between Johnson and his main opponent, former mayor Ken Livingstone, and secured a number of promises from him to switch over to a Dutch-style approach.

"I hope what we have done since then as the Civil Society is try to support really brave councillors and brave politicians and brave officials - because political bravery seems to be the key ingredient here, but it's more easily talked about than achieved.

"We are here to help and we are here to try and create that political space for you. Perhaps we could do more to work in dialogue and conversation with politicians to open up that little space for you."

Another contributor remarked: "When it comes to difficult messages then surely the messenger matters as well. My observation is that sometimes people are not willing to accept new messages from local government telling them what to do and what not to do, but perhaps if it came from a charity ... talking about the importance of changes locally, healthy streets and so on, perhaps that can help to open up the conversations."

### **Stop the in-fighting between sustainable modes**

Contributors said there were conflicts between supporters of different sustainable transport modes.

A councillor said that their city has a group called the Green Partnership. "You have got cyclists in there who argue with bus people who argue with tram people. I keep saying to them you are here to address the carbon problem. Please get together as modes and present your case as a joint body not as individual modes arguing with each other."

Another contributor argued: "We have had a lot of calls to stop the in fighting between different sustainable modes and speak with one voice, building on that sometimes quite protracted debate about urban, interurban and strategic when it comes to public transport. I think we need to stop that fighting. We need to think about seamless door-to-door journeys and different journey purposes, not just what's more important."

"I think we see that sometimes from DfT and National Infrastructure Commission that they don't necessarily think about the whole journey ... 80% of emissions come from trips over 20 kilometres."

### **Are we being honest with political leaders?**

One contributor asked: "Do we think the industry is being honest enough with our elected leaders and members? We know that it's not just about the planning system and it's not just about sustainable transport, and it's not just about demand management and it's not just about digital. It's about ALL of those things and it's about doing them ALL now, and really to their fullest extent."

"So it's great to hear some of the local examples but nowhere is delivering on all of these components to the extent, with the urgency that's required. And I'm wondering are we holding the mirror up as the industry to inform our leaders so that they can make decisions with the best information possible?"

Picking up on this point, another said: "We have to achieve two-thirds reductions in the next decade essentially. Is anywhere even remotely close to that? Are we building strategies that we don't think we have any chance of delivering on?"

"If we do that do we then avoid the difficult thing of turning it back to central government and saying 'with what we have got now we are not going to be able to support all of what you need to do' ... We are promising local electorates that we will deliver zero carbon by 2030, 2028 in Nottingham, But actually, can we? And if we can't, what are we going to do and say about that?"

ENDS