Where the money’s going

Are the new Local Transport Bodies heading in the right direction?
Foreword

Stephen Joseph
Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport

Improving transport is central to strengthening local and regional economies but choosing the right schemes is important. This report is the first analysis of how the new Local Transport Bodies (LTBs) have chosen their priorities and a wide variety of approaches has emerged.

Some have made choices in a transparent way, seeking out local views and considering a full range of transport modes. This has led to balanced and imaginative packages of projects to support local economies and reduce car dependency, building on the good work of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF). This is a Government initiative that has produced effective, good value projects by combining smaller sustainable transport measures that tackle transport problems on multiple levels bringing together different types of transport.

Others have been less forward thinking. Several have adopted closed decision-making processes and there is a tendency overall to favour road building and widening over more cost effective options. Our analysis shows there is much to learn from the first round of LTB spending plans.

If LTBs are to help their local economies and come up with real solutions to the transport problems they face, they will need clear and open decision making based on good evidence, together with guidance and oversight from central Government.

Shaun Spiers
Chief Executive, Campaign to Protect Rural England

The localism agenda was expected to mean greater community control and innovation in the way we do things. As our report shows, these worthy aims are struggling to get a foothold when it comes to transport.

But it is not just the principles of accountability and local democracy that are failing to get through to some of the new Local Transport Bodies.

Coalition announcements about protecting the natural environment and increasing cycling risk falling on deaf ears. Many of the schemes being put forward are discredited road schemes that would damage the countryside, while not a single scheme is focused on cycling.

There are good examples as well as poor ones in this report, and the challenge is show that simply building more roads is neither environmentally nor economically sustainable. With great uncertainty about how new processes such as Strategic Economic Plans will work, the nightmare is that we may start to see plans for the sort of sprawling business parks that still gridlock many American cities, however many extra lanes they build.

This need not be a counsel of despair, however. Our report highlights how rural shires can prioritise innovative schemes for sustainable travel just as much as cities. What is crucial is that there is transparency and openness to change from the start if this is to happen: true localism, in other words.
As part of its drive to devolve power, the Government is letting new partnerships, known as Local Transport Bodies (LTBs), decide how to prioritise transport investment. LTBs were required to publish draft priorities for capital spending from 2015 to 2019 by August 2013. This report analyses for the first time where these bodies want to take us.

Key findings

- Road building and capacity projects made up a large majority (59%) of planned capital spending by LTBs from 2015 to 2019.

- Other modes of transport are receiving much less support, and less than in previous rounds of spending. Just over a quarter (26%) of projects are for public transport and sustainable travel. Bus projects make up 7% of the total, compared with 22% of projects in the final group of Department for Transport-funded local major transport schemes.

- Although six projects aimed primarily at cycling infrastructure appeared on longlists, none made it into the final priority schemes from the LTBs.

- Of 65 projects that were stated to be for the support of new housing, retail, industrial or business developments, we found that 55 included new road capacity and just ten were for improved public transport or active travel.

- LTBs varied widely for transparency and public consultation. While some made a wide call for new ideas, others appear to have promoted older schemes behind closed doors. We found a clear link between a better choice of projects and more transparency and openness in the processes.

Recommendations

For national Government in the short term:

- DfT should send back LTB lists that have not been drawn up with public consultation, and any lists that include previously rejected road projects.

- DfT should also ensure all plans are subject to an open consultation, with alternative ideas sought, before they are finally accepted.

Medium term:

- DfT should engage with BIS to produce (and enforce) strong guidance on choosing transport priorities within the new Growth Deal process.

- DfT should present LTBs and LEPs with the strong evidence base for Local Sustainable Transport Fund-type projects and ensure similar schemes are put forward within Growth Deals.

Long term:

- More accountable structures are needed, with clear governance and priority setting. Membership should be wider than Local Enterprise Partnerships and Local Transport Authorities to make sure that a full range of factors that make local economies successful are considered, including quality of life, health and wellbeing and the environment.

For LTBs:

- Each LTB should consult the public on project lists if they have not done this fully already, and should be prepared to change priorities.

- They should seek out a wider range of options and new ideas, not just established ‘local needs’. Public transport, cycling and public realm projects should be prioritised for development for this and subsequent priority lists.

- LTB objectives should be amended to support real sustainable development, including public health, town centre regeneration, public and open spaces, heritage and reducing carbon emissions.

Read more about how we rated the LTBs:

- Rankings - page 10
- Comments on each LTB - page 15
- Methodology - page 21
The devolution of local transport funding

Local transport schemes up to 2012

For large (>£5 million) local authority transport projects most of the money has, over the last few decades, come from the Department for Transport (DfT) with additional contributions provided by local authorities. However, under the Government’s localism policy, the way central funding is allocated to local transport infrastructure is changing.

Up to 2012, authorities would bid for money for a transport scheme, and the DfT would decide centrally whether to give the amount asked for and how much the local authority should contribute.

To be successful, bidders had to follow the DfT’s rules and criteria for choosing projects and assessing the benefits of a scheme. (This process also included prioritisation of transport schemes by regional bodies, until the regional government structures were abolished in 2010.)

The introduction of Local Transport Bodies

For schemes to be funded from 2015 onwards, new Local Transport Bodies are being formed to take charge of the funding provided by the DfT at a more local level.

The areas covered by the new LTBs are larger than local authority areas and currently follow approximately the same boundaries as the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). Membership of LTBs includes representatives from LEPs and local transport authorities (county councils and unitary authorities).

This report

Earlier in 2013, the 38 LTBs outside London were allocated a share of the DfT local transport capital budget and the power to decide how to spend it, subject to guidelines. Each LTB had to submit a prioritised list of their first transport projects to the DfT by August 2013.

Campaign for Better Transport and CPRE have now obtained these lists from 37 LTBs (one delayed its announcement while a related City Deal was finalised) and this report presents an analysis of the plans across England and the performance of each LTB in supporting projects that lower car dependency, help reduce traffic and support sustainable development.

It may also include representatives from other local authorities, such as district and parish councils, and stakeholders from the community, such as environmental groups, but this is not compulsory.
What is being planned across England?

Results countrywide

Across the 37 LTBs that submitted their priority lists at the end of July, a total of 210 projects were put forward, with another 155 projects either listed in submissions to the DfT as an additional pool of 'reserve' schemes or kept within the LTB as a longlist of schemes for future funding.

- TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS: 210
- RESERVE PROJECTS: 155
- FUNDING AVAILABLE FOR 2015-19: £902 million
- PLANNED SPENDING BY LTBs: £1,325 million

Focus on road building

The charts opposite show that the majority of schemes - 123 or 59% - are focused on new road building, road widening or increasing capacity for private motor traffic at junctions, roundabouts and other 'pinch points'.

Another 29 schemes (14%) are classified 'mixed' as they include spending on other modes, such as bus lanes, transport interchanges or cycleways. However, all the schemes in this category also involved an element of new road capacity for cars and lorries. (for more on the scheme categories used, see page 23).

What types of schemes are the LTBs planning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What types of schemes are the LTBs planning?</th>
<th>TOTAL: 210 PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro/tram</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed projects - sustainable modes only</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/public realm</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road - new capacity</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road - maintenance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed projects - with new road capacity</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What types of schemes are the LTBs planning?

PROPORTION OF PROJECTS

- 58.6% Road - new capacity
- 13.8% Road - maintenance
- 10.0% Mixed projects - with new road capacity
- 7.1% Mixed projects - sustainable modes only
- 4.8% Walking/public realm
- 1.4% Cycling
- 1.4% Rail

CYCLING PROJECTS IN PRIORITISED LISTS: 0
CYCLING PROJECTS IN RESERVE LISTS: 6
MIXED SCHEMES WITH AN ELEMENT OF NEW CYCLING PROVISION: 27
For LTB spending, the picture is very similar, with £710 million (54%) devoted to road building or widening plans, and another £151 million (11%) going to mixed schemes that include new road capacity.

This is far higher than the spending planned for public transport, public realm, walking and cycling projects. If all the sustainable transport LTB spending plans are added together, the total is just £442 million (33%).

This is a very worrying set of results: decades of evidence have shown that adding road capacity can worsen rather than solve local traffic problems and similarly can weaken rather than strengthen local economies. New link and ring roads can attract new developments onto greenfield and out of town sites, weakening the vitality of local high streets.

**Are the LTBs promoting cycling and walking?**

During the summer, the Government announced additional funding for cycling as part of its ambition to help more people cycle. Yet this funding ends in 2016, just as LTBs take over prioritisation of transport spending. This included new funding to ‘cycle-proof’ trunk roads. So, it was extremely concerning to see that although six cycling-focused schemes appeared on long lists, no such schemes made it through to the list of schemes submitted to the DfT.

Our analysis also took note of any ‘mixed’ or ‘mixed - sustainable’ schemes that included new cycling infrastructure. We found that 27 schemes (13% of the total) included at least some spending on separate facilities for cycling, although we could not judge the quality of the plans from the details provided so far.

There was slightly better news for walking and active travel, with £65 million proposed for 6 schemes focused on improving walking routes and public spaces within city and town centres.
### Association with large developments

We also collected evidence on whether schemes were intended to support specific new developments, noting this only where a development was named in the scheme description or supporting documents. A total of 65 transport schemes linked with development were identified. Of these, 55 were road-based and only 10 supported public transport or active travel.

Again, this is a worrying trend. The UK is one of the most car dependent countries in Europe, and planning developments on the basis that car travel will remain the norm, even for short journeys, means locking us to car dependency in for the foreseeable future. The development of major new housing and employment sites offers the potential to secure a step change in public transport services. Although some new car and lorry travel is likely to be generated still, such improvements can also provide good alternatives to current car trips. This can mean no major road-building is needed even where there are significant increases in population.

### Size of the projects

The chart above shows the average total cost of the schemes and the average LTB contribution to each.

The largest LTB contributions were to the mixed packages of sustainable travel and the walking and public realm projects, probably reflecting the unwillingness of developers and other funding sources to contribution to these schemes, compared with new road links. The average road scheme was £17m in total cost, with £6m being provided by the LTB.

### Profile of reserve schemes

The chart opposite shows the types of schemes held in reserve by the LTBs. These are likely to make up the next wave of LTB spending, as additional pots of funding (including from the LSTF) are added to the Local Growth Fund being administered and controlled locally by the LEPs.

There is a higher proportion of public transport and active travel within this set of schemes, although 45% of the projects are still devoted to road building.
Performance of individual LTBs

The pie charts shown on the map on page 9 illustrate the proportion of LTB spending planned for projects covering different mode of transport.

The LTBs varied widely in their choices, with some prioritising only road-based projects, some giving all their funding to public transport, and others distributing their funds across schemes that benefitted a range of different modes.

Ranking the LTBs

Our ranking system looked at the processes followed and schemes chosen by the LTBs, how well they performed in promoting sustainability, and how transparent, open and democratic their scheme selection processes have been so far.

Overall, the LTBs did not perform well. The average total score was 12 from a possible maximum of more than 30. In the three categories, the average scores were:

- **SCHEME CHOICE**
  4.0 out of 10 + bonuses

- **SUSTAINABILITY**
  3.2 out of 10

- **TRANSPARENCY**
  5.0 out of 10 + bonuses

Lancashire delayed publication until after our analysis, due to its final allocation depending on the Preston City Deal, so it was not scored for scheme choice and doesn’t appear in our rankings.

Best and worst LTBs

The top three LTBs in our ranking were:

- GLOUCESTERSHIRE
- COVENTRY AND WARWICKSHIRE
- GREATER BIRMINGHAM AND SOLIHULL

These LTBs all focused their choices on public transport and public realm schemes, and also had a number of these types of projects in reserve.

The bottom three LTBs were:

- OXFORDSHIRE
- BUCKINGHAMSHIRE
- TEES VALLEY

Tees Valley’s projects were all road schemes for large development sites. Buckinghamshire’s spending was split between road and rail but it scored poorly for sustainability and transparency. Oxfordshire’s mixed schemes included public transport measures aimed at a large new housing area, but other scores were low.

How we ranked them:

The scores given to LTBs in each category are shown in the table on page 10, and more details of our methodology can be found on page 21.
PLANNED LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY SPENDING

ROAD - NEW CAPACITY
ROAD - MAINTENANCE
MIXED
RAIL
BUS
METRO/TRAM
CYCLING
WALKING/PUBLIC REALM
MIXED - SUSTAINABLE

PIE CHARTS SHOW THE PROPORTION OF LTB CONTRIBUTIONS FOR EACH TYPE OF PROJECT WITHIN LTB PRIORITY LISTS
## Scores and rankings for each LTB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Local Transport Board</th>
<th>No. of schemes on priority list</th>
<th>No. of schemes on reserve list</th>
<th>Total LTB spending planned, £m</th>
<th>DfT allocation for 2015-19, £m</th>
<th>Score for Scheme choice (out of 10 + bonuses)</th>
<th>Score for Sustainability (out of 10)</th>
<th>Score for Transparency (out of 10, plus open data bonus)</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gloucestershire Local Transport Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coventry &amp; Warwickshire Local Transport Body</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greater Birmingham &amp; Solihull Local Transport Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>West of England Local Transport Body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly Local Transport Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Yorkshire Local Transport Body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Local Transport Body</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>153.0</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Liverpool City Region Local Transport Body</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Solent Local Transport Body</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coast to Capital Local Transport Body</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Heart of the South West Local Transport Body</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Norfolk and Suffolk Local Transport Body</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Black Country Strategic Transport Board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Marches Local Transport Body</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Leicester and Leicestershire Transport Board</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sheffield City Region Local Transport Body</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Swindon and Wiltshire Local Transport Body</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Berkshire Local Transport Body</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>West Yorkshire and York Local Transport Body</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Transport Body</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Humber Local Transport Body</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>South East Local Transport Board</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>North East Local Transport Body</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cumbria Local Transport Body</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>South East Midlands Local Transport Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Enterprise M3 Local Transport Body</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cheshire and Warrington Local Transport Body</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>D2N2 Local Transport Board</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dorset Local Transport Body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Northamptonshire Local Transport Body</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hertfordshire Local Transport Body</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Stoke-on-Trent &amp; Staffordshire Local Transport Body</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Worcestershire Local Transport Board</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lincolnshire Strategic Transport Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Oxfordshire Local Transport Board</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire Local Transport Board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Tees Valley Local Transport Body</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport for Lancashire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGES**: 5.5, 3.7, 35.8, 24.4, 4.0, 3.2, 5.0, 12.2
Findings on transparency
For transparency, we scored LTBs on whether they provided full online information about their plans, whether they publicised meetings in advance and whether they had carried out any public consultation on their draft lists. All of these things were requirements within the DfT’s guidelines for LTBs.

The average score for transparency was just 5, where the bare minimum of compliance with the guidelines would have given a score of 6, and full information and good public consultation would have given 10. Additional points available for any LTB that provided open data that complied with overall Government policies on transparency (although no LTB did this).

Relatively low transparency scores were also achieved by the large conurbations. West Yorkshire and York, West of England, Greater Manchester, Greater Birmingham and Solihull and North East all failed to score above 5 out of 10 for this measure.

For these cities and regions, this appears to be due to the related City Deal processes. These areas are planning a longer term programme of transport improvement and integrating transport into wider governance and funding regimes, so were possibly less willing or able to select a small number to receive this specific pot of funds. However, the scheme choices made by these LTBs was, in the main, good and most appear in the top half of our overall rankings.

First place: Gloucestershire LTB
Gloucestershire Local Transport Board issued a rare public call for scheme ideas and considered a wide range of sustainable transport projects including - uniquely - a canal project, and a scheme focused on public health.

The highest priority schemes include schemes to improve or add bus lanes on the A40 into Cheltenham (proposed by Stagecoach), a junction scheme and the redevelopment of Cheltenham Spa station (proposed by Cheltenham Development Task Force).

Reserve projects include replacing a railway bridge in order to re-open a canal in Stroud and the Lydney Transport Strategy aimed solely at supporting active travel in an area with relatively high rates of obesity. Another reserve project is for cycling.

Key to the selection of a more imaginative programme seems to be the ‘crowd sourced’ way scheme proposals were sought, with proposers not restricted to local authorities. The LTB told us: “We adopted a very transparent approach – in particular by organising a ‘call for schemes’ from any organisation or individual. This appears to be quite unusual amongst LTBs. It was therefore very unfortunate that the relatively small DfT allocation has not, to date, allowed us to potentially fund more schemes in the list.”

Gloucestershire’s projects - priorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>LTB £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A40 Bus Lane, Benhall</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40 Over Roundabout and Highnam Lodge</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40 Corridor Bus Priority</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Spa Station</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbeymead/Metz Way Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed - sust</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Quarter Bus Station</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED Street Lighting Replacement - phase 1</td>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A38 Berkeley Railway Bridges</td>
<td>Road - maintenance</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydney Transport Strategy</td>
<td>Mixed - sust</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames and Severn Way</td>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinderford Northern Quarter Link Road</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A419 Corridor, Stroud to M5 J13</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Railway Bridge - phase 1b of the Cotswold Canals restoration</td>
<td>Mixed - sust (Canal)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehouse (Bristol Road) Railway Station</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Next best:**

**Coventry & Warwickshire**

Coventry & Warwickshire LTB spread its funding around a range of projects, with only a small contribution going to a road project in the area.

The LTB also scored well for sustainability, with goals defined more widely than simply for economic growth. It also chose schemes to support town centres rather than out of town developments. On transparency, the LTB scored reasonably well, with a good website that invites the public to attend meetings and gives guidance on making representations.

**Coventry and Warwickshire's projects:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>LTB £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coventry Station Access Improvements</td>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCKLE Phase 2 (Kenilworth Station)</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry South Mass Rapid Transit Scheme</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry A45 Transport Corridor Efficiency Scheme</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greater Birmingham & Solihull**

Greater Birmingham & Solihull LTB scored highest for scheme choice, selecting four priority schemes that all supported sustainable transport.

Two of these schemes are ambitious public realm projects linking stations in the city centre with "key employment, civic and retail destinations". The others support high quality public transport, with a metro tram extension and a new bus rapid transit project being funded.

**Greater Birmingham and Solihull's projects:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>LTB £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Station</td>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland Metro - New Street Station to Centenary Square</td>
<td>Metro/Tram</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the Connections for Growth</td>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagley Road SPRINT</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transparent LTBs chose better projects**

It is noticeable that the highest scoring LTBs for scheme choice also tended to do well for transparency, and that the lowest scoring LTBs also received low transparency scores. The case study of Gloucestershire - which was in the top 3 for both these rankings - suggests that running an open process resulted in a wider range of schemes.

In areas outside the large cities, there appears to be a correlation between a transparent process and LTBs covering more than one transport authority. It is likely that the need for a fair process to choose between schemes promoted by each authority also prompted better communication with the public.

**The ‘County’ LTBs**

Where the transport authority and LTB covered the same area, there was a tendency for schemes to be more road-based and less balanced between modes.

Dorset, Northamptonshire, Hertfordshire, Worcestershire, Lincolnshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire all appeared in the bottom ten of our overall ranking and these county-wide LTBs also scored in the bottom half of the ranking for scheme choice.

Four of these LTBs - Dorset, Northamptonshire, Hertfordshire and Lincolnshire have committed 100% of their funding to road-based schemes. At the top of our table, however, the presence of Gloucestershire and Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly shows that this doesn't have to be the case and that this kind of relatively rural LTB can choose better.
Reviving road schemes
The DfT guidelines for the LTBs specifically warned against reviving road schemes that had previously been rejected, saying: 5

“LTBs should exercise particular caution if asked to consider schemes that have been previously proposed and rejected on value for money grounds. They should look in particular at the reasons for the previous rejection and ask whether costs, scope or circumstances have changed to such an extent as to be likely to change the previous assessment.”

An initial review has found evidence that this advice has not been followed. Examples of such road schemes within the LTB lists include:

- Stafford Western Access Route (Stoke-on-Trent & Staffordshire) - this was rejected by the DfT in February 2011 due to low value for money. 6
- A21 Baldslow Link (South East) - this was dropped from the Highways Agency (HA) programme in 2010. Figures obtained by Campaign for Better Transport showed the scheme was low value for money and could only count £40 million in benefits over 60 years. 7
- Great Yarmouth River Crossing (Norfolk and Suffolk) - this £112 million scheme was excluded from the priorities of the East of England Development Agency in 2009. 8
- Hereford City Link Road (The Marches) - this project failed to win DfT Local Pinch Point Funding in May 2013. 9,10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>LTB £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Gate</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrack Relief Road</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A174 Extension Dualling</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A66(T) Elton Interchange</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>1.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A66(T) Yarm Road (Grade Separation)</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>3.2*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These criteria clearly favoured roads and worked against the rail and metro projects in the LTB’s longlist.

Tees Valley also scored poorly for sustainability, only gaining points in this category for including carbon in its criteria for initial assessment process. However, even this was questionably defined entirely in terms of increasing traffic speeds rather than, for example, switching people onto lower carbon transport modes.

For transparency, we were unable to award many points either. It was possible to find documents relating to the LTB by searching local council websites, but no online presence has been provided by the LEP.

Last place:
Tees Valley
Last place in our ranking was Tees Valley Local Transport Body, where all 5 priority schemes were found to involve new or expanded roads.

The projects chosen included a new road, a dualling project and ‘pinch point’ schemes to widen or create new layouts and slip roads at junctions. The LTB has published its shortlisting criteria, from which a longlist of schemes were reduced to five. These were:

- Gross Value Added (GVA) - ‘the number of jobs facilitated’
- Homes delivered - ‘estimated from the extra road capacity generated by a scheme’
- Carbon benefit - defined by the LTB as ‘a scheme which increases the average speed on the surrounding road network will improve fuel efficiency and therefore increase the carbon benefit’
Conclusions and recommendations

Key concerns

Our findings highlight some serious concerns about the selection of projects by the new Local Transport Bodies.

Whilst we have found some good practice, many LTBs have selected mainly road projects. The lack of any cycling projects in the initial selection is very worrying, reflecting a wider neglect of sustainable and active travel within priority lists.

The proportion of public transport schemes is very low, as is the proportion of spending committed to these modes. A comparison with schemes supported recently by the DfT is shown opposite. The competitive ‘Development Pool’ in 2011 was how the final set of schemes was selected for DfT Local Major Scheme funding support, which the more localised LTB system has now replaced.

The proportion of public transport - and bus schemes in particular - was much higher within this process. The sharp drop in bus funding between the Development Pool and the first proposals from the LTBs raises concern that, without better processes and more open decision making, the development and renewal of local public transport facilities will suffer.

Our findings on transparency were particularly worrying, as the general lack of openness and willingness to consult shown by the LTBs is not compliant with the DfT’s own guidelines for how the LTBs should make decisions.

What should be done

Our recommendations cover a range of actions to mitigate and rectify the problems with this process - by the LTBs immediately, and by national government in the short, medium and long term.

Short-term recommendations for Government:

The widespread lack of compliance among LTBs with the DfT’s guidance framework for this process should be of great concern within Government.

DfT should send back LTB lists that have not been drawn up according to its guidance, and which include previously rejected road projects.

DfT should also ensure all lists are subject to an open consultation, with alternative ideas sought, before finally accepting them.

As described above, these consultation processes should include seeking ideas for new schemes, in order to broaden the range of options considered for this funding, and in the upcoming Growth Deal bidding process.
Medium-term recommendations for the Strategic Economic Plan and Growth Deal processes:

DfT should engage with BIS to produce (and enforce) strong guidance on choosing transport priorities within the Growth Deal process.

In July 2013, the allocations made to LTBs were around a third smaller than initially indicated. The remainder, along with a pool of other funding, is intended to be awarded competitively as part of the Growth Deals being negotiated in a process led by BIS and the LEPs. This will start with the development of Strategic Economic Plans (SEPs) and spending plans for the £2 billion Local Growth Fund during 2015-16. Draft SEPs will be submitted in March 2014.

The funding going into this process will also include £100 million from future LSTF funding and £200 million from Integrated Transport Block funds.

Our research raises serious concerns about this process for two reasons:

- That the option consideration processes carried out for these initial LTB lists could potentially be judged to have been completed, so that, when further funding becomes available, the schemes remaining in reserve will simply be brought forward as the next wave.
- That, if new transport projects are sought from LTBs as part of Growth Deal processes, a similar narrow range of options will be considered, and a similar lack of transparency and engagement with the public will take place.

A strategic approach to spatial planning - putting the right developments in the right places - is also key to achieving sustainable growth and strong local economies.

DfT should present LTBs and LEPs with the strong evidence base for LSTF-type projects and ensure similar schemes are put forward within Growth Deals.

The schemes also contain very few projects similar to those in the current LSTF - where packages of measures are employed simultaneously to promote and improve public transport and/or active travel.

With the LSTF capital funding stream being folded into the Local Growth Fund from 2015, there is an urgent need to ensure LEPs use this funding wisely.

Long-term recommendations for local transport development:

The LTBs are now going to be relatively short-lived, with their functions being incorporated rapidly into LEPs and a new process taking over, with details that are not year clear. Priority setting has been clearer in the larger cities that were already taking part in the related (and somewhat clashing) City Deal processes. However, there have clearly been rushed decisions in some areas, and these have been made in ways that have shut out local communities from taking part in these decisions.

Long term, Government needs to look again at how local transport is planned and funded.

More accountable structures are needed, with clear governance, priority setting and funding regimes. Membership should be wider than just LEPs and Local Transport Authorities, and include other bodies to make sure a full range of factors that make local economies successful are considered, including quality of life, health and wellbeing, and the environment.
Recommendations for LTBs and local authorities

With the final decisions on LTB spending plans still to be signed off, and with further funding available for the development of more projects, there is time for LTBs that have not performed well so far, to rectify these problems. Our recommendations are as follows.

Consult the public on initial lists
We found that a narrower choice of projects by LTBs was correlated with a lack of public consultation. The DfT guidelines for LTBs are clear that the public should have been consulted about these priority lists but only 12 LTBs have carried out any kind of consultation processes so far, with most of these a very basic invitation to comment.

All LTBs should consult the public on their draft lists, including reserve projects and any proposals on their longlists. This is an essential step before priority lists can be considered to be compliant with the DfT’s process.

Seek out a wider range of options and new ideas, not just established ‘local needs’
A wider ‘call for schemes’ to a range of stakeholders, not just transport authorities seems to be key to Gloucestershire’s success at picking sustainable transport schemes with a wide range of benefits for the community.

LTBs carrying out consultations should also add a call for new ideas, asking for the public, businesses, local authorities at all levels and other organisations to put forward alternative plans. The LTBs should be prepared to take forward viable new ideas in preference to any current proposals that are not considered a priority by the public consultation.

With a tight timetable, some of the LTBs selected only schemes with business cases already available, and this appears to have been the reason for some of the road schemes in these areas being preferred.

The new Local Growth Fund is being allocated under a similarly tight schedule, starting this summer and finishing by July 2014, and there is a danger we will simply see the next wave of reserve schemes being given this funding unless LTBs and LEPs are given more time and guidance to seek out and develop a broader range of projects.

Look at packages of smaller measures not just big building projects
More consultation and additional time would also enable more innovative schemes, and packages of sustainable transport measures to be put together. The success of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, and the good value for money shown by combining smaller measures into larger packages to support public transport and active travel, shows that this would be very worthwhile. LTBs should also consider setting aside a proportion of their funding specifically for smaller projects.

Once devised, these measures are also quicker to put in place than large schemes that need to go through planning processes and other approvals before work can start.

Use a wider range of sustainable development goals and criteria
Very few of the LTBs have set objectives and goals that go beyond economic growth, which is often defined in terms that favour road-building. ‘Sustainable Development’ is the goal of the Government’s planning and transport policies, and the definition of this must include broader factors than how many car journeys can be facilitated.

In our scoring system we rewarded LTBs for having a broader range of goals for supporting sustainable development. These included public health, supporting town centre regeneration, investing in public and open spaces, protecting heritage, supporting low carbon innovation and reducing carbon emissions.

Public health objectives would also be one way to increase the number of cycling schemes chosen. Countrywide, there is a clear and urgent need for cycling networks, not just in large cities but also linking smaller towns and rural areas to each other and to local centres. The existing Cambridge ‘string of pearls’ programme and the Thames and Severn Way on Gloucestershire’s reserve list are good examples of these kinds of cycling schemes.
Comments on each Local Transport Body

For each LTB, our ranking, total score and scores within each category are shown in the table on page 13. Comments on our findings for each of the LTBs are also given below.

Further details about the programmes of schemes chosen by each LTB can be found via the web addresses shown (all accessed during September 2013). If you wish to find out more about the selections of LTBs who haven’t yet published their lists and supplied these to our researchers via email, please contact Campaign for Better Transport.

Berkshire Local Transport Body
Total score: 12.0
An average overall score for Berkshire, with its schemes split evenly between roads and sustainable transport schemes, and an emphasis on buses. The LTB’s lowest ranking was for transparency. The related LEP made a prompt announcement of the prioritised list, but no other information about the LTB appears on its site.
Web: http://thamesvalley berkshire.co.uk/2013/07/23/berkshire-local-transport-body-publishes-prioritised-list-of-schemes/

Black Country Strategic Transport Board
Total score: 13.4
Black Country was in the top half of our ranking, giving prominence to public transport and including two rail schemes within its five priorities and two bus schemes in reserve. Its sustainability score was low but good communication gave it a transparency score of six.
Web: http://www.blackcountrylep.co.uk/place/local-transport-body

Buckinghamshire Local Transport Body
Total score: 2.8
A very low score across all categories for this LTB. Scheme spending was split between rail, road and road-maintenance giving a moderate scheme choice score of 1.7, and the LTB scored just one point for sustainability in its process. LTB documents appeared on the Buckinghamshire County Council website when a search was performed but there was no dedicated web page.
Web: Not found

Cheshire and Warrington Local Transport Body
Total score: 8.9
With spending split between road and rail schemes, Cheshire and Warrington achieved an average score for scheme choice. The LTB’s best rating was for sustainability, where it gained some credit for having objectives aimed at public health and the environment.
Web: http://www.candwlep.co.uk/cwltb

Coast to Capital Local Transport Body
Total score: 14.9
Coast to Capital covers West Sussex, Brighton and Hove and parts of Surrey. Most schemes included an element of new road capacity, but the Valley Gardens scheme in Brighton aims to reduce the size and impact of a road in the centre of the city and was classified as ‘mixed - sustainable’ and rewarded in the sustainability category for improving public spaces. In transparency, points were given for plans for a public consultation in the autumn.
Web: http://www.coast2capital.org.uk/local-transport-body.html

Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Local Transport Board
Total score: 22.6
This LTB achieved fifth place for scheme choice and third place for sustainability, putting it in the top five overall. It had a green objective in its assurance framework and did not fund schemes aimed at facilitating out-of-town developments.
Coventry & Warwickshire Local Transport Body
Total score: 27.1
Coming second in our rankings and with high scores in all three categories, Coventry and Warwickshire ran a relatively successful process. For more detailed comments, see the case study on page 12.
Web: http://www.cwlep.com/local-transport-body

Cumbria Local Transport Body
Total score: 9.5
Cumbria scored below average due to reasonably low scores in all three categories. Its funding was mainly for mixed schemes aimed at increasing the use of rail with elements of cycling, although car parks and new roads were also included in most of these packages.
Web: http://www.cltb.org.uk/

D2N2 Local Transport Board
Total score: 8.3
The D2N2 area covers Nottinghamshire, Nottingham, Derbyshire and Derby. 80% of this LTB’s funding was given to roads, with the rest allocated to bus projects. D2N2 scored poorly for sustainability, but a good website gave a higher than average score for transparency.
Web: http://www.d2n2lep.org/D2N2LTB

Dorset Local Transport Body
Total score: 8.2
All of Dorset’s funding was given to one road maintenance and widening project on the A338. This reduced its sustainability score and its scheme choice rankings alike. A reasonable transparency score came from a good webpage hosted by Bournemouth Borough Council, on which LTB documents were posted promptly.

Enterprise M3 Local Transport Body
Total score: 9.1
Enterprise M3 covers a range of district authorities across Hampshire and Surrey. All its funds have been set aside for road or mixed schemes involving elements of new road capacity. It ranked fourth for transparency, as the LTB webpages invite public comments on its programme.
Web: http://www.enterprism3.org.uk/enterprise-m3-local-transport-body/

Gloucestershire Local Transport Board
Total score: 27.3
Our highest scoring LTB, with a good choice of schemes covering a range of modes and a pipeline of even more imaginative projects including canal transport. The process was transparent from the start, holding public events and inviting proposals from any organisation or individual, gaining the LTB top marks in this category. More detailed comments are in the case study on page 11.
Web: http://www.gltb.org.uk

Greater Birmingham & Solihull Local Transport Board
Total score: 23.6
Our second placed LTB, with all its funding committed to high quality public realm and public transport projects. The LTB lost marks in the transparency category, despite a good website, for late posting of its prioritised list. More detailed comments are in the case study on page 12.
Web: http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/ltb

Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Transport Body
Total score: 11.3
More than three quarters of this LTB’s funds were promised to projects that increase road capacity. However, it gained credit for having an environmental aim, for posting documents on an easy to find webpage and for inviting comments on its programme.
Web: http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/transport/strategies/transport-plans/Local+Transport+Body.htm

Greater Manchester Local Transport Body
Total score: 20.2
A high score for scheme choices for this LTB came from covering a range of different modes and for putting more than half its funding into ‘mixed - sustainable’ packages. It was not, however, easy to find LTB-related documents as they were stored in the Greater Manchester Combined Authority meeting calendar rather than collected on a webpage.
Web: http://www.agma.gov.uk/transport/gm-local-transport-body/index.html
Heart of the South West Local Transport Board
Total score: 14.2
Covering Devon and Somerset, along with related unitary areas, this LTB’s programme consisted of five road and rail schemes, with 89% of funds going towards the roads. Its above average score came almost entirely from an exemplary website, and the fact that a full public consultation was held before the final shortlist was selected in July.
Web: http://www.heartofswlep.co.uk/local-transport-board

Hertfordshire Local Transport Body
Total score: 6.2
Hertfordshire’s small budget was dedicated entirely to three road schemes. In sustainability, only basic assessment was carried out and, although documents were posted online, there was no sign of a public consultation.
Web: http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/transtreets/ tranpan/hertsltb/majorsherts/

Humber Local Transport Body
Total score: 11.2
Just over half of Humber’s funding will be put towards rail projects, with the rest on roads, keeping its scheme choice score below average. An otherwise useful and clear webpage had documents posted only retrospectively and there is no indication that public comments on its programme are welcome.

Leicester and Leicestershire Transport Board
Total score: 12.4
All this LTB’s schemes were ‘mixed’, keeping its scheme choice score low, although two schemes with elements of cycling provision gained it bonus points in this category. It was also one of the few LTBs with a green goal in its assurance framework. Meeting minutes posted on its webpages noted the need to hold a consultation, but no details have yet appeared.

Lincolnshire Strategic Transport Board
Total score: 4.2
Lincolnshire is an example of a county-wide LTB that chose only road-based schemes for funding, although final funding details have not yet been submitted. The LTB framework document says that the LTB will not hold a funding consultation on schemes that already appear in local development plans, which is not ideal.
Web: http://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/lincolnshire-strategic-transport-board

Liverpool City Region Local Transport Body
Total score: 17.4
Similar to other large city regions, Liverpool’s schemes covered a range of modes, including public realm projects in the city centre. Several of the projects were road schemes to serve new developments, although at least one of these was central rather than out of town. The website is good, but no public consultation has yet been carried out.
Web: http://moderngov.merseytravel.uk.net/ mgOutsideBodyDetails.aspx?id=264&bcr=1

The Marches Local Transport Body
Total score: 12.7
The Marches LTB spending plans were split between road schemes (84%) and bus projects (16%) so its scheme choice score was low. A dedicated website contains lots of information, but no active public consultation is yet in evidence.
Web: http://www.marchesltb.co.uk/

Norfolk and Suffolk Local Transport Body
Total score: 14.2
Norfolk and Suffolk only submitted a provisional list of schemes to the DfT, but it appears that a high proportion of Norfolk and Suffolk’s spending will go to roads. Smaller schemes for other modes are also supported, gaining it some points for scheme choice. The website provides a lot of information and a public consultation appears to be planned.
Web: http://www.norfolkandsuffolkltb.org.uk

North East Local Transport Body
Total score: 10.0
North East’s projects were divided between roads and other modes, although a majority of spending is allocated to road schemes. A summary and map of schemes was found via local council websites but it was difficult to find more detailed scheme information or any dedicated web presence for this LTB.
Web: Not found
North Yorkshire Local Transport Body
Total score: 22.4
By committing all of its £9.6m funding pot to one rail project (the Leeds-Harrogate-York railway line), this LTB was given a high score for scheme choice but no bonuses were received for covering a range of modes. A clear website also scored well for transparency.
Web: http://www.blackcountrylep.co.uk/place/local-transport-body

Northamptonshire Local Transport Body
Total score: 8.1
Two road schemes, on the A43 and A45, comprised the whole programme for Northamptonshire. The website, hosted by the LEP, is basic but had all the required information and also clearly invited the public to attend meetings.
Web: http://www.northamptonshirelep.co.uk/local-transport-body/

Oxfordshire Local Transport Board
Total score: 3.2
Coming third from last in our rankings, all of Oxfordshire’s 14 priority schemes aimed to increase road capacity in some way. However, three schemes qualified as ‘mixed’ and support for cycling facilities was part of the Eastern Arc project. In August we were unable to find the list online and obtained it via email.
Web: http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/oxfordshire-local-transport-board

Sheffield City Region Local Transport Body
Total score: 12.3
While its initial scheme choices scored poorly, comprising three road schemes and two mixed schemes, an element of cycling in one scheme gained this LTB some points. Sheffield has also recently launched a public consultation on its list.
Web: http://www.sheffieldcityregion.org.uk/2013/08/consultation-starts-on-investment-schemes/

Solent Local Transport Body
Total score: 17.3
Solent’s scheme choices impressed us with their focus on packages of schemes and a large proportion of spending on an ambitious city centre project aimed at improving pedestrian routes to the station in Southampton. A similar scheme for Portsmouth is held in reserve.
Web: http://www.3.hants.gov.uk/transportplanning/solent-local-transport-body

South East Local Transport Board
Total score: 10.4
South East LTB covers a large area from Sussex to Essex. Its scheme choices were focused on roads but the need to consult large numbers of local authorities led to a relatively transparent process where both long and short lists were easily available online. A wider public consultation would have been preferred, however.
Web: http://www.southeastlep.com/south-east-local-transport-board

South East Midlands Local Transport Board
Total score: 9.1
This LTB covers Bedford, Bedfordshire, Luton, Milton Keynes and parts of Northamptonshire. With scheme selections limited to four road projects and a low sustainability score, South East Midlands was low down in our ranking. Online information was only presented via news items on the LEP website.

Stoke-on-Trent & Staffordshire Local Transport Body
Total score: 5.0
Another LTB choosing only road projects, ensuring a low score and ranking. Despite a good webpage with plenty of information, the scheme list was published late, and was one of the last to be received by us.
Web: http://www.stokestaffslep.org.uk/stoke-trent-staffordshire-local-transport-body

Swindon and Wiltshire Local Transport Body
Total score: 12.3
All of Swindon and Wiltshire’s budget was allocated to three road schemes. However, the LTB website hosted by the LEP had a full index of documents and says they are now seeking views on their proposals.
Web: http://www.swlep.biz/transport

Tees Valley Local Transport Body
Total score: 2.2
Last in our rankings, Tees Valley’s five projects were all road schemes associated with large developments, although one of these is a city centre mixed-use site. More detailed comments can be seen in the case study on page 13.
Web: Not found
Transport for Lancashire
Total score: 2.0
Lancashire was awaiting confirmation of its final allocation from the DfT, part of the Preston City Deal process, and did not submit a priority list by the end of August. This means that no scheme information was available and it was scored only on sustainability and transparency for its processes so far.
Web: http://www.lancashirelep.co.uk/about/?siteid=6441&pageid=42757

West of England Local Transport Body
Total score: 22.8
After considering a very wide range of schemes in its longlist, West of England’s high score reflected its final choice to dedicate its funding entirely to phase one of the MetroWest project, which will develop new local rail lines.
Web: http://www.westofenglandlep.co.uk/transport-and-infrastructure/ltb

West Yorkshire and York Local Transport Body
Total score: 11.5
The West Yorkshire ITA is in the process of agreeing a city deal and supplied its draft LTB proposals to us confidentially for assessment - therefore scoring low for transparency. The wider programme so far looks like it will cover a wide range of modes, but with some large road schemes included.
Web: No dedicated pages on the WYITA site

Worcestershire Local Transport Body
Total score: 4.5
Two roads and one rail project (Worcester Parkway Station) made up Worcestershire’s programme. One of the last LTBs to provide our researchers with information, it was hard to find anything about this LTB online until long after the deadline for submissions, resulting in a zero score for transparency.

Methodology
Each LTB was ranked in three categories: scheme choice, sustainability and transparency. In the scheme choice category, high marks were awarded for having a range of scheme types, for having a high ratio of public and active transport spending compared with spending on projects that increased road capacity, and for promoting cycling.

In sustainability, LTBs were scored according to whether they promoted social, environmental and economic sustainability, with recognition given to schemes that promoted town centre development over greenfield sites and long travel distances.

In transparency, points were awarded for holding public consultations (or planning one) on the initial list of priorities, for having a clear website and for publishing the information submitted to the DfT swiftly after the 31st July deadline.

Obtaining information
After the deadline for each LTB to submit its priority list to the DfT, our researchers obtained these submissions either from LTB, LEP and local authority websites, or by contacting relevant people within these authorities. The template document for the priority lists included space for a short description and these were used, where possible, to categorise the schemes. Where the description was unclear, we tried to find out more information from the same authorities before choosing the appropriate category. In determining whether a scheme was associated with a development, we relied almost entirely on the short descriptions given. Many LTBs included these details in their descriptions, but this is likely to have led to an underestimate of this measure.

Scores for rankings
To create our rankings, we scored the LTBs on three aspects of their performance so far:

1. Scheme Choice (range 0 to 14)
After classifying the schemes from each LTB, using the categories defined on page 23 the initial scheme choice score (before bonuses) was created by calculating the ratio between planned LTB spending on the public transport, public realm and cycling categories and spending on road and mixed schemes and scaling the result so that the LTBs ranged from zero to nine.
Where LTBs had chosen only sustainable modes (and calculating this ratio would have given an error, a score of ten was awarded).

**Bonus points:**
In this category, bonus points were also available for having a range of different sustainable modes considered (both priority and reserve schemes were examined for this and bonuses given ranged from zero to nine). Two bonus points were given for having a dedicated cycling scheme and one for including cycling facilities within a ‘mixed’ or ‘mixed – sustainable’ package.

### 2. Sustainability (range 0 to 10)
Sustainability was assessed by awarding up to nine points (later weighted to give a score out of 10) for actions and activities covering the three established aspects of sustainable development. In making initial scheme choices, the LTBs were strongly urged by DfT guidance to use the Early Sifting and Assessment Tool (EAST) and three points were available for processes that complied with requirements within EAST.

**Social development points were awarded for:**
A) Promoting public health as a clear and easily identifiable objective in the LTB’s assurance framework.

B) If the nature of schemes chosen met the needs of different types of people, particularly minorities, the socially and economically disadvantaged and physically challenged, as set out in "Transport for Everyone" published by the DfT in December 2012.

C) Using protecting or improving cultural heritage as a consideration when making prioritisation assessments – e.g. if the LTBs took into account the protection or improvement of local heritage or historic resources when prioritising new LTB schemes.

**Environmental development points were awarded for:**
A) Promoting a carbon reduction or other environmental aim or objective in the LTB’s assurance framework.

B) Assessing environmental impacts when prioritising the schemes (the basic requirement of EAST).

C) Improving public and/or open spaces as a result of the prioritised schemes – LTBs typically received a point here by prioritising a public realm scheme.

**Economic development points were awarded for:**
A) Including schemes that promote town centre regeneration.

B) Not prioritising schemes that promoted car-dependent out of town development projects. This was chosen to judge if the LTBs took into account future generations that are likely to be unable to rely on car travel.

C) Promoting low carbon innovation as a scheme choice. This was chosen to reward LTBs whose choices encouraging transport modes that utilise low carbon innovation and technologies. None of the existing LTBs prioritised such a scheme for this funding.

### 3. Transparency (range 0 to 10)
The DfT’s guidelines for LTBs were clear that openness, consultation and transparency should be a priority. As part of localism, this is an important aspect of making sure schemes reflect local needs and involve the public in the decision making.

**Five aspects of transparency were considered, with one or two points available for each aspect:**
A) List of schemes was easy to find online.

B) Full information was readily available and accessible online soon after 31 July 2013. To receive two points here, the LTBs needed to make only the following information available online: the scheme prioritisation shortlist, cost and brief details.

C) The LTB has held or is planning a public and stakeholder consultation. According to the DfT’s guidelines, all LTBs should have taken into account the public’s opinions when choosing the final list of schemes. Only a clear invitation to comment on schemes was awarded points for this aspect of transparency.

D) LTB has held a meeting in public. Any invitation to the public to attend meetings was rewarded here.

E) Up-to-date meeting minutes were made available as well as future meeting agendas. Again, this was a minimum requirement of the DfT’s guidance.

**Open data:**
While scoring transparency effectively out of 10, we also planned to award points to any LTB with an open data policy or evidence of open data being provided in ways that reflect the Government’s Open Data White Paper (2012). Unfortunately, no LTB provided open data and none were awarded any bonus points here.
SCHEME CATEGORIES:

- **ROAD - NEW CAPACITY**: schemes that add capacity to the road network for private motor traffic
- **ROAD - MAINTENANCE**: schemes that only repair or replace existing structures or traffic management systems, with no new capacity added
- **MIXED**: schemes with multiple modes that include some new road capacity
- **RAIL**: schemes that add to or improve rail facilities
- **BUS**: schemes that add to or improve bus facilities
- **METRO/TRAM**: schemes that add to or improve metro/tram facilities
- **CYCLING**: schemes that add to or improve cycling facilities
- **WALKING/ PUBLIC REALM**: schemes that improve public spaces and/or facilities for walking
- **MIXED - SUSTAINABLE**: schemes with multiple modes that only include improvements to sustainable transport
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