Funding for Local Authority Transport and Land Use Schemes in the UK

Charlotte Brannigan, BSc (Hons), MRes, TRL, Crowthorne House, Nine Mile Ride, Wokingham, Berkshire, UK.

Neil Paulley, BSc (Hons), MSc, TRL, Crowthorne House, Nine Mile Ride, Wokingham, Berkshire, UK.

Abstract - This paper focuses on the research activities, findings and planned products of one of the UK EPSRC-funded DISTILLATE (Design and Implementation Support Tools for Integrated Local Land use, Transport and the Environment) projects on the funding of transport and land use schemes. Research activities have included a literature review, dialogue with local authority case studies and a funding workshop. Barriers to funding have been identified as including lack of revenue funding, difficulties in obtaining funding for ‘soft’ schemes, the formation of partnerships and timing-related issues. The proposed key outputs of the project as a result are discussed, including a ‘funding toolkit’ for local authorities, and guidance for funding bodies regarding the barriers faced.
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Introduction
Identifying and obtaining appropriate funding for both capital investment and for operation is a recognised barrier for the effective planning and implementation of transport and land-use schemes by local authorities. This issue has been addressed within the UK DISTILLATE project (Design and Implementation Support Tools for Integrated Local Land use, Transport and the Environment), a UK EPSRC (Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council) funded project which seeks to enable significant improvements in the ways in which sustainable transport and land use strategies are developed and delivered in the UK. More effective and efficient selection,
planning and delivery of schemes and projects will enhance the sustainability of urban areas and the quality of life of people who live in them.

DISTILLATE consists of seven projects looking at Organisational Behaviour and Barriers, Option Generation, Indicators, Organisational Delivery, Funding, Analytical Support Tools and Appraisal. Figure I provides an overview of the project’s structure.

This paper focuses on Project E: Improved Mechanisms for Funding and Phasing of Implementation. The project seeks to understand the funding procedures which affect transport and land use projects and how these procedures affect implementation. The paper describes the findings of the research activities undertaken to date, and discusses the planned outputs.

**Background**

The DISTILATE ‘Organisational Behaviour’ project acts as an overarching project, dealing with the identification of barriers to the implementation of sustainable urban transport systems at the local authority level. Part of the methodology has involved a number of questionnaires and in-depth interviews with local authority practitioners. The results from this research have been used within DISTILLATE projects for identifying issues and for monitoring changes in local authority perspectives as a result of the study.

A questionnaire was developed and administered amongst UK local authority partners on the barriers to the delivery of transport solutions (Hull and Tricker, 2004). Interviews and a second survey were undertaken in 2006, addressed to local transport planners and their counterparts in public health, environmental strategy, land-use planning and local authority corporate policy units, and focused on the barriers to cross-cutting sustainable transport solutions and methods of cross-sector working.

The following issues were found to be forestalling local authorities’ progress towards the implementation of more sustainable urban transport systems (Hull et al, 2006):

- Societal constraints on the development of ‘sustainable’ strategies;
- Strength of focus on narrow transport priorities;
• National government unwillingness to use its own executive actions to support transport policies;
• Lack of local control over the implementation and operation of schemes;
• Funding for sustainable urban transport solutions;
• Complexities of organisational collaboration in the process of transport planning;
• Analytical capabilities and technical decision-making skills;
• Physical characteristics of local areas;
• Professional mindsets; and
• Politics.

Specific barriers were also identified which affect other sectors’ abilities to engage in policy formulation and with the implementation of transport schemes at the local level. These include:
• High levels of funding uncertainty;
• Political influences adversely affecting cross-sector policy integration;
• Territorial and/or temporal mismatches between service delivery activities across different sectors;
• Organisational constraints (time, resources, leadership, interests, structures and systems)
• Broken links between the ‘4 Ps’: Priorities, Policies, Principles and Philosophies;
• Impact of direction and decisions of central government (vertical/diagonal integration); and
• Clarity and consistency of communication between sectors (horizontal interaction) (Hull et al, 2006).

Uncertainty and barriers associated with funding have been identified in both lists. The research has also identified a number of other barriers closely related to funding issues, including:
• Adverse effect on the availability of staff time (e.g. because of cost efficiency agendas);
• Adverse impacts upon scheme prioritisation and delivery processes due to specific funding pots/streams; and
• Difficulties occur in delineating contributions between partners in joint funding packages across sectors (Hull et al, 2006).

Therefore these and other funding barriers have been more closely examined within the Funding Project, as part of the overall aim of DISTILLATE to develop tools and products which will aid local authorities in overcoming barriers.

**Methodology**

A number of research activities have been undertaken within the DISTILLATE Funding Project. An extensive literature review was completed (Burke et al, 2005) which identified a variety of funding sources used within the UK to finance local transport projects. A subsequent Review of Funding Sources was completed in 2006. These reviews identified public, private, and public-private sources of funding that could be used for local transport projects, and potential barriers to obtaining and using them. The literature review identified that key barriers associated with the Local Transport Plan (LTP) process were linked to the lack of revenue funding, where authorities were ‘capital-rich, revenue-poor’ (see next section for description of the LTP).

The DISTILLATE project involves 16 local authority partners from across the UK. Each project within DISTILLATE has been working with selected local authorities in developing and utilising case studies related to transport and land-use schemes. The Funding Project is associated with five case studies, which are as follows:

- A cycle/shared use route (part of the National Cycle network – NCN);
- A Showcase Bus Route;
- City centre redevelopment and transport improvements;
- An airport rail link; and
- Provision of a bus service and transport infrastructure in a new housing development.

Meetings and informal interviews have been held with the case study local authorities to find out more about their schemes and the associated funding issues and barriers that have been experienced.
The most recent activity within the Funding Project was the organisation of a workshop which was attended by various local authorities and transport consultants. In addition to a number of local authority presentations, breakout sessions were held to discuss a variety of funding-related topics, including:

- Local authority barriers;
- Funding barriers;
- Partnerships;
- Revenue Funding;
- Capital Funding; and
- Innovative funding mechanisms.

The findings from these ongoing activities will contribute to the two key outputs of the Funding Project; a funding toolkit for local authorities; and guidance for funders on funding barriers and issues faced by local authorities.

**Funding of Local Transport Schemes in the UK**

This section looks in more detail at the mechanisms currently in place in the UK for the funding of local transport schemes.

The main source of funding for local transport projects in England is the DfT's LTP scheme. The first round of LTPs was for 2000-2005, and the second round of LTPs is set to run from 2006 to 2011. LTPs are prepared by all County Councils, Unitary Authorities and Partnerships in Metropolitan Areas, but also Passenger Transport Executivesii (PTEs) and Metropolitan areas in partnership with associated District Councils. The LTPs should set out an authority's local transport strategies and policies, and an implementation programme (DfT, 2005a).

The LTP is used by the DfT to inform decisions on capital funding, the development of DfT policies on local transport, monitor the delivery of key objectives and targets that are delivered through the actions of local government and feed into the authority's Comprehensive Performance Assessment Scoreiii. In the second round of LTPs, more than £8b of capital funding is planned to be distributed. There are three main funding streams:
Major Schemes: Those individual schemes that are in excess of £5m;

Integrated Transport Block: non-maintenance schemes that are less than £5m in value;

Maintenance: funding or structural local road maintenance (DfT, 2005a).

Revenue funding is provided through a wider local government settlement. The main transport element is for routine highway maintenance, and is decided through the use of a formula consisting of road length, condition and other factors.

Funding and Funding-Related Barriers and Issues in the UK

The literature review, discussions with case study authorities and the Funding Workshop highlighted a number of specific funding issues faced by local authorities. Key issues relate to the availability and use of revenue funding, the formation of partnerships to obtain funding and subsequently deliver transport schemes, issues related to the funding of ‘soft’ or non-motorised schemes, the requirement to be innovative when bidding for funds, the need for political support, and timing restrictions. These issues are discussed in more detail below.

Revenue Funding

In the UK, revenue funding provided to local authorities is not ring-fenced; transport must compete for resources with other services, such as education and health. The majority of local authorities consider themselves to be ‘Capital Rich, Revenue Poor’. The lack of revenue is a persistent problem with no clear solutions. Revenue is required for a variety of uses, including running services, maintenance of vehicles and infrastructure, provision of information (such as Real Time Passenger Information, RTPI), repainting of road markings and removal of graffiti and other vandalism. The DfT is aware that many local transport authorities would prefer LTP allocations to include an element of revenue funding; however, this is not intended in the second LTP round. Local authorities are therefore required to consider funding revenue-requiring activities in support of an LTP from other DfT funding for specific initiatives, from non-ring-fenced revenue support, or from funds raised locally. The LTP is required to indicate how the revenue funded programmes it contains will be funded.
The DfT commissioned a research study into the first round of the local transport plans; ‘Long Term Process and Impact Evaluation of the LTP Policy’ (DfT, 2005b). That study was based on the findings of workshops with a range of stakeholders and local transport practitioners as well as interviews, data analysis and regional case studies. It addressed the issue of whether the LTP system is effective and outlines the impacts and consequences at ground level that the policy has had.

The study revealed that local authorities identified revenue as a key barrier to LTP delivery, although findings in the report indicate that increases in funding have allowed authorities to be more ambitious in the programmes that they pursue. A lack of revenue funding was outlined by all stakeholders as a ‘pressing’ issue. The report suggests that as a result, it is becoming increasingly difficult to fund maintenance for infrastructure, so benefits may diminish, schemes requiring high revenue may be delayed or cancelled, and easily-funded capital works may replace revenue-based schemes, such as increases in bus services (DfT, 2005b).

It is also suggested that revenue shortages could even result in inadequate staffing, particularly in rural areas where measures tend to be more revenue intensive. Options for external support are also identified as being ‘limited’ in rural areas (DfT, 2005b). The issue of revenue available for staffing needs was also identified at the DISTILLATE funding workshop there are significant implications. Participants estimated that approximately 30% of project costs was staff time where staff time cannot be charged to projects, then there are huge implications and schemes may, in some cases, be unable to get off the ground. Factors such as increasing costs for existing transport services and local political issues may further exacerbate the problems of low revenue funding.

Findings of the report (DfT, 2005b) suggest they some authorities are viewing the revenue problem constructively through the development of local solutions, such as creating partnerships with revenue-rich, capital poor partners (e.g. bus operators), and strengthening the case internally for transport, i.e. by stressing its contribution to wider corporate and community objectives.

The Second Local Transport Plan guidance (DfT, 2004) does not offer any direct solutions to the revenue problem but suggests that authorities consider how revenue
based transport spending which supports capital investment could be funded, with district auditor support, from the capital programme. DfT (2005b) suggests however that in the long term Local Government could make it easier for capital and revenue expenditure to be integrated. Innovative approaches are also mentioned as a way to secure funding in the future, through land value tax and increased trade schemes, for example.

Discussions held during the workshop organised by DISTILLATE echoed many of these findings regarding revenue funding. The potential availability of revenue funding was often identified by local authorities, but as it often comes from a variety of sources, obtaining it is often viewed as a time-consuming process. However, examples of revenue sources were provided, such as developer contributions, but there were generally of a short term nature. In another example ‘shuttle buses’ may be provided by superstores, but problems are felt by the users of these services when the funding ceases. Parking charges and advertising revenue were also identified as sources.

Examples of revenue issues experienced by the case study local authorities are detailed below.

The case study Local Authority implementing Showcase Bus Routes stated that a high level of revenue is required for the maintenance and continued running of the service if they are to continue to attract passengers. However, the local authority is often uncertain as to the varying revenue allocations year on year (with the amounts received depending on council tax) making it difficult to forward plan. In some cases the allocation amounts are unknown until July (four months into the financial year). The Local Authority has tried to overcome some of these maintenance revenue problems through ensuring the use of high quality materials for the City’s second Showcase Bus Route. Although this solution has positive implications for revenue funding requirements in the longer term, there are initial capital implications.

An alternative solution is the raising of revenue through advertising contracts. The Local Authority has recently renegotiated their agreements with advertising firm ADSHELL. Rent revenue can be created through providing advertising space at bus shelters, which in turn can provide revenue to maintain shelters, including weatherproofing and the
removal of graffiti. However, in some circumstances, the combination of advertising in
the shelter may detract from the purpose it has been designed for, and may deter
waiting passengers from seeing approaching buses, reducing visual splays etc. Build-
outs rather than raised kerbs are being implemented, which help to retain the position of
the bus in traffic. The pedestrian footprint is also retained within the pavement area,
whilst the shelter provides security.
Smaller or ‘soft’ schemes often require a high level of revenue funding, and are therefore
notoriously difficult to finance (both capital and revenue funding). The lack of availability
of funding for cycling schemes in general is leading to difficulties in delivering
comprehensive cycling facilities. The Local Authority involved in delivering the
cycle/shared use route (which is part of the National Cycle Network) have experienced a
number of difficulties. Funds have been stretched as far as they can to complete as
much of the cycle/shared use route as possible. This has ultimately resulted in a lower
quality of scheme in some areas, which ultimately poses higher maintenance (revenue)
implications for the future. This in itself is another major problem, as revenue to maintain
off-highway cycleways is difficult to achieve. Sustrans has been successful in securing
a Department for the Environment, Fisheries and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) grant for bank
and hedgerow trimming, which will last for 10 years. However, other sources will need to
be identified to maintain seating benches, information boards, and eventually the
surfacing of the route (although this should last approximately 15 years). There are also
concerns such as vandalism, particularly upon leaving certain build-up areas along the
route, which will have further implications for revenue funding.
The provision of public transport services to new residential developments is extremely
important if new occupants are to be able to use sustainable transport alternatives to the
car. Ideally, these transport services will be implemented and operational to use as soon
as residents have moved in to ensure sustainable travel patterns and habits from the
start. In one English county, a large housing development of approximately 2,000 homes
is planned to the north of an existing town. The existing public transport bus service has
been extended to include the planned housing development. It was intended that the
revenue support would be gained for the service from the developers for the first 10
years. However, although building was due to commence a couple of years ago, this is yet to happen. Therefore, no funding has been received from the developers to support the running of the bus service. The service has been operational since autumn 2005, and the Local Authority took the decision to launch and support the service themselves, in order to ensure that it is up and running as soon as residents move to the area. As a result of the revenue shortfall, the Local Authority is hoping to be reimbursed by the developers at a later stage.

**Formation of Partnerships**

Partnerships are often formed to aid the delivery of transport schemes and projects. They can be internal partnerships within different sectors of Local Authority responsibilities (transport, planning, education, health etc), between neighbouring authorities, or including partners from the private sector (businesses, bus operators, voluntary sector etc). The study has found that the formation of partnerships as important in relation to identifying and securing of funding for transport schemes and projects.

Many of the case study local authorities spoken to had experience of forming partnerships in order to obtain funding or to deliver a scheme. In some cases the partnership was found to be instrumental to the success of the scheme, particularly in obtaining funding from a variety of sources, whereas others highlighted the potential difficulties of managing a large number of partners, which can hinder the process. Local authorities, especially smaller ones, may often lack the skills and resources required to form and maintain a successful partnership.

The DfT’s report on the *Long Term Process and Impact Evaluation of the LTP Policy* (2005b) (reviewed in the literature review, Burke *et al*, 2005) reveals the elements that an effective partnership is dependent on, which include:

- A clear shared view of a common problem and an appreciation that a joined-up approach is needed to find a solution;

- One or more committed and proactive champions, more beneficially at sufficiently senior level within their organisations to take key decisions and commit resources (time or funding) as necessary;
A suitable mix within the partnering bodies, often beyond those specifically focused on transport;

Availability of funding, either from the key partners (e.g. matching the capital and revenue) or using the strength of the partnership to secure external support (e.g. Urban Bus Challenge, Sustainable Towns);

Appropriate systems and support, including capital success factors; and

Encouragement and guidance to incentivise the partner bodies (DfT, 2005b).

Where these factors are not present, the effectiveness of partnerships is likely to be undermined. Groups that are formed are in danger of becoming little more than ‘talking shops’ (DfT, 2005b). However, the report identifies that local authorities are beginning to pay attention to these factors which make partnerships work.

Working with other service areas is becoming more common through the availability of Travel Plan bursaries from the UK Department of Education and Skills, encouraging greater integration between the transport and education sectors. Similarly, accessibility planning is driving increased integration with health (DfT, 2005b). However, it is primarily the transport departments that are instigating these partnerships, rather than other service areas.

The DISTILLATE ‘Organisational Delivery’ project undertook case study research which identified a number of factors considered to influence the success or failure of a partnership (Snell et al, 2006). It was found that those factors instrumental in creating a partnership include:

- Similar goals;
- Two-way needs (mutual benefits and exploitation of synergy);
- Financial gain or added value;
- Mandatory requirements; and
- Clear links between policies regardless of departmental divisions.

The factors highlighted as an important part of maintaining partnerships include:

- Close physical location;
- Clearly defined mandatory requirements;
- Champions at all levels;
• Political/high level support; and
• Consistency in availability of staff/personnel.

One of the case study authorities within the DISTILLATE Project was involved in setting up an Urban Regeneration Company (URC), with the local Regional Development Agency and National Regeneration Agency. The partnership was formed to focus on the regeneration of a city centre. The Local Authority considers the formation of the partnership to be partly responsible in the success of obtaining funding for the majority of improvements, including extensive transport improvements. The partnership has been successful in identifying and obtaining funding from a wide variety of sources, including European Objective One, Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) and various private sector sources, in addition to Local Transport Plan settlements.

DISTILLATE funding workshop delegates considered partnerships to be about collaboration and communication, a way of stimulating dialogue between different organisations and exchanging ideas. Accessibility planning was given as a good example of a shared approach which has resulted in shared agendas, e.g. between transport and education.

Where joint LTPs have been prepared, local partnership working has been perceived as being easier. Although many challenges were discussed, it was felt that this was primarily due to the fact that large blocks of funding needed to get schemes off the ground would not have been given without the officers from different authorities working together. It was perceived that a lot of grant funders (Central and Local Government, private sector and the voluntary sector) like to see partnerships applying for transport funding, and this may therefore increase their chances of obtaining funding from these sources.

**Funding of ‘Soft’/Non-Motorised Schemes**

In comparison to other transport schemes, ‘soft’ schemes, such as those for walking or cycling, are often on a much smaller funding scale. However, despite the lower costs involved, authorities have experienced difficulties in obtaining funding. Part of the problem lies in appraising such schemes. Cycling and walking schemes in particular are likely to have a range of benefits, including security, health and physical fitness,
improved access, as well as a reduction of negative impacts of motorised transport (noise/air pollution, safety etc), which are often difficult to quantify. Therefore, when competing against other schemes which display obvious monetary benefits (time savings etc), these softer schemes tend to lose out. DfT does recognise these problems and has commissioned research into the issue. It is also being examined within the DISTILLATE project.

The cycle/shared use route case study which is partly being completed by one Local Authority demonstrates how a relatively low cost scheme has had to attract funding from a vast number of sources in order to complete the route. The route, costing just over £2m, attracted in excess of 25 different funding sources, ranging from £250 to £250,000. Sources included neighbouring local authorities, DfT grants, New Opportunities Fund viii, Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund ix (ALSF) grants, parish councils and arts councils (not a full list).

**Political Support**

Political support is seen as a key factor not only in scheme development, but in the subsequent acquisition of funding. Local authorities agree that political support for a scheme is essential in the funding and implementation process. It is considered that political interest and support should be consistent over time and that a political champion is needed.

Such commitment has been witnessed in the case study Local Authority promoting the development of a rail link. The scheme has been in preparation for in excess of 20 years. As scheme development has been over such a long time period, it has been essential that continued support, both technical and political, has been provided. However, for schemes such as walking or cycling improvements, where there are already shortages in funding, funding can fluctuate with political commitment, and there is a difficulty in obtaining what small funds do exist.

**LTP Allocations and Other Timing Restrictions**

The way in which LTP funding is allocated is perceived to be creating a barrier for local authorities. In December of each year, local authorities are informed of their allocation as an Integrated Transport Block from Central Government. A political process is then
undertaken within the local authority to allocate the funding across activities. It is only then, in the April, that the transport delivery team will know the exact amount of the allocation. Therefore, 5 months have passed in the annual cycle, presenting a problem in ensuring the money is spent effectively for the remaining period. This is considered to be a major barrier for implementation.

Case Study local authorities identified and discussed other sources of funding that also involve time restrictions. Funding sources, including LTP allocations, tend to work on an annual rotation, whereby they require allocated funds to be used within a year.

For example, one local authority reported receiving a funding allocation from the Aggregates Sustainability Levy Fund (ASLF) in 2003. However, they were driven to spend this funding by April 2004. In hindsight, it was realised that the money may not have been spent as efficiently as it could have been if time restrictions were not in place. It would have been more effective to break the implementation works into more manageable sections, rather than rushing to get as much of the route completed as possible, with implications for the resulting quality of the scheme.

There are additional considerations and pressures linked to funding and phasing of transport projects, particularly when timing restrictions outside of the funding arena have to be considered. One example was provided relating to the construction of a rural cycle route. Due to the nature of the scheme, the Countryside and Wildlife Acts created additional phasing issues. Bird nesting is an important issue and clearance work can only be undertaken between September and February, so as to not disturb the birds. Additionally, if there are badgers within the vicinity, works cannot involve the closing of sets or disturbing the land close to sets between July and November. These restrictions can often mean that advance work and careful planning is necessary, particularly if trying to fit work in according to funding schedules.

Involving the community and stakeholders from the start of the process may also be beneficial to the smooth running and implementation transport schemes. Where unexpected objections to planned work are received, additional delays are placed on implementation.
Conclusions and Next Steps

Funding is always going to be a ‘hot-topic’ amongst local authorities when discussing or considering the implementation of transport schemes. As the findings of the DISTILLATE Funding Project have shown, funding issues are wide-ranging and can vary greatly between authorities and between scheme types. Although local Transport Plan funding is available to authorities, they also need to be aware of alternative funding sources to substitute LTP allocations.

The literature review concluded that research has identified that revenue funding is a key issue for Local Authorities. One of the studies revealed that Local Authorities are using a wide variety of funding sources to supplement the LTP capital allocation. However, the use of alternating funding streams have had their draw backs, such as their time consuming nature (particularly during the bidding processes), and Local Authorities should ensure that this does not detract from effective delivery. In addition to the more traditional sources of funding, innovative funding mechanisms were identified, including applying Land Value Tax\textsuperscript{x}, Work Place Parking Levies\textsuperscript{xi}, road user charging, developer levies and Transport Development Areas\textsuperscript{xii} (TDAs). Some of these methods are beginning to be used in the UK, such as road user charging, whereas others are still in the early stages of development. However, there re some positive opportunities for alternative funding mechanisms to assist the funding of transport schemes in the UK.

The DISTILLATE Funding Project intends to issue two key outputs related to funding and the overcoming of barriers.

The first is a ‘Funding Toolkit’. It is intended that this Toolkit will be aimed at local authorities and will provide decision makers with an overview of potentially available funding sources to use for a variety of schemes and projects. It has been demonstrated through the research activities of the DISTILLATE Funding Project, local authorities regularly face barriers when identifying or applying for funding, and this toolkit will help them in both identifying alternative sources of funding, and highlighting the potential barriers at an early stage. The toolkit will provide advice on using various sources of funding, including private sector, other central, regional or local government initiatives, initiatives of governmental organisations or bodies, and the voluntary/charitable sector.
The toolkit intends to provide descriptions of existing sources, the types of schemes they can be used for, case study examples of the funding sources used in practice, and the potential benefits and disadvantages of using the source. Advice on partnership working will also be provided, to strengthen partnership working in the identification and attaining of funds.

The research undertaken in DISTILLATE Funding Project has been useful in identifying a number of barriers faced by local authorities concerning the funding of transport schemes. The second key output will be the preparation of guidance for funding agencies, the potential funders of transport and land use schemes. It is intended that the guidance will identify and examine the funding barriers faced by local authorities and the potential implications these may have, on both the organisations and the resultant schemes. Where appropriate, recommendations on improvements to existing funding mechanisms and regimes will be made.

It is hoped that these outputs produced by the DISTILLATE Funding Project will assist local authorities and the funding bodies overcome the barriers that they currently face in the financing of transport and land use schemes in the UK.
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Footnotes

i DISTILLATE Consortium Members include ITS (Leeds), SEI (York), Heriot-Watt University (Edinburgh), UCL (London), and TRL.

ii Passenger Transport Executives (PTEs) are local government bodies which are responsible for public transport within large urban areas.

iii Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPAs) is an element of the Government's performance framework for local government which aims to support improvement planning in local authorities and lead to co-ordinated and proportionate audit and inspection and increased freedoms and flexibilities for local government. Judgement is formed on the performance and proven corporate capacity of every single tier and County Council in England. A balanced scorecard is the produced for each authority, an they are given a rating – excellent, fair, weak or poor, to describe how it is performing overall.

iv Sustrans is a UK-based Sustainable Transport Charity who is heavily involved in aiding the completion of the UK’s National Cycle Network (NCN)

v European Objective One is an EU initiative to provide resources for project-based activities that bring about social, economic and environmental development. In England, three areas have been designated for Objective 1 support – the Southwest (Cornwall), Northwest (Merseyside) and South Yorkshire.

vi The Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) is run through Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) and provides resources to support regeneration initiatives designed to enhance the quality of life in disadvantaged areas in England and reduce inequalities.

vii Many local authorities may find it beneficial to establish joint sub-regional transport planning units, and to produce a single joint LTP for that sub-region. It is considered that joint LTPs allow more efficient use of human and technical resources, and could provide greater flexibility to all plan partners.

viii The New Opportunities Fund (NOF) is the former name for the 'Big Lottery Fund', the body who distributes the largest amounts of national lottery funding. The aim of the grants awarded is to improve communities and the lives of people most in need.
The Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund (ALSF) is a former Countryside Agency initiative. A levy was introduced on aggregate abstraction in April 2002. A proportion of the money raised is in the fund, which is used to address environmental and social costs of aggregate extraction through delivering environmental improvements and minimising the demand for primary aggregated and reducing the local effects of aggregate extraction.

Land Value Tax (LVT) is the policy of raising state revenues by charging each landholder a portion of the assessed site-only value of improved land.

Work Place Parking Levies (WPPL) is a levy allowing local authorities to charge companies and organisations for each commuter car parking space provided in a specified work place.

Transport Development Areas (TDAs) are ‘well-designed, higher density, mixed use areas situated around good public transport points in urban areas’ (RICS, 2003)