

Chapter 3

THE INTERACTION BETWEEN TRANSPORT AND LAND-USE PLANNING

Dr David Simmonds*

INTRODUCTION

Objectives

Amongst those involved professionally or politically in what is broadly called “planning” it is almost universally agreed that the planning of land-uses and the planning of transport provision need to be effectively integrated if “planning” overall is to achieve the most satisfactory results, however those results are judged. This has been professionally understood for a long time, and has become a more prominent argument in the political discussion of planning over the past decade or so. A great deal of attention has been given both to the institutions and processes for integrated land-use/transport planning and to understanding and sometimes forecasting how transport and land-use influence one another, at different spatial scales.

Within any of the planning processes in land-use or transport, close to the boundary between technical analysis and political decision-making, there is of necessity a process of making judgments about the advantages and disadvantages of alternative courses of action, whether the eventual decision is a yes/no choice for a specific proposal, or a choice between several alternative actions. One aspect of the interaction between land-use planning and transport planning that seems to have attracted surprisingly little discussion is the contrast between the formal processes of appraisal in transport planning and equivalent processes, or lack of them, in land-use planning. This Chapter attempts to compare and contrast these processes in the two fields of planning, and to discuss some of the issues arising.

*Dr David Simmonds is Director of David Simmonds Consultancy, Cambridge.

One immediate point of clarification: the terms “appraisal” and “evaluation” are often used as synonyms in the wider planning literature. In UK transport planning practice, “appraisal” refers to assessment of the merits and demerits a proposal before it is implemented (*ex ante* analysis), and “evaluation” to assessment of its merits and demerits after implementation (*ex post* analysis). To reduce the scope for confusion, the UK transport planning convention is used in this Chapter: the Chapter is concerned with *ex ante* analysis as part of the decision-making process, and hence the term “appraisal” is used throughout.

Whilst much of the author’s daily work is concerned with formal methods of land-use/transport modelling and forecasting, the focus of this Chapter is on what forecast impacts and consequences are taken into account in the appraisal and decision-making processes, not with how the impacts and consequences are forecast.

To avoid multiplication of references, this Chapter concentrates on the processes and methods of planning as they currently appear in England, though most of the points made apply equally elsewhere in the United Kingdom and indeed further afield.

Structure of the Chapter

The first part outlines how issues relating to land-use are considered in current appraisal practice as set out in Department for Transport (DfT) guidance followed by a review of the approach to (or lack of) appraisal in the guidance on spatial planning issued by what is now the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). The next part considers some of the issues from these different sets of guidance and from the contrasts between them. The final part attempts to draw some conclusions as to the potential problems these contrast imply, and how planning practice may advance in these areas.

TRANSPORT APPRAISAL

NATA and WEBs

The core of the DfT guidance on transport policy and scheme appraisal is the New Approach to Transport Appraisal, or NATA. This was introduced in the last 1990s and is now published in electronic form as WebTAG(see www.webtag.org.uk), incorporating a variety of revisions including those resulting from the Department’s *Guidance on Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies*. Other, more recent, guidance concerns accessibility planning, and the calculation of Wider Economic Benefits (WEBs). This section summarises and comments on the elements of NATA that relate explicitly to land-use, and then does the same for WEBs.

The general objectives of transport planning set out in NATA relate to

- Economy
- Accessibility
- Safety
- Integration
- Environment.

Issues of the relationship between land-use and transport planning enter mainly in the areas of Economy, Integration and Environment. The treatment of Economy is in two parts, that of Transport Economic Efficiency and that of Wider Economic Impacts. Note that the Wider Economic Impacts, considered in NATA, are different from the Wider Economic Benefits (which are not [at least yet] in NATA).

Transport Economic Efficiency analysis

A major component of transport appraisal is the Transport Economic Efficiency (TEE) analysis, which is a form of cost-benefit analysis. The benefits forecast to result from the proposal under consideration are quantified in monetary terms, and compared with the forecast costs of delivering the proposal. For conventional transport infrastructure proposals, the pattern is typically one of a high initial capital cost delivering a stream of benefits which extends many years into the future. As a result, both the forecasts of travel demand (which are essential to the benefit calculations) and the discount rate are critical to the results. The most important categories of benefits measured in TEE are typically time savings and accident reduction. The comparison of benefits with costs results in a number of standard measures of the value of the scheme, notably its benefit/cost ratio (BCR) and its Net Present Value (NPV).

An important characteristic of TEE is its bottom-up or consumer-oriented nature. In principle it sums all of the effects on the “welfare” of all transport users (and on the costs and revenues of transport suppliers and of government). So far as individual transport users are concerned, the effects are measured in terms of the changes in consumer surplus – that is, in terms of the changes in the difference between what consumers would be willing to pay (in time and inconvenience or discomfort as well as in money) for the transport “service” received and what they actually pay. The nature of these calculations should be the same irrespective of the type of intervention being appraised, and irrespective of whether the region in which the intervention is proposed is one struggling with the consequences of economic growth or one struggling with a lack of economic growth.

What is particularly important is that in appraising the impacts of the intervention on the consumers of transport, TEE concentrates (as far as methods of analysis allow) on how much better or worse off they would perceive themselves to be if they were all in a position to compare the with- and without-intervention situations. There has been extensive debate about the details of this - for example, about the valuation of small time savings which may in practice be imperceptible to many individuals - but the approach retains the characteristic of concentrating on benefits as they accrue to individual users of the transport system. The approach therefore makes few assumptions about the objectives of the scheme other than implying that a more efficient use of resources is preferable to a less efficient use. Other objectives – such as an objective of distributing transport investment more equally across regions – enter in other parts of NATA but not in the TEE. The TEE is therefore firmly rooted in the welfare economics tradition of seeking to assess whether those affected by a proposal will, at least in aggregate, consider themselves to be better off, rather than whether the proposal conforms with any other objectives of planning and policy.

The TEE analysis does not in itself consider land-use impacts, in any of the senses of changes in land values, changes in the physical use of land or changes in the type or intensity of the activities located on land or in buildings. The conventional argument is that the TEE analysis captures all of the impacts on the economy (including land-use effects), and that anything else that happens represents a transfer of the benefits (or disbenefits) rather than an additional benefit (or disbenefit). Hence for example the electrification of a suburban railway, resulting in faster commuting times, may lead to more people commuting longer distances, and to additional residential development to accommodate them. The standard view is that whilst these changes transform benefits (for example through people choosing to live in a cheaper or more attractive location and to commute further), and redistribute benefits (for example from inner-city landowners to suburban landowners) but that they do not change the overall magnitude of benefits; as a result, the overall BCR and NPV values are unaffected by such indirect consequences.

In their 1999 report on Transport and the economy, SACTRA concluded that the argument for all indirect benefits being transfers or transformations of the direct transport benefits would be true if the conditions of “perfect competition” applied both in the transport-supplying and transport-using sectors. (The analysis of Wider Economic Benefits, currently outside NATA, seeks to deal with the additional effects that may arise in conditions of imperfect competition.)

The standard approach to calculating user benefits in TEE is based on considering the changes in generalised cost between each origin and each destination, typically for different purposes of personal travel and different categories of freight movement. An important limitation of this approach is that the calculations are only valid if land-uses (and any other factors not captured in the generalised cost measures) are kept constant. If there is any difference in land-uses between the Base Case and the Alternative being appraised, the TEE calculation is invalidated - even if these differences in land-uses are the forecast land-use impacts of the scheme being appraised. (For more detail and an example, see David Simmonds Consultancy and John Bates Services, 2001.)

The fixed land-use pattern assumed in TEE is often derived from the DfT’s own forecasts of future land-uses and resulting trip-ends – known as TEMPRO, though where land-use models are being used the convention is to use TEMPRO as a control on regional totals rather than constraining to TEMPRO figures at the finest possible level. This satisfies one of the original objectives of TEMPRO, which is to prevent every region or authority from seeking a higher share of the available transport funding by assuming a higher-than-average rate of demographic and economic growth. The process of preparing the TEMPRO data has evolved over time to take more account of spatial planning policy, mainly in terms of the planned distribution of new housing. It remains a curiosity that the forecasting of the consequences of land-use planning is carried out mainly by the ministry responsible for transport rather than by ministry responsible for land-use planning itself or by the regional or local bodies responsible for preparing particular plans.

Economic Impact Reports: Wider Economic Impacts

Economic Impact Reports were introduced into the transport appraisal process in response to recommendations made in SACTRA's 1999 report on Transport and the economy. The introduction of this component recognizes that even if all of the land-use effects of a transport scheme are transformations of the benefits which are assessed as benefits to transport users in the TEE calculations, there may be important policy reasons for some land-use effects to be more desirable than others. The standard practice in Economic Impact Reports is to focus on whether the transport scheme being appraised is likely to generate additional employment in recognized regeneration areas (RAs), on the basis that such increases in employment (even at the expense of "non-regeneration" areas) represents an additional benefit.

SACTRA recommended that EIRs should be developed for all schemes (see WebTAG, Unit 2.8, para 1.3.5). DfT guidance is that "This recommendation has been accepted by DfT but only for schemes which may impact on regeneration areas" (ibid), which effectively means that EIRs are only likely to be prepared in cases where the impacts on regeneration areas are likely to help the case for the scheme, or where potentially negative impacts on regeneration areas cannot be ignored. "The need for an EIR must be considered for all major schemes, that is, those with a capital cost of £5m or more." [Unit 3.5.8, para 3.1.1]

Para 1.4.1 says that "The Department's chosen measure of contribution to regeneration objectives is the change in the number of RA residents in employment. An additional measure which may also be useful is the change in the number of jobs in the RA." In one bullet point it also specifies that that "it is not necessary to demonstrate whether any new jobs generated by a transport scheme would otherwise have gone somewhere else in the country." In the following point it says that that "[the EIR] provides an indirect measure of regional impacts by focusing on under-performing areas that are themselves more likely to be part of under-performing regions." The latter leaves some question marks about the role of EIRs when considering impacts on regeneration areas within over-performing areas (eg the Thames Gateway within the London/South-East/East of England regions).

Integration with land-use plans

The other area where NATA links directly to land-use planning is under the land-use policy sub-objective of the Integration objective. The guidance on this (WebTAG Unit 3.7.2) is that transport schemes should be more positively considered if they will help to achieve objectives set out in current land-use plans. Rather confusingly, the definition of "land-use plans" in WebTAG (paragraph 2.1.2 of Unit 3.7.2) seems to include Local Transport Plans. The guidance on Economic Impact Reports can of course be seen as a special case of this, relating to regeneration areas designated in land-use plans, and considered within the Economic rather than Integration objective.

The method proposed in the guidance (paragraph 1.1.6) is simply to count the number of planning strategies that are helped or hindered by the transport scheme, without any weighting of their importance. Beyond that, the guidance is rather imprecise about the required relationship between the transport scheme and the other planning documents in question. We return to this point later.

Wider Economic Benefits

A more recent part of the government response to SACTRA's 1999 report emerged in the guidance on Wider Economic Benefits published in 2005. As outlined in that guidance (DfT, 2005), 'Appraisal seeks to include all benefits and costs, and so should in principle include the best estimates of wider benefits (or costs)', and SACTRA had concluded that the presence of market imperfections in transport using sectors could lead to an incomplete measure of the welfare impacts of transport schemes. Building on this, the purpose of the 2005 guidance was to "set out methods for incorporating in transport scheme appraisal the wider economic benefits that are missing from current appraisals." It identifies, and sets out methods for calculating, four wider welfare benefits which could be included in welfare appraisal of transport schemes and a number of currently un-assessed GDP impacts. The four welfare effects (with the codes used to identify them in the DfT guidance) are:

- WBI Agglomeration economies
- WB2 Increased competition as a result of better transport
- WB3 Increased output in imperfectly competitive markets
- WB4 Wider benefits from consequences on the exchequer

Of these four, WB2 would not normally be expected to be significant, while WB4 depends on the calculation of a range of currently un-assessed impacts, which transport interventions may have on GDP, in particular any GDP effects of changes in labour force participation (GPI), and any movement of jobs to more or less productive locations (GP2).

One point to note about the WEB analysis is that it is concerned strictly with the impacts on welfare and GDP across the whole economy. Whilst it is influenced by any changes in the distribution of jobs resulting from the transport scheme being appraised, particularly in the agglomeration and move to more productive locations effects, the nature of these benefits is that positive WEBs are most likely to arise from schemes which concentrate economic activity in already prosperous areas. As such, the WEBs analysis is likely to run contrary to some of the socio-economic objectives of planning which continue to some extent to try to bring "work to the workers" rather than moving "workers to the work".

It should also be emphasised that whilst the WEBs guidance has generally been seen as an addition to the appraisal process, much of it actually represents an additional set of models forecasting additional effects which are excluded from standard quantitative analyses (not least because they are much wider in scope than EIRs, and outside the scope of TEE because of the requirement that TEE should have the same land-uses (and hence the same economic activity) in both Base and Alternative).

The Eddington Review

The Eddington Review (Eddington, 2006) has recently produced a number of recommendations about transport planning and its contribution to economic growth, including recommendations relating specifically to the appraisal of transport proposals.

The Review is generally positive about the nature of the appraisal analysis carried out by or for DfT, noting that the Department is widely recognized as a leader in this respect. (It would seem implicitly that this approval extends to the Wider Economic Benefits analysis, which was first extensively carried out for the Eddington Review, as well as to the standard NATA approach.) The Review itself emphasised the need to recognize “enabling economic productivity” as an objective, and made a number of more specific recommendations for “capturing the impacts of transport on the performance of the economy” (Figure 1.4, Volume 4, p 238). These recommendations (with the present author’s comments in square brackets) involved

- ❑ basing the valuation of time savings on local wages - “essential to capture the true economic gain from a transport improvement in a particular region”;
- ❑ freight valuations: Eddington questions whether the current valuation of time fully reflects the benefits of transport improvements to business operations, including logistics;
- ❑ reliability: “it is clear that the performance of the transport network in terms of reliability often matters just as much, if not more, than any direct time savings”, and “evidence suggests that these [presumably, reliability improvements] are considerably higher than has been appreciated in the past” (this could be because congestion of the road network is becoming increasingly important as more and more of the country is connected by roads which offer good travel speeds when they are not congested, and because similar issues have been arising in the railways in those areas where they are economically most significant)
- ❑ agglomeration economies: “the UK is at the forefront of establishing techniques [ie those in the WEBs guidance] on how this relationship can be modelled. However, it is clear that there is merit in better understanding this relationship, not least because of the continuing importance of urban agglomerations to the future prosperity of the UK. The DfT’s developing methodology on agglomeration economies should be applied to the appraisal of all transport schemes. This could increase the assessed value of schemes, especially in urban areas”
- ❑ gains from trade: “the contribution of transport policy in supporting trade is not well understood or quantified”; the resulting benefits “are not captured currently in appraisal”. “New research would need to be undertaken to consider how such gains could be captured and reflected.”
- ❑ globally mobile activity: “additional GDP gains are difficult to quantify for individual schemes, but analysis suggests that it will be important for transport policy [and hence presumably for transport appraisal] to reflect this driver at relevant times”.

This Chapter does not attempt to consider the recommendations which Eddington made in relation to the processes and procedures of transport planning and the promotion of transport schemes. However it is important to note that Eddington recommends more comprehensive analysis of the expected impacts of transport schemes earlier in the process of planning, preparing and choosing between them. This is in many respects highly desirable, but it does imply increasing problems in considering transport schemes in the wider context

of land-use planning – it could well result in transport planners having to appraise transport schemes which are not even be scheduled for completion within the time horizon of current land-use plans!

LAND-USE PLANNING

Appraisal in land-use planning - an absence

Whilst much has been written in the land-use planning literature about the appraisal of land-use plans, there is no body of formal techniques embedded in official guidance equivalent to that described above which is generally required to be followed in transport planning. Even in the area of housing, which is the aspect of land-use planning subject to the highest proportion of formal, quantified analysis (For an overview, see Gallent, 2007 - but note that PPG3 has been succeeded by PPS3), there is no requirement for analysis of how the planned housing provision will affect the welfare of consumers (ie residents) in general, despite the fact the objectives set out for local planning authorities in relation to planning for housing (PPS3) include “to achieve a wide choice of high quality homes” and “seeking to improve choice” (PPS3, paras 9 and 10).

For reasons which are not often discussed, land-use planning seems to be pursued on the basis that formal forecasting and appraisal of the consequences of land-use planning interventions are carried out, if at all, as research, usually commissioned by central government to inform the preparation of policy guidance which local authorities are expected to follow. There is no requirement to show by any formal analysis that a chosen plan, or any particular element of a plan, is better than any alternative course of action or than no action at all. One of the consequences seems to be that there is a wide variety of guidance to be taken into account, and no clear way in which conflicts between different aspects of the guidance should be resolved. “Evidence-based planning” in relation to land-use (or spatial) planning therefore relies on very indirect evidence about the consequences and desirability of particular actions, whereas transport planning relies heavily on the preparation of evidence (based, necessarily, on forecasting) about each individual action.

Possible reasons for this contrast include

- ❑ the view that transport planning is subservient to land-use planning, transport planning being more “technical” whilst land-use planning is essentially “political”;
- ❑ the importance of property rights in the evolution of British planning, with a resulting focus on justifying the restrictions on development of each individual site rather than in measuring the benefits to society as a whole – the latter often being taken for granted;
- ❑ perhaps most critically, the fact that many appraisals in transport planning are carried out in order to secure central government funding as well as central government permission.

The first of these arguments does not seem to stand up to scrutiny; major transport decisions are highly political, and in any case transport outcomes are now included amongst the

objectives of land-use planning (eg in PPG3 again, among the objectives for planning of housing; to “seek to reduce car dependence...”). The third point is important, but the fact that transport appraisal is concerned with allocation of public money and land-use planning with the use of (predominantly) private space would not seem to be a sufficient reason for major differences in appraisal methods. One can see that when transport planning is a process of competition for funds from single national fund, the process of appraisal needs to be more rigorously controlled, to ensure comparability of the “bids”, than is necessary for regions in deciding about the development of their respective territories. However, both land-use planning and transport planning are concerned with allocating scarce resources (whether money or land) in ways which are intended to generate greater benefits for society than might otherwise be the case, and there seems to be a lack of rigour in showing that this is actually achieved in land-use planning.

It should be noted that the concept of indicators has been gaining importance in planning and that lists of key indicators are now specified for regional and local planning (see ODPM: *Core output indicators for regional planning*, March 2005, and equivalent guidance for local development frameworks). However, whilst these help to provide a quantified assessment of what is happening, it is not clear how these indicators relate to benefits for those affected by planning, nor is it apparent that these indicators are necessarily to be considered in assessing the merits of alternative plans - they seem to be simply for use in monitoring, which is important but not a substitute for *ex ante* appraisal (or indeed for *ex post* evaluation).

INTEGRATING LAND-USE AND TRANSPORT PLANNING

Introduction

As mentioned in the introduction, this Chapter does not set out to give an overall prescription for the integration of land-use and transport planning. This section simply raises raising a number of questions and suggestions.

Analysis of consumer benefits in land-use planning?

Transport planning, and its outcomes in terms of major transport developments and heavy expenditure of public funds, is heavily influenced by benefits to consumers and business in the form of numerous small time savings - small to any one traveller in any trip, but very large when aggregated over all the travellers (or hauliers of goods) on any one day, over the days of the year and (with discounting) over a long series of future years. Comparable attention should perhaps be given to measuring the magnitude of the welfare benefits to households which will flow from (for example) different ways of pursuing the PPG3 objective of “wider housing opportunity and choice”, etc, not just in the general case but in relation to the housing land allocations and related decisions for specific regions. This would not replace other planning objectives, but would (as in the transport case) provide important information about the aggregate effect of the policy decisions on the people affected.

Almost by definition it is difficult or impossible to find UK examples of the kind of analysis suggested here. One very relevant piece of work is however contained in Cheshire and Sheppard (2002). They examine the impact of the constraints on urban expansion for a typical

large town in Southern England, and estimate that the present level of restraint imposes net costs on residents equivalent to a tax of nearly 4% on incomes. These very significant costs are the net costs essentially of constraining the housing supply, resulting in household occupying smaller and more expensive dwellings than would otherwise be the case, after allowing for the benefits (if any) arising from protecting a larger area of agricultural land.

The Cheshire and Sheppard analysis is not exhaustive. It does not for example consider whether there are transport benefits to residents from the slightly more compact form of the town (though we know from other work - see for example Coombe and Simmonds (2000) - that whilst more compact urban forms may reduce the absolute **need** to travel, they do not in themselves significantly reduce **actual** travel, and may generate disbenefits through increased congestion). Certainly the benefits to residents would be much higher if the land protected from development was of high landscape value to many residents (for example, highly visible hills such as the North Downs escarpment) rather than just of agricultural value. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the net costs that Cheshire and Sheppard estimate suggests both a need to consider more thoroughly how the planning system affects the well-being of residents, and that the differences between alternative plans for a given area could have significant impacts on that well-being.

Avoiding targets?

One of the consequences of more rigorous assessment of the benefits flowing (or failing to flow) from alternative plans would be to diminish the emphasis on targets - for housing, for reuse of brownfield land, and so on. Targets are generally pernicious as components in planning - they imply artificially high values on achieving whatever is identified as the target, and artificially low values thereafter, as well as artificially low values on anything which is not given a corresponding target. It is just possible that the target figures of 20,000 extra houses in Bassetshire over the next 15 years is the optimum number, but it is much more likely that an extra 1,000 houses above that figure would yield additional benefits - but neither contention can be considered without assessment both of the costs and of the direct and indirect implications of the kinds of houses that are being delivered.

Consider economic consequences of land-use planning actions

As described above, the DfT's Wider Economic Benefit methodology identifies a range of effects which transport changes can have on economic performance. Some of these, notably the agglomeration effects and the economic consequences of increasing employment in more rather than less productive areas, imply that economic benefits will flow from land-use planning interventions which increase agglomeration and allow more jobs to be located in most productive areas. Whilst we see a need for improvements in the methodology used to forecast these effects, it would seem important to consider these consequences for land-use plans as well as for transport plans.

Take account of social impacts arising from WEB effects

Whilst the guidance on WEBs is an important step forward in transport (and possibly land-use) appraisal, there are as noted above aspects which seem to conflict with other planning objectives. This comment splits into two parts:

- ❑ much of the WEB analysis is identifying extra effects which are not normally modelled, such as lower commuting costs increasing net wages for potential workers, inducing them to fill otherwise unfilled jobs (or alternatively reducing real wage costs, leading to an increase in the number of jobs offered by employers) - which will result in more commuting, more congestion etc - these are effects which should ideally be **forecast** (modelled) (if only to show that the environmental consequences of induced economic growth have been taken into account)
- ❑ other aspects may remain strictly in the appraisal, eg the WEB methodology generally implies that it is beneficial to move jobs from an area of low incomes to an area of high incomes, whereas on social grounds a great deal of regional and planning policy effort has gone into trying to achieve the exact opposite - if WEB benefits based on moving jobs to more prosperous areas are to be accepted, the social disbenefits of doing so should at least be recognized and preferably quantified.

Avoiding circularity?

As discussed earlier, the present WebTAG guidance specifies that the appraisal of transport schemes and policies should (in effect) credit the intervention with generating additional benefit if that intervention helps to implement the relevant national, regional or local land-use policies and plans. In some studies the focus has been on whether the land-use and economic impacts of the transport intervention will help to achieve the published planning objectives, but in many cases the process is simply one of seeing whether the transport scheme has itself been included in the previous planning documents.

This leads to the risk that the relatively rigorous transport appraisal process can assume that a transport intervention is of greater benefit simply because it has been included in a less-rigorously appraised list of schemes elsewhere. The logic should be to assess the contribution of the scheme to meeting the objectives of the planning document other than those which are (fully) assessed in the transport appraisal - this would require that the planning objectives to which the transport scheme is intended to contribute should be more clearly set out in the planning process

Avoiding hard boundaries?

The argument for economic impacts to be considered by looking only at impacts on regeneration areas seems weak, especially in the absence of any clear definition of what actually constitutes a regeneration area. The present approach seems to ignore

- ❑ the potential for negative impacts of a transport intervention (which might actually push an economically struggling area into a state where it would need to be declared a regeneration area in response!)
- ❑ the effect of other policy measures - for example, a particular transport intervention can be regarded as generating additional benefits because it is expected to have positive impacts on a regeneration area even if other (non-transport) policies are in place which should overcome the problems which have led to the regeneration area being declared (and may do so before the transport intervention is likely to be implemented).

The original SACTRA (1999) recommendation that economic impacts should be considered in all significant cases and for all areas still appears valid.

CONCLUSIONS

Where we may be going wrong

This purpose of this Chapter is not to argue to that “planning” (of land-use and transport together) has necessarily gone badly wrong – though this may be happening. To make such a case it would be necessary to examine actual outcomes, not just the guidance on methods which are used as part of the decision-making process. However, it does argue that there is a potential for planning to go wrong on the basis of current methods and approaches, and evidence for concern about this.

These concerns stem from the discrepancy in methods of appraisal. The most apparent is that the land-use planning system pays little formal concern to its own impacts on the “consumers” of land-use, particularly on residents in terms of the price and space standards of housing. The Barker Report proposes some changes to pay more attention to price, but little in respect of standards of internal or external space. It seems inconsistent that so much attention is paid to using land and capital to allow people to save a minute per trip as they move around, but so little attention is paid to the possible use of land and capital to allow them to enjoy an extra square metre of house or garden space while they stay at home. We are perhaps in danger of producing urban structures and housing stocks which are ever less satisfactory to the people living in them, mainly in order to protect agricultural land of very limited economic, ecological or aesthetic value.

The more formal processes of appraisal in transport planning practice do take account of both the accumulated impacts on individual consumers and (through the integration and Economic Impact Report components) of wider objectives of planning policy. The increasing emphasis on economic impacts - particularly the assessment of Wider Economic Benefits – does however risk crediting transport projects with “benefits” which run directly counter to wider planning policies, especially those land-use/economic planning policies which are concerned with trying to redistribute prosperity to poorer areas rather than with supporting the further growth of areas that are already flourishing.

Some ways in which we might do better

This Chapter does not attempt to prescribe exactly how land-use planning and transport planning should be better integrated. The author’s argument is that whilst the case of integration of land-use and transport planning is well established, even self-evident, the very different approaches that are taken to the formal processes of making choices, and the radically different criteria that are applied, make it unlikely that attempts at integration will succeed in identifying which plans will do most for the welfare of the people affected. More attention to the impacts on welfare, both in land-use planning generally and in the integration of land-use and transport planning, would appear essential to achieving better results. This is not to

downplay the importance of the wide range of objectives which both types of planning seek to address, and it is certainly not to suggest that narrowly conventional economic objectives should be pursued to the exclusion of anything else. The social and redistributive elements of planning remain important, and the value of measures which have a progressive rather than a regressive effect should be properly recognized. This however requires more rigorous assessment of the benefits arising in the planning process, which probably involves quantifying and monetising a wider range of effects, and more rigorous analysis of how – and whether – they flow from the decisions being made.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to colleagues at DSC and elsewhere for previous discussions of the ideas presented here. He remains solely responsible for any errors of fact or lapses in judgement. All of the opinions expressed are personal ones.

REFERENCES

- Gallent, N (2007): Regional household projections and strategic housing allocations. In H Dimitriou and R Thompson (eds): *Strategic planning for regional development in the UK: a review of principles and practice*. Routledge, London.
- Cheshire, P and S Sheppard (2002): The welfare economics of land use planning. *Journal of Urban Economics*, vol 52 pp 242–269.
- Coombe, D and D C Simmonds (2000): The transport implications of alternative urban forms. In Burton E, M Jenks, K Williams (eds): *Achieving sustainable urban form*. Spon, London.
- David Simmonds Consultancy and John Bates Services (2001): *Appraisal in land-use/transport interaction: design*. Report to the Government Office for the North-West (England). Available at www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_transstrat/documents/downloadable/dft_transstrat_028647.pdf
- Eddington, R (2006): *Transport's role in sustaining the UK's productivity and competitiveness*. HMSO, London.
- SACTRA (Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment) (1999): *Transport and the economy*. HMSO, London.

