

## Why the U-Turn on Sustainable Transport?

*Michael Cabill\**

In 1997 the newly elected Labour government promised a “New Deal” on transport involving a clear commitment to a sustainable, integrated transport system. Walking and cycling would be prioritized together with public transport, and demand management would be used to persuade people to use their cars less. Ten years later there are millions more cars on the roads, walking and cycling have continued to decline, and there are major concerns about reduced physical activity among the U.K. population and the associated increase in obesity levels. At least one of the environmental consequences of this car-dependent transport system is now widely recognized: carbon emissions from transport amount to 28 percent of the total of national carbon emissions. Ten years after recently resigned British Prime Minister Tony Blair’s victory came into office seems an appropriate time to consider why the Labour government failed to meet the challenge of producing a sustainable transport system. Why did Labour abandon its “New Deal” on transport, and what does this u-turn tells us about the difficulties of achieving environmental change in the U.K.?

### **Automobility**

Over the last decade, the environmental and social problems resulting from the U.K. transport system have gotten steadily worse with more pollution, congestion, and reduced access for those without cars. The privatized bus and rail companies have proved inadequate to the challenges they face. Created by the Conservative governments of Margaret Thatcher and John Major, the private bus and rail companies have not had social nor environmental objectives at the top of their agenda. In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the advent of mass motoring in the U.K. remade the country, producing a freedom and accessibility for drivers but also reducing the ability of non-drivers to travel and participate in society. The car transformed the way we shop, travel to work, and where we live. By the 1960s, both the Conservative Party and the Labour Party, Britain’s two main political parties, were committed to car ownership just as much as home ownership. Although as early as 1962, the Buchanan Report warned what the motorization of the U.K. was doing to the urban landscape, there was little critical discussion of the process.

As the numbers using buses and trains declined, so did walking and cycling journeys, though governments gave little thought to where this was leading. Both main political parties were committed to extending the benefits of car ownership to as many people as possible. Yet this promise of mobility for all was never going to be achieved. The ranks of non-motorists are many and include those with certain physical disabilities, frail elderly people, those who cannot afford a car or who do not want to drive, and every child in the country. Mass motoring has produced new social divisions between those with access to cars and those without and exacerbated others—the majority of the carless are from the lowest income quintile. As of 2006, the total number of vehicles on U.K. roads was 32.9 million. And despite ever increasing consensus about global warming, private car numbers continue to rise—from 2 million in 1951 to more than 26 million in 2005.

From the 1950s the advent of mass motoring began to redraw the map of Britain. There were large-scale population movements to the suburbs, rural, and semi-

rural locations. Out-of-town retail parks emerged, which drained the economic and social life out of numerous towns and city centers. Journeys to work stretched to cover longer travelling distances as firms relocated to the suburbs and the countryside. The U.K. is now an automobile society in which the car provides the principal means of communication and access. These spatial changes were accompanied by a growing social and psychological attachment to the car. The freedom to travel when and wherever one wants is something many motorists cherish, and it probably explains the resonance of appeals to “the freedom of the motorist” whenever the government proposes a measure that will improve safety—be that wearing seatbelts or installing speed cameras on the roads. This psychological attachment to the car has become a part of some motorists’ identity, as essential to them as the clothes they wear.

### **Political responses**

In response to rising congestion, in 1989 the Thatcher government inaugurated, to quote the then Transport Secretary, the “biggest road building program since the Romans.” This statement was based on the principle of “predict and provide”—that is, predict how many people will want to drive and then build the roads to accommodate the extra traffic. Improving transport links was seen as vital to growing the economy and providing “roads for prosperity.”

But a more skeptical view was taken by some transport planners who advocated the “new realism” in transport policy. This view accepted that demand management, not more road building, was the way forward, because Britain, being a small, crowded island, could not accommodate the extra road space required. While in opposition, Labour embraced many of the “new realist” ideas—John Prescott MP, then the Labour shadow transport minister, wrote the introduction to a collection of essays by environmental transport campaigners. When Labour came to power in 1997, it took the bold step of integrating the transport and environment ministries into the Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions, with John Prescott at its head.

The new ministry’s Transport White Paper, *A New Deal for Transport*, produced in 1998, aimed to get people out of their cars and onto public transport. It was announced as a sustainable transport plan for the U.K. and contained the following pronouncement: “We also need a transport system which doesn’t damage our health and provides a better quality of life now—for everyone—without passing onto future generations a poorer world.” And integrated transport was to mean “integration with our policies for education, health and wealth creation so that transport helps to make a fairer, more inclusive society.”

The White Paper’s proposals were embodied in the Transport Act of 2000. But in crucial ways this legislation was a disappointment. *A New Deal for Transport* had promoted road pricing—workplace parking charges and other measures to reduce the attraction of car use—but the Transport Act conferred these powers on local authorities rather than introducing a national scheme. Local authorities knew such policies would be unpopular with the electorate, and this was confirmed when a referendum in Edinburgh rejected a congestion-charging scheme. Only London and Durham (with a very limited plan) succeeded in introducing road charging.

Political leadership was needed, and in London this was provided by Mayor Ken Livingstone, who has shown how effective congestion charges are in reducing traffic. In

the central London area covered by the charge, in four years overall traffic levels have gone down 15 percent. Car, van and truck traffic are 30 percent lower, while congestion levels have fallen by 20 percent. Further inducements away from cars included large-scale investment in buses and bus lanes, cycle lanes, the underground system, trains and trams, stricter parking restrictions, and free travel for children and adults over 60.

However, leadership at the national level has been absent. In 1992, the Conservative government of John Major introduced an escalating fuel tax under which the cost of petrol increased by 5 percent over the cost of inflation each year. This measure succeeded in reducing increases in traffic growth. But in 2000, an alliance of farmers and road haulers protested the cost of fuel, causing widespread disruption by blockading fuel depots. The government offered no environmental arguments in support of the measure. In fact, the following year the escalating fuel tax was abandoned. The integrated transport perspective proposed in the “New Deal for Transport” gave way to a 10-year plan in 2000, which was conspicuously biased toward private car use. It even included a program of road building, which many had thought was a thing of the past. It foresaw a continued increase in vehicle ownership projected over the next 25 years, with a rise in traffic levels of 1 percent a year. Furthermore, it predicted a reduction in motoring costs of 20 percent by 2010.

The Conservatives had severely curtailed their road-building program in the 1990s in the face of opposition from an alliance of eco-activists and Tory voters in the shires. In 1997 Labour was also committed to cutting back on road building. How different this now looks with 150 road schemes either approved or under construction—four times as many when Labour came to power in 1997.

## **Flying**

The social and environmental damage produced by the car resulted from a road-building program premised on “predict and provide.” The same formula underlies the government’s approach to air travel. In line with its acceptance of the requirements imposed by the global market, New Labour thinking on aviation is distinguished by a priority given to the economic payoff for the country in being a major hub for international air travel. The government’s aviation policy, outlined in the Aviation White Paper of 2003, is based on a projected growth from 200 million air passenger movements in 2003 to around 470 million in 2030. In the ten years between 1990 and 2000, the carbon emissions from U.K. aviation doubled. The U.K. generates more flights than any other European country. A fifth of all international air passengers worldwide are on flights that arrive or leave from U.K. airports. Cairns and Newson conclude:

Much of the recent expansion in flying has occurred because better off people are flying more often. There is little evidence that those on low incomes are flying more; flying cannot be regarded as a socially inclusive activity.

This is reinforced by the data released by the Civil Aviation Authority, which showed that people from the top three social classes take on average more than four times as many flights each year than those in the bottom three social classes. Emerging evidence on the impact of various forms of transport on carbon emissions reveals that air travel accounts for 70 percent of passenger transport climate change impact at the individual level.

This work would seem to show that a relatively small number of people—frequent flyers—are making a major contribution to carbon emissions. As a result, taxes on flights, fuel and airports would seem appropriate. Yet there seems little enthusiasm for this among the British government. Before he stepped down, Tony Blair ruled out this form of taxation on the grounds that it would prove unpopular with the electorate.

### **The Politics of Sustainable Transport**

Sustainable transport is transport that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own transport needs. We might say that the argument for sustainable transport was won in the 1990s. *A New Deal for Transport* stated that walking and cycling should be greatly encouraged, public transport was to be boosted, and demand management would be used to restrict traffic growth. So why is it that a Labour government that accepted this case is now building four times as many roads as the Conservative government planned?

*A New Deal for Transport* was a policy failure—a story of good ideas and laudable aims that produced little in the way of change. It would be too easy to blame the outcome on the power of the motoring lobby; it was more that a government acutely sensitive to public opinion did not want to alienate the electorate and was terrified of being seen as “anti-motorist.” Hence there was a lack of leadership in 2000 over the fuel protests, which could have provided an opportunity to make an environmental argument for higher fuel prices. The tabloid press is quick to condemn any “anti-motorist” sentiment it perceives in government, as it did, for instance, with its virulent campaign against speed cameras, which were intended to make the roads safer. The government’s policy on encouraging walking provides another good example of how its fear of the press’s reaction inhibits policy. Given the alarming rise in obesity, which has trebled since the 1980s, and the fact that almost two-thirds of all adults, approximately 31 million people, are either overweight or obese, there is widespread agreement from U.K. National Health Service professionals to transport planners that more needs to be done to encourage walking. The government cycling strategy of 1996, which set out ambitious targets to get more people cycling, was to have been followed by a walking strategy. The work was done and the strategy written, but it never appeared. The reason was that the government could not find a way to present it without it being ridiculed in the press as the “Ministry of Silly Walks” with accompanying pictures of John Cleese from Monty Python.

Having said this, one has to acknowledge the power of the motoring lobby, which derives, in part, from the ubiquity of motoring. Many motorists who are members of the Automobile Association (AA) or the Royal Automobile Club (RAC) for their breakdown services would not necessarily endorse the policy aims of the two organizations. Both the AA and the RAC have been very successful pressure groups with “insider” status at the Department for Transport. Car manufacturers, too, have always had a privileged relationship with government officials at Whitehall. Until the 1970s, the retention of motorcar manufacture by Britain was a point of national pride like the nuclear deterrent. Although the industry is now foreign controlled, the government remains keen to support car manufacture.

Car manufacturers are able to permeate the national consciousness with their message using enormous budgets for ever present advertisements in newspapers,

magazines, and on television. Any health promotion campaigns on the benefits of cycling and walking have difficulty competing against the budgets and the range of artistic talent at the disposal of the car firms. Though it's impossible to know the extent to which the pervasiveness of these advertising campaigns has contributed to car dependence among the U.K. population, one can surmise that they are a key part of the car industry's strategy.

Another part of the appeal of the car is that it is not only a means of transport but also a mobile entertainment center where one can play music, listen to the radio, and be insulated from the rest of the world. There are also compelling safety reasons for its attraction. For some people, particularly women, journeys on foot or on public transport can be frightening because of the fear of attack. The major increase in female employment has also strengthened the appeal of the car. Women are more likely than men to "chain" their journeys—to carry out a number of tasks in the course of one journey, for example, taking a child to school on the way to work, or shopping on the way home from work. These journeys are much more difficult, if not impossible using public transport.

It has been an axiom of transport policy for decades that a good transport system is essential for a growing economy. A variation on this theme is the argument that new roads can play a major part in the regeneration of an area—a view dismissed by Sir Rod Eddington, a former head of British Airways and the author of a government report in 2006 on the future of Britain's transportation infrastructure. Eddington argues that the skills base, stable macroeconomic conditions, and a good business environment are more important than new roads. Interestingly, he points out that if a national road-pricing scheme was already in force, 80 percent of the projected expenditure for new roads after 2015 would be unnecessary. As it is, new roads and bypasses often quickly exceed the traffic growth projections several years earlier than forecast, bearing out the view that traffic expands to fill the extra space available. For the longer term, one can find some optimism in the Eddington report's conclusions that road pricing will fall hardest on the private motorist, because it will make cycling, walking and the use of public transport more attractive. Eddington's major recommendation is that transport routes to airports and ports be improved, as these are the "gateways" in a global economy. However, he is unduly sanguine regarding the contribution that transport should play in cutting carbon emissions, and claims that major cuts will not be necessary before 2050. Yet by Eddington's cost-benefit yardstick, walking and cycling schemes are commended.

Despite Eddington's encouragement of alternative, sustainable modes of transport, much of the resistance to them comes from local business people. Too often they believe that walking and cycling priorities—pedestrianized streets, traffic restrictions, and cycle ways—will be damaging to their businesses. This is particularly the case with small shopkeepers, despite sufficient and growing evidence to show that these fears are, on the whole, unwarranted.

The early 21<sup>st</sup> century has seen a revival of interest in public space—sometimes referred to as the public realm—and a belated recognition by many local authorities that out-of-town shopping, privatized malls, and multi-story car parks, while catering for the car, have squeezed the life out of many urban environments. The planned cities of the last 50 years, which have accommodated the car, have created many zoned areas that become "dead space"—places where people are often afraid to venture after the shops shut for the evening. Providing walking routes through cities and pedestrianized

precincts and squares offer a way of revitalizing the public spaces of our cities. In this respect, local authorities are learning from their European neighbors. Copenhagen, for example, made a conscious decision from the early 1960s to gradually introduce car-free areas. Brighton has hired Jan Gehl who designed such improvements in pedestrian areas in the center of the city. There is a growing literature on how to put (human) life back into our cities, and cycling and walking are central to this.

Both cycling and walking have the advantage of not producing carbon emissions and are also an excellent way to maintain physical fitness. The decline in cycling and walking among the British population is one of the reasons for the alarming rise in obesity levels, along with poor diet and sedentary leisure activities. Currently a quarter of adults are obese, and it is estimated that by 2010, if current trends continue, one-third of adults and one-fifth of all children will be obese. When one bears in mind that most journeys are under five miles, the case for walking and cycling is strong. Yet this is not reflected in the spending priorities of the highways authorities which continue to spend the bulk of their budgets on road schemes and road maintenance.

### **Cycling**

The 1996 National Cycling Strategy (NCS) was designed not only to halt the decline in cycling but also provide an action plan to revive cycling as an accepted mode of transport. The NCS wanted cycling trips to double by 2002 and then double again by 2012. But the government abandoned these targets within a few years after concluding that they could not be achieved. Although properly segregated cycle lanes in towns and cities are a good example of ways to encourage cycling, on the whole, cycling initiatives tend to be low-cost and subordinated to car traffic needs. The creation of the National Cycle Network, which uses abandoned railway lines to provide car-free walking and cycling routes through the countryside, has been very successful. That's because one of the major reasons many people do not cycle is their fear of injury on heavily trafficked roads. The key to more people cycling is reducing speeds on roads, and there is an encouraging, if small, trend towards creating 20 mph zones in a number of urban areas.

### **Walking**

Walking has been one of the most underrated forms of transport and has experienced a marked decline in the U.K. over the last half century. Today Britons walk less than ever before. Walking now accounts for fewer than a quarter of all trips made in Great Britain. The average distance walked fell by 20 percent during the 1990s. Even so, 80 percent of trips under one mile are made on foot. Walking is the chief mode for that one-third of households—mostly those on low incomes—that do not have access to a car. About half of the trips taken by people in non-car owning households are on foot compared with one-quarter in households that have one car. In households with two or more cars, only one in six journeys are made on foot. Because people in non-car owning households usually travel on public transport, they tend to walk more, since nearly every public transport journey involves a walk. Another reason walking has declined is that there are fewer places to walk to. Beyond a certain distance, most people will regard a walking journey as unfeasible if it is too time-consuming. The closure of thousands of local food shops, post offices, chemists, newsagents, butchers, green grocers, and banks over the last 30 years has also likely contributed to the decline in walking and is a key dimension of social exclusion for those in the population who do not have access to a car.

The walking environment has been degraded by the priority given to cars in the planning of public space over the last half-century. As mentioned above, fear, not just of motor traffic but of street crime, is another factor in the decline of walking, especially by children. It is also perhaps the main reason many women will not contemplate walking journeys, particularly at night. More than 40 years ago in her classic book, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, the American writer Jane Jacobs argued that regular, informal contact in the streets supported community life—she called it the informal surveillance of the street. As car dependence becomes the norm, far fewer people walk, reducing further that informal surveillance.

There is a paradox in the treatment of walking. Though walking lacks the prestige, status, and esteem afforded to motoring, it is increasingly being recognized as an excellent form of aerobic exercise and a necessary activity to reverse the decline in the physical fitness of the U.K. population and the rise in obesity. Yet, there are still few resources devoted to promote walking by central or local government—e.g., pavement repairs, measures to restrict traffic, and the like—compared to the large sums spent on road building and highway maintenance. Until the publication of the government’s “New Deal for Transport” White Paper in 1998, walking had been consistently ignored by transport planners, who had regarded transport as something that requires a machine, whether that be a car or a bike.

## Public spaces

The primacy given to the car beginning in the 1950s meant that cities and towns had to be rearranged, redeveloped, and rebuilt in order to accommodate cars. The resulting decentralization of jobs, services and shops dependant on the rise of mass-motoring culture has drained the lifeblood from many cities and towns. Now after half a century of relative neglect, government policy is to reinvigorate urban centers. This policy shift creates some hope for sustainable transport, since historically, streets in large urban settlements were much more populated, as people walked to and from mass transit systems. The Rogers report, *Towards an Urban Renaissance*, points out that streets were used for a variety of purposes, including children’s play and meeting people. In order to reclaim “the potential of the ‘street’ to meet many different community needs, as opposed simply to providing a conduit for motor vehicles,” streets need to be opened up to other activities.

As would be expected, there is a strong connection between being poor and living in an area with poor public spaces. In the 88 most deprived U.K. neighborhoods, twice as many houses were affected by poor air quality as in other districts. The proportion of litter, rubbish, dumping, and vandalism are all greater. Williams and Green, citing the evidence from the English House Condition Survey—the primary source of evidence on the state of housing—remark: “Poor public space positively correlates with poor housing and hence poor health.” In these areas, although it is sometimes hazardous to walk, there is a high percentage of walking journeys. For example, Hine and Mitchell’s study of three deprived areas in Scotland found walking to be “a very significant mode of transport.”

The car has changed our valuation of time. Walking generally has a low valuation because of the increased time it takes that could be spent on more important activities.

Frequently, however, those dependent on cars will not be able to walk to facilities, because they are too far away, or if they live in a rural location, there may not be any pavement. In the transport world of the multi-car household, most facilities are a drive away. Walking is often something done on a treadmill at the out-of-town fitness club: 89 percent of visits to these venues are by car. With the assumption of motor car access and streets that are off-limits to the general public, gated communities are a logical development in this lifestyle.

### **Children, Space and Transport**

Walking is a key achievement in a child's life, ranking alongside the acquisition of language. Unfortunately, the opportunities young children have to walk have been severely constrained over the last few decades. For older children, their ability to travel independently of their parents has declined markedly, which for them means that often their bike will be more of a plaything than a form of transport. The age at which parents give their children permission to travel independently is now much higher than it was in the past. Children who live in the most socially disadvantaged areas are those most likely to walk and to be the victims of serious injury and death. There is a clear social class gradient in the accident and mortality statistics. Grayling, et al. estimated that the likelihood of a child pedestrian injury was four times higher in the most deprived ward in England compared to the least deprived, partly because "children in more deprived areas are more likely to make more journeys on foot because their parents are less likely to have a car and more likely to play on the street unsupervised because they are less likely to have access to gardens or other safe play areas."

In interviews with children, Thomas and Thompson found that loss of play space was the number one complaint about their local environment. Mayer Hillman refers to the removal of local play space as the loss of the "informal class room," a place in which children can discover and learn about the world for themselves or with friends. This matters on a daily basis for children, and occasional visits to a theme park do not in any way compensate them. Play space is important for children not only psychologically but also for their physical fitness, which has been threatened in no small part by the fear that now surrounds their lives. To some extent this has been compounded by the daily transport decisions of millions of adults not to walk and use the pavements, thus removing the informal surveillance they would otherwise provide to children playing on the street.

There has been a major erosion of children's rights in the local environment: the right to play in the street, the right to visit their friends without an adult escort, the right to ride their bike as a form of transport—i.e., to get to see their friends or go to the swimming pool. Ironically this occurred over the last 30 years as a discourse of "children's rights" became increasingly popular in social and education services. Despite that fact, no connection was made between the life children lived in schools and the life they lived outside school. Numerous surveys and studies of children's views on the environment tell the same story. Children want less traffic, better public transport, more green space, trees, dens, hiding places, and less litter.

The massive market research effort dedicated to obtaining children's preferences as purchasers of goods and services clearly shows that children are highly valued as consumers. Similarly, the school system has made much of listening to children's views on matters to do with school uniforms, discipline, and school organization. However,



children as a major group of non-motorists are ignored. The reason has much to do with their lack of power *vis-à-vis* the motoring lobby in addition to a complacency about the value of public space.

### **The Future of Sustainable Transport**

The trends increasingly point towards more cars on our roads and more people in the population being able to drive them. This is not surprising given the fall in the cost of motoring relative to public transport costs since 1980. The overall cost of motoring has in real terms remained at or below the 1980 level, while bus fares have risen by 31 percent and rail fares by 37 percent.

Adams has produced a compelling analysis of contemporary transport trends, which, if unchecked, will lead to “hyper-mobility.” Existing personal transport modes will, in turn, result in more anonymity, more gated communities, less exercise in daily routines, more crime, more surveillance, and—crucially—less democracy, as political institutions become international and global. This future is likely to emerge if the present mobility trends are allowed to continue without modification. These trends will also deepen social polarization.

Walking has been described as the “acid test” for the sustainable transport policy of this government, but it is also a challenge for those who wish to address the contribution of transport to social exclusion. The Social Exclusion Unit report on transport, *Making the Connections*, was justly criticized for overemphasizing the role of public transport in improving access to key facilities for those without cars, while failing to recognize the importance of walking and cycling. Other government policies on neighborhood renewal and sustainable communities are needed to help foster an environment that people feel safe walking in. Although the status of walking has steadily diminished over the last half century, if it is given priority, it could help revive many urban areas as well as play a significant role in improving the nation’s fitness.

Transport has to be seen as a network—a way of connecting people to each other and to businesses and services. But those businesses and services should not be allowed to position themselves so that the transport costs fall upon those least able to afford them. Land-use planning then becomes really important so that shops and key facilities are within convenient distances for those who rely on walking and public transport to get around. But in order to achieve this, policy-makers must ensure that there are safe and pleasant places for people to walk and cycle. The car has led to the decentralization of services, housing and retailing, and many people now live at a considerable distance from the necessities of daily life—shops, schools, health care. As long as public transport in the form of inconvenient bus schedules makes these journeys difficult, walking journeys will not be able to replace the car. So far the efforts of government to effect behavioral change in transport decisions have been notably unsuccessful. Government initiatives would find success if they were allied with environmental taxation, most obviously with road charging.

Part of the transport problem is that it has been viewed too often as a separate policy area when, in fact, it is a part of other policy areas such as health, social services and housing. Transport decisions are about the way we want to live. Too often the human being is subordinated to the car. Children, if left to their own devices, want to play near their house. Elderly people want to be able to walk along the pavements in

safety. And we all want to be able to cross the road without being killed. Ultimately, because of the need to curb carbon emissions, use of the car will have to be curtailed. This will be a painful adjustment if no alternative fuels can be found, since many people live in car-dependent areas where it is assumed that the car will be used for most activities. High-density urban living is needed to provide the population for shops and transport. Central to this will be good, safe walking and cycling routes. John Urry gives an unattractive account of our society: “Civil society is thus in part a ‘civil society of auto mobility,’ a civil society of quasi-objects or ‘car drivers,’ and much less of separate human subjects who can be conceived of as autonomous from their machines.”

Against this we can propose that mobility and access should be viewed as citizenship rights. T.H. Marshall argued that the welfare-state measures of the post-war Attlee government had produced social rights—to education, health, social services and social security for all citizens. Recent work has shown that the exercise of some of these rights is hampered by the inaccessibility of facilities and services to those who do not have access to a car. Public transport should provide a “national minimum” of mobility even though this would be unprofitable on certain services and routes.

New Labour had the policies to limit the environmentally damaging and socially divisive consequences of mass motoring, but not the political will. As we have seen with the London Congestion Charge, these measures can work, can reduce traffic, and make more money available for public transport. In spring 2007, an e-petition on the Downing Street web site against road pricing attracted an unprecedented 1.8 million signatures. The signatures were collected against a scheme that the government did not have in mind—a wholly new and additional tax on motorists—but it revealed the depth of opposition to the idea. In his reply to the e-petitioners, Blair announced that any scheme was at least ten years away, despite the fact that the technology exists now to implement a national scheme. If the government had the political will, it would substantially increase spending on public transport to enable people to make the switch to less environmentally damaging forms of transport. Sustainable transport has a vital role to play in transport policy. The present complacency of national government in relation to promoting cycling, walking, and the use of public transport will surely change as the enormity of the problem of climate change continues to unfold.