

## Summary

Integration is interpreted as having three distinct meanings for the purposes of appraisal:

- Transport integration;
- Transport land-use integration;
- Policy integration.

In appraising the *transport integration* impacts of a proposal, it is important to avoid double-counting items which will already be captured in Transport Economic Efficiency or Economic Activity and Location Impacts.

In services and ticketing, two thresholds are defined:

- Seamless public transport network (where the user's experience is of a single, genuinely integrated system);
- Seamless ticketing (where no barriers are presented to purchasing whole-journey tickets).

A greater variety of impacts can be expected within the categories of infrastructure, interchange layout and information. Planners are advised to use established benchmarks where possible and to quantify impacts as much as possible.

No transport integration impacts, over and above those covered under the economy objective, are envisaged as a result of freight proposals.

The appraisal of *land-use transport integration* is split between the two parts of the appraisal process. In Part 1, planners must test a proposal for its fit with established local/structure plans and consult with key stakeholders on their views.

In Part 2, a more active transport assessment should be carried out in accordance with established planning policy to gauge the likely impacts of a proposal in terms of existing and planned land-use developments.

For *policy integration*, a series of checks is specified to establish the proposal's impact in terms of integration with Government policy outside those areas already captured under the other objectives:

- The proposal's fit with the aims of wider (non-transport) government policies and national transport targets should be tested in Part 1;
- Any genuinely additional benefits in the context of Scottish policy on disability, health and rural matters should be identified in Part 2, together with further social inclusion impacts.

## 9. INTEGRATION

### 9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 In *Travel Choices for Scotland*, the following was said about integrated transport:

“We see an integrated transport policy encompassing:

- integration within and between different modes of transport - so that each contributes its full potential and people and goods can move easily between them;
- integration of transport with the environment - so that our transport choices support a better environment;
- integration between transport and land-use planning - at the Scotland and local level, so that the two work together to support more sustainable travel choices and reduce the need to travel;
- integration of transport and our policies for education, health and wealth creation - to make a fairer, more inclusive society.”

9.1.2 Of these four interpretations, integration between transport and the environment is dealt with under the Environment objective and is covered in Chapter 6. Integration with social inclusion is dealt with under the Accessibility and Social Inclusion chapter and described in Chapter 10. Leading on from this, therefore, the Integration objective has three specific interpretations:

- Transport integration – the degree to which a proposal fits with other transport infrastructure and services;
- Transport-land-use integration – the fit between the proposal and established land-use plans and land-use/transport planning guidance;
- Policy integration – the appropriateness of the proposal in light of wider policies both of central and local Government.

9.1.3 These are quite different in both concept and scope and therefore require separate treatment in the appraisal process. They are considered in turn.

#### **Transport Integration**

9.1.4 In its fullest sense, transport integration has wide implications for the mobility of people or goods. An integrated transport system aids accessibility by connecting people to opportunities and goods to markets with the minimum of fuss. This is the source of the concept of the “seamless journey”. But the need to interchange is a fact for a great many journeys made by bus, train or a combination of both. Interchange is also a necessary feature of any inter-modal freight movement and one which carries a cost. Finally, facilities such as Park & Ride by their nature imply an interchange between the car (or other mode used to access the site) and the public transport vehicle which completes the journey.

- 9.1.5 With very few exceptions, efforts which improve the process of interchange confer a benefit on both those already making a journey and those who are attracted to using the facilities as a result of the improvement. Many of the changes in the costs of interchange are accounted for in cost-benefit analysis carried out in the Transport Economic Efficiency exercise (TEE) (see Chapter 8). There is therefore a need to be vigilant that double-counting does not take place when carrying out appraisal under this sub-objective.
- 9.1.6 The guidance in this chapter concentrates on those aspects of transport interchange which are genuinely additional to those which are captured by the TEE. They largely relate to matters of quality, comfort and co-ordination.

### **Land-Use Transport Integration**

- 9.1.7 The relationship between land use and transport planning needs close attention. Many of the decisions driving land use are long-term, leading to an assumption that most transport planning exercises should look on the land-use scenario as a fixed input. This ignores the fact that developments in travel behaviour in recent decades have been greatly influenced by the locations and types of land use. It could be argued, in fact, that the land-use-transport relationship has been neglected in the past, leading to development decisions which have promoted car use and compromised the capacity of those without a car to get to important destinations.
- 9.1.8 The natural conclusions of this discussion are twofold: that a positive approach to land use and transport planning can pay significant dividends in environmental and social terms; and that it is very important to appraise this aspect of a proposal adequately.
- 9.1.9 A major aspect of the land-use-transport relationship is accounted for by the effects of transport actions upon the functioning of the economy. These are separately dealt with under the Economy objective under the heading of Economic Activity and Location Impacts (EALIs), dealt with in Chapter 8.
- 9.1.10 Developments in UK and Scottish Government policy in recent years have provided a clear framework for the integration of land use and transport planning with a focus on sustainability and reducing the need to travel. The appraisal process outlined in this guidance follows the principles of this policy.

### **Policy Integration**

- 9.1.11 Education, health and wealth creation are all cited in *Travel Choices for Scotland* as being policy areas of concern when planning transport. This reflects the simple observation that transport decisions have wide impacts upon communities.
- 9.1.12 Whilst the other aspects of the appraisal process will capture the vast majority of a proposal's impacts, there is a need to consider the proposal against a wider policy context. The challenge is to avoid an overly cumbersome appraisal structure which strives to cover all facets of Government policy, but at the same time to identify key impacts beyond the areas captured in the body of the appraisal. The guidance

below reflects a pragmatic approach; planners will need to assess which policy issues are relevant and therefore deserve attention.

## 9.2 Transport Integration

### Introduction

9.2.1 Given the remarks at §9.1.5 concerning the degree to which the TEE can be expected to capture costs and benefits of transport interchange, any impacts recorded under this sub-objective can only be identified if planners can confidently answer “yes” to the following two questions:

- Is there an identifiable impact upon transport interchange resulting from this proposal?
- Is it definitely the case that some aspect(s) of this impact will *not* be captured by the TEE or another aspect of the appraisal?

9.2.2 The text supporting the AST will need to include a brief explanation as to why the planners have answered yes to both. If the answer to one or the other is “no”, planners should write “no impacts” in the relevant box on the AST.

### Movement of People

9.2.3 The relevant aspects of transport interchange from the point of view of appraisal can be divided into the following two broad categories:

- Services and ticketing;
- Infrastructure and information.

#### *Services and Ticketing*

9.2.4 This is the area in which it is particularly important to avoid double-counting. The following impacts of a proposal on transport interchange should already be accounted for in the TEE:

- Time savings resulting from better co-ordination of services;
- Reliability improvements (and, potentially, losses) resulting from the establishment of procedures for holding one service for the arrival of another;
- Monetary cost savings from the introduction of through ticketing;
- Savings of time and interchange penalties resulting from the introduction of through services.

9.2.5 This leaves relatively little that can be identified under this category. Planners may argue that there are benefits in the following two areas:

- Where public transport services have been co-ordinated to the extent that a claim can be made for “seamless” movement across a network (and if there is confidence that this level of integration will endure), it is legitimate to describe the system as a “seamless public transport network”. This reflects the view that the

seamlessness confers benefits additional to those resulting from savings and new patronage;

- Where ticketing across a network is made more convenient and simpler as a result of integration regardless of any discounts which may accrue to the user, a benefit entitled “seamless ticketing” can be argued for.

9.2.6 Neither of these claims can be made lightly. The extent of integration in each case will need to be considerable and should be supported by shared branding and whole-journey information. In both cases, planners should expect arrangements to be founded upon formal quality partnerships or other agreements of similar robustness.

#### *Infrastructure and Information*

9.2.7 These two aspects relate to what is provided at an interchange point independently of which buses or trains visit the site.

9.2.8 It is expected that most impacts which are genuinely additional to those captured elsewhere in the appraisal will fall into this category. In the case of Park & Ride schemes and other proposals which facilitate interchange between private and public transport, it is likely that all additional impacts will fall into this category.

9.2.9 Planners should first ask whether there is an established benchmark against which to assess the value of the proposal. For example, Railtrack’s *Developing Modern Facilities at Stations* (1998) could be used as a best practice guide for railway interchange improvements. Citing the achievement of established performance thresholds will make it easier for Ministers to arrive at a balanced judgement of the proposal’s value.

9.2.10 Planners should then embark on attempting to classify the impacts. The following is a list of typical areas of impact:

- Quality of infrastructure: waiting areas, amenities on site (such as toilets, refreshment areas and shops), quantity and quality of seating;
- Layout: distances between boarding points, changes of level, widths of corridors, physical accessibility/barrier-free design, weather protection;
- Information: provision of accessible information, provision of whole-journey information, accuracy of information (e.g. real-time), signing between points.

9.2.11 Security is not considered here since it should have been adequately covered in the appraisal of safety (Chapter 7).

9.2.12 It is sometimes the case that detailed research will have been carried out to assess the willingness of individuals to pay for qualitative improvements such as those listed above. Planners should make full use of such data to derive a quantitative measure of impact if possible, *unless* the data has been included in generalised cost measures for journeys and the impact is therefore implicit in the TEE. Equally, where attitudinal information is available concerning the value placed by actual and

potential users on qualitative improvements, this should be to the fore in the presentation of findings.

- 9.2.13 The preference should be for quantitative information over qualitative, provided that the quantities adequately capture the types of benefit. And where it is possible to make reasonable estimates of the value of such benefits, this should be done.

### **Movement of Goods**

- 9.2.14 It is unlikely that any interchange impact in terms of freight movement will be truly additional to those captured by other aspects of the appraisal, for the simple reason that freight movement is governed by commercial decision-making, reflecting time, cost, security and reliability. A better freight interchange will show its value in the business it attracts and the time savings it produces.
- 9.2.15 Where planners are confident that a freight scheme has interchange impacts which are genuinely additional, they can identify them in this section of the AST, ensuring that accompanying text clearly sets out the rationale for the claim.

### **Presentation of Information**

- 9.2.16 The qualitative nature and diversity of the impacts described, defies a uniform style of presentation. Planners should, however, attempt to quantify the number of passenger journeys in a given period (probably a year) affected by impacts on the movement of people. As stated at §9.2.12, survey information should be cited where available, as should performance against any established benchmarks. In particular, where interchange facilities have been made fully accessible, it is desirable to identify this explicitly. Other than this, planners should identify the categories from the list cited at §9.2.10 under which impacts have been identified, saying in each case whether the impact is positive or negative.
- 9.2.17 The two categories “seamless public transport network” and “seamless ticketing” constitute special cases and should be identified separately from any individual category of impact.

## **9.3 Land-Use Transport Integration**

### **Introduction**

- 9.3.1 Most of the guidance that follows is directed at the identification and, where appropriate, amelioration of any conflicts between the proposal and planning policy. But planners should not ignore consideration of whether the proposal might bring benefits in terms of facilitating the achievement of land use aspirations.
- 9.3.2 A preliminary appraisal of the proposal’s fit with established land use policy and environmental designations at a local and, where appropriate, national level, should be carried out in Part 1 of the appraisal. This will allow any serious conflicts to be identified early and so avoid any wasted effort in working up a proposal which is not viable. In its most specific sense, this is a test of whether any land required for the proposal is preserved for uses which are entirely incompatible with transport. There

is a second, more general question of whether the proposal fits with the policies of local authorities and the Scottish Executive concerning transport and land use. If, however, objectives for the transport planning exercise have been derived in accordance with the advice in Chapter 2, problems should be unlikely to arise.

9.3.3 Whilst the Part 1 appraisal will largely determine the proposal's performance under this sub-objective, there is scope for additional analysis to be carried out in Part 2. It may be appropriate to do this, for example, where a proposal has not been precisely located until the later part of a study; here it would be necessary to revisit planning policy once a final location or alignment was proposed to check that no conflicts arose.

9.3.4 The main aspect of appraisal under this sub-objective consists of comparison and consultation. But planners should show a more general awareness of the need to promote sustainability and reduce the need to travel, by identifying key relationships between the proposal and relevant existing or future developments and analysing them in sufficient detail.

### **Policy Comparison**

9.3.5 In any transport planning exercise, there will exist statutory documents concerning planning which should be checked as a matter of course to establish any spatial conflicts. In the exercises to which this guidance relates, development plans comprising the following are likely to feature:

- Structure plans;
- Local plans.

Any Environmental Report produced for SEAs of plans or programmes should be referred to for commitments and objectives.

9.3.6 Planners should take care to establish with confidence the nature and gravity of any spatial conflicts between the proposal under consideration and established planning policy at either level. But because this will ordinarily form part of the Part 1 appraisal, it is not appropriate to grade the compatibility. Rather, it will be necessary to record the conflict and to take a view as to whether it would be likely to jeopardise the feasibility of the proposal. This question can be more readily answered following the consultation described below.

9.3.7 Planners should give most credence to statutory documents (remembering that the approved structure plan and adopted local plan represents an authority's legal position). But they should take proper account of the age of a given policy for example, a local plan which is more than five years old may well be near obsolete and they should therefore take proper account of the policies being developed to replace it.

9.3.8 In addition to these documents, there exist a number of Scottish Planning Policy statements (SPPs), replacing the series of National Planning Policy Guidelines (NPPGs) which should also be examined to ensure compatibility. The key document, which should be used in all planning exercises, is NPPG17, *Transport*

and Planning and its addendum SPP17 – *Transport and Planning, Maximum Parking Standards*. Planners should also refer to the accompanying Planning Advice Note, PAN57.

9.3.9 In addition, it may be desirable to consider:

- SPP2: *Economic Development*;
- SPP3: *Planning for Housing*;
- *West Edinburgh Planning Framework* (aimed at developing the area’s long-term co-ordinated plans to meet economic, transport and environmental needs);
- NPPG8: *Town Centres and Retailing*;
- NPPG14: *Natural Heritage*;
- NPPG15: *Rural Development*;
- PAN59: *Improving Town Centres*;
- PAN66: *Best Practice in Handling Planning Applications Affecting Trunk Roads*.

9.3.10 A full list can be viewed at [www.scotland.gov.uk/planning](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/planning) under the policy and advice menus. Planners may wish to consult with the Scottish Executive as to whether additional policy documents should also be consulted. They may also wish to follow the guidance on this topic set out in DMRB Volume 11.

### **Consultations**

9.3.11 It is typical for transport planning exercises to involve consultation with a number of stakeholders. In terms of transport-land-use planning integration, it is appropriate to target individuals involved in planning decisions at the local and, if the scope of the proposal demands it, regional level. Whilst there is no blueprint for this type of discussion, planners should aim to establish the following:

- Whether the proposal constitutes “the best fit possible” with planning objectives; and
- Whether any key stakeholder would have cause to oppose the proposal as presented.

9.3.12 It should be noted that there are specific consultation requirements for those proposals requiring SEA or EIA. These requirements are set out in, respectively: The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes (Scotland) Regulations 2004 and The Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999.

9.3.13 Where some material objection may exist, planners should go on to explore whether alterations to the proposal could resolve any conflict whilst still achieving the key objectives of the proposal within the context of local policies.

### **Pro-active Analysis**

9.3.14 For the Part 2 appraisal, planners should carry out a proper analysis of the relationship between the transport proposal and any major existing or proposed

developments likely to be affected. With an eye to the principles of sustainability and reducing the need to travel, they should investigate whether the proposal would be likely to increase or reduce the need to travel. . Where the chances are that more trips will be made or that existing trips are likely to lengthen, planners should investigate any mitigation measures which could be incorporated into the proposal in order to reduce this negative impact.

9.3.15 This process is well-established and is continuing to evolve. In effect, it is equivalent to the task of carrying out a transport assessment as described in NPPG17 and PAN57, though starting with a transport proposal rather than one focussed on land development. A Guide to Transport Assessment in Scotland is currently out to consultation. The methodology is therefore not repeated here. However the emphasis on identifying accessibility impacts in NPPG17 and PAN57 should be noted from two perspectives:

- the analysis undertaken for assessing accessibility and social inclusion impacts (Chapter 10) may assist;
- double counting with the accessibility and social inclusion criteria findings should be avoided.

9.3.16 Evidently, planners will need to gauge the degree of detail required in undertaking such analysis and it is important that they do not carry out detailed research unnecessarily. Again, this is a point on which NPPG17 and PAN57 provide useful advice.

9.3.17 It will be necessary for planners to provide a commentary in the Part 2 appraisal text. This should detail the process undergone, the sites thought likely to generate or attract more or longer car trips and the range of measures considered for mitigation. It should further relate the conclusions reached and the expected results of the mitigation measures decided upon.

### **Interdependence of Land-Use and Transport Proposals**

9.3.18 It is sometimes the case that land-use and transport proposals are worked up in tandem and that, in appraisal, a circular argument seems to arise whereby:

- The viability of the land-use proposal depends upon the implementation of the transport proposal;
- The viability of the transport proposal depends on the trips which would be generated by the land-use development.

9.3.19 Such a situation is bound to make it difficult to establish the true merits of either proposal. However, following on from NPPG17, the Scottish Executive published research in 2001 entitled *Key Sites Appraisal Methodology for Development Planning*. One of the key objectives of the guidance is to locate major travel generating uses so that they can support more sustainable travel patterns. Planners should refer to the guidance including the alternative terminologies to 'key sites' in chapter 7 relevant to the work being undertaken. Research published by the Executive includes *An Integrated Approach to the Transport and Land Use Planning Aspects of Development Applications* and is helpful background, for

example on transport assessment or travel plans. The following is proposed as a rule of thumb to help disentangle the respective impacts of the proposals:

- The total costs and benefits of the *combined* proposals should be appraised against the established *land use* objectives (probably set out in the local/structure plan) with the accompanying question: “could the land use objectives be better achieved by some other means (perhaps involving other transport proposals)?” Here, the *better achievement* of land use objectives should reflect a measure of value for money which will be a matter of judgement for the relevant land-use planners;
- The total costs and benefits of the *combined* proposals should also be appraised against the established transport planning objectives (see section 2.2) with the equivalent question: “could the transport planning objectives be better achieved by some other means?”

9.3.20 Where the answer to both questions is “yes” this would appear to present a mandate to reconsider the wisdom of both proposals, subject to the following further test. Two answers of “yes” imply that there exist preferable alternatives in each case. The combined costs and benefits of these alternatives should be looked at against those of the original combination. If the costs and benefits of the alternatives appear preferable to those of the original, this would strengthen the case for review. If not, there may be an argument for the original combination on the grounds of “net” savings. This would not be conclusive but the very exercise is likely to have prompted a sufficiently thorough analysis of the options to ensure that the precise relationship between component proposals is much better understood.

9.3.21 By the same token, if the answer to both is “no” there would seem good cause to proceed with both. In a mixed case, it would make sense to see the combined proposals as serving the aims for which they appear optimal (e.g. if a better way of meeting land-use objectives cannot be found then the package of land-use and transport proposals should be seen as serving land-use objectives first and foremost). This should help to clarify the appropriate planning and funding paths.

9.3.22 The totalling of costs and benefits is likely to be only nominally possible – it will probably be a process of juxtaposition rather than aggregation.

## 9.4 Policy Integration

### Introduction

9.4.1 As stated at §9.1.12, the need to keep this aspect of the appraisal tractable results in a straightforward process of checks to establish the fit of the proposal with wider Government policy.

9.4.2 In a Part 1 appraisal, all that is required is a simple check to see if the proposal is in harmony with the aims of wider (non-transport) government policies and national transport targets, and whether it would have an actively positive impact in terms of contributing towards these objectives.

9.4.3 For Part 2 of the appraisal, more detailed checks should be carried out in all cases because the relevant policy/legislation applies across Scotland. These checks

should not be confused with the accessibility and social inclusion impacts discussed in Chapter 10. The purpose here is to check for compliance with legislation and policy over and above the specific accessibility issues:

- *Disability*: though the requirements of the *Disability Discrimination Act 1995* will have been largely covered elsewhere in the appraisal, planners should briefly state whether the proposal has noteworthy impacts in terms of overcoming barriers for people with disabilities. Examples are that accessible vehicles are to be introduced in advance of the deadlines set in the Act or that station infrastructure will be enhanced beyond the requirements of the Act;
- *Health*: the health impacts of a transport proposal may be quite great, particularly if they lead to increased exercise on the part of a significant number of people. Planners should note instances of this, citing relevant legislation or policy as appropriate;
- *Rural Affairs*: recent policy sets out a vision for rural Scotland in which rural communities strengthen or remain strong through retention of population and access to essential services. The consideration of EALIs as set out in Chapter 8 will cover any impacts of a transport proposal as far as regeneration is concerned but where an expected impact is simply that a community or communities will not decline, this should be noted here.
- *Social Exclusion*: although the bulk of the social inclusion impacts will have been considered under the accessibility and social inclusion criterion (Chapter 10) there may be additional issues worth considering such as the opportunities for a training scheme to be offered through the transport proposal.

9.4.4 Similarly, when undertaking a Part 2 appraisal a more detailed assessment of the consistency of the proposal with national transport targets (e.g. for road traffic reduction) should now be feasible.

9.4.5 Planners should not feel limited by the range of policy areas listed above. It is perfectly legitimate to identify additional policy implications associated with a transport proposal.