

FINAL REPORT OF TRANSPORT POLICY GROUPSUMMARY1. Terms of Reference

The Group was set up with the following Terms of Reference:

- (i) To investigate means of promoting private sector initiatives, involvement and innovation in urban public transport, whether by bus, rail or other multi passenger vehicle; and to recommend measures of incentive or decontrol to encourage the rapid development of new and better services on this basis.
- (ii) To investigate further possibilities of privatisation in whole or in part of existing State and municipally owned transport undertakings.
- (iii) To apply the above approach to related suburban, local and rural transport services.

2. Membership

The Group consisted of the following members:

Mr John Lee MP (Chairman)
Mr Sydney Chapman MP
Mr Barry Porter MP
Mrs Margaret Hook
Mr Jan Hildreth
Sir Donald Walters
Mr John Tweddle
Miss Katharine Marsh (Secretary)

3. General Observations

The Group met on 12 occasions from January to March 1983 and meetings generally lasted for an hour. The Group regrets that because of the tight time scale and limited resources it was not able to pursue some lines of investigation which might have yielded interesting material for the Report. In particular, with more time, the Group would like to have looked at developments and experiments in other countries.

Nevertheless, the Group managed to reach a broad degree of unanimity on nearly all the main themes and recommendations of the Report. The Report can therefore be seen as reflecting the thinking of all members of the Group.

4. Main Themes

During the Group's discussions on specific areas of policy, some common themes emerged. These were:

- a) That both in political and practical terms the main problem which needs to be tackled is not primarily how to move towards privatisation and deregulation, but how to ensure better public transport, better service for the customer and a more cost effective use of resources.
- b) That in order to fulfil the objectives in (a) public transport should be more publicly accountable. Greater accountability can be achieved with a general move away from blanket subsidies to operators and towards a concept of 'community sales' whereby elected representatives buy individual services with public subsidy. For this system to work individual transport services must be properly costed.
- c) That if subsidies are allocated to specific services this will enable the better management of cross subsidy and will provide a rational basis for privatisation where appropriate.
- d) That the Government should give better guidance, sense of purpose and direction to public transport managers and should exert substantial pressure towards the fulfilment of specified performance aims.

5. Specific Recommendations

In summary the Group's recommendations are as follows:

Railways

- 1) Split BR into regional management sections.
- 2) Move to proper costing of individual rail services with some devolution of power to grant subsidy to local communities.
- 3) Clear terms of reference and performance aims for management to be given by the Government with sustained pressure for achievement of specified targets.
- 4) A plan for better integration of rail services with other services eg bus and car.
- 5) Rationalisation, separation then if possible privatisation of British Rail Engineering Ltd (BREL).
- 6) Contracting out catering and maintenance and leasing terminals.
- 7) Pilot schemes for private trains (or other non-BR trains) on British Rail track.

Urban Transport

- 1) The establishment of a Metropolitan Transport

Authority for London with responsibility for public transport and traffic management.

- 2) Proper costing for all services in urban areas with subsidy allocated by route by the MTA (or the Passenger Transport Authorities outside London) as a contracting authority.
- 3) Move towards sub-contracting by the MTA on a competitive basis.
- 4) Clear terms of reference for management.
- 5) London's main roads to be transferred to the Department of Transport but with no major new road building programme.
- 6) Passenger Transport Authorities in metropolitan areas to have same contracting powers as Metropolitan Transport Authority in London.
- 7) Experimental schemes for contracting out some peak bus services to private operators.

Rural Services

- 1) Better monitoring of low cost and unconventional services. Government to fund some 'demonstration' schemes.
- 2) Rationalisation of public sector rural road passenger services with use of market surveys.
- 3) More powers to Districts and Parishes to give 'seed corn' grants.
- 4) Examination of scope for using off-peak urban buses.
- 5) Possible extension of compulsory periodic tendering to rural County Council areas.
- 6) Rationalisation of legislation affecting voluntary services.

Buses and the National Bus Company

- 1) Scope for privatisation of the National Bus Company to be examined. Options to be considered are: Either splitting NBC back into its original companies or selling the Express business and holiday business separately, and then examining the scope for privatisation of stage carriage services.
- 2) Traffic Commissioners to continue to exercise quality and safety licensing powers, but quantity licensing powers to be transferred to Metropolitan Transport Authority and PTAs in urban areas.
- 3) Private buses to be allowed to use bus lanes as of right.
- 4) Favourable consideration to be given to 'AMOS' type minibus schemes.

Miscellaneous Recommendations

- 1) Taxis to be allowed to take multiple fares.
- 2) More visible 'demonstration' schemes for cycle routes in urban areas to be funded by the Government.
- 3) Possible revision of rules for compensation where properties blighted by proposed road schemes.
- 4) Better enforcement of parking restrictions in urban areas.

/... FINAL REPORT

FINAL REPORT OF THE TRANSPORT POLICY GROUP1. Basic Approach

During the Group's discussions, a central theme became clear: the need to put the customer first in the provision and planning of transport. This was a theme stressed by Norman Fowler in his pamphlet 'The Right Track', but the Group feels that the theme could be developed beyond the limited deregulation that occurred under the Transport Act 1980.

It also became evident during the Group's discussions that one of the factors which hampers sensible policy making in public transport is the inadequacy of costing techniques within publicly owned transport companies. For example, it is impossible to tell from British Rail's figures what is the real cost to the community of maintaining a particular service. The same applies to publicly owned bus operations. It is impossible to tell within the National Bus Company and within London Transport the true costs of individual services.

This gives rise to several problems.

- i) Local communities and the publicly owned transport operators themselves are seldom aware of the cost to the taxpayer or ratepayer of particular services. So there is very little incentive for them to see whether or not they get value for money, and no criteria upon which performance can be judged.
- ii) Cross subsidisation and market domination by monopoly operators has enabled publicly owned bus companies to freeze out private sector competition. The 1980 Transport Act, though it meant more and cheaper coach services has resulted in an expansion of National Bus Company services, not of privately run services. It was thought that even where private companies were in reality cheaper than the National Bus Company, in most cases the NBC had been able to undercut and freeze them out.
- iii) Without proper costing of services, it is very difficult to assess the scope for more privatisation or competition.

The theme of the Group's report is therefore the need for more accountability in public transport operations. On the basis of proper calculation of the real costs of running particular services, the Group believes that there is a need to move away from 'blanket' subsidies whether given by Government or local authorities and towards the concept of 'community sales': the sale of specific, properly costed services by the operator to the public 'paymaster'.

2. Railwaysa) Politics

The Group discussed the Serpell Report and the implications of the Report for future policy. The Group feels very strongly that the Conservative Party is seen as 'anti rail' and that this is

both inaccurate and very damaging. It feels that it would be politically unwise to countenance major cuts in the network, and that if it is accepted that this is not a realistic option in the next Parliament, the Government should be more forthright in saying that it does not intend to preside over major surgery of this sort. The Group hopes that such surgery will not be necessary. It would be damaging in an election if the Government did not have a robust answer to the charge that it intends to adopt one of Serpell's nastier network options. It is not enough merely to say that 'any decisions about the longer term will be reached only after full public discussion' and to 'rule nothing out'. That could be seen as covering up an intention to cut the network.

So the Group agrees that the Government should try to change its 'anti rail' image if possible by being more encouraging about the future of the network and rural lines. At the very least, the Government should be prepared to say that the route network will be maintained as a public right of way but that we should look at ways of achieving the best value for money on those routes (see remarks on page 8 on rural railways).

b) Structure of BR and Subsidies

As the Group sees it, there are two major obstacles hampering sensible decision making about the future of the railway network and planning improvements in service. The first is the ineffectiveness of management decision making in Rail House resulting partly from a low calibre of leadership but also resulting substantially from a lack of clear direction from the Government. The second lies in the fact that most of the public support to loss making lines is subsumed in the 'blanket subsidy' given to BR by the Government. Not only does this mean that costs of individual services are not identified in any way, but it makes any proposals affecting services or the network highly politically controversial.

Naturally enough, the reaction of local communities to the prospect of losing a rail service is usually extremely hostile, because they feel they are unlikely to get replacement services or the money to provide them. The role of the Government as the public paymaster means that network decisions of this sort can easily be blamed on lack of Government support.

The Group therefore sees considerable advantages in:

- i) Splitting BR down into manageable sections, probably on a regional basis along the lines of the old private companies. These sections should have their own regional managing directors, and managers at each regional level co-operating with their counterparts elsewhere, responsible for particular business sectors.

This, the Group believes, would encourage better team spirit and motivation, closer management/staff relations, and better planning for services and manning levels by people with knowledge of local needs. In time, if a region becomes profitable, it may also provide the basis for privatisation.

- ii) Moving towards more local responsibility for subsidy provision and away from over centralisation, and towards the attachment of all subsidy to individual services, and away from open-ended subsidy.

It seems probable that there will continue to be central Government subsidy, but the Group believes that the Government should try to devolve more power to grant subsidy to representatives of the local community. For example, in London this might be a new Metropolitan Transport Authority; in rural areas the County Councils etc. Given the high cost of many lines, it is anticipated that most of this money would still come from the taxpayer possibly through an expanded TSG or some other formula.

Whoever grants the subsidy the Group believes that steps should be taken to move away from 'blanket subsidy' and towards allocation of subsidies to individual services. In order for this to work, BR will have to move to a proper basis for costing so that people can see how much they are paying to support a particular service. With the devolution of powers to grant subsidy, it might in time occur to local people that the money would be better spent in a different way. Getting local communities to realise the true cost of the services they are buying may defuse the political problem of closing high loss-making lines. Proper costing will also help BR management to identify the areas of inefficiency.

c) Government/Management Relations

The Government has rightly emphasised that managements in nationalised industries must be allowed to manage, but the Group considers that the Government has not given adequate leadership to BR, possibly because of uncertainty in its own mind about the role railways should be expected to play. The Group agrees that the Government needs to give the management of British Rail clear terms of reference and agreed specific performance targets against which its performance can be judged. Without these, the signs are (as is evident from the Serpell Report) that management tends to 'drift' and management discipline and cost control are low. Once targets have been agreed, the Government should exert substantial pressure on management for performance against these targets.

d) Integration

The Group considers that in the longer term better planning of transport services is needed to integrate public transport services together through better train/bus interchange facilities and more facilities for car parking. The possibility of providing tax incentives for the provision of car parks near railway stations should be considered.

e) Privatisation

The scope for privatisation of services themselves might become more clear when BR has been broken down into regions. Otherwise

the Group believes that there should be some pilot schemes on particular lines to explore the possibility of allowing private (or other non-British Rail trains) to run on BR tracks (the Victoria to Gatwick line was one suggestion).

The Group sees more scope for the privatisation of associated services: maintenance, catering and development of terminals. In particular the Group would like to see the privatisation of catering services on trains and in stations. A good private sector catering service would provide an excellent practical demonstration of the advantages of privatisation. If possible BR should franchise these services to private companies, and should lease major terminals to private companies who may be able to develop them more profitably.

BREL

Following the Serpell Report, the Group sees no reason why British Rail Engineering Limited should continue to be run by BR. As a first step it should be rationalised then separated from BR and if possible privatised.

f) Efficiency

The Group agrees that the main positive message from the Serpell Report is that there is enormous scope for improved efficiency at the present level of service and within the present network. The Group believes that most people recognise this. Where it is possible to create pressure for better management through competition, to a large extent the market can be relied upon to bring this about. But where privatisation and competition are not realistic options, the Group emphasises the need for better accounting standards, and greater clarity of purpose within management. This can only come about when clear terms of reference are given by the Government to the Board with sustained pressure on management towards agreed performance targets.

Summary

In summary the Group recommends:

- * Split of BR into regional sections
- * Move to proper costing of individual rail services with some devolution of power to grant subsidy to local communities.
- * Clear terms of reference and performance aims for management and sustained pressure for performance against specific targets.
- * A plan for better integration of rail services with other services eg bus and car.
- * Rationalisation, separation, then if possible privatisation of BREL.
- * Contracting out catering and maintenance, and leasing terminals.
- * Pilot schemes for non-BR trains on BR track.

4. Urban Transport

The Group believes that the same concept of proper service costing and 'community sales' should apply to publicly owned transport undertakings in urban areas as to British Rail,

and for the same reasons. Information about the true costs of individual services will aid subsidy decisions and will help to identify the scope for privatisation.

a) London - A Metropolitan Transport Authority

London's problems are particularly severe. The Group agrees that the Capital can no longer afford the 'luxury' of Ken Livingstone. The Group strongly supports the idea of the establishment of a Metropolitan Transport Authority responsible for overseeing all public transport and traffic management (though not road building) in London and covering the main British Rail commuter rail lines. This authority should become the main contractor for public transport services in and around London. It should have powers to grant subsidy to public transport, and should control the cross-subsidisation of public transport services. In other words it should take over executive responsibility from the London Transport Board and LT would operate as a subcontractor, selling services to it. The MTA would also have the responsibility of planning better integration and would be a watchdog, monitoring the performance of transport operators.

The Group agrees that there could well be opposition to this scheme from within the Conservative Party, particularly as the MTA would probably have to be able to raise a precept on shires outside the present GLC area. The Government would need to be aware of the potential opposition from the shires, and some Conservatives on the GLC. However, it is agreed that it would be unpopular to add one more precepting authority to London's already overloaded system, and that the abolition of the GLC would therefore be necessary at the same time.

b) Scope for Privatisation of London Transport Services

The MTA would have responsibility for contracting out to private companies where appropriate. London Transport should be made to cost its services, and the MTA would be able to contract services out to any operator on any route offering the best service for the public resources involved. The MTA would collect a tariff from the operator on profitable routes related to the financial contribution to overheads and profit made by LT. The operator would be allowed to keep any excess above that. On loss-making routes, the MTA would pay subsidy related to that required by the LT service, allowing operators to make profits on the difference between the subsidy and the cost of their own operations. The most practical first step might be to consider 'break even' routes as candidates for contracting out so as not to disrupt LT's cross-subsidisation. An MTA should also experiment with the privatisation of peak services on some routes to see whether it is possible to get better value for money by relieving London Transport of pressure on resources at the peak. If these experiments prove successful, a good Chairman of the MTA could then look further to routes which require cross-subsidy.

c) Management & Structure of London Transport

Management in LT clearly suffers from similar problems to the management of British Rail, worsened by the fact that it is the GLC and not the Government that provides political guidance. The Group re-emphasises the need for clear terms of reference, (to be

given by the MTA) and proper financial and performance targets for each section of the business. After an MTA has been established, it might consider breaking LT down into separate companies, one managing the underground system, and one the buses. If it makes managerial sense, the MTA might look at the possibility of further breakdown into management areas along similar lines to BR.

d) Roads in London

The Group believes that the Government should take responsibility for main roads in London. Many of London's roads are of as much strategic importance as trunk roads and motorways and it is ridiculous that they should be the responsibility of the GLC. However, the Group believes that it would be unwise to start a massive road building programme in London. Road building tends to attract more cars and more congestion and tempt people away from public transport. The Group sees a need to speed up progress on roads in London which are already in the programme together with more road improvements and sensible traffic management measures designed to relieve congestion at bottlenecks. Otherwise a 'minimum necessary' road building programme should be the aim with the improvement of existing roads having the highest priority.

e) Transport in Other Urban Areas

The problems of transport in other urban areas are not as chronic as in London. The Group believes that the London Metropolitan Transport Authority could be effectively a 'pilot scheme' for other areas. Meanwhile, the Passenger Transport Executives (PTEs) should be required to adopt proper route costing principles and the subsidies should be allocated by routes, not as a 'blanket' grant. Passenger Transport Authorities (PTAs) should have the same powers as the London MTA to control cross subsidy and buy services. It is agreed that the PTA's should have more control over management personnel and that like the GLC, they should be given powers to sack individual directors, (at the moment they only have powers to sack the whole Board of the PTE). In the Government's review of the future of the Metropolitan County Councils, the Group believes that the Government should consider involving representatives of District Councils on the Boards of the Passenger Transport Authorities.

The same principles in relation to privatisation and management apply in the other urban areas, as in London.

Summary

- * The establishment of a Metropolitan Transport Authority for London with responsibility for public transport integration and traffic management in London and covering the main BR commuter lines.
- * Proper costing for all services in urban areas with subsidy allocated by route, not as open-ended payment.
- * Split up of rail and bus business of LT, possible further changes later.
- * Subcontracting services in urban areas, initial privatisation probably on 'marginal' routes and

and experiments with privatisation of peak services.

- * Clear terms of reference for management.
- * London's main roads to be transferred to Department of Transport with progress on existing programme, road improvements and traffic management, but no major road building programme in London.

5. Rural Services

The Group recognises that the problems of public transport in rural areas are very different from those in urban areas, and the Group does not believe that it will be possible to promote dramatic improvements in rural transport without significantly increasing public support. However, a significant increase in public support would not be cost effective, as bus services in rural areas tend to serve social needs. The economic purpose served by buses in cities of providing high density transport to and from work in peak hours is less important in rural areas. However, the Group believes that improvements could be effected within limited resources.

a) Unconventional Rural Schemes

The Government has been trying to encourage low cost 'unconventional' schemes, yet no organisation actually monitors and assesses these schemes. The Group believes that the Transport and Road Research Laboratory should keep a record of the nature and performance of all unconventional rural services in order to disseminate help and advice to local councils and voluntary groups wishing to set up their own schemes. The Government should also fund and publicise some pilot schemes for demonstration purposes in rural areas.

b) Rationalisation of Public Transport

There is obviously much scope for the better co-ordination and more rational use of public sector road transport services in rural areas. Except in some areas, health authority buses, school buses, post buses and conventional commercial services are all run or overseen by separate departments in local authorities. In many areas, services are run when they are not needed, and are not run when they are needed.

The Group agrees that County Councils should be encouraged to commission market research in order to establish basic public transport requirements and to plan for public transport services on the basis of these requirements. Surveys of this nature have been carried out in Dyfed, where it was discovered that it was possible to provide more than 20 additional services by using the bus and minibus stock already operated within the County. It may be sensible for the Government to sponsor a national market survey scheme of this sort or to sponsor such schemes in a number of areas for demonstration purposes.

The Group agrees that local authority transport officials should be encouraged or charged with the duty of co-ordinating all public road passenger services with the aim of achieving the best value for money and subject to the rights of other authorities to use their buses or minibuses to provide the service for which

they were originally intended.

c) 'Seed Corn' Grants

Parish Councils and/or District Councils should be given powers and be encouraged to give 'seed corn' grants to voluntary services in rural areas, and part of the transport budget in any rural area should be set aside for this sort of assistance.

d) Off-Peak Urban Buses

The needs of urban areas are primarily for peak services, but rural services tend to cater for off-peak travel, particularly people going shopping, women and old people. Once a structure of 'community sales' has been set up in an urban area, the MTA or transport authority will be able to contract with private operators for peak services in the town. The private operator may be able to use the same buses in the off-peak elsewhere outside the town.

e) Tendering

The Group is impressed by the success of the 'Trial Area' set up in Hereford and Worcester. It is working on the principle that the County Council puts services out to tender on a periodic basis and buys in the cheapest service.

The Group feels that this system should be tried elsewhere and believes that consideration should be given to requiring rural County Councils to put bus services out to tender in the same way.

f) Minibuses

'Rural Voice' argued that the current 'Minibus Act' and community bus legislation needed to be simplified. The Group therefore suggests that the Government reviews existing legislation affecting voluntary transport services in order to simplify and remove anomalies.

g) Rural Rail Services

With the breaking down of British Rail into regional sectors, and the devolution of powers to grant subsidy, local communities may see advantages in cutting traditional rural rail services and paying for better bus services or cheaper rail services such as light rail buses. The Group believes that it should be made clear that all or a large part of the central government grant and accepted expenditure which would go towards the upkeep of a rural line, would still be available to that local community for spending on transport if the rail service ceases to exist.

Summary

- * Better monitoring of low cost services.
- * Rationalisation of public sector rural road transport and market surveys to assess transport needs in rural areas.
- * More powers to Districts and Parishes to give 'seed corn' grants.
- * Examination of scope for using off-peak urban buses.

- * Possible extension of compulsory periodic tendering to rural county council areas.
- * Rationalisation of legislation affecting voluntary services.

6. Buses and the National Bus Company

a) The National Bus Company has been the main beneficiary of the 1980 Transport Act. The number of NBC express services increased dramatically after the Act, and NBC has been able to freeze out most of the opposition.

The Group agrees that it would be desirable in principle to privatise National Bus Company services. It sees no reason why a bus company of this sort should remain in the public sector when many of its constituent parts used to operate quite successfully in the private sector. However, the Group recognises a major obstacle to privatisation. This is that the value of NBC partly lies in its market monopoly and in the local monopolies it enjoys in the provision of bus services. Therefore, any proposals to allow more competition in the provision of bus services will affect the market's assessment of the value of the company. To a certain extent, the Government will have to make up its mind as to whether it is better to encourage more competition, or whether the priority is to privatise NBC.

The Group therefore puts forward a number of options which may be considered if the Government believes it is possible to privatise NBC, with comments on each option. The options are:

- i) The privatisation of NBC in its entirety as a single company. The Group does not favour this approach, as it would transfer a monopoly from the public sector into the private sector, a monopoly which will be capable of using (and would possibly use) its market domination and cross-subsidy to freeze out private sector competition.
- ii) The split up of NBC into its old subsidiary companies with a mixture of businesses (express service, tours and stage carriage services) within each company. The profitable subsidiaries could then be floated off; the unprofitable or marginal ones would find it less easy to oust private sector competition and a market 'colossus' would be removed from the scene. In principle this option has the greatest appeal.
- iii) The flotation of the express service, and holiday businesses in the first instance. As this is clearly the Government's intention at the moment, the Group believes that in practice it will probably be the chosen option. If the express business is privatised, the Group would like the Government to consider whether it can be sold in smaller units, rather than as a whole, in order to prevent over-heavy market domination by one company. If the express business is privatised separately the problem of stage carriage services remains. The Group believes that they should be split

into regional sections operating as separate companies tendering on a local basis along with other operators for local services. These regional sections should not be allowed to cross-subsidise across regional borders, and should be made to cost their services properly. The opportunities for further privatisation or the transfer of NBC services to local authorities can then be reviewed on a local basis.

b) Private Bus Companies

Private bus companies will benefit if NBC's market domination is removed. Apart from that, the Group recommends that private buses should be allowed to use bus lanes as of right and the Government should review the ownership and planning of bus terminals with a view to giving private bus companies better facilities in towns.

c) Minibuses

The Group believes that the Government should favour 'AMOS' (Associated Minibus Operators) type schemes in urban and rural areas. However, these should only be allowed on designated routes as alternatives to conventional bus services, but with the ability to pick up and set down as they wish.

d) Traffic Commissioners

The Group agrees that the Traffic Commissioners should continue to have licensing powers relating to quality and safety. But if the Government wishes to move to an extension of tendering and contracting out, quantity licensing powers should be given to the MTA and PTAs, in urban areas.

Summary

- * If possible privatisation of NBC on lines of old NBC companies, or privatisation of express service and holiday business and split up of stage carriage business.
- * Private buses to use bus lanes as of right.
- * Favourable consideration to minibus schemes of the 'AMOS' type.
- * Traffic Commissioners' 'quantity' licensing powers in urban areas to be transferred to MTA and PTAs.

7. Miscellaneous Items

a) Taxis

As a 'quid pro quo' for allowing minibus services to operate, taxi drivers should be allowed to take more than one fare per journey.

b) Bicycles

The Group agrees that it is important to be seen to be sympathetic to the bicycle lobby. The numbers of cyclists are increasing, but

the accident rate is rising. The Group believes that more pilot schemes should be funded by the Government in several different locations as visible demonstrations of what can be achieved, and in order to see whether there is scope for making life more pleasant for the cyclist and for encouraging more people to use cycles.

c) Public Inquiries and Roads

The problem of (politically motivated) disruption at inquiries has to be tackled and a solution to the problem of separating the interests of locally affected residents from the outside influence of professional agitators might lie in a new approach to compensation.

The sheer length of time between the conception and construction of an urban road drives up the eventual cost far beyond what it need be. One idea suggested, though not unanimously accepted by the Group was that if owners of properties adversely affected were offered compensation at full market value plus, say, 20 per cent - provided they settled within a reasonable but short period - the negotiation period could be reduced and money actually saved.

The extra compensation not only would be an added incentive but would reflect the cost of moving and inconvenience. The Government ought also to consider being more generous to people whose properties are blighted by proposed road schemes by recognising the change in market values that has come about and offering more generous compensation.

d) Parking

The Group agrees that in urban areas, the need for better enforcement of parking restrictions is urgent, perhaps with incentive schemes for traffic wardens. The Government should look again at measures to ensure better 'follow-up' where fines have not been paid. The Group also believes that better facilities should be provided for car parking adjacent to bus and rail stations.

Summary

- * To allow taxi drivers to take multiple fares.
- * More bicycle route pilot schemes.
- * More compensation for people adversely affected by road building.
- * Better enforcement of parking regulations.