TRANSPORT SCOTLAND
CÒMHDHAIL ALBA

transport.gov.scot

Reducing car use for a healthier, fairer, and greener Scotland: Analysis of Consultation Responses

(Prepared in November 2022)

Contents

Executive Summary

Background

The Scottish Government's strategy to achieve net zero emissions by 2045 comprises a number of different elements. One car-related policy outcome in its Climate Change Plan update, published in December 2020, was to reduce car kilometres by 20% by 2030, in order to meet Scotland's statutory obligations for greenhouse gas emissions reduction by 2045.

Transport Scotland, in collaboration with COSLA, co-developed a route map to achieve a 20% reduction in car kilometres by 2030, which was published in January 2022. This route map set out the interventions that would support people to reduce car use wherever possible and identified four key behaviours for people to consider when planning a journey. These were:

- To make use of sustainable online options to reduce the need to travel.
- To choose local destinations or reduce the distance travelled.
- To switch to walking, wheeling, cycling or public transport where possible.
- To combine a trip or share a journey to reduce the number of individual car trips made, if the car remains the only feasible option.

The consultation process

The consultation ran for 12 weeks from January to April 2022 and most responses were submitted via Citizen Space which is the Scottish Government's online consultation hub.

Respondent profile

In total, there were 679 responses to the consultation, of which 64 were from organisations and 615 from individuals. A full list of organisations and their sub-groups is provided in Appendix 1.

Key themes

A number of key themes were evident across consultation questions as well as across respondent groups. To a large extent, the actions and policies outlined in the route map were supported, with many respondents echoing the interventions,

actions and policies outlined in the route map as good approaches to reduce car kilometres by 20%. The key themes are summarised below.

- There was general support for the holistic approach suggested in the route map, with respondents agreeing that behaviour change will be necessary to support the actions within the route map. Of the four behaviours outlined in the route map, the least supported was combining trips and sharing journeys.
- A key theme was a desire for an initial focus on improvements to public transport and active travel to be introduced, so as to ensure there are viable alternatives to car use. Respondents felt that the other interventions set out in the route map would be more effective once investments in public transport and active travel had been made.
- The car is currently perceived to be cheap, convenient and quick while public transport tends to be viewed as expensive, inconvenient and slow.
- There is a desire for a fully integrated public transport system offering connectivity between and across all forms of travel. For example, having a hub and spoke system offering good connections between public transport and active travel options and offering universal ticketing so that it is easy to switch between different modes to complete journeys. There were also calls for the public transport system to be cheaper, safer, efficient and far more extensive than at present.
- There were some calls for a demand-responsive[1] public transport system, with some suggestions that this could follow the Uber business model, offering dial-up services and so on.
- In addition to improvements to public transport, a desire was also identified for improvements to active travel networks in term of ease of use and safety, and connectivity with public transport modes.
- There were some views that the route map is less appropriate for rural areas and island communities where public transport provision is poor, and for disabled people who use cars as a mobility aid. As such, there were some suggestions that the route map should focus on towns and cities where there are already reasonably well established public transport options, with a perception that these areas offer the most scope to help achieve a 20% reduction in car kilometres, and also that interventions should avoid disadvantaging those who use cars as a mobility aid.

[1] Demand-responsive public transport is a form of shared public transport for groups of individuals traveling where vehicles alter their routes for each journey based on particular transport demand without using a fixed route or timetabled journeys. These vehicles typically pick-up and drop-off passengers in locations according to passengers needs and can include taxis, buses or other vehicles.

- There was support for the action within the route map for changes to the planning process so that towns and new developments are built around people; creating 20 minute neighbourhoods that have local services and amenities and reducing the need for residents to have to travel elsewhere to obtain the services they need. The National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) is seen as an opportunity to help bring this about.
- There was support for the action within the route map to ensure IT connectivity for all Scotland so that people are enabled to work from home and use more online services. Other incentives and encouragement for working from home were also put forward.
- There were views that all vehicle types should be included in the route map, for example, commercial vehicles, as these are felt to be as polluting as cars in terms of contributing to emissions.
- A number of disincentives to car use were suggested. These included low traffic zones, bans from city centres, traffic calming measures, living street designs, road user charging and high parking charges, although based on the proviso that viable alternatives to car use need to be in place before any disincentives are introduced.
- There was support for the route map actions to provide investment, long term in bus transport and increased in active travel, with some respondents requesting greater levels of investment to help bring about the actions and policies contained within the route map.
- Positive messaging via education campaigns was perceived as something which could help a move towards a reduction in car kilometres.
- The opportunities for public sector organisations and large businesses to set a good example in reducing the car dominance of their staff was noted by a number of respondents.
- While there was broad support for the need to reduce car kilometres from many of these respondents, there were some who disagreed with the route map, feeling that their car use was essential, their freedoms would be impinged, and that drivers should not be disadvantaged. There were also some respondents who felt that it will be difficult to bring about behaviour change given the car-centric culture of today.
- Some respondents felt the 20% reduction in car kilometres was unambitious. Conversely there were some comments that any approaches to reducing car kilometres will have little impact when considered in a global context.

Introduction

Background

In 2020, emissions from transport made up more than one quarter of Scotland's total emissions and road transport accounted for 66.5% of these emissions. The National Transport Strategy, published in February 2020, set out a vision for a transport system that reduces inequalities and increases equality of opportunity and outcome; takes action to minimise the negative impact of transport on the climate; helps to deliver sustainable and inclusive economic growth; and enables a healthy, active and fit Scotland.

The Scottish Government's strategy to achieve net zero emissions by 2045 comprised a number of different elements. One car-related policy outcome in its Climate Change Plan update, published in December 2020, was to reduce car kilometres by 20% by 2030, against a 2019 baseline, in order to meet Scotland's statutory obligations for greenhouse gas emissions reduction by 2045. A reduction of 20% in car kms would mean a return to car travel at a level last seen in the 1990s.

Since the publication of the first Climate Change Plan in 2011, the distance travelled by car has increased and this trend is predicted to continue, unless measures are introduced to manage demand. While restrictions associated with the COVID pandemic suppressed use of all forms of transport and people were advised not to use public transport unless absolutely necessary, travel by car has been closer to previous levels than any other mode of travel. Research conducted by the RAC, in its Report on Motoring for 2020, looked at the possible impact of COVID on motorists. A key finding was that for the first time since 2002 fewer than half of drivers (43%) said they would use their cars less if public transport was improved. This is considerably lower than the level of 57% seen in 2019. Furthermore, statistics published by the Scottish Government show that the number of motor vehicles registered in Scotland is at an all-time high of about three million.

Overall, reducing the distance travelled by car by 20% by 2030 is a huge challenge and will need a reversal of decades of growth in car usage, as well as in predicted future increases. To help bring about the necessary changes, the Scottish Government has developed a car use reduction route map, that sets out a wide range of actions that will be taken to support people in Scotland to reduce their car use, including long term investment of over £500m in bus priority infrastructure, along with an additional package of over £500m to increase levels of active travel over the next five years.

The consultation

Transport Scotland worked in collaboration with COSLA to develop and publish the document: 'Reducing car use for a healthier, fairer and greener Scotland: A route map to achieve a 20 per cent reduction in car kilometres by 2030', which was published in January 2022. This was developed in recognition of the need for joint ambition and action at both a national and local level and included input from a wide range of stakeholders to ensure it reflects the needs and aspirations of people across Scotland.

The route map aims to encourage a reduction in the current overreliance on cars wherever possible, by implementing interventions that will support people to choose from four key behaviours when planning a journey. These were:

- To make use of sustainable online options to reduce the need to travel.
- To choose local destinations or reduce the distance travelled.
- To switch to walking, wheeling, cycling or public transport where possible.
- To combine a trip or share a journey to reduce the number of individual car trips made, if the car remains the only feasible option.

The consultation on the publication contained 16 questions, which offered respondents the opportunity to provide comments on the approach and policies set out in the route map.

Respondent profile

In total, there were 679 responses to the consultation, of which 64 were from organisations and 615 from individuals. A list of all those organisations that submitted a response to the consultation is included in Appendix 1. Respondents were assigned to respondent groupings to enable analysis of any differences or commonalities across or within the various different types of organisations and individuals that responded.

As shown in the following table, the highest number of organisation responses was from local authorities, followed by third sector organisations and regional transport partnerships.

Table 1: Respondent profile

Respondent group	Number of responses
Business	2
Health / NHS	3
Local authority	13
NDPB (Non-departmental public body)	2
Regional transport partnership	8
Representative body*	7
Third sector (other)	7
Third sector (environmental)	8
Third sector (sustainability)	9
Other	5
Total organisations	**64**
Individuals	615
Total responses	679

*For this analysis, 'Representative body' was defined as 'any organisation representing individuals belonging to a transport user group or professional body

Methodology

Responses to the consultation were submitted using the Scottish Government consultation platform Citizen Space, or by email or hard copy. Three respondents submitted a generalised response which did not answer the specific consultation questions; these responses have been analysed and incorporated into the report at the relevant sections.

Responses were checked for any co-ordinated responses using text comparison tools to ascertain whether any responses were part of a campaign. A total of 73 campaign responses, based on a standard text, were received and issues raised in these have been incorporated into the report where relevant. In some of the campaign responses, additional comments were provided and these have been incorporated where relevant in the report. One third sector organisation also conducted a survey among its members and the results have been included in our analysis.

It should be noted that the number responding at each question is not always the same as the number presented in the respondent group table. This is because not all

respondents addressed all questions. This report indicates the number of respondents who commented at each question. While the analysis was qualitative in nature, as the questionnaire only contained a small number of quantifiable questions, as a very general rule of thumb it can be assumed that: 'a small number' indicates less than 3% of respondents, 'a small minority' indicates between 3% and 10%, 'a significant minority' indicates between around 10-24% of respondents; a large minority indicates between 25-49% of respondents; and a majority indicates more than 50% of those who commented at any question.

Some of the consultation questions were composed of closed tick-boxes with specific options to choose from. Where respondents did not follow the questions but mentioned clearly within their text that they supported one of the options, these have been included in the relevant counts.

The researchers examined all comments made by respondents and noted the range of issues mentioned in responses, including reasons for opinions, specific examples or explanations, alternative suggestions or other comments. Grouping these issues together into similar themes allowed the researchers to identify whether any particular theme was specific to any particular respondent group or groups. Where any specific sub-group(s) held a particular viewpoint, this is commented on at each relevant question. In many instances, actions, policies or issues suggested by respondents mirrored those outlined in the route map. This has been referenced where relevant.

When considering group differences however, it must also be recognised that where a specific opinion has been identified in relation to a particular group or groups, this does not indicate that other groups did not share this opinion, but rather that they simply did not comment on that particular point.

While the consultation gave all who wished to comment an opportunity to do so, given the self-selecting nature of this type of exercise, any figures quoted here cannot be extrapolated to a wider population beyond the respondent sample.

Main findings

Views on the behaviour change approach

The consultation paper noted that the car-use behaviours that contribute to overall car kilometres in Scotland show that it will not be possible to reduce car kilometres by 20% by focusing on a single trip type, such as commuting, or a single behaviour, such as switching from car to walking or cycling for short journeys. As such, there is a need for a holistic framework of interventions to provide car-use reduction options for different types of trips in different geographical areas. The Scottish Government has also made use of behaviour change theory and the published evidence base on what works in reducing car use. This has led to the development of a framework of positive sustainable travel behaviours, and the identification of a range of transport and non-transport policies that will support people to adopt one or more of the behaviours. The behaviours were selected because they were applicable in rural and urban settings and allow for a variety of mobility needs. These can be adopted in different geographical locations by people with different personal circumstances and travel needs. The four behaviours are:

- To make use of sustainable online options to reduce the need to travel.
- To choose local destinations or reduce the distance travelled.
- To switch to walking, wheeling, cycling or public transport where possible.
- To combine a trip or share a journey to reduce the number of individual car trips made, if the car remains the only feasible option.

The first consultation question asked:

> **Question 1: 'Do you agree with the overall behaviour change approach, and do you have any comments on the four behaviours outlined above?'**

As detailed in table 2, a majority of respondents agreed with the overall behaviour approach, although a large minority disagreed (325 agreed while 224 disagreed). Agreement was almost unanimous amongst organisations, but amongst individuals nearly as many disagreed as agreed (271 individuals agreed and 223 disagreed). Of those who disagreed with the approach, this was largely due to a disagreement with the target, and no alternative approaches to meeting the target were offered.

Table 2: Agreement with the overall behaviour change approach

Response type (Sample Size)	Responses			
	Agree	**Disagree**	**Don't Know**	**Not Answered**
Business (2)	-	-	-	2
Health / NHS (3)	1	1	-	1
Local authority (13)	13	-	-	-
NDPB (Non-departmental public body) (2)	2	-	-	-
Regional transport partnership (8)	8	-	-	-
Representative body (7)	5	-	-	2
Third sector (other) (7)	5	-	-	2
Third sector (environmental) (8)	7	-	-	1
Third sector (sustainable transport) (9)	9	-	-	-
Other (5)	4	-	1	-
Total organisations (64)	**54**	**1**	**1**	**8**
Individuals (615)	271	223	38	83
Total respondents	**325**	**224**	**39**	**91**

A total of 483 respondents went on to comment on the four behaviours. A significant minority overall - including three in four organisations - voiced general agreement and positive comments about the overall behaviour approach in principle, stating they were sensible and feasible, with a few noting health benefits. However, some felt that the 20% target was unambitious. A large minority of comments either pointed to changes that would be required and issues to be resolved before the proposals could work – a number of the changes suggested included interventions that are set out in the route map, or reiterated general disagreement, citing problems and barriers.

The target to reduce car use is a national target and the route map clearly states that there is not an expectation for car use to reduce by the same amount or at the same rate in all geographical areas, or by all individuals. Nevertheless, the most frequent issue raised regarding the overall approach, by a significant minority of respondents, was that of attaining behavioural changes in rural or island areas. Specific problems included a lack of alternative options to using cars, other options taking too long, the

distances involved being too lengthy for active travel, and a lack of local facilities and amenities meaning that these areas were unlikely to benefit from 20 minute neighbourhoods. A few respondents advocated separate policies for urban and rural areas, maintaining that the four behaviours were only possible in the former and suggesting that implementing them in urban areas would have the greatest overall effect. A few respondents focused on problems with behavioural change for the disabled or elderly; again, cars were cited by some as the only feasible option for these groups, with barriers to cycling (age or disability) and public transport use (access) mentioned.

Other general changes regarded as being needed in order for the proposals to have a positive effect were each raised by a few respondents; however, the suggested changes are things that the route map already includes:

- A need for infrastructure to address barriers and put alternatives to current behaviour in place first.
- A need for investment.
- A need for cultural or behavioural change (e.g. via education).

Significant numbers of respondents, including a large minority of organisations, thought there was a need to focus on systemic change or a more holistic approach to change as opposed to purely making modifications at an individual behaviour level. A wide variety of mentions were made regarding this, particularly in the planning process in designing towns and cities around people rather than cars. It was also intimated that measures in the proposals should be aimed at other sources of motor vehicle use too, such as businesses, the public sector, schools and the NHS (refer NPF4 interventions in the route map).

Amongst the large minority of respondents who did not view the behavioural change approach favourably, the most frequently mentioned reason was that it was impractical. Likewise, they thought that it failed to reflect the real world, where cars are regarded as being the most convenient means of getting around, and the pace of modern life. These respondents either disagreed with the target to reduce car use or disagreed that the target was achievable without generally suggesting alternative approaches. Other objections – each cited by small numbers of respondents – revolved around dangers from the removal of freedom of movement and individual choice, Scotland's vehicles only being responsible for a tiny proportion of the world's carbon dioxide emissions, and a belief that the government should focus on other areas of emission reductions, such as targeting commercial vehicles and technology developments to reduce environmental damage.

Reducing the need to travel

Many of those responding to this question focused on negative issues in relation to reducing the need to travel. However, the smaller numbers of positive comments about reducing the need to travel mainly focused on encouraging digital alternatives such as online meetings and encouraging less travel via more working from home, with a suggestion to reward companies offering this. A small number of individuals also indicated that they already reduce their need to travel as much as they can.

Around one in three respondents who commented made observations about reducing the need to travel; the majority of these cited drawbacks and barriers, with small numbers raising each of the following issues:

- Limitations to online options (e.g. not everyone can work from home, has fast enough internet connectivity[2], can afford internet or can get cheap online deliveries).
- Concerns about digital options working against the viability of local facilities, production and town centres and the local economy, thus working against the 'Living well locally' behaviour.
- Queries about whether getting online deliveries is sustainable, due to the use of large transport modes and products coming long distances.
- Stated preferences for face-to-face social interaction rather than online contact to avoid isolation and mental health issues.

Small numbers of respondents perceived digital alternatives as excluding those unable to use technology and those uncomfortable doing so due to integrity or privacy issues. This behavioural change was also perceived to clash with tourism promotion policies for long car trips (e.g. the NC500) with the concern that tourists would be given car preference use over locals.

Living well locally

Less than one in five respondents at this question made specific remarks about living well locally; almost all of these (a significant minority of respondents overall) focused on a current lack of local amenities such as shops, hospitals, doctors, dentists and leisure facilities to enable this behaviour, with consequent requests for support and investment. A few respondents maintained that this behaviour takes place anyway as no one travels further than they have to or that people able to make this change have already done so. Very small numbers suggested that shopping locally may

[2] Though Intervention 1b about extending superfast broadband should be noted in this context

come at a cost to city or town centres and supermarkets, which may lead to food price increases.

Switching modes

This behaviour elicited the most attention from respondents, with two in three commenting on the behavioural change, mainly citing actions required to enable it.

Small numbers of respondents made comments regarding actions to make walking easier, including safer walking routes, bigger pavements, increasing the numbers of crossing points and more pedestrian zones. Drawbacks with walking were also noted, such as the distances being too far and the poor condition of footpaths and pavements. There were only a small number of mentions of wheeling, all of which mirrored the comments made above about walking.

Requests for safer and easier cycling were also made by significant numbers of respondents. These included route segregation, improved networks, cheaper cycle costs and more parking facilities, thereby supporting active travel investment as a route map intervention. Similar numbers drew attention to a variety of perceived difficulties with cycling as an alternative travel mode, including breakdown problems, safety issues (e.g. potholes), bad weather, physical disabilities, not being able to carry loads (e.g. shopping), hilly terrain, limited light availability in winter, affordability of cycles, length of time to complete trips, and the lack of contribution of cyclists to road upkeep.

The most quoted theme from a significant minority of respondents was that there is a need for more public transport availability (i.e. trains and buses), routes and links with more integration of modes needed, with requests for more night services, more options available outside the central belt, and extension of the rail network. Further actions regarding public transport provision, some of which echoed those outlined in the route map, were also made by smaller, but still significant minorities of respondents as follows:

- Investment in public transport infrastructure generally.
- Costs to be reduced, with free bus travel for the under 22s welcomed and current expense compared to use of cars noted.
- Better public transport reliability, regularity, and frequency.

Additionally, a small minority of respondents complained about various facets of bus travel. These included limited or closed services, lack of heating, passenger behaviour, lack of cleanliness, and a lack of maps and other information provision. Points were also made about public transport and other modes taking too long for longer trips.

Other more general requests were made by a small minority for safer, easier and cheaper alternatives to the car. Similar numbers agreed there was too much dependence on car travel, expressing a preference for active travel and / or public transport if these were available.

Disincentives for car use were advocated by a small minority, with suggestions mooted including low traffic zones, bans from city centres, traffic calming measures, living street designs, road user charging, high parking charges (e.g. Workplace Parking Levy, thereby supporting the route map policy) and congestion charging.

A significant minority of individual respondents maintained that their car use was essential, citing instances of having to transport large loads (e.g. shopping), unsocial hours or shift-working, safety reasons and children and families needing to be transported.

The route map explicitly sets out reasons why electric vehicles are not proposed as a solution; however, some respondents disagreed with that approach and a small minority of respondents wished to see more encouragement for electric or hybrid car travel as an alternative, in particular by way of more (and less costly) charging points. A small number of respondents wished to see encouragement of other transport such as electric bikes, motorbikes, e-scooters and powered two-wheelers (PTWs). A small number also advocated other alternatives, such as park and ride options, car clubs and other shared modes of transport.

Combining trips / sharing journeys

A small minority of respondents to this question made comments regarding combining trips or sharing journeys. Almost all dismissed car or vehicle sharing as impractical, saying that they do not live close to their co-workers, that it was not good for combining trips, and that it was inconsistent with being told to stay apart due to COVID. Safety concerns about fellow drivers or passengers and difficulties in planning trips were also mentioned. A small number perceived vehicle sharing as never having worked before, while similar numbers said they already try to combine trips or vehicle share.

Km/miles

Finally, a number of respondents were concerned over some of the phrasing in the consultation (e.g. use of ‘km’ rather than ‘miles’ and the perceived vagueness of ‘where possible’ phrases).

Key opportunities

The next consultation question asked:

Question 2: 'What are the key opportunities of reducing car kilometres?'

A total of 546 respondents opted to provide commentary in response to this question.

A key opportunity for reducing car kilometres, albeit only cited by a small minority of respondents, was improvement to the environment due to reduced carbon emissions which would also lead to better air quality and less air and noise pollution.

A similar number of respondents referred to improvements in individuals' health and fitness levels, with some specific references to the health benefits of active travel options such as walking or cycling. Allied to this, there were a small number of comments that this would also have the benefit of reducing the current strain on the NHS. While some respondents focused on health benefits, there were also some references to improvements in wellbeing and happiness as 20 minute neighbourhoods would become nicer to live in, help to reduce social isolation, and bring communities together.

Other opportunities outlined by respondents included:

- Less road accidents because streets would be safer. This would also allow more space for people and play areas for children.
- Reduced congestion on Scotland's roads.
- More local travel would provide economic benefits to local communities and help build local businesses.

Some respondents identified opportunities for a more radical change to the existing public transport network, with some suggestions for a fully integrated network which links into all forms of public transport and active travel (for example, a hub and spoke system). This would make it easy for a cyclist to use a train or bus for part of their journey. There were a small number of comments on the opportunities to introduce a public transport system that is more flexible and demand-responsive. There were a also a small number of suggestions that the Scottish Government should examine what public transport networks offer in other countries, such as the Netherlands or Denmark, although there were also some references to positive initiatives from TfL (Transport for London).

While the focus for many respondents was on public transport, there were a small number of comments on the opportunities presented by including all road users in the route map and the need to ensure reduced kms across all forms of traffic. TfL's Direct Vision HGV Standard was cited as an example of a positive initiative.

A small number of respondents identified opportunities for the Scottish Government to show a large-scale educational commitment on the need for increased use of public transport, which would also help to counter the negative views still held by some individuals who have not returned to using public transport because of COVID. As noted by a Regional Transport Partnership, the promotion of positive messages about the wider benefits of a reduction in car kms will be an important element in embedding views about the positives for health, wellbeing and the economy, as well as helping to tackle inequalities and maximising opportunities to bring about the necessary modal shift.

The opportunities for public sector organisations and large businesses to set a good example in reducing the car dominance of their staff was noted by a small number of respondents.

Differences between urban and rural areas were noted by a significant minority of respondents, with references from some that a reduction in car kilometres is much more suited to cities and large towns which already have relatively good public transport networks. As such, some respondents felt that the route map should focus on cities and towns only.

There were also a small number of suggestions that opportunities are offered by specific situations, such as working from home as during COVID, or by focusing on the school run to help reduce the number of short journeys made. Again, it was felt this could be supported by key messages focusing on the health and wellbeing benefits.

While some respondents outlined opportunities of reducing car kilometres, some answered this question by outlining challenges to reducing car kilometres.

A desire to improve public transport and create a viable alternative to car use was the key theme that emerged. This was cited by almost half of those who responded to this question across all sub-groups**.** Three key factors were outlined by respondents in relation to this issue. First, the current public transport network is seen to be inadequate in terms of service provision, with comments on the need for wider geographical coverage, particularly in rural areas, along with more frequent services. Second, public transport is perceived to be an expensive option in comparison to using a car. Finally, many public transport journeys are seen as inconvenient and too lengthy, with some respondents also referring to a lack of safety and cleanliness on some services. While it is likely that some public transport

journeys are made longer due to high levels of congestion from private vehicles, this issue was not raised by respondents. Some of these respondents also noted the importance of improving the current public transport network as an immediate priority in order to persuade some car users to consider public transport as a serious alternative. As one individual observed:

> *"Improved train and bus services with the subsequent infrastructure in place to allow seamless transition from either train or bus onto community electric vehicle assets. Improved public health as a result of improved access to good cycle routes with mandatory changing facilities at workplaces to encourage an active commute."*

Another individual also commented on the cost, cleanliness and facilities available:

> *"Public Transport has to be vastly improved. I live in Glasgow but work in Edinburgh, a 35 minute train between the two would cost me £25 per day which is frankly outrageous. I had to make the journey last week and the cleanliness, reliability and quality fell far short of the extortionate price and the single toilet on the train was out of order - it's honestly quite shocking to see how poor the standards are and how much you have to pay for the privilege."*

Many of those who were receptive to the concept of reducing car kilometres felt it would be difficult to bring about the necessary behavioural change without improvements to public transport.

Linked to the need for an improved public transport system, a small minority of respondents also noted the need for improvements in active travel routes, with references to safe cycling and walking routes, an increased number of cycle paths and an infrastructure that provides safety for all users. There were also calls for improved cycle access on public transport and secure cycle parking facilities. There were a small number of suggestions to reduce the amount of space allocated to cars and use this instead for people walking wheeling and cycling and buses. It was felt by some respondents that improvements in active travel routes would in turn lead to higher levels of cycling, wheeling and walking.

Some respondents identified specific actions – some of which mirrored those set out in the route map – that could be undertaken in order to reduce car kilometres. These included:

- Changes to working practices, such as increased working from home, greater flexibility in working days and hours; for example, working a condensed week.
- Setting up a greater number of car share clubs and promotional campaigns outlining the advantages of belonging to a car club.

- Encouraging the use of e-bikes and e-scooters, alongside some suggestions for funding to help bring this about.
- Increasing the infrastructure for electric vehicles; for example, more charging points across Scotland.

In response to this question specifically, a small minority of respondents felt that car use should be disincentivised. Suggestions to help bring this about included road pricing, banning cars from city centres, the enforcement of speed limits and removal or reduction of parking facilities.

In line with this, a few respondents commented on a perceived disconnect between the need to reduce car kilometres and the promotion of car-based tourism, for example, the North Coast 500. There was a perception that the tourism industry is dependent on car usage, with little by way of a public transport network that is suitable for tourists, particularly in rural and remote areas.

A small number of respondents noted their support for 20 minute neighbourhoods and the creation of communities rather than housing estates with very little facilities, which embed use of the car. There were comments on the need to ensure the availability of local amenities and for new developments to have a suitable infrastructure including shops and access to healthcare to prevent many car journeys. In line with this, there were some comments on local planning decisions, with a few respondents observing that houses should not be built on green belt areas or that there should be a stop to building out of town retail parks. A third sector organisation noted the importance of finalising and adopting NPF4 by the summer of 2022 as well as suggesting that the development and delivery of a National Walking Strategy should be mentioned in the route map.

While most respondents were relatively receptive to the concept of reducing car kilometres, a small minority of respondents commented that this is a bad idea or that drivers should not be disadvantaged. There were some concerns that there would be a negative impact on high streets and city centres with the creation of 20 minute neighbourhoods.

Finally, there were a small number of concerns – primarily from third sector organisations – that implementation of the route map could impact negatively on specific groups of people, such as disabled people, who can be reliant on using private cars.

Key challenges

Having ascertained views on the key opportunities of reducing car kilometres, the next question asked:

Question 3: 'What are they key challenges faced in reducing car kilometres?'

A total of 557 respondents opted to provide commentary in response to this question. To an extent, challenges identified by respondents mirrored views expressed at the previous question and many of these echoed issues raised in the route map. The key comment from a significant minority of respondents – across most sub-groups – was the lack of public transport options available. Comments included that the current service provision is unreliable, does not offer a viable alternative to the car, and that there is a lack of connectivity across the existing public transport network, particularly in rural areas. Linked to this, there were some comments on the need for a properly integrated public transport system offering faster and more regular connections, as well as access to other active travel options. That said, an individual noted that time is needed to introduce a programme of modernisation along with the necessary investment to bring this about. There were also some comments on the need to improve other alternatives to car use that are cost and time effective; initiatives cited by respondents included park and ride schemes, e-bus options, secure cycle storage, more space for cycles on trains and improved integration with active travel approaches.

Fewer respondents across most sub-groups, although still a significant minority, referred specifically to the expense of public transport and a lack of available cost effective alternatives. There were some suggestions from a few respondents of a need for investment in public transport and / or subsidies to be offered by the Scottish Government.

Other criticisms of the existing public transport network included:

- Concerns over safety and cleanliness.
- A lack of facilities for disabled people.
- Length and inconvenience of journeys.
- Difficulties accessing public transport in rural areas.

A significant minority of respondents focused on current car usage and the advantages this offers over and above public transport. For some, the car was seen to be more convenient and easier than public transport, with examples given of getting heavy shopping home, visiting family and friends who are a distance away, and getting to work. Again, cars were felt to be more necessary in rural areas.

The car is also perceived by some to be a relatively cheap option compared to other forms of travel, with some respondents providing examples of the cost of various journeys. There were also a few comments that the sunk costs of having a car (e.g.

MOT, insurance, etc..) mean that incremental journeys do not appear to cost much, which can help lead to the perception that using a car is cheaper than train and bus services. While both rail and bus services were perceived to be an expensive option in comparison to the cost of car travel, rail was considered to be the more expensive of the two.

Growth in housing estates and out of town shopping centres are seen to further encourage use of the car, with comments that these are both designed around car use. There were also some comments that many are inaccessible by public transport.

A significant minority of respondents referred specifically to public attitudes towards car usage. There were some observations on the car-centric culture of today where driving is the default for most journeys, and an allied lack of willingness to change this view, particularly when there is a general perception of a lack of alternative options. This is seen to have been brought about by a promoted culture of car use in recent decades, which will be difficult to reverse. Linked to the issue of public attitudes, there were also some comments on the lack of political will to implement the necessary changes and on the power of the car lobby to influence political decisions. A third sector (sustainable transport) organisation commented:

> *"Unsustainable travel behaviours are long-standing and entrenched. These habits and preferences are barriers to behaviour change and may be difficult to overcome for certain population groups – especially those for whom car use remains an affordable, convenient choice due to household income or location. A minority of the population is likely to be vocally opposed to measures which disincentivise car use, from 'Spaces for People' changes to road user charging. There will be a need for political will from the Scottish Government, local government and UK Government to drive forward changes which are necessary and will benefit everyone …. At present, alternatives to car use and ownership, from public and community transport to car clubs, often compare unfavourably on affordability. Although the cost of motoring in the UK has increased by over 25% since 2012, the cost of bus travel (58%) and rail travel (30%) have increased even further over the same period. The cost of travel should, ultimately, reflect the Sustainable Transport Hierarchy."*

A number of the suggestions made by respondents mirrored those outlined in the route map. Suggestions that supported the route map included:

- A need to keep roads in a state of good repair in order to encourage cycling.

- To increase and improve upon the availability of active travel options and infrastructure; for example, creating new and segregated routes for cycling, wheeling or walking; albeit some people will be unable to consider active travel alternatives, along with a view that the Scottish weather can inhibit active travel.
- To improve upon the existing public transport infrastructure; for example, better bus shelters or improving accessibility.
- Disincentivising car usage; examples provided included road pricing, a workplace parking levy, reduced parking spaces, higher road taxes. That said, there were some comments on the need to have alternatives in situ before any driver disincentives are introduced. As noted by a third sector organisation:

  "Addressing this will require system change with long-term planning for positive outcomes and will need both "Carrots" – making doing the right thing easier and "Sticks" – disincentivising car use. Sticks might include vehicle and fuel taxation, road closures, road pricing, parking controls and reduced speed limits. Carrots would encourage alternative travel modes, cheaper, quicker and more reliable public transport, park and ride, car share options, multi-modal ticketing, better walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure and flexible and home working."

- Changes in planning policy; for example, designing new developments with local amenities and incorporating active travel infrastructure.
- Encouraging businesses to allow employees to work from home.
- The Scottish Government to work with partners and adopt a holistic approach; to integrate their vision into regional and local transport plans. It was felt by some that there is a current disconnect between a coherent and consistent national policy position and regional implementation.

Other suggestions made by respondents included:

- An increased focus on the use of electric vehicles (EVs), which are perceived to allow the freedom to travel but in a way that is good for the environment. There were also some suggestions for encouraging people to buy EVs and make them more attractive to potential users, for example, in providing preferential parking areas or an increased number of charging stations.
- Adopting other new technologies such as hydrogen cars or e-scooters.
- Educating people via an information campaign about climate change impacts and what is needed to bring about behaviour change, although this would need to be framed in a positive way.

- A need to speed up introduction of the route map in order to reach 2030 targets, with interim targets set and monitored so as to be able to measure success.
- Greater support for organisations that can help promote behaviour change.

There were a small number of concerns over a lack of a business case for bus service providers due to low passenger numbers and that a private deregulated market is inefficient in delivering better public transport. A very small number of respondents noted that public transport should become a public service.

In summarising a number of these issues, a third sector (environment) organisation observed:

> *"With the need to cut 75% of greenhouse gases by 2030, we cannot afford delays. Another challenge we face is that people on lowest incomes often live in areas poorest served by public transport and with least navigable pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. These inequalities in funding allocation need to be addressed immediately before we can expect modal shift. In considering the challenges in achieving this target, we must consider power and vested interests in our current car-dominated system. Many powerful building developers are intent on building large out of town estates with a 1-car-to-1-resident design. These developers are well resourced to overcome planning objections and have an apparent disinterest in sustainability. Likewise, out of town commercial developers, retail parks which decimate high streets, and drive-through coffee shops. Many of these developments in recent years should not have received planning approval, so obviously at odds with local needs, but local authorities are not empowered or resourced to challenge."*

Further actions to support behaviour change

The Scottish Government was keen to obtain details of any further actions respondents would like to see included in the future to support behaviour change. The first of these questions asked:

Question 4: 'Are there any further actions you would like to see included in future to support behaviour change – reducing the need to travel?'

A total of 479 respondents made comments at this question. Several themes emerged as the main factors involved in reducing the need to travel. The largest numbers of respondents noted their support for actions outlined in the route map and desired more encouragement of, and incentives for, working from home. Suggestions for working from home included allowing staff to continue to work from home post-Covid, employers offering hybrid or flexible working, employer or employee tax incentives or rebates, or a home energy allowance. A small number of respondents also recommended more compressed working, such as a 4-day week. A small minority suggested having easier to reach employer locations, with more consideration given to how location affects the workforce, proposing for employers to locate in densely populated areas rather than out of town industrial parks or to instigate community work hubs.

As in earlier questions, a number of points raised by respondents echoed the route map. These included similar numbers of respondents who advocated investing in more local facilities and amenities nearer homes, such as shops, healthcare facilities, schools, childcare, post offices and distribution hubs, on a general theme of decentralisation. Some of these specifically mentioned 20 minute neighbourhoods. Significant minorities wished to see better planning or changes to the planning system to help enable this with requests not to build housing estates far away from amenities and from public transport hubs, and a small number of mentions urging strong commitment towards this in NPF4. Similar numbers of respondents pinpointed a need for better infrastructure and facilities in rural areas in terms of public transport and broadband, again noting a need to take account of rural and urban differences.

More access to and improvements in high speed internet and broadband were recommended by a significant minority of respondents, including a large minority of organisations. Smaller minorities also urged other digital-related improvements as follows:

- More services to be made available online (e.g. healthcare, education, local ordering and delivery, smart work centres, more local digital hubs, perhaps at libraries or via local work hubs).
- Free or low cost support to help people access the internet, to help reduce digital exclusion (e.g. provision of low cost computer equipment or training to increase digital literacy).
- Reduction of non-climate friendly online deliveries (e.g. last mile delivery by bike, wheel or cargo bike, or taxing long distance suppliers).

Significant numbers of respondents chose to make comments relating to alternative modes of transport to the car. The largest numbers of comments - a significant minority – urged the use of demand management measures to reduce car use. A variety of suggestions were made including an increase in road tax, congestion

charging, limitations or increased charging on parking, more low traffic neighbourhoods and LEZs, limitations on school run drop-offs, speed reductions and an excess levy on high mileage motorists. As a third sector respondent put it:

> *"Using sticks as well as carrots to change behaviour is the only way mass modal shift can be achieved. Reducing parking, charging per mile, minimum fuel prices or increased parking charges will end up being necessary to turn this tanker around in the time available."*

Other transport mentions mainly reiterated points made in previous questions:

- Cheaper and more regular, frequent and reliable trains and buses.
- More investment in public transport and more routes and integration of public transport modes.
- Better and safer cycling, wheeling and walking infrastructure.
- Other support for active travel, such as incentives towards cycle purchasing.

A small minority of respondents desired more government advice, education and promotion about the advantages of travel reduction and non-car use (e.g. better health, air quality). Small numbers of mentions were also made suggesting an increase in park and ride facilities, and car sharing or community transport schemes; more focus on motorcycles, scooters and electric vehicle infrastructure; and action to reduce tourist vehicles, such as promoting local tourism.

However, objections to the behavioural change were voiced by a large minority of respondents. These respondents did not address climate change, or offer other ways by which emissions reductions could be achieved. Most mentions stated that it was important for individuals to have the freedom to travel for social, sporting, cultural, leisure and mental health reasons. These respondents said they do not want to be kept at home and do not want to do everything online. Significant numbers of respondents said it was impractical to reduce the need to travel as it was necessary for work, shopping and family reasons, and that no one travels more than they have to. Respondents also reiterated their general disagreement with aspects of the strategy, stating a preference for driving and urging that motorists should not be targeted. There was a small minority who expressed concerns about adverse economic impacts and unintended consequences arising from reducing the need to travel. It was hypothesised that being forced online would detrimentally affect the local economy, reduction in travel would affect the viability of public transport, and delivery vehicles would proliferate on the roads.

Finally, a small minority of respondents said they had no further actions they wished to see included to support reducing the need to travel.

The next question asked:

Question 5: 'Are there any further actions you would like to see included in the future to support behaviour change – choosing local options?'

A total of 469 respondents made comments at this question, many of which supported actions outlined in the route map. Several main themes emerged, with the most quoted one (from a significant minority, including a large minority of organisations) being better provision or investment in local amenities and services. Specific local facilities mentioned included medical, dental, leisure, education, childcare, post offices and toilets. The regeneration of high streets and town centres in general was also advocated, along with calls to stop the centralisation of services. Improvement in terms of the quality of local appearances and experiences was also urged, for example local access to green space. A small minority desired cheaper local shopping options to be available to reduce the need to travel to large supermarkets for cheaper goods. Similar numbers wished for better provision of information or promotion of what local alternatives are available, with examples given of online mapping and signposting of routes to town centres.

A significant minority of respondents wished to see encouragement and support for local businesses and shops (e.g. subsidies for locally produced food, farmers' markets and local businesses, or cheaper rents and business rates for premises in non-urban areas). A small minority were of the view that a balance was needed with online shopping and commerce, so that it does not negatively affect local economies, with a few arguing for more local or green deliveries from local suppliers.

There was also a wish (from a small minority) to see encouragement for more local work and employment opportunities, for example via outreach hubs and local meeting spaces, along with a small number of requests for increased home or remote working.

The other major theme raised as an enabler for choosing local options was changes to or action regarding the planning system, mentioned by a significant minority, including a large minority of organisations. Specific restrictions and other suggestions included the following:

- No more or fewer developments allowed for out of town retail / cinemas.
- No more drive through fast food outlets.
- No more housing developments without including local amenities / facilities / transport infrastructure (e.g. restore mixed use neighbourhoods).

- Ensure NPF4 / Local Development Plans have sufficient powers to support local options and choices.
- Use 20 minute neighbourhoods in town planning development control.
- Make active travel central to planning.
- Fewer student flat developments in local communities.
- Easier planning regulations for local shops and businesses (e.g. make change of use for buildings easier).

A small minority suggested tax-related actions to help with choosing local options, including with several of the issues raised in points above; taxing online commerce; tax breaks for local or smaller shops; taxing high car usage; council tax reductions for non-car owners; taxing large online retailers heavily; taxing non-sustainable delivery options; a carbon tax on new housing remote from infrastructure' taxing to disincentivise the use of out of town retail; and taxing land ownership (to discourage out of town shopping centres) were all suggested.

Significant numbers of respondents again focused their remarks on alternative transport options to the car. Comments largely reflected those made at previous questions and included the following:

- More public transport options, including more connectivity and accessibility (e.g. routes, links, integrated transport, stations (buses, trains, park and ride schemes, etc.), and a small number suggesting the use of stations as mobility hubs).
- Free or cheaper public transport.
- More reliable and quicker local public transport.
- Better and safer (local) cycling and wheeling infrastructure (e.g. parking, lanes, storage, segregation from motor vehicles, buses carrying cycles, more routes, weather protection and more use of e-scooters and electric bikes).
- More transport electrification.
- Better and safer walking and wheeling infrastructure (e.g. better and more pavements, more pedestrianisation, paths and pedestrian crossings).
- Help for disabled access to non-car transport.

A significant minority (including a large minority of organisations) suggested car disincentivisation or demand management measures, including the following:

- Parking limitations (e.g. parking charges for edge of town shopping malls and better inconsiderate or illegal parking enforcement).
- Reallocation of road space away from cars (e.g. removal of traffic from high streets, instigation of low traffic neighbourhoods or low emissions zones, school run restrictions).
- Speed limit enforcement.

- Congestion charging.

Other changes and actions were each suggested by small numbers of respondents as follows:

- Changes to local government (e.g. less cuts, or more devolved powers to assist areas to develop solutions fitting their particular needs).
- Changes in tourism focus (e.g. no longer promoting the NC500, promoting local tourism, promoting tourism and leisure trips by public transport and discouraging inappropriate parking).
- More community consultation or involvement of communities in decision-making.
- More acknowledgement of urban and rural differences (e.g. 20 minute neighbourhoods may not be possible in rural areas, and different plans or interventions may be needed between different localities).

A small number of respondents saw a need for more research (e.g. into household decision-making, motivators and habits, and on the time and money required to develop local options and trials of solutions) before moving forward. A very small number of suggestions advocated promotion of, or support for, the Place Standard Tool.

A significant minority of respondents disagreed with the behaviour change, mainly citing the impracticality of living locally due to a lack of local options, for instance with regard to large scale shopping, employment (a small number of respondents cited a lack of housing affordability near workplaces), schools, culture and sport. A small number of respondents disagreed with local living, citing freedom of choice or reiterated their opposition to aspects of the strategy as a whole.

Finally, a small number of respondents said that no further actions were necessary or that the proposal was fine as it stands.

The next question asked:

Question 6: 'Are there any further actions you would like to see included in future to support behaviour change – switching to more sustainable modes of travel?'

A total of 509 respondents made comments at this question. The theme with most responses (by a large minority of respondents which included a majority of organisations) was action on better and safer cycling, walking, and wheeling infrastructure and active travel routes. Various facets to this were advocated including the following:

- More networks, dedicated paths and active travel routes away from roads.
- Safer roads (e.g. dedicated lanes, better awareness from lorry / car drivers).
- Hiring and sharing schemes for cycles.
- Secure cycle storage facilities.
- Provision for cargo bikes.
- Money off schemes for those wishing to acquire cycles (e.g. cash / subsidies / vouchers / VAT removal).
- Better or more cycle transportation facilities on buses / trains.
- Cycle training at schools.
- Bike buses to schools.
- Better road maintenance (e.g. fixing potholes to make cycling safer and save on repair costs).
- Improving the traffic and road orders system or the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process for active travel schemes (e.g. compulsory purchasing or not getting diverted by spurious objections).

A small minority of respondents urged more support for the use of electric bikes, with suggestions for schemes to make these more affordable, using e-cargo bikes for last mile deliveries and allowing speeds of up to 20 mph. Similar numbers desired support for the use of other powered two-wheelers (PTWs), such as mopeds, motorbikes, and e-scooters, citing their usefulness in terms of working in rural communities, causing less congestion, and being good for travel ranges beyond cycling.

Drawbacks with cycling as a travel method were however raised by a small minority. Specific issues perceived were inclement weather; being an unsafe transport mode in winter; commuting issues (distance involved and the need for a shower after arrival); not being a useful mode for shopping or the elderly; cycle security problems; the behaviour of fast cyclists; and the lack of funds raised from cyclists by way of road tax or insurance.

A significant minority of respondents (including a large minority of organisations) were in favour of encouraging walking and wheeling with better and safer pedestrian infrastructure. Specific mentions were made about improving paths, providing better lighting, having more crossing junctions and reward schemes for walking.

A small minority wanted to see more information and promotions about switching to sustainable travel options, such as public campaigns, maps, signage, cycle events and walking groups.

The other major theme discussed by respondents was public transport provision, particularly relating to buses and trains (with occasional mentions of Edinburgh's trams and Glasgow's underground system). The greatest numbers of these - a

significant minority of respondents, including a large minority of organisations – expressed a desire for cheaper or free public transport. There was a wish to make costs comparable to the cost of car travel. Suggestions as to how to bring this about included a desire for more railcards, subsidies and discounts. More specifically there were requests to eliminate peak hours fares, expressions of support for the on-going Fair Fares review undertaken by Transport Scotland to consider both the availability of services and the range of discounts and concessionary schemes which are available on all modes including bus, rail and ferry, and positive comments about free bus travel for the under 22s.

Nearly as many comments were received which advocated better public transport links, routes and accessibility, and connectivity between bus, train, tram and underground modes. There were requests for more stations or stops, with a very small number of mentions of the success of the Borders railway line. Likewise, respondents argued for better links with active travel routes and the introduction of smart ticketing for use across all companies and types of transport.

A significant minority expressed a desire for more reliable, frequent and quicker public transport, in part to help make journey times closer to those for using the car. Suggestions included more night services, more segregation of bus lanes, and more bus priority on roads. Slightly smaller numbers (but a large minority of organisations) were in favour of more investment in public transport infrastructure in terms of modernisation, with a small number of suggestions to renationalise this.

Other public transport improvements were suggested, again by a significant minority. These included making public transport safer, cleaner (e.g. to overcome Covid concerns), more spacious, comfortable (e.g. more bus shelters), reducing fare dodging, reducing anti-social behaviour, using greener fuels, electrification of rail and more electric buses.

A significant number of respondents focused on a need for improved rural transport options or infrastructure. There were references to the difficulties involved in offering rural alternatives to the car and the perceived inequities of accessing funding streams. A representative body stated that rural Scotland sees only a fraction of the concessionary travel budget (such as the under 22s bus pass), which is mostly used for urban areas.

A small number of respondents each made the following other mentions about sustainable travel modes:

- Requests for more community transport (such as dial-a-bus) and community-driven transport solutions, with suggestions that these forms should be more prominent in the provision of health and social care-related transport.

- Adjusting the tourism and visitor focus to slower and less rushed holidaying or removing advertising of road trips such as the NC500.
- Provision of more park and ride facilities.
- More workplace sustainable transport schemes.
- Tax actions to promote sustainable transport use (e.g. increasing fuel tax or road tax).
- More heed to be taken of provision for disabled people and the elderly (e.g. those who find it difficult to use active travel options or tend to be dependent on cars) with suggestions of better wheelchair access, dropped kerbs and adapted cycles.

There were also a small number of queries as to the meaning of 'sustainability' and 'sustainable modes', and what modes qualify.

A small minority of respondents thought there should be a focus on more electric cars or electric vehicle use, with suggestions for switching being aided by financial help for purchasing, more affordability, incentives, hire schemes or zero VAT. Similar numbers made a case for better or more electric vehicle infrastructure (in particular more charging points, improved servicing expertise, using batteries for storage and paying a feed out tariff, and grants to home owners for EV charging installation). However, similar numbers again were against electric vehicles, citing their unaffordability, environmental costliness (via lithium mining and battery disposal issues), fears of running out of charge and many perceived 'don't do's' in relation to battery care. A small number of individual respondents hailed hydrogen-powered vehicles as a better possible long term solution.

A small minority of respondents were of the opinion that the government and politicians should take the lead or show the way by example (e.g. councils, the Scottish Government and public servants) by using alternative sustainable travel modes rather than, for example, fleet cars or planes. It was also perceived that councils do not access much of the active travel funding, and that there is a need for long term planning, albeit with a need to deliver planned measures with more speed. There was also a suggestion from a third sector (environment) respondent to use new powers in the Transport Act to start new municipal bus operators.

Car disincentives were seen as part of the solution for take up of sustainable transport modes by a significant minority of respondents, including a large minority of organisations. Forms this could take were suggested, including financial disincentives in the form of more tax on SUVs; congestion charging; road mileage pricing; and the Workplace Parking Levy. There were also references to traffic regulations such as enforcing speed limits; more 20 mph zones; restricting car lanes; restrictions to city centre parking; the enforcement of no pavement parking; Low Traffic Neighbourhoods; and Low Emissions Zones. Other suggestions made

included compensation for car owners to dispose of cars; restricting school car runs; and limiting road construction. A few respondents voiced opposition to anti-car measures, saying that traffic congestion caused by cycle lanes caused more pollution; extra parking charges would reduce city centre or high street footfall; and there would be general complaints about loss of freedoms and impracticalities.

Finally, there were a small number of calls for better transport planning around new housing and other developments, support for car sharing, and small numbers of reiterations of opposition to the proposals.

The next question asked:

Question 7: 'Are there any further actions you would like to see included in future to support behaviour change – combining or sharing journeys?'

A total of 402 respondents made comments at this question. There was one predominant theme cited by a large minority, almost all of whom were individual respondents, who took the view that car sharing was impractical and unrealistic, the main concern being Covid transmission risk?. The following variety of reasons were also given:

- Driving would be necessary to meet up.
- Insurance issues (e.g. liability questions in the case of accidents, car sharing not being a standard part of policies).
- Safety issues with strangers.
- Safety considerations for women and children.
- Lack of feasibility in rural or remote areas (not enough critical mass).
- Lack of spare car space (e.g. due to large families).
- Work routines failing to synchronise.
- Difficulties finding people who want to go to the same place at the same time.
- Practical difficulties for those with disabilities.

Significant minorities of mainly individual respondents were opposed to car sharing for other reasons, in particular that it still encourages car use and ownership and that priority actions should be geared towards the first three behaviours (making use of sustainable online options to reduce the need to travel; choosing local destinations or reducing the distance travelled; and switching to walking, wheeling, cycling or public transport where possible) which will have the greatest effects. Other reasons given were that car sharing had been tried before without success and a wish to maintain personal space.

A significant minority (including a large minority of organisations) reiterated that it would be better to prioritise improvements to public transport, in terms of cost, reliability, coverage and integration, with a small number commenting that shared journeys are best done by enabling facets of public transport provision such as universal ticketing.

Other priorities to car sharing were also reiterated by a small minority of respondents, largely reflecting opinions voiced at the previous questions. These included prioritising active travel and integrating linkage with public transport; introducing more anti-car measures; and supporting home working.

However, small minorities, particularly amongst organisations, each urged actions to encourage more car sharing. These included the following:

- Offering incentives for car sharing (e.g. reducing vehicle charges for multiple occupants, fuel rebates or discounts, reduced parking charges, tax reliefs or reductions, instigating car pool lanes or enabling use of bus lanes, workplace incentives, shared road charging, discounts on congestion charges, incentives linked to local businesses / employers (eg priority parking), and encouragement for taxi sharing.
- Use of online technology, apps (e.g. similar to Uber), web portals or booking systems to enable car sharing and other transport options (e.g. Mitfahrzentrale in Germany, BlaBlaCar in Spain, the Liftshare portal or a local facebook page) with secure systems (e.g. people screening, ID vetting), and allowing postings of journey details.
- More publicity and promotion of, and guidance about, car sharing.
- Offering further car sharing options (e.g. car-pooling initiatives, involving businesses and employers, for instance to offer hours that synchronise for employee sharing).
- Prioritising car sharing in certain scenarios by using natural groupings (e.g. hospitals or company settings where employees' work patterns synchronise or where it is possible to plan ahead, or in rural areas).
- Introducing measures against solo drivers (e.g. extra charges, an increase in parking charges (for instance at workplaces), and a reduction in the number of lanes they can drive in).

There were also a small minority of respondents who stated that they already car share where practical or operate a car sharing scheme. Additionally, there were positive comments about car share schemes helping to strengthen community connections at a local level, being an option for those who cannot cycle, and helping to reduce car ownership. There were also some comments that car or lift sharing is easier to do if arranged informally amongst family and friends rather than with strangers. Mobility hubs were seen as a possible aid to expanding car sharing, in the

forms of parking locations, laybys and grocery pick up points as well as providing a location where different travel options including walking, cycling, car, bus, etc. come together. This can ensure that the last mile of a journey can be met with alternative shared options and help move people away from their reliance on private vehicle use.

Support for expansion of car club schemes was expressed by a small minority, particularly organisations. More affordability and encouragement of siting these in suburban areas were recommended, along with enabling pick up and drop off at different locations and making them accessible to disabled people. Other positive comments were received from respondents, in particular in relation to helping reduce car ownership and members tending to only using car club cars when necessary. Examples were given including CoWheels and the Green Mobility model in Europe.

Electric vehicle sharing schemes (e.g. for car clubs or e-bikes) were recommended by a small number of respondents.

A small minority of respondents saw value in the opportunities provided by Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) and Mobility as a Service (MaaS). Suggestions were made to use digital Apps such as for dial-a-bus and dial-a-taxi scenarios. Suggested situations where DRT and MaaS could help included rural areas, organised supermarket visits, and community and staff transport, as well as in areas where bus routes are not commercially viable.

Only a small number of comments made referenced combining journeys; these all simply stated that people combine trips anyway wherever possible (e.g. the school run with commuting).

A small minority of respondents did not see any additional actions as being necessary to support this behaviour change; slightly smaller numbers reiterated their general opposition to the strategy or various aspects of it.

Views on specific policies within the route map

The final question in this part of the consultation asked:

> **Question 8: 'Do you have any comments to make on any of the specific policies contained within the route map?'**

A total of 340 respondents made comments at this question, although many of the comments made did not refer to the specific policies set out in the route map. Responses were very diffuse with many different themes taken up by relatively small numbers of respondents; most of these respondents repeated views stated in earlier questions. The largest proportions – significant minorities – firstly commented on the need to make public transport accessible, affordable and more integrated in terms of ease of switching between modes, and secondly foresaw a need to take account of the different situations and requirements of people living in rural areas. For the latter, the main train of thought was that it was not practical for the stated policies to work in rural areas, due to: a lack of alternatives to car use, in particular a lack of fast digital connectivity; a lack of public transport; and a lack of amenities for a 20 minute neighbourhood[3].

A smaller but still significant number of respondents (including a large minority of organisations) saw a need for investment in cycling and active travel infrastructure in terms of safer routes and parking and storage of cycles, with a small number of criticisms about a lack of specificity regarding these in the route map. A small number recommended better road maintenance and road improvements to help improve active travel, reduce fuel usage for motorised transport and improve safety generally.

Smaller minorities of respondents (though a large minority of organisations) voiced generally supportive comments for the route map, welcoming the constituent policies with some mentions of these already being delivered and linking well to other policy areas. There were also a few mentions of insufficient urgency being shown to meet the 2030 timescale or to stop climate change, and of the proposals having insufficient ambition (e.g. 20% reduction in emissions not being enough to combat air and noise pollution or carbon dioxide emissions, or more measures being needed to achieve a 20% reduction).

A small minority of respondents advocated that there should be a focus on building sustainable and workable options and infrastructure as per the Route Map interventions with these being attractive, cheap and practical.

There were some concerns raised about action areas not given sufficient coverage in the route map, where respondents felt they should be more in focus. Small numbers of respondents each pinpointed the following:

- Concerns about a lack of specificity or emphasis in the route map for demand management measures.

[3] Though these are catered for as part of the Route Map

- Queries about the lack of mention of a role for electric vehicles, for instance regarding e-scooters, electric buses and cars, e-bikes, and train electrification; albeit with a small number of comments concerned about their expense, charging facilities and environmental impacts incurred in production and wastage.
- Queries about the lack of mentions for other transport modes (e.g. motorcycles, mobility scooters, LPG vehicles).
- Concerns about the whole focus being on private individuals and the public (e.g. a lack of business usage policies such as putting goods transportation onto rail, or funding businesses for pool bikes or cargo bikes), with further worries that the consequence of fewer individual car trips may create an increase in commercial traffic, such as that needed for home deliveries.
- A need to introduce actions to mitigate tourism impacts (e.g. through car use and aviation, with suggestions for the route map to interlink with VisitScotland's Destination Net Zero initiative or promotion of 'slow tourism').
- A need to focus on actions to disincentivise the use of larger vehicles, such as SUVs and pick-ups, which use more fuel and pollute more, rather than smaller cars.

In addition, there was a small minority of calls for specific car disincentivisation measures (i.e. to use a stick, as well as a carrot). These reiterated ideas mentioned previously, such as congestion charging, reduced access to city centres, increased parking charges, more speed bumps and further introductions of low emission zones. There were also a small number of comments welcoming 20 mph speed limits where appropriate and where properly enforced. Similar numbers however opposed what they viewed as excessive punishment of petrol and diesel car owners with several reiterating that there was a lack of practical alternatives.

The following concerns about certain aspects of the route map were made, each by small numbers of respondents:

- Concerns about sufficient funding being available for proper implementation, with remarks about a need for massive public sector investment and work needed regarding the overall funding patterns required to achieve the desired outcomes.
- Concerns about disabled people and the elderly being able to meet policies (despite the route map clearly stating that the target is a national one, and recognises that not all individuals will be able to reduce their car use to the same extent), with remarks about these groups carrying an unfair burden, being unable or less able to travel by active modes and having cars as their only practical option. There were calls to involve disabled people in developing the plan or being offered exemptions.

- Concerns about the detrimental impact on, or lack of account taken of those in poverty or with limited incomes, in terms of potential unaffordability of cars with less ability to make use of alternatives (e.g. those in lower paid employment may not have the option of home working,; and may work less sociable hours making public transport less of an option). There were calls for these groups to be financially supported through the transition.

A small number of respondents thought the proposals were not specific enough, calling for more information on their delivery and a firmer commitment to more targets and dates. Similar numbers felt that the route map needs to be more joined up with other transport and health policies.

Other comments were also made by small numbers of respondents as follows:

- Education around climate change in order to change behaviour is key, with particular emphasis on children. For instance, the Eco Schools Scotland Programme as part of the Learning for Sustainability Programme was welcomed.
- There is a need to keep monitoring, researching, analysing and evaluating policy progress to see if the desired impacts are achieved, with a consistent approach needed nationally. For instance, use of the Scottish Household Survey to get robust data on travel behaviours was recommended by a local authority.
- There is a need for local solutions to local problems, with comments that there is no one size fits all solution. Suggestions included a need for action from individual local authorities and only targeting the route map at those most able to adapt.

Small numbers of other comments mentioned a need to learn or copy from overseas success stories, such as those in Dutch cities, and stronger policies needed around schools, such as no parking and clean air zones. Points were also made about Scotland's weather and climate reducing the feasibility of active travel (and public transport in winter) and concerns were raised about revenue losses from reduced amounts of vehicle and fuel tax.

Finally, a significant minority consisting almost entirely of individual respondents reiterated their opposition to the policies, citing their impracticality and unworkability, objecting to the perceived curtailment of freedoms.

Impacts on specific groups of people

Transport Scotland was keen to gather views on the potential impacts, and mitigation of these impacts, of the interventions on groups with protected characteristics, island communities and across socio-economic disparity. A number of questions focused on this.

Impacts on people with protected characteristics

The first question in this section asked:

> **Question 8.1a: 'Do you think that the proposals set out in this plan could have positive or negative impacts on any particular groups of people with reference to the listed protected characteristics?'**

The responses people have provided in this section have largely focussed on people's concerns about how easy or difficult it is for these groups to reduce their car use, and less on how the interventions in the route map will impact on this, bearing in mind that there is no stipulation in the route map for all individuals to reduce their car use by 20%.

As detailed in the table below, a large majority of respondents thought the proposals could have positive or negative impacts on particular groups of people. Only one organisation thought this not to be the case, though nearly one in five responding individuals believed there would be no impacts.

Table 3: Whether the proposals set out in this plan could have positive or negative impacts on any particular groups of people with protected characteristics

Response type (Sample Size)	Responses			
	Yes	**No**	**Don't Know**	**Not Answered**
Business (2)	-	-	-	2
Health / NHS (3)	2	-	-	1
Local authority (13)	11	1	-	1
NDPB (Non-departmental public body) (2)	-	-	-	2
Regional transport partnership (8)	5	-	1	2
Representative body (7)	2	-	1	4
Third sector (other) (7)	2	-	3	2
Third sector (environmental) (8)	4	-	2	2
Third sector (sustainable transport) (9)	6	-	1	2
Other (5)	4	-	1	-
Total organisations (64)	**36**	**1**	**9**	**18**
Individuals (615)	283	90	135	107
Total respondents	**319**	**91**	**144**	**125**

Four hundred respondents went on to explain their answer. A majority of these (almost two in three) cited examples of negative impacts, while a large minority (one in three) cited examples of positive impacts. A Small minority (less than one in ten) gave both negative and positive impacts. Slightly more organisations gave examples of positive impacts than negative ones, but more than twice the number of individuals gave negative impacts than positive ones.

Amongst almost all the mentions of positive impacts, an overarching theme was that these positives depend on what the state of public transport will be when the proposals become reality. A significant minority said there will be positive impacts generally if people are able to access a safe, cheap and reliable public transport system or if the active travel infrastructure is sufficient to enhance travel options. Smaller numbers hailed positive impacts for all arising from a healthier, more sustainable environment with less pollution and fewer carbon dioxide emissions, and health benefits arising from increased (active travel) exercise levels.

A significant minority (particularly local authorities and non-disabled third sector organisations) saw positive impacts for disabled people. Respondents said that the proposals allow for disability access support (e.g. well-designed public transport and active travel infrastructure such as places to rest and greater space for wheelchairs) which are positive for disabled people who do not drive or have access to a car, and provide easier use of cars for disabled people who do drive and are car-dependent.

Small minorities of respondents said the proposals will have positive impacts on the following groups:

- Young people and older children: tend to be more flexible with changes, less danger from road vehicles, ease of traveling independently and with better active travel options (will not need to be driven around as much).
- Those on lower incomes or living in area of deprivation: assumed easier options for walking, cycling and buses which are used more frequently by those on lower incomes, and less pollution.
- All who do not drive: as above, with assumed easier options for non-car travel.

A small number of respondents also foresaw benefits for the elderly (less traffic, assumed easier and safer options for non-car travel and health benefits for those able to actively travel), women (assumed safer public transport and greater safety in numbers on active travel routes) and ethnic minorities (perceived as less likely to drive). A very small number of mentions were of benefits to pregnant women, young parents and those on higher incomes – the latter being perceived as being able to afford electric vehicles.

A small minority saw benefits arising from the addressing of inequalities, with a small number seeing benefits to all from perceived intermixing via increased use of public transport and active travel, engendering more community spirit.

The most commonly cited negative impacts were on disabled people, by a large minority of respondents. It is important to note that these generally relate to perceived disbenefits to individuals if they are prevented from driving, rather than disbenefits to individuals that result from an overall reduced level of car use across Scotland. The route map has explicitly set out that there is no intention in its policies to prevent individuals who need to use a private vehicle as a mobility aid from doing so, and that interventions are designed to support and encourage those who have the opportunity to drive less to make that choice. The main themes were:

- Extra expense to move around.
- Inability to easily walk, wheel, cycle or bus, therefore relying on cars.

- Difficulties using public transport (e.g. cars being safer from point of view of Covid or other infection risks, and a lack of space for wheelchairs).
- Not all disabled people have blue badges, further reducing access to key services and parking.

There were suggestions that disabled people need special dispensation or exemption from car restrictions due their potential loss of independence, and that they need assessments to determine the precise impact.

A significant minority perceived negative impacts on the elderly, which mainly reflected the same themes expressed for disabled people. It was also felt that state pensioners may have less money than younger people to compensate for extra travel costs, and that this group may be less capable of doing things online.

A significant minority perceived negative impacts generally or for all groups. Difficulties getting to amenities, a lack of freedom to travel, the lack of choice as some have no alternative to the car, safety issues without a car or on public transport, and increased travel costs and time were all given as reasons for this.

Negative impacts on those on lower incomes or living in areas of deprivation were also perceived by a significant minority, with these groups seen as among the least likely to be able to change behaviour easily. It was felt they would suffer disproportionately in relation to travel costs; they would have less access to the internet; and poorer access to public transport and amenities generally.

People in rural areas were also perceived to be negatively impacted by a significant minority of respondents. Negative impacts included a lack of car alternatives, extra travel costs and penalties being incurred from travelling long distances, as well as weather issues and those on lower incomes being overrepresented in rural areas.

Small minorities of respondents perceived negative impacts on the following:

- Women: safety issues without a car (e.g. issues with car-sharing or car-pooling, security on public transport and lighting at night on active travel routes).
- Pregnant women: as above, as well as the inability to use an active travel option easily or use long bus journeys (lack of toilets) and need of a car if in labour.
- Parents with young families: lack of ease using active travel and having to integrate school drop-offs into working days.

Small numbers of respondents also foresaw negative impacts arising for ethnic minorities (concerns about abuse on public transport), those using a car to transport or care for elderly, disabled and child family members (concerns about being unable

to provide assistance), people of faith (problems getting to places of worship), and the young (shrunken employment horizons if unable to travel). Very small numbers cited those with mental health problems; those who are not -IT literate; those who cannot access the internet; single people;, and the LGBT community.

A small number of respondents referred to the need for more information first before determining whether the proposals would have impacts on particular groups. There was specific reference to the Equalities Impact Assessment process that will/is/has been carried out by Transport Scotland as a means of providing this information? This was mentioned by a small number of local authority and third sector / sustainable transport organisations.

There were a small minority who regarded the question as being either not sensible or understandable, or thought the list of protected characteristics had little relevance to the proposals.

The next question went on to ask:

Question 8.1b: 'If you think the proposals will have a particular impact on certain groups due to protected characteristics, what measures would you suggest to maximise positive impacts or mitigate negative impacts?'

A total of 283 responses were received for this question. Most of these reiterated actions detailed in the previous two questions. The most frequently mentioned measure (by a significant minority including a large minority of organisations) was improvements to public transport in terms of reliability, frequency, accessibility and connectivity (e.g. smart ticketing across modes and more local transport options). Small minorities urged cheaper or free public transport, particularly for the elderly and those on low incomes, and better safety or security on these modes. A similar number requested more public transport facilities for the affected groups; suggestions included spaces for prams and wheelchairs on buses, step-free access, ramps, toilets on buses and anti-discriminatory training for staff.

A significant minority suggested improving facilities for those walking, wheeling and cycling; these included accessible infrastructure for the elderly or disabled people (e.g. for mobility scooters, wide enough gaps for two wheelchairs to pass, or having adapted cycles), cycle tracks, good connections to public transport with cycle transit and storage facility availability, and parent, carer and child equipment (e.g. tag along bikes, bike trailers). There were further suggestions to make active travel for children easier and to encourage women and ethnic minorities to use active travel more. There were also a small minority of calls for better safety for active travel, with a variety of recommendations as follows:

- Reducing or enforcing speed limits.
- Better road and track maintenance.
- Banning cyclists from pavements and cars from pavement parking.
- Segregated lanes and cycle paths.
- More surveillance.
- Open spaces and safe routes around schools.

There were a small number of suggestions that these improvements would benefit women.

Additionally, a few suggestions were made recommending pavement improvements for disabled people and pushchair users including more lighting, dropped kerbs, less street furniture and wider pavements.

Small minorities advocated the following measures:

- Allowing exemptions, separate policies or schemes for certain specified groups; disabled people (increased disabled parking or blue badge spaces, exempt from road pricing if this were to be introduced); those in rural areas; those on lower incomes; families; and carers. A small number of mentions were also made recommending the use of legislation to make sure measures are implemented correctly.
- More consultation or input to the design from the affected groups (e.g. older people, disabled people or their representative organisations, and those in rural areas) to ensure that policies meet their specific requirements. A few comments were made urging that the needs of affected groups are fully funded.
- Measures to make local living easier, by improving local services, making working from home easier, supporting 20 minute neighbourhoods, and providing support to sustain local businesses.

Other recommendations – each from a small number of respondents – were as follows:

- Reiterations of support for e-vehicles; in particular support for those on low incomes to switch to electric vehicles or supporting electric car clubs.
- More call-up buses (also called DRT) , on demand transport options. MaaS services or community transport are seen as offering a high proportion of wheelchair accessible vehicles and door-to-door pick-ups, and therefore used by disabled people, the elderly and those in rural areas. A small number mentioned the use of individualised support such as taxis for disabled people or the elderly.

- More car disincentivisation measures as reiterated previously, helping to minimise air pollution in deprived communities and also benefitting groups with a preponderance of non-car users such as older people, young people, ethnic minorities and disabled people. Small numbers however reiterated views about reductions in car usage being a choice by users, and about providing practical travel options before punishing car use.
- Maintaining non-digital options for the elderly, non-IT literate and those without internet access (or alternatively providing education and support with digital options).

Further points were made by small numbers of respondents about needs for further research and data on impacts, and for more information/promotion about on changes of approaches to travel.

Significant minorities of respondents reiterated their opposition to proposals, urged non-penalisation of car users who had no other options (such as people in rural areas, disabled people, and those needing travel access for employment or health reasons), and reiterated negative impacts on specified groups without providing further details.

Impacts on island communities

The first question in this section asked:

> **Question 8.2a: 'Do you think that the proposals set out in this plan could have a particular impact (positive or negative) on island communities?'**

As previously, many of the responses to this question appear to relate to perceived concerns about the impact of any policy changes hindering car travel in rural areas, rather than the proposals in the plan themselves.

As detailed in the table 4, a large majority of respondents who expressed an opinion thought the proposals could have a particular impact on island communities, though a majority of respondents overall either did not know or did not make a response to the question.

Table 4: Whether the proposals set out in this plan could have a particular impact (positive or negative) on island communities

Response type (Sample Size)	Responses			
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Not Answered
Business (2)	-	-	-	2
Health / NHS (3)	1	-	-	2
Local authority (13)	3	-	9	1
NDPB (Non-departmental public body) (2)	-	-	-	2
Regional transport partnership (8)	3	-	1	4
Representative body (7)	2	-	1	4
Third sector (other) (7)	-	2	3	2
Third sector (environmental) (8)	3	-	2	3
Third sector (sustainable transport) (9)	3	2	2	2
Other (5)	3	-	2	-
Total organisations (64)	**18**	**4**	**20**	**22**
Individuals (615)	198	42	257	118
Total respondents	**216**	**46**	**277**	**140**

A large number of respondents (289) went on to explain their answer. A majority of these (almost two in three) cited examples of negative impacts, while only one in five cited examples of positive impacts. Slightly more organisations gave examples of negative impacts than positive impacts, but more than three times the number of individuals gave negative impacts compared to those who provided positive examples.

As in Question 8.1a, almost all comments about positive impacts had the proviso that these very much depended on the implementation of improvements and investments being made to alternative travel options, particularly with regards to public transport (cited by a significant minority). Apart from reiterations of improvements suggested previously, there was a particular request that public transport modes should have better integration with ferries.

Much smaller numbers of respondents suggested other positive impacts on island communities, all with the proviso that there were assumed improvements to the services and amenities mentioned. Each of the following were suggested by a few or small numbers of respondents:

- Better active travel options (e.g. cycling infrastructure, more facilities for multi-mode travel, such as cycle storage on ferries).
- Better local facilities and amenities arising from 20 minute neighbourhoods (e.g. resulting in lower travel expenses needed to get to the mainland, local economy benefits and reduction of pressure on ferries so that there is more space on them for locals).
- Better broadband and internet connectivity could mean more local or home working and a reduced need to travel, helping to maintain island populations.
- Greater ease of living on islands, which may again limit? population losses or encourage more people to live on them.
- Less tourism-related traffic congestion and quieter, more sustainable tourism.
- Environmental benefits from fewer cars (e.g. less of a sea level rise).

There were also a small number of calls for more electric vehicle use, with a very small number of views that the islands could show leadership in green motoring.

A small number of comments noted that impacts would vary depending on the island in question, for instance whether it was reachable by bridge or ferry, or by terrain. For example, a couple of views perceived that Shetland and Orkney have better public transport than many places on the mainland.

A few respondents envisaged no particular different impacts on islands than elsewhere, and two local authorities referred to the Draft Island Communities Impact Assessment.

A small minority of individuals said they could not comment on impacts as they were unfamiliar with the islands; a few of these said there was a need to consult people living on them.

The most frequently mentioned negative impact was that there are none or very few other options to using the car on islands, cited by a significant minority (including a large minority of organisations). Remarks were made indicating that there is more reliance on the car and other motorised transport than elsewhere, and that any car use disincentives would have a very negative impact on living and working in these areas. A significant minority pointed to a lack of public transport alternatives with no trains and few buses servicing the islands. Furthermore, it was suggested that providing extra levels of service to meet the sparse populations' needs would be more carbon intensive than relying on cars. A small minority perceived that active travel would not be a realistic alternative either, with the weather, distances involved, poor access routes and hilly terrain providing too much of a challenge to most users. Similar numbers cited general concerns that islanders will be hit hard by the proposals, without giving more details.

A significant minority highlighted that travel and transport generally on islands is costly and challenging, with fears expressed that these will increase with higher fuel costs. There were also concerns expressed by a small minority about ferry services; these focused on reliability, the need for replacement ferries, affordability and connectivity with other public transport, with a few worries about the lack of mention of ferries in the consultation.

A significant minority perceived islands as having similar negative impacts to those of any other rural and remote communities, such as those in the Highlands. Nearly as many respondents advocated separate treatment and tailored solutions for these areas due to their unique challenges.

Small numbers of respondents voiced the following additional concerns about negative impacts:

- Concerns about the effects of increased isolation if there are reduced opportunities to travel on the islands (because of less car use).
- Concerns about less car use adversely impacting tourist numbers to islands (as they tend to use cars).
- Concerns about a lack of investment compared with other areas.
- Concerns about a lack of digital connectivity.

A small number of further comments referred to the loss of freedoms, and negative impacts accruing to particular island groups, such as disabled people, the elderly and those on low incomes.

The next question went onto ask:

Question 8.2b: 'If you think that proposals will impact on island communities, what measures would you put in place to maximise positive impacts or mitigate negative impacts?

A total of 218 responses were received at this question. Most of these reiterated actions detailed previously. The most frequently advocated measure (by a significant minority) was again public transport improvements, with a focus on more regular and frequent buses. Further comments desired better public transport connections, links and timetable connectivity and synchronisation, for instance between trains and buses with ferry terminals and sailings. There were also a few calls for cheaper ferries (e.g. discounts or concessionary fares for residents) and cheaper buses.

While not relevant to the route map, the other main request (again from a significant minority) was for ferry improvements, in terms of reliability, frequency of sailings, new ferry provision (in particular better planning of replacements), better access for

locals (i.e. reductions in tourist traffic), and improvements to port facilities and carbon footprints.

Small minorities advocated the following other transport-related measures:

- More electric transport and associated infrastructure and support (e.g. small electric buses, charging points, electric vehicle schemes, e-scooters, e-bikes, electric cars, grants, subsidies and incentives), and a very small number of suggestions about using local renewable power production to help subsidise e-vehicle costs.
- Better cycling and walking infrastructure and active travel networks (e.g. better paths, lighting, safety, cycle storage on public transport, cycling initiatives).
- Support for shared mobility and on-demand transport, such as community transport, car sharing, dial-a-bus, ride on request minibuses and post office bus services.
- Action to reduce the use of tourist cars, caravans and other tourism vehicles (e.g. by removing road equivalent tariffs for tourists, introducing a tourist tax for those with cars, or incentivising foot and cycle passengers on ferries).

Other recommendations included greater investment and funding for the islands generally (e.g. to be on a par with that in other areas), more local services and amenities in order to alleviate travel needs to the mainland, more reliable broadband connectivity and cheaper delivery services.

A significant minority reiterated advice to consult with islanders, bearing in mind that the needs of individual islands may differ, and to learn from examples in island communities in other countries. The same proportion urged that islands should have their own particular solution, with some of these pointing out that islands are only a small part of the overall car use problem and that most benefit is therefore gained by applying solutions in urban situations. A small number of respondents mooted that island solutions should be similar to those for rural mainland areas.

A significant minority were in favour of not discriminating against car use for the reasons stated above or leaving the choice up to the islanders to decide. A few respondents noted that it was difficult to fix negative impacts from the proposals, with reasons given such as remoteness, the weather, economic dependence on car tourism and power outages regarding electric vehicle charging.

Impacts on people facing socio-economic disadvantages

The first question in this section asked:

> **Question 8.3a: 'Do you think that the proposals set out in this plan could have a particular impact (positive or negative) on people facing socio-economic disadvantages?**

As detailed in table 5, a large majority of respondents who expressed an opinion (around nine in ten respondents) thought the proposals could have a particular impact on people facing socio-economic disadvantages.

Table 5: Whether the proposals set out in this plan could have a particular impact (positive or negative) on people facing socio-economic disadvantages

Response type (Sample Size)	Responses			
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Not Answered
Business (2)	-	-	-	2
Health / NHS (3)	2	-	-	1
Local authority (13)	11	-	1	1
NDPB (Non-departmental public body) (2)	-	-	-	2
Regional transport partnership (8)	5	-	1	2
Representative body (7)	1	-	2	4
Third sector (other) (7)	2	1	2	2
Third sector (environmental) (8)	4	-	1	3
Third sector (sustainable transport) (9)	7	-	1	1
Other (5)	3	-	1	1
Total organisations (64)	**35**	**1**	**9**	**19**
Individuals (615)	313	41	125	136
Total respondents	**348**	**42**	**134**	**155**

A large number of respondents (390) went on to explain their answer. Almost equal numbers of respondents cited positive impacts and negative impacts, though slightly higher proportions of organisations envisaged positive impacts than did individuals.

As in previous questions, positive impacts almost all came with the caveat that it was assumed that improvements would be implemented properly to transport and other infrastructure, as per the proposals. The largest numbers – a significant minority – again hailed the benefits of perceived public transport improvements, such as buses and trains being more accessible, frequent, reliable and interlinked. Slightly smaller numbers perceived benefits from more affordable public transport, with free bus passes and concession schemes recommended. Similar numbers saw a positive impact arising from better active travel options, pinpointing their cheapness (especially if there was supported purchase of cycles) and ensuing health benefits.

A significant minority deduced benefits for non-car owners, seen as tending to make up a large proportion of the socio-economically deprived, deriving from easier non-car travel and possibly a reduced travel need if alternatives were available. Smaller numbers saw less need for reliance on private cars, so reducing the costs of 'forced car ownership'.

Similar numbers saw the proposals as being generally beneficial for reducing inequalities and levelling up society, enabling those facing disadvantages to access more opportunities socially and employment-wise.

Small minorities perceived other possible benefits as follows:

- Less suffering from the effects of air pollution and noise, and reduced pedestrian accidents because of less busy roads.
- Better local services and amenities arising from the advent of 20 minute neighbourhoods, with advantageous knock on effects of reducing travel costs.
- Better and more affordable internet connectivity, with a suggestion to use apps which lay out low cost options.
- Better car sharing options (e.g. car clubs, community cars).

A dominant theme (from a large minority of respondents) emerged amongst those noting negative impacts: the increased difficulty in travelling for many if cars were disincentivised and made more expensive. Concerns were raised about a lack of travel options, particularly for the those living in deprived areas in rural communities. , leading to these people being cut off or isolated from society, work, healthcare and reasonably priced shops. On a related note, a significant minority of respondents noted concerns that public transport could be more expensive and that only the well-off will be able to afford cars, leaving the lower socio-economic groups at a disadvantage. In addition, a small minority of respondents pointed out that non-car transport is more time consuming and unreliable with changes and transfers often needed: there would be negative knock-on effects, such as longer childcare arrangements being needed.

Other negative impacts were perceived by small minorities or small numbers of respondents as follows:

- General problems arising from rising costs (e.g. energy, housing, local shopping), hitting the disadvantaged disproportionately.
- Those on lower incomes or in poorly paid employment being the least able to cope with changes (e.g. tending to work unsocial hours and having the least travel alternatives).
- Electric cars and other vehicles are unaffordable.
- Bicycles are expensive and not always practical (e.g. storage and theft issues).
- Those on lower income or living in areas of derivation are less likely to be able to use online services or able to work at home.

Small numbers of comments foresaw an increase in inequalities due to the proposals amid doubts that there would be enough investment in development of the infrastructure.

A small minority said there would be negative impacts but gave no further details; a few envisaged no particular different impacts for this group as compared to the general population; and a few reiterated opposition to the proposals with a couple of suggestions to fund improvements to disadvantaged areas instead.

The next question went on to ask:

> **Question 8.3b: 'If you think the proposals will have a particular impact based on socio-economic factors, what measures would you suggest to maximise positive impacts or mitigate negative impacts?'**

A total of 273 respondents commented at this question. Again, the measures suggested mostly reiterated those put forward at previous questions. The largest numbers (a large minority) put less costly public transport at the top of the agenda, with suggestions including discounts, reductions and bus passes for poorer or vulnerable groups (e.g. those on universal credit), and to try to make public transport use as cheap or cheaper than car use. A significant minority discussed public transport (bus and train) improvements, focusing on serving deprived areas with suggestions to incentivise their use including discounts on leisure facilities and provision of more transport during unsocial hours.

A significant number focused on a need for better walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure and support for active travel networks (e.g. lanes, paths, lighting and safety as a priority in disadvantaged areas), and especially cycle storage facilities on

public transport or at homes, workplaces and other common destinations. Cycling initiatives, help to buy cycles (via grants, loans, etc.), second hand or recycled cycle schemes, free bikes for pupils, free maintenance, maintenance training, support for cycling charities and cargo bikes were all specifically mentioned in this context. A small number voiced support for good public transport connections with active travel routes and modes.

A few respondents were in favour of cheaper electric transport such as cars, cycles and scooters, or wanted to see 20 minute neighbourhoods encouraged to reduce travel. A small minority desired greater investment and funding on infrastructure to be focused on deprived areas. There were also a few calls to ensure affordable living options for those at a greater disadvantage more generally (e.g. more benefits and less housing and energy costs).

The following other specific measures were advocated by small numbers of respondents:

- Cheaper and better internet connectivity, and training for those who need it in accessing online services.
- Bringing in disincentives to discourage car use (e.g. increasing costs on single occupancy use and increased parking costs), with a small number of suggestions to target larger or high end car models, since these tend to be owned by wealthier people and tend to use higher amounts of fossil fuels.
- More promotion of, and education about, alternative travel options.

Referring to comments at earlier questions, there were a small minority who encouraged consulting with those living in areas of social deprivation to take heed of specific issues and barriers. Similar numbers pointed out that there should be separate solutions and measures for those living in deprived communities in rural and island areas, e.g. exemptions from the proposals as these constitute only a small part of the problem.

Smaller numbers wanted all people with disadvantages to be exempted from perceived discrimination against car use regarding those who can't change easily, perceiving these people would be affected the worst, or to leave choices up to the people to decide. A small minority again reiterated their opposition to the proposals, stating negative impacts generally.

Impact on the environment

Transport Scotland was keen to gather views on the potential impacts and mitigation of these impacts on the environment. The next question asked:

Question 9: 'Do you think the actions proposed in the route map are likely to have an impact on the environment? If so, in what way?'

A reduction in greenhouse gas emissions was the key positive impact outlined by a large minority of respondents across all sub-groups. An improvement in air quality and reduced air pollution was identified by a significant minority of respondents across all sub-groups. A smaller proportion noted that the actions proposed in the route map would have a positive impact on the environment but did not specify in which way.

Other positive impacts perceived by smaller numbers of respondents included:

- Less noise pollution.
- Fewer cars on the road and less congestion.
- Positive health impacts and improved wellbeing.
- More open space / green space.
- Fewer collisions involving people or wildlife.
- Improved biodiversity.
- Benefits to local communities and services.

Some respondents made suggestions for ways in which an additional positive impact on the environment could be achieved, most of which reflected actions outlined in the route map. Once again, comments tended to focus on a need to develop a better public transport system that is fully integrated and accessible for all, serving local and national needs. That said, a small number of respondents felt there is no need to focus on reducing car use due to a move to using EVs, although a few others noted that there is still an environmental cost in the production of EVs. There were also a small number of references to the need to consider other technological advances and ensure that these can be adopted by all forms of transport, including trains, buses, ferries and school buses. There were also a small number of comments of the need to reduce the number of tourists using cars and campervans.

Other mentions in line with the route map were for:

- Significant investment to help bring about change.
- Prioritisation of active travel and public transport improvements.
- The need to persuade people to use public transport using positive messaging rather than introducing punitive measures.
- Greater planning for 15 or 20 minute communities and the planning of nice places which offer local services and amenities.

A few respondents felt the introduction of the route map would not reduce carbon emissions, either because of an increased use of public transport options or because reduced carbon levels from reduced car journeys may be offset by increased carbon emissions from alternatives. This could be, for example, through building new infrastructure, such as concreted cycle paths or pedestrian routes.

A small minority of respondents also felt that any approaches adopted within Scotland would have little or no impact when considered in a global context, given the use of fossil fuels by other countries and the negligible levels of emissions created in Scotland. Linked to this, a small minority of respondents felt that the route map will not bring about the necessary behaviour change and reduce car kilometres. There were some references to the need to use cars for essential journeys, such as getting to work or accessing health services, particularly in areas where there is little by way of public transport provision.

A similar number of respondents felt that there is a need to consider the wider context and focus on a range of issues, rather than look at car usage in isolation, all of which impact negatively on the environment. These included the use of plastics, waste management, recycling, packaging, farming, the regeneration of peatlands and housebuilding and planning.

A small minority of respondents commented specifically on the route map, with some feeling that the 20% target lacks ambition and is insufficient to bring about a difference. A similar number requested more detail including impact assessments – even if they were provided as part of the consultation - or queried what evidence has been used in the development of the route map (the evidence used in the route map was set out in the route map annex but some comments suggested this has not been read in conjunction with the route map). Again, there were a small number of comments on the need for targets to be set and measured to gauge success of the route map.

A few respondents also noted the route map is likely to impact more on those on lower incomes and living in areas of socioeconomic deprivation.

Additional Comments and campaign responses

The final question asked:

Question 10: 'Do you have views you would like to express relating to parts of this consultation which do not have a specific question?'

A total of 283 respondents opted to provide comments in response to this question, many of whom reiterated issues raised in response to earlier questions.

A small minority of respondents focused on a need for public transport provision to be improved in rural areas, with a few comments that the route map, as it currently stands, is not suitable for rural areas. An allied need to consider rural transport policy was identified by some of these respondents.

A need for regular, low carbon, affordable and reliable public transport was cited by a small minority of respondents, so as to provide competent and reliable services across Scotland that are a suitable alternative to car usage. There were a few comments that public transport should be free for all. A few respondents also mentioned rail travel specifically and wanted to see improvements in train services and expanded rail services.

As in earlier questions, a significant minority of respondents commented that there is a need to have viable alternatives to the car in place. A similar number of respondents suggested the introduction of disincentives to car use. Examples provided included:

- removing cars from city centres;
- removing parking spaces;
- increased taxes for drivers with the example of France where there is additional tax for cars over 2000kg;
- introducing 'one car, one household' policies and penalties for a second or more cars;
- increasing tax on vehicles and road pricing structure.

-

There was a degree of criticism of the route map. Again, a few respondents commented on the need for further evidence to demonstrate the benefits of the route map, along with more detail on baseline data and targets to be achieved. It was also felt that the route map needs greater vision and transparency. Conversely, a similar number of respondents also noted their support for the route map.

Other issues raised at this question and echoing points made at earlier questions included:

- The desire for investment in public transport and funding to local authorities.
- More provision of active travel routes, including separate cycle routes.
- A greater focus on green vehicle alternatives and incentives to help bring about behavioural change.
- Consideration of initiatives being introduced in other countries, such as the Netherlands, Denmark or Finland.
- Concern that cars are an integral part of peoples' lives and will continue to be used at the same level as present.
- Concern that an uptake of cycling is not seen as a serious alternative to car usage because of the Scottish weather, individuals' ability to cycle and safety concerns.
- Offer incentives to drivers to, for example, increase car sharing or EV usage.
- A need for collaboration across all stakeholders to bring about the behavioural change outlined in the route map, as well as engagement with communities and educational campaigns.
- A focus on other issues that impact the environment, such as planning policy, access to services and having a holistic approach that works across a range of policy areas.

A number of respondents provided additional comments, some of which reiterated points made at earlier questions. Additionally, a total of 73 respondents – almost all individuals – responded to a campaign; some of these respondents referred to their personal experience of using bus services to illustrate the issues they raised.

Some of the respondents welcomed the opportunity to respond to the consultation and provided background information on their organisation to provide context for their response. Some also noted their keenness to be involved in further discussions in this area and work with Transport Scotland.

A few comments were made regarding the needs of disabled people. These included a need for adaptive vehicles and concerns over the affordability and accessibility of public transport (such as dropped kerbs at bus stops or places for wheelchairs). Rail travel was perceived to be better for disabled people than buses.

An organisation involved in the provision of mobility solutions noted that, while it will not be possible to remove the need for cars entirely, car club and rental vehicles can offer a solution, particularly as they are cleaner and newer than many private vehicles. They also suggested that Transport Scotland should work with shared mobility providers who have demonstrated expertise in delivering shared mobility solutions. This organisation also referred to mobility credits which help to ensure that people from disadvantaged backgrounds are not unfairly impacted by any of the proposed interventions. These schemes allow consumers to trade in their old cars in

return for credits which can be used on a variety of locally available sustainable transport modes.

The campaign responses focused on a number of specific key issues. These were:

- Agreement that the route map for achieving 20% traffic reduction is right to focus on behaviour change, although there is a need for significant improvements to the infrastructure for non-car road users.
- The National Planning Framework should give councils the powers to reject unsustainable planning developments such as out of town retail parks and drive-through coffee shops. Out of town developments that require extensive car use should be constrained. This would also help to rejuvenate town centres.
- The Scottish bus service should be nationalised as per the rail network, with councils allowed to start publicly-owned bus companies to provide essential routes.
- Services should be moved closer to where people live as part of creating 20 minute neighbourhoods.
- The Scottish Government should work with the UK Government to address the costs of public transport which are more expensive, relative to inflation, than the costs of motoring. Consideration should be given to the introduction of road user charging.

Appendix 1: Respondent Organisations

Business (2)
Enterprise Holdings
Uber
Health / NHS (3)
Glasgow Centre for Population Health
NHS Ayrshire and Arran
Public Health Scotland
Local Authority (13)
Aberdeen City Council
Aberdeenshire Council
City of Edinburgh Council
Clackmannanshire Council
Dumfries & Galloway Council
East Lothian Council
Falkirk Council
Glasgow City Council
SCOTS – Society of Chief Officers of Transportation in Scotland
Scottish Borders Council
South Lanarkshire Council
Stirling Council
The Highland Council
Non-departmental public body (2)

Business (2)
Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park Authority
SportsScotland
Regional Transport Partnership (8)
HITRANS
NESTRANS
SETrans
Strathclyde Partnership for Transport
Sustrans Scotland
SWestrans
Tactran (Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership)
ZetTrans
Representative Body (7)
CIHT
Community Rail Network
Confederation of Passenger Transport (Scotland)
Edinburgh Bus users Group
Glasgow Chamber of Commerce
Transport Focus
Scottish Rural Action and Scottish Rural and Island Transport Community
Third Sector (Environmental) (8)
2050 Climate Group
A Greener Melrose
Friends of the Earth Scotland
Keep Scotland Beautiful
Northern Corridor Community Volunteers

Business (2)
Zero Carbon Daviot
Paths for All
Ramblers Scotland
Third Sector (Sustainable Transport) (9)
Aberdeen Cycle Forum
Community Transport Association
CoMoUK
Cycling Dumfries
Cycling Scotland
Cycling UK in Scotland
Energy Savings Trust
Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign
Transform Scotland
Third Sector (Other) (7)
Asthma + Lung UK Scotland
Children in Scotland
Cromar Future Group
Disability Equality Scotland
G15 Buses SCIO
Living Streets Scotland
National Trust for Scotland
Other (5)
ConnectedCities Ltd
Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland Sabbath Observance Committee
Kirknewton Community Council

Business (2)
Mobility and Access Committee Scotland
Scottish Green Party

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND
CÒMHDHAIL ALBA

Further copies of this document are available, on request, in audio and visual formats and in community languages. Any enquiries regarding this document/publication should be sent to us at info@transport.gov.scot.

Published by Transport Scotland, June 2025

Follow us:

transcotland

@transcotland

transport.gov.scot