



House of Commons
Transport Committee

National Policy Statement on National Networks

Sixteenth Report of Session 2013–14

*Report, together with formal minutes relating
to the report*

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 29 April 2014*

The Transport Committee

The Transport Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Transport and its Associate Public Bodies.

Current membership

Mrs Louise Ellman (*Labour/Co-operative, Liverpool Riverside*) (*Chair*)

Sarah Champion (*Labour, Rotherham*)

Jim Dobbin (*Labour/Co-operative, Heywood and Middleton*)

Jim Fitzpatrick (*Labour, Poplar and Limehouse*)

Karen Lumley (*Conservative, Redditch*)

Jason M^cCartney (*Conservative, Colne Valley*)

Karl M^cCartney (*Conservative, Lincoln*)

Mr Adrian Sanders (*Liberal Democrat, Torbay*)

Chloe Smith (*Conservative, Norwich North*)

Graham Stringer (*Labour, Blackley and Broughton*)

Martin Vickers (*Conservative, Cleethorpes*)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

The Reports of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the internet at <http://www.parliament.uk/transcom>. A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Parliament is at the back of this volume.

The Reports of the Committee and the formal minutes relating to that report are available in a printed volume. Written evidence is published on the internet only.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Mark Egan (Clerk), Nick Beech (Second Clerk), Richard Jeremy (Committee Specialist), Adrian Hitchins (Senior Committee Assistant), Stewart McIlvenna (Committee Assistant), and Hannah Pearce (Media Officer)

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Transport Committee, House of Commons, 14 Tothill Street, London SW1H 9NB, The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 6263; the Committee's email address is transcom@parliament.uk

Contents

Report	<i>Page</i>
Summary	3
1 Introduction	5
2 Does the NPS achieve its aims?	7
Conclusion	9
3 Is the policy right?	11
4 Conclusion	15
Conclusions and recommendations	16
Formal Minutes	18
Witnesses	19
Published written evidence	20
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	22

Summary

The National Policy Statement on National Networks, which the Department for Transport (DfT) has published in draft for consultation, sets out the policy against which the Secretary of State will make decisions on applications for development consent for nationally significant infrastructure projects on the strategic road and rail networks.

We welcome the Government's decision to bring forward the draft NPS on National Networks. However, we have a number of detailed recommendations aimed at making the document clearer and more useful. The NPS should:

- specify more types of transport scheme which the Government thinks are needed—such as enhancements to the rail network to promote east-west connectivity; better road and rail connections to ports and airports and to parts of the country which are currently not well served by those networks; and schemes to promote regional economic development.
- more explicitly address criticisms of the DfT's road and rail demand forecasts.
- include an estimate of the impact on UK carbon emissions of meeting projected demand for growth in road traffic by building more road infrastructure.
- be more candid about the adverse impacts of major transport schemes on localities and provide clearer guidance about when the benefits arising from a scheme justify such impacts.
- give scheme promoters clarity about how they should interpret EU requirements for alternatives to schemes to be appraised as part of the planning process
- include specific provision for scheme promoters to assess and manage the impacts of developments to national networks on local networks.
- make explicit reference to the desirability of connecting HS2 to the classic rail network, so that people from around the UK can benefit from the new high speed rail line.
- require promoters of roads schemes to look to improve road safety (including for cyclists and pedestrians).

The Government is seeking to accommodate increasing demand for roads by building more infrastructure rather than seeking to manage demand. We comment on this issue in more detail in our report on Better roads. Investment in the road network will require new funding streams. This is a challenge that must be addressed. However, a consensus would be required to introduce any road user charging scheme across the strategic road network as an alternative to road taxation, and the many issues involved would have to be resolved.

We also repeat our recommendation from Better roads that the DfT should seek to integrate planning for passenger and freight transport by route or region, rather than look

at each mode individually.

We will request a debate on the final version of the NPS when it is laid before Parliament.

1 Introduction

1. Significant infrastructure projects—such as new nuclear power stations, airport terminals or motorways—are almost invariably controversial. Planning processes can last for several years and become the focus of wider debate, and sometimes protest, about Government policy. One of the aims of the Planning Act 2008 was to speed up planning processes for nationally significant infrastructure projects. Under the Act, the Government can publish National Policy Statements to set out the policy against which the Secretary of State will make decisions on applications for development consent for such projects. The draft National Policy Statement (NPS) on National Networks is the second to be published by the Department for Transport (DfT) and covers nationally significant road and rail projects in England.¹

2. The Planning Act gives select committees a formal role in the process by which NPSs are agreed.² Our recommendations must be addressed by the Secretary of State before the NPS comes into force.³ In addition, we are able to request a debate on the document before it receives final parliamentary approval. We intend to do this.

3. On 7 January we published a call for evidence on the draft NPS, supplementing the Government's own consultation on the document. We asked for views on the following questions:

- Has the Government identified a compelling need for development of the national road and rail networks and of strategic rail freight interchanges?
- Does Government policy on the development of the national road and rail networks, and the investment programme relating to the road and rail networks, meet that need?
- Does policy on the development of the networks take appropriate account of environmental, safety, sustainability and accessibility issues as well as the impact of new technology?
- To what extent does the draft NPS provide clear guidance to the Secretary of State about how to assess schemes? Does it help scheme promoters understand the approach the Secretary of State is likely to take to nationally significant road and rail infrastructure projects?
- How does the draft NPS relate to other aspects of the Government's transport strategy, including HS2, and to integration with local transport networks?

1 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/263046/executive-summary-consultation-document.pdf. The previous NPS dealt with ports – see Transport Committee, *Fifth Report*, Session 2009-10, *The proposal for a National Policy Statement on Ports*, HC 217.

2 [Section 9](#).

3 [Section 5\(4\)](#).

4. We have published 41 written submissions and we also heard oral evidence on 31 March from a range of business interests, planning, environmental and expert groups, and from Robert Goodwill MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the DfT. We are grateful to everyone who contributed to our inquiry.

5. The aim of the NPS is “to provide clarity and certainty for scheme promoters and remove the need for lengthy planning inquiry consideration of fundamental questions at the application stage”. In our next chapter we will assess whether the draft NPS achieves this aim. Our third chapter will examine some of the arguments about the policy underlying the NPS. Finally, we summarise how the NPS should be changed before it comes into force.

2 Does the NPS achieve its aims?

6. The Minister told us that the NPS “provides in one place clarity and certainty on Government policy on the need for nationally significant infrastructure projects, and the way in which these developments will be assessed”. As such, it “addresses a key concern of scheme developers and promoters, and it demonstrates this Government’s commitment to deliver the infrastructure and investment the economy needs for continued growth, by making the planning system easier to navigate”.⁴

7. Most witnesses considered that the draft NPS was a potentially significant document which could make the process for gaining approval for major road and rail projects easier.⁵ Inclusion in the document of strategic rail freight interchanges–distribution centres linked to the strategic road and rail networks–was particularly welcomed by the rail industry,⁶ Maggie Simpson of the Rail Freight Group said that the NPS could “only help” promoters of strategic rail freight interchange schemes by providing more clarity about the approval process.⁷

8. However, Quod and the Kilbride Group argued that:

- Aside from Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges, the document does not identify the types of national network infrastructure which the Government thinks is needed; and
- The NPS should more explicitly acknowledge the adverse consequences of major transport schemes, particularly where they infringe on Green Belt land, and set out the principles which should be used to decide whether or not schemes should go ahead.

Quod and Kilbride Group argued that without these changes, the NPS could make it more difficult to secure permission for major transport schemes.⁸

9. Some other witnesses also suggested that the draft NPS was insufficiently clear about the type of transport schemes which the Government thinks is necessary.⁹ For example, the Royal Academy of Engineering said:¹⁰

The statement is ... non-specific in its reference to the new infrastructure that could be built to enhance the strategic road network. In order to develop a more compelling strategic vision for that network, the Academy feels that

4 Q87.

5 For example, Civil Engineering Contractors Association (NPS0002), British Chambers of Commerce, paragraphs 5 and 18-19 (NPS0011), Royal Town Planning Institute (although with reservations) (NPS 018), and the Institution of Civil Engineers (NPS0037).

6 For example, Rail Freight Group, paragraph 3 (NPS0008), DB Schenker paragraph 3.1.4 (NPS0019), Freight on Rail (NPS0022) and Freightliner Group (NPS0023).

7 Q19.

8 Quod and the Kilbride Group (NPS0029) and Qq 50-53.

9 For example, Royal Town Planning Institute (NPS0018) and National Infrastructure Planning Association (NPS0031).

10 NPS0014 paragraph 11.

specific proposals should be laid out by the government as soon as possible, and discussed in terms of their ability to reduce congestion

Naomi Luhde-Thompson of Friends of the Earth said “It would not be clear what sort of projects would be appropriate and what projects would be considered as the ones that should be coming forward, because there is no clear test as to what sort of projects should be coming forward”.¹¹

10. The Minister emphasised the importance of the NPS in terms of preventing planning inquiries into specific projects becoming dominated by discussion of broader Government policy, particularly in relation to the environment. He said:¹²

Let’s say we are going to build a bypass around a market town in north Lincolnshire, and a number of groups are against it. While it is absolutely important that local considerations about air quality and the effect on habitats are taken into account, there should not be an opportunity posed by the planning inquiry to open up the whole debate on the emissions strategy for trucks, the overall issues about how the country addresses its CO2 obligations and the forecasts that have been made for overall traffic and other demand for transport in the country. In my view, it means that you will be able to focus on the local planning considerations at that inquiry, and not allow a wider discussion. It is very important that we stop the ice caps melting and that we protect polar bears, but a planning inquiry on a bypass round a small market town in north Lincolnshire is not the place for it. That should be for this statement, which looks at our overarching planning considerations and our forecast for transport. Therefore, that can be taken out of the process to allow the local planning inquiry to look at the local issues that are most pertinent to that inquiry

11. We have sympathy with the Minister’s wish to ensure that planning inquiries focus on the local impacts of a scheme. However, it will be difficult in practice to keep broader issues off the agenda. For example, the NPS includes the DfT’s forecasts for future car usage to 2040, which envisage that “growth in traffic nationwide is likely in any conceivable scenario”.¹³ We comment in the next chapter on whether the Government should aim to meet, rather than manage, this demand. However, there is a lively academic debate about whether these assumptions are right.¹⁴ The Minister and John Dowie, Director of Strategic Roads and Smart Ticketing, defended the quality of the DfT’s modelling but Mr Dowie conceded that the modelling of road traffic in London needed to be reconsidered.¹⁵ Basing the need for additional road infrastructure on predictions where are contested may not succeed in keeping these matters out of the planning process for major schemes.

11 Q56.

12 Q88.

13 [Draft NPS](#) paragraph 2.7.

14 For example, see Dr David Metz ([NPS0005](#)) and WSP paragraphs 3.3-3.4 ([NPS0021](#)).

15 Qq 92-93.

12. Some witnesses argued that the DfT's demand forecasting underplayed the importance of new technologies in radically changing travel patterns.¹⁶ Martin Heffer, Technical Director, Rail Transit and Aviation, from planning consultancy Parsons Brinckerhoff said:¹⁷

The [DfT] forecasts have been proven right to date, and the basic connection between output, population, economic growth and trip making has been seen to be robust up to now. We are on the verge of technology changes in the next two or three generations that may challenge some of those relationships. What we would like to see are forecasts that can look at sensitivities about what those changes might bring.

However, John Rhodes said “technology will impact at the margin ... the need for an infrastructure network is still a bigger driver of where investment should be going”.¹⁸

13. The Minister's view that planning decisions should not generally include consideration of Government policy on reducing carbon emissions is also controversial.¹⁹ The draft NPS states that a road-building programme on the scale currently envisaged would account for under 0.1% of average annual carbon emissions.²⁰ It also argues that there will be a switch to ultra-low emission vehicles over the next decade.²¹ However, opponents of a scheme may well wish to argue that a major road project could induce additional traffic and undermine national carbon emissions targets, particularly if a number of major road projects are being pursued simultaneously, carbon emissions targets are being missed and Government predictions of take-up of ultra-low emissions vehicles are not met.

Conclusion

14. **We welcome the Government's decision to bring forward the draft NPS on National Networks, albeit after some delay.**²² It will help ensure that major projects to upgrade the road and rail networks come forward and gain approval. However, it is not clear why strategic rail freight interchanges are the only type of transport scheme specifically mentioned in the NPS. *We recommend that the NPS specify other types of scheme which the Government thinks are needed—such as enhancements to the rail network to promote east-west connectivity and better road and rail connections to ports and airports and to parts of the country which are currently not well served by those networks. In particular, schemes to promote regional economic development should be specified.*

16 See Qq 48, 81.

17 Q27.

18 Q82.

19 See paragraph 10. For criticism see, for example, Friends of the Earth (NPS0034) paragraph 13, Planning Officers Society (NPS0013) paragraphs 11-12 and North East Combined Transport Roundtable (NPS001) paragraph 19.

20 Draft NPS paragraph 3.5.

21 Draft NPS paragraph 3.3.

22 See Transport Committee, [Eighth Report](#), Session 2013-14, *Access to Ports*, paragraph 32.

15. The DfT's road and rail demand projections are both disputed, for different reasons.²³ *The NPS should more explicitly address these criticisms, in order to minimise opportunities for planning inquiries to become fora for fresh debate about the forecasts.*

16. *We recommend that the NPS include an estimate of the impact on UK carbon emissions of meeting projected demand for growth in road traffic by building more road infrastructure.*

17. The Minister told us that there were a number of “exciting new technologies in the pipeline” which could increase the capacity of the road and rail networks and which could also affect demand for transport.²⁴ These issues are briefly acknowledged in the draft NPS but there is scope for the Government to say more.²⁵ *We recommend that the NPS include an assessment of how road and rail demand forecasts could be affected by new technologies and require scheme promoters to show how they will use new technologies to maximise the capacity of the infrastructure they wish to build.*

18. *The NPS should be more candid about the adverse impacts of major transport schemes on localities and provide clearer guidance about when the benefits arising from a scheme justify such impacts.*²⁶

19. Balfour Beatty and Parsons Brinckerhoff told us of a potential ambiguity in the relationship between the NPS and EU directives which scheme promoters must follow:²⁷

Various European Directives (e.g. Environmental Impact Assessment, Habitats & Water Framework) require alternatives to be considered as part of the assessments/appraisals needed to comply with the Directives, and to date these have included strategic alternatives. Does the NPS have a status which limits the alternatives which have to be considered for individual projects without exposing those projects to the risk of a successful legal challenge on the grounds of non-compliance with EU Directives?

The DfT has accepted that more thought needs to be given into how promoters can meet the requirements of EU law without having to consider strategic alternatives to their schemes which could result in broad aspects of Government policy being the subject of debate at planning inquiries.²⁸ *The NPS must give scheme promoters clarity about how they should interpret EU requirements for alternatives to schemes to be appraised as part of the planning process. The Government should consider what further steps it might need to take to establish the primacy of the NPS, including, if necessary, legislation.*

23 On rail demand see Qq 28-34.

24 Q112.

25 [Draft NPS](#) paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12.

26 See [Draft NPS](#) paragraph 5.164 for current treatment of this issue.

27 [NPS0006](#) paragraph 23.

28 Qq 99-101. Also see [Draft NPS](#) paragraphs 4.22-4.25.

3 Is the policy right?

20. The draft NPS advocates the development of the national road and rail networks:

- to accommodate forecast demand growth
- to unlock regional economic growth and regeneration
- to deal with areas of high growth, housing developments, new employment opportunities and other significant infrastructure developments, which will place new demands on the networks

In relation to roads, the NPS states that better maintenance, modal shift (from road to rail, cycling or walking) and demand management will not be sufficient to meet growing demand so more infrastructure is needed. The Government would like to see more passenger and freight movements by rail and advocates expansion of the railway in various ways, as well as more electrification.²⁹

21. The draft NPS also includes some guidance to scheme promoters on wider policy matters:

- Environmental and social impacts of schemes should be mitigated. Where possible, environmental benefits should be delivered.³⁰
- Rail schemes should seek to improve safety (no similar point is made in relation to road schemes, although there is extensive discussion of how schemes could improve road safety in the assessment principles section of the NPS).³¹
- Road schemes should address the needs of cyclists and walkers and invest in infrastructure where roads sever communities.³²
- Schemes should improve disabled access to transport.³³

22. The biggest area for debate about these policies concerns whether it is right for the Government to seek to accommodate increasing demand for roads by building more infrastructure rather than seeking to manage demand, for example by introducing road pricing. For example, Andrew Shaw of the Planning Officers Society suggested that road pricing would be an “obvious solution” for managing congestion over the next 25 years.³⁴ The Campaign for Better Transport said “policies of demand management and mode shift

29 [Draft NPS](#) paragraphs 2.16-2.24 and 2.32-2.36.

30 [Draft NPS](#) paragraph 3.6.

31 [Draft NPS](#) paragraphs 3.8-3.10 and 4.55-4.68.

32 [Draft NPS](#) paragraph 3.14.

33 [Draft NPS](#) paragraph 3.17.

34 Qq 70-72.

are ... the only rational response to high growth forecasts, being robust to both low and high traffic growth scenarios and the only way to reduce congestion below current levels, rather than simply make it less worse in future”.³⁵

23. We discuss these issues at more length in our *Better Roads* report.³⁶ **Investment in the road network will require new funding streams. This is a challenge that must be addressed. However, a consensus would be required to introduce any road user charging scheme across the strategic road network as an alternative to road taxation, and the many issues involved would have to be resolved.**

24. A number of witnesses commented on the impact on local networks of developments on the national road and rail networks. For example, Jeremy Evans from the Institution of Engineering and Technology said:³⁷

You cannot just look at forecasting growth on the strategic network without looking at the impact on the local network. Most of those inter-urban journeys originate or terminate in an urban area, and the capacity of those local roads is not going to change significantly over the next 10, 20 or 30 years. As an example, if the M1 southbound was improved dramatically, it would still turn up at Staples Corner on the north circular road, so the risk is that that improvement to a road network would simply be a big car park. You have to look at improvements to the national strategic network alongside local roads as well.

The DfT’s view is that, so far as road schemes are concerned, a mechanism to integrate the development of national and local networks is already in place.³⁸

25. It is surprising that the draft NPS only discusses impacts on local transport networks in relation to proposals for strategic rail freight interchanges and in relation to the construction of road and rail projects.³⁹ These impacts—increased traffic, congestion, impacts on the reliability of the railway and safety implications—should be part of the assessment of all proposals to develop the strategic road and rail networks. ***We recommend that the NPS include specific provision for scheme promoters to assess and manage the impacts of developments to national networks on local networks.***

26. The NPS does not apply to the High Speed 2 project because this will be authorised by an Act of Parliament rather than through the normal planning process. However, high speed rail is not absent from the document. The NPS concludes that “where major new rail

35 [NPS0033](#) section 2.

36 Transport Committee, Fifteenth Report, Session 2013-14, *Better roads: improving England’s strategic road network*, HC 850.

37 Q54. Also see Transport Planning Society ([NPS0020](#)), Greengauge 21 ([NPS0026](#)) Friends of the Lake District ([NPS0025](#)) Transport for London ([NPS0028](#)) paragraphs 6.4-6.5 and the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport ([NPS0024](#)). For a different view, see Q82.

38 [NPS0017](#) paragraphs 5.7-5.8.

39 [Draft NPS](#) paragraph 5.184 and [NPS0017](#) paragraphs 5.5 to 5.8.

alignments are required, high speed rail will be considered".⁴⁰ Jeremy Evans argued that the NPS should include reference to integrating high speed rail stations with other networks.⁴¹ Paul Plummer, speaking for the Rail Delivery Group, emphasised the importance of integrating high speed lines with the classic rail network.⁴²

27. We previously recommended that the Government, working with Network Rail, should identify opportunities to identify potential "High Speed Britain" projects by the end of 2014, for inclusion in the post-2020 Control Period 6 planning round, aimed at ensuring that the benefits of HS2 are felt across the country.⁴³ Work of this nature is now underway.⁴⁴ ***In this context, we recommend that the NPS make explicit reference to the desirability of connecting HS2 to the classic rail network, so that people from around the UK can benefit from the new high speed rail line.***

28. Section three of the draft NPS specifically requires promoters of rail schemes to seek to improve the safety of the railway. However, no equivalent requirement is placed on promoters of road schemes at this point.⁴⁵ Later in the document, it is stated that promoters of road schemes should seek to improve safety.⁴⁶ ***We recommend that section three of the NPS should specifically require promoters of roads schemes to look to improve road safety, analogous to the requirement on rail scheme promoters in paragraph 3.10 of the draft.***

29. There was also criticism of the draft NPS for assessing road and rail networks in isolation from one another. For example, the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation said:⁴⁷

A national transport strategy would be most effective if developed around an overall spatial strategy that looks at the demand for the country's transport networks (including non-strategic/local interfaces) in an integrated sustainable manner. This would allow future needs of networks to be assessed holistically and in a way that balances investment across all networks, maximising the efficiency of both public and private investment.

30. We have examined this issue in more detail in our *Better Roads* report. Our conclusion was:

The DfT should commission integrated passenger and freight plans for strategic transport routes or regions, rather than looking at one mode of

40 [Draft NPS](#) paragraph 2.34.

41 Q78.

42 Q15.

43 Transport Committee, [Ninth Report](#), Session 2013-14, *High speed rail: on track?* HC 851, paragraph 32.

44 HC Deb, [17 Mar 14](#), cc 53-54WS.

45 [Draft NPS](#) paragraphs 3.8-3.10.

46 [Draft NPS](#) paragraph 4.55.

47 [NPS0032](#) paragraph 1.3. Also see, for example, Local Government Technical Advisers' Group ([NPS0038](#)) paragraph 2.3 and Transport for London paragraphs 3.1-3.3 ([NPS0028](#)).

transport in isolation. Such integrated plans, which should be developed in consultation with local authorities, local enterprise partnerships and community and road user groups, must take into account how different options for the use of infrastructure and technology will impact on transport movements and on economic development. The DfT must then identify projects—including maintenance schemes—within the chosen plan for implementation within the five-year funding cycle. Every project should be subject to a post-implementation review to assess the effectiveness of the investment. We recommend that this process be set out in the forthcoming Roads Investment Strategy.

4 Conclusion

31. The Minister told us that he would aim to bring a final version of the NPS before Parliament in the autumn. This is an appropriate and realistic timetable given the need to consider the various points raised in the Government's consultation process and in this report. **We look forward to seeing the NPS in final form later this year and debating its contents.**

32. **The NPS is necessary because it will help guide decision makers in assessing major road and rail projects by clarifying Government policy. The current draft requires some improvement and we have made a number of recommendations which should be taken on board. Most importantly, the Government must provide more examples of the type of transport scheme it thinks should be promoted to meet the nation's needs; it should provide more guidance about how to determine whether a scheme which interferes with the Green Belt or other sensitive planning or environmental matters should go ahead; and it should seek to integrate planning for passenger and freight transport by route or region, rather than look at each mode individually.**

Conclusions and recommendations

Does the NPS achieve its aims?

1. We welcome the Government's decision to bring forward the draft NPS on National Networks, albeit after some delay. (Paragraph 14)
2. We recommend that the NPS specify types of scheme [other than strategic rail freight interchanges] which the Government thinks are needed—such as enhancements to the rail network to promote east-west connectivity and better road and rail connections to ports and airports and to parts of the country which are currently not well served by those networks. In particular, schemes to promote regional economic development should be specified. (Paragraph 14)
3. The NPS should more explicitly address criticisms [of its road and rail demand forecasts], in order to minimise opportunities for planning inquiries to become fora for fresh debate about the forecasts. (Paragraph 15)
4. We recommend that the NPS include an estimate of the impact on UK carbon emissions of meeting projected demand for growth in road traffic by building more road infrastructure. (Paragraph 16)
5. We recommend that the NPS include an assessment of how road and rail demand forecasts could be affected by new technologies and require scheme promoters to show how they will use new technologies to maximise the capacity of the infrastructure they wish to build. (Paragraph 17)
6. The NPS should be more candid about the adverse impacts of major transport schemes on localities and provide clearer guidance about when the benefits arising from a scheme justify such impacts. (Paragraph 18)
7. The NPS must give scheme promoters clarity about how they should interpret EU requirements for alternatives to schemes to be appraised as part of the planning process. The Government should consider what further steps it might need to take to establish the primacy of the NPS, including, if necessary, legislation. (Paragraph 19)

Is the policy right?

8. Investment in the road network will require new funding streams. This is a challenge that must be addressed. However, a consensus would be required to introduce any road user charging scheme across the strategic road network as an alternative to road taxation, and the many issues involved would have to be resolved. (Paragraph 23)
9. We recommend that the NPS include specific provision for scheme promoters to assess and manage the impacts of developments to national networks on local networks. (Paragraph 25)
10. We recommend that the NPS make explicit reference to the desirability of connecting HS2 to the classic rail network, so that people from around the UK can benefit from the new high speed rail line. (Paragraph 27)

11. We recommend that section three of the NPS should specifically require promoters of roads schemes to look to improve road safety, analogous to the requirement on rail scheme promoters in paragraph 3.10 of the draft. (Paragraph 28)

Conclusion

12. We look forward to seeing the NPS in final form later this year and debating its contents. (Paragraph 31)
13. The NPS is necessary because it will help guide decision makers in assessing major road and rail projects by clarifying Government policy. The current draft requires some improvement and we have made a number of recommendations which should be taken on board. Most importantly, the Government must provide more examples of the type of transport scheme it thinks should be promoted to meet the nation's needs; it should provide more guidance about how to determine whether a scheme which interferes with the Green Belt or other sensitive planning or environmental matters should go ahead; and it should seek to integrate planning for passenger and freight transport by route or region, rather than look at each mode individually. (Paragraph 32)

Formal Minutes

Tuesday 29 April 2014

Members present:

Mrs Louise Ellman, in the Chair

Jim Fitzpatrick
Karl M^cCartney
Jason M^cCartney

Adrian Sanders
Graham Stringer
Martin Vickers

Draft Report (*National Policy Statement on National Networks*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 32 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Sixteenth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

[Adjourned till Tuesday 13 May at 4.00 pm]

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the Committee's inquiry page at www.parliament.uk/transcom.

Monday 31 March 2014

Question number

<p>Paul Plummer, Group Strategy Director, Network Rail on behalf of the Rail Delivery Group, Maggie Simpson, Executive Director, Rail Freight Group, Richard Ballantyne, Senior Policy Adviser, British Ports Association, and Martin Heffer, Technical Director, Rail Transit and Aviation, Parsons Brinckerhoff</p>	Q1-43
<p>John Rhodes, Director, Quod, Andrew Shaw, Planning Officers Society, Jeremy Evans, member of the Transport Policy Panel, Institution of Engineering and Technology, and Naomi Luhde-Thompson, Planning Adviser, Friends of the Earth</p>	Q44-86
<p>Robert Goodwill MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, and John Dowie, Director of Strategic Roads and Smart Ticketing, Department for Transport</p>	Q87-113

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the Committee's inquiry web page at www.parliament.uk/transcom. INQ numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 North East Transport Combined Roundtable ([NPS0001](#))
- 2 Civil Engineering Contractors Association ([NPS0002](#))
- 3 Highways Term Maintenance Association (HTMA) ([NPS0004](#))
- 4 Dr David Metz ([NPS0005](#))
- 5 Balfour Beatty & Parsons Brinckerhoff ([NPS0006](#))
- 6 Campaign for National Parks ([NPS0007](#))
- 7 Rail Freight Group ([NPS0008](#))
- 8 Living Streets ([NPS0009](#))
- 9 TravelWatch NorthWest ([NPS0010](#))
- 10 British Chambers of Commerce ([NPS0011](#))
- 11 GB Railfreight ([NPS0012](#))
- 12 Planning Officers Society ([NPS0013](#))
- 13 Royal Academy of Engineering ([NPS0014](#))
- 14 The Institution of Engineering and Technology ([NPS0015](#))
- 15 Tim Marshall ([NPS0016](#))
- 16 Department for Transport ([NPS0017](#))
- 17 Royal Town Planning Institute ([NPS0018](#))
- 18 D B Schenker ([NPS0019](#))
- 19 Transport Planning Society ([NPS0020](#))
- 20 WSP ([NPS0021](#))
- 21 Freight on Rail ([NPS0022](#))
- 22 Freightliner Group Limited ([NPS0023](#))
- 23 The Chartered Institute of Logistics And Transport ([NPS0024](#))
- 24 Friends of The Lake District ([NPS0025](#))
- 25 Greengauge 21 ([NPS0026](#))
- 26 Passenger Focus ([NPS0027](#))
- 27 Transport for London ([NPS0028](#))
- 28 Quod and the Kilbride Group ([NPS0029](#))
- 29 National Infrastructure Planning Association ([NPS0031](#))
- 30 Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation ([NPS0032](#))
- 31 Campaign for Better Transport ([NPS0033](#))
- 32 Friends of the Earth (England, Wales And Northern Ireland) ([NPS0034](#))
- 33 Dominic A Clarke ([NPS0035](#))
- 34 ClientEarth ([NPS0036](#))
- 35 Institution of Civil Engineers ([NPS0037](#))
- 36 Local Government Technical Advisers' Group ([NPS0038](#))
- 37 Campaign to Protect Rural England ([NPS0039](#))
- 38 Rail Delivery Group ([NPS0040](#))
- 39 British Ports Association ([NPS0041](#))

- 40 UK Major Ports Group ([NPS0042](#))
- 41 Friends Of The Earth ([NPS0043](#))

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/transcom.

The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

Session 2013–14

Sixteenth Report	National Policy Statement on National Networks	HC 1135
Fifteenth Report	Better roads: improving England's strategic road network	HC 850
Fourteenth Report	Putting passengers first, disruption at Gatwick, Christmas Eve 2013	HC 956
Seventeenth Special Report	Land transport security—scope for further EU involvement?: Further Government Response to the Committee's Eleventh Report of Session 2012–13	HC 1192
Thirteenth Report	Forging ahead?: UK shipping strategy	HC 630
Twelfth Report	Future programme 2014	HC 1143
Eleventh Report	Safety at level crossings	HC 680 (HC 1260)
Tenth Report	Ready and waiting? Transport preparations for winter weather	HC 681 (HC 1139)
Ninth Report	High speed rail: on track?	HC 851 (HC 1085)
Fifteenth Special Report	Cancellation of the InterCity West Coast competition: Government update on the Laidlaw and Brown reports	HC 1086
Eighth Report	Access to ports	HC 266 (HC 1083)
Seventh Report	Local authority parking enforcement	HC 118 (HC 970)
Seventh Special Report	The new European motorcycle test: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report of 2009–10	HC 656
Sixth Report	Flight Time Limitation: Follow-up	HC 641 (HC 795)
Fifth Report	Access to transport for disabled people	HC 116 (HC 870)
Fourth Report	Cost of motor insurance: whiplash	HC 117 (Cm 8738)
Third Report	The work of the Vehicle and Operator Services Agency (VOSA)	HC 583 (HC 678)
Second Report	Future programme: 2013–14	HC 438
Fifth Special Report	The European Commission's 4 th Railway Package: Government Response to the Committee's Twelfth Report of Session 2012–13	HC 439
Third Special Report	Rail 2020: Rail Delivery Group and Passenger Focus responses to the Committee's Seventh Report of Session 2012–13	HC 81
Fourth Special Report	Land transport security—scope for further EU involvement?: Government Response to the Committee's Eleventh Report of Session 2012–13	HC 177

Second Special Report	Marine Pilotage: Government Response to the Committee's Ninth Report of Session 2012–13	HC 79
First Report	Aviation strategy	HC 78 (HC 596)
First Special Report	Cancellation of the InterCity West Coast franchise competition: Government Response to the Committee's Eighth Report of Session 2012–13	HC 80

Session 2012–13

Twelfth Report	The European Commission's 4 th Railway Package	HC 1001(HC 439)
Eleventh Report	Land transport security—scope for further EU involvement?	HC 875
Ninth Special Report	Rail 2020: Government and Office of Rail Regulation Responses to the Committee's Seventh Report of 2012–13	HC 1059
Tenth Report	The Coastguard, Emergency Towing Vessels and the Maritime Incident Response Group: follow up: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report of 2012–13	HC 1018
Ninth Report	Marine Pilotage	HC 840
Eighth Report	Cancellation of the InterCity West Coast franchise competition	HC 537
Eighth Special Report	Plug-in vehicles, plugged in policy?: Government Response to the Committee's Fourth Report of Session 2012–13	HC 884
Seventh Report	Rail 2020	HC 329
Sixth Report	The Coastguard, Emergency Towing Vessels and the Maritime Incident Response Group: follow up	HC 647
Fifth Report	Future programme: autumn and winter 2012–13	HC 591
Fourth Report	Plug-in vehicles, plugged in policy?	HC 239
Third Report	Competition in the local bus market	HC 10 (HC 761) (Incorporating HC 1861–i–iii)
Fifth Special Report	Flight Time Limitations: Government Response To The Committee's First Report Of Session 2012–13	HC 558
Fourth Special Report	Air Travel Organisers' Licensing (Atol) Reform: Government Response To The Committee's Seventeenth Report Of Session 2010–12	HC 557
Second Report	Road safety	HC 506 (HC 648) Incorporating HC 1738
First Report	Flight time limitations	HC 164 Incorporating HC 1838
Third Special Report	Sulphur emissions by ships: Government Response to the Committee's Sixteenth Report of Session 2010–12	HC 87
Second Special Report	Counting the cost: financial scrutiny of the Department for Transport 2011–12: Government Response to the Committee's Fifteenth Report of Session 2010–12	HC 15

First Special Report	Draft Civil Aviation Bill: Pre-Legislative Scrutiny: Government Response to the Committee's Thirteenth Report of Session 2010–12	HC 11
Session 2010–12		
Seventeenth Report	Air Travel Organisers' Licensing (ATOL) reform	HC 1798
Sixteenth Report	Sulphur emissions by ships	HC 1561
Fifteenth Report	Counting the cost: financial scrutiny of the Department for Transport 2011–12	HC 1560
Fourteenth Report	Cable theft on the Railway	HC 1609 (HC 1933)
Thirteenth Report	Draft Civil Aviation Bill: Pre-Legislative Scrutiny	HC 1694
Twelfth Report	Cost of motor insurance: follow up	HC 1451 (HC 1934)
Eleventh Report	Thameslink rolling stock procurement	HC 1453 (HC 1935)
Tenth Report	High Speed Rail	HC 1185–I (HC 1754)
Ninth Report	Out of the jam: reducing congestion on our roads	HC 872 (HC 1661)
Eighth Report	Bus Services after the Spending Review	HC 750 (HC 1550)
Seventh Report	Taxis and private hire vehicles: the road to reform	HC 720 (HC 1507)
Sixth Report	The Coastguard, Emergency Towing Vessels and the Maritime Incident Response Group	HC 948, incorporating HC 752–i (HC 1482)
Fifth Report	Keeping the UK moving: The impact on transport of the winter weather in December 2010	HC 794 (HC 1467)
Fourth Report	The cost of motor insurance	HC 591 (HC 1466)
Third Report	Transport and the economy	HC 473 (HC 962)
Second Report	Financial Scrutiny of the Department for Transport	HC 683
First Report	Drink and drug driving law	HC 460 (Cm 8050)
Tenth Special Report	The proposal for a National Policy Statement on Ports: Government Response to the Committee Fifth Report of Session 2009–10	HC 1598
Third Special Report	The performance of the Department for Transport: Government response to the Committee's Fourth Report of Session 2009–10	HC 549
Second Special Report	Update on the London Underground and the public-private (PPP) partnership agreements: Government response to the Committee's Seventh Report of Session 2009–10	HC 467
First Special Report	The major road network: Government response to the Committee's Eighth Report of Session 2009–10	HC 421