



House of Commons  
Transport Committee

---

# Passenger transport in isolated communities

---

**Fourth Report of Session 2014–15**

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

*Ordered by the House of Commons  
to be printed 14 July 2014*

**HC 288**  
**[INCORPORATING HC 853, SESSION 2013–14]**  
Published on 22 July 2014  
by authority of the House of Commons  
London: The Stationery Office Limited  
£9.00

## 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<sup>c</sup>Cartney (*Conservative, Colne Valley*)

Karl M<sup>c</sup>Cartney (*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](http://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 Gordon Clarke (Clerk), Nick Beech (Second Clerk), Richard Jeremy (Committee Specialist), Alexandra Meakin (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](mailto:transcom@parliament.uk)

# Contents

---

<b>Report</b>	<i>Page</i>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
Inquiry	6
<b>2 Isolated people</b>	<b>7</b>
Isolated communities	7
Isles of Scilly	8
Vulnerable groups	9
<b>3 Bus and rail</b>	<b>11</b>
Bus services	11
Stimulating demand	12
Community Rail Partnerships	13
<b>4 Alternative provision</b>	<b>16</b>
Community transport	16
Total transport	17
<b>Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>19</b>
Visit to Colne Valley	21
<b>Annex</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Formal Minutes</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Witnesses</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Published written evidence</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament</b>	<b>27</b>

## Summary

---

People who live in isolated communities use passenger transport to access employment, education, training and healthcare. Passenger transport in isolated communities is therefore a concern for not only the Department for Transport (DfT) but other Departments and agencies. The DfT must show strategic leadership in driving joined-up policy making to allow people who live in isolated communities fully to participate in society.

Older people, younger people, unemployed people, people on low incomes and disabled people who live in isolated communities rely on passenger transport and are disproportionately affected by inadequate or reduced services. We conclude that policy makers must take the needs of all those vulnerable groups into account rather than making potentially damaging trade-offs between them.

Policy makers sometimes equate 'isolated communities' with 'rural communities', but we found that isolated communities also exist in urban and suburban areas. We recommend that the DfT drafts a definition of 'isolated communities' for use across central and local government, which should be used to target scarce resources.

We recognise the importance of community transport, but believe that Central Government and local authorities are being unrealistic if they expect voluntary community transport projects to compensate for decreased bus services.

'Total transport' involves pooling transport resources to deliver a range of services. For example, it might involve combining hospital transport with local bus services. That new approach could revolutionise transport provision in isolated communities by making more efficient use of existing resources. We recommend that the DfT initiates a large-scale pilot to test the concept in practice.

# 1 Introduction

---

1. Passenger transport is fundamental to the sustainability and independence of isolated communities, because it provides people with access to public services, employment, education and training. Isolated communities are found in both urban and rural areas. They include disabled people, older people, younger people, unemployed people and those on low incomes. As the Department for Transport (DfT) acknowledged, “inadequate transport provision is a very real concern and can be a barrier to the prosperity of all those living in such areas.”<sup>1</sup> The provision of passenger transport to isolated communities facilitates social inclusion and allows people to access vital services provided by the Department of Health, the Department for Education and the Department for Work and Pensions.

2. Commercial operators often struggle to run passenger transport services in isolated communities where demand is thin or diffuse.<sup>2</sup> Local authorities therefore subsidise passenger transport in isolated communities according to local circumstances and priorities.<sup>3</sup> Those subsidies have decreased in the past four years as part of a wider squeeze by central Government on public spending.<sup>4</sup> The combined effect on service provision of the 28% reduction in local authority revenue spending from 2011–12 and of the 20% reduction in the Bus Services Operator Grant from 2012–13 provided the background to this inquiry.<sup>5</sup>

3. The DfT is ultimately responsible for passenger transport in isolated communities, because it determines the level of subsidy to local government; it has the capacity to define and consequently support ‘isolated communities’; and it decides which vulnerable groups are provided with concessionary transport services. The Minister of State, Transport, Baroness Kramer of Richmond Park told us that “local authorities themselves that are best placed to decide what support to provide, in response to local views and need, and in the light of their overall funding priorities.”<sup>6</sup> We agree that local authorities are best placed to determine priorities in their local areas, but we do not ignore the impact of decreased funding on services following the Spending Review 2010.

---

1 DfT (TIC 098) para 14

2 DfT (TIC 098) para 15

3 DfT (TIC 098) para 22

4 DfT (TIC 098) para 17

5 Transport Committee, Eighth Report of Session 2010-12, *Bus services after the spending review*, HC 750, para 11

6 Q175

## Inquiry

4. This inquiry considered how passenger transport is provided in isolated communities in England.<sup>7</sup> It began with a call for evidence seeking views on the following questions:

- How do Government and local authorities identify demand for passenger transport in isolated communities?
- To what extent are the needs of different groups of passengers—for example, people with disabilities, older people and young people—taken into account in determining the provision of public transport to isolated communities?
- What are the main challenges associated with providing better and more consistent bus and rail services to isolated communities? How can these challenges be overcome?
- How effectively do Community Transport services address the needs of passengers in isolated communities? How could Community Transport be improved?
- To what extent should passengers in isolated communities be expected to rely on taxis and other demand-responsive transport services?
- What are the main challenges associated with funding transport services in isolated communities? How can these services be made more affordable?

The call for evidence produced more than 100 written responses from local authorities, transport providers, representative groups, consultants and interested individuals. We are grateful to everyone who took the time to submit evidence to our inquiry.

5. The first oral evidence session took place on 13 January 2014, when we heard from campaigners, representative groups and transport providers. The second and final oral evidence session took place on 3 March 2014, when we took evidence from local authority representative groups and Baroness Kramer. At that session, we also considered the case study of the Isles of Scilly (see paragraph 8). In addition, the Committee visited Colne Valley to see one example how passenger transport is delivered in practice to an isolated community (see Annex).

---

<sup>7</sup> This Report addresses passenger transport in isolated communities in England. In Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland, the respective devolved Administrations, rather than the DfT, are primarily responsible for policy and funding decisions in relation to passenger transport. However, the Committee considered evidence from Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland in the course of its inquiry.

## 2 Isolated people

---

### Isolated communities

6. There is no widely agreed definition of an isolated community.<sup>8</sup> The Passenger Transport Executive Group (pteg) told us that any community risked isolation if it did not have passenger transport that fulfilled these four criteria:

- i) Available: the passenger transport network should be within easy reach of where people live and take them to and from the places they want to go at times and frequencies that correspond to patterns of social and working life. People also need to be kept informed of the services that are available.
- ii) Accessible: vehicles, stops and interchanges (and the walking routes to and from these) must be designed in such a way that, as far as possible, anyone can use them without difficulty.
- iii) Affordable: people should not be ‘priced out’ of using passenger transport because of high fares and should be able to easily find the right ticket for them.
- iv) Acceptable: people should feel that passenger transport is something that is equipped to meet their needs as well as comfortable, safe and convenient.

If one (or several) of these criteria are not fulfilled, people can find themselves isolated from opportunity.<sup>9</sup>

7. pteg’s definition encompassed not only isolated rural communities, but isolated suburban, urban and island communities. That is important, because we heard that policy makers sometimes equated isolated communities with rural communities.<sup>10</sup> For example, the DfT told us that “most isolated communities are in rural areas and our evidence concentrates on these.”<sup>11</sup> The lack of a widely accepted definition of an ‘isolated community’ is a barrier to effective policy making. The DfT pointed out that there “are well established definitions for urban and rural areas used by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) and Government Statistical Service, whereas no such definitions exist for isolated communities.”<sup>12</sup> It is axiomatic that the first step in solving a problem is to define it. ***The DfT should draft a definition of ‘isolated communities’ for use in central and local government that captures isolated urban, rural and island communities. We recommend pteg’s available-accessible-affordable-acceptable model as a practical starting point.***

---

8 DfT (TIC 098) para 1

9 pteg (TIC 0133)

10 pteg (TIC 033) para 2

11 DfT (TIC 098) para 2

12 DfT (TIC 098) para 2

***When such a definition has been agreed, the DfT must actively promote its use across Government Departments to facilitate joined-up policy making.***

## Isles of Scilly

8. The Isles of Scilly are an archipelago of five inhabited islands and approximately 140 uninhabited rocky islets located some 30 miles off Land's End.<sup>13</sup> We heard that Penzance to the Isles of Scilly is arguably the longest stretch of unsubsidised essential travel in England.<sup>14</sup> We also heard how comparable islands in Scotland are served by ferries which are subsidised by the Scottish Government.<sup>15</sup>

9. On 3 March 2014, we took evidence from Cornwall Council, the Council of the Isles of Scilly and Friends of Isles of Scilly Transport. We heard how fares to the Isles of Scilly have dramatically increased in the past two years and how those increases have impacted on visitor numbers.<sup>16</sup> We also heard how decreased choice and increased fares make it difficult for island residents to access healthcare and other services on the mainland.<sup>17</sup> In response, the Council of the Isles of Scilly told us that “the current operator is commercially viable and, therefore, there has never been a requirement or need to identify subsidies to make it viable.”<sup>18</sup>

10. We identified the need to establish a broad definition of an ‘isolated community’ for use by central and local government (see paragraph 7). People who live on islands need to access public and other services, and they should therefore receive subsidised travel if their island is isolated. In July 2014, the Council of the Isles of Scilly reversed its opposition to subsidised passenger transport and engaged in discussions with the DfT to introduce a travel subsidy based on ‘social need’.<sup>19</sup>

**11. We welcome the discussions between the Council of the Isles of Scilly and the DfT on introducing subsidised travel based on social need. The DfT must recognise that the people living on the Isles of Scilly are an isolated community and that they consequently need support to access healthcare and other vital services on the mainland. We expect the DfT to set out the result of those discussions in its response to this Report.**

---

13 The inhabited islands are St Mary's, Tresco, St Martin's, St Agnes and Bryher. There are other inhabited islands in England, such as Lundy.

14 FRIST (TIC 117) para 23

15 FRIST (TIC 117) para 17

16 Q121

17 Q122

18 Q145

19 Scilly Today, *FRIST Welcomes Council U-Turn On Travel Costs*, 2 July 2014

## Vulnerable groups

12. Although all sections of society can and do use passenger transport, some groups of people rely on passenger transport and are disproportionately affected by reduced or revised provision:

- Older people. Many elderly people are unable to drive, in which case passenger transport is their only option. Older people use cars less and travel by passenger transport more than the middle-aged.<sup>20</sup>
- Younger people. Like older people, younger people use cars less and travel by passenger transport more than the middle-aged. Young people make significantly fewer car journeys than in the past. In the mid-1990s, the average young person took almost 600 car journeys each year; that figure decreased to 377 trips in 2011. Some 48% of 17 to 20-year-olds held a driving licence in the early 1990s; today, 38% of 17 to 20-year-olds hold a driving licence.<sup>21</sup>
- Unemployed people. Passenger transport is essential for unemployed people, because it allows them both to sign on at a jobcentre and to look for work. That is a particular concern in urban areas, because some 77% of jobseekers in British cities outside London do not have regular access to a car, van or motorbike.<sup>22</sup> More widely, two out of five jobseekers cited lack of transport as a barrier to finding work.<sup>23</sup> A recent Joseph Rowntree Foundation study found that while 70% to 90% of unfilled low-skilled job vacancies were easily accessible by car, only 35% to 55% could be reached within 30 minutes by public transport.<sup>24</sup>
- People with low incomes. Low-income families are more dependent than others on bus travel. People in the lowest income quintile make three times more journeys by bus than people in the highest income quintile.<sup>25</sup>
- Disabled people. We heard that passenger transport allows disabled people to access employment and community and family life. Some 60% of disabled people have no car in the household, and disabled people use buses about 20% more frequently than the non-disabled population.<sup>26</sup>

13. Some vulnerable groups of people receive concessionary travel which is subsidised by local authorities. For example, transport authorities must provide older and disabled

---

20 Campaign for Better Transport (TIC 045) para 2.4

21 Campaign for Better Transport (TIC 045) para 2.8

22 pteg (TIC 133)

23 Campaign for Better Transport (TIC 045) para 2.11

24 pteg (TIC 133)

25 Campaign for Better Transport (TIC 045) para 2.14

26 Campaign for Better Transport (TIC 045) para 2.15

people with off-peak travel on buses. We heard how services for one vulnerable group of people were sometimes provided at the expense of other vulnerable groups:

In Greater Manchester, child fares had to increase by 20p to cover the costs of providing statutory free travel for older and disabled people. Research among parents found that, as a result, they were restricting the journeys that their children made, particularly for those activities falling outside of school. Research by the All Party Parliamentary Group on Social Mobility found that participation in after school activities is a key factor in breaking the cycle of social immobility.<sup>27</sup>

**Policy making to deliver passenger transport in isolated communities must address the needs of all vulnerable groups. To facilitate fairness and joined-up provision, policy makers must avoid trade-offs between generations or between vulnerable groups of people.**

14. Many younger people, unemployed people and people on low incomes rely on passenger transport (see paragraph 12). Providing those groups of vulnerable people with discounted or free travel would allow them to access employment, healthcare, education and training. Such targeted support would allow people to access vital services provided by the Department of Health, the Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Education.<sup>28</sup>

*15. The DfT must recognise that passenger transport provision is fundamental to achieving the objectives of the Department of Health, the Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Education in isolated communities. The DfT needs to work with those Departments and other concerned agencies to secure targeted funding that provides passenger transport services for young people, people with low incomes and unemployed people who live in isolated rural and urban communities. To meet that target, the DfT will need to take a leadership role on behalf of isolated communities to facilitate cross-departmental and multi-agency working.*

---

27 pteg (TIC 133)

28 Q11

## 3 Bus and rail

---

### Bus services

16. The bus is the only mode of passenger transport in many isolated communities. The bus market outside London is deregulated. In practice, commercial bus operators do not run unprofitable services to isolated housing estates or rural areas, focusing instead on profitable major corridors and commuter routes.<sup>29</sup> Where gaps in bus services emerge, transport authorities must decide whether to fund a tendered service to cover unmet transport need.

17. The central Government grant to local authorities to subsidise ‘socially necessary’ bus services—the Bus Service Operator Grant (BSOG)—was decreased by 20% from April 2012.<sup>30</sup> That decrease affected services to isolated communities, which in turn limited access to employment, education, key services and social activities.<sup>31</sup> The 20% decrease in the BSOG may have been a false economy. pteg told us:

In our areas—the PTE areas—bus networks generate £1.3 billion in user benefits, from access to jobs, training, shopping and leisure opportunities; and that for every £1 of public money spent you get £3 of benefits from the socially necessary bus services that connect isolated communities and connect people to opportunities.<sup>32</sup>

The Government appeared to accept that argument in the Spending Review 2013, which included an announcement that “spending on BSOG will be protected for 2015/16.”<sup>33</sup> **We welcome the protection of the BSOG in the Spending Review 2013, but note that that freeze will not address the gaps in service provision caused by the 20% decrease introduced in 2012.**

18. The affordability and availability of bus services are particular issues in urban areas outside London. More than 80% of public transport trips in metropolitan areas outside London are made by bus, which equates to more than 1 billion journeys annually.<sup>34</sup> In the 2011-12 local government funding settlement, funding for metropolitan districts fell by around 10% in real terms, compared with a 5% cut in non-metropolitan areas.<sup>35</sup>

---

29 pteg (TIC 033) para 5.2

30 DfT (TIC 098) para 17

31 pteg (TIC 033) para 5.3

32 Q158

33 DfT (TIC 098) para 17

34 pteg (TIC 133)

35 pteg (TIC 033) para 8.6

19. We considered how bus services are provided in detail in two Reports earlier in this Parliament.<sup>36</sup> In those Reports, we identified how transport authorities can use powers in the Local Transport Act 2008 to shape the deregulated bus market to meet the needs of local people. In particular, we highlighted the potential for local authorities to emulate the success of bus provision in London by introducing Quality Contracts.<sup>37</sup> A Quality Contract would replace deregulated bus markets with a franchising system similar to that in London, where the local transport authority would specify what the bus network will provide and the private sector would compete for the right to provide it.<sup>38</sup> Quality Contracts could be used to ensure the provision of bus services to isolated communities. Such services could be specified as part of the package that operators bid for, which would allow cross-subsidisation by more profitable routes and which will reduce or eliminate the need for tendered services.

20. Several passenger transport executives are currently developing Quality Contracts for consultation.<sup>39</sup> Nexus in Tyne and Wear were the first to launch a formal public consultation, which closed on 4 June 2014.<sup>40</sup> **We welcome the initiative shown by Nexus in introducing its draft Quality Contract in Tyne and Wear. Given that no Quality Contract has yet been agreed using the powers in the Local Transport Act 2008, this will be an important test case in determining whether Quality Contracts are a viable means by which to deliver bus services.**

21. Partnerships between local authorities and bus operators may be the most realistic means of delivering bus service improvements to isolated communities given current levels of public spending. Where possible, such partnerships should include multiple operators and competition should take place within a framework that benefits the public. That will require local authorities and the bus industry to show leadership in developing partnerships, the best of which are based on shared interests and long-term-relationships.<sup>41</sup>

## Stimulating demand

22. The key factor that shaped passenger transport provision in England since the 1950s was the growth of private motoring.<sup>42</sup> Over time, increased car ownership reduced demand for passenger transport, which in turn reduced passenger transport provision and incentivised car ownership.<sup>43</sup> That downwards spiral was most apparent in rural areas, where the majority of people currently own a vehicle. Some 9% of households in rural areas

---

36 Transport Committee, Third Report of Session 2012-13, *Competition in the local bus market*, HC 10; Transport Committee, Eighth Report of Session 2010-12, *Bus services after the spending review*, HC 750

37 Transport Committee, Third Report of Session 2012-13, *Competition in the local bus market*, HC 10, para 68

38 pteg (TIC 033) para 5.4

39 pteg (TIC 033) para 5.4

40 Nexus, *Bus strategy*

41 Transport Committee, Third Report of Session 2012-13, *Competition in the local bus market*, HC 10, para 80

42 Q18

43 DfT (TIC 098) para 8

in Great Britain do not own a car compared with 45% of people in London boroughs, 33% of people in metropolitan built-up areas and 27% of people in large urban areas.<sup>44</sup> Action for Communities in Rural England told us:

It becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. While there is no alternative, more who can afford to do so are forced into car ownership. The problem is reversing that trend. If there was regular and reliable transport, more families would feel confident not having to rely on buying their own car.<sup>45</sup>

23. We heard that that trend might be halted or reversed through improved marketing of bus services to stimulate demand and to make potential passengers aware of what is available. The Campaign for Better Transport told us that

there isn't enough marketing done for a lot of the subsidised services. They have tended to be run because they have always been run, without looking at them properly. Where local authorities and operators have got together and marketed networks of services in more rural areas, or even in relatively urban ones, they have been able to get people back on to buses who have not been there for a long time.<sup>46</sup>

The Association of Transport Co-ordinating Officers (ATCO) added:

We know that young people are a captive market anyway because they cannot drive, and the cost of driving is now very expensive. I do not quite see operators stepping up to the mark and saying, "We want young people to carry on using the bus, not just now but as they get into employment," and putting in place innovative products. Maybe I am wrong and we will see that come through, but at the moment I do not see them responding as every other industry with a captive market would do.<sup>47</sup>

**24. Bus operators have a vested interest in maintaining and stimulating interest in their services through effective marketing. *The DfT must work with the bus industry to facilitate and co-ordinate the dissemination of best practice in order to maximise revenue and to minimise costs.***

## Community Rail Partnerships

25. Around 170 railway stations serve isolated communities.<sup>48</sup> Many of those stations are supported by Community Rail Partnerships (CRPs). We heard that CRPs

bring together a number of disparate interests who have an interest in the success of their local railway. The core membership includes the local

---

44 DfT (TIC\_098) Annex A

45 Q20

46 Q23

47 Q167

48 Association of Community Rail Partnerships (TIC\_056) Executive summary

transport planning authority (county or unitary councils in England), the train operator and the rail user group. Other members may include district, town or parish councils, Network Rail, National Parks, universities or heritage railways. A wide spectrum of supporters are drawn from local people, amenity groups, the Women's Institute, local traders and indeed anyone who wants to see improvements to their railway.<sup>49</sup>

In addition to facilitating local rail transport, we saw how Community Rail Partnerships can drive rail-based tourism in our visit to Colne Valley (see Annex).

26. The Association of Community Rail Partnerships explained how partnerships provided leadership to co-ordinate voluntary activity:

CRPs are typically run by a paid partnership officer, usually employed by the local authority, sometimes on a part time basis. Much of the financial support for promoting the lines and making minor improvements comes from train operators, the tourism sector and (until recently) from local authorities. The work is mainly done by volunteers, from customer service and leaflet distribution to landscaping, station gardens and running special events such as music trains. In particular, volunteers provide new ideas and are ambassadors for the railway within their communities. The value of time of the volunteers supporting CRPs has been estimated at £27 million a year.<sup>50</sup>

Employing partnership officers appeared to be a sound investment given the subsequent level of voluntary activity. We heard that the average benefit to cost ratio of a community rail scheme is almost 5:1.<sup>51</sup>

27. Crucially, train operating companies supported CRPs:

The train companies are extremely supportive of community rail partnerships, to the extent that they are now an integral part of the rural railway. It is quite difficult to imagine the rural railway operating without those CRPs. They bring benefits in terms of local focus and practical support in a range of ways for train companies and rail services. They provide innovation at a local level. In particular, they engender the kind of partnership working that is quite important to ensure that rural routes are successful.<sup>52</sup>

28. The Association of Community Rail Partnerships provided an example how such partnership working can deliver bespoke transport outcomes for isolated communities:

The best example I can give is the line between Blackburn and Clitheroe, where they did not have a Sunday service for a long time. By community

---

49 Association of Community Rail Partnerships (TIC 056) para 5

50 Association of Community Rail Partnerships (TIC 056) para 6

51 Association of Community Rail Partnerships (TIC 056) para 7

52 Q66

agreement, they agreed to have the fares slightly increased on Monday to Saturday in order to offset the cost of running a Sunday service. Now the Sunday service is very successful, and very popular because it was by community diktat.<sup>53</sup>

29. CRPs do not attract ring-fenced funding. After the 2010 Spending Review, funding for Community Rail Partnerships decreased in line with cuts to local authority budgets.<sup>54</sup> The DfT told us that it “supports the setting up of new Community Rail schemes”. There seems little point in setting up such schemes if they are not financially sustainable.<sup>55</sup> The Association of Train Operating Companies (ATOC) told us that it

obviously cannot fill the gap that is left by central or local government funding, because that is where the substantive amount of funding for local services comes from. We are always prepared to help at the margin.<sup>56</sup>

We welcome that ATOC’s recognition of the value of CRPs. In addition, CRPs could help themselves by working with train operating companies to ensure that revenue is maximised through the efficient payment of fares. They could also seek to build partnerships with local industry to support local rail, a process which might be co-ordinated by local enterprise partnerships.

**30. Community Rail Partnerships are a cost-effective way to facilitate passenger transport in isolated communities, but their future viability may be threatened by a funding shortage. The Association of Community Rail Partnerships must lead the CRP sector in taking up the offer of financial help from the Association of Train Operating Companies. It must also work with train operating companies and the DfT in sharing best practice on maximising revenue from fare collection.**

**31. We welcome the DfT’s recognition of the value of Community Rail Partnerships. The DfT must translate its support for Community Rail Partnerships into ring-fenced funding to reinforce the sector, which is a proven means of harnessing the power of volunteering to deliver passenger transport in isolated communities.**

---

53 Q72

54 Association of Community Rail Partnerships (TIC\_056) para 7

55 DfT (TIC\_098) para 17

56 Q89

## 4 Alternative provision

---

### Community transport

32. ‘Community transport’ describes passenger transport schemes owned and operated by local community groups. Community transport is provided on a not-for-profit basis and is run by volunteers. Community transport schemes serve people who do not have access to conventional public transport or who are unable to use it. Particular schemes may set their own conditions for who can be carried, according to local priorities.

33. Community transport encompasses a range of transport services:

- Voluntary car schemes. An organised form of lift giving where volunteer drivers use their own cars to provide door to door journeys for people without transport. Passengers are charged a rate per mile for their journeys to cover drivers’ costs.
- Community bus services. Minibuses operated by volunteers serve regular routes to a published timetable. They are available to all members of the general public.
- Minibus hire. Vehicles owned by community groups are made available to other local organisations for low-cost hire. This service can be useful for a number of different purposes, including leisure, education and sport. Some vehicles are wheelchair accessible.
- Dial a ride. This service provides door-to-door journeys for people who are unable to use conventional public transport. Potential passengers need to register as members to use the service. Journey bookings are usually made in advance.

34. The DfT “sees community transport as key to addressing the needs of passengers in rural areas and isolated communities in England.”<sup>57</sup> Baroness Kramer told us that “between 2011 and 2012, we provided £20 million to local authorities in rural areas to help community transport initiatives.”<sup>58</sup> ***Community transport has an important role to play in all isolated communities. The DfT must extend its financial support for community transport to all isolated communities rather than only supporting such services in rural areas.***

35. Other witnesses were more cautious than the DfT about how significant a role community transport might play in addressing the needs of isolated communities. In particular, they doubted whether community transport can fill gaps in provision caused by decreased subsidies for buses. The Campaign for Better Transport told us that “community transport can only fill between 10% and 15% of former supported transport provision.”<sup>59</sup>

---

57 DfT (TIC 098) para 25

58 Q175

59 Campaign for Better Transport (TIC 045) para 4.3

36. ATCO pointed out that in practice community transport schemes served particular groups of people rather than the whole community:

They are very small—often one, two or five minibuses only—relying upon declining numbers of volunteers and primarily looking after the needs of the elderly, or the frail elderly, and people going to hospital appointments. To look after the needs of the young and people seeking employment is a very long way from their focus. While we have had those conversations with them, to expect unpaid volunteers to get up at six in the morning to drive people to work, who are going to earn a wage, often does not fit comfortably with some of those models.<sup>60</sup>

**37. Central Government and local authorities are being unrealistic if they expect voluntary community transport projects to compensate for decreased bus services. Although community transport has an important role to play, in practice it does not serve all sections of the community and therefore cannot substitute for bus services.**

## Total transport

38. Total transport involves integrating transport services that are currently commissioned by different central and local government agencies and provided by different operators. Such integrated services might deliver improved passenger transport in isolated communities by allocating existing resources more efficiently. That might entail, for example, combining conventional bus services with hospital transport. pteg argued that

instead of the Department for Education commissioning transportation services, or the health service using ambulances with paramedics purely to transfer people to and from hospital, those things can be done in a total way with better use of existing funding. It is not a requirement for new money; effectively, it is better use of existing resources.<sup>61</sup>

The total transport concept is especially applicable to isolated communities where transport resources are scarce and where the scale of the administration in relation to budgets and vehicle fleets is relatively manageable.

39. Several small-scale total transport projects have been implemented in England. For example, Norfolk County Council and the East of England Ambulance Service have piloted an integrated transport project.<sup>62</sup> In addition, a taxi-bus service has been trialled in Devon and NHS transport has been integrated with local transport authority services in Greater

---

60 Q160

61 Q164

62 pteg *Total transport event report*

Manchester.<sup>63</sup> No large-scale total transport trial has taken place in the UK, but large-scale total transport has been successfully implemented in the Netherlands.<sup>64</sup>

40. pteg highlighted

the wider difficulties that can be associated with convincing agencies at national, but also local level, to release some control and to work at breaking down silos of responsibility for the greater good. Often, agencies can be willing to collaborate, provided this does not involve a financial commitment.<sup>65</sup>

There are structural barriers to implementing the total transport approach, which is contingent on providers collaborating and sharing their current powers and resources. Those barriers will only be overcome by leadership and co-ordination from central Government. Baroness Kramer appeared to accept that point when she told us that “central Government can lead the way by working more closely together.”<sup>66</sup>

41. Baroness Kramer explained why she supported the concept of total transport:

We very much encourage the kind of integrated thinking that you were talking about. You have local authorities and others providing services for schools and hospitals and for a whole variety of reasons. Rather than thinking in silos, in pulling that together one could potentially come up with a different integrated profile.<sup>67</sup>

We also believe that total transport could hugely benefit isolated communities. However, we do not have clear evidence on the benefits and costs, because no large-scale trials have yet been carried out in this country. It is important that such trials are carried out in the near future, because we heard that decreased local authority budgets may result in core services being reduced to such a level that full-scale trials of total transport will become impossible.<sup>68</sup>

**42. We welcome the DfT’s support for total transport, which has the potential to revolutionise transport provision in isolated communities by making more efficient use of existing resources. *The DfT must work with local government to co-ordinate large-scale total transport pilot schemes in a range of urban and rural communities. We expect the DfT to report back to us with an interim evaluation of progress on such trials by July 2015.***

---

63 Q182

64 Q159

65 pteg, *Total Transport: Working across sectors to achieve better outcomes*, p8

66 Q182

67 Q180

68 Q165

# Conclusions and recommendations

---

## Isolated communities

1. The DfT should draft a definition of 'isolated communities' for use in central and local government that captures isolated urban, rural and island communities. We recommend pteg's available-accessible-affordable-acceptable model as a practical starting point. When such a definition has been agreed, the DfT must actively promote its use across Government Departments to facilitate joined-up policy making. (Paragraph 7)

## Isles of Scilly

2. We welcome the discussions between the Council of the Isles of Scilly and the DfT on introducing subsidised travel based on social need. The DfT must recognise that the people living on the Isles of Scilly are an isolated community and that they consequently need support to access healthcare and other vital services on the mainland. We expect the DfT to set out the result of those discussions in its response to this Report. (Paragraph 11)

## Vulnerable groups

3. Policy making to deliver passenger transport in isolated communities must address the needs of all vulnerable groups. To facilitate fairness and joined-up provision, policy makers must avoid trade-offs between generations or between vulnerable groups of people. (Paragraph 13)
4. The DfT must recognise that passenger transport provision is fundamental to achieving the objectives of the Department of Health, the Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Education in isolated communities. The DfT needs to work with those Departments and other concerned agencies to secure targeted funding that provides passenger transport services for young people, people with low incomes and unemployed people who live in isolated rural and urban communities. To meet that target, the DfT will need to take a leadership role on behalf of isolated communities to facilitate cross-departmental and multi-agency working. (Paragraph 15)

## Bus services

5. We welcome the protection of the BSOG in the Spending Review 2013, but note that that freeze will not address the gaps in service provision caused by the 20% decrease introduced in 2012. (Paragraph 17)
6. We welcome the initiative shown by Nexus in introducing its draft Quality Contract in Tyne and Wear. Given that no Quality Contract has yet been agreed using the powers in the Local Transport Act 2008, this will be an important test case in determining whether Quality Contracts are a viable means by which to deliver bus services. (Paragraph 20)

### Stimulating demand

7. Bus operators have a vested interest in maintaining and stimulating interest in their services through effective marketing. The DfT must work with the bus industry to facilitate and co-ordinate the dissemination of best practice in order to maximise revenue and to minimise costs. (Paragraph 24)

### Community Rail Partnerships

8. Community Rail Partnerships are a cost-effective way to facilitate passenger transport in isolated communities, but their future viability may be threatened by a funding shortage. The Association of Community Rail Partnerships must lead the CRP sector in taking up the offer of financial help from the Association of Train Operating Companies. It must also work with train operating companies and the DfT in sharing best practice on maximising revenue from fare collection. (Paragraph 30)
9. We welcome the DfT's recognition of the value of Community Rail Partnerships. The DfT must translate its support for Community Rail Partnerships into ring-fenced funding to reinforce the sector, which is a proven means of harnessing the power of volunteering to deliver passenger transport in isolated communities. (Paragraph 31)

### Community transport

10. Community transport has an important role to play in all isolated communities. The DfT must extend its financial support for community transport to all isolated communities rather than only supporting such services in rural areas. (Paragraph 34)
11. Central Government and local authorities are being unrealistic if they expect voluntary community transport projects to compensate for decreased bus services. Although community transport has an important role to play, in practice it does not serve all sections of the community and therefore cannot substitute for bus services. (Paragraph 37)

### Total transport

12. We welcome the DfT's support for total transport, which has the potential to revolutionise transport provision in isolated communities by making more efficient use of existing resources. The DfT must work with local government to co-ordinate large-scale total transport pilot schemes in a range of urban and rural communities. We expect the DfT to report back to us with an interim evaluation of progress on such trials by July 2015. (Paragraph 42)

# Annex

---

## Visit to Colne Valley

On 20 February 2014, Jason McCartney MP and the Second Clerk of the Transport Select Committee visited Colne Valley to experience how transport is provided to isolated communities in practice. We travelled by bus and rail from the village of Wilberlee to the local hospital, Huddersfield Royal Infirmary. We took that journey because access to health facilities is a key concern for people who live in isolated communities. The itinerary is set out below:

11:49 Depart Wilberlee on Bus No. 335 operated by Stotts Coaches under tender to West Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive.<sup>69</sup>

11:53 Arrive Slaithwaite Railway Station.

12:04 Depart Slaithwaite Railway Station on the hourly Northern Rail Service from Manchester Victoria to Huddersfield.

12:12 Arrive Huddersfield Railway Station.

12:15 Short walk (100 metres) to Huddersfield Westgate.

12:22 Depart Huddersfield Westgate on bus No. 372 operated by First Bus.

12:30 Arrive Huddersfield Royal Infirmary.

The buses and trains were used by significant numbers of local people. Timetables were clear and all services were punctual. Importantly, the bus service was co-ordinated with the train at Slaithwaite railway station, which facilitated a joined-up transport service to Huddersfield. Slaithwaite railway station is supported by a Community Rail Partnership (see paragraph 32). The Community Rail Partnership not only co-ordinates rail travel for local people, but drives local tourism through its promotion of the Transpennine Real Ale Trail.<sup>70</sup>

---

69 West Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive was formally abolished on 1 April 2014, when it was replaced by West Yorkshire Metro.

70 *Transpennine Real Ale Trail*

# Formal Minutes

---

**Monday 14 July 2014**

Members present:

Mrs Louise Ellman, in the Chair

Sarah Champion  
Jim Dobbin  
Jim Fitzpatrick

Karl M<sup>c</sup>Cartney  
Graham Stringer  
Martin Vickers

Draft Report (*Passenger transport in isolated communities*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

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

Paragraphs 1 to 42 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Annex agreed to.

*Resolved*, That the Report be the Fourth 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 Monday 1 September 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](http://www.parliament.uk/transcom).

### Monday 13 January 2014

*Question number*

**Janice Banks**, Chief Executive, Action with Communities in Rural England, **Claire Haigh**, Chief Executive, Greener Journeys, and **Stephen Joseph**, Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport Q1-31

**Bill Freeman**, Chief Executive, Community Transport Association, **Ewan Jones**, Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Operations, Community Transport Association, **Martin Higginson**, Adviser, Association of Local Bus Company Managers, and **Claire Walters**, Chief Executive, Bus Users UK Q32-62

**Neil Buxton**, General Manager, Association of Community Rail Partnerships, and **David Mapp**, Commercial Director, Association of Train Operating Companies Q63-118

### Monday 3 March 2014

**Theo Leijser**, Chief Executive, Council of the Isles of Scilly, **Councillor Chris Thomas**, Council of the Isles of Scilly, **Nigel Blackler**, Head of Transportation, Waste and Environment, Cornwall Council, **Marian Bennett**, Co ordinator, Friends of Isles of Scilly Transport, **Tim Guthrie**, Member, Friends of Isles of Scilly Transport, and **Robert Francis**, Member, Friends of Isles of Scilly Transport Q119-151

**David Brown**, Chair, Passenger Transport Executive Group, **Rebecca Fuller**, Researcher, Passenger Transport Executive Group, and **Bruce Thompson**, Association of Transport Co-ordinating Officers Q152-173

**Baroness Kramer**, Minister of State, Department for Transport, and **Anthony Ferguson**, Head of Buses and Taxis Division, Department for Transport Q174-189

## 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](http://www.parliament.uk/transcom). INQ numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 Action on Hearing Loss ([TIC112](#))
- 2 Action with Communities in Rural England (Acre) ([TIC026](#))
- 3 Age Scotland ([TIC003](#))
- 4 Alex Cook ([TIC012](#))
- 5 Andrew McCloy ([TIC094](#))
- 6 Appleby Town Council ([TIC011](#))
- 7 Association of Community Rail Partnerships ([TIC056](#))
- 8 Association of Local Bus Company Managers (Album) ([TIC021](#))
- 9 Association of Train Operating Companies ([TIC105](#))
- 10 Association of Transport Co-ordinating Officers ([TIC096](#))
- 11 Aylesbury Vale Transport Users Group ([TIC085](#))
- 12 Blanchland Parish Council ([TIC027](#))
- 13 Borrowdale Parish Council ([TIC018](#))
- 14 Brian Kennish ([TIC007](#))
- 15 Broomley and Stocksfield Parish Council ([TIC029](#))
- 16 Buckinghamshire County Council ([TIC042](#))
- 17 Bus Users UK([TIC107](#))
- 18 Cambridgeshire County Council ([TIC069](#))
- 19 Campaign for Better Transport ([TIC045](#))
- 20 Campaign to Protect Rural England ([TIC089](#))
- 21 Capital Traffic Management Limited ([TIC057](#))
- 22 Carplus Trust ([TIC060](#))
- 23 Centro (West Midlands Passenger Transport Executive) ([TIC132](#))
- 24 Ceredigion Green Party ([TIC049](#))
- 25 Chair of Trustees Gostart Community Transport ([TIC0131](#))
- 26 Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport (UK) Cymru Wales ([TIC050](#))
- 27 Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation ([TIC025](#))
- 28 Community First ([TIC030](#))
- 29 Community Transport Association ([TIC079](#))
- 30 Community Transport Association ([TIC113](#))
- 31 Compass Disability Services ([TIC010](#))
- 32 Council of the Isles of Scilly ([TIC0116](#))
- 33 CTC ([TIC0114](#))
- 34 Cumbria County Council, Integrated Transport Team ([TIC106](#))
- 35 Department for Transport ([TIC098](#))
- 36 Derwent Parish Council ([TIC088](#))
- 37 Devon County Council ([TIC041](#))
- 38 Devon Senior Voice Transport Group ([TIC078](#))
- 39 Donna Howitt ([TIC014](#))

- 40 Dr John Disney ([TIC083](#))
- 41 Dr Roger Sexton ([TIC001](#))
- 42 East Riding of Yorkshire Council ([TIC058](#))
- 43 East Riding of Yorkshire Council ([TIC058A](#))
- 44 East Suffolk Travellers' Association ([TIC086](#))
- 45 East Sutton Parish Council ([TIC099](#))
- 46 Eddie Gerrard ([TIC076](#))
- 47 Elisabeth Bendall ([TIC103](#))
- 48 Ellingham Parish Council ([TIC052](#))
- 49 Exmouth and District Community Transport Group ([TIC075](#))
- 50 Fare Enough ([TIC038](#))
- 51 Fellowtravellers Ltd ([TIC020](#))
- 52 Flybe ([TIC073](#))
- 53 Friends of Isles of Scilly Transport ([TIC0134](#))
- 54 Friends of Isles of Scilly Transport ([TIC0136](#))
- 55 Friends of Isles of Scilly Transport ([TIC117](#))
- 56 Gloucestershire Rural Community Council ([TIC019](#))
- 57 Grange Over Sands Town Council ([TIC013](#))
- 58 Greener Journeys ([TIC044](#))
- 59 Guide Dogs ([TIC065](#))
- 60 Gwen Harlow ([TIC 037](#))
- 61 H Compton ([TIC015](#))
- 62 Hambleton and Richmondshire Rural Transport and Access Partnership ([TIC036](#))
- 63 Hampshire County Council ([TIC070](#))
- 64 Hastoe Group ([TIC016](#))
- 65 Headway Cambridgeshire ([TIC093](#))
- 66 Healthwatch Isles of Scilly ([TIC0135](#))
- 67 Hexham Town Council ([TIC063](#))
- 68 Janet Erskine ([TIC017](#))
- 69 Jean Keyworth ([TIC006](#))
- 70 Jim Kent ([TIC109](#))
- 71 JMP Consultants Ltd ([TIC067](#))
- 72 John Greenwood ([TIC137](#))
- 73 Kenneth A.G. Harris ([TIC047](#))
- 74 Kirkby Thore Parish Council ([TIC080](#))
- 75 Leeds Northern Railway Reinstatement Group ([TIC115](#))
- 76 Leeds-Lancaster-Morecambe Crp ([TIC046](#))
- 77 Leslie Bowman ([TIC035](#))
- 78 Living Streets ([TIC138](#))
- 79 Llandoverly U3A – Transport Group ([TIC090](#))
- 80 Longframlington Parish Council ([TIC054](#))
- 81 Lostwithiel Transport Users Group ([TIC048](#))
- 82 Margot Fish ([TIC101](#))
- 83 Michelle Levy ([TIC077](#))
- 84 National Pensioners Convention ([TIC108](#))

- 85 National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers (RMT) ([TIC091](#))
- 86 Nick Mitcham ([TIC092](#))
- 87 Norfolk Community Transport Association ([TIC043](#))
- 88 Norfolk County Council ([TIC064](#))
- 89 Norfolk County Council ([TIC068](#))
- 90 North Salop Wheelers ([TIC102](#))
- 91 Northumberland County Council ([TIC040](#))
- 92 Okehampton Town Council ([TIC097](#))
- 93 Passenger Focus ([TIC066](#))
- 94 Prudhoe Community Transport Working Group ([TIC084](#))
- 95 pteg ([TIC033](#))
- 96 pteg ([TIC133](#))
- 97 Public Transport Users' Committee for Wales ([TIC110](#))
- 98 Public Transport Action Group ([TIC005](#))
- 99 Ramblers' Association ('The Ramblers') ([TIC032](#))
- 100 National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers (RMT) ([TIC091A](#))
- 101 Rural Community Council of Essex ([TIC028](#))
- 102 Ruth Rigg ([TIC008](#))
- 103 Seascale Parish Council ([TIC039](#))
- 104 Sherborne Transport Action Group ([TIC139](#))
- 105 Shropshire Seniors ([TIC111](#))
- 106 Shropshire Seniors ([TIC129](#))
- 107 Simon Norton ([TIC023](#))
- 108 Slaley Parish Council ([TIC095](#))
- 109 South Somerset District Council ([TIC059](#))
- 110 Spectrum ([TIC002](#))
- 111 Susan Hedley ([TIC051](#))
- 112 Susan Hedley ([TIC118](#))
- 113 Sutton Valence Parish Council ([TIC022](#))
- 114 Tees Valley Rural Community Council ([TIC074](#))
- 115 Teesdale U3A ([TIC024](#))
- 116 The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport ([TIC104](#))
- 117 The Muncaster Microbus Ltd ([TIC055](#))
- 118 Torbay Line Rail Users Group ([TIC100](#))
- 119 Travelsure ([TIC062](#))
- 120 TravelWatch NorthWest ([TIC031](#))
- 121 TravelWatch SouthWest Cic ([TIC061](#))
- 122 TSSA Retired Members' Group ([TIC034](#))
- 123 Verwood Town Council ([TIC081](#))
- 124 Vicky Von-Hessler ([TIC009](#))
- 125 West Dorset District Council ([TIC004](#))
- 126 West Somerset Council ([TIC087](#))
- 127 Wooler Parish Council ([TIC082](#))

# 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](http://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 2014–15

Fourth Report	Passenger transport in isolated communities	HC 288 (Incorporating HC 853, Session 2013–14)
Third Report	Cycling safety	HC 286 (Incorporating HC 852, Session 2013–14)
Second Report	Offshore helicopter safety	HC 289 (Incorporating HC 992, Session 2013–14)
First Report	Driving premiums down: fraud and the cost of motor insurance	HC 285 (Incorporating HC 286, Session 2013–14)
First Special Report	Forging ahead: UK shipping strategy: Government Response to the Committee's Thirteenth Report of Session 2013–14	HC 254

## Session 2013–14

Seventeenth Report	Land transport expenditure: Who decides?	HC 1140
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) (HC 274)
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 <sup>th</sup> 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
<b>Session 2012–13</b>		
Twelfth Report	The European Commission's 4 <sup>th</sup> 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
<b>Session 2010–12</b>		
Seventeenth Report	Air Travel Organisers' Licensing (ATOL) reform	HC 1798
Fifteenth Special Report	Cable theft on the railway: Government Response to the Committee's Fourteenth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1933
Fourteenth Special Report	Thameslink rolling stock procurement: Government Response to the Committee's Eleventh Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1935
Thirteenth Special Report	Cost of motor insurance: follow up: Government Response to the Committee's Twelfth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1934
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)
Twelfth Special Report	High Speed Rail: Government Response to the Committee's Tenth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1754
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)
Eleventh Special Report	Out of the jam: reducing congestion on our roads: Government Response to the Committee's Ninth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1661
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
Ninth Special Report	Bus services after the Spending Review: Government Response to the Committee's Eighth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1550
Eighth Special Report	Taxis and private hire vehicles: the road to reform: Government Response to the Committee's Seventh Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1507
Seventh Special Report	The Coastguard, Emergency Towing Vessels and the Maritime Incident Response Group: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1482
Sixth Special Report	Keeping the UK moving: The impact on transport of the winter weather in December 2010: Government Response to the Committee's Fifth Report of Session 2010–12	HC 1467
Fifth Special Report	The Cost of motor insurance: Government Response to the Committees Fourth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 750
Fourth Special Report	Transport and the economy: Government response to the Committee's Third Report of Session 2010-12	HC 962
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