

Evaluating the effects of the M6 Toll Road on industrial land development and employment

Pugh, Geoffrey; Fairburn, John

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Pugh, G., & Fairburn, J. (2009). Evaluating the effects of the M6 Toll Road on industrial land development and employment. *Regional Studies*, 42(7), 977-990. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400701654087>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.



Evaluating the effects of the M6 Toll Road on industrial land development and employment

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2005-0210.R3
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	R11 - Regional Economic Activity: Growth, Development, and Changes < R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R33 - Nonagricultural and Nonresidential Real Estate Markets < R3 - Production Analysis and Firm Location < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R42 - Government and Private Investment Analysis < R4 - Transportation Systems < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	transport infrastructure, industrial land development, wider economic benefits, evaluation, additionality and displacement, M6 Toll Motorway

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Evaluating the effects of the M6 Toll Road on industrial land development and employment

Geoffrey Pugh and Jon Fairburn (Institute for Environment, Sustainability and
Regeneration, Staffordshire University) *

* Corresponding author: Geoffrey Pugh, Staffordshire University Business
School, Leek Road, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 2DF, UK; g.t.pugh@staffs.ac.uk

Jon Fairburn, Staffordshire University, Faculty of Science, College Road, Stoke-
on-Trent, ST4 2DE, UK; jon.fairburn@staffs.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper reports the first evaluation of the wider economic effects of the M6 Toll, the UK's first toll motorway. Methodologically, it contributes to the literature evaluating the economic effects of new transport infrastructure by exploiting a new source of data, applying fresh econometric techniques, and triangulating quantitative results with interview data. We conclude that the M6 Toll has caused a positive development effect at the sub-regional level. In addition, we advance reasons why the development potential of new road infrastructure may be amplified rather than reduced by tolls.

Keywords:

M6 Toll Motorway; transport infrastructure; industrial land development; wider economic benefits; evaluation; additionality and displacement.

JEL classification: R11; R33; R42.

Introduction

The M6 Toll is the UK's first toll motorway. The explicit aim of the M6 Toll is illustrated by its former name, the Birmingham Northern Relief Road. The aim of the road is to cut congestion around the Birmingham area and to facilitate inter-urban travel by providing a new 27 mile route. However, although the explicit aim was to facilitate through transport, the development potential of the scheme became an issue for political debate. As a through route there is little justification for a high density of junctions. However, in its final form the M6 Toll has eight junctions that have had a major impact on the accessibility and hence development of industrial land sites in the surrounding area.

This paper reports an evaluation of the impact of the M6 Toll on economic development in the southern Staffordshire sub region. (Figure 1 shows the route of the M6 Toll together with the six districts that comprise southern Staffordshire.) This paper's wider contribution is to evaluating the potential economic impact of toll roads, which may be the future form of motorway development in the UK. In the UK, the need for such evaluation has been highlighted in discussions on the M6 Toll by the House of Commons Select Committee on Transport (2005, Paragraphs 89-90): 'These impacts must be fully evaluated ... before other projects of this sort are undertaken'. This paper also contributes to a wider policy debate initiated by the Scottish Executive's Transport Research Planning Group: '... the potential ability of transport infrastructure investments to produce transport benefits ... is not questioned. The debate is over whether there are additional benefits from these investments' (GVA Grimley, 2004, p.3; also p.65). For reasons of space, this paper does not directly address the broader literatures and policy debates surrounding the economic impact of

1
2
3 infrastructure – especially roads - and public investment policy (Gramlich, 1994),
4 road infrastructure and regional development (OECD, 2002), or wider land use
5 changes, social inclusion and ecological impacts (Spellerberg, 1998). Yet, by
6 reporting an ex post study of the wider economic effects of a new road, this paper
7 does contribute to the evidence base of these broader literatures and contentious
8 policy areas.
9

10
11 We contribute to the understanding and measurement of the additional economic
12 benefits of transport infrastructure by applying econometric techniques not previously
13 used in this literature to analyse previously neglected “before” and “after” data on the
14 development of industrial land sites in the M6 Toll corridor. In addition, we
15 “triangulate” the quantitative analysis with interview data and present a simple
16 method for calculating the present value of development associated with the M6 Toll.
17
18 Data limitations mean that attention is restricted to the development impact of the M6
19 Toll on industrial land sites in southern Staffordshire (see Figure 1).¹ Moreover, this
20 paper does not address environmental or social exclusion agendas and thus takes no
21 account of potential negative externalities caused by the M6 Toll. Accordingly, this
22 paper focuses only on positive externalities and is thus just one contribution to a
23 comprehensive evaluation of M6 Toll effects.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 The paper proceeds as follows. The next Section reviews the literature, considers the
52 implications of toll charges for the development effects of new roads, and explains
53 our empirical methodology. Section 3 describes the data, the model and the
54 econometric methods. Section 4 reports and discusses the estimated M6 Toll effects
55 on industrial land development and translates these into employment and output
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 effects. Section 5 investigates the validity of our econometric results. Section 6
4
5 concludes.
6
7
8
9

10 **Figure 1: The M6 Toll and industrial land (development) sites in the southern**
11 **Staffordshire sub region**
12

13
14 Source: Crown Copyright; GVA Grimley (2003) for site drivetimes
15

16
17
18
19 **Literature review and methodology**
20
21

22 Analytic and empirical research on the additional economic benefits of transport
23 infrastructure is dominated by North American studies, while the smaller evidence
24 base from UK and European studies is weakened by less frequent use of time series
25 data for “before and after” studies (GVA Grimley, 2004, p.9; see also Llewelyn-
26 Davies et al., 2004, pp.2 and 24, and SACTRA, 1999, p.214). Indeed, according to
27 SACTRA (1999, pp.223 and 225), most assessments of transport projects in the UK
28 are ‘*ex-ante* ... undertaken on a commercial basis for scheme promoters and are not
29 typically in the public domain’; there are few ‘good examples of *ex-post* evaluation
30 studies which would reveal the economic impacts of transport interventions’. In
31 particular, the ‘state of the art’ of ‘specific local studies ... is poorly developed and
32 the results do not offer convincing general evidence of the size, nature or direction of
33 local economic impacts’ (SACTRA, 1999, p.7). Moreover, the literature concerning
34 the impact of major roads is still narrower (GVA Grimley, 2004, pp.66-68 and 106)
35 and results are ‘disputed’ (Llewelyn-Davies et al., 2004, p.21; Holvad and Preston,
36 2005, p.18). More than 30 years ago, Dodgson (1974, p.76) reviewed cost-benefit
37 analyses of inter-urban road investments and concluded that ‘the techniques for
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 measuring the benefits to traffic of such investments have been continuously extended
4
5 and sharpened'. However,

6
7
8 when we come to consider the effects of inter-urban road investment on
9
10 regional development ... it is far from clear how these benefits, other than
11
12 those in the form of traffic benefits to residents of such regions, can be
13
14 measured.

15
16
17 More than 20 years later, Linneker and Spence (1996, p.79) concluded similarly that
18
19 'there is no general agreement on the relevant framework or appropriate methodology
20
21 for evaluating the economic development implications of major road investments'.
22
23

24
25
26
27 In a recent literature review on the additional economic benefits of road projects,
28
29 Holvad and Preston (2005, p.19) conclude that 'the most realistic studies so far have
30
31 been ex-ante appraisals' and 'suggest that an alternative approach might be an ex post
32
33 evaluation of the economic impacts of a major transport infrastructure'. Holvad and
34
35 Preston (2005, pp.16-17) identify 22 ex post studies that examine links between road
36
37 infrastructure and local economic development. Nine are from the UK, and date back
38
39 as far as 1973.² Of these, six studies summarise the effects on employment or other
40
41 substantive development measures as "small" (or similar descriptor) and two as
42
43 "substantial". Of these six, Linneker and Spence (1996, p.89) is representative in
44
45 finding that 'the construction of the M25 (pure road effect on accessibility) is
46
47 positively related to demand for labour'. However, Holvad and Preston (2005) find
48
49 that there are still no studies of the long-term additional economic benefits of UK
50
51 motorway infrastructure.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Most narrow in the literature is published empirical analysis of the economic impact
4 of toll roads, which is limited to a single study of two toll roads in Orange County,
5 California: Boarnet and Chalermpong (2001, p.600) find that construction of these
6 roads 'created accessibility premiums that are reflected in home sales prices'.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13
14
15 This brief literature review suggests that the present paper is slightly unusual in that it
16 examines both a new infrastructure investment and one that is being delivered in a
17 different way from earlier examples in the UK, namely through a user pays toll. This
18 raises questions about the separation of the infrastructure effect from the toll effect
19 and, hence, about the generality of the results. There are insufficient comparable
20 studies to enable an empirically based identification of toll effects separately from
21 infrastructural effects. Consequently, we apply some theoretical reasoning to address
22 both this issue and the associated issue of drawing wider implications from this study.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 From the law of demand, we deduce that as the price (toll) rises so commercial road
37 use and associated development benefits fall. (At the limit, as tolls rise, use and
38 development effects must eventually fall to zero.) Yet, the adverse effects of
39 congestion imply that decongestion, through increasing reliability with respect to
40 journey times and costs, may have a positive effect on commercial road use and
41 associated development. In this case, tolls reduce road use, increase reliability and so
42 favour development. Accordingly, we hypothesise that tolls give rise to offsetting
43 effects on commercial users and, hence, on development: a directly negative price
44 effect; and an indirectly positive decongestion or "reliability" effect. This observation
45 has implications for our ability to generalise the results of this study. *If congestion is*
46 *not an issue* then indirect reliability effects are not economically significant, in which
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 case a toll-free motorway will maximise transport and wider development benefits.
4
5 Conversely, *if congestion is an issue* then reliability effects suggest that a toll may
6
7 increase transport and wider development benefits so long as the marginal cost of the
8
9 toll is outweighed by the marginal benefit of reliability. Because of offsetting direct
10
11 and indirect effects, theory cannot determine whether the transport and wider
12
13 development benefits of a toll road are more or less than those of a non-toll road. The
14
15 corollary is that we should be cautious in generalising the results of this study,
16
17 especially to non-toll road developments. However, we can set out some principles.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 If congestion is not an issue, then development effects estimated from a toll road
26
27 study are likely to *understate* the potential development effects of a similar non-toll
28
29 road. Conversely, congestion implies reliability effects, in which case tolls may have a
30
31 positive development effect. Hence, if congestion is an issue, development effects
32
33 estimated from a toll road study may *overstate* potential development effects if
34
35 generalised to a similar non-toll road. Accordingly, because the possibility of
36
37 significant congestion on the new road is suggested both by the particular experience
38
39 of the M6 (House of Commons Select Committee on Transport, 2005, paragraph 84)
40
41 and by evidence that new roads in general “induce” traffic (Noland and Lem, 2002),
42
43 tolls may well have increased development relative to the counterfactual of the new
44
45 road being conventionally toll free.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Where land is readily available for development, it is easy for developers to bring new
55
56 land to market after an increase in demand (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco,
57
58 2001). Accordingly, adjustment to improved location and correspondingly increased
59
60 demand occurs not only through price change but also through quantity change. The

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

implication for empirical strategy is that we expect to see locational improvements created by the M6 Toll reflected both in property prices and in the pace of physical development. In this evaluation, because there is no suitable price data for commercial property or land, we exploit data on the physical development of industrial land sites.

Our empirical approach is to treat the M6 Toll as a “natural experiment” (Wooldridge, 2002, p.129). We distinguish a *treatment* group (sites whose accessibility is hypothesised to be changed by the M6 Toll) and a *control* group (sites whose accessibility is unchanged). We can then identify and measure the impact of the announcement or completion of the M6 Toll by analysing site development for both groups in periods *before* and *after* this M6 Toll “event”.

To test the maintained hypothesis that the M6 Toll has a positive effect on the development of industrial land sites, together with the alternative hypotheses that the M6 Toll has either an indeterminate or a negative effect, we need data on the developments of industrial land sites

1. for two periods, *before* and *after* the M6 Toll, and
2. for two groups, a *control* group and a *treatment* group.

Unfortunately, neither theory nor the small empirical literature gives precise guidance for defining either periods or groups (i.e., geographic zones defined in relation to the M6 Toll). The rest of this Section discusses how we operationalise these crucial distinctions.

1
2
3 To define before and after periods, we have to hypothesise a “threshold period”,
4 before which there are no M6 Toll effects and during and/or after which such effects
5
6
7
8 become apparent. The history of the M6 Toll is outlined in Figure 2.
9

10 11 12 **Figure 2: History of the development of the M6 Toll Motorway** 13 14

15
16
17 Periods before and after the M6 Toll cannot necessarily be separated by the time of
18 completion/opening. In theory, anticipation of the M6 Toll may affect property
19 markets via speculative motives. Moreover, there is empirical evidence for such
20 “expectation effects” (SACTRA, 1999, p.224; Boarnet and Chalermpong, 2001).
21
22 Accordingly, the “before” period must not only be one during which the M6 Toll did
23 not exist but also one in which it was not definitely happening. In any case, the
24 threshold period cannot be determined by theoretical reasoning; rather, it is chosen by
25 a mixture of investigating the history of the M6 Toll, consultation with practitioners in
26 local authorities and the business community, and our own empirical results (use of
27 the latter to refine choice of the threshold period follows Boarnet and Chalermpong,
28 2001). Legal challenges to the M6 Toll were finally rejected by the Appeal Court in
29 1999, uncertainties over construction finance and the compulsory purchase of land
30 were resolved during 2000, and construction began in 2001. Moreover, without
31 exception, practitioner opinion was that actual development decisions were
32 undertaken only *after construction began* in 2001. However, both decisions and
33 implementation occurred with lags. Accordingly, our preferred “threshold period”
34 excludes data from April 1st 2000 to March 31st 2002 from both the “before” and
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 “after” periods.

1
2
3 Neither is the definition of control and treatment areas straightforward (GVA
4 Grimley, 2004, p.87). In principle, these correspond to geographic areas in which the
5 M6 Toll has no or negligible influence on property markets and others in which the
6 M6 Toll does exert a significant effect. Control and treatment areas must be chosen to
7 be as similar as possible in all respects other than the influence of the M6 Toll. Here
8 we have a trade-off between the need to achieve the strongest possible contrast in M6
9 Toll effects, which can be achieved by comparing locations close to and distant from
10 the M6 Toll, and the need to achieve the greatest possible similarity between the
11 locations in other respects, which suggests choosing areas that are close to each other.
12 We deal with the trade-off between separation and similarity by grouping
13 developments into “zones”, defined by increasing drivetime from access to the M6
14 Toll (Boarnet and Chalermpong, 2001; Cervero and Duncan, 2002).³ We follow the
15 practitioner convention of grouping development sites within the M6 Toll Corridor
16 into those within 5-minutes, 10-minutes and 15-minutes drivetime of an M6 Toll
17 junction (*InStaffs*, 2003; GVA Grimley, 2003). This weights the terms of the trade-off
18 between variable distance to the M6 Toll and closeness, hence similarity, of the bands
19 towards the criterion of closeness. By maximising the similarities between sites in all
20 respects other than the influence of the M6 Toll, we minimise the possibility that
21 results are biased by unobserved systematic - confounding - influences. This
22 procedure also tends to increase the difficulty of finding systematic differences
23 between developments in the three bands and thus tends to bias our results away from
24 our maintained hypothesis rather than towards it.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Data, model and method of estimation

The data

We investigated the whole population of industrial land sites within the Staffordshire part of the M6 Toll corridor. Our source of data on these 18 sites is Staffordshire County Council's annual *Staffordshire Employment Land Availability Survey* (henceforth, *Survey*) published continuously from 1994 to 2004 and detailing the situation on March 31st of the year of publication.⁴ This source enabled compilation of a longitudinal (panel) dataset on the development of each of the 18 sites over an 11 year period, which enables a clean separation of our "before" period (1994-2000; i.e., data from April 1st 1993 to March 31st 2000) from our "after" period (2003-2004; i.e., data from April 1st 2002 to March 31st 2004). Altogether, the dataset contains 197 observations (i.e., 18 sites × 11 years minus one site lacking data for 1994). Each year contains data on the variables in our model (see below). Unfortunately, the *Survey* contains no value - price or rental - data.

The model

The following model sets out the variables required to implement the natural experiment methodology described in the previous section (Wooldridge, 2002, pp.129-30). The 18 industrial land sites are indexed by subscript i ($i=1, \dots, 18$); and the 11 years in the sample period are indexed by subscript t ($t=1994, \dots, 2004$).

$$\begin{aligned}
 Development_{it} = & Intercept + \sum Year_DVs + \sum District_DVs \\
 & + 5 \text{ min } Zone_{Before} + 5 \text{ min } Zone_{After} \\
 & + 10 \text{ min } Zone_{Before} + 10 \text{ min } Zone_{After} \\
 & + 15 \text{ min } Zone_{Before} + 15 \text{ min } Zone_{After} + (u_i + \varepsilon_{it})
 \end{aligned}$$

The dependent variable ($Development_{it}$) is actual development in hectares on site i in year t . The model relates actual development to a constant term (*Intercept*) and to the following independent variables.

- $\Sigma Year_DVs$ denotes dummy variables for each year, 1995-2004. These control for period-specific influences that do not vary between locations. Hence, these control for general but time-specific influences on development such as the property cycle, changes in economic conditions within southern Staffordshire, and changes in the planning regime.
- $\Sigma District_DVs$ denotes dummy variables that control for influences specific to each of five districts of southern Staffordshire relative to Cannock (the reference district). These variables control for district-specific influences that do not change substantially over time, including different patterns of economic development and/or structure and differing mixes of greenfield and brownfield sites (*Survey*, 1998, p.14 and *Survey*, 2004, p.17).
- Six dummy variables for all sites in the three drivetime zones in both “before” and “after” periods: “before” ($5MinZone_{Before}$) and “after” ($5MinZone_{After}$) M6 Toll effects in the 5-minute zone; “before” ($10MinZone_{Before}$) and “after” ($10MinZone_{After}$) M6 Toll effects in the 10-minute zone; and “before” ($15MinZone_{Before}$) and “after” ($15MinZone_{After}$) M6 Toll effects in the 15-minute zone.
- ($u_i + \varepsilon_{it}$) is a composed error term. The u_i control for unobserved site-specific heterogeneity. ε_{it} is the usual white-noise error term.

In addition, we follow conventional practice and augment these required variables with additional covariates. Total land available (*total*) controls for variations in the size of the site. Supply-side factors influence development at the time of decision

1
2
3 making rather than during the period of construction or completion. Accordingly, this
4
5 variable is lagged by two years. Land readily available (*readily*) - i.e., ‘no major off-
6
7 site access, drainage or service impediments to development’; *Survey*, 1994, p.4 -
8
9 controls for supply constraints that may be both site specific and time specific. This
10
11 variable is also lagged by two years, for the same reason as “total”. Finally, we
12
13 included a dummy variable to control for ownership of the site (i.e., whether private
14
15 or public sector).
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Our variables of interest are the six dummy variables for all sites in the three
23
24 drivetime zones in both “before” and “after” periods. According to the design of our
25
26 natural experiment, estimates of all three “before” dummy variables should indicate
27
28 zero M6 Toll effects.⁵ Conversely, the three “after” variables measure the effect of the
29
30 M6 Toll in 2003 and 2004 on the quantity of industrial land developed within the 5-,
31
32 10-, and 15-minute drivetime zones respectively. If the hypothesised positive M6 Toll
33
34 effect is present in the data, then we expect a positive and statistically significant
35
36 effect within the 5-minute zone and successively smaller effects - if any - in the 10-
37
38 and 15-minute zones.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 We estimate two slightly different versions of our model. In Variant 1, two dummy
47
48 variables are included for the Stafford district (“stafford”): one for the period “before”
49
50 the M6 Toll (1994-2000) (*Stafford_{Before}*); and one for the two years “after” the M6 Toll
51
52 (2003-04) (*Stafford_{After}*). All three of the Stafford sites are within five minutes
53
54 drivetime of Junction 14 on the M6 Motorway, which continues northwards from the
55
56 M6 Toll (see Figure 1). Moreover, the rationale for the M6 Toll was to relieve
57
58 congestion on the M6 (House of Commons Select Committee on Transport, 2005,
59
60

1
2
3 paragraph 84). Accordingly, the M6 Toll and the M6 are not independent, which
4 precludes use of the M6 corridor as a “control corridor”. Unfortunately, no suitable
5 control corridor exists within southern Staffordshire. Instead, Variant 1 allows us to
6
7 control corridor exists within southern Staffordshire. Instead, Variant 1 allows us to
8
9 test a supplementary hypothesis; namely, that the M6 Toll may exert positive *indirect*
10
11 effects on sites located along roads with which it is continuous. Moreover, by
12
13 estimating both Variant 1 and Variant 2, which includes “before” and “after” dummy
14
15 variables for *all* sites in the 15-minute drivetime zone, we can compare the “before”
16
17 and “after” M6 Toll effects in the Stafford sites with those in the 15-minute drivetime
18
19 zone generally. Positive effects in the former and zero (or, at least, smaller) effects in
20
21 the latter would be consistent with the supplementary hypothesis of *indirect* M6 Toll
22
23 effects (on such indirect benefits, see Rand Europe, 2004).
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 *Method of estimation*

31
32
33 Developers do not necessarily bring sites to market in each period, while potential
34
35 clients require new sites only at infrequent intervals. Accordingly, the market outcome
36
37 of this behaviour for development at particular locations is often zero, but when
38
39 development does take place its extent varies. On the 18 sites in this study, from 197
40
41 possible observations on the dependent variable, 145 are zero; the 52 observations of
42
43 construction range between 0.14 and 20.68 hectares. For a dependent variable with
44
45 this structure, we require a “tobit” model (Wooldridge, 2002, pp.518-19; see also
46
47 Greene, 2003, p.778).
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 In our tobit model, the estimated coefficients reveal whether the independent variables
56
57 affect the dependent variable positively or negatively. However, these relationships
58
59 are best quantified by two “marginal” effects (Wooldridge, 2002, pp.520-21). In our
60
61 model, for changes in the values of the independent variables, “conditional” effects

1
2
3 estimate changes in the expected (or predicted) value of construction *for those sites on*
4 *which construction is observed*; and “unconditional” effects account, in addition, for
5
6 the effect of changing values of the independent variables on *the probability that*
7
8 *development will take place at all* (i.e., will change from zero to positive and thus
9
10 observable). Unconditional effects should be larger than conditional effects, because
11
12 they account both for changes in the conditional expectation of construction on sites
13
14 where it is observed and for changes in the probability that construction will take
15
16 place at all.⁶
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 To exploit the full potential of our panel data, we first estimated our model by
26
27 random-effects (RE) tobit regression. RE estimation not only exploits the full
28
29 potential of the panel dataset, by taking into account both between-site variation and
30
31 within-site variation over time, but also controls for unobserved site-specific
32
33 influences that do not change substantially over time. Among such unobserved
34
35 influences might be accessibility with respect to labour and suppliers; density and
36
37 type of surrounding land use; neighbourhood quality; and whether the site is
38
39 greenfield or brownfield. Together with the selection of sites and dummy variables for
40
41 district effects and time effects, the structure of the econometric model thus helps to
42
43 control for potentially confounding influences.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Our estimation method does not control for the possibility that site developments in
53
54 each of our three drivetime zones are spatially correlated with developments in other
55
56 zones. Accordingly, we risk attributing the effects of spatial dependency to our
57
58 independent variables, thereby overestimating our M6 Toll effects. Unfortunately,
59
60 even in the spatial econometrics literature, tobit estimation in the presence of spatial

1
2
3 dependency has been ‘relatively neglected’ (LeSage and Pace, 2004, p.128; see also
4
5 Flores-Lagunes and Schnier, 2004). However, recent experimental evidence (LeSage
6
7 and Pace, 2004, p.117) suggests that in the context of tobit estimation even ‘strong
8
9 spatial dependence’ typically inflates coefficient estimates by no more than 20
10
11 percent. Accordingly, we acknowledge the possibility of a small upward bias in our
12
13 estimated M6 Toll effects.
14
15
16
17

18 19 **Results**

20
21 This section reports quantitative estimates of M6 Toll effects on industrial land
22
23 development. The first subsection explains how we implemented tobit estimation to
24
25 obtain the results set out in Tables 1 and 2; the second interprets these estimates; and
26
27 the third uses these estimates to calculate the employment effect of the development
28
29 associated with the M6 Toll.
30
31
32

33 34 ***Implementation***

35
36 The model is estimated in two variants: Table 1 reports Variant 1 with “before” and
37
38 “after” dummy variables for the Stafford sites; and Table 2 reports Variant 2 with
39
40 “before” and “after” dummy variables for all sites in the 15-minute drivetime zone
41
42 (i.e., including the Stafford sites).
43
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 Random effects estimates are reported for both variants of the model. However, in
51
52 both cases a likelihood ratio test overwhelmingly supports the null hypothesis that the
53
54 random effects are not significant ($\sigma_{u_i} = 0$) (Gutierrez, et al., 2001; StataCorp,
55
56 2003, p.234). Because unobserved site-specific heterogeneity is not a significant
57
58 influence on the dependent variable, the tobit panel estimator is not different from the
59
60 tobit pooled estimator (StataCorp, 2003, p.234). Although the pooled estimator does

1
2
3 not control for unobserved site-specific heterogeneity, it does enable us to exploit our
4 panel data by estimating both dynamic effects (by lagging variables) and “before and
5 after” effects for the same sites (Wooldridge, 2002, pp.129 and 169-170).
6 Accordingly, we report the estimated coefficients from the pooled estimator together
7 with the unconditional and conditional marginal effects for both Variant 1 and Variant
8 2.
9

10
11 We followed the standard “testing down” procedure. First, for both Variants 1 and 2,
12 we estimated a model with all possible variables suggested by theory and available in
13 the dataset. Secondly, we deleted insignificant variables: the estimated time effects
14 (year dummy variables) proved statistically insignificant both individually and jointly
15 ($p=0.68$ for the test of joint significance); and the ownership of sites (i.e., public or
16 private sector) proved not to be a significant influence.⁷ Accordingly, we arrive at the
17 parsimonious models reported in Tables 1 and 2.
18
19

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 **Table 1: Variant 1**

40
41 **Table 2: Variant 2**
42
43
44
45

46 ***Interpretation of the results***

47
48 Tables 1 and 2 report estimated coefficients and marginal effects. The pattern of
49 statistically significant results suggests the following quantitative conclusions.⁸
50

- 51 1. Strictly, “Total land” availability (i.e., the size of the site) is not a statistically
52 significant influence on the development of industrial land. However, the
53 estimated coefficients and marginal effects consistently achieved “borderline”
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 levels of significance (just outside 10 percent). The marginal effects suggest a
4
5 very small positive effect of the size of the site on its development.
6
7

- 8 2. The quantity of land “readily available” on a site is a statistically significant
9
10 influence: an increase in available land of one hectare increases - on average -
11
12 development by one-twenty fifth of a hectare. As expected, the more readily
13
14 available land on the site, the less the supply-side constraint and the more
15
16 development.
17
18
- 19 3. Many district effects achieve borderline statistical significance. However, we
20
21 restrict our attention to districts with consistently significant effects. On
22
23 average, in comparison with Cannock, Lichfield has benefited from a
24
25 significantly higher level of development of industrial land over the period
26
27 1994-2004 (in Variants 1 and 2, respectively, the unconditional effects are
28
29 2.69 and 2.61 hectares). Results for East Staffordshire also suggest an
30
31 advantage in relation to Cannock.
32
33
- 34 4. “Before” the M6 Toll, in the period 1994-2000, there are no significant
35
36 variations in development caused by location in any of the three drivetime
37
38 zones (or by location in the Stafford portion of the M6 corridor).
39
40
- 41 5. “After” the M6 Toll, in the period 2003-04 (i.e., from April 1st 2002 to March
42
43 31st 2004), there is: a robust and statistically significant increase in
44
45 development in the 5-minute drivetime zone (the unconditional effects are
46
47 both significant at the highest level); a statistically significant increase in the
48
49 10-minute drivetime zone (again, the unconditional effects are both significant
50
51 at the highest level); and no statistically significant change in the 15-minute
52
53 drivetime zone.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 From comparison of “before” and “after” effects in the three drivetime zones, we
4
5 conclude that the M6 Toll stimulated development of industrial land. The estimated
6
7 unconditional effects suggest that, in the period from April 1st 2002 to March 31st
8
9 2004, location within 5-minutes drivetime of an M6 Toll junction was associated with
10
11 increased industrial land development of a little over three hectares (3.01 and 3.09 in
12
13 Variants 1 and 2, respectively). In addition, location within 10-minutes drivetime was
14
15 associated with increased industrial land development of about 1¼ hectares (1.24 and
16
17 1.23 in Variants 1 and 2, respectively). However, location within 15-minutes
18
19 drivetime of an M6 Toll junction had no such effect. Together, these results support
20
21 the hypothesised locational benefits of the M6 Toll. They *suggest positive*
22
23 *development effects on sites that have easy access to the M6 Toll and that these effects*
24
25 *diminish with drivetime.*
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Table 1 (Variant 1) compares “before” and “after” effects for the three Stafford sites
35
36 along the “M6 corridor”. All three of the Stafford sites are within five minutes
37
38 drivetime of a junction on the M6 Motorway, which continues northwards from the
39
40 M6 Toll (see Figure 1). Hence, particularly because the rationale for the M6 Toll was
41
42 to relieve congestion on the M6, we expect an *indirect* M6 Toll effect on the Stafford
43
44 sites. The results for the Stafford M6 corridor sites do suggest a positive indirect
45
46 effect (1.44 hectares) for sites that are within close proximity of the M6. However, in
47
48 both absolute and relative terms the effect is much smaller than for those sites within
49
50 close proximity of the M6 Toll: in the “after” period (2003-04) 1.44 hectares was
51
52 11.74 percent of the industrial land “readily available” in the M6 corridor sites; in
53
54 comparison, the estimates of direct M6 Toll effects (3.01 and 1.24 hectares)
55
56 constituted, respectively, 22.43 percent and 33.42 percent of such land in the 5-minute
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and 10-minute drivetime zones. This *evidence is consistent with indirect M6 Toll*
4 *effects on the Stafford sites*. Moreover, this small positive effect in Variant 1 contrasts
5
6 with the zero effect of location within the 15-minute drivetime zones generally that is
7
8 displayed in Table 2 (Variant 2). This *contrast is consistent with the hypothesis of an*
9
10 *indirect M6 Toll effect enhancing the benefits of proximity to nearby parts of the*
11
12 *motorway network*. However, in contrast to the highly robust direct M6 Toll effects,
13
14 this indirect M6 Toll effect is supported by only one estimated coefficient, which is
15
16 significant at the lowest conventionally acceptable level; moreover, it is not supported
17
18 by results from the three different specifications of our model referred to below.
19
20 Accordingly, *the evidence for indirect M6 Toll effects is weaker than the evidence for*
21
22 *direct M6 Toll effects*. Finally, an alternative hypothesis is that Variant 1 is detecting
23
24 the effects of proximity to the M6 motorway, rather than indirect effects of the new
25
26 M6 Toll. However, this is unlikely. There is no reason to think that a general
27
28 motorway proximity effect would be time varying in just the right way to account for
29
30 the “before and after” effects that we interpret as indirect effects of the M6 Toll.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Employment and development effects**⁹

41
42 We combined our estimate of 4¼ hectares of additional industrial land development
43
44 (from Table 1 - comprising 3.01 and 1.24 hectares, respectively, in the 5- and 10-
45
46 minute drivetime zones) with a local estimate of employees per hectare (from
47
48 Staffordshire County Council, 2003a, pp.26-28; and Arup Economics, 2001, pp.6-7)
49
50 to obtain an estimate of additional jobs. Then we combined this estimated number of
51
52 new jobs with average wage data for Staffordshire’s six southernmost districts (from
53
54 the *New Earnings Survey*, 2002) to obtain an estimate of the overall development or
55
56 wealth creation effect. Accordingly, the employment effect of the M6 Toll up to
57
58 March 31st 2004 in southern Staffordshire was 265 new jobs in excess of those created
59
60

1
2
3 to operate the M6 Toll, which implies additional annual earnings in excess of £5
4 million.¹⁰ Discounted to a present value at an annual interest rate of five percent (i.e.,
5 “capitalised” at a risk-free rate), this suggests a development effect in current values
6 of around £100 million. Given that the asset value of the M6 Toll on 31st December
7 2004 was £1090m (based on net present value calculations) (Macquarie, 2005), this
8 estimate is in line with the view expressed by SACTRA (1999, p.213) that, ‘on
9 average’, the ‘ratio of total net benefits to transport net benefits ... appears unlikely to
10 differ from unity by a very large margin’.¹¹
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Discussion of the results

30 In this section, we discuss the validity of our results from three perspectives:
31 robustness; “additionality” and displacement”; and the implications of various
32 limitations of our study.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 We discuss robustness of our quantitative results with respect to statistical
40 assumptions, different model specifications, an alternative hypothesis, and
41 triangulation with qualitative evidence.¹² First, the whole available range of diagnostic
42 tests and checks suggests that the underlying statistical assumptions of tobit
43 estimation are appropriate for our data. Secondly, we estimated three additional
44 models in which we redefine both the “After” and “Before” periods and the dependent
45 variable. The direct M6 Toll effects reported above are robust to these different
46 specifications. However, the Stafford “M6 corridor” effect is not stable across
47 different specifications. Hence, the indirect M6 Toll effect should be regarded as
48 indicative rather than robust.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Thirdly, we consider the alternative hypothesis that time-varying changes in other
7
8 economic conditions within southern Staffordshire - i.e., apart from the M6 Toll -
9
10 might explain the quantitative changes in development detected by our estimates.
11
12 Theoretically, this is unlikely, because the location of the drivetime zones is
13
14 independent of pre-existing patterns of economic or administrative activity that could
15
16 determine, at just the right time, the pattern of diminishing effects in our findings.
17
18 Moreover, the results of a natural experiment depend on adequate specification of
19
20 both “before” and “after” periods and “control” and “treatment” groups rather than on
21
22 the model having high explanatory power (Wooldridge, 2003a, p.31).¹³ Accordingly,
23
24 the specification of the models reported in Tables 1 and 2 is designed so that time-
25
26 varying changes in conditions other than those associated with the M6 Toll would
27
28 affect all three drivetime zones in the “after” period, which would refute the
29
30 hypothesised M6 Toll effects. In addition, the previously noted individual and joint
31
32 statistical insignificance of the estimated time effects is also inconsistent with this
33
34 alternative hypothesis.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Our final approach to robustness was to triangulate our quantitative research with
45
46 semi-structured interviews with four senior practitioners involved in industrial land
47
48 development within the M6 Toll corridor. For reasons of space, we refer here only to
49
50 the most relevant interview evidence; our qualitative analysis is presented fully in
51
52 Pugh (2005, pp.58-63). Two respondents referred - independently - to the ‘ripple’
53
54 effect of the M6 Toll, meaning that development effects diminished with drivetime
55
56 distance, which is consistent with our main quantitative finding. Moreover, according
57
58 to one of these respondents, there is an M6 Toll effect on the Stafford sites: it is
59
60

1
2
3
4 'indirect, but its there'. This is the "indirect" development effect of the M6 Toll
5
6 working further along the motorway network.
7
8
9

10
11 Our second approach to validity is to assess the extent to which the quantitative
12
13 development effects identified by our natural experiment might have occurred even in
14
15 the absence of the M6 Toll (hence, are not "additional") and/or reflect reduced
16
17 development elsewhere (hence, are mere "displacement" effects). SACTRA (1999,
18
19 p.213) defines the "additionality" of transport projects as the benefits and costs
20
21 'additional to the transport benefits/disbenefits'. Accordingly, by assuming that the
22
23 transport benefits of the M6 Toll are reflected in the toll revenue, we define all the
24
25 development effects reported above as *potentially* "additional".¹⁴ To evaluate the
26
27 *actual* degree of development additionality associated with the M6 Toll, we first
28
29 consider whether or not the development effects we identify as associated with the M6
30
31 Toll would have occurred in its absence (following Department of Trade and Industry,
32
33 2000, pp.18-20). According to this criterion, the results of our natural experiment
34
35 suggest that the development effects quantified in Tables 1 and 2 are additional
36
37 benefits. If the developments on sites in close proximity to the M6 Toll had been
38
39 unrelated to the M6 Toll, then they could have occurred at any time; hence, would
40
41 have been just as likely to occur in our "before" as in our "after" period. Conversely,
42
43 additionality is suggested by our findings that developments were systematically more
44
45 likely in the "after" period on sites in close proximity to the M6 Toll, and that the
46
47 strength of this relationship diminishes with drivetime distance. Moreover, this
48
49 inference of additionality is consistent with our interview evidence (Pugh, 2005,
50
51 pp.61-63).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 According to SACTRA (1999, p.55; also DTI, 2000, p.20), to evaluate additionality
4 also requires assessment of “displacement” effects.¹⁵ In the present context, assuming
5 a regional perspective, this means assessing the extent to which developments in the
6 M6 Toll corridor are merely relocations from elsewhere in the region. To this type of
7 direct displacement effect may be added the possibility that increased development
8 might cause existing local firms to contract, which is an indirect displacement effect.
9 With respect to direct displacement effects, the interview evidence suggests that, in
10 terms of floor space, most development is accounted for by investment from outside
11 of the region; while, with respect to indirect displacement effects, the impact on
12 existing local businesses has been either neutral or positive (Pugh, 1995, pp.60-61).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Two limitations of our quantitative study may bias our results, but in opposite
30 directions. On the one hand, we have acknowledged that ignoring spatial dependence,
31 which is the conventional response to the limitations of existing techniques
32 (Wooldridge, 2002, p.6), entails the possibility of a small upward bias in our
33 estimated M6 Toll effects. On the other, according to SACTRA (1999, p.224), ‘both
34 theory and evidence indicate that responses build up over a prolonged period after the
35 intervention’. The latest data available for our quantitative analysis covers the period
36 ending March 31st 2004, only a little more than three months into the operating period
37 of the M6 Toll. Accordingly, quantitative results in this study capture mainly
38 “anticipation” effects and an incomplete adjustment process. In this case, we have
39 estimated short-run effects that are likely to be smaller than the final, long-run effects
40 of the M6 Toll.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The evidence presented in this section suggests that our quantitative results are robust;
4 that the development effects of the M6 Toll are additional; and that biases inherent in
5 our methodology are neither large nor unidirectional.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

This paper evaluates the impact of the M6 Toll on economic development in southern Staffordshire. Primarily quantitative analysis is “triangulated” with qualitative analysis of interview data, which is in line with methodological recommendations in a recent report on evaluating the wider economic effects of transport infrastructure (GVA Grimley, 2004, p.1).

Our quantitative methodology embodies other best practice recommendations from authoritative sources (SACTRA, 1999; and GVA Grimley, 2004). The data provided annual observations on the development of the population of southern Staffordshire industrial land sites within the M6 Toll corridor (defined by 15-minutes drivetime from an access point), in a standard form and continuously from 1994 to 2004. Accordingly, we were able to treat the advent of the M6 Toll as a “natural experiment” (Wooldridge, 2002 and 2003b) and so analyse “before and after” accessibility effects on sites at varying drivetime distances from the new road. This procedure provided methodological solutions to the ‘treatment of time’ and to the linking of ‘accessibility changes and distance’ within suitable ‘catchment areas’ (GVA Grimley, 2004, p.1; see also SACTRA, 1999, p.224).

Our quantitative results are consistent with both the small empirical literature (Boarnet and Chalermpong, 2001; Holvad and Preston, 2005) and the expectation of

1
2
3 SACTRA (1999) that additional economic benefits arising from new transport
4 infrastructure, even if large in absolute terms, are likely to be small in relation to
5
6 directly measured transport benefits (see above). The main results are as follows.
7
8
9

- 10 1. The M6 Toll has stimulated development of industrial land. We estimate that,
11 in the period April 1st 2002 to March 31st 2004, location within 5-minutes
12 drivetime of an M6 Toll junction was associated with increased industrial land
13 development of 3.01 hectares; and location within 10-minutes drivetime was
14 associated with increased industrial land development of 1.24 hectares.
15 However, location within 15-minutes drivetime of an M6 Toll junction had no
16 such effect. Together, these results are consistent with the hypothesised
17 locational benefits of the M6 Toll. They suggest development effects on sites
18 that have easy access to the M6 Toll and that these effects diminish
19 continuously with drivetime.
20
21
- 22 2. Results for the Stafford “M6 corridor” suggest a positive *indirect* effect (1.44
23 hectares) for sites within close proximity of the M6 motorway, which
24 continues northwards from the M6 Toll. However, in both absolute and
25 relative terms, this indirect effect is much smaller than the *direct* M6 Toll
26 effects on those sites within close proximity of the M6 Toll. Also, the
27 statistical evidence for this indirect effect is less robust than for the direct
28 effects.
29
30
- 31 3. The direct M6 Toll effect of an additional 4.25 hectares of industrial land
32 development implies 265 new jobs in excess of those created to operate the
33 M6 Toll and a development effect in current values of around £100 million.
34
35

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58 Qualitative data from interviews with development practitioners uniformly supported
59 the primary finding that direct M6 Toll effects are significant on nearby sites but
60

1
2
3 diminish rapidly with drivetime distance. In addition, the interviews yielded more
4
5 limited support for the secondary finding of “indirect” development effects of the M6
6
7 Toll working further along the motorway network. The conclusion is that *the M6 Toll*
8
9 *is associated with a positive development effect in excess of benefits reflected in toll*
10
11 *revenue*. These are short-run effects that are likely to be smaller than the final, long-
12
13 run effects of the M6 Toll.
14
15

16
17
18 We can be only tentative in generalising our results to future road investments and in
19
20 commenting on possibly different effects of toll and non-toll roads. Of previous
21
22 studies, only Dodgson (1974, p.88) offers a directly comparable quantitative result,
23
24 although this arises from an entirely different and ex-ante methodology: ‘... a
25
26 maximum additional increase in employment of about 2,900 per annum in a region
27
28 with a total employed population of 3,400,000’. Our estimate of 265 new jobs
29
30 compares with 288,000 total resident workers in the much smaller southern
31
32 Staffordshire sub-region (Staffordshire County Council, 2003b). Hence, both
33
34 estimates suggest employment effects from new road projects of less than 0.1 percent.
35
36 Dodgson (1974, p.75) acknowledged that his results gave only a ‘very tentative
37
38 indication’ and, above, we acknowledge limitations that qualify our own quantitative
39
40 results. Nonetheless, there is consistency between the findings of these two studies,
41
42 separated by more than 30 years, and the “small” additional economic benefits
43
44 suggested by Holvad and Preston’s (2005) survey. This very limited evidence base
45
46 suggests that our quantitative results reflect infrastructural effects. However, in our
47
48 study these are combined with toll effects.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 In Section 2 above, we set out principles for assessing the contribution of toll charges
5
6 to development effects. Unfortunately, theoretical reasoning does not uniquely predict
7
8 the relationship between tolls and the development effects of new roads. However, the
9
10 greater the likelihood of congestion on a new road, the more likely it is that tolls, via
11
12 decongestion and reliability effects, will promote commercial use and development.
13
14 Current and anticipated congestion on UK roads (Department of Transport, 2004 and
15
16 2006) suggests that the development potential of new road infrastructure may be
17
18 amplified rather than reduced by tolls.
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 **Acknowledgements.** The author would like to thank Mike Kinghan of the Southern
26
27 Staffordshire Partnership, who managed the project from which this paper is derived;
28
29 Bob Simpson at the Government Office for the West Midlands; John de Kanter, Tony
30
31 Joynson and Keith Daniels at InStaffs; and Steve Burrows, Janet Edwards and Steve
32
33 Bradford at the Development Services Department of Staffordshire County Council.
34
35 Rosie Duncan at Staffordshire University's Institute for Environment, Sustainability
36
37 and Regeneration created Figure 1. In addition, the author gives particular thanks to
38
39 the private and public sector practitioners whose contributions are anonymous but
40
41 whose generosity in sharing knowledge during lengthy interviews has enriched this
42
43 research. Finally, this paper has been substantially improved by comments and
44
45 suggestions from the anonymous referees and journal editors. All remaining
46
47 shortcomings are the responsibility of the authors.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Notes

¹ Staffordshire County Council's 'industrial land survey includes land in the industrial, office, warehousing and distribution sectors' (*Survey*, 2003, p.5). Of the 27 development sites within the M6 Toll corridor (Instaffs, 2003), 18 are in Staffordshire, five in North Warwickshire and four in Birmingham.

² In our view, one of these (Dodgson, 1974) is an ex ante study.

³ Tolls ensured that traffic on the M6 Toll was "free flowing" throughout the period investigated. Hence, differential access time to the M6 Toll is the key to its effects at different locations. On the use of drivetime rather than distance or compound "cost" measures, in addition to the references in the text, Holvad and Preston (2005, p.18) conclude from their review of studies on the additional economic benefits of road projects that 'results are more consistent if travel time is used as a measure of accessibility rather than travel distance'; see also Linneker and Spence (1996).

⁴ Archive copies were kindly supplied by the Development Services Department, Staffordshire County Council, Riverway, Stafford. ST16 3TJ.

⁵ Significant non-zero "before" effects could indicate either that the threshold period was incorrectly defined or that the three drivetime zones had characteristics that systematically influenced development independently of the hypothesised M6 Toll effects.

⁶ For analysis, estimation and interpretation of these marginal effects, see Greene (2003, pp.764-66); Wooldridge (2002, pp.521-24); Wooldridge (2003, pp.567-69); and Cong (2000).

⁷ We do not delete variables whose estimated coefficients are statistically non-significant when these are required for comparison within "sets" of variables: this applies to variables for total land available (comparison with total land readily available); all "before" and "after" effects; and the district dummies.

⁸ The intercept term is included to ensure that the estimated residual in the tobit model satisfies the assumption of a zero mean (Greene, 2003, pp.765 and 771; Wooldridge, 2002, p.520). However, 'the intercept should *not* be relied on for purposes of analysis or inference' (Studenmund, 1992, p.242; see also pp.96-98 and 240-242).

⁹ For further detail on the calculations in this Section, see Pugh (2005, pp.55-57).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

¹⁰ These calculations take no account of potential multiplier effects (i.e., the extent to which spending additional income leads to further job creation). Although typically local multipliers are very small (around 1.05-1.11; SACTRA, 1999, p.219), the existence of wards in Cannock that are both close to the M6 Toll and eligible for EU Regional Development Funding suggests the presence of under-utilised resources consistent with positive multiplier effects.

¹¹ The ratio of total net benefits to transport net benefits is defined as

$$\frac{(\text{Transport benefits} - \text{Transport costs}) + (\text{Additional economic benefits} - \text{Additional economic costs})}{\text{Transport benefits} - \text{Transport costs}}$$

¹² These tests and checks on robustness are fully reported in Pugh (2005, pp.51-54), but are omitted here for reasons of space.

¹³ Indeed, the low “pseudo R-squared” measures reported in Tables 1 and 2 are typical of this type of regression (Wooldridge, 2002, p.529; Wooldridge, 2003a, p.31).

¹⁴ As we noted in the Introduction, we do not account for potentially negative externalities associated with the M6 Toll. Hence, we have nothing to say about “additional disbenefits” (detrimental impacts).

¹⁵ SACTRA also recommends taking account of multiplier effects. This becomes particularly relevant when we consider employment effects; see note 10.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 Arup Economics (2001) *Employment Densities: A Full Guide*. English Partnerships
11 and the Regional Development Agencies. London.
12
13
14 Boarnet, M. and Chalermpong, S. (2001) New Highways, House Prices, and Urban
15 Development: A Case Study of Toll Roads in Orange County, CA.. *Housing*
16 *Policy Debate*, 12(3), 575-605.
17
18
19 Cervero, R. and Duncan, M. (2002) Transit's Value-Added: Effects of Light and
20 Commuter Rail Services on Commercial Land Values. *Transport Research*
21 *Board, 81st Annual Meeting presentation* (January 2002).
22
23
24 Cong R. (2000) Marginal effects of the tobit model. *Stata Technical Bulletin*, 56, 27-
25 34.
26
27
28 Department of Trade and Industry (2000) *Guidance on Preparing Evaluation Plans*.
29 London: DTI, Central Evaluation Team.
30
31
32 Department of Transport (2004) *The Future of Transport*. HMSO. Available online
33 (as of 26/03/2007): <http://www.dft.gov.uk/about/strategy/whitepapers/fot/>
34
35
36 Department of Transport (2006) *Transport Trends*. HMSO.
37
38
39 Dodgson, J. (1974) Motorway Investment, Industrial Transport Costs, and Sub-
40 Regional Growth: A Case Study of the M62. *Regional Studies*, 8, 75-91.
41
42
43 Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco (2001), Natural Vacancy Rates in
44 Commercial Real Estate Markets, *Economic Letter 2001-27*; October 5, 2001.
45 Available online (as of 26/03/2007):
46
47 <http://www.frbsf.org/publications/economics/letter/2001/el2001-27.pdf>
48
49
50 Flores-Lagunes, A. and Schnier, K. (2004) Estimation of Sample Selection Models
51 with Spatial Dependence. University of Arizona, Department of Economics
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(mimeo: December 2004). Available on-line (as of 26/03/2007):

<http://www.econ.uiuc.edu/~roger/seminar/flores.pdf>

Gramlich, E.M. (1994) Infrastructure investment: a review essay. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 32, 1176-96.

Greene, W. (2003; 5th Ed.) *Econometric Analysis*. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Gutierrez R., Carter S. and Drukker D (2001) On boundary-value likelihood ratio tests. *Stata Technical Bulletin*, 60, 15-18.

GVA Grimley (2003) *M6 Toll: The Wider Picture* (2003) - consultancy report by Mott MacDonald and ECOTEC Research in association with GVA Grimley.

GVA Grimley (2004) *Developing a Methodology to Capture Land Value Uplift around Transport Facilities*. Scottish Executive, Transport Research Planning Group: Transport Research Series (November 2004). Available online (as of 26/03/2007): www.scotland.gov.uk/planning

Holvad, T. and Preston, J. (2005) Road Transport Investment Projects and Additional Economic Benefits. Presented at the 45th Congress of the European Regional Science Association (ERSA conference papers ersa05p522). Available online (as of 26/03/2007): http://www.feweb.vu.nl/ersa2005/final_papers/522.pdf

House of Commons Select Committee on Transport, *Seventh Report* (March 2005).

InStaffs (2003) *M6 Toll Road: Commercial Development Opportunities* (published by InStaffs on CD).

LeSage, J. and Pace, R. (2004) Using Matrix Exponentials to Estimate Spatial Probit/Tobit Models. In: Getis, A., Mur, J. and Zoller, H. (2004) *Spatial Econometrics and Spatial Statistics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Linneker, B. and Spence, N. (1996) Road transport infrastructure and regional economic development. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 4(2), 77-92.

1
2
3
4
5 Llewelyn-Davies, Banister, D. and Hall, P. (2004) *Transport and City*
6
7 *Competitiveness: Literature Review*. London: Department for Trade and
8
9 Industry.

10
11 Macquarie (2005) *Macquarie Infrastructure Group: Interim Financial Report 31*
12
13 *December 2004*. Available online (as of 26/03/2007):
14
15 [http://www.macquarie.com.au/au/mig/acrobat/full_concise_sixmonth_results_](http://www.macquarie.com.au/au/mig/acrobat/full_concise_sixmonth_results_2004.pdf)
16
17 [2004.pdf](http://www.macquarie.com.au/au/mig/acrobat/full_concise_sixmonth_results_2004.pdf)

18
19
20
21 *New Earnings Survey* (2002): from NOMIS, included in Staffordshire County Council
22
23 (2003) *Monitoring Social Inclusion in Staffordshire*. Development Services
24
25 Department. For availability, see Note 4.

26
27
28 Noland, R. and Lem, L. (2002) A Review of the Evidence for Induced Travel and
29
30 Changes in Transportation and Environmental Policy in the United States and
31
32 the United Kingdom. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and*
33
34 *Environment*, 7(1) (January), 1-26. Available online (as of 26/03/2007):
35
36 <http://www.cts.cv.imperial.ac.uk/documents/publications/iccts00244.pdf>

37
38
39
40 OECD (2002) *Impact of Transport Infrastructure Investment on Regional*
41
42 *Development*. OECD, Paris.

43
44
45 Pugh, G. (2005) *The economic impact of the M6 Toll on southern Staffordshire: Final*
46
47 *Report (June 2005) for the Southern Staffordshire Partnership*. Staffordshire
48
49 University. Available online (as of 18/03/2007) at
50
51 [http://www.staffs.ac.uk/schools/sciences/geography/links/IESR/downloads/M](http://www.staffs.ac.uk/schools/sciences/geography/links/IESR/downloads/M6_Toll_evaluation_FinalReport%20.pdf)
52
53 [6_Toll_evaluation_FinalReport%20.pdf](http://www.staffs.ac.uk/schools/sciences/geography/links/IESR/downloads/M6_Toll_evaluation_FinalReport%20.pdf)

54
55
56
57 Rand Europe (2004) *M6 Toll Road Stakeholder Depth Interviews*. Rand Europe for
58
59 the UK Department for Transport, Department for Transport, London.

1
2
3
4
5 SACTRA (Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Appraisal) (1999)
6
7 *Transport and the Economy*. Department for Transport, London.

8
9 Spellerberg, I. (1998) Ecological effects of roads and traffic: a literature review.
10
11 *Global Ecology & Biogeography*, 7(5), 317-333.

12
13 Staffordshire County Council (2003a) *Staffordshire Industrial Estates Survey 2002*.
14
15 Development Services Department. For availability, see Note 4.

16
17 Staffordshire County Council (2003b) *Southern Staffordshire Baseline Indicators*.
18
19 Development Services Department. For availability, see Note 4.

20
21 StataCorp (2003) *Longitudinal/Panel Data*. StataCorp LP, College Station, TX.

22
23 Studenmund, A. (1992; 2nd Ed.) *Using Econometrics*. Harper Collins, New York.


24
25
26
27
28 *Survey*: Staffordshire County Council, *Staffordshire Employment Land Availability*
29
30 *Survey* (published annually from 1994 to 2004); for availability, see Note 4.

31
32
33 Wooldridge, J. (2002) *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. The
34
35 MIT Press, London.

36
37
38 Wooldridge, J. (2003a) *Solutions Manual and Supplementary Materials for*
39
40 *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. The MIT Press,
41
42 London.

43
44
45 Wooldridge, J. (2003b; 2nd Ed.) *Introductory Econometrics*. Thomson South-
46
47 Western, Mason, Ohio.

Figure 1: The M6 Toll and industrial land (development) sites in the southern Staffordshire sub region



Source: Crown Copyright; GVA Grimley (2003) for site drivetimes

View Only

Figure 2: History of the development of the M6 Toll Motorway

Year	Event
1980	Proposals for a new publicly funded motorway
1984	Consultation on five route options
1986	Announcement of preferred route
1988	Public Inquiry on publicly funded scheme
1989	Announcement that the road will be built by the private sector
1991	Midland Expressway Ltd (MEL) announced as competition winner
1994	Public Inquiry on MEL scheme
1995	Public Inquiry ends
1997	Final go-ahead from Government
1997	Legal challenges against the scheme (Alliance against BNRR)
1999	Legal challenges cleared
2000	Competition for design and build contract
2000	MEL signs contract with CAMBBA for design and construction. Contract Value (Design and Construction): £905m
2000	MEL signs contract for financing
2001	Construction begins
2003	Toll prices announced; MEL awarded concession until 2054
2003	M6 Toll opens

Table 1: Influences on the development of industrial land sites within the M6 Toll corridor, 1994-2004 (RE and Pooled tobit regressions)

Dependent variable: site development ($Development_{it}$) (“Before” period = 1994-2000; “After” period = 2003-04)

Variant 1: Stafford sites “before” and “after” the M6 Toll

		Random Effects		Pooled	
Independent variables		Coefficient	Coefficient	Marginal effects	
				Unconditional	Conditional
Total land available (t-2)	total_lag2	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01
Land readily available (t-2)	readily_lag2	0.19 ***	0.19 ***	0.04 ***	0.04 ***
5-minute drivetime sites before the M6 Toll	5MinZoneBefore	2.10	2.09	0.57	0.53
5-minute drivetime sites after the M6 Toll	5MinZoneAfter	6.74 **	6.75 **	3.01 ***	2.31 ***
10-minute drivetime sites before the M6 Toll	10MinZoneBefore	1.58	1.60	0.41	0.39
10-minute drivetime sites after the M6 Toll	10MinZoneAfter	3.67 *	3.70 *	1.24 ***	1.04 **
Stafford sites “before” the M6 Toll	StaffordBefore	-0.27	-0.27	-0.06	-0.06
Stafford sites “after” the M6 Toll	StaffordAfter	4.01	4.02	1.44 *	1.18
Tamworth	tam	3.14	3.15	0.93	0.83
Lichfield	lich	6.35 *	6.38 *	2.61 ***	2.05 ***
South Staffordshire	sstaffs	0.68	0.67	0.16	0.16
East Staffordshire	estaffs	5.26	5.32	1.88 **	1.55 *
Stafford	stafford	3.25	3.28	0.98	0.87
Intercept term	Intercept	-9.82 ***	-9.85 ***	-2.18 ***	-2.25 ***
Variance components					
Panel-level variance (σ_u)	sigma_u	0.34			
Overall variance (σ_e)	sigma_e	4.73 ***			
Contribution (%) of the panel variance component	rho	0.01			
Diagnostics and “Goodness of Fit”					
Likelihood-ratio test of ($H_0: \sigma_u = 0$)	chibar2(01)	0.32 †			
Log likelihood		-174.55	-174.71		
Likelihood Ratio Test (against H_0 : joint significance)	chi2(13)	47.41 †	47.93 †		
Estimated standard error of the regression	_se		4.76		
Pseudo R2			0.12		
Conditional moment test against H_0 : normal errors				14.19 †	

*** Significant at the one-percent level or better; ** Significant at the five-percent level or better;

* Significant at the ten-percent level or better; † Null not rejected at the five-percent level or better

Observation summary:

45 uncensored observations; 116 left-censored observations; 0 right-censored observations

Table 2: Influences on the development of industrial land sites within the M6 Toll corridor, 1994-2004 (RE and Pooled tobit regressions)

Dependent variable: site development ($Development_{it}$) (“Before” period = 1994-2000; “After” period = 2003-04)

Variant 2: All sites in the 15-minute drivetime zone “before” and “after” the M6 Toll

		Random Effects		Pooled	
				Marginal effects	
Independent variables		Coefficient	Coefficient	Unconditional	Conditional
Total land available (t-2)	total_lag2	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01
Land readily available (t-2)	readily_lag2	0.18 ***	0.18 ***	0.04 ***	0.04 ***
5-minute drivetime sites before the M6 Toll	5MinZoneBefore	2.19	2.18	0.60	0.55
5-minute drivetime sites after the M6 Toll	5MinZoneAfter	6.87 **	6.87 **	3.09 ***	2.36 ***
10-minute drivetime sites before the M6 Toll	10MinZoneBefore	1.57	1.58	0.40	0.39
10-minute drivetime sites after the M6 Toll	10MinZoneAfter	3.67 *	3.68 *	1.23 ***	1.04 **
15-minute drivetime sites before the M6 Toll	15MinZoneBefore	-0.86	-0.86	-0.18	-0.19
15-minute drivetime sites after the M6 Toll	15MinZoneAfter	0.91	0.91	0.22	0.22
Tamworth	tam	3.44	3.45	1.05	0.92
Lichfield	lich	6.51 *	6.52 *	2.69 ***	2.11 ***
South Staffordshire	sstaffs	0.77	0.76	0.18	0.18
East Staffordshire	estaffs	5.72	5.75	2.10 **	1.71 **
Stafford	stafford	4.71	4.73	1.60 **	1.34
Intercept term	_cons	-9.99 ***	-10.01 ***	-2.23 ***	-2.29 ***
Variance components					
Panel-level variance (σ_u)	sigma_u	0.27			
Overall variance (σ_e)	sigma_e	4.80 ***			
Contribution (%) of the panel variance component	rho	0.003			
Diagnostics and “Goodness of Fit”					
Likelihood-ratio test of (H_0 : $\sigma_u = 0$)	chibar2(01)	0.19 †			
Log likelihood		-175.43	-175.52		
Likelihood Ratio Test (against H_0 : joint significance)	chi2(13)	45.66 †	46.30 †		
Estimated standard error of the regression	_se		4.82		
Pseudo R2			0.12		
Conditional moment test against H_0 : normal errors			15.27 †		

*** Significant at the one-percent level or better; ** Significant at the five-percent level or better; * Significant at the ten-percent level or better; † Null not rejected at the five-percent level or better

Observation summary:

45 uncensored observations; 116 left-censored observations; 0 right-censored observations