Motorcycle Industry Association (MCIA) submission

Transport Select Committee: Joined-up Journeys: Achieving and Measuring Transport Integration – 16th October 2025

About MCIA

1. MCIA is the trade association for 'L-Category' vehicles, which include powered two (mopeds and motorcycles), three (tricycles), and light four-wheeled vehicles (quadricycles/nano cars). Collectively, they are known as 'powered light vehicles' (PLVs). Members include manufacturers of whole vehicles, accessory and components and those providing associated services to the industry.

2. With a mission to promote and protect the industry, MCIA works tirelessly to advance the growth, safety, and sustainability of L-Category vehicles. MCIA plays a vital role in shaping policies and regulations that impact the industry, working closely with government bodies and other relevant stakeholders to ensure the potential of our vehicles is fully realised.

3. MCIA actively promotes motorcycle safety, aiming to enhance awareness and education among users and the public. Through campaigns, initiatives, and partnerships, MCIA strives to reduce accidents, improve rider skills, and advocate for the implementation of effective safety measures.

4. MCIA welcomes the Transport Select Committee's inquiry into achieving and measuring transport integration, and the opportunity to contribute evidence on how L-Category vehicles can contribute to a more integrated, sustainable, and accessible transport system - provided the right infrastructure, regulation, and incentives are in place, and based on the right vehicle for the right journey.

Executive Summary

5. L-Category vehicles provide compact, flexible, and low-emission mobility options, especially where walking, cycling and public transport use isn't viable. They can reduce congestion, improve air quality, and support last-mile logistics. When fully integrated into the transport mix, PLVs offer seamless first-and-last mile connectivity to public transport, space-efficiency, low-impact urban mobility, adaptable logistics solutions through modular and e-cargo formats, and scalable contributions to decarbonisation and productivity.

6. Despite these advantages, L-Category vehicles are too often overlooked in national and local transport policy. Kay barriers include:

- A complex and costly licensing regime for potential users and DVSA.
- Inconsistent local access rules undermining network discernability (e.g. bus lane access).
- Car-centric infrastructure with limited dedicated infrastructure for PLVs, including dedicated and free (or reduced) motorcycle bays.
- Zero financial incentives for low and zero emission PLVs, apart from the Motorcycle Plug-in Grant (PiMG) (set to last until at least April 2026).
- A regulatory framework that has not kept pace with emerging mobility options, and therefore putting PLVs at a distinct disadvantage compared to e-scooters and e-bikes (often illegally used and/or tampered with). The rise in illegal use of e-scooters and tampered with e-bikes has severely impacted the lower end of the L1 (moped) market due to zero barriers to entry (unlike licensing, registration, PPE, and insurance requirements for PLVs). As a result, new registrations of 0-50cc mopeds have fallen by over 40% between 2021-2024.[1]

7. To realise a truly integrated transport network, the Government must embed L-Category vehicles as a core component of the mobility ecosystem – not an afterthought. We are calling on the Government to:
   - Include L-Category vehicles in the Government's forthcoming Integrated National Transport Strategy to ensure the *right vehicle for the right journey* mantra is at its heart.
   - Conduct a full-scale regulatory review of emerging micromobility options and their interaction with L-Category vehicles. This should include consideration of bringing e-scooters under L-Category regulation, should the Government decide to legalise private use. The review should also future-proof regulation to ensure a level playing field for L-Category manufacturers to innovate in this space.
   - Conduct a full-scale review of L-Category licensing requirements in line with MCIA's A *Licence to Net Zero* proposals to improve accessibility (and safety).
   - Revert its decision not to allow motorcycles access to bus lanes as its default position.
   - Implement a bespoke consumer and business incentives package for L-Category vehicles that acknowledges their varying use cases to incentivise uptake.

8. L-Category vehicles are integral to a joined-up, low and zero emission transport system. With modernised licensing, up to date regulation, appropriate infrastructure, and bespoke incentives, they can complement – rather than compete with – other sustainable modes. By embedding L-Category vehicles in the forthcoming Integrated National Transport Strategy, the Government can

[1] Source: MCIA

deliver a faster, fairer route to zero emissions while creating an accessible, integrated transport network for all.

Response to Inquiry Questions

a. What are the key features that make a transport system feel joined up to the user? How would 'integrated' transport look different to current services and networks?

9. An integrated transport system would allow for the public and businesses to use different transport modes smoothly, guided by the principle of using *the right vehicle for the right journey*.

10. L-Category vehicles can help deliver this by:
    - Where walking, cycling or public transport aren't viable, offer a cost effective and sustainable alternative.
    - Providing first-and-last mile connectivity to public transport hubs.
    - Delivering space efficiency that will ease kerbside pressure, reduce dwell and parking time, and maintain traffic flow, benefitting other modes of transport.
    - Offering business functionality through adaptable modular and e-cargo vehicles which will optimise urban deliveries with cleaner and quieter operations.

11. An integrated transport network would look and perform differently as it would necessitate L-Category vehicles being considered as a fundamental facet of mobility, rather than an afterthought. This would include L-Category vehicles being considered as key mobility forms in local transport plans, with streets designed to promote active travel and L-Category vehicle use, and logistical hubs outside of city centres being encouraged to cater for last mile deliveries using L-Category vehicles rather than lightly laden vans or single occupancy cars.

12. There would also need to be a reimagination of infrastructure delivery to account for the needs of L-Category vehicles. This would include increased parking infrastructure and charging facilities for electric L-Category vehicles. Many electric PLVs have a significant advantage over electric cars and vans, in that they can be charged via a conventional three-pin domestic plug with removable batteries. However, to be considered as part of an integrated transport network, it would be prudent for secure storage or lockers being made available to users to plug in the removable batteries and charge them while away from the vehicle. Additionally, many large capacity electric motorcycles require bespoke charging facilities, so future infrastructure delivery needs to be all-encompassing.

b. What stops effective integration happening now, and how can these barriers be overcome?

13. The current licensing regime for L-Category vehicles imposes unnecessarily burdensome, time-consuming and expensive requirements on both potential users, training schools and the DVSA. As a result, this system limits the ability of L-Category vehicles to displace less efficient car and van journeys and support the integration of a wider range of mobility options. MCIA's *A Licence to Net Zero*[2] campaign aims to simplify the licensing process and increase uptake of L-Category vehicles, thereby accelerating towards low and net zero emissions. Our proposals also address perverse incentives within the current licensing regime that discourage users from advancing their training and becoming safer road users. Implementing *A Licence to Net Zero* would directly support transport integration by making access easier, raising the skill level of users, and improving safety across the transport network.

14. The previous Government planned to announce its intention to review L-Category user licensing. It is essential that the current Government retains this proposal, as per MCIA's joint Action Plan with the previous government.[3] Simplifying L-Category licensing supports greater transport integration by facilitating an accelerated modal shift and improving the uptake of efficient transport options, making choosing the right vehicle for the right journey more accessible and appealing to a wider range of road users.

15. L-Category vehicles are often overlooked in local transport planning, street design, or procurement, so policy decisions inadvertently exclude them. PLVs need to be explicitly included in national and local transport strategies so they form part of the modelling, Clean Air Zone rules and regulations, procurement and modal-shift interventions.

16. Inconsistent rules, such as motorcycle bus lane access, makes it harder for road users to choose the right vehicle for the right journey. Despite broad support,[4] the Government's 2024 consultation[5] decided not to introduce default national motorcycle access. Allowing motorcycles to use bus lanes would make these vehicles more attractive, offering access to less congested road space and safer conditions, particularly for new or inexperienced users. A clear, national framework for bus lane access would support integrated transport planning, promote modal shift, and advance wider decarbonisation goals by making light, low-emission vehicles a more practical choice.

---

[2] A Licence to Net Zero, MCIA, 2023
[3] Delivery Roadmap for Net Zero Transport in the UK, 2024
[4] 98% of individual respondents (13,885 out of 14,089) and 93% of stakeholder organisations (185 out of 198) supported the measure.
[5] Motorcycles in bus lanes consultation outcome, Nov 2024

17. Current transport infrastructure remains heavily car-centric and is not always suitable for L-Category vehicles. There is limited provision for dedicated parking, charging facilities, or secure storage. The Government's Integrated Transport Strategy and Road Safety Strategy should therefore include clear, prescriptive guidelines for local authorities to support the safe and increased uptake of L-Category vehicles.

18. To address charging barriers, funds from the Low Emission Vehicles Infrastructure (LEVI) programme could be reallocated specifically towards developing dedicated motorcycle charging stations. This should include designating areas within existing charging sites for L-Category vehicle use and ensure access to bespoke charging solutions.

19. Developing robust and accessible infrastructure will help build consumer confidence in internal combustion engine (ICE) and electric PLVs, encourage wider adoption, and support their seamless integration into the broader transport network.

20. Incentives for L-Category vehicles remain insufficient. The PiMG for L1 mopeds ended in April 2024, and the grant for L3 motorcycles is due to close in April 2026, with no public plans for continuation. Furthermore, the maximum grant of £500 is too low to drive meaningful uptake and excludes electric motorcycles above the £10,000 threshold. This is reflected in a 43.9% decline in electric L1/L3 sales between 2022 and 2024, compared with a 3.1% increase in internal combustion engine (ICE) L1/L3 sales over the same period.

21. To achieve a truly integrated transport network, the Government should introduce bespoke consumer and business incentive packages for PLVs beyond 2026. Adoption could also be accelerated through the introduction of Ride-to-Work schemes for L1 and L3 vehicles, modelled on the success of Cycle-to-Work schemes. Such initiatives would offer a practical, low-emission alternative for individuals unable or unwilling to cycle, while providing financial incentives that support the transition to more efficient and sustainable transport options.

22. Regulatory gaps for emerging light mobility modes - particularly e-scooters not currently classified within the L-Category regime - underscore the need for a new, fit-for-purpose regulatory framework. Existing regulations restricts the safe deployment of new vehicle types and limits their potential to contribute to an integrated transport system. MCIA proposes the creation of two new vehicle categories:
    - E-Step Scooter L0: integrating e-scooters into L-Category regulation, with a maximum continuous power of 250W and peak power of 500W.
        - This would ensure e-scooters are subject to type approval – neither e-scooter sharing schemes nor the 750,000 privately owned e-

scooters are subject to type approval. Implementing this standard would lead to higher quality and improved safety
    - MCIA also proposes e-scooters be registered and display a number plate, which would make it easier for law enforcement to distinguish between legal and illegal e-scooters. This would prevent the de facto legalisation of uncapped e-scooter speeds due to the difficulty of differentiating between legal and illegal vehicles.
    - MCIA also proposes mandatory training for e-scooter users and mandatory use of a cycle helmet.
- Light Electric Moped (L1-CA): MCIA proposes the creation of a new lightweight electric moped operating with a maximum continuous power of 1kW and a maximum peak power of 1.5kW, speed limited to 21.75mph.
    - The age of access would be 14+ and users will undergo practical training to acquire a licence and require insurance, theory test, CBT and mandatory use of a motorcycle standard helmet.
    - The creation of a light electric moped category mirrors advancements in promoting light mobility in countries with exceptional road safety records, such as Sweden and Denmark. L1-CA offers a valuable opportunity for L-Category manufacturers to support the growing light mobility ecosystem.
    - L1-CA could play a key role in creating a more integrated transport network by introducing a new option for personal mobility, particularly aimed at young people.

c. What kinds of interventions and policy decisions are needed to provide joined-up transport, including in areas beyond transport such as planning?

23. Government must explicitly include L-Category vehicles in the National Transport Strategy and ensure they are fully considered in local transport plans. This should include clear guidance on how these vehicles can be used to make transport more accessible, efficient, and better integrated into everyday travel and logistics. For Clean Air Zones (CAZs), policy should be proportionate and consistent across the country. Currently, treatment of L-Category vehicles varies by location. For example, in Bath, motorcycles and mopeds are exempt regardless of emissions,[6] whereas in London, motorcycles need to meet minimum emissions standards when travelling within the Ultra Low Emission Zone.[7] PLVs contribute very little to overall vehicular emissions, as confirmed by DEFRA's 2017 draft Air Quality Plan,[8] however, the lack of a consistent national framework creates confusion for users and businesses, and risks discouraging modal shift away from higher-emission

[6] Bath's Clean Air Zone
[7] Motorcycles, mopeds and more, TfL
[8] UK Plan for tackling roadside nitrogen dioxide concentrations, July 2017

vehicles. Government should therefore provide national guidance to ensure that L-Category vehicles are treated fairly and consistently within CAZs, reflecting their environmental performance and contribution to reducing congestion and emissions.

24. New building developments should be designed and planned to enable and encourage the use of L-Category vehicles as apart of an integrated, low-emission transport system. This includes providing secure parking, charging facilities, and appropriate access for such vehicles. Developments should be required to incorporate micro-logistics opportunities, dedicated spaces of small-scale hubs where goods can be transferred from larger vehicles to L-Category cargo vehicles for last-mile deliveries, allowing for smaller, cleaner, and more space-efficient vehicles to complete local deliveries rather than vans. By embedding PLV-friendly infrastructure and micro-logistics capability at the planning stage, new developments can help mainstream the use of L-Category vehicles and support the wider goal of a connected, integrated, sustainable transport network.

25. To fully realise the potential of integrated transport, the Government must also support the development of the UK manufacturing base and supply chain for low and zero emission L7 cargo vehicles. These vehicles have significant potential to replace vans in urban logistics, providing quieter, cleaner and more space-efficient delivery options. However, the current UK market is constrained by limited choice. Targeted industrial support would help increase the availability and diversity of models, strengthen UK competitiveness, and provide businesses and local authorities with greater choice when transitioning fleets to sustainable, integrated transport solutions.

26. There is also a clear need for a national awareness campaign – jointly led by Government and industry – to promote the existence, availability, and benefits of low and zero emission PLVs to both consumers and businesses. Despite their proven ability to reduce congestion, emissions, and operating costs, PLVs remain under-represented as viable, sustainable transport and logistics options. A co-ordinated campaign would help address this knowledge gap by highlighting how modern PLVs – both electric and otherwise – can provide efficient first-and-last mile connectivity, affordable commuting, and cleaner urban deliveries. By showcasing practical use cases and success stories, such a campaign would help normalise PLV use, accelerate modal shift, and support the Government's broader decarbonisation and integration goals.

d. How should transport integration and its benefits be measured and evaluated—including the impact on economic growth, decarbonisation and the Government's other 'missions'?

27. Measuring transport integration effectively requires a clear framework that captures not only how well different modes connect, but also the wider social, economic, and environmental outcomes that result. Using a series of Key Performance Indicators provides a structures and transparent way to track progress and ensure interventions deliver real-world benefits. Integration affects many facets – user experience, network performance, environmental outcomes, and inclusivity – so KPIs will help to demonstrate what success looks like.

28. By adopting this approach, Government and local authorities can make evidence-led decisions, benchmark progress, and target investment where it will make the greatest difference. It also allows performance to be assessed consistently across regions, supporting accountability and helping to identify best practice.

29. Evaluation should therefore combine quantitative and qualitative data, using measures such as:
    - User experience: overall journey times, ease of multimodal connections, satisfaction with travel
    - Modal and network performance: changes in modal share, uptake of PLVs and public transport, reductions in congestion, and improved journey reliability.
    - Environmental outcomes: reductions in lifecycle CO2 emissions, and improvements in local air quality through lower NOx and particulate matter levels as users migrate from cars and vans to PLVs.
    - Economic impact: productivity gains from reduced congestion, time savings, improved access to employment, and business growth linked to micro-logistics.
    - Inclusivity and accessibility: improved transport options for lower-income groups and communities with limited public transport.
    - Safety: changes in Killed or Seriously Injured figures for PLVs and other modes.

30. Together, these indicators provide a balanced view of how integration is improving journeys, reducing environmental impact, and supporting local economies. They also allow policymakers to assess whether interventions are achieving the desired outcomes.

e. How should the cost of interventions needed to deliver transport integration be assessed and appraised? Will proposed changes to methodology in the Treasury's 'Green Book', including the introduction of 'place-based business cases', change this?

31. Costs should be appraised using standard Green Book techniques which consider monetised travel time, emissions, health, safety and the wider local economic impacts. This can be supplemented with lifecycle emissions and non-monetary benefits such as user experiences and inclusivity. When considering L-Category

vehicles, lifecycle analysis and local air quality benefits should be included as they can materially change the value-for-money calculus.

32. The Treasury's Green Book review explicitly introduces and supports 'place-based business cases', and signals improved guidance for appraising transformational, place-level interventions.[9] This will make it simpler to package transport with housing, skills and local economic measures so complementary projects are appraised together rather than in isolation. This is directly relevant to L-Category vehicle integration as many PLV benefits are local/place-specific, such as congestion relief, local air quality, jobs and access, and are therefore best captured in place-based appraisal.

f. Will integration in itself deliver other benefits such as wider transport options in more places, and behaviour changes such as mode shift? What other impacts could it have?

33. Transport integration on its own will not automatically deliver widespread behavioural change or mode shift. To realise its full potential, integration must be supported by a targeted package of incentives and reforms that make the use L-Category vehicles an attractive and accessible choice for individuals and businesses.

34. A bespoke incentives framework, incorporating both financial and non-financial measures, is essential to drive adoption. Financial incentives could include extending and uprating the existing PiMG, introducing a scheme modelled on the *Cycle-to-Work* scheme, providing tax incentives to encourage businesses to adopt PLV-solutions, or salary-sacrifice options for employees. These measures would make ownership more affordable and help accelerate uptake, particularly among commuters, gig-economy workers, and small businesses.

35. Non-financial incentives are equally as important. Licensing reform remains a key enabler. Simplifying the L-Category licensing process and making it less onerous – without compromising safety – would lower barriers to entry and encourage more people to consider PLVs as a practical alternative to cars, allowing individuals to choose the right vehicle for the right journey. This would directly support ambitions for decarbonisation, congestion reduction, and improved access to education, employment, etc.

36. When integration is pared with a comprehensive incentive and reform package, the benefits multiply. Wider mode choice becomes a realistic option for more people, congestion and emissions fall, businesses gain flexible, low-cost logistics solutions,

[9] Green Book Review 2025: Findings and actions, 11 June 2025

people gain greater social inclusion benefits, and there would be opportunities for growth in L-Category manufacturing and supply chains, aligning with the Government's Industrial Strategy.

37. PLVs hold significant untapped potential and can offer solutions to many societal and transportation challenges. Integration will provide the framework, but incentives and licensing reform will provide the spark needed to turn policy ambition into real behavioural change.
    - MCIA is undertaking a detailed modelling exercise to access how a balanced package of financial and non-financial incentives could accelerate adoption of L-Category vehicles. The intention is to provide Government with robust, evidence-based options that stimulate sustainable market growth while supporting national objectives on decarbonisation, congestion reduction, and affordable urban mobility. MCIA would welcome the opportunity to brief Committee members on this modelling in due course.

g. What is needed to ensure that integration is inclusive and meets the diverse needs of transport users? Will integration necessarily lead to better outcomes for accessibility?

38. To encourage modal shift whilst ensuring that integration is inclusive and meets the needs of transport users, options need to be designed for multiple user groups. The range of L-Category vehicles available ranges from mopeds (L1) to powered two-wheelers (L3) to micro-cars (L7). While an older or mobility-impaired person may be less inclined to use a moped, they may feel more comfortable with using a micro-car to get from A to B as it has an enclosed passenger compartment and a maximum speed of 56mph. Conversely, an apprentice, just starting out on their next steps post-education may find that an L1 moped is the ideal means to travel between home, college and their place-of-work. To allow for inclusive integration, subsidies or finance options must be made available to a range of users who have different requirements. Access must be affordable.

39. Any new PLV interventions by Government to encourage transport integration should be thoroughly researched in the planning stages, with measurable outcomes set and evaluation of the effectiveness completed at the end of the intervention. A national research project to ensure future campaigns are targeted correctly and that the messages can be delivered effectively, is much needed to fund campaigns to target younger, older and mobility-impaired demographics.

40. Deployment of sharing schemes or charging infrastructure needs to be considered in the context of its environment. It would be folly to only focus on city centres, as that undermines the purpose of integration. Government should consider rural and

suburban pilots to ensure schemes and infrastructure work and are utilised in lower-density areas.

41. Integration will not automatically improve accessibility, but rather, integration creates the opportunity for better accessibility, but outcomes depend on explicit design choices – PLVs being made more affordable through Government incentives, infrastructure being more accessible, and licensing being less burdensome. Therefore, integration must include equity goals, measurable targets and ring-fenced measures for underserved groups.

h. Will the meaning of integration vary across different kinds of areas and for different kinds of journeys? (such as rural and suburban areas, and inter-city journeys)

42. Integration in relation to transport networks will vary. Whilst it will not be uniform, that is to be expected – what will work in urban centres may not necessarily translate to rural journeys. But the principle of an integrated network will be universal where it is easy, accessible and affordable to travel across different modes – integration must be contextual.

43. In urban centres, there would be a focus on micro-hubs and last-mile deliveries, shared electric PLV fleets, corridor redesign and CAZs with PLV-aware rules. For inter-city travel, integration could focus more on interchanges, safe and secure parking infrastructure and multimodal connections (i.e. train followed by PLV last mile).

44. In suburban, peri-urban or rural communities, there would need to be a greater focus on affordability and targeted encouragement for modal shift. This could include park-and-ride services with PLV feeder services, secure parking infrastructure for PLVs and incentives to replace short car journeys with PLVs. PLVs can be practical option where active travel and frequent public transport are not realistic.

i. What lessons can be drawn from attempts to integrate transport elsewhere in the UK and around the world? What examples should the Government seek to emulate?

45. E-scooter sharing schemes have emerged in European cities and have been trialled extensively in the UK for a number of years. Schemes are often operated through simple mobile apps. This is proving a popular new model for travel, illustrating the changing nature of vehicle use, that doesn't necessarily involve ownership.

Carefully staged trials with clear operating rules with apps that can be used intuitively can scale shared PLV use.

46. Local CAZs should exempt PLVs from charging. Some UK authorities, e.g. Bath, exempt motorcycles and mopeds from the daily fees on the basis that they reduce overall congestion and emissions in comparison to cars. This should become the norm in all authorities where CAZs have been implemented; proportionate charging for the offenders of air pollution rather than the reducers will increase adoption without losing air-quality objectives, and aid transport integration.

47. PLV profiles must be included in Connected and Autonomous Vehicle (CAV) testing. The Dutch testing authority RDW found that many Adaptive Cruise Control systems have trouble recognising PLVs.[10] This clearly represents a latent and growing road safety issue as well as a missed opportunity for transport policy development capitalising on the potential benefits of both autonomous vehicles and transport integration – a concerted effort for a modal shift to PLVs will not materialise if users do not feel safe in the vicinity of CAVs.

48. In London a majority of the public have supported powered two-wheelers being able to use bus lanes.[11] The most common reasons given by Londoners for supporting motorcycles and mopeds in bus lanes are that it is safer and will reduce accidents, keeps motorcycles and mopeds out of live-traffic lanes, and helps to reduce congestion/improve traffic flow. Furthermore, more non-cyclists said they would be more likely to take up cycling as a result of motorcycles and mopeds using bus lanes – demonstrating real modal shift in road users. Uniformed bus-lane access across the country would deliver tangible benefits in terms of integrated transport and modal shift.

Recommendations

49. MCIA recommends that the Government consider the following recommendations to aid transport integration:
    - Explicitly recognise L-Category vehicles in the national transport strategy and require local transport plans to model them.
    - Reform licensing to simplify the process and raise the skill level.
    - Introduce proportionate incentives to drive adoption and introduce schemes akin to the cycle-to-work scheme.
    - Integrate e-scooters into L-Category regulation.
    - Use place-based business cases to bundle PLV-friendly infrastructure, licensing reform and local economic measures so benefits are fully captured.

[10] Adaptive Cruise Control & Motorcycle Recognition, RDW 2018
[11] Attitudes to the Trial of Motorcycles in Bus Lanes, TfL, Dec 2009

- Pilot and evaluate micro-hubs, shared PLV fleets and uniformed CAZ charging exemptions for low-impact PLVs.
- Undertake a national research project and subsequent campaigns targeted at varying demographics to encourage modal shift.
- Support the development of the manufacturing base and supply chain in the UK for low and zero emission L7 cargo vehicles.
- Mainstream PLV detection and representation in CAV standards and testbeds.

Conclusion

50. L-Category Vehicles are integral to a joined-up, affordable and low-carbon transport network. With proportionate regulation, consistent access rules, modernised licensing, targeted infrastructure and stable incentives, L-Category vehicles will complement walking, cycling and public transport – not compete with them – and help deliver a faster, fairer route to low and net zero and integration.

51. MCIA urges the Committee to recommend that Government explicitly incorporates L-Category vehicles into the forthcoming National Transport Strategy and adopts the policy package set out in this submission.

52. MCIA would welcome the opportunity to provide evidence to the Committee on this subject.