

In contrast to the more reliable, frequent and affordable public transport systems in many countries alongside the greater density in most other European or Asian cities (e.g. Hall, 2014), this paper has underlined the significant limitations to TOD as a sustainable form of development, especially in regional Green Belts like the West Midlands, as opposed to the panacea that its proponents sometimes promote it to be (Chance, 2019). However, despite trying to follow the recommendations of the TOD literature, planners are arguably constrained by nationally advised housing targets, a challenging range of actors in order to facilitate TOD, especially HRT with the disconnect between the national rail network and local planning, and broader governance and administrative restrictions within an era of localism (Knowles, 2012; Knowles and Ferbrache, 2019; Mace, 2018). Indeed, it has highlighted the broader disconnect that there sometimes is between the aspirations of planning policy and practical outcomes of development underlining the critical importance of another 'D' – 'delivery' in TOD – as well as frequency see Table 2 (Ewing and Cervero, 2010; Curtis, 2012, p. 83; Knowles et al., 2020): Although beyond this paper's scope, land ownership and the amount of investment available for supporting TOD resulting from land value uplift is also very important (Knowles, 2012; Stokenberga, 2014; Cheshire and Buyuklieva, 2019).