The economic development and the rising interest for mobility in developing nations are prompting an expanded measure of traveler vehicle ownership. This has prompted congestion as well as increases the carbon emission. The vehicle sector spent 29% of the entire energy during 2005, bringing about major discharges of greenhouse gases, for example, CO2, methane, as well as NOx. The development of private vehicle use decreases the quality of life in urban territories because of noise, traffic accident risks, as well as wasteful land use. Also, availability to different services is weakened because of congestion and restricted parking spots (KII & Hanaoka, 2003).

Individuals nowadays tend towards purchasing as well as utilizing their own vehicles since they feel that it is helpful and simple. There are such a large number of cars and motorbikes in Phnom Penh that it makes the city confront "severely congested" streets as well as traffic. It is ending up more bad and additionally awful consistently that the smoke radiated from the huge number of vehicles makes air contamination one of the real worries for the public health. Consequently, I believe that the government must put confinements on private transport and begin empowering and supporting the usage of public transport (KII & Hanaoka, 2003).

Public transport would spare individuals cash. Public transport incorporates transports, trains, trams, and different types of transportation that charge fixed fares, keep running on settled routes, and are accessible to people in general. So it is less expensive in light of the fact that a person shares the ride with numerous other individuals; though, it is all the more expensive towards owning a personal ride since a person requires fuel as well as maintenance for the vehicle. As indicated by American Public Transportation Association (APTA), "each $1 spent into public transportation produces around $5 in monetary returns" which implies the more a person spend on public transport, the improved the economy. Then again, so as to achieve an individual vehicle or motorbike, one may need to pay expensive for it, from USD$3,000 up, roughly. Likewise, an individual would need to spend on pricy fuel and month to month support for their very own vehicle or motorbike (Romero-Jordán, et al., 2014).

The second factor behind why public transport must be supported is that it would decrease roads traffic jams. In Singapore, there's no street congestion and the traffic runs truly smooth and adequately on the grounds that the nation's public transport network is especially effective. Moreover, if private transport was confined or restricted, there shall be less vehicles and motorbikes out on the street, which can lessen traffic congestions. Furthermore, when there's no congested road, the entire nation would probably be progressively beneficial in light of the fact that traveling from one place then onto the next would be quicker, which brings about sparing times and cash (Chuen, et al., 2014).

Thirdly, confining private transport and supporting public transport will diminish contamination in the town. Exhausted smoke produced from the fuel run cars is recognized to be a standout amongst the most unsafe contaminations that influence ozone layer, plants, animals, and people's

health. Thus, if private transport was restricted, there shall be less vehicles and motorbikes out on the street, and that implies less smoke would be produced to the environment. Moreover, public transport creates less exhausted smoke than private transport (Chuen, et al., 2014).

However, there are three noteworthy sets of taxation in transport: "Buy of vehicles; Ownership of vehicles; Use – fuel and employer-provided transport benefits".

The taxation actions intended for these 3 sets would have diverse effects. For example, if the strategy point is towards "green the vehicle fleets" (for example advance eco-friendly vehicles or advance substitute fuels) at that point the initial two groups are vital. As far as purchase measures, majority of the EU nations have explicit vehicle purchase or registration taxation, which at times was improved in the direction of supporting cleaner cars. For instance, in Finland, there is a decrease for lower emanation cars. The Netherlands has an arrangement of payments against a usual vehicle purchase taxation of 45%. This rate of taxation might appear to be high, however is diminished through the counter-balancing tax decreases (Romero-Jordán, et al., 2014). Therefore, the fixed taxation decrease cuts the duty charge essentially for littler and additional eco-friendly autos and increases the cost of bigger and a smaller amount eco-friendly cars. Germany as well as the UK has no car purchase taxation. The UK has a "Car Purchase Tax" of "10% on five-sixths" of the list value estimation of new vehicle till 1991. This was diminished towards 6% during 1991 as well as abrogated by and large during 1992. It was substituted through the UK approach for higher petroleum tax, whereby up to 2000, petroleum tax raised high than the inflation rate. France in 2004 declared plans towards changing of their car registration taxation in a 'feebate' plot (Hysing, et al., 2015). Vehicles that radiate over "180g/km of CO2" or diesels with no particulates filter would recompense an extra charge of "€1,500 - €3,500 ($US2, 000 - $US4, 600), with a discount of €200 to €700 ($US260-$US920)" for vehicles that emanate below "140g/km of CO2" as well as diesels with particulate filters. Vehicles in the middle, releasing somewhere in the range of "140 and 180g/km of CO2" shall be obligated towards neither an extra charge nor discount (Kallbekken, et al., 2013).

Ownership or use measures could have impact on vehicle decision if they are exceptionally reviewed. The majority of developed markets have a graded yearly registration (or circulation') taxation, qualifying the proprietor for drive a vehicle on the public highway. In the USA as well as few different nations this appears as 'number plate' taxation. This long standing taxation is frequently differed by motor size or power of a vehicle, yet a few countries have acquainted an eco-change with this taxation. The taxation changes with fuel utilization in Denmark, though Germany interfaces the taxation obligation specifically towards the Euro emanation norms, with the minimum contaminating vehicle disbursing just 20% of the rate of the most contaminating vehicle (Gallo, 2011). Nonetheless, the general dimension of the taxation is lower (just about "€50/$US70" per vehicle), that its effect on vehicle decision is irrelevant. During 1999, the UK gradually transformed from a fixed rate yearly registration tax, and after 2001 embraced a CO2 discharge based framework in 4 groups (A-D), with the charge changing from "£100 - £160 ($US180-$US290". Other gasoline vehicles are assessed on similar bands; however have a

marginally lesser charge of amid “£90 - £150 ($US160-$US270)”. From 2003 two additional groups were included for lower CO2 discharge cars, with the charge variety broadened to “£55 - £165 ($US100 - $US300)”. Be that as it may, this is a generally little taxation and does not seem to have applied a critical impact on car purchase choices (Romero-Jordán, et al., 2014).

The vehicle use measure that has brought about a transformation in purchasing choices was the UK's change of “company car taxation”, which produced results from 2002. This is the yearly taxation bill for individuals whose business gives them a vehicle for private along with driving usage just as commercial reasons and could add up to a huge number of pounds yearly (Princen, 2017). The taxation is an evaluation of the private advantage of this “benefit in kind”. During 2002 the taxation charge on company vehicles has shifted through the dimension of the vehicle's CO2 discharges, developing from 16% of the vehicle's cost, for vehicles emanating “165 grams for each kilometer (g/km) CO2, in 1% steps for each extra 5g/km over 165g/km”. The greatest charge is on 36% of the vehicle's cost. Diesel vehicles not satisfying “Euro IV” discharges norms bring about an extra charge of 4%, almost the 36% ceiling. There are additional decreases for company vehicles utilizing cleaner gasolines and advancements (Bulteau, 2016). This change has influenced the utilization as well as kind of vehicles inside the UK organization vehicle fleet. In the primary year of the new framework the quantity of business miles was diminished through more than 300 million miles for every year as well as the normal CO2 emanations of new organization vehicles diminished from “196 g/km during 1999 to 182 g/km” (De Borger, 2011).

To advance behavioral change by means of modular shift, the third group is the most essential. The stage of petroleum taxation could influence both the sort of vehicles driven (for example through giving inducements to littler motor sizes, or “greener fuels”) and, through the common level of tax collection on engine gasolines raising costs, impact modal decision as well as the travel volume (Dspace.lboro.ac.uk, 2006).

Thus to conclude this, public transport, whenever supported by the government, would help in saving individuals cash, help in decreasing roads congestions in the city , and help in diminishing contamination also. Due to the reasons above, it would said that if the government offer motivating forces to this specific industry, and to put a constraint on private transport, for example, forcing high taxation on private vehicles as well as forcing appropriate laws on the streets, it would help in decreasing traffic congestions.

References

Bulteau, J., 2016. Revisiting the bottleneck congestion model by considering environmental costs and a modal policy. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation,* 10(3), pp. 180-192.

Chuen, O. C., Karim, M. R. & Yusoff, S., 2014. *Mode Choice between Private and Public Transport in Klang Valley, Malaysia.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3950369/
[Accessed 12 January 2019].

De Borger, B., 2011. Optimal congestion taxes in a time allocation model. *Transportation research part B – methodological,* 45(1), pp. 79-95.

Dspace.lboro.ac.uk, 2006. *The tax treatment of employer commuting support: an international review.* [Online]
Available at: https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/bitstream/2134/3330/1/potter%20et%20al%20international%20tax%20Transport%20Reviews%2026%205%2005.pdf
[Accessed 12 January 2019].

Gallo, M., 2011. A fuel surcharge policy for reducing road traffic greenhouse gas emissions. *Transport policy,* 18(2), pp. 413-424.

Hysing, E., Frändberg, L. & Vilhelmson, B., 2015. Compromising sustainable mobility? The case of the Gothenburg congestion tax. *Department of Economy and Society, Unit for Human Geography,* 58(6), pp. 1058-1075.

Kallbekken, S., Garcia, J. H. & Korneliussen, K., 2013. Determinants of public support for transport taxes. *Transportation research part A – policy and practice,* Volume 58, pp. 67-78.

KII, M. & Hanaoka, S., 2003. Comparison of Sustainability between Private and Public Transport Considering Urban Structure. *IATSS Research,* 27(2), pp. 6-15.

Princen, S., 2017. *Taxation of Company Cars in Belgium– Room to Reduce their Favourable Treatment.* [Online]
Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/eb026_en_0.pdf
[Accessed 12 January 2019].

Romero-Jordán, D., Sanz, J. F. & Burguillo, M., 2014. Is it environmentally desirable to encourage public transport through taxes? Evidence for Spanish households. *Cogent Economics & Finance,* 2(1).