Executive Summary

Measure description and implementation process

The main aim of this measure was to reduce the number of single car journeys by employees travelling to and from work, and to reduce the impact of the ‘School Run’ (parents driving their children to and from school), so as to achieve a sustained increase in the number of safe sustainable journeys to and from school.

These aims were achieved by working with businesses and schools to help them develop Travel Plans which detailed a range of measures to encourage more employees/children & parents to walk, cycle, use public transport or car share.

Evaluation approach and key results

The evaluation for this measure focussed predominantly on assessing modal shift. This was mainly done using ‘Hands-Up’ surveys for schools, and iTrace surveys for businesses. It also looked at the impact of individual initiatives at specific schools and businesses.

- The percentage share of car trips to and from schools within the Civitas corridor has reduced by 13% during the lifetime of the measure, compared to an 8% reduction in schools outside of the corridor. This represents a 5% saving in car trips.

- One of the businesses worked with was Brighton & Hove Bus and Coach Company. The percentage share of car trips to and from their Conway Street depot reduced from 32% in 2010 to 26% in 2011. Their Whitehawk Road depot saw a 14% share reduction in car trips.

Lessons learned

- A successful Travel Plan campaign relies heavily upon building robust relationships with key personnel in the targeted businesses and schools.

- Being able to link the Travel Plan campaign into targets/actions already being taken by the business/school in key to securing the longevity of the measure.
A Introduction

A1 Objectives and Target Groups

A1.1 Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The measure objectives are:</th>
<th>Commuter (Work-Place) Travel Plans</th>
<th>School Travel Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) High level / longer term:</td>
<td>To reduce the number of people commuting by single occupancy vehicle by maximising the take up of more sustainable options, bringing about decreases in CO2 and local pollutant emissions from transport.</td>
<td>To reduce the impact of parents driving their children to and from school so as to achieve a sustained increase in the number of safe, sustainable journeys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Strategic level:</td>
<td>To introduce innovative, integrated and bold strategies to reduce car journeys to and from the work place.</td>
<td>To introduce innovative, integrated and bold strategies to reduce car journeys to and from schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Measure level</td>
<td>• Develop Commuter Travel Plans for 20 employers in Brighton and Hove by 15\textsuperscript{th} August 2011 (M36).&lt;br&gt;• Implement computer software to monitor development of commuter travel plans by 15\textsuperscript{th} January 2010 (M17).&lt;br&gt;• Develop and implement sustainable transport incentives for employees between 15\textsuperscript{th} January 2010 (M17) and 15\textsuperscript{th} September 2011 (M37)</td>
<td>• Local Education Authority School and Nursery Travel Plans produced for every school in the Civitas corridor. 37 LEA Schools and nurseries, 10 Independent Schools and 12 Independent nurseries.&lt;br&gt;• Independent School and Nursery Travel Plans produced by 15\textsuperscript{th} July 2011 (M35)&lt;br&gt;• Incentive schemes will be explored and evaluated in 22 focus LEA and Independent Schools and Nurseries&lt;br&gt;• Develop a dedicated route planner for safe school routes by 15 January 2010 (M17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A1.2 Target groups
For Commuter (Work-place) Travel Plans: Employees of businesses within the CIVITAS plus Corridor.
For School Travel Plans: Parents, carers, pupils and staff of schools within the CIVITAS Plus Corridor.

A2 Description

A2.1 Commuter (Work-Place) Travel Plans:
The main aim of this measure was to reduce the number of single car journeys by employees travelling to and from work. We aimed to achieve this by working with businesses to help them develop a Business Travel Plan, which detailed a range of measures to encourage more employees to walk, cycle, use public transport or car share. We also offered some businesses the opportunity to be involved in a range of sustainable travel initiatives and monitor the development of travel planning using a computer software package called ITrace.

A2.2 School Travel Plans:
The main aim of this measure was primarily to reduce the impact of the ‘School Run’ (parents driving their children to and from school), so as to achieve a sustained increase in the number of safe sustainable journeys to and from school. We aimed to achieve this by working with schools to develop a School Travel Plan which detailed a range of measures to encourage more children to walk, cycle, use public transport or car share. We also offered some schools and nurseries the opportunity to be involved in a range of sustainable travel initiatives and all schools were invited to use a web-based route planner that also promoted more sustainable journeys.

Both of these measures aimed to yield an important learning experience. They represent a perfect opportunity to learn about approaches to travel planning and community engagement, and to develop best practice. This is in addition to seeing actual modal shift.

A3 Person in charge for evaluation of this measure

Name of person Stephen Kelly/ Eleanor Togut (Project Managers), Sarah Jay (Local Evaluation Co-Coordinator)
Name of organisation Brighton and Hove City Council
Direct telephone 01273 291028
e-mail Stephen.kelly@brighton-hove.gov.uk, eleanor.togut@brighton-hove.gov.uk, sarah.jay@brighton-hove.gov.uk
B Measure implementation

B1 Innovative Aspects:
The innovative aspects of the measure are:

• **Use of technology/ITS** - to be used in:
The development and implementation of a computer software package, Itrace, that helped businesses and schools (see Deviation 2) develop and review their travel plans and up-date their action plans. For schools the development and implementation of a School Journey Planner to aid parents and pupils plan a safe and sustainable journey to school.

• **Targetting specific user groups:**
Throughout the life of the project we worked with sustainable travel user groups in businesses and schools to develop and implement travel incentives and initiatives.

• **New approach to travel planning and engaging with the community:**
Our 'new approach' to travel planning can be summarised as 'Measure first and travel plan second'. In order to attract the interest of schools and businesses in travel planning we offered them an incentive to work in partnership with us and this lead to the development and implementation of a travel plan. "Traditional" travel planning ordinarily leads with the development of a travel plan framework and initiatives follow as part of an action plan. With this project we started with a simple action plan and the travel plan developed as the partnership work progressed.

B2 Planning of Research and Technology Development Tasks
Not applicable

B3 Situation before CIVITAS

B3.1 Commuter Travel Plans
In the UK 41 per cent of all trips are less than two miles and nearly a quarter of all car trips are less than two miles and 56% are less than 5 miles which make a large proportion of the journeys transferable to foot, cycle or bus¹.

During peak times commuter traffic contributes significantly to congestion on many of the main routes throughout the city.

In Brighton and Hove the traditional route for a Commuter Travel Plan to be developed was as part of a planning agreement. This meant that any organisation or business that wanted to expand their premises would need to negate any environmental impact that the development had on the transport. The main method of doing this was to write a compulsory Travel Plan.

In 2007 a Commuter Travel Plan Officer was appointed. His main role was to develop compulsory Travel Plans. It was at this stage that the City started to investigate the possibility of working in partnership with businesses on developing Voluntary Travel Plans. One of the main ways of doing this was to establish a Business Travel Plan Partnership which is still running to date and brings together a number of local key businesses and organisations

---

¹ A Sustainable Future for Cycling (2008), Cycling England, Department for Transport
within the City to discuss, promote and explore innovative ways of promoting sustainable travel to and from the workplace.

The role of the CIVITAS Project was to focus and build on the Voluntary Travel Plan partnerships by supporting existing businesses to implement the sustainable travel elements of their Travel Plans. It also opened up opportunities to work with new businesses in the same way.

B3.2 School Travel Plans
In 2005 approximately 35% of all journeys to and from all schools in the City were made by car. This meant that many of the vehicles on the road during peak travel times in the city was ‘school-run’ traffic.

In 2004 the School Travel Initiative (a government initiative) facilitated the development of the first School Travel Plans in Brighton and Hove. The schools that developed and implemented a School Travel Plan were given a grant to promote the sustainable travel aims of the Plan. This fund was made available to all Local Education Authority (LEA) schools. By 2010, when the grant funding ended, all LEA schools had an approved Travel Plan in place.

However although schools had an approved Travel Plan, this did not necessarily mean they were able to action the initiatives within the plan.

Independent Schools and nurseries (under 5’s) were not eligible to apply for the government grant. As the Independent schools make up 25% of all schools in Brighton and Hove, this left a gap. There are also many small private nurseries in the City who were not engaged in the Travel Planning process.

The CIVITAS Project served to bridge the gap of encouraging sustainable travel to all schools irrespective of status and type within Brighton and Hove. The CIVITAS Project also enabled schools to implement the initiatives within their Travel Plans.

B4 Actual implementation of the measure
The measure was implemented in the following stages:

B4.1 Commuter Travel Plans
Stage 1 Planning and data collection (M4 to M17).
This included investigating the appropriateness of a Travel Planning programme called i-trace to see if this served to collect data effectively.
Evaluation indicators and methodologies were also established.
We identified businesses and approached a number of organisations and businesses to see if they were interested in developing a Travel Plan.
We established links with the Commuter Travel Plan Officer to enhance his work and that of the Commuter Travel Plan Partnership.
Stage 2  Implementation and impact evaluation (M5 to M37).

We developed Commuter Travel Plans with 17 out of an anticipated 20 employers in Brighton and Hove.

We continued to identify businesses and approach a number of organisations and businesses to see if they were interested in developing a Travel Plan. Part of this work was carried out through the Commuter Travel Plan Partnership.

We worked with businesses to develop a number of sustainable travel initiatives as part of the Travel Planning process. These included Bike to Work Week (June 2010) and Walk to Work Week (May 2011). These initiatives have been monitored and evaluated individually as stand alone projects.

We decided that i-Trace was an appropriate Travel Planning monitoring tool and therefore we used this to measure mode of travel for workplace staff in as many of the 20 employers as possible.

Stage 3  Final evaluation results and sharing of findings (M30 to M44)

Evaluation for the Commuter Travel Planning focused on the individual impacts experienced at particular businesses and implementing particular initiatives.

These findings were then brought together and referenced with awareness and acceptance surveys and an analysis of iTrace data.

Details of individual evaluation approaches can be found below.

Sharing of Findings: (Dissemination/Exploitation)

We shared our methodology of Travel Planning through training sessions/workshop and evaluation reports to the five CIVITAS cities, CIVINET and other UK Local Authorities and internal partners.

Commuter Travel Plans

Engage with 20 businesses or organisations to develop Commuter Travel Plans; Develop and implement sustainable transport incentives for employees; implement iTrace Commuter Travel Planning monitoring tool.

Implement Work Place Travel Plans:

We worked with local businesses in the CIVITAS area to develop Work Place Travel Plans. These plans provide a written framework within which businesses can develop ways of promoting sustainable travel to and from work, including walking, cycling and the use of public transport.

Our approach in developing these plans has been to build on the work of the existing Commuter Travel Officer and has focused on implementing actions within existing Travel Plans and developing new Travel Plans. Much of this work has been carried out through working with members of the Brighton and Hove Business Travel Plan Partnership.
Evaluation of the approach took place by contacting partners within local businesses through questionnaires and face-to-face interviews. This established the effectiveness of the process that we had developed which was to work with the business to find out what they need to make travel more sustainable followed by the development of the Travel Plan. We were particularly interested in analysing the effectiveness of developing a good rapport and enabling clear lines of communication.

**Implement Sustainable Travel Incentives for Employees:**

**Dr Bike Sessions – Study Group Language School**

The Study Group Language School moved into new premises near to Brighton station in 2009. Partnership work between the Study Group Travel Co-ordinator and CIVITAS enabled a Dr Bike bicycle maintenance day to take place. Throughout the day 45 members of staff either had their bicycle checked or engaged with us about cycling-related matters.

**Cycle Storage – Brighton and Hove Buses**

Brighton and Hove Buses is a long-term member of the Business Travel Plan Partnership and as a business are keen to support all forms of sustainable transport. The key link with the organisation has been through their Senior Staff Manager and Travel Plan Co-ordinator.

Although they had a basic Travel Plan in place, through the work with CIVITAS, the organisation has achieved three key measures:

- Regular monitoring and collating of how staff travel to work by using the iTrace questionnaire annually
- Installation of secure cycle storage at two out of the three sites and monitoring of the difference that the storage has made
- A more comprehensive Travel Plan
Figure 1: Staff Cycle Storage – Conway Street site, Brighton and Hove Buses

- Spin-off benefits from partnership work with CIVITAS have been:
  - Tax-free bike scheme taking place annually – during 2010, 35 members of staff took part in the scheme
  - A greater regular flow of communication between Brighton and Hove City Council and Brighton and Hove Buses regarding sustainable travel

As part of the Evaluation, we measured the impact of the Travel Plan approach by interviewing the Senior Staff manager. We analysed the modal split by working through data from the iTrace programme and measuring CO2 through analysing the bike count surveys.

**Cycle Training Initiative - Sussex Police**

Sussex Police have embraced encouraging their staff to cycle to work and are keen supporters of the B&H Business Travel Plan Partnership. In order to encourage new staff to try cycling to work, we worked in partnership with the Travel Plan Co-ordinator to put on a ‘Dr. Bike’ day with the opportunity of staff taking up cycle training. 50 employees visited the event. The idea was to build up confidence through the cycle training and enable staff to cycle to work safely and confidently.

Evaluation of the partnership work involved measuring the short term and long term impact of the cycling training. This was achieved by using findings from the initial training, and comparing it to current cycling trends.

**Walk to Work Week at Sussex Community NHS Trust and Brighton and Hove City Council**
Sussex Community NHS Trust has many sites across East and West Sussex. The partnership work that was carried out through CIVITAS included:

- Installation of a shower and changing unit for cyclists
- A Walk to Work Week initiative
- A Focus Group Evaluation and report on how the participants found the initiative. 8 people took part in the Focus Group
- An enhanced evaluation to discover how to make walking sustainable

The Evaluation aimed to reveal:

- What main features from the Walk to Work Week initiative are effective to increase walking among staff in this organisation through the Focus Group Evaluation
- What other changes/initiatives the organisation could put into effect to sustain an increase in walking among staff by working in more depth with staff from September-December 2011

Implementation of the ‘iTrace’ computer package to monitor Commuter Travel Plan development

‘iTrace’ enables businesses to record and monitor the development of their staff travel to and from work. Using the computer package with businesses in Brighton and Hove enabled the CIVITAS team to start to create a baseline of travel habits among employees in Brighton and Hove. By 2010, 29 businesses, organisations or sites (both in and out of the CIVITAS corridor) had completed an iTrace survey.

We used the modal split reports generated by iTrace as part of our final evaluation.

B4.2 School Travel Plans

The measure was implemented in the following stages:

Stage 1  Planning and data collection (M1 (Schools), M4 - M17 (Work))

This included investigating the appropriateness of a Travel Planning programme called iTrace to see if it would serve to collect data effectively. We also considered the effectiveness of the School Census as a means of establishing an appropriate baseline.

We identified and approached schools to encourage them to develop a Travel Plan.

We identified Focus Schools and Nurseries for implementation of School Travel Plan initiatives.

Stage 2  Implementation and impact evaluation (M1 to M35)
This included the development and implementation of School Travel Plans in 37 LEA schools, 6 independent schools, 1 academy, and 6 Nursery schools.

We implemented sustainable travel initiatives in 22 focus schools/nurseries. These included the Pedometer Challenge (May 2010), The Golden Flip Flop (2009-2011) and Scooter Training (January and May 2011).

We identified that the School Census would be an appropriate way to measure Journey Share. Although we considered iTrace as a monitoring tool, we decided that the programme was not sufficiently well developed to be effective.

Stage 3  Final evaluation results and sharing of findings (M30 to M44)

Timetable:

Evaluation for the School Travel Planning focused on the individual impacts experienced at particular schools and implementing particular initiatives.

These findings were then brought together and referenced with awareness and acceptance surveys and an analysis of School Census data.

Details of individual evaluation approaches can be found below.

Sharing of Findings: (Dissemination/Exploitation)

We shared our methodology of Travel Planning through training sessions/workshops and through evaluation reports to the five CIVITAS cities, CIVINET and other UK Local Authorities and internal partners.

School Travel Plans

Implement Local Authority School Travel Plans:
We worked with 37 Local Authority Schools in the CIVITAS area to develop School Travel Plans. These plans provide a written framework within which schools can develop ways of promoting sustainable travel to and from school, including walking, cycling and greater use of public transport.

Our approach in developing these plans was to build on the work of the School Travel Team and has focused on implementing actions within a School Travel Plan. For example, a school may have wanted to promote walking and we have supported them in doing this by offering them the opportunity to take part in a Walking Initiative.

A typical plan contains a survey of travel habits of both pupils and staff, issues that the school community face that might be a barrier to safe, sustainable travel options, as well as what the school is doing to promote walking and cycling.

Some schools analyse the results of the surveys themselves, but in others we have undertaken this task for them and have produced graphs of the results. Included in this report is an exemplar school travel plan from a school that has engaged in the school travel planning process since 2002.
**Implement Independent School Travel Plans**
Independent Schools are privately funded and outside Local Authority control. However, due to a variety of reasons, Independent Schools have a significantly higher proportion of cars being used on the ‘school-run’ and our approach has always been to include them in the school travel planning process should they wish to be involved. The CIVITAS project has meant that we have been able to engage with 7 Independent Schools. Our approach has been the same as that of Local Authority Schools, offering them the opportunity to work in partnership with us to look at the issues around promoting sustainable travel and supporting them with a range of practical initiatives to encourage walking, cycling, scooting and use of public transport.

**Implement Nursery School Travel Plans**
These have been completed in 6 schools using a similar approach to that used in Local Authority and Independent Schools.

In one nursery we installed some cycle storage for staff (8 spaces) and attended open evenings to carry out travel surveys. Incentives were offered to complete the surveys. We also worked with two families to find out what their barriers to walking were. A travel diary in one nursery was also produced, a sample of which can be found in the Appendix.

As part of the final evaluation we returned to a nursery that had recently completed a travel plan and asked them to share their experiences of the travel plan process.

![Roundabout Nursery and Children’s Centre staff enjoy their new cycle storage](image)

**Figure 3: Roundabout Nursery and Children’s Centre staff enjoy their new cycle storage**

Since the start of the School-Travel Initiative in 2004, one of the main ways of engaging with schools in travel planning and promoting sustainable travel has been to install cycle storage. As part of our CIVITAS work with nurseries we installed cycle storage in an attempt to find
out how important the installation has been in keeping the nursery on-track with the development of their travel plan.

As part of the final evaluation we also reported on the methodology used in supporting all types of schools in developing and implementing a school travel plan.

**Initiatives to promote sustainable travel to schools**

Below are summaries of the evaluations of initiatives that took place during the School Travel measure. Full versions of these can be found in the Appendices.

**Pedometer Challenge Initiative**

To evaluate the effectiveness of incentive-based walking schemes in schools in Brighton and Hove we joined forces with the School Travel Team, the JourneyOn Team and Brighton & Hove School Sport Partnership.

The Walk to School Week Challenge is a bi-annual event, which has been supported by the School Travel Team at Brighton & Hove City Council for at least six years. The event is promoted in May and in October each year during the nationally celebrated Walk to School Week.

In May 2010 we added another element to the Walk to School event, by introducing a Pedometer Challenge. Twelve schools were invited to compete in this challenge by measuring their walking journeys using a personal pedometer. Approximately 360 children took part. Focus Group sessions were also carried out at two of the schools participating.

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 4: The Pedometer Challenge was enjoyed as part of Walk to School Week**

A full evaluation of this Initiative took place in summer 2010 and these results have been added to the final evaluation to get an overall picture of the impact of ‘Walking Initiatives’.
Golden Flip-Flop Walking Initiative
The Golden Flip Flop is an incentive-based walking scheme aimed at encouraging primary age children in Brighton and Hove to walk to school.

The scheme was developed during 2008 and was run as a pilot with children (approximately 90 children) age 4-5 in three primary schools in 2008/9.

Following an evaluation of the pilot, alterations were made including changing the resources offered, the length of time for which the scheme ran and the age of the children involved. The scheme with changes (2\textsuperscript{nd} Round) was then run in 5 schools in the first half of the autumn term 2010. Approximately 200 children were involved.

Stickers, certificates and badges were awarded to the children for making an effort to walk to school. For those with special needs the scheme was adapted so that they could take part, should they wished.

The five schools competed with each other over four weeks to see who could walk the greatest number of school journeys and the winning school was awarded the Golden Flip Flop Trophy.

Figure 5: Coldean Primary School - Winners of the Golden Flip-Flop Challenge

Scooter Training Initiative
Over the past few years, more and more pupils seem to be scooting to school, as it is fun and faster than walking. The School Travel Team saw this as an opportunity to offer scooter training to a selected number of school children and assess its impact.

A pilot scooter-training scheme was organised by one of the School Travel Advisors and the Bikeability team who provided expert advice on the content of the course and organised the trainers. We also consulted with the BHCC Child Pedestrian Training Co-ordinator.

Through the review of their school travel plan, some schools had expressed an interest in our pilot scheme. We gave priority to schools that were in the process of reviewing their plan and with whom we had developed a positive working relationship. Moreover, we were keen to work with those schools we were already working with to install scooter storage.

School children, aged 6-7, in three schools took part in the pilot scheme (in autumn 2010). Since then, 12 schools in total have taken part with approximately 300 children being trained.

We were also keen to see how the scooter training would be received in nursery schools. In June 2011, we ran the training in a nursery school with three members of staff from other nurseries observing with a view to running it in their own schools.

Figure 6: Scooter training with Nursery-age children which was observed by staff from a number of nurseries

Scooter Storage Initiative (installation)
CIVITAS has paid for the installation of scooter storage in 4 schools. We are interested in finding out if scooter storage alone is enough to increase scooting numbers.
The numbers of children using scooters prior to installation was counted, and after counts were also conducted as part of the evaluation to see if the numbers of children scooting has increased over time.

**School Journey Planner**

We have worked with the City Councils' JourneyOn Team to implement a newly developed School Journey Planner, which was aimed at helping children, families and schools to plan a safe and sustainable journey to school.

The Journey Planner also has lots of interesting information about different ways of travelling to and from school and will show the amount of carbon used in a typical vehicular journey compared to one of walking or cycling.

Road safety is at the heart of any school travel plan and the Journey Planner also includes what road safety features e.g. controlled crossings can be found on a journey to school.

Before launching the Journey Planner was tested with three schools and we got feedback from the children and staff.

The Journey Planner can be viewed at [www.journeyon.co.uk/schools](http://www.journeyon.co.uk/schools)

**B5 Inter-relationships with other measures**

The measure is related to other measures as follows:

- Measure 10 – Emissions VMS (both) – Suggested initial contacts
- Measure 44 – Road Safety Campaign (both) – Safer routes to school
- Measure 71 – Personalised Travel Plans – JourneyOn (both) – Pedometer Challenge
C Planning of Impact evaluation

C1 Measurement Methodology

C1.1 Impacts and Indicators

C1.1.0 Scope of Impact

The predominant indicators for this measure are vehicle related; measuring modal split and vehicle occupancy. (see Deviation 4) This has mainly been done using ‘Hands-Up’ surveys for schools, and iTrace surveys for businesses. For environmental monitoring the original intention was to use the online ‘JourneyOn planner’ to measure CO2 emissions of individual trips. However, after initial testing the JourneyOn planner has proved impractical for this task and therefore school census and modal split information will be used to derive CO2 monitoring.

Environment – Pollution levels will be explored in order to assess the impact the Travel Plans have upon the environment. CO2 emissions will be estimated using national average emission data in conjunction with average journey times to and from school/work. This will produce an estimate of CO2 saving per vehicle taken off the road. The modal split data will then be used to estimate how far emission levels have been improved through the measure.

Society – This indicator will monitor the acceptance of the Travel Plans. Awareness and acceptance surveys will be conducted via interviews with members of staff at both schools and workplaces. School children will also be surveyed to see whether the information learned during specific initiatives is retained long-term. Overall this will provide an assessment of the longevity of the positive impacts of the Travel Plans measure.

Transport – This indicator will mainly focus on modal split, and the impact the Travel Plans measure has upon it. This will include average modal split for passengers, vehicles, and trips. This data will be obtained through school ‘Hands Up’ surveys, and iTrace workplace surveys. Both surveys types have their pros and cons, which will be explored in order to achieve a balanced assessment of the changing use of modes in the Civitas corridor. Vehicle occupancy will also be looked at, however survey data for this indicator is harder to find.
**Measure title:** Travel plans in Brighton & Hove  
**City:** Brighton and Hove  
**Project:** Archimedes  
**Measure number:** 32

### C1.1.1 Selection of indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>EVALUATION CATEGORY</th>
<th>EVALUATION SUB-CATEGORY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATA /UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Pollution/Nuisance</td>
<td>Emissions</td>
<td>CO2 emissions</td>
<td>CO2 per vkm by type</td>
<td>quantitative, derived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SOCIETY</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Awareness level</td>
<td>Awareness of the policies/measures</td>
<td>qualitative, survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance level</td>
<td>Acceptance level</td>
<td>Attitude survey of current acceptance of the measure</td>
<td>qualitative, survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>TRANSPORT</td>
<td>Modal split - passengers</td>
<td>Average modal split - passengers</td>
<td>Percentage of passenger – km for each mode</td>
<td>%, quantitative, derived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modal split - vehicles</td>
<td>Average modal split - vehicles</td>
<td>Percentage of vehicle – km for each mode</td>
<td>%, quantitative, derived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle occupancy</td>
<td>Average occupancy</td>
<td>Mean no. persons per vehicle/day, per mode</td>
<td>Persons/vehicle, quantitative, derived, measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modal split</td>
<td>Average modal split-trips</td>
<td>Percentage of trips for each mode</td>
<td>quantitative, derived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C1.1.2 Methods for evaluation of indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>TARGET VALUE</th>
<th>Source of data and methods</th>
<th>Frequency of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Modal Split – Passengers</td>
<td>Reduction in number of single car journeys to and from businesses or schools</td>
<td>ITrace surveys were used to monitor numbers of passengers for Business Travel Plans. Most businesses were invited to take part in the ITrace survey in September each year with responses collated in January. The National School Census (compulsory) survey was used to monitor numbers of passengers in Local Authority (LA) Schools. For Independent Schools (usually fee-paying) modal split was monitored by a voluntary ‘hands – up’ surveys. Both surveys required pupils to answer the question ‘How do you usually travel to school?’ In LA schools the mode of travel was collected by a school administrator and sent to the Department for Children, Families and Schools (DCFS) for analysis and distribution. The census took place in January and results published in August. 2011 was the last year that the ‘Mode of Travel’ question will be included on the School Census. For Independent schools it is not compulsory to complete a travel survey,</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>TARGET VALUE</td>
<td>Source of data and methods</td>
<td>Frequency of Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Modal Split - Vehicles</td>
<td>Reduction in number of single car journeys to and from businesses or schools</td>
<td>IT Trace surveys were used to monitor numbers of vehicles for Business Travel Plans. The School Census and Hands-Up surveys were used to monitor numbers of vehicles for School Travel Plans. (as above).</td>
<td>Annually - usually in Sept – Jan each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Average Vehicle Occupancy</td>
<td>Reduction in number of single car journeys to and from businesses or schools</td>
<td>Vehicle occupancy was obtained from IT Trace surveys for Business Travel Plans (timetable as above) and from the School Census and Hand Up surveys for School Travel Plans.</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Modal Split - Trips</td>
<td>Reduction in the number of car journeys to and from businesses or schools during and following incentives and initiatives</td>
<td>Modal split survey before, during and following an initiative or incentive scheme with focus businesses or schools/groups. In schools this information was gathered via the School Census (as above) and checked with a hands-up survey before, during and following the initiative. The surveys will count numbers cycling to school, numbers of parked bicycles at schools, numbers of scooters, numbers walking and other modes.</td>
<td>Immediately before initiative, during and then immediately after and several months later to measure for sustainability of measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Acceptance – Awareness of measure</td>
<td>Awareness levels raised</td>
<td>Survey of target group (school or business) asking if the measure has been heard of before, during and after event/initiative/incentive. 5 schools and 5 businesses were selected as ‘Case Studies’ as a way of measuring acceptance and awareness. During the case studies a one-to-one interview took place between a CIVITAS Travel Plan Project Officer and the Travel Plan Co-ordinator or person who has led the initiative. The 22 focus group schools were also sent a questionnaire to complete aimed at gauging acceptance of the measure. This took place in between September 2011 and December 2011. Businesses were approached with a similar questionnaire via the Business Travel Plan Partnership Meeting held in September 2011.</td>
<td>As part of the final evaluation between Sept 11 – March 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Acceptance – Acceptance of measure</td>
<td>Acceptance levels raised</td>
<td>Survey of target group (school or business) asking if the measure has been generally ‘accepted’ before, during and after event/initiative/incentive (see methods as in 13 above)</td>
<td>As part of the final evaluation, between Sept 11– March 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pollution – levels of CO2 emissions</td>
<td>Reduction in CO2 levels for focus schools</td>
<td>The ‘JourneyOn Planner’ was to be used to convert user group journeys into ‘journey to work carbon footprint’ prior to, during and after initiative. However on application it was found that using the Journey On Planner was not appropriate so this indicator was measured using school census and modal split data.</td>
<td>Immediately before initiative, during and then immediately after and several months later to measure the sustainability of measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure title: Travel plans in Brighton & Hove
City: Brighton and Hove  Project: Archimedes  Measure number: 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>TARGET VALUE</th>
<th>Source of data and methods</th>
<th>Frequency of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C1.1.3 Planning of before and after data collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION TASK</th>
<th>INDICATORS INVOLVED</th>
<th>COMPLETED BY (DATE)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE ORGANISATION AND PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Monitoring</td>
<td>Environment (8)</td>
<td>M10 – 11, M23, M34</td>
<td>Stephen Kelly/Eleanor Togut BHCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Deviation 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>M43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys – In target group (e.g. with businesses - PCT)</td>
<td>Society (13, 14)</td>
<td>M9 &amp; M10,M22 &amp; 34</td>
<td>Stephen Kelly/Eleanor Togut BHCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(tbc) - M43</td>
<td>(tbc) - M43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal Split –Manual cycle counts, iTrace, school census/hands up survey</td>
<td>Transport (26 - 29)</td>
<td>M16, M28 – M43</td>
<td>Stephen Kelly/Eleanor Togut BHCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12.2 Baseline and first results from data collection</td>
<td>All indicators</td>
<td>Month 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12.3 Draft results template available</td>
<td>All indicators</td>
<td>Month 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12.4 Final version of results template available</td>
<td>All indicators</td>
<td>Month 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C1.2 Establishing a Baseline

The approach used to establish a baseline for this measure was to monitor the number and type of journeys made to businesses and schools in Brighton & Hove. The emphasis is put upon changing travel behaviour by promoting travel alternatives; therefore before data on the number of single occupancy commuting trips and school run trips must be appraised.

Data obtained/surveys undertaken to establish baseline:
- iTrace data for 2006/7 for a small number of businesses in Brighton & Hove, including some within the Civitas corridor
- School Census data for 2006/7 for all state schools in Brighton & Hove, including those within the Civitas corridor
- ‘Hands up’ surveys for private schools in Brighton & Hove
- Details of Walk to School week which engages all schools in Brighton & Hove (8 years historical data)
- 2001 National Census data for Brighton & Hove (plus 2007 snapshot).

C1.3 Building the Business-as-Usual scenario

This Business as Usual scenario will examine the situation outside of the CIVITAS Travel Plans measure, highlighting the factors which have potentially impacted upon the findings of the measure. These factors combined will demonstrate what the scenario would have been (surrounding the evaluation indicators) should the measure not have been implemented. From this we can hope to identify the specific impact of the Travel Plans measure alone.

Included in this scenario is an appraisal of:
- Additional Civitas measures and how they impact upon sustainable travel in B&H
- Brighton and Hove City Council work programme and it’s impact upon sustainable travel in B&H
- Local, national, and international factors influencing sustainable travel in B&H

Related measures and their potential impacts:

Measure No. 10 Emissions VMS (both)

- The Emissions VMS measure will be implementing initiatives in schools to reduce emissions from associated traffic. It will therefore have a similar impact as is expected for the Travel Plans. 2 out of 3 of the schools engaged in the Emissions VMS measure are also engaged in the School Travel Plans measure (Elm Grove and St Bartholomew’s). It will be important to try and disentangle the impacts of the two measures.

Measure No. 44 Road Safety Campaign (both)

- The Road Safety Campaign aims to raise awareness of safety issues and the presence of other users, whilst at the same time implementing hard measures to reduce casualties. Potentially this could impact modal shift in the areas of implementation (London Road and Lewes Road), as well as affecting awareness and acceptance of alternative modes of transport.
Measure No. 31  Personalised Travel Plans (both)

- The PTP measure will increase awareness of sustainable transport modes as well as disseminating specific information regarding travel planning. Alongside this the measure will attempt to affect modal shift in the area of implementation (which changes year by year), which will undoubtedly coincide with the location of schools and businesses engaged in travel planning.

Measure No. 71  Personalised Travel Information Website (both)

- The Personalised Travel Information Website (JourneyOn) is a source of varied information regarding sustainable travel and therefore aids raising awareness, as well as encouraging modal shift. It also has a school journey planner which was utilised as part of the School Travel Plans measure.

Measure No. 55  Cyclist priority (both)

- The Cyclist Priority measure will be directly encouraging cycling on and around the academic corridor in Brighton & Hove. This is likely to affect cycling levels in the areas of schools and workplaces engaged in travel planning.

Related BHCC initiatives/works and their potential impacts:

Possibly the most important factor for the Business as Usual scenario, is the work of the School and Commuter Travel Teams at BHCC prior to and during the implementation of the CIVITAS Travel Plan measure.

- School Travel Team programme at Brighton & Hove City Council. This programme of work included the delivery of:
  - Travel Plans
  - Walk to School Week and Walk to School Month
  - Walking Buses
  - Walking Initiatives
  - How do you Travel to School (Information Booklet for parents and children)
  - School Keep Clears - engineering measures outside schools
  - The team consults with other teams about parking enforcement and engineering measures
  - Data collection of “How do you travel to School”

- Road Safety Team programme at Brighton and Hove City Council. This programme of work included the delivery of:
  - Child Pedestrian Training
  - Bicycle Training (Bikeability)
  - School Crossing Patrols
  - Safer Routes to School (Engineering Team)
  - Road Safety Education
• Bike-it - some of the schools receive assistance in promoting cycling via the SUSTRANS Bike-It scheme. Bike-It schools receive a number of fun, promotional events and competitions throughout the year aimed at encouraging more children to cycle regularly to school. The scheme has been running for a number of years now and has been very well received by schools.
• The Cycling England programme facilitated improved provision for cyclists in Brighton & Hove with the implementation of: Advance Stop Lines (ASLs), cycle lanes, cycle parking, and cycle training in schools (Bikeability). Funding for this project was received 2006-2011. Data from this project was passed on to Sustrans\(^2\) for analysis, and it was found that between 2006 and 2009 there had been a 27% increase in cycling in the city. Since 2009 this increase has been maintained.
• Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) 2011/12. New funding for sustainable transport initiatives focussed on the Lewes Road corridor (within the CIVITAS corridor). Most works will be post-Civitas timeframe however there could be some impact upon post data collection. To be confirmed.
• Local Transport Plan (LTP). City targets for transport which include reducing single occupancy car journeys and increasing cycling. It also includes targets for improving air quality in Brighton & Hove. The work packages that are driven by the LTP will inevitably impact upon the findings of all of the Civitas measures.
• The impact of other sustainable travel initiatives happening within Brighton and Hove, but outside the scope of the Civitas Project.

**External factors and their potential impacts:**

• National and international commitments to tackling global warming and reducing emissions – political support for sustainable transport solutions, more funds available.
• Increasing cost of fuel – as standard forms of fuel become more and more expensive there is likely to be a shift to more sustainable transport usage.
• Green administration newly elected in Brighton & Hove (May 2011) – on a local level, the new administration in Brighton & Hove are likely to look much more favourably on sustainable transport schemes.
• 10:10 campaign. Brighton & Hove City Council signed up to the 10:10 campaign which sought to reduce world emissions by 10% in 2010.

**C2 Measure results**

**C2.1 Commuter Travel Plans**

Results for the commuter travel plans will look at the general travel information for businesses in Brighton & Hove from the iTrace surveys. i-Trace is a Travel Plan Management Application which allows a robust, standardised approach to making like for like comparisons on Travel Plan data – from one year to the next, from one organisation to the next. Many of the businesses engaged in the commuter travel planning measure have agreed to complete

\(^2\) UK Sustainable Transport Charity
the iTrace survey. However, the strength of the data is wholly reliant upon businesses engaging with the survey on a yearly basis; this is not always the case.

The following initiatives took place as part of the commuter travel plans work programme:

- Walk to Work Week – Focus Group Evaluation
- Walk to Work Week – Social Marketing Scoping Project
- Bike Maintenance Days – Sussex Police, Study Group and Primary Care Trust

The full evaluation of the Focus Group Evaluation and the Social Marketing Scoping Project can be found in the Appendices.

In addition specific Case Studies have been carried out of individual businesses were explored in order to highlight the varying successes and findings of different experiences. The full version of these can be found in the Appendices.

Case Studies:

- Sussex Police – Complete travel plan experience
- Brighton and Hove Buses – Complete travel plan experience and cycle storage implementation
- Study Group – Complete travel plan experience and cycle storage implementation

**iTrace**

Initial results obtained from iTrace are displayed below. Due to the relatively recent implementation of iTrace there are limited data for workplaces; some have only started completing the survey in 2010, others started earlier but have not followed through year on year (only 46% of businesses surveyed in the Awareness/Acceptance survey (below) had used iTrace, and half of them had a negative experience). This makes assessing modal shift across the whole commuter travel plan measure problematic. With more years of operation, and a stronger commitment from businesses to complete the surveys, the data will be far more useful.

**25 businesses completed iTrace surveys in 2010**

**29 businesses completed iTrace surveys in 2011**

Figure 7: Percentage share of modes to travel to work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Percentage share of modes to travel to work.
Sussex Police

Three Police Stations in Brighton & Hove completed the survey in 2010. Out of these three only the John Street station was involved in Civitas Travel Planning. Therefore a direct comparison can be formed between those engaged and those not.

In this example, the Police Station involved in the measure shows a lower percentage of car and motorcycle trips, and a higher percentage of public transport, bicycle, and walking trips.

Figure 9: Modal comparison of Sussex Police stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>John Street</th>
<th>Crowhurst Road</th>
<th>Holland Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Modal comparison of Sussex Police stations
Measure title: Travel plans in Brighton & Hove
City: Brighton and Hove Project: Archimedes Measure number: 32

![Modal Split for three Police Stations in Brighton & Hove (2010)](image)

**Brighton & Hove Bus and Coach Company**
Both workplaces sited below were involved in the Civitas measure. In this case their differing results can be attributed to their locations in Brighton & Hove and the accessibility of services; Conway Street bus depot is directly adjacent to Hove railway station and good bus links to the rest of the city, therefore its public transport share in significantly high whereas its car share is much lower (lower even than the average over all businesses completing iTrace surveys in 2010). In contrast Whitehawk Road shows a much higher percentage of single occupancy car journeys.

**Conway Street**
Figure 11: Modal comparison 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Modal comparison 2010-11
Figure 13: Modal comparison 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The significant shift in car trips from 2010 – 11 can most likely be attributed to a parking scheme adjacent to the depot. The increased cost of parking would have potentially encouraged employees not to drive their cars to and from work.

**Awareness/Acceptance Survey**
Survey was conducted at the Business Travel Plan Partnership Meeting on 14 September 2011. The survey was subsequently emailed to any businesses not present at the meeting. 26 businesses responded to the survey. A summary of results is contained below.

**Q.1  Are you aware of the Civitas/Travel Plan project?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 (73%)</td>
<td>6 (23%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.2  Are you aware of/have you been involved in any of the following travel planning initiatives at your place of work?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Parking/Storage</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Training</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Plans</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 (11.5%) out of the 26 businesses surveyed responded that they hadn’t had any involvement.
Q.3  What impact do you feel these initiatives have had upon travelling in Brighton & Hove?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 (85%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.6  Have you had any experience of using iTrace?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 (46%)</td>
<td>13 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.7  What was your experience of using iTrace?

Out of the 12 people that said they had used iTrace, 11 answered this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 (55%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C2.1.1  Society

Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Before (date)</th>
<th>B-a-U (date)</th>
<th>After (Sept 2011)</th>
<th>Difference: After-Before</th>
<th>Difference: After-BaU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Awareness level</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Acceptance level</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C2.1.3  Transport

Transport System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 Modal Split - vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C2.2 School Travel Plans

Results for the school travel plans were divided up by looking at the different initiatives that have taken place across different schools, and analysing the data that has been collected during these initiatives and alongside the whole measure. In addition specific case studies of individual schools were be explored in order to highlight the varying successes and findings of different experiences.

The following initiatives have taken place as part of the school travel plans work programme:

- Pedometer Challenge
- Golden Flip Flop initiative
- Scooter Training
- Scooter Storage
- Bicycle Storage
- Walk to School Week
- Journey Planner
- Walk Once a Week (non-Civitas funded initiative, but one which compliments the school travel plans evaluation).

Data collection:

- Initiative specific data
- Case study specific data
- School Census Data (‘Hands-Up’ surveys conducted annually at State schools)
- Independent Hands-Up surveys (conducted annually at Independent schools)
- ‘Bike It’ Hands-Up surveys (non-Civitas funded initiative, but one which includes data which will compliment and support the evaluation of this measure).

Case Studies:

- Downs Junior school - complete travel plan experience
- Roundabout Nursery -complete travel plan experience and cycle storage implementation
Both summaries of the case studies are included in the Appendices.

A summary of the Golden Flip Flop Walking Initiative and the Pedometer Challenge Walk to School Week initiative can be found below. A fuller version of these case studies and that of the Scooter Training can be found in the Appendices.

The robustness of the data listed above can and does vary significantly. It is perceived that the school census data is the least reliable (despite being nationally recognised) as some schools fail to conduct the surveys thoroughly or correctly. In general the Independent Hands-Up surveys tend to be more reliable, and the Bike It surveys and initiative specific data the most reliable of all.

All data will be treated equally and where possible cross-referenced to create the clearest and most robust conclusions.

**State School Census Data**

From 2007-2011, The Department for Education (DfE) collected data on Local Education Authority pupils and schools through the School Census, which is also known as PLASC (Pupil Level Annual School Census).

The school census is an annual Hands-Up survey of school children to determine the mode of transport employed to get to school on that day. It is conducted in January each year, only by state schools.

It was mandatory for all schools with a school travel plan (STP) to collect ‘usual mode of travel to school data’ and to include it each year in their Spring Census return. For schools that did not have a school travel plan the collection of mode of travel to school data, via the School Census, was voluntary. Data was collected for all pupils in schools (i.e. includes those younger than 5 and older than 16). ³

In 2011, the “usual mode of travel to school data” question in the School Census was made optional by The Department for Education.

In 2012 Brighton and Hove City Council’s School Travel team devised a way to continue collecting the data via a City-wide consultation portal which each Local Authority School has access to. This has enabled a continuous flow of data collection.

Previous to 2012, the schools used various methods to collect data for the DfE School Census. The question for these surveys was ‘How do you usually travel to school?’ The

³ Where a pupil uses more than one mode of travel for each journey to school, the longest element of the journey by distance should be recorded. For example a pupil who travels 5 miles by car and then walks the last mile to school, then their usual mode of travel should be recorded as Car / Van. Car share covers both informal car share arrangements and formal car share schemes.

If a pupil uses different modes of travel throughout the week and the most frequently used weekly mode cannot be determined, then the most commonly used mode throughout the academic year must be recorded. Pupils whose usual mode of travel is by scooter, skateboard or roller skates / blades should record their usual mode of travel as Walking.
method used to collect data in 2012, via the council portal, was by hands-up surveys in class. The question for this survey was ‘How did you travel to school today?’

Both methods of collecting “Travel to School Data” gives a nationally accepted snapshot of travel to school behaviour and can chart any patterns in modal shift throughout the year preceding, during, and after the Civitas initiative.

The results below show the percentage share of modes to state schools in 2007 (base year) and 2011 (after year). The data is divided into Schools within the Civitas Corridor and Schools outside of the Civitas Corridor (those outside of the Civitas Corridor will be treated as the Control/BaU).

### 2007 Base Year

![Figure 15: Baseline modal comparison of schools within and outside of the Civitas corridor](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIVITAS Schools</th>
<th>Non-CIVITAS Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 16: Baseline modal comparison of schools within and outside of the Civitas corridor](image)
The base year shows car trips exactly even between the schools to be involved in the Civitas initiative and those not to be involved. Walking is already much higher in the Civitas schools (11% higher); however this is counterbalanced by far more journeys in non-Civitas schools being taken by public transport (9%). Local knowledge explains these differences as being largely due to differing catchment areas for the schools in the different areas (there is a large quantity of schools not involved in Civitas which are serviced by school buses due to the sporadic nature of their pupils).

**2011 After Year**

Figure 17: After modal comparison of schools within and outside of the Civitas corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIVITAS Schools</th>
<th>Non-CIVITAS Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: After modal comparison of schools within and outside of the Civitas corridor
The most significant change by 2011 has been in the number of car journeys to school. In the Civitas schools they are down by 13% on 2007; in the non-Civitas they are down by 8%. This suggests a general trend in the reduction of car journeys, which has potentially been accelerated by the Civitas initiative. Walking trips have increased in both groups of schools; by 9% in Civitas schools and 7% in non-Civitas. The gap between public transport use has reduced to only 7%, due to a 3% increase in Civitas schools comparable to a 1% increase in the non-Civitas schools. Cycling levels have remained fairly unaffected.

The data below focuses more closely on Car trips and Walking trips in the two groups of schools, comparing how the modes have changed in use over the 5 years analysed.

**Car Trips**

Figure 19: Comparison of car trips to schools within and outside of the Civitas corridor during the lifetime of the measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIVITAS Schools</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-CIVITAS Schools</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20: Comparison of car trips to schools within and outside of the Civitas corridor during the lifetime of the measure
As noted above, the number of car trips to school has been steadily reducing in both groups of schools. However, the graph above demonstrates how the relative rate of decrease is growing wider year on year with no % difference in 2007, 1% in 2008, 3% in 2009, 4% in 2010, and 5% in 2011.

**Walking Trips**

Figure 21: Comparison of walking trips to schools within and outside of the Civitas corridor during the lifetime of the measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIVITAS Schools</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CIVITAS Schools</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22: Comparison of walking trips to schools within and outside of the Civitas corridor during the lifetime of the measure
The comparative increase in the number of walking trips has remained fairly constant over the 5 years, except in 2010 where walking in Civitas schools actually decreased by 1% whereas in non-Civitas schools it increased by 4% from 2009. In 2011, non-Civitas schools maintained the same level of walking, whereas Civitas schools actually increased walking rates by 4% from 2010.

**Independent Hands-Up Survey Data**

The school census detailed above does not include the Independent schools in Brighton & Hove, however a certain number of these schools complete independent Hands-Up surveys conducted in much the same way as the state schools census.

In a similar problem to that experienced with the iTrace surveys for commuter travel plans, the independent hands-up surveys suffer from a lack of commitment from schools to complete the surveys on a regular basis.

An analysis of year on year Independent Hands-Up survey data has identified that no robust conclusions can be drawn due to schools not completing the surveys on a regular consecutive basis.

However with the schools that do respond to the survey on a regular basis, we can draw the following conclusions. For 2012-12, the driving figures are lower within the CIVITAS area than outside the area as more children seem to be travelling by public or community transport. The walking figures are also lower within the CIVITAS area and this may be due to the wider catchment areas that these schools are drawing from.
Pedometer Challenge

How the Evaluation measured results

Hands up Surveys
To measure the impact of the walking initiatives, a baseline of data was collected using a ‘Hands Up’ survey with each class participating. This is a simple method of going through each mode of travel with the students and asking them which they used on a particular day. These surveys were carried out before, during, and after the initiative took place.

63 classes at 12 schools across Brighton and Hove were asked to carry out the 3 surveys, giving a total of 183 potential surveys. 96 surveys had been returned by the closing date giving a response rate of 52%. This is slightly lower than the most comparative school Travel Plan ‘hands up’ surveys, which returned an average response rate of 65% across Brighton and Hove.\(^4\)

\(^4\) School Travel Plans Response Rates to ‘Hands Up’ Surveys (Local Authority Schools only):
In order to compare pre, during and post results, only classes that returned complete sets have been included in this analysis. In total 19 classes from 7 different schools returned complete sets.

Focus Group sessions were also carried out at two of the schools participating: St Nicolas School and Downs Junior School. Two sessions were carried out at each school, one during Walk to School Week and one several weeks later. The same six children attended each 30-minute session, all of which were mediated by two council representatives. Both Focus Groups came from Year 4 (ages 8-9). The children from St Nicolas School had taken part in the Pedometer Challenge whereas those from Downs Junior School were using sticker as a reward during W2SW. This was to give a comparable picture between the two schools.

Results

Survey dates
- Pre Walk to School Week (W2SW): week commencing Monday 3rd May 2010
- During W2SW: week commencing Monday 17th May 2010
- Post W2SW: week commencing Monday 21 June 2010

Walking

Figure 23: Before, during, and after comparison of walking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>No. of classes</th>
<th>% Walking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before W2SW</td>
<td>During W2SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstone Primary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangleton Junior *</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patchham Junior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bartholomews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas *</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehawk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These schools were taking part in the Bike-it Scheme (see C1.3 Business as Usual) during this evaluation. Their results reflect the impact of the Bike-it scheme – there is a decrease in car use during and after W2SW. Whereas part of this decrease has lead to an increase in walking, it has also lead to an increase in sustainable travel (which includes cycling).

- Pre School Census Mode of Travel (2006) – approx response rate was 65%.
- Post School Census Mode of Travel – response rate approx 95%.

For this analysis the pre-School Census figure has been used, as prior to 2006/7 there was no statutory duty to provide the figures, as with W2SW. From 2006/7 schools have been required to provide this information as part of the statutory annual School Census.
Figure 24: Before, during, and after comparison

- **Average 9% increase in walking trips turning W2SW**
- **Average 4.5% sustained increase in walking trips after W2SW**

**Impact of W2SW**
These results show that across the City of Brighton and Hove, Walk to School Week had a positive impact on the number of children walking to school. Prior to W2SW an average of 59.5% of school children walked to school. In the schools listed this increased by 9% to 68.5% during W2SW.

**Lasting impact on walking numbers**
The third set of surveys were carried out 5 weeks after W2SW, giving enough time for the excitement surrounding the event to decrease and more 'normal' travel habits to resume. On average walking numbers dropped by 4.5% in the weeks following W2SW, indicating an overall increase of 4.5% from before to after W2SW.

### Car Journeys

Figure 25: Before, during, and after comparison of car journeys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>No. of classes</th>
<th>% Car Before W2SW</th>
<th>% Car During W2SW</th>
<th>% Car After W2SW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goldstone Primary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 26: Before, during, and after comparison of car journeys

- Average 10% decrease in car trips during W2SW
- Average 5% sustained decrease in car trips after W2SW

Lasting impact on car use

The results show a reduction in the number of children travelling to school by car, both during and after W2SW.

An average of 30.5% of children in the city travelled to school by car before W2SW. This number reduced by 10% to 20.5% during W2SW. In the following 5 weeks, this number increased by 5% to 25.5%, indicating an overall reduction in car travel of 5%.

Comparative Schools

At two of the Pedometer schools, Hangleton Junior and Whitehawk Primary, hands up surveys were also carried out in classes that only received stickers in order to obtain more comparative information.

Results

A complete set of data was received from one of the Hangleton classes. A second class returned pre and post results, allowing the longer term impact of W2SW to be assessed. Whitehawk Primary also returned a complete set from one of their sticker-only classes. These results are shown below in Table 2 below:
**Main Conclusions**

**Success of the Project**

**From Focus Groups**
- Overall every class shows higher walking numbers during and after W2SW.
- For these age groups the pedometers do not appear to have had more of an impact than the stickers on the number of children walking to school.
- Including a competitive element clearly adds to the excitement and helps maintain involvement throughout the week.
- The Focus Group sessions show that the children were generally excited by the Walk to School Week event, the stickers and by the competitive element. Those who also received pedometers were certainly excited by them; however they did not seem more motivated than the children who did not receive pedometers.
- The feedback from teachers indicates that while stickers are a good motivator for younger classes, older children are not very interested in them.

**Contributions to measure objectives**
The measure objectives are:
- To reduce the impact of parents driving their children to and from school and sustain the increase the number of safe, sustainable journeys
- To introduce innovative, integrated and bold strategies to reduce car journeys to and from school

**Golden Flip Flop Challenge**
How the Golden Flip Flop Evaluation measured results

Hands up Surveys
To measure the impact of the Golden Flip Flop walking initiatives, a baseline of data was collected using a ‘Hands Up’ survey with each class participating. This is a simple method of going through each mode of travel with the students and asking them which they used on a particular day. These surveys were carried out before, and after the initiative took place.

Collation of walking results
The students were responsible for the collection of their own results. Each student involved was given a weekly record chart with a number of stickers. Each time they walked into school, they awarded themselves a sticker. This took place in five schools over four weeks and involved 198 children aged between 7-8 years.

The teachers of each class involved collected the results from each student at the end of the week they would send the results to the School Travel Team officer to collate.

Feedback sessions with teachers and children
Feedback sessions took place through written questionnaires with teachers and responses from students were gained by the teacher asking the students for their views. 3 out of the 5 teachers and their classes responded.

Results

Hands Up survey
The average ‘walking’ figures (number of journeys on foot including scooting and bicycle) across the five schools before the start of the scheme was 59%. This had increased to 91% by the end of the competition.
Feedback sessions and children

- All children enjoyed taking part.
- The GFF design and prizes were well liked.
- A majority of the children enjoyed the competitive element of the scheme.
- A majority of the children said that the scheme encouraged them to walk more.
- A majority of the children said that they would have preferred to have known what the winning prize was at the beginning at the competition.

Feedback sessions with teachers

- The Golden Flip Flop incentive scheme was a good way encouraging more children to walk to school.
- The scheme ran for an appropriate length (4 weeks) of time for this age group.
- The rewards and prizes were well received and age appropriate.
- The competitive element of the scheme worked well.
- Overall, the scheme was not too onerous to administer. Collating the weekly results on the class record sheet (see below) and sending them in was the most time-consuming element for teachers.
- The scheme encouraged ‘less-active’ children to be involved.
- The scheme did not encourage ‘quiet’ children to be more involved.

Awareness/Acceptance Surveys

An awareness & acceptance survey was mailed out to participating schools in May 2012. It aimed to test the impact of the various sustainable transport initiatives implemented across the schools, and to explore any future plans for implementation.

22 surveys were sent out and 13 surveys were returned.
The participants were asked how aware they were of the CIVITAS programme. The results show that 77% of participants were aware of the CIVITAS programme.

![Chart showing awareness of CIVITAS]

Participants were also asked whether they had been “aware” or “involved” in 11 initiatives that were run during the CIVITAS School Travel programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Parking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Plans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scooter Storage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scooter Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedometer Challenge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Golden Flip Flop Challenge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to School Week</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Once a Week (W.O.W)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buggy Storage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Shelter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were asked whether they thought the initiatives had lead to a change in travel behaviour.

The results below show that scooter storage and cycle storage have lead to the most change in travel behaviour. It is worth noting that these are also the most visible to monitor so this needs to be taken into account.
Four schools were also sent a Scooter Storage Survey as scooter storage had been installed in these schools and additional feedback was required from them. This survey consisted of 6 questions.

**Has there been an increase in the number of children scooter to and from school since the installation of the storage?**

100% of the schools said YES!

**What kind of feedback have you had regarding the scooter storage?**

100% of schools said “Mostly Positive”

**When asked if the schools had any future activities planned for scooting**

All schools said “Yes”. This included: Installing more scooter storage/initiate scooter training or hold scooter events

“We had nowhere to keep scooter and teachers did not know what to do with them. Some scooters were put in classrooms and were trip hazards, while others were taken home (reluctantly) by parents. We could not encourage scooting”

“Lots of scooters blocking the pathway because they fell over”

### C2.2.2 Society

**Acceptance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Before (date)</th>
<th>B-a-U (date)</th>
<th>After (date)</th>
<th>Difference: After-Before</th>
<th>Difference: After-BaU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Awareness level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Acceptance level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The acceptance level is based on an average of acceptance levels from the 2 largest initiatives:

- During Walk to School Week 68.5% of pupils walked to school.
- During the Golden Flip Flip initiative 91% of pupils walked to school.

### C2.2.3 Transport

**Transport System**

|-----------|--------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
Measure title: Travel plans in Brighton & Hove  
City: Brighton and Hove  
Project: Archimedes  
Measure number: 32

## Modal Split - vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(2007)</th>
<th>After-Before</th>
<th>After-BaU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car – vehicles</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S – vehicles</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT – vehicles</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk – vehicles</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle – vehicles</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – vehicles</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Modal split trips (School Census data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>27</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car – trips</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S – trips</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT – trips</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk – trips</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle – trips</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – trips</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (26) Modal Split Passengers – See D1: Deviation 5
- (28) Vehicle Occupancy – See D1: Deviation 5

### C3 Achievement of quantifiable targets and objectives

#### C3.1 Commuter Travel Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Engage with 20 businesses or organisations to develop Commuter Travel Plans</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop and implement sustainable transport incentives for employees</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Implementation of ‘iTrace’ computer package to monitor Commuter Travel Plan development</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Travel Plans for Businesses - Good Practice Guide</td>
<td>Expected to achieve in full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C3.2 School Travel Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop 37 Local Authority School Travel Plans</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop 10 Independent School Travel Plans and 12 Nursery School Travel Plans</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Implement an On-line School Route/Journey Planner</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Incentive schemes will be explored and evaluated in 22 focus LEA and Independent Schools and Nurseries</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Travel Plans for Schools - Good Practice Guide</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = Not Assessed  
O = Not Achieved  
* = Substantially achieved (at least 50%)  
** = Achieved in full  
*** = Exceeded
C4 Up-scaling of Results

This measure has explored a wide variety of initiatives and events involved in promoting sustainable travel to work and school; some have had more success than others, and in some locations but not others. For successful up-scaling to take place an appraisal of what works best and where, is of the highest importance. Evaluation results include detailed case studies which demonstrate drivers and barriers of the interventions and suggest methods for future work.

This measure has proven that the featured initiatives are effective. However for initiatives to succeed they the support and engagement of schools and teachers. Any upscaling attempt must ensure that the host school are aware of, and in support, the aims of the initiative.

Project results have been communicated to interested stakeholders through training sessions, workshops, and an evaluation report. This has taken place in conjunction with Civitas exploitation activities and has involved a full appraisal of what up-scaling can and will take place.

C5 Appraisal of evaluation approach

This measure has used a wide variety of approaches to evaluate the impact of the initiatives. This has included evaluations for specific initiatives such as the Golden Flip Flop, the Scooter Training, the Pedometer Challenge and Walk to Work Week. These evaluations aim to find out whether these initiatives are having the desired effect on the audience. They all use face to face meetings (focus groups and informal feedback) as well as comparative data (before and after the initiative) and questionnaires. They are comprehensive pieces of work and assess the impact of the initiative.

More generally the measure relies on data collected from schools, nurseries and businesses to assess whether the implication of the measure has had an impact on the mode of travel. Although the data is not without fault (when left to the school or the business to collect, it is often patchy and can be unreliable) it does give a general indication of the change in travel habits and a break down of which mode of travel is being used on an annual basis.

C6 Summary of evaluation results

The evaluation results in the Civitas area, where measures in schools have been implemented, show that from 2007-2011 the number of car journeys to school has decreased by 13% compared to a decrease of 8% in the non-Civitas schools.

Walking trips have increased by 9% in the Civitas areas and by 7% in the non-Civitas schools. This indicates that there is a general trend towards less car dependency but the figures suggest that where initiatives are in place there is an increase in modal shift.

Where measures have been implemented in businesses 2010-2011 there has been a decrease in single car use by 3% and an increase in public transport by 6%.
The similarities between the Travel Plan Measure and Measure 31 which focused on Personalised Travel Plans in the city, warrants some comparison between the headline findings for each. The MERT for Measure 31 provides the results of the travel plans project in full; however, the key findings were as follows:

- In PTP areas that were targeted in 2010 and 2011, a drop in car use of 0.7% was recorded.

The main comparison between the two methods of delivering Travel Planning is in the numbers that are reached. PTP by its community-based nature is able to reach a far greater number of people within their locality. However, as implemented in Brighton & Hove between 2009-11 participants in the PTP project generally do not have a sustained involvement as it moves from one area to the next.

By contrast business and school travel reach fewer people but are able to work more intensely with a fixed the community (their place of work or study). By its very nature this type of travel planning will have more impact on commuter journeys whereas PTP impacts more on both commuter and leisure journey.

Looking at the results, they show that business and school travel planning have most impact on modal shift.

Nevertheless, assessments of related projects in the UK and elsewhere highlight the merits of both PTP and school and business travel planning together alongside infrastructural improvements. Indeed, the two measures need not necessarily be distinct and there are examples where PTP has been used as an action and means of delivering targets within an organisation-based travel plan.

C7 Future activities relating to the measure

Commuter Travel – The Travel Plan Partnership is continuing to meet on a regular basis and creating links with new and existing businesses.

School Travel – The School Travel Team are continuing to deliver the Scooter Training in schools across Brighton and Hove and are continuing to support schools with their Travel Plans and other walking and cycling initiatives.

---

5 Deliverable R31.1 Study of Personalised Travel Planning for Brighton & Hove
D Process Evaluation Findings

D0  Focused measure

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D1  Deviations from the original plan

- Deviation 1 – To work with 20 businesses or organisations (change from 28). This deviation was reported at the beginning of the project and therefore we will be evaluating against an agreed target of 20.

- Deviation 2 – The iTrace School Travel planning software package has not been used to monitor the implementation of school travel plans. Following further investigation of its capabilities at an early stage within the Measure, it was decided that the package did not meet our needs.

- Deviation 3 – Inter-relationships with other measures. Although we have been aware of the Cyclist Priority and Personalised Travel Plan Projects our travel planning work has overlapped with these projects very little.

- Deviation 4 – Please refer to Selection of Indicators Table C1.1.2 Pollution – levels of C02 emissions. It is only possible to give a very approximate measure of C02 emissions as part of the travel plan process. This is mainly because no technological measurement was planned for during the project. Similarly, any measuring of air quality is outside the scope of this Measure.

- Deviation 5 – Please refer to Selection of Indicators Table C1.1.1 Vehicle Occupancy and Average Occupancy. No measurement of vehicle occupancy or average occupancy will be available as this information cannot be obtained from either the School Census or iTrace (for Commuter Travel Plans). In some circumstances car-share figures can be reported.
D2 Barriers and drivers

D2.1 Barriers

Preparation phase

• 5. Involvement / Communication. Contacts within schools and businesses. It was very hard to “sell” the concept of sustainable travel particularly to businesses unless there was an existing contact. It is very time consuming to “cold call” businesses and in our experience was not successful.

• 9. Financial. Too much dependency on public funds. In some cases, particularly with businesses, we tried to secure some financial commitment to support the implementation of a travel plan. In the increasingly challenging economic climate this was difficult.

• 1. Political / strategic. Politicians conflict over local sustainable travel policy which, in some circumstances, led to delays in the completion of travel plans.

Implementation phase/ Operational phase

• 8. Organisational. Personnel change in businesses/schools. Success of the initiatives can rely on strong links and with the economy shrinking during the life of the project; we lost a number of contacts through redundancies and posts being deleted.

• 5. Involvement / Communication. Lack of shared urgency among key stakeholders. Head teachers/Principals of Schools and Directors of businesses are often not engaged in the travel planning partnership and this can lead to top-down apathy toward travel plans amongst employees.

• 8. Organisational. Schools are often overwhelmed with demands from outside agencies. Even with a reliable contact within the school, collecting feedback from teachers once a scheme has been delivered can be unreliable.

• 3. Cultural. Initiatives in schools often have a life span. Both children and adults enjoy new ideas. It is a good to deliver initiatives for a certain length of time and then introduce something new.

• 9. Financial. Towards the end of the life of the project, businesses began to feel the impact of the economic recession. There was a definite shift in priorities and staff that had been major contacts moved on due to their posts being cut or changed.

• 8. Organisational. In a minority of cases, once the financial incentive was in place, the organisation lost interest in working together
D2.2 Drivers

Preparation phase

- **5. Involvement / Communication.** Having existing contacts within the schools or businesses is a real help and saves a lot of time. Contacts that have a personal interest in sustainable transport will ensure that initiatives are adopted with enthusiasm. Developing a contact that is in a management position is the ideal way for the organisation to become engaged with the travel planning process.

- **8. Organisational.** Working with colleagues within our organisation who have similar objectives can enable a seamless delivery and building on existing programmes in the development of new ones. An example of this is in the development of the scooter training programme. We used the existing cycle training programme (Bikeability) as a basis for the scooter training (Scootability). We worked with the manager of Bikeability and by using a similar method of delivery were successful in developing Scootability.

- **8. Organisational.** The Business Travel Plan Partnership has been developed by a colleague who delivers the Commuter Travel Programme and provides a platform for businesses to meet and discuss sustainable travel ideas. The Travel Plan Partnership meets quarterly and provided the CIVITAS Commuter Travel Project with a body of contacts, a platform to present ideas and report progress on the project. These quarterly meetings helped to raise the profile of the project and be more easily accepted by businesses.

Implementation phase/Operation phase

- **7. Planning.** Consistency is important as well as change. Ensure that certain schemes (like Walk to School Week) are delivered year on year. Schools get used to the administration of the schemes and the initiative becomes part of the schools’ annual calendar.

- **9. Financial.** The financial incentive was key in getting new contacts on board. Public funds are made available to support the development and implementation of travel plans.

- **1. Political / Strategic.** Commitment of key partners who understand the need to develop a sustainable travel vision. Of particular importance is the need for involvement at Director level.

- **4. Problem related.** Travel plans can offer schools and businesses a framework for solving travel related problems. e.g. congestion.

- **8. Organisational.** National pressure/awareness of changes to support sustainability. (Carbon emission targets). Organisational targets to enable sustainable good practice often helped to engage with the business or school.
• 5. Involvement / Communication. Having a key contact who has an interest in environmental changes and the vision to see the benefits is a key factor in driving a scheme forward.

D2.3 Activities

Preparation phase

• 5. Involvement / Communication. Using existing networks in schools and nurseries we arranged meetings and asked the contacts what would be most useful for them to get their staff, parents and students travelling sustainably.

• 5. Involvement / Communication. We initially attended the Partnership meeting to let businesses know how they could get involved and provided them with financial incentives to take part.

• 5. Involvement / Communication. We attended all relevant team meeting to inform them of our project. We continued to attend these meetings to update them with our progress.

Implementation phase/ Operation phase

• 5. Involvement / Communication. We contacted school and business staff by phone and e-mail during the project. We also arranged feedback sessions from staff and parents to find out what they needed most to make their journeys more sustainable.

• 5. Involvement / Communication. We attended each Business Travel Plan Partnership meeting to keep them up to date with our progress.

• 5. Involvement / Communication. We consulted with fellow team members to ensure that new ideas were in line with existing ones.

D3 Participation

D.3.1. Measure Partners

• 1. City. School Travel Team, Brighton and Hove City Council

• 2. City. Commuter Travel Team, Brighton and Hove City Council
D.3.2 Stakeholders

17 Businesses have been engaged with in the travel planning process:
   Artists Residence Hotel, Brighton and Hove Buses, Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Trust, City College, The Martletts Hospice, Mott McDonald, New England House, Primary Care Trust, Phoenix House, RNLI, Royal Sussex County Hospital, Royal Mail, Study Group, Sussex Police, Sussex Community NHS Trust, Whitehawk Inn, YMCA

37 Local Education Authority Schools have developed and implemented travel plans.

6 Independent Schools and 1 Academy (7 in total) have been engaged in the travel planning process:

6 Nursery Schools have been engaged in the travel-planning process:
   Brighton College Pre-Prep School, Hopscotch Nursery, Montessori Nursery School, Roundabout Children’s Centre, Roundabout Nursery, Tarnerland Nursery

22 ‘Focus Initiative’ Schools:
   St. Andrew’s C of E Primary School, St. Bartholomew’s Primary School, Bevendean Primary School, Brighton College Prep School, Brighton Steiner School, Coldean Junior School, Coombe Road Primary School, Downs Junior School, Fairlight Primary School, Goldstone Primary School, Hangleton Junior School, St. Martin’s C of E Primary School, St. Mary’s Hall School (has since been closed), Montessori School, St. Nicholas Junior School, St. Paul’s C of E Primary School, Patcham Junior School, Whitehawk Primary School, Hertford Infant School, Roundabout Nursery School, Tarnerland Nursery School, Windlesham School.

D4 Recommendations

D.4.1 Recommendations: measure replication

- Recommendation 1
  - A key person supporting the scheme in the management team with a key person working at delivering the scheme on the ground

  - Recommendation 2
    – Linking the delivery into a target that the organisation you are working with needs to achieve (health targets, reducing carbon emissions etc)

D.4.2 Recommendations: process (related to barrier-, driver- and action fields)

- Recommendation 1
– Ensure that your own wider team understand the importance of evaluation for the CIVITAS projects

  • Recommendation 2

- Find out if there are any existing schemes that can tie in to the evaluation of your project
## E Summary time schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Task name</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Commuter Travel Planning</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Commuter Implementation</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>School Travel Plans</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>School Travel Plan Implementation</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation tasks
- Commuter travel cycle monitoring (Bike week & then annually)
- School census/hands up survey
- Air quality monitoring

### Deliverables
- M12.1 Draft MLEP
- D12.1 Final MLEP
- D12.2 Baseline and first results
- D12.3 Draft results Temp
- D12.4 Final result temp