



CiViTAS
Cleaner and better transport in cities

VANGUARD
.....

CIVITAS PAC POSITION PAPER

The Future Development of the
Urban Dimension of Transport

December 2012



THE CIVITAS INITIATIVE
IS CO-FINANCED BY THE
EUROPEAN UNION

The CIVITAS Political Advisory Committee

The Political Advisory Committee (PAC) constitutes a small group of motivated politicians from within CIVITAS cities that acts as the Initiative's steering group. Members participate in a personal capacity.

- Typically the PAC's work takes the form of short, policy-styled notes (the "PAC statements"). These are drafted by the PAC with the support of a Secretary, and may be directed towards policy makers at either European, national or local levels, as well as towards industry, transport operators, and other stakeholders. They may also be publicised at international events, e.g. the CIVITAS Forum conference or the European Mobility Week.

PAC members apply for membership in their personal capacity and can serve a maximum of three mandates of two years each. Every two years a call for interest is launched and the new PAC is formed. PAC members are ultimately appointed by the European Commission based on general criteria of representativeness and proven record of the individual candidates.

As a result of the 2011 call for new PAC members, a new PAC was constituted in September 2011. These are its members:

- Bruno Miguel Camacho Pereira (Chair), Deputy Mayor of Funchal, Portugal
- Roman Jakic, Member of Ljubljana City Council, Slovenia
- Gonçalo Nuno de Sousa Mayan Gonçalves, City Councillor, Municipality of Porto, Portugal
- Rimantas Mikaitis, Deputy Mayor of Kaunas, Lithuania
- Sándor Nagy, Deputy Mayor of Szeged, Hungary
- Mariann Nørgaard, Alderman, Aalborg, Denmark
- Gerhard Rüschi, City Councillor, Graz, Austria
- Jon Albizu, Mobility Councillor, Donostia–San Sebastian, Spain
- João Paulo Barbosa de Melo, Mayor of Coimbra, Portugal
- Roberto Ciccone, Mobility Councillor, Perugia, Italy
- Paolo Gandolfi, Deputy Mayor of Reggio Emilia, Italy
- Lennart Holmlund, Mayor of Umeå, Sweden
- Matteo Lepore, Deputy Mayor of the Municipality of Bologna, Italy
- Denis Leroy, Vice-President of La Rochelle Urban Community, France
- Zvonimir Mrcic, Mayor of Koprivnica, Croatia

For any further questions concerning the PAC, please contact its Secretary: Ms. Gordana Kozhuharova, gkozhuharova@rec.org, C/o The Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC), Ady Endre Ut 9-11, 2000 Szentendre, Hungary, Tel: +36 26 504 000 ext. 421

About this document

This position paper answers to the questions which the European Commission publicly raised on Sept. 17th in a call to solicit feedback on “The future development of the Urban Dimension of Transport” (See: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/urban/consultations/2012-12-10-urban-dimension_en.htm).

The public consultation pays considerable attention to the initiatives on integrated urban mobility as put forward in the transport white paper, including sustainable urban mobility plans, access restriction schemes (i.e. urban road user charging) and urban logistics. This document represents the PAC members’ responses to the survey (i.e. Graz, Szeged, Funchal, Koprivnica, La Rochelle and Umea) based on several rounds of electronic consultation. It was edited by the PAC Secretariat.

The Future Development of the Urban Dimension of Transport

LOCAL STRATEGIES FOR BETTER AND MORE SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY – AND THE PLANS THAT UNDERPIN THEM

Background

It is widely held today that the development of ambitious, yet realistic local strategies, and the plans to support their implementation, are crucial starting points for improving performance and sustainability of urban transport systems. The concept of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans¹ received particular attention in the 2009 Action Plan on Urban Mobility. Several EU initiatives have been realised to establish and disseminate good practice for their establishment.

The 2011 Transport White Paper observes that many cities have established Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans, but it is not yet the norm and this practice needs to be further encouraged. The Commission proposes to establish a European “framework for the development of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans including procedures and support mechanisms”. The Commission would not seek to prescribe top-down solutions, but to provide the competent authorities in the Member States at local level with a sound but flexible framework for urban transport planning and a strong support structure.

¹ *A Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan is a Strategic plan designed to satisfy the mobility needs of people and businesses in cities and their surroundings for a better quality of life. It builds on existing planning practices and takes due consideration of integration, participation, and evaluation principles. Source: www.mobilityplans.eu/docs/SUMP_guidelines_web0.pdf*

Do you think that there is a lack of coordination between authorities and other actors in the use of various policy instruments and that integrated urban mobility planning could be an answer to tackle this issue?

Yes. There is land-use planning, mobility planning and transport planning and this must be coordinated. Often different departments within cities deal with the topic of “mobility” by pursuing own strategies which complicate good solutions for better mobility. Therefore coordinated, integrated urban mobility planning is very important to improve the mobility behaviour and reach declared goals. Whatsoever, political aims differ very often from aims defined by experts.

The lack of a holistic approach is still creating big problems for the future. Urban and transport planning cannot be separated. It is acknowledged in all supporting documents (but the White Paper itself) that urban sprawl is a major contributor to the mobility problems and

we have to see that it has the greatest long-lasting effect. Modal split surveys shows that parts of cities with lower densities produce greater car traffic. Yet in a densely populated city like Vitoria-Gasteiz one witnesses an astonishing 50+ percent pedestrian share in the modal split.

Integrated urban mobility planning is crucial for succeeding in sustainable mobility planning. Cities have built-in structural problems in their transport systems with urban sprawl, functional separation and barriers and we can't solve these problems with sectoral planning. We need a holistic approach where land-use and mobility planning appears within a single concept. Especially in countries with less successful planning practice.

Additionally, local authorities are the main actors on public policy and measures concerning urban mobility. However, cooperation with all the different tiers of administration is required, particularly with the national government, in order to guarantee a consistent legal and economic framework in which cities can operate and implement their policies of managing access and parking. This is why we believe sustainable urban mobility plans should be further encouraged at the regional level, as transport is not an issue that can be planned at the local level.

Do you agree that integrated Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans are a useful tool for fostering coordination at local and regional level?

Yes. Even from an early stage, it is recognisable that a SUMP helps coordinate planning processes and addressing issues at a regional, not only local level. However, in some case (e.g. Sweden) there is a municipal planning monopoly and this makes it difficult to see benefits at a regional level.

Furthermore, a SUMP is a planning tool in which it is possible to implement strategies, establish goals and action plans that involve all actors, including institutional authorities and different transport operators, whether public or private. It's an integrated vision for the city and not the sum of various groups' actions. The diagnosis must be shared and involve all stakeholders. An integrated vision is very important for territory and transportation. They require coherency and necessitate a 'global' approach. In so doing, they provide a guarantee of efficiency against centralized techno structures.

Nevertheless, SUMPs have to be defined at the scale of a living area and must set territorial boundaries. They help define modes of mobility, but at the time should go beyond institutional boundaries. Last but not least, an urban mobility plan cannot be exempt from being in coherence with other urban planning documents.

Do you think that EU-support for the development of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans would contribute to the broader take-up of such plans in urban areas across Europe?

Generally there is agreement, that yes, EU-support helps and accelerates the broader take-up of such plans by giving strength and added value to the initiatives developed by the cities, while the European dimension helps local authorities, especially in areas where such planning practices were lacking by encouraging more to experiment, plan and initiate action. But the following caveats are also issued:

1. The SUMP initiative must start in each city of its own volition;
2. EU support will be more successful in those cases/areas where interest has already been established; and
3. The financial situation in the different member states is not identical, and in the countries with EC intervention programs,¹ as well as in some new member states, financial support is crucial for the successful implementation of these plans.

What support should be provided at the EU level to facilitate the development of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (multiple answers are possible)?

The PAC supports the following measures:

- Development and exchange of best practice on sustainable urban mobility planning;
- Support R&D projects on urban mobility planning;
- Provide a platform for cities to exchange best practice;
- Development of guidelines and recommendations
- Support for professional training activities and staff exchange;
- Financial support for the development of sustainable urban mobility plans; and
- Mandatory development of sustainable urban mobility plans for cities in certain situations (e.g. air quality problems, congestion)

In addition, the following measures were also put forward:

- On-site training;
- Benchmarking best practice examples with regard to different European cities;
- Transfer of know-how and experiences where different measures and methods were applied, so as to improve ecology-minded mobility.
- Funding the development/implementation of mobility plans which concern specific topics and address special problems
- Different cities have their own specific conditions. Training activities and support in certain special situations/cases can be of great value. For example, in a workshop coordinated by the Commission, the possibility to creatively discuss solutions together with cities carrying similar challenges would be welcome. These occasions are also important opportunities for transport engineers, architects and other professionals to meet.
- An overall study about the SUM planning problems in Europe: how many cities are affected, how are urban area structures, climates, cultures, GDP implicated in mobility issues, how much of this is quantifiable?

¹ The financial resources that are available are driven towards other fields, such as in the social theme, which are considered by citizens to be more urgent. The classic vision of the development indices based on consumption (electric energy, number of vehicles sold, etc) has to be changed by establishing indicators that are adjusted to the current scenario and the new economic frameworks. There needs to be greater interdependence between regional funds and the framework programs.

Ideally, the Commission's support and information will find its way into the mainstream transport and urban planning "domain." SUMP for example is not even described in Wikipedia, not even in English.

Which topics should a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan address (multiple answers are possible)?

The PAC considers the following topics ought to be included:

- Public transport plan (i.e. accessibility, travel information, ticketing and payment systems in the city itself and border-crossings);
- Walking and cycling;
- Procedures for citizen and stakeholder engagement;
- Urban logistics (delivering goods, returning goods, reduction of emissions ...);
- Access restriction schemes;
- Coherence with urban development and land-use planning;
- Accessibility, social inclusion and demographic change;
- Safety and security;
- Parking management²;
- Coherence with transport plans developed at regional, national and EU level;
- Procedures for impact or process evaluation, monitoring; and
- Investment, financing, public private partnerships.

In addition, the following topics were suggested:

- Use of bicycles (bicycle lanes, parking areas, protection against rain ...);
- Pedestrians (short connections without crossing main streets, short trails to the daily needed providers);
- Traffic (speed-reduction, Parking fees, restrictions of accessibility ...); and
- Improvements for railways and flights (connecting important economical areas).

In fact, all these topics are important and can not be dealt distinctly. Not taking one or other into account may imbalance the plan.

The PAC wishes to stress once more the importance of financing to cover the costs for the elaboration, and more significantly, plans' measure implementation. On the other hand, mobility plans should have realistic and measurable goals in order to allow for its monitoring and evaluation, to safeguard against resulting plans being mere expressions of intent.

² Parking management and controlling the local parking situation provides the city with a powerful tool in handling traffic-intensive areas. Ambitious parking strategies and measures can change the competitive situation between transport modes, providing incentives and time savings for sustainable transport modes with relatively small economic effort. But on a policy level, it can be very difficult. Within urban transport policy, this is an area that could be highlighted further on EU level.

ACCESS RESTRICTIONS AND URBAN PRICING SCHEMES

Background

Towns and cities across Europe are considering or have completed the establishment of urban Access Restriction Schemes¹ in order to improve air quality, reduce congestion, or to foster the development of alternative transport modes and the use of cleaner and more energy-efficient vehicles.

The Commission noted in its 2007 Green Paper "Towards a new culture for urban mobility" that "a lot of stakeholders have called for guidance and development of harmonised rules for urban Green Zones² at the EU level in order to facilitate a wider use of such measures without creating disproportionate barriers to mobility for citizens and goods. Furthermore, harmonisation and interoperability of similar technologies will reduce costs."

A study delivered within the Action Plan on Urban Mobility concluded that "Access Restriction Schemes are seen as a powerful policy instrument by most stakeholders groups, and that their potential in addressing the major challenges of urban sustainability (notably air quality, noise, congestion, but also the need to strengthen the role of non-motorised modes) is recognized as considerable." The study also concluded that the approach to the implementation of Access Restriction Schemes varies considerably across the 27 Member States.

The 2011 Transport White Paper announced the Commission's intention to tackle this issue by providing an EU-level "framework for urban road user charging and Access Restriction Schemes and their applications, including a legal and validated operational and technical framework covering vehicle and infrastructure applications". This framework would seek to address the modalities for the development of Access Restriction Schemes. Authorities at local level would retain their authority to decide on the appropriateness of an Access Restriction Scheme and to delimit the area under the scheme, to fix the amount of fees levied where a charging scheme is used, etc.

¹ Urban access restriction schemes are demand management strategies based on the concept of 'controlled access' which entails the more or less gradual interdiction of selected urban areas to motorised traffic (source: Study on Urban Access Restrictions, Rome, December 2010). Existing types of urban Access Restriction Schemes are e.g. 'low emission zones', 'green zones' and 'congestion charging zones'.

² E.g. pedestrianisation, restricted access, speed limits, urban charging, etc.

Do you live or work in an urban area where an Access Restriction Scheme is considered or has been introduced?

A number of PAC members indicated they are part of urban areas where access restriction schemes operate and these already serve to create better walking conditions, create more space and improve security for pedestrians. In areas with road restrictions and mild climate, these have positively impacted on commercial activities leading to the appearance of the "outdoor shopping centre."

The further benefits of access restriction schemes are expected to be seen in the sustainable development of a city, particularly vis-à-vis air quality (mainly Nitrogen dioxide but partly PM10 as well).

A challenge in a country like Sweden, however, is that its authorities don't have the full suite of measures and tools at their disposal that many of sister cities in the EU already successfully enjoy (and with good results). Surveillance and monitoring for instance is a key factor of success in enforcing access restrictions, however, Swedish law does not support municipalities to use CCTV cameras. Obtaining authorization is an extremely long, difficult and expensive procedure. Therefore a comprehensive European legal basis can enable municipal authorities to fully handle and solve problems at local level.

What should be the principal objectives of an Access Restriction Scheme?

The PAC considers the following principal objectives ought to be included:

- Improve accessibility;
- Improve air quality;
- Reduce noise emissions;
- Improve liveability, leisure and recreation.

Among others suggested are the following:

- Creation of a healthy and secure environment at the human level.

Do you consider 'low emission zones' an effective measure to improve air quality in urban areas?

Most members of the PAC strongly agree although there was also some disagreement.

Do you consider 'congestion charging zones' an effective measure to improve accessibility in urban areas?

The PAC somewhat disagrees.

For example, while special charges for entering city centres reduce traffic and traffic jams (and thus improve accessibility), they are no solution to improving the liveability of these areas.

Other members don't believe that access should be linked to a charge, because it allows certain stakeholders to 'buy' their way out of a problem [sic].

The PAC warns that social in/exclusion should be carefully taken into account when addressing the issue of accessibility in order to avoid discrimination and to maintain a high level of mobility for all categories of users. Limitations should be accompanied by concurrent increases of alternative transport supply, namely through public transport, cycling and pedestrian options.

The PAC also suggests that the use of revenues collected through fines and tariffs is a crucial issue and that legislation should allow local authorities to directly utilise these revenues, mainly reinvesting in environmental care, public transport improvements, and urban renewal.

Overall, road pricing, access restrictions and parking policies should adopt flexible and diversified schemes reflecting, as much as possible, the different levels of pollution/noise and the different criteria of accessibility in tariffs and limitations. Municipal authorities ought to concentrate actions on specific problem areas in order to obtain effective improvements in accessibility, for example. In certain instances then, this may mean access restrictions for heavy traffic in transit and a reduction of commuting traffic by limiting parking for employed personnel.

Finally, the PAC advises those involved in future Access Restriction Schemes to ensure their purposes are clear and simple. In order to increase citizens' acceptability, local authorities have to identify and communicate in a transparent way whether the main aim is to collect revenues, to reduce pollution/noise, and/or to improve the accessibility of areas.

Which access criteria are most suitable to develop and implement Access Restriction Schemes in urban areas? (multiple answers possible)

The PAC considers the following access criteria as most suitable for an Access Restriction Scheme:

- Vehicles categories (passenger cars, light and heavy duty vehicles, etc.);
- Size and weight of a vehicle;
- Time based criteria;
- Environmental criteria of vehicle; and
- Area based criteria; but add that it also:
- Depends on local circumstances/objectives

Do you think that EU support could facilitate a more harmonised development of Access Restriction Schemes by local authorities?

The PAC agrees there is a role for the EU to play, because any local solution lacking European support will otherwise meet a lot of initial resistance.

Furthermore, however, the harmonisation of access restriction schemes within the framework of a regulation at European level should continue to facilitate the free movement of citizens across Europe, while at the same time ensuring an equitable charging system.

Which support should be provided by the EU to facilitate a more harmonised development of Access Restriction Schemes?

The PAC is in favour of a top-down approach that backs-up and supports local policy-makers. It considers the following support should be provided:

- Development and exchange of information and best practice;
- Development of voluntary guidelines and recommendations (e.g. regarding access criteria, the assessment of impacts, certification, monitoring and evaluation); and
- Interoperability standards for equipment.

In regard to guidelines and recommendations, the EU is asked to lead a dynamic process in which the creation of initial standards ought to be complemented in the future with the implementation of more restrictive rules. The process ought to begin based on the definition of national recommendations and guidelines which are then harmonized at EU level. In other words, all levels must be harmonized otherwise punitive fees will not be accepted if local emissions [elsewhere] exceed EU-levels. A concern, however, is to ensure local level involvement.

Which aspects regarding the development of Access Restriction Schemes should be covered by a more harmonized EU-approach? (multiple answers possible)

The PAC considers the following aspects should be included in the harmonized EU-approach:

- Road signals;
- Vehicle identification, incl. standards for corresponding technologies;
- Methodology for impact assessment;
- Technical interoperability (e.g. On Board Units)
- Access criteria;
- Exemptions; and
- Methodology for monitoring and evaluation.

In particular, standardisation of signs, access methods, and payments for access could improve take-up, as it would lead to "off the shelf", solutions for cities which can be more easily introduced.

Would a more harmonised EU approach on Access Restriction Schemes be beneficial?

The PAC agrees it would be beneficial, since harmonisation and standardization would facilitate the better movement for citizens across European territory.

Could a more harmonised EU approach on Access Restriction Schemes help develop the market for clean and energy-efficient vehicles and other 'green' transport technologies, as well as new mobility services?

The PAC agrees a harmonised approach may boost the market for clean and energy-efficient vehicles inter alia, as this will encourage fleet renewal, and besides that, promote a modal shift towards public transport and soft modes.

EU FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR URBAN TRANSPORT PROJECTS

Background

The European Union is supporting the development and implementation of urban transport solutions through various instruments and programmes, such as the EU Research Framework Programme or its financial instruments in the field of regional development and cohesion. EU-funded urban transport projects contribute to reaching key policy objectives for better, more efficient and more sustainable transport in Europe.

In the 2011 Transport White Paper the European Commission proposes to link access to regional development and cohesion funds for urban transport projects to the existence of validated Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans which give due consideration to the relevant EU policy objectives as identified above.

Commission initiatives, such as CIVITAS, support European cities and companies in testing innovative concepts and novel technologies in the field of urban transport and to turn them into validated solutions. Such initiatives support the generation and dissemination of knowledge and help advance the state-of-the-art. They presently provide little or no financial support for subsequent steps in the innovation chain, deployment and market entry.

Here the regional policy and cohesion instruments can play an important role by supporting the up-scaling and exploitation of proven solutions that are innovative and correspond to the latest-state-of-the art, and thus contribute to their successful and broad market entry.

Would linking the access to EU funding for urban transport projects to the existence of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans provide a safeguard that supported projects are in line with relevant local, national and EU policies?

The PAC agrees to link EU funding for urban transport projects to SUMP, noting that it would strengthen the status of the SUMP and reward long term thinking in sustainable transport planning. At the same time, however, and should not be a pre-requisite to action. It should not restrain initiative and intuition and neither should it be exclusive.

The PAC also stresses the role of the EU in providing some financing for SUMP elaboration. Besides the suggestions made above (see pg. 5), rules to elaborate SUMP should take into account the local specificities, namely those found in ultra peripheral regions.

Does particular added value arise where EU funding for urban transport projects seeks to foster innovation?

Yes, the PAC believes there is added value from EU funds fostering innovation in urban transport. Says one PAC member, innovation would not have been possible without EU support!

The CIVITAS Initiative is particularly important, since it serves to demonstrate and disseminate innovative action. It helps to create pilot technologies that can be validated by cities with low costs while the respective collaborative projects enable the transformation of innovative technologies into market-based solutions. The initiative also aids collaboration with universities and research institutions. In these ways, it also helps justify future funding for innovation, while also increasing the number of 'demonstration' cities. In fact, more EU attention ought to be devoted to dissemination and demonstration, so as to attract new cities to the process while streamlining the benefits from those innovation projects already implemented.

Beyond CIVITAS, funding innovation contributes to encouraging and driving sustainable development. It can be especially effective when combined with long term transport planning, because this helps keep cities 'on track.'

However, more needs to be done to help cities see the benefit of becoming part of an innovation process. There are risks of failure and even if this is a legitimate outcome of any research process, the EC could provide more guidance and funding to ensure the greater likelihood of a 'win.' By documenting failures, the experiment can be useful for others (and ought not to be punished, in correspondence with the 'Frascati Manual').

On the other hand, examples of past efforts should be presented to city decisionmakers and advisors in a more attractive way. Unfortunately, most of the knowledge that is theoretically available is only available in a few languages. It could be very useful to organize the knowledge and make it available in more and more languages.

Finally, applied research, that is, successful demonstration of new technologies - is important. However, it should not take place at the local level (i.e. in a city) without the population's involvement. Innovation should not be understood as 'technological' only; it should necessarily be accompanied with a dimension of citizen "integration" to support the implementation of innovation, of progress. This helps convince people that this progress is beneficial to all. It is needed to ensure the benefit is shared by all.

How should Commission initiatives like CIVITAS or SMART CITIES AND COMMUNITIES evolve to engage cities more effectively in the innovation process?

The PAC wishes the EC to continue to encourage and support pilot projects that adhere to specific strategies, while continuing to support the exchange of experience.

The PAC also wishes the EC in future calls for proposals to encourage cities' involvement of their citizens and users in the successful implementation of measures. This includes disseminating information to local stakeholders, allocating adequate time to support and raise awareness as well for the appropriation of technologies by users.

URBAN FREIGHT LOGISTICS

Background

Urban logistics is central to the efficiency and economic vitality of cities however it is a much neglected area of urban transport planning. Passenger and freight transport are equally important, but the lack of integrated treatment causes many problems.

There is consensus amongst all actors on the need for action. Under the Action Plan on Urban Mobility, the Commission launched a study to explore the scope for action fostering more efficient and sustainable urban freight logistics. The study recommended "a set of policy measures such as the internalisation of external costs in urban areas, research into the support of zero emission vehicles and the application of ITS, investigation of standards for low noise freight vehicles and the availability of TEN-T funding for urban freight transport." The study also recommended "that urban freight transport plans should be part of sustainable urban transport plans".

The 2011 Transport White Paper announced the Commission's intention to produce "best practice guidelines to better monitor and manage urban freight flows" and to put forward "a strategy for moving towards 'zero-emission urban logistics'".

Does current urban transport planning give sufficient consideration to urban freight logistics?

The PAC feels improvements are still possible and more needs to be done to take into account the economic, social and environmental weight of urban freight logistics, despite the attention given to this by CIVITAS and its demonstration cities.

How could local authorities, logistics companies, and consignees improve urban freight deliveries?

The PAC feels proper forms of cooperation need to be found between local authorities, logistics companies and consignees. Examples include:

- Strategies for improvement that are built upon sound legal frameworks;
- Clear rules for freight transportation on competitively neutral grounds;
- The use of municipal freight flows and volume restrictions as a starting point for building a coordinated distribution system;
- The introduction of new technologies and relevant technical equipment, including adapting fleets to specific needs (pallets, cold chain), and using simple means such as bikes (eg. cyclocargo type); and
- Hosting reflection and consultation with different stakeholders concerned with the issue of 'last mile' delivery.

Should Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) be used to make urban freight transport more efficient?

Yes, respond the PAC.

ICT/ITS (e.g. global positioning devices, tools that facilitate the management and the circulation of freight vehicles, and RFIDs (radio frequency identification) to efficiently manage goods flows) helps optimize the distribution chain, decrease the number of trips, increase the

occupation of vehicles and optimize the circuits. It offers the possibility to handle accessibility issues for freight transporters including timeslots, vehicle categories, size and weight. On the other hand, it can also play a key role in improving the management of public space that is destined to be used for parking vehicles for loading and unloading operations.

Appropriate responses ought to be rewarded by awarding access, as was demonstrated by the GOFER project implemented by SINTEF in Norway.

Which policy actions should be taken at EU level to support this? (multiple answers possible)

The PAC feels the following actions ought to be taken:

- Development and exchange of best practice;
- Provide a platform for stakeholders to exchange best practice and support R&D projects;
- Legislation (e.g. on interoperability of equipment)
- Development of standards on ICT-applications
- Support R&D projects
- Development of guidelines and recommendations

In regard to the second suggestion, the PAC notes that successful urban freight transport systems are hard to find and are hard to ‘translate’ to the local level. A platform for stakeholders to exchange best practice, but also as a forum for discussions and problem solving would add a lot of value to cities with a high cost-effectiveness. It would be important to include local stakeholders in this process from the very beginning, in order to create a common base of knowledge. EU support is valuable to and appreciated by cities where new approaches may be attempted, whether a city proceeds with the innovation or not. This could occur in the form of pilot projects or workshops, training events and similar.

The PAC would also like to encourage equal consideration be given to different forms of freight transport. If goods are delivered by trucks the pollution/emissions are higher compared with the train. However, larger trucks are still able to deliver directly to the customer – even in city centres, while in contrast to the train, vans are still required to deliver within the ‘last mile.’

Nevertheless, the PAC would still like to see alternatives to roads favoured, eg. to develop solutions by water, river and rail routes, “because the EU can do a lot.”

Do current Access Restriction Schemes in the city where you live or work affect urban freight logistics positively or negatively?

Access restriction schemes do not exist uniformly in PAC members’ cities and vary in their effectiveness from having “no effect on urban freight deliveries” owing to a lack of resources for monitoring, to aiding efficient urban freight deliveries and to causing “backlash.”

The PAC feels that such schemes have to be appreciated as part of a larger European effort to help efficient urban freight deliveries. For instance, if a logistics operator has to change its fleet, it obviously hinders their activity, but it is not necessarily a problem.

Also, when access restriction schemes are introduced, logistics-related aspects have to be taken into account, namely the specificities of the area, the activities (residential, commerce, services), and type of goods (urgent and perishable).

2.5 OTHER ISSUES

Do you have any other issues, suggestions and/or comments that you would like to raise related to the urban dimension of EU transport policy?

For many cities in new member states, infrastructure is still an issue, aging rolling stock is still an issue, even after some EU-funded projects. The need to address hardware and infrastructure (including trams and busses) could be an opportunity for linking their funding to more complex measures, that include restrictions, not just public transport developments. Besides new vehicles, Park + Ride, Bike + Ride facilities, and rebuilding streets for sustainable modes should also be considered.

Soft measures too ought to be supported, including mobility planning in residential areas, workplaces, ITS, etc. and deserve a greater place in urban mobility.

Furthermore, not all policies fit each and every city because the topography and local circumstances should be respected too.

Whereas there are valid concerns in new member states, there are even bigger concerns in those who are not yet member states. If the existing wealth of knowledge and experience is efficiently transferred to these countries through the exchange of experience and EU support, many improvements could be realised in a short space of time.

The PAC wishes to note that within any process of change, it is crucial to involve citizens in the decision making process as well as to create mechanisms to facilitate citizen's participation.

Finally, lest we forget, cities currently face a crisis period where funding public transportation remains a challenge. A focus for future actions could be placed upon the optimization of the existing services (e.g. adaptation of the means to the needs, adapted vehicles, on-demand services, sharing of services) as well as on the development and the promotion of clean transport modes as less draining on public resources e.g. cycling and walking, electric bicycles.

Indeed, the technological development of electric vehicles (cheaper and more efficient batteries) and car-sharing schemes must be encouraged and urban legislation ought to take into consideration the increasing importance of these modes.