




# **SUMPs - a new planning paradigm for sustainable urban mobility - how to bring it about and what it can achieve**

Tom Rye, Professor, Head of Transport Planning  
Transport and Roads, Lund University, Sweden



# Structure of presentation

- What is a sustainable urban mobility plan (SUMP)?
- Why and how is EU keen on SUMPs?
- Current approach to SUMP in different EU countries
- What SUMP can achieve
- How can EU best encourage - or mandate – SUMP activity across EU?
- Conclusions






## What is SUMP?

- Older style transport planning – which scheme do we want to build?
- SUMP: process to make our cities better more sustainable places:
  - Review transport-related problems
  - Set objectives to solve problems
  - Choose measures to meet objectives
  - Implement measures
  - Monitor, review, improve
- Summed up in a plan – but very much a process





# [4] Structure of SUMP



# SUMP – promoted by EU



## Increased importance of SUMP at EU level

- Various recent EU Policy statements in favour of SUMP
- SUMP as a way to achieve White Paper policies, cut CO2 emissions, greater social equity in transport?
- How can EU ensure that more cities really do develop *and implement* SUMPs?



# SUMPs and traditional transport planning



<i>Traditional urban transport planning</i>	<i>Sustainable urban mobility planning</i>
Infrastructure is the key issue	> Infrastructure is one way to achieve the wider goals
Project planning	> Strategic and goal-oriented planning
Non-transparent decision-making	> Transparent decision-making that includes the public
Traffic flow capacity and speed as key goals	> Accessibility and quality of life as key goals
Focus on traffic	> Focus on people
Investment-intensive planning	> Cost-efficient planning
Meeting transport demand	> Transport demand management
Focused on large and costly projects	> Focused on efficient and gradual improvements
In the domain of transport engineers	> Interdisciplinary; integration of engineering, health, environment, and spatial planning sectors
Selecting transport projects without strategic assessments	> Strategic assessments of the options, considering the set goals



# The SUMP way?



# The non-SUMP way?








[9]

## “Mandatory” SUMP systems

- SUMP systems mandatory in:
  - England, Wales
  - Italy
  - France
  - Catalunya
  - Portugal
- Systematic evidence of impacts in:
  - England (2001-2008)
  - Wales
  - France (2001 only)
- Strong link to funding in:
  - Spain (from 2011)
  - Flanders
  - Wales
  - England (1999-2008)
  - Netherlands (GVVP)



## More detail on Flemish system



- Mobility covenants – semi-voluntary agreements between actors in cities' transport.
- Link between covenant and money from higher levels of government for transport.
- SUMP not compulsory part of a covenant - but 97% of Flemish cities have SUMP
- Monitoring bodies at local and Flemish level
- No requirement to submit monitoring results
- SO no consistent national data on what SUMP/covenants have achieved



# More detail on Catalan and Spanish systems



- SUMP in Catalonia Autonomous Region in Spain required by Mobility Law 2003.
- Financial incentive to prepare a plan – required to qualify for some transport subsidies
- Content of the plan can influence the amount of subsidy received
- Whether the plan is implemented or achieves its objectives – has no influence on money received.
- No consistent “national” monitoring.
- Similar system extended to rest of Spain 2012 (but no money!)
- Major growth in number of cities with SUMP





## English system of SUMP

- 1999-date SUMP compulsory for all English local councils: the **Local Transport Plan (LTP)**
- Some transport funding from national government linked to quality of LTP *and achievement of objectives (2001-2008)*
- **Monitoring reports required** – so different from almost every other system





## [13] Changes resulting from LTPs

- Lots of bus infrastructure – lanes, information, stops and stations
- Cycling and walking routes
- Road safety schemes
- Traffic calming and management
- Expansion of parking zones
- Much more maintenance
- New local roads



## Was this different from before?

- Yes, undoubtedly
- With LTP - many cities thought about sustainable transport for first time
- Objectives-based approach, targets, monitoring – all new
- Tight specification of LTP by government – (more) activities/spending in new areas (cycling, PT, MM, parking)



# [1] Did LTP system change travel overall?

- At a macro level, basically, not much – table shows % pax km



	EU25					UK			
	Passenger Cars	P2W	Bus & Coach	Rail - way	Tram & Metro	Passenger Cars	P2W	Bus & Coach	Rail, tram and metro
<b>2004</b>	80.6	2.6	9.1	6.4	1.3	85	1	6	8
<b>2003</b>	80.7	2.6	9.1	6.3	1.3	85	1	6	8
<b>2002</b>	80.7	2.5	9.1	6.4	1.3	86	1	6	7
<b>2001</b>	80.2	2.5	9.3	6.7	1.3	85	1	6	8
<b>2000</b>	80.0	2.5	9.4	6.8	1.3	85	1	6	8
<b>1999</b>	80.1	2.5	9.5	6.6	1.3	86	1	6	7
<b>1998</b>	80.0	2.5	9.7	6.5	1.3	86	1	6	7
<b>1997</b>	79.8	2.5	9.8	6.6	1.3	86	1	6	7
<b>1996</b>	79.6	2.5	9.8	6.7	1.4	87	1	6	6
<b>1995</b>	79.4	2.5	9.9	6.8	1.4	87	1	6	6



## Why did travel not change in UK overall?



- **LTP issues**
  - Little new rail or tram built – so speed of on-road public transport (PT) not increased – improvements often minor
  - Some LTPs not fully supported within their authority
  - Distribution of money
- **Many key issues not affected by LTPs:**
  - Relative costs of travel
  - Buses still quite slow, expensive, controlled by private sector
  - Lots of new roads continue to be built (local and national)








# So some results from individual cities (not just in UK)



# Strasbourg France


(thanks to F Wefering, Rupprecht Consult)



- Park and ride
- Tram
- Urban renewal and pedestrianisation
- City centre some parking restraint
- Traffic calming, zone 30



# Burgos Spain




- Restructured bus network
- City centre pedestrianisation
- Extension of parking blue zones
- Cycling network, Traffic calming, zone 30



# Nottingham




Figure 9.4: Bus and tram patronage levels in Greater Nottingham



# Car journey times and traffic growth Nottingham



Figure 9.3: Traffic Growth in Greater Nottingham vehicle km travelled comparison with Great Britain urban roads



## How did they do this?

- **Nottingham** – 600,000 people in east central England near other major cities and shopping centres. Industrial and university city.
- **As part of SUMP:**
  - Quite strict parking policy but easy to park if you pay
  - Park and ride
  - High quality buses on simplified network with simple fares structure
  - Pedestrianised, high quality city centre
  - Tram (one line only)
  - Traffic calming, zone 30
- **Very successful city** for jobs and retailing






# Edinburgh



# Bus Patronage Vs Length of Bus Lanes









# 2010 Casualty Reduction Targets

**Target 1 : a 40% reduction in people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents**



# How did they do this?



- **Edinburgh** – historic capital city of 450,000 people
- **As part of SUMP:**
  - Strict parking policy
  - Traffic calming, zone 30
  - Park and ride
  - High quality buses on simplified network and bus priority
  - Excellent cheap bus service with simple fares structure
  - Reduction in road capacity in city centre
  - Linking land use planning with sustainable mobility
- **Very successful city** for jobs and tourism







# Lund, Sweden (thanks to Christian Ryden, Lunds Kommun)



# Public transport trips in Lund



# Annual mileage by car per citizen (km/year)



# EU considering making SUMP<sup>SUT</sup>s obligatory



- First needs more *systematic* evidence that cities with SUMP<sup>SUT</sup>s have more sustainable transport than cities without
- If so, then...
- A mandatory system - which would work best?
- Depends on objective:
  1. SUMP documents in place;
  2. SUMP measures funded but no knowledge of outputs; or
  3. SUMP funded and implemented as planned
- English type system most likely to deliver (3)
- But – COSTS of such a system - unknown



## Find out more



[www.mobilityplans.eu](http://www.mobilityplans.eu) – Guidelines, general info

[www.eltis.org](http://www.eltis.org) – case studies of measures to implement in your SUMP

[www.its.leeds.ac.uk/konsult](http://www.its.leeds.ac.uk/konsult) - costs and impacts of measures to implement in your SUMP

[www.transportlearning.net](http://www.transportlearning.net) – training and capacity building materials



[32]

# Conclusions

- SUMP at individual city level can achieve results
- Need for improved alternatives and restrictions on car use (parking management) to achieve mode shift
- Transport in country as a whole needs action at national not just city level if change to be achieved
- (Mandatory) SUMP can change transport planning
- Real change needs real incentives to cities to implement SUMP
- But... cost of such a system unknown; operation at EU level?
- Theory casts some light on how well policy can transfer from one country to another

