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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
Structure of SUMP

Problem analysis

Objective setting, targets, indicators

Approaches for each “mode”

- Cycling
- Walking
- Public transport
- Road safety
- Mobility management
- Parking management
- Accessibility
- Maintenance
- Traffic restraint
- Intermodality
- Freight

Public consultation

Integrate with other policies – planning, health, env, social inclusion

Monitoring, evaluation, review
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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 SUMP?
## SUMP and Traditional Transport Planning

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

• SUMP systems mandatory in:
  – England, Wales
  – Italy
  – France
  – Catalunya
  – Portugal

• Systematic evidence of impacts in:
  – Wales
  – France (2001 only)

• Strong link to funding in:
  – Spain (from 2011)
  – Flanders
  – Wales
  – 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

- 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 SUMPs

• 1999-date SUMPs 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
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)
Did LTP system change travel overall?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EU25</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Cars</td>
<td>P2W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
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

![Graph showing the relationship between bus patronage and length of bus lanes in Edinburgh from 1990 to 2005. The graph indicates a trend where the length of bus lanes increased while patronage also increased.](image_url)
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

![Graph showing public transport trips in Lund from 1998 to 2012.](image-url)
Annual mileage by car per citizen (km/year)
EU considering making SUMPs obligatory

• First needs more *systematic* evidence that cities with SUMPs 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 – Guidelines, general info

www.eltis.org – case studies of measures to implement in your SUMP

www.its.leeds.ac.uk/konsult - costs and impacts of measures to implement in your SUMP

www.transportlearning.net – training and capacity building materials
Conclusions

• SUMP$s$ 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$s$ can change transport planning
• Real change needs real incentives to cities to implement SUMP$s$
• 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