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What will we cover?

- **Part 1** – the SUMP concept and process
- Poll and discussion – the main challenges in moving to a SUMP approach?
- **Part 2** – involving citizens and stakeholders
- Poll and discussion – what level of participation is achieved in your cities
- **Part 3** – the challenge of institutional cooperation
- Q & A and discussion
What is a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan (SUMP)?

- European Commission Recommendation to develop SUMPs: Urban Mobility Package COM(2013) 913, Annex 1
- SUMP Guidelines, Jan 2014
- [http://www.eltis.org/](http://www.eltis.org/)
- SUMP-Projects (e.g. CH4LLENGE, ENDURANCE)
- SUMP Coordination Platform and Annual SUMP Conference
Key characteristics of an SUMP

Urban Mobility Package
Annex 1

– Long-term **vision** and clear implementation plan
– **Assessment** of current and future performance
– Balanced and integrated development of **all modes**
– **Horizontal and vertical integration**
– **Participatory** approach
– **Monitoring**, review, reporting
The Planning Cycle for a SUMP...

...helps to structure a complex, integrated planning process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Transport Planning</th>
<th>Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on traffic</td>
<td>Focus on <strong>people</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary objective:</td>
<td>Primary objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow capacity and</td>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong> and <strong>quality of life</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal-focussed</td>
<td><strong>Balanced development</strong> of all relevant transport modes and shift towards sustainable modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure as the main</td>
<td><strong>Combination</strong> of infrastructure, market, services, mechanisms, information, and promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral planning document</td>
<td>Sectoral planning document consistent and complementary to related policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short- and medium-term delivery plan</td>
<td>Short- and medium-term delivery plan embedded in a <strong>long-term vision and strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to an administrative area</td>
<td>Related to a <strong>functioning area</strong> based on travel-to-work patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain of transport engineers</td>
<td><strong>Interdisciplinary</strong> planning teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning by experts</td>
<td>Planning with the <strong>involvement of stakeholders</strong> using a transparent and participatory approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited impact assessment</td>
<td>Intensive <strong>evaluation</strong> of impacts and shaping of a <strong>learning</strong> process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainability and quality of life

From industrial city to city of knowledge

- Sustainable urban development as a motto

Malmö
Sustainability and quality of life

Traffic and mobility plan

- 310,000 inhabitants:
  - 15% walking
  - 22% cycling
  - 21% public transport
  - 40% car

- 360,000 inhabitants:
  - 15% walking
  - 30% cycling
  - 25% public transport
  - 30% car

- 400,000 inhabitants:
  - 15% walking
  - 30% cycling
  - 25% public transport
  - 30% car

Scenarios:
- Scenario A: 2030
- Scenario B: 2030
Mobility Planning Practices in Europe

- **National level** is typically responsible for setting up overall policy, legislative and funding framework – **cities and regions** operate more or less independently.
- **EU** coordinates major transnational policies (e.g. rail policy, core networks), but also climate policy with **increasing impact on urban mobility policy**.
- France, Flanders (Belgium) and England & Wales are examples for a strong national policy, recently also Romania has enacted legislation.
- Map does not represent the individual “bottom-up” dynamism of **lighthouse cities**.

---

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Legally defined</th>
<th>National Guidance</th>
<th>Plans in Place</th>
<th>Sustainability objective</th>
<th>Public involvement</th>
<th>Linked with finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td>Legal frame, but not mandatory*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes, widely applied*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes, obligatory*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England¹</td>
<td>Yes, mandatory*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes, widely applied*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Yes, mandatory*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes, widely applied*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes, obligatory*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>No*</td>
<td>Non-binding guidance in 2012*</td>
<td>Voluntary, some good examples</td>
<td>Not officially, but widely applied*</td>
<td>Voluntary, many examples</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>No*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>To some extent*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>No*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹There is no common UK approach. Different arrangements apply to Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland as transport is a devolved matter. Wales also belongs to the countries with a well-established transport planning framework (Transport Wales Act 2009/ Official guidance). The Scottish system is more akin to the countries which are moving towards an approach to SUMPs. Northern Ireland belongs to the countries which yet have to adopt SUMPs.


---

Note: map created 2012 and already outdated.
The PDUs in France

- ‘Plans de Déplacements Urbains’ (PDUs) introduced through the Law on Domestic Transport in December 1982
- Goal: “…to ensure a sustainable equilibrium between the needs for mobility and accessibility with the protection of the environment and health“
- 20 years on, PDUs have proved effective in decreasing car use in major urban centres
- Nevertheless, integration of PDUs into the hierarchy of planning documents remains a challenge
The Local Transport Plans (LTPs) in England

- The LTP is a statutory requirement established by the Transport Act 2000
- Since 2000, local authorities had to develop three sets of LTPs: 2001-6, 2006-2011 & 2011-2016
- Local authorities given more flexibility and autonomy in the third LTP round
- Expectation that LTPs will contribute to the national transport goals:
  - Supporting economic growth
  - Tackle climate change
  - Promote equality of opportunity
  - Contribute to better safety, security and health
  - Improve quality of life
- Requirements for consultation do not go as far as the SUMP concept
New generation of transport planning: SUMP is becoming mainstream!
Comprehensive Mobility Plans (CMPs) in India

- National Urban Transport Policy focuses on transit orientated development and non-motorised modes
- Objective to provide citizens with equitable access to safe, affordable, convenient sustainable transport
- 2008 - creation of Toolkit to help cities prepare Comprehensive Mobility Plans (CMPs)
- Cities must have their CMPs approved by the state to be eligible for funding support – Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JnNURM)
- They should be integrated into existing city plans and informed by a stakeholder consultation process.
# Challenges for Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Actively involving local stakeholders and citizens in mobility planning processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Improving geographic, political, administrative and interdepartmental cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Selection</td>
<td>Identifying the most appropriate package of measures to meet a city’s policy objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Assessing the impact of measures and evaluating the mobility planning process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges in the SUMP process
Poll

Q. What do you think is the main challenge in moving to a SUMP approach in your country?
- Participation
- Institutional cooperation
- Measure selection
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Other
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Participation in SUMP development

Guidelines Activity 2.3 “Plan for stakeholder and citizen involvement”

The benefits:

- inclusion of new, local knowledge;
- increasing the range of options and ideas;
- testing evidence and positions;
- addressing uncertainty and conflict; and
- making public acceptance of the final plan more likely.
Participation in SUMP development

The challenges:

- lack of political will for carrying out an open and transparent participation process;
- additional staff time and resources are required;
- it can be difficult to create a fair balance in the involvement of different stakeholder groups;
- the process needs to be open and honest;
- poor coordination with other participatory processes can result in “consultation fatigue”; and
- public engagement only occurs in the form of objection when proposals are at a late stage of development – the “dilemma of participation”
Recommendations and examples from the SHAPE-IT project

- **Political commitment and engagement** - When the idea of a participatory planning process for the development of a policy is on the table, engage early with politicians and convince them to become part of the involvement process.

- **Appropriate integration with decision-making** - Ensure appropriate integration of participation results and have the courage to involve citizens and stakeholders in decision-taking.
Recommendations and examples from the SHAPE-IT project

- Create clear participation routines and a structure for active involvement -
  Develop participation routines to:
  - enhance the social learning process
  - familiarise participants with participatory planning
  - fine-tune the involvement tools applied

- Early engagement with local supporters and potential veto players -
  Identify all relevant stakeholders as well as their objectives, power, capacities and planning resources
Example: Participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre

- Since 1989, citizens have been invited to decide on the city’s budget
- Annual debate held by neighbourhood assemblies across 16 designated districts and neighbourhoods
- Process includes “thematic“ assemblies and meetings of delegates for citywide coordinating sessions
- Since the approach was pioneered in Porto Alegre, more than 140 cities across Brazil have established participatory budget systems.

Downtown Porto Alegre
Source: Andreson-commonswiki
Poll

Q. What level of participatory planning is undertaken on mobility issues in your city?
- Informing people about decisions
- Asking people to provide comments in writing
- Holding interactive meetings and workshops
- Involving citizens in decision-making
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Recognition of need for greater integration

**Vertical integration** - the alignment of relevant legislation, guidelines and supporting policies - between the different levels of government

**Spatial / territorial integration**
- The area of a “functioning city” is increasing (trend for longer-distance commuting)
- UK – Travel to Work Areas (TTWAs): 334 in 1981 compared to 243 in 2007

**Policy integration** (EU example)
- Covenant of Mayors initiative urges integration in energy planning
- 6,148 signatories preparing Sustainable Energy Action Plans (SEAPs)
Challenges to integrated planning in Europe

Low level of formalised cross-boundary planning (mostly voluntary, but some noteworthy exceptions)

- territorial boundaries are increasingly less useful as planning units
- traditional institutions cannot always cope with increasingly complex, interconnected problems
- planning requirements are not well coordinated across policy fields (there is a need to work across policy “silos”)
- specific issues of metropolitan regions:
  - urban pro-growth vs. rural NIMBYism
  - differences in resources and expertise between urban and rural authorities
  - timescales and priorities may conflict
  - legislation is not always helpful
Looking beyond borders: West Yorkshire, UK

- 2.2m people (3m in City Region)
- 1m workforce
- 100,000 businesses
- Multi-centred
- 5 Local Authorities
- 1 Transport Authority
Governance – Present!
Stronger, simpler governance

- March 2014
  - Local Transport Authority
  - Transport strategy
  - Public Transport delivery
  - Economy, Land use, Highways, Health with District Authorities

- April 2014
  - Transport AND Economic Regeneration
  - Joined up decision making
  - Strategic economic planning
  - Bus, Train, Road, Cycle etc
West Yorkshire LTP 2011 - 2026

Our Vision

MyJourney West Yorkshire Vision 2026 - Connecting People and Places

Working together to ensure that West Yorkshire’s transport system connects people and places in ways that support the economy, the environment and quality of life.

Our Objectives

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Economy.</strong> To improve connectivity to support economic activity and growth in West Yorkshire and the Leeds City Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Low Carbon.</strong> To make substantial progress towards a low carbon, sustainable transport system for West Yorkshire, while recognising transport’s contribution to national carbon reduction plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Quality of Life.</strong> To enhance the quality of life of people living in, working in and visiting West Yorkshire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Metropolitan Planning Organisation, Portland

- Federal-Aid Highway Act 1962 – all urbanized areas larger than 50,000 population must form a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
- Urbanized areas larger than 200,000 population must also form Transportation Management Organization (TMA)
- Portland’s MPO, Metro, carried out a planning process involving:
  - stakeholder driven planning to extend the existing light rail system;
  - territorial / geographical integration in planning by working with City of Milwaukie and Clackamas County.
Time left for commercials?

SUMP Self-Assessment
now available online!

The SUMP Self-Assessment Tool enables planning authorities to measure their progress towards achieving a genuine Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan:

✓ Assess your plan’s compliance with the EU’s SUMP Guidelines – during or after the planning process.

✓ Understand the strengths and weaknesses of your preparation process and your plan.

✓ Work with peer cities and compare your results.

✓ Answer a clear and transparent set of 100 questions following the steps in the SUMP planning cycle.

✓ Get assistance in form of a glossary, online version of SUMP Guidelines, and online learning resources.

✓ Use the free tool on a non-commercial basis.

The SUMP Self Assessment Tool has been developed by Rupprecht Consult, the authors of the SUMP Guidelines. More information: sump@rupprecht-consult.eu

Visit http://www.eltis.org/mobility-plans/theSUMPprocess
Time left for commercials?

3rd European Conference on Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans

Save the Date
12-13 April 2016
Bremen, Germany

This is the principal annual event for all those involved in turning the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan concept into practice. Be one of the 300 delegates from across Europe to attend this free event. This is a unique opportunity for networking and learning about the latest developments in urban mobility planning.
Time left for commercials?

For more information, visit http://www.sump-challenges.eu
Thank you!

Contact us:
info@urban-mobility-solutions.eu
www.urban-mobility-solutions.eu
@SOLUTIONS_EU
SOLUTIONSproject
YouTube