

## Policy brief: Integrated planning

### Statement of Issue

Integrated planning encompasses all the CIVITAS themes and looks at developing integrated strategies for sustainable urban mobility, including land use planning.

The main focus is the development of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP).



### Policy options from the CIVITAS 2020 projects SUMP<sub>s</sub>-UP, PROSPERITY, SUITS

The CIVITAS 2020 Initiative is strongly investing in the ensuring the take-up of SUMP<sub>s</sub> around Europe. Two of these projects (SUMP<sub>s</sub>-UP and PROSPERITY) have together carried out a major needs assessment with regards to SUMP<sub>s</sub>. These are the key results.

#### What are the drivers for developing a SUMP?

Drivers for developing a SUMP were investigated through an online survey and a dedicated group discussion during focus group meetings. From the combined analysis of results, it emerged that:

- Availability of national funding is a strong incentive for SUMP development, as also highlighted by the survey, where 85% of the respondents stated that access to funding is a very important driver;
- CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction targets and air pollution are strong drivers to develop a SUMP in cities, especially in the countries where they are legally binding. Moreover, all the prescribed challenges, namely health, congestion, safety and security, social inclusion and integration, climate change, air pollution and participation seem to be significant to be addressed through a SUMP. Similarly, 83% of the respondents of the survey see SUMP<sub>s</sub> as a solution to address transport challenges, whilst 55% of them think that legal requirement to develop a SUMP is a key factor.
- Political and public support play a very important role in SUMP development. This finding is confirmed by the 78% of respondents to the online survey, mentioning political will as an important element.
- Improved city attractiveness achieved through SUMP implementation is a strong argument to start a SUMP, as it can have a positive impact on the economic and touristic development of the city and thus on city finances.
- Both the online survey and focus group showed that drivers are mainly influenced by the country where the city is located, while no clear correlation between drivers and city type

and city characteristics seems to exist. For example, improved access to funding is a much more important driver in Romania and Poland, while the most important drivers in Spain are political will and the fact that SUMP is perceived as a solution to address transport challenges.<sup>1</sup>

## What are the barriers to developing a SUMP?

In the needs assessment, numerous barriers have been identified by cities as interfering in the process of designing, developing, or implementing a SUMP. During a dedicated discussion in the focus group meeting, the following ones were identified, and in turn often corroborated by the outcomes of the interviews:

- Different levels of administration the city cooperates with, namely the district level, municipal, regional and national levels, whose sets of priorities are often conflicting. This seems to be particularly true in capital cities, where the interactions with the national levels are more recurrent;
- Lack of national support and adequate regulatory framework is a barrier to SUMP implementation, such in the case of low emission zone regulations;
- Lack of horizontal integration constitutes a barrier in cities' administrations where the competences are split across different departments. Interviewed national experts confirmed the need to tackle this issue through dedicated training;
- Similarly, the identification of financing priorities can largely differ within the same city administration and between developers in the traffic department on one side and the traffic operators on the other side;
- Political will is another strong barrier, as well as the capacity to prioritise implementation of measures in a context of limited resources available. Eight of the countries interviewed in the needs assessment process confirmed that skills on achieving political and internal buy-in to SUMP should be fostered;
- Citizens and interest groups, if not adequately involved in a dynamic, open and flexible decision process can hinder the implementation of valid plans. This result is backed by the interview conclusions, where all the ten participating countries expressed a need for further development of communication, marketing, addressing citizens through public consultation, and participation skills;
- Lack of data and weak culture of monitoring results were mentioned by participants as a shared and crosscutting issue. Even where some degree of data is available, little evaluation is carried out to adjust the SUMP accordingly;

---

<sup>1</sup> EUROCITIES, ICLEI (2017). *European Programme for Accelerating the Take-up of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans*, p. 45.

- The pace of technological change – or *technological tsunami* - anticipates the capacity of local administrations to put in place adequate regulatory frameworks that are to able respond to the challenges that those innovations pose subsequently pose.<sup>2</sup>

## Which are the countries, regions and types of cities where take-up is low?

There is, in absolute numbers, a higher need for support in selecting and implementing measures and for additional national support in starter cities, small cities, towns in rural areas and in cities with high share of private motorised traffic. The cities seem to have similar *priorities* based on the ranking of needs though. In other words, there is no clear correlation between cities' need for support on one side, and city type and city characteristics on the other side.

	STARTER CITY	INTERMEDIATE CITY	EXPERIENCED CITY
<b>SUMP experience</b>	City is not yet familiar with sustainable urban transport planning.	City has already applied sustainable urban transport measures, but not systematically.	City has already conducted integrated sustainable urban transport planning
<b>Status of SUMP activities</b>	No activities Consider developing first SUMP Developing first SUMP	Finalised SUMP waiting to be adopted SUMP is adopted but not implemented Implementing the SUMP	Evaluation and revision of the previous SUMP Preparing 2nd/3rd generation SUMP
<b>City size</b>	Small ( < 25 000 citizens)	Medium (100 000 – 500 000 citizens)	Large ( > 500 000 citizens)
<b>Share of private motorised traffic</b>	High (> 60%)	Medium (45-60%)	High (< 45%)

**Table:** Overview of characteristics of cities' level of maturity and experience in SUMP based on aspects examined in SUMP-UP survey (to be considered as generalised results from survey).

There are some differences between participating cities depending on the country where they are located, for example there is a higher need for support for selecting measures in Italian participating cities regarding urban logistics and mobility management, as well as in Spanish participating cities as far as integration of different transport modes is concerned. The participating cities from Greece expressed a high need for support in selecting measures within intelligent transportation systems, automation in car traffic and public

<sup>2</sup> EUROCITIES, ICLEI (2017). European Programme for Accelerating the Take-up of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans, p. 46.

transport, and shared mobility. Participating cities from Germany claimed to have the lowest need for support among those countries that have been reported separately in this report.<sup>3</sup>

## What are cities' take-up needs and thematic priorities in sustainable urban mobility planning?

When addressing cities' take-up needs and thematic priorities, it is worth recalling that traditional transport planning approaches in the past were mainly focused on optimising car traffic flows, road infrastructure construction and catering parking spaces for cars.

Then a new season and a transport paradigm arose, with a slow shift from transport to mobility planning approaches, moving from engineering car-centred solutions to people-centred planning processes.

Mobility planning is now encompassing new policy areas where planners look at improving and harmonising people and goods movement in urban environments, reducing private car use, and tackling public health and road safety problems.

In that respect, the following conclusions on cities' take-up needs and thematic priorities in SUMP development can be drawn from the results presented in this report:

- Cities need support in selecting measures for sustainable urban mobility planning, especially for new mobility policy areas, e.g. urban logistics, shared mobility services, use of public space, low emission zones and access restriction, and automation in car traffic and public transport. As emerged from the focus group meeting discussion and interviews, city administrations still tend to have a limited knowledge of them and would be in favour of addressing those in dedicated trainings;
- On the other hand, there is a lower need for support in more traditional mobility modes, such as cycling and policy fields, such as urban road safety, road transport and car parking management. According to the cities participating in the focus group meeting, this is linked to the degree of measure maturity: traditional modes and policy measures have been selected years ago and must now be implemented, which creates a need for support- For instance, cities showed a low need for support for selecting cycling measures, but at the same time a high need for support for their implementation.
- These discrepancies between need for support on selecting and implementing measures may be explained by the fact that cities are currently taking on newer mobility policy fields, such as urban logistics, shared mobility, use of public space, automation, and low emission zones and access restrictions, meaning they need support in selecting measures in these fields.
- There is some evidence of country-based thematic priorities, as explained in the previous section. Urban logistics and mobility management seem to be thematic priorities in Italy,

---

<sup>3</sup> EUROCITIES, ICLEI (2017). European Programme for Accelerating the Take-up of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans, p. 47

integration of different transport modes in Spain and intelligent transportation systems and automation in Greece.

- From the needs assessment, it also emerged that there is currently a strong political will for some newer mobility policy areas, for instance electric mobility and clean fuels, which have pushed the interest in these measures to the top of the political agenda in some countries, whereas measures related to cycling and urban road safety are not gaining the same degree of attention.<sup>4</sup>

## What is the type of support and tools cities need?

The combined analysis of survey and focus group results contributed to the following considerations:

- According to cities participating in the focus group discussion, a good practice example should contain photos – to better visualise the physical solution-, advantages and disadvantages of the measure, a clear overview of results and barriers to the measure implementation. On the other hand, legal aspects and funding information are not considered very useful as they can largely differ from one country to another. Also, a good practice example should target a variety of readers, both politicians and technical experts;
- Workshops, peer to peer learning activities, as well as handbooks, guidelines and manuals were also valued as useful tools by the respondents of the survey.
- Only 7-9% of the participating cities in the survey expressed no need for support from the CIVITAS SUMP projects.
- 85% of the cities participating in the survey are positive about attending learning activities in English. For example, all Romanian cities participating in the survey stated that they would join learning activities in English. The participating cities from France more often prefer their national language, but at the same time there is a high prevalence of SUMP in France and therefore French cities may not have the same need for learning activities as other European cities.
- Evaluation and mobility indicators or indicator sets were almost never mentioned by participating cities in the survey as tools or methods used in transport planning, which indicates that systematic evaluation of transport planning is not undertaken and still has a low priority in European cities.
- Most of the participating cities also expressed a need for additional support for SUMP development from their national government, especially for financing SUMP development and measures, but also for guidance, expertise, trainings, networking and better legal framework.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> EUROCITIES, ICLEI (2017). European Programme for Accelerating the Take-up of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans, p. 48

<sup>5</sup> EUROCITIES, ICLEI (2017). European Programme for Accelerating the Take-up of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans, p. 49