

SUTP DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE

D1.0 STATE OF THE ART REVIEW



Prepared for

**European Commission,
DG Environment**



by



**as part of the PILOT Project
Consortium**

Final version

SUTP DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE

D1.0 STATE OF THE ART REVIEW

Prepared for
European Commission, DG
Environment



by



as part of the PILOT Project
Consortium

Author(s)	Alastair Byers Owen Clark
Quality Control	Tom Parker
Version	Final
Date	November 2005
File location	\\Server\company\TTR Projects\Current Projects\PILOT\Technical\WP 1 - State of the Art\Deliverables\D1.0 - State of the Art\D1.0 PILOT SOA final print.doc
Last edited	4 th November 2005
This report has been prepared for European Commission, DG Environment in accordance with the terms and conditions of appointment. Transport & Travel Research Ltd cannot accept any responsibility for any use of or reliance on the contents of this report by any third party.	



GB2000157

CONTENTS

0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
0.1	Findings of Expert Working Group (EWG) and recommendations	i
0.2	Findings of the Literature Review	ii
0.3	Summary of the national reviews of SUTP in Europe	iii
0.3.1	SUTP planning and approach	iv
0.3.2	SUT plan contents and design	iv
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	METHODOLOGY	3
2.1	Literature review	3
2.2	SUTP national reviews	4
2.2.1	SUTP planning: general approach and basis for plans	4
2.2.2	SUT plan: Contents & Design / General Practice and focus of plans	5
2.2.3	SUTP aspirations	5
3	CONTEXT FOR THE REVIEW OF SUTP	6
3.1	Findings of the Expert Working Group (EWG)	6
3.2	Literature Review of SUTP	7
3.2.1	Introduction	7
3.2.2	Sustainable urban policies	8
3.2.3	Integration	8
3.2.4	Implementation steps	8
3.2.5	Conclusions	9
4	A REVIEW OF SUTP IN THE EU	11
4.1	Introduction	11
4.2	SUTP Planning and approach	11
4.2.1	National Regulations	11
4.2.2	Spatial Coverage & Responsible Authorities	13
4.2.3	Citizen Participation & Stakeholder Consultation	15
4.2.4	Gender equity & equality	19
4.2.5	Capacity Building	19
4.2.6	Drivers, barriers and good practice in SUT Planning	20
4.3	SUT plan contents and design	23
4.3.1	Subject definition	23
4.3.2	Status analysis and baseline scenario	26
4.3.3	Definition of a vision, objectives and targets	28
4.3.4	Delivery plan / Action and budget plan	31
4.3.5	Policies and measures	33
4.3.6	Monitoring and evaluation	35
4.3.7	Adoption, approval and assessment	37
4.3.8	Drivers, Barriers and Good Practice in SUT Implementation	38
4.4	SUT Aspirations	40
4.5	Conclusions	42
4.5.1	SUTP planning and approach	42
4.5.2	SUT plan contents and design	43

5	PILOT CITY BASELINE	44
5.1	Introduction	44
	Braila (Romania)	44
	Evora (Portugal)	44
	Lancaster (United Kingdom)	44
	Tallinn (Estonia)	45
5.2	Methodology for conducting a city baseline analysis	45
5.3	Example analysis - Braila	45
6	CONCLUSIONS	50
6.1	The EWG	50
6.2	The Literature Review	51
6.3	The National reviews	52
	6.3.1 SUTP planning and approach	52
	6.3.2 SUT plan contents and design	53

0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Executive Summary contains headline results and summary information from the three key subjects covered by this State of the Art review:

- Findings of Expert Working Group (EWG) and recommendations;
- Findings of the Literature Review;
- Summary of the national reviews of SUTP in Europe.

0.1 Findings of Expert Working Group (EWG) and recommendations

An important consideration of PILOT has been to ensure that existing experiences and knowledge are fully integrated into the project. An Expert Working Group (EWG) was drawn together to consider the potential for an EC directive on SUTP implementation in all Member States. The importance of incorporating the findings and recommendations of the EWG on SUTP into the work plan of PILOT were recognised, and their contribution to knowledge in this area is acknowledged here.

In outline, their main task was threefold,

1. To consider the approach to SUTP. “Design of procedures, instruments and measures needed for SUTP”,
2. The content of the potential directive and
3. The support base required (“actions”) for improving SUTP in Europe.

What the EWG did not do was to recommend whether or not SUTP should be adopted as an obligatory statute i.e. directive. That is what this part of the work, the current study, should move towards.

As such the EWG worked to develop what they considered to be a practical instrument that should be used to develop and deliver SUTP. This can be summarised in the following five key steps:

1. Defining a vision – the aim
2. Objectives and targets – what you want to achieve
3. Budgeted action plan – supported by polices and measures (for implementation) – how to get there
4. Allocation of responsibility (ownership) and resources – who will champion SUTP and take it forward. The funding of it.
5. Monitoring and evaluation.

In December 2004 the final recommendations of the EWG were presented. The EWG aimed to provide a balanced stakeholder feedback on what a potential EC Directive to provide a framework for SUTP regulation in all Member States should contain. The Group made a number of recommendations and included a description of the minimum requirements for SUTP, and a framework for defining good practice.

EWG recommendations on minimum requirement for SUTP were:

- Establish a common evaluation framework

- Provision of financial support
- Guidance
- Training and dissemination (of best practice)
- Co-ordination of current policies.

In order to develop SUTP as a tool the EWG further considered what component parts or in some cases who was ideally needed to deliver SUTP. This became what is referred to as the framework for defining good practice:

- Citizen Participation
- Stakeholder Consultation
- Actor Cooperation
- Policy Co-ordination
- Achieving integration with comprehensive planning
- Land use planning

The EWG identified that the process (“Planning”) of producing SUTP is at least, if not more, important as the Plans themselves. The EWG’s recommendations therefore considered the two main components of SUTP:

1. **SUT-Planning:** The specific qualities of the planning approach in terms of procedures and actor relations;
2. **SUT-Plan:** The design of the planning instrument that ensures the efficient implementation of policies and measures, and ultimately target achievement.

The Groups findings lay the foundation for PILOT and were incorporated into several of the tasks undertaken within Work Package 1. The EWG’s recommendations acted as the basis for the development of the National Review framework and checklist developed within Task 1.1. Each of the EWG’s recommendations was used in a checklist tool, against which the specific qualities of the planning approach within each review country could be clearly established.

0.2 Findings of the Literature Review

The second key source of information that informed the development of the national review framework and checklist, and has informed the study as a whole is the literature review. The conclusions set out below underline the important lessons derived from that work.

The development of Sustainable Urban Transport Plans is complex and can benefit from following strict guidance. When a plan is considered it needs to be viewed and set within a wide context to account for a full and accurate set of measures to be applied. The implementation of those measures should be supported with a fully developed and budgeted action plan i.e. a strategy. The strategy should be given a long-term perspective and requires political support from national, regional and local levels. This requires a good foundation of cooperation and (political) will to progress. Inevitably this will need ‘cross border’ cooperation at a wider i.e. European, national and regional level, as well as at the local level of application.

The issue of support is reflected in public participation, an essential tool that if used effectively will enable a balance of views to be implemented. A variety of tools are available to aid this process and they should be applied wherever possible. The development of

expertise and training is an important precondition for the development of effective policies, both in government and private sector.

With regard to the implementation mechanism itself, four basic elements were identified in the Literature Review in this regard:

1. Status analysis and baseline assessment;
2. Definition of vision, objectives and targets;
3. Budgeted action plan;
4. Monitoring and evaluation mechanism.

Each is considered briefly in turn here.

The baseline assessment serves as the foundation for the development of the plan and will be an important tool that can and should be used in raising awareness amongst local politicians, transport providers regarding the application of SUTP at the local level. It defines a long term vision and sets out the objectives and targets for achieving the plan. Targets should be relevant and follow an outcome based approach. Furthermore, they should wherever possible be challenging but realistic.

The scenario building process should help a local authority to identify best value for money solutions. It should also serve to demonstrate how the targets will be realised. In essence it is a first stage of reality checking. Where local authorities are increasingly scrutinised regarding expenditure and delivery of programmes within constrained budgets, this is a key area that should be given due consideration. It is also becoming progressively more important that local authorities build on existing infrastructure. This should be a constituent part of what is often referred to as a package of measures.

The budgeted action plan specifies actions, describes measures, sets a reasonable timeframe and allocates responsibility for the delivery of the plan. It allocates a clear budget for each measure. It needs to be flexible, regularly evaluated and supported by a comprehensive communication strategy.

The development of a comprehensive evaluation framework is essential in order to monitor progress. Several methodologies can be applied but the key element is to develop a systematic approach that is clearly defined and understood by all that use it. Benchmarking is a key element that will not only clearly set out the targets or aims of the plan, but may also prove useful in the sharing of best practice and exchanging of ideas.

0.3 Summary of the national reviews of SUTP in Europe

The objective of this chapter has been to summarise the national strategic reviews, make comparisons and quantify the results of national review on a topic by topic basis. Where sufficient information has been supplied, it has drawn out similarities in approach and provided an analysis. Furthermore, we have sought to highlight some examples of individual countries' approach to transport planning, mainly in terms of good examples of approach.

In using the checklist, reviewers have been very explicit in the approach taken in their country and provided a very good level of detail in response to individual questions. In some cases there is a focus on description. In other responses, reviewers have added more detail, or made specific reference to technique, e.g. modelling and forecasting scenarios. Some have

based their response around the legal requirements that can in some case add value, or seemingly in others detract or hinder progress in the application of SUTP.

The reviews contain some succinct descriptions of how specific aims and definitions regarding how SUTP is applied by individual nation states. An example of this is the results showing the difference in how transport planning law is applied. In a large number of cases reviewers have referred in some detail to what are quite unique approaches.

0.3.1 SUTP planning and approach

The key results found from an analysis of country reviews on planning and approach is:

- In almost two thirds of countries reviewed, local and urban plans are not compulsory;
- In approximately half of the countries reviewed, plans are produced using a national framework or national guidance document;
- In over half of cases, competent authorities are responsible for both developing and implementing plans;
- Reviewers reported that citizens were actively engaged in the stakeholder consultation process, albeit with varying approaches;
- In two thirds of countries reviewed, it was reported that there is integration between transport and land use planning;
- In over two thirds of cases, respondents either failed to comment or did not think training was adequate.

This highlights some specific areas of knowledge and possible concern that will need to be taken forward as the PILOT programme progresses. SUTP has evidently been adopted across a number of member states, albeit with varying levels of detail and application. Evidently many countries do demonstrate a good level of engagement with the SUTP process. There is variation in approach to national statutes. The level of accomplishment and application does not seem to be influenced by whether plans are compulsory or not. There is a good deal of variation between member states in terms of who takes responsibility for the SUTP. This responsibility is most acutely demonstrated at the local level, i.e. the local level impact or delivery of plans.

The reviewers highlight that there are some areas that seem to need further attention. Two key areas, namely gender equity and equality and training and dissemination of best practice, highlighted by the EWG in their work will need due consideration in future work packages within the PILOT programme. Gender equality was highlighted within the Literature Review as an area that has not been widely investigated in research programmes. Training and dissemination of best practice was highlighted as a minimum requirement in the recommendations of the EWG report.

0.3.2 SUT plan contents and design

The key results from the reviews of SUT plan contents and design are:

- In over two thirds of cases there are specific aims within planning law. These are defined and listed in various levels of detail by the reviewers from each country;
- Variation does exist in the individual interpretation of transport planning law in nation states;

- In about half of cases reviewers responded that countries did evaluate the impacts and effectiveness of previous transport plans;
- In just under half of responses reviewers said that tangible targets are defined based on a realistic analysis of problems and objectives;
- In just over a third of cases reviewers said that plans do implement policies and deliver actions to achieve real change and meet the specific targets that have been set;
- In approximately a third of cases at least some implementation was found to be monitored based on a selected set of indicators; and
- Budget plans are produced including costs and benefits in just under a third of responses.

These results highlight some interesting areas that will confirm what was known in some cases and may highlight a need for further investigation in others.

In some responses it is clear that there is variation in the application of plans at the local level in member states. Furthermore, problems are seen as needing to be addressed on a case by case basis. However, it is recognised that clear objectives are important regardless of the application of any given individual element of SUTP. The importance of a clear and defined structure is prevalent here, in particular where reference is made to the application of the process of SUTP.

Two areas stand out as requiring further attention and review as the PILOT programme progresses. Both regard consistency in approach. The first is a matter of interpretation with regard to indicators. There does seem to be some confusion in the interpretation of what an indicator is or the role it should fulfil. This will need consideration beyond this report. Further, there is an issue of measuring or evaluating progress over time and specifically what time should elapse between progress reports. This varies between annual, biannual and every five years or more in some cases. One must allow for interpretation by member states but the variation does underline the different approaches to SUTP. This may seem a relatively minor issue but does serve to illustrate the point that the variety in application of SUTP will need to be considered as the PILOT programme progresses.

1 INTRODUCTION

The PILOT project forms a key contribution to the formulation of the Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment as set out in the 6th Environmental Action Programme. The project responds to the recommendations of the Working Group on Sustainable Urban Transport, which identified the preparation of Sustainable Urban Transport Plans (SUTPs) as an important cornerstone for promoting sustainable urban transport. PILOT particularly recognises the necessity to provide guidance for the practical preparation of SUTPs. Furthermore it sets out to develop a common indicator-based monitoring and assessment framework for SUTPs and to disseminate ‘good practice’ and raise awareness about sustainable urban mobility issues. In this way, the project aims to provide substance to the design of the Thematic Strategy by addressing a number of strategic and operational objectives. PILOT is a research project that will demonstrate the preparation of sustainable urban transport plans (SUTP) in four European cities (Evora, Lancaster, Tallinn, Braila) and establish a “pilot-network” for this innovative undertaking.

The PILOT general objective will be achieved through a series of operational objectives in the course of the project. Such operational objectives include: a) an overview of preparatory work, existing research and practices, SWOT analysis, road map for PILOT cities; b) guidelines, assessment and recommendations for cities on Urban Transport Plans; c) Urban Transport Plans preparation and monitoring; d) Training and dissemination activities. In particular, the empirical basis of the project will be provided by an analysis of current Urban Transport Plans preparation practice and research in Europe. The analysis will focus on existing examples of good practice and research results, and establish the key parameters of UTP preparation, identifying instrument categories and success factors, drivers and obstacles, as well as key issues for transferability.

This first Deliverable provides the basis for the remainder of the workpackages. It includes four distinct sections of commentary within the main body of work, supported by extensive material in two Annexes. The report draws out the key findings from the initial tasks completed of WP1.

The content of this Deliverable is as follows:

- A section on the methodology and approach used;
- A summary of the Expert Working Group (EWG) findings and a literature review on SUTP projects, findings and recommendations completed in WP1 of PILOT;
- A summary of the key findings from national reviews of SUTP in Member and Accession States;
- A description and illustrative outputs from the pilot city Baseline Analysis, Task 1.3.

These chapters provide an evidence base for the deliverable, enabling it to draw out key practices, processes, and to develop recommendations that will inform subsequent tasks and key deliverables within the project.

A challenge in producing this deliverable has been how to process the large volumes of information produced in undertaking these tasks. It was decided at an early stage of the development of this work that the best way to proceed was to make the main body of work within this report a summary and commentary of the findings of the research undertaken. In presenting a clear and coherent summary of the findings it has been important to focus, as far

as possible, more on developing an analytical approach. As such the main document acts as an interpretation or discussion of the key findings, with the detailed information such as the national reviews and full literature review forming technical annexes to the main report.

Due to the submission date of this deliverable, Task 1.3 has not been fully completed at this stage. Further more detailed analysis will be completed by the end of November 2005. The partners and cities involved in this task have worked hard towards producing an initial draft baseline for inclusion in D1.0. The section in the deliverable should highlight the work undertaken up to the submission of this deliverable, and at least introduce the PILOT cities and provide an overview of the key issues and challenges faced by each of the four cities.

In the next chapter of the report we discuss the methodology applied to the key completed tasks of this deliverable.

2 METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the approach used to undertake the Literature Review and the National Reviews of SUTP are outlined.

2.1 Literature review

The main objective of the literature review was to provide a review of relevant research in relation to sustainable urban transport plans. It focused mainly on EC research within the Framework programmes and other notable studies outside of the Framework Programmes that involved sustainable transport issues. The main sources of information were reports and deliverables from Community Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development projects. This was guided by the Expert Working Group's Final Report on SUTPs and the National Review Framework developed in PILOT Task 1.1 which provided contextual information for the completion of this task. In addition, a guidance note was provided by the WP Leader to steer this Task, providing direction on the content and structure of the review.

The Technical Annex of the PILOT proposal was a primary source of information about research relevant to the PILOT project. An initial examination of studies was undertaken with a view to identifying a range of research which could be reviewed to an acceptable standard within the time available. This process was used to identify the most relevant research ensuring that the short-list of evidence covered all the issues. It was decided that the literature review presented the research results from approximately 20 recent and relevant projects or studies.

A 'checklist' of broad topics was established and considered for the Literature Review. The aim was to create a systematic approach toward the assembly of information for this task. The following list of broad topics was considered:

- Integrated transport planning approaches, cooperation and frameworks;
- Mobility management, demand management and modal shift;
- Decision support, assessment tools and benchmarking;
- Land-use, urban and regional development;
- Social inclusion, participation, communication and training;
- Public transport services; freight transport and logistics;
- Clean vehicles, energy efficiency and air quality;
- Transport interchanges;
- Shared vehicle use; and
- Transport safety.

One outcome of this approach was that it served to provide a coherent summary of the relevant parts of the various reports reviewed. The review was relatively selective in so far that it identified a number of projects on the basis of certain criteria but this process of selection enabled the reviewers to focus on what was required for the development of the PILOT 'tool box'.

It was decided to limit to 20 the number of projects that were analysed to compile the review. Cases were selected on the basis of very simple criteria. Firstly, only projects with a sound

research orientation were selected for the review. Secondly, only either fully completed projects or projects that had already been produced as interim outputs were short-listed. Thirdly, projects that had a visible follow up, or were (after or during completion) overarched by other projects (e.g. pricing, LUTR, MM projects) were not selected. Instead, overarching or follow up projects were selected. Fourthly, it was ensured that at least one project covered each of the broad research topics listed above. Finally, the case selection process excluded excessively 'measure' oriented projects (e.g. shared car use, design of transferia).

A template was used to assist the identification of common elements in all the case studies. The template was based on three main areas, namely: Sustainable Urban Transport Plans Policies and Measures, Sustainable Urban Transport Planning; and Sustainable Urban Transport Plans. In the first phase of information collection, 87 relevant research projects were identified. A qualitative methodology was used to analyse the 20 short-listed research projects, which can be found listed in the full Literature Review (see Annex 1).

2.2 SUTP national reviews

A framework was produced by the WP leader to guide the SUTP national reviews. The framework covered all aspects of SUTP production, including what was considered to be the three key stages of preparation, implementation and monitoring. The main tool used to carry out the review was the Review Checklist. The checklist was based around the knowledge and recommendations of the Expert Working Group on SUTP plus further research and understanding of good-practice in SUTP preparation.

In simple terms the key aim of the checklist has been to aid a national strategic review and define the baseline for the remainder of the project. It was also intended that the review identified selected examples to highlight good practice within particular aspects of the process. The checklist was not used to review individual plans but to gather information regarding the approach each Member State uses for transport planning in general and SUTP in particular.

The checklist comprises three distinct sections which cover:

- 1 Planning, or the general approach to transport plan production;
- 2 The content and design of the plans themselves;
- 3 A final section intended for countries that do not have SUTP, but covering aspirations and reasons for developing SUTP in the future.

2.2.1 SUTP planning: general approach and basis for plans

The first section of the checklist covered the general approach to urban transport planning within each review country. The intention here was for each member state or accession country to complete the checklist by assessing the specific qualities of the planning approach within their country and provide a review of that process to TTR. The key aim here was to clearly establish a record of the procedures and interactions between levels of government and other key actors within the process. Six category areas were included for this purpose:

- A. National regulations;
- B. Spatial coverage & responsible authorities;

- C. Citizen participation & stakeholder consultation;
- D. Policy integration;
- E. Gender equity & equality;
- F. Capacity building;

The review checklist was completed wherever possible by a designated member of staff who had had involvement with the development of the type of SUTP that were used in the country being reviewed. Furthermore, it was still considered to be of value to complete the checklist against the nearest equivalent plan, where a SUTP was not available. In this case, it was considered important to highlight the differences in the approach taken within the review country and establish the barriers to SUTPs being produced within such countries.

A series of conditions, as guided by the recommendations of the Expert Working Group on SUTPs, was developed under each category. The reviewer was requested to carefully consider each statement in the checklist and whether the conditions were met (Yes) or unmet (No). A request was also made for the reviewer to provide concise comments and specific details regarding each statement made.

2.2.2 SUT plan: Contents & Design / General Practice and focus of plans

The second section of the checklist addresses the design of the planning instrument, the implementation of policies and measures, and monitoring and evaluation. There are 9 category areas to consider here:

- A. Subject definition;
- B. Status analysis and baseline scenario;
- C. Definition of a vision, objectives and targets;
- D. Delivery plan / Action and budget plan;
- E. Policies and measures;
- F. Assignment of responsibilities and resources;
- G. Monitoring and evaluation;
- H. Adoption, approval and assessment;
- I. Complete planning and implementation mechanism.

This checklist was to be completed in the same manner as the first section. The reviewers were requested to consider the strategic overview in completing this section. It was stressed here that it is important to draw out common practice and the aim of national guidelines.

2.2.3 SUTP aspirations

Reviewers were requested only complete this section where the country under review did not have SUTP in place. The aim here is to identify the aspirations within the country being reviewed for developing SUTP in the future, and the possible barriers to their implementation.

The checklist and supporting guidance was used by the PILOT consortium members to undertake reviews of the Member and Accession States in the EU, either directly through their working knowledge or more often with considerable assistance of contacts and supporters of the project in relevant Government, Research and Academic Institutions.

3 CONTEXT FOR THE REVIEW OF SUTP

This chapter incorporates the findings of the Expert Working Group (EWG) and the review of relevant research and study results provided by the literature review. The latter summarises findings from the full document, appended to this Deliverable as Annex 1. This section highlights some key aspects of the SUTP process, and highlights advice on the process or approach, the content and design of transport plans, and relevant policy areas and measures.

3.1 Findings of the Expert Working Group (EWG)

An important consideration of PILOT has been to ensure that existing experiences and knowledge are fully integrated into the project. An Expert Working Group (EWG) was drawn together to consider the potential for an EC directive on SUTP implementation in all Member States. The importance of incorporating the findings and recommendations of the EWG on SUTP into the work plan of PILOT were recognised, and their contribution to knowledge in this area is acknowledged here.

In outline, their main task was threefold,

1. To consider the approach to SUTP. “Design of procedures, instruments and measures needed for SUTP”,
2. The content of the potential directive and
3. The support base required (“actions”) for improving SUTP in Europe.

What the EWG did not do was to recommend whether or not SUTP should be adopted as an obligatory statute i.e. directive. That is what this part of the work, the current study, should move towards.

As such the EWG worked to develop what they considered to be a practical instrument that should be used to develop and deliver SUTP. This can be summarised in the following five key steps:

1. Defining a vision – the aim
2. Objectives and targets – what you want to achieve
3. Budgeted action plan – supported by polices and measures (for implementation) – how to get there
4. Allocation of responsibility (ownership) and resources – who will champion SUTP and take it forward. The funding of it.
5. Monitoring and evaluation.

In December 2004 the final recommendations of the EWG were presented. The EWG aimed to provide a balanced stakeholder feedback on what a potential EC Directive to provide a framework for SUTP regulation in all Member States should contain. The Group made a number of recommendations and included a description of the minimum requirements for SUTP, and a framework for defining good practice.

EWG recommendations on minimum requirement for SUTP were:

- Establish a common evaluation framework
- Provision of financial support

- Guidance
- Training and dissemination (of best practice)
- Co-ordination of current policies.

In order to develop SUTP as a tool the EWG further considered what component parts or in some cases who was ideally needed to deliver SUTP. This became what is referred to as the framework for defining good practice:

- Citizen Participation
- Stakeholder Consultation
- Actor Cooperation
- Policy Co-ordination
- Achieving integration with comprehensive planning
- Land use planning

The EWG identified that the process (“Planning”) of producing SUTP is at least, if not more, important as the Plans themselves. The EWG’s recommendations therefore considered the two main components of SUTP:

1. **SUT-Planning**: The specific qualities of the planning approach in terms of procedures and actor relations;
2. **SUT-Plan**: The design of the planning instrument that ensures the efficient implementation of policies and measures, and ultimately target achievement.

The Groups findings lay the foundation for PILOT and were incorporated into several of the tasks undertaken within Work Package 1. The EWG’s recommendations acted as the basis for the development of the National Review framework and checklist developed within Task 1.1. Each of the EWG’s recommendations was used in a checklist tool, against which the specific qualities of the planning approach within each review country could be clearly established.

3.2 Literature Review of SUTP

3.2.1 Introduction

Throughout Europe, a number of promising initiatives in the field of sustainable urban transport have been implemented. These initiatives range from cycling projects to the exploration of new alternatives transport modes as well as mobility management strategies. They constitute a mix of pull and push measures and aim at achieving a reduction of car trips or a change in the modal split towards sustainable transport modes. Transport related problems such as congestion or air pollution require complex solutions taking into consideration all important policy issues closely linked to the transport sector (social inclusion, land use planning etc). These solutions then need to reflect and be part of an integrated transport strategy addressing the needs and interests of all relevant stakeholders. Public participation in decision making is increasingly important in this respect.

The PILOT project aims at delivering concrete recommendations for designing a European policy framework that promotes sustainable urban transport planning in cities all over Europe. In order to base its recommendations in concrete and up-to-date facts, it was decided to conduct a literature review of 20 key research projects that will provide the necessary context and knowledge to base the further analysis on. The structure of the review has been

chosen to reflect all important aspects to take into consideration when building a sustainable urban transport plan. This literature review aims to provide an overview of what has been already discussed in Europe as regards SUTP.

3.2.2 Sustainable urban policies

The first set of issues focus on ‘Sustainable Urban Policies’ and clearly highlights the main trends to be analysed when starting the elaboration of a sustainable urban transport plan. All local authorities will strive towards a reduction of the need for transport, an efficient transport management system, a clean-safe and fair transport. Within this, the following items are particularly highlighted:

- Strong need for mobility management strategies;
- Importance of political support when elaborating a new strategy;
- Provision of an efficient use of space;
- Investment in and introduction of new technologies and applied technological innovations;
- Need for stakeholders participation at all levels;
- Importance of public transport;
- Improvement of safety and security on the roads;
- Importance of social inclusion.

3.2.3 Integration

SUTP should be embedded in an overall sustainable development strategy with a long-term perspective and should integrate transport and mobility planning with a comprehensive planning and sector plans, especially for land use and spatial development, environment, social inclusion, economic development, safety, health, education and information and communication technologies. The strategy could already exist or could be elaborated within the framework of the SUTP, but should in any case provide the overall local policy framework for SUTP. The considerations that Sustainable Urban Transport Planning should focus on are:

- Citizens participation, stressing the importance of consultation processes and participative planning tools;
- Policy integration;
- Gender equity and equality;
- Capacity building and efficient management;
- Adoption, approval and political assessment procedures.

There are currently many practical experiences in developing and implementing sustainable urban transport schemes. The process of decision making, the management and engagement strategy are vital to the success of such initiatives. The elaboration of a comprehensive and coherent action plan as well as its constant evaluation will lead to a broad acceptance of local and regional transport schemes and to better results.

3.2.4 Implementation steps

The elaboration of a Sustainable Urban Transport Plan is a step-by-step approach. A five-step implementation mechanism is recommended, comprising status analysis (with all conditioning factors such as existing transport space, vehicle ownership, mobility patterns), the selection of clear objectives and targets, followed by a scenario building process and

appraisal, a budgeted action plan including various policies and measures as well as the operation and management of transport systems and the evaluation framework. All different steps are thoroughly explained and commented in the last chapter of this document.

3.2.5 Conclusions

On the basis of this analysis of SUTP, some conclusions can be drawn, summarizing the key elements to keep in mind when elaborating a SUTP. The conclusions set out below underline the importance for a comprehensive evaluation framework, sufficient financial support, guidance and training as well as integration with other policies.

The elaboration of Sustainable Urban Transport Plans is complex and needs to follow strict guidance. This transport plan needs to be set in a wide context, taking into consideration all policies influencing the transport sector, such as social inclusion, safety issues, environment and economic viability of a region. Measures put forward in the budgeted action plan should ensure the implementation of an integrated transport strategy covering all transport priorities set for the local or regional levels. The strategy should be envisaged in a long-term perspective and receive political support from all governance levels. A good cooperation between the different actors is definitely required.

Ideally, the SUTP should work across authority boundaries, reflecting the need to address some transport issues over a wider geographical area, such as travel to work areas. In some cases it will be sensible for local authorities to produce joint plans. Indeed, reducing the need for transport or ensuring safe and clean transport are objectives that cannot be achieved without a good cooperation with all levels and complementarities of measures introduced to achieve a better mobility. An integrated planning approach can greatly enhance the efficiency of urban transport policies. Measures selected within the budgeted action plan should represent balanced and comprehensive solutions.

Public participation is essential and allows a better understanding of transport problems and needs. It helps generating innovative solutions and is a key factor in public acceptance of measures introduced within a city. A variety of participation typologies and tools are available and can range from public debates and consultation to more active forms of participation such as workshops or consultation processes. While ensuring the participation of the public in decision making procedure in the field of mobility and transport, it is also crucial to pursue the issue of accessibility for all and give a place for analysing gender equity and equality. This issue was the less investigated within the projects reviewed, together with ex-post adaptation.

The development of expertise and training is an important precondition for the development of effective policies, both in government and private sector. A wide range of organisational, financial, legal structures as supporting the transport systems.

As regards the implementation mechanism, four basic elements have been put forward:

1. Status analysis and baseline assessment;
2. Definition of vision, objectives and targets;
3. Budgeted action plan;
4. Monitoring and evaluation mechanism.

Each and every step takes on a particular importance.

The baseline assessment will serve as a basis for the elaboration of the plan and will be an important instrument for raising awareness of local politicians or transport operators/providers as to the necessity of SUTP at local level. Defining a long term vision, objectives and targets is essential as will serve as a guide throughout the elaboration of the strategy. Addressing the question of transport objectives and targets needs to be set in order to support sustainable economic growth and social inclusion. Targets should visibly support these policies and relate to outcomes. They need to be challenging but realistic and take into account local priorities and national targets for road safety, public transport patronage and air quality. While local authorities will pursue different objectives, it is however thought that a good sustainable urban transport plan will address the following problems: congestion, accessibility, safer roads, air quality and other quality of life issues.

The scenario building process will help the local authority identify the best value for money solutions. As the plan should demonstrate how the local authority will deliver its targets, evidence based on what works, in particular on programmes which change behaviour need to be provided. Several mechanisms have been presented in this report and could be easily transferred. It is also increasingly important that local authorities build on existing infrastructure, including through efficient maintenance and management of the local road network and avoid focussing on capital investment at the expense of other innovative solutions. Packages of complementary measures, with measures to address both demand and supply, should be considered, including the new opportunities for supporting strategies to tackle congestion in towns and cities.

The budgeted action plan specifies concrete actions, describes measures, sets timeframe and responsibilities and allocates a clear budget for each measure. It needs to be flexible, regularly evaluated and supported by a comprehensive communication strategy. Financial support needs to be clearly determined. It might come from various government bodies, public transport operators or less frequently private sector. Getting funding often implies stable and positive political framework conditions. Funds should be managed efficiently in order to avoid delays, cancellation or other problems in the course of the implementation of the strategy.

The development of a comprehensive evaluation framework is essential in order to monitor progress. Several methodologies have been elaborated and could be of use for local authorities. Not even is it important to monitor results and internal management but it is also essential to benchmark the strategy against other similar strategies. The benchmarking procedure can help in exchanging useful experiences and learn from one another.

To conclude, comprehensive and well-thought SUTP may be useful for cities to implement an integrated transport strategy at local levels. The debate on whether these plans should be made compulsory or not is very controversial and further research on the benefits of such plans and additional guidance might need to be foreseen in order to convince everyone of SUTP necessity.

4 A REVIEW OF SUTP IN THE EU

4.1 Introduction

This chapter of the report sets out a summary of the national strategic reviews conducted in Task 1.1. It highlights the current status of SUTP, illustrate the opportunities to transfer good practice between member states and indicate the position from which generic guidelines would be received. All the completed checklists containing detailed reviews of each member state and accession country form an Annex to this report.

The objective of this chapter is to summarise the national SUTP reviews, make comparisons and quantify (where possible) the results of national review on a topic by topic basis. Where sufficient information has been supplied, this chapter draws out similarities in approach. Furthermore, we have sought to highlight some examples of individual countries' approach to transport planning, mainly in terms of good practice.

A tabular approach has been used in the majority of cases to summarise the results of the national review on questions which were part of the checklist. These are presented in a simple format of either a Yes, a No or a Not Known (NK) response to each question. The sequence of topics follows that of the checklist tool, to be found in Annex 2.

What this section aims to do is draw together the various approaches and summarise these across the member states and accession countries. It is not intended to recommend a given approach, in terms of best practice, as this has been done already by the EWG and through the Literature Review (Task 1.3). However, in drawing out approaches to SUTP that are shown to work in individual countries this will inevitably give a sense of demonstrating good practice.

4.2 SUTP Planning and approach

4.2.1 National Regulations

Are local and urban plans compulsory according to national legislation?

One of the three main tasks of the EWG was to consider the approach of EU member states and accession countries to SUTP. In almost two thirds of countries reviewed, local and urban plans are not compulsory. However, SUTP are still considered and adopted, albeit with varying success. This level of adoption does not seem to be influenced by whether plans are compulsory or not.

Yes	No
France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Slovenia, UK	Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Estonia, Luxembourg

Plans are implemented on a voluntary basis in Austria. In the Flanders region, Belgium LTPs are carried out in the municipalities, whereas in the Walloon region, authorities are strongly encouraged to adopt plans. In Slovakia a strong foundation and appreciation of SUTP principles are demonstrated although not compulsory. In the Czech Republic, the system there is evolving to become more orientated towards mobility but is neither systematic nor a real mobility plan/SUTP at present. Hungary states simply that it bases its national transport legislation, general planning laws and special laws on EC guidelines, and in Romania the foundations of SUTP are still in development.

In some countries, such as Denmark, SUTP are not mandatory but elements are included in statutes such as the Danish Planning Act. In Finland the Land Use and Building Law includes detailed provisions regarding the promotion of public transport, walking and cycling.

Looking at countries with firm national regulations on the subject, in France the structure is firmly placed in a succession of laws that have addressed SUTP since 1982 (LOTI). This includes the 1996 LAURE that addressed air quality and the reduction of energy use and more recently the urban solidarity and renewal SRU law of 2000. In Italy, the PUM, a strategic medium-long term plan, is backed by a shorter, 2 year term, the PUT. A Master Plan regulates transport planning at the regional level. In the UK the Transport Act 2000 placed a statutory requirement on local authorities to produce local transport plans. The focus was placed on mobility and access in the White Paper, The Future of Transport in 2004.

What this demonstrates is that there is great variety in approach across states in Europe. Whilst there are similarities in approach, ultimately each country has its own unique adaptation.

Are plans produced using a National framework / guidance document?

In approximately half of the countries reviewed, plans are produced using a national framework or national guidance document. There is variation in approach to these national statutes, as might be expected, but even more so is that it is interesting to note that almost half do not produce national framework documents.

Yes	No	NK
Belgium (regional) Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (not compulsory), Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania (not compulsory), Netherlands, Slovenia, UK	Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia Malta, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden,	Luxembourg, Slovakia

However, it is not the case that where no compulsory legislation exists, no plans are produced. Rather, in four cases – Belgium, Denmark, Finland and the Netherlands - national plans are produced using a national framework despite the fact that plans are not compulsory in national legislation. For example, in Sweden, work is in progress that includes an integrated national transport planning framework backed by a guidance document. In further examples, in the Netherlands, the Mobility Policy Document sets out which national interests must be taken on board in the decentralised traffic and transport policy. In Finland the National Road Administration has drawn up a guide for transport planning, which can be applied in various cases. In Denmark the Danish Planning Act and Danish Road Act are the two key national framework documents. The former provides the backbone and formal anchoring of a voluntary municipal TEAP (Transport and Environment Action Plans). Procedure and guidelines are also part of the approach in all regions in Belgium. In the UK detailed guidance is produced by the Department for Transport to guide local authorities in the preparation of their LTPs. Accessibility is a key element of the approach in the latest LTP2.

There is no uniform legislation (national regulations) regarding local urban transport plans in Austria and Germany. In Germany guidelines are not binding for the municipal authorities.

Italian PUTs are based on national legislation. PUMs are also kept within economic and social guidelines which are fixed at a regional level. This link to the regional level of planning is reflected in the Hungarian approach. The objectives of SUTP are specified in the “LOTI” in France and have been supplemented with guidance regarding methodology from CERTU.

This demonstrates a variety in approach across a number of countries to local and urban transport planning at the national policy level. It shows that frameworks and guidance are valued and used in SUTP production even when not mandatory.

4.2.2 Spatial Coverage & Responsible Authorities

Plans are applicable to all urban areas in excess of 100,000 people:

In just under two thirds of all responses to this statement, plans were found to be applicable in urban areas with more than 100,000 inhabitants.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, UK.	Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Portugal, Romania, Sweden	Bulgaria, Czech Republic,

In France plans are compulsory in conurbations of more than 100,000. In the Walloon region of Belgium the threshold is lower at 50,000. This is lower still, 30,000 in Italy for PUTs. The PUM is obligatory in urban agglomerations with over 100,000 inhabitants.

In Hungary all urban areas are obliged to produce UTPs regardless of population and density. In the UK LTPs cover all authorities although responsibility varies between Highway Authorities, in the majority of cases, and Passenger Transport Authorities in the six main agglomerations outside London. This reflects the Swedish system that produces a comprehensive plan for every municipality regardless of size. In Lithuania, Master Plans exist for the major cities but smaller towns or urban areas can also create their own plans on a voluntary basis.

Plans are adopted although not compulsory in most big cities in Austria and in all cities on a voluntary basis in Spain. In Belgium as with Austria, where national legislation is not mandatory, some plans are applied on a basis of voluntary collaboration between adjacent municipalities. In other cases the structure is seemingly more complex, such as Denmark. In the Netherlands provinces and urban areas produce a “Trafficplan”. However, if funding is required for smaller settlements then a plan, stating policy and aims, has to be produced.

In some cases there are limitations in terms of coverage simply due to geography. Slovakia only has two cities with a population of more than 100,000. In Malta, in a similar fashion, a limited number of 8 urban areas produce Local Plans. In Finland Transport System Plans are prepared on a voluntary basis in the ten largest city regions.

Are competent authorities and bodies responsible for developing and implementing the plans?

This section deals with responsibility at the local level, i.e. the local level impact or delivery of plans. In over half of cases competent authorities are responsible for developing and implementing plans. In approximately a quarter of cases however we do not know from the responses if authorities do or do not maintain responsibility.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, UK.	Greece, Malta, Portugal, Romania.	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Sweden.

There is a good deal of variation in terms of which organisation takes responsibility within member states for SUTP.

In Italy the municipality retains responsibility for developing and implementing plans, as it is in Denmark. In Slovenia the town planning authority retains responsibility for developing and implementing the plan. Responsibility also lies with the cities or communities in Austria. A similar system applies in Hungary, although seemingly quite complex in nature. This contrasts with the UK where responsibility is clearly defined with local authorities in most cases. In Finland, a contrasting approach is used, where a national partnership maintains responsibility for developing and implementing plans.

Some reviews have also described the type of agreement that exists. In some cases there is a voluntary agreement. In Germany, although not obliged to have specialist transport departments, many local authorities do in fact operate one. In France, the urban transport authority (AOTU) provides a basis of voluntary cooperation between adjacent municipalities. Municipalities are also responsible for developing SUTPs in the Flanders and Brussels regions of Belgium.

In cases where the response was negative (or not known) to the question of whether plans were applicable to all larger urban areas, some interesting commentary was supplied to explain the status quo. In Romania, where there is currently no assumed responsibility, there are plans to develop and implement urban transport plans through local authorities. This includes issues regarding operation, monitoring and overall control, for example, of urban traffic systems. In other cases, such as Malta, it appears that the effective implementation of plans is hampered by the lack of coordination between governmental departments with no single department taking the responsibility for the delivery of plans. A similar lack of clear definition seems to exist in Greece. In Sweden, the combination of transport planning and land use planning into one framework is developing, although at this stage it is unclear exactly how this is to be defined and where responsibilities will lie.

4.2.3 Citizen Participation & Stakeholder Consultation

Is citizen participation, information and stakeholder consultation built into the plans from the start of the process?

Stakeholder Consultation was one element of the framework for defining good practice developed by the EWG. Almost two thirds of the country reviews carried out found that stakeholder consultation was built into SUTPs from the start. However, in almost a third of responses it was not clear or not known whether consultation was built into the planning from the start.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Slovakia, UK.	Greece, Romania, Sweden	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Luxembourg, Portugal (said N/A because plans are mandatory), Slovakia, Spain

Generally, those reviews that found consultation to be “built in” provided further information on how this was done. Reviewers reported that citizens were actively engaged in the stakeholder consultation process, albeit with varying approaches.

In the UK local authorities engage with and involve local people, the local business community, those delivering other public services and other key stakeholders. The structure discussed in the French response reflects a thorough approach that includes national, regional and local representation as well as representatives of transport users and professionals, chambers of commerce and industry and environmental associations. In Austria citizens and stakeholder groups can propose amendments and changes and discuss them with the responsible authority. The round table and forum approach is also undertaken in Italy. In Luxembourg a system of consultative committees and bodies is used for consultation. In the following examples it was not clear from the responses whether or not stakeholder consultation was mandatory in the country. However, what is important is that it takes place

The review of Hungary opinioned that the theory of wide participation is often not matched by practical delivery of it in practice, due to perhaps a rather conservative approach.

In other examples of approaches to consultation, it is compulsory on at least one occasion to carry out stakeholder consultation in the preparation of any strategic policy in Belgium, Brussels region. In Finland, citizen participation has recently become mandatory, when considering impact assessment of schemes and strategic planning issues. In Lithuania, public consultation is carried out through meetings and discussions. These are regulated by law. This two to three month process includes a system of appeal.

In one case, there was explicit reference to consultation being carried out but not being mandatory. In the Flanders region of Belgium, consultation is recommended but not compulsory.

Interestingly the review of Germany found the only specific reference to special needs groups i.e. disabled people and elderly people. This is part of a wide ranging level of consultation with the public and service providers.

How are the general public informed about the plans?

Methods for the dissemination of information to public parties generally fall into two categories, named, for the purpose of this analysis, Limited and Varied. Limited in this case refers to countries that have listed only a few information sources e.g. newspapers and journals in their response. Varied usually includes further reference to the World Wide Web (www), consultation through forums, questionnaires, etc.

Varied, usually multimedia, www etc.	Limited (that includes reference only to journals and newspapers)	NK
Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Luxembourg, UK.	France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Netherlands, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden.	Malta, (“Unknown”), Slovakia, Spain

Where the country reviews indicated a varied approach, there were further variations in approach. In Belgium, Flanders region, different methods are used: information folders, public hearings, specific campaigns, municipal journal, website etc. In the Walloon region of Belgium, consultation is carried out through round tables, questionnaires, working group meetings and reaction to produced documents. Additionally, in Denmark, direct mail is used to inform local interest groups and homeowners that are affected by any development. In Italy direct and indirect methods were reported to inform the public, such as letters, emails, leaflets and phone. In Luxembourg the public are informed by web and booklets on initiatives and schemes.

Where responses indicated a more limited approach, there was also variety in delivery. In Germany, transport plans (NVPs) are published officially in newspapers and local official journals. Interestingly, public enquiry was reported as the main form of consultation in France, reported independently. In Greece the public are informed mainly through the newspapers. This reflects a similar approach in Hungary, where the media is used with local official journals to inform the general public about plans. This may be limited in its impact, as it may not reach the public, maintaining the information mainly in professional circles. In Slovenia the main forms of public participation are through conferences and public hearings. The Romanian response is the exception to the rule, in the main, in that it makes limited reference to methods but talks about use of the web and round table debates to disseminate information.

Is there integration between transport and land use planning?

Achieving comprehensive integration with planning was one element of the framework for defining good practice developed by the EWG. The key issue here is to manage or control development and improve environmental management, and thus lessen the impact of development. In two thirds of countries reviewed it was reported that there is integration between transport and land use planning.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary (relatively recent), Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Slovakia (although not systematic), Slovenia, UK.	Germany (no obligation), Lithuania, Portugal, Romania, Sweden,	Bulgaria, Estonia, Spain

France has a very explicit integrated approach in its planning process. Land use, national and regional master plans; regional and local air quality plans; Local land use plans; everyday local decisions i.e. road management, construction, traffic management and regulation.

Other countries were found to have taken varying approaches, distinct to planning law in place, and integration exists to varying degrees. In the UK, regulation aims to influence policy coordination through the definition of specific assessment criteria. These concern the consistency with national plans and objectives from other policy domains, and the coordination with specific sectoral policies concerning disabled persons, social inclusion, air quality and noise, as well as climate change. In Belgium, Walloon region, there are explicit links between the urban transport plan, regional spatial development plans and local transport plans. In the Flanders region of Belgium, the SUTP gives special attention to strategic urban developments (linked to the land-use plan). In Slovenia all aspects of transport planning are felt to be a component part of integrated social planning that includes economic and social aspects. This is reflected in the approach taken in Malta. In Slovakia, although it is not felt to be systematic, the Master Plan integrates transport, land use, environment, industry and housing. In Denmark, integration is guaranteed by the Municipal Plan. In the Netherlands the national mobility plan follows the spatial plan, clearly demonstrating the link. In Italy traffic plans must be produced according to the city land use plan. In Hungary, the integration of transport and the environment is a relatively new concept, but was reported as taking place. In Finland the new land use and building law focuses on the community and the integration of appropriate land use planning in the SUTP process.

Where reviewers responded in the negative to this question there was limited evidence to suggest that integration does not exist per se, for different reasons. In Germany the authorities are not obliged to synchronise their NVPs with other relevant land use plans. In Sweden they are striving toward this as one of the main objectives within the ongoing development process.

4.2.4 Gender equity & equality

Is gender and equality promoted in transport planning?

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Greece, Lithuania (in development), Sweden.	Belgium, Denmark, Finland (in development), France, Germany, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, UK.	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, , Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Spain,

Gender equity and equality was highlighted within the Literature Review as an area that has not been widely investigated in research programmes. This may be reflected in responses to this question found by the country reviewers. ‘No’ in the responses has often been left blank but where a comment has been made it mostly refers to the fact that there is no specific requirement to promote equity between genders in terms of transport planning e.g. in Denmark, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia. This is not to say that in all cases, it does not exist. For example, in Finland, it is considered that women are well represented in general. In the Netherlands again there is nothing specified in the planning process because men and women are considered equal. Women are equally represented in public forums such as “womenboards”.

Where a response is ‘Yes’ the issue of personal security or safety for women and not the planning process itself is highlighted, for example in Austria, whereas in Lithuania all projects (currently) have to be prepared in the way of promoting and ensuring gender equity and equality. Change is also in process in Romania, more from a general point of view with regard to equity, although specific reference is made to decision makers in the planning process.

In the UK, attempts are made to integrate gender and equity into the planning process, but it is felt that there remains an imbalance in the equity between sexes. Similar sentiments are echoed in the review Sweden, where the issue has been the subject of an official target in national transport planning.

4.2.5 Capacity Building

Do local authorities and stakeholders ensure that their key personnel have the necessary skills for driving and managing the plan process? Do they have an adequate skills base, training amongst staff in the municipalities?

Training and dissemination of best practice was highlighted as a minimum requirement in the recommendations of the EWG report. This is corroborated by this project’s review of the current State of the Art, as in over two thirds of cases respondents either failed to comment or did not think training was adequate.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Finland, France, Italy, Netherlands, Sweden, UK.	Belgium, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta (N/A), Portugal (N/A), Romania,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain,

Where country reviews found that necessary skills were in place, there was some variation in the approach adopted by individual countries, and therefore some good examples of how it might be approached. France has a structured management process including human resources, a specified person employed to pilot the process, backed by a (binding) contract. In the UK staff undertake personal development plans and complete identified training requirements. In the Netherlands training is considered to be integrated as part of everyday practice within local authorities and if the skills base is not suitable, will hire in expertise e.g. specialist consultants. In Finland a new training programme is to be introduced in autumn 2005.

The theme of “buying in” expertise is highlighted by reviews that found skills were not in place in their municipalities. In the Walloon region of Belgium, an external consultant can be employed by the municipality. In the Flanders region of Belgium, the level of expertise seems to be dependent on the size of the municipality. When experts are employed it is more dependent on a specified action requiring bespoke expertise.

In some country reviews, the negative response to this question was a result of answering a sub-question of whether or not it is mandatory to train key personnel. In Lithuania, local authorities are not obligated to ensure that their personnel possess the necessary skills for managing and driving the plan. However, the practical experience of the matter is that personnel are trained in most aspects of the planning process, although it is not clear if this specifically relates to SUTP. This is also reflected in the responses from Germany and Hungary and therefore does rebalance the proportion of Yes / No results presented in the summary table.

4.2.6 Drivers, barriers and good practice in SUT Planning

Under the following checklist topics are listed the significant comments and examples that resulted from questions about Drivers, Barriers and Good Practice. They provide an illustration of the different approaches adopted by various member states, according to the reviewers.

Drivers: What are the key drivers influencing the process of urban transport planning?

Commitment and Investment

- Strong and well planned transport policy is required (Luxembourg);
- Long term commitment for projects, for example, in Luxembourg commitment to 2015-20 backed by 2.6 billion euro investment transport programme, which demonstrates political will and major investment;
- Good cooperation between regional authority, municipality and (regional) public transport operator (Belgium);

- It is important that politicians are involved / strongly engaged in the SUTP process (Belgium) and political willingness is also discussed in the review of Slovenia;
- Involvement of all users in the decision making process (Italy);
- Voluntary approach with central government funding support (Denmark);
- Good detailed information / knowledge base i.e. extensive mapping of environmental (air quality) hotspots (Denmark);
- Value for money – political coherency and cooperation and developing the whole transport system with common aims (Finland);
- A major investment programme in Hungary of 653 million Euro;
- The renaissance of the inner city (Sweden);
- Good data collection programme to substantiate and inform (decisions regarding) transport policy (France);
- Integration of transport services and deriving the connection between mobility and urban planning, including land use (France);
- Lack of national, uniform regulation regarding public transport in Germany gives the advantage of allowing greater levels of flexibility for local practitioners;
- Interdisciplinary knowledge – SUTPs need ‘cross sectoral thinking’ – plus effective targets and indicators (Italy);
- Fast, efficient public transport network connections to workplaces, train-tram-bus. (Luxembourg);
- Strong and effective partnership between local and regional politicians, public transport partners and the public (Netherlands);
- Pan European Corridors connections to beyond the country’s own borders (Slovenia);
- Increasing use of mobility management (Sweden);
-
- Key drivers listed in the review of Portugal that influence the process of urban transport planning are to:
 - Reduce traffic congestion
 - Reduce parking problems
 - Improve public transport
 - Social equity
 - Territorial equity
- The negative impact of unrestrained car growth is a major driver in Slovakia - clear links are seen not only to the sustainable future of traffic growth but also the implications that traffic growth will have on road safety;
- Technological development with alternative fuels such as biogas (Sweden);

Barriers: What are the barriers to effective urban transport planning in the review country?

- Level of detail and content of transport plans varies greatly across the country (Austria);
- Lack of political support at the local level. Local decision makers exercise caution to avoid becoming ‘tied’ and committed to specific targets (Czech Republic);
- Electoral rules with short mandates that do not allow the development of (long term) ambitious transport policy (France);
- National targets difficult to deliver at local level as interdepartmental coordination weak, politically and within the local planning system (Sweden);
- Realisation of the true operating costs of implementing SUTP measures (France);

- Difficult to coordinate neighbouring municipalities in adjacent areas (Germany) and across city /rural boundaries (Lithuania);
- Parking policy favours car usage (Hungary);
- Lack of a national traffic management strategy favouring public transport (Hungary);
- Lack of participation and involvement by stakeholders and public in general planning and development; Lack of coherence between policies and funding programmes; investment in public transport (Lithuania).
- Local and national air quality, finance and the time it takes to deliver a plan – 3 key barriers to effective urban transport planning in the Netherlands;
- Four key barriers to implementing SUTP in Portugal: Cost, Ownership, Political risk/population willingness, Bureaucratic system;
- Weak financing, under-developed public transport system, predominance of car, weak public transport partnerships, central focus with a lack of regional administrative levels and topography (Slovenia);
- Perceived lack of understanding at local level of national planning and political processes (Sweden);

Good Practice: What examples of good practice can be highlighted?

- ‘Covenant system’, introduced mid 1990s, 80% of all communities have approved SUTPs, 100% with pop of <100,000 in Flanders region (Belgium);
- Car sharing scheme (VIVALDI), distinct major public transport schemes, focus on cycling in Copenhagen (Denmark);
- Regional cooperation particularly in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area (Finland);
- Public Partnership (France);
- ‘Lobbying group’ transport partnership in Budapest involving a range of public transport groups, rail and bus, both operators and other governing bodies or organisations;
- Integration is achieved between national, regional and local level transport planning (Germany);
- Long term plan – Lithuanian Transport System Development Strategy to 2025;
- Road safety partnership between nations, UK, Sweden and Netherlands. (Netherlands);
- An established sustainable transport system in Sweden since 1997;

It is interesting to note that many different member states have similar underlying approaches to transport planning and address issues such as coordination, cooperation and engagement as key drivers. However, the clear majority have distinct approaches that make each country unique. This embodies the individual needs of member states to adapt higher level, strategic approaches to SUTP and apply policy at the local level. The key is delivery and many see that as the major challenge. Funding and (political) willingness do appear in a number of cases to be perceived as both a driver and a barrier.

4.3 SUT plan contents and design

4.3.1 Subject definition

Are there specific aims and definitions regarding SUTP within transport planning law?

In over two thirds of the country reviews carried out, it was found that there are specific aims within transport planning law. These are defined and listed in various levels of detail by the reviewers of each country. As for other questions in the checklist, there is a certain commonality underlying the responses, but variation does exist in the individual interpretation of transport planning law in nation states.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, (except freight), Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, UK	Romania,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Luxembourg, Spain, Sweden,

Considering firstly the affirmative responses, some reviewers have been very explicit in the approach taken in the country under review and provide a good level of detail in response to this question. In the following, we list three examples of specific aims and definitions regarding SUTP within transport planning law in France, Italy and the UK.

France:

The LOTI law defines 8 aims for the SUTP:

1. Improve road safety for all users, particularly pedestrians and cyclists;
2. Reduction of motorised traffic;
3. Development of public transport and more economical and less polluting modes of travel such as cycling and walking;
4. Improve efficiency of use of main roads by sharing the use and implementation of information actions about traffic;
5. Organisation of car parking and the pricing system applied at the urban area level, for all types of users;
6. Rationalization of freight transport and delivery of merchandise and development of multi modal transport;
7. Encouragement of travel plans in companies and other activity sites particularly to promote the use of public transport and car pooling;
8. Implementation of fare and tickets systems to encourage inter-modal transport.

Italy:

The key areas within the Italian system of Urban Traffic Plan (PUT) are:

- Re-organisation of the public transport local network;
- Organisation of street mobility;
- Support safety policies for incident reduction;
- Analysis of parking trends (street stalls)
- Identification of areas of environmental risk;
- Deployment and management of cycle tracks;
- Deployment and management of pedestrian routes and pedestrian areas, special pedestrian areas around schools and management of architectural barriers;
- Deployment and timetable for the setting up of construction sites;
- Deployment of ITS for the improvement of urban mobility;
- Setting up of specific actions for Mobility Management.

United Kingdom:

The Government and Local Government Association (LGA) agreed, in July 2002, a set of seven shared priorities for local government. These priorities are a focus for the efforts of Government and councils for improving public services. The shared priorities include:

- Tackling Congestion;
- Delivering Accessibility;
- Safer Roads;
- Better Air Quality;
- Other Quality of Life Issues.

In Belgium there is a marked variety in affirmative responses and approach within the different major regions. In the Flanders region, there is strong integration between strategic urban developments, the optimisation of infrastructure networks for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport and supporting so called soft measures. A series of plans is listed for the Brussels region, Belgium with reference to road network hierarchy, cycling and pedestrian facilities, the improvement of the public transport supply and average speed, optimisation of the capacity of the existing networks, traffic safety, parking - including parking management, and an overall management plan for the integration of different measures. In the Walloon region, further to the plans listed for the Brussels Capital region, they include mobility management for important attractions, railway stations and intermodal interchanges, heavy goods vehicles / freight movement and spatial development and urbanism.

In Germany the level of integration between the aims of national policy, i.e. the NVPs, differs slightly at the local, Länder-level, in terms of delivery. Generally, each Länder should integrate public and individual transport and non-motorised transport into their plans.

In Hungary the focus is on measures, including:

- Traffic restraint in the inner city, through a combination of traffic and parking management measures.
- Pedestrianisation of city centres and promoting cycling and walking.
- Incentives for rail and water transport as well as combined/multimodal shipping methods.

In Lithuania, the focus is on controlling traffic flow and moving it away from city centres, and encouraging walking and cycling and modal shift to public transport.

Does the content and design of the plans reflect the concept of mobility?

Mobility management is considered in a little less than half of the countries that were reviewed against this question.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Portugal, UK.	Italy, Slovakia, Malta,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Slovenia, Sweden,

In those reviews that have found a positive response to this question there is some variation in the comment and interpretation regarding mobility. In the UK, plans contain policies for the promotion and encouragement of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport facilities and services to, from and within defined areas.

In Belgium, Brussels Capital Region, the approach is apparently more prescriptive in that the focus is on supporting measures concerning:

- Traffic management;
- Transport demand management;
- Parking management;
- Signposting; and
- Information / sensitisation / promotion towards stakeholders in the field.

In Lithuania plans take into account the individual needs of users. The authorities there are trying to address the requirements of different user groups and to fit the transport plans to their expectations. In Germany the plan takes into account the users' requirements for private and business travel and aims at a balance of interests between different groups of users and their differing needs and expectations. The same sentiments are reflected in the comments made by Austria. In France the main tool in mobility management is the use of workplace or company travel plans, with a particular focus on promoting public transport use and car pooling.

In Finland, although less advanced in terms of the application of mobility the issue is nonetheless being considered.

Where reviews have found an answer of no to this question, commentary has been added in the response. In Malta the plan is concerned with all aspects of social, economic, and physical infrastructure. Planning is mainly concerned with land use where the focus is on development control. As such, the reviewer feels that the plan has failed to address what are considered to be the key issues of growing car ownership and car use, congestion, accidents and decreasing bus modal share.

4.3.2 Status analysis and baseline scenario

Is a comprehensive review of the current situation conducted and a baseline scenario developed against which progress can be measured?

The EWG considered in their recommendations that one of the minimum requirements for SUTP was to establish a common evaluation framework. In half of cases a comprehensive review of the current situation is conducted and a baseline scenario developed against which progress can be measured. In the majority of positive responses reviewers have referred in some detail to what are in the main quite unique approaches.

Yes	No	NK
Belgium, Denmark, France, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Portugal,	Austria	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden,

In terms of the solitary negative response to this question, for Austria the review explains that the current situation is described at a general level without thorough analysis. The remainder of the commentary here will make reference to those reviewers who answered yes to this question.

In Germany, authorities are obliged to evaluate the status quo in their NVPs and draft a framework for the development of public transport against this background. The Cologne plan, for example, gives detailed descriptions and forecasts including transport development, land use, and economic growth. Similarly in Lithuania competent authorities are obliged to monitor the current situation and the plan's implementation. Progress is measured through an associated reporting process.

The review of Belgium focuses on a description of the two stage process adopted there. In the Flanders region a system of monitoring is carried out in two phases. In the first phase (orientation) the current status is analysed. In the second phase of the process different scenarios are set out: a trend scenario (baseline scenario) and at least one sustainable scenario. In the Walloon region of Belgium again the two phase approach is utilised. In the first phase a review of the current situation is conducted that includes current accessibility profiles, existing plans, major challenges and problems. All are quantified if possible. In phase 2 the situation is projected for the medium and long term. However in this case a baseline scenario is not compulsory.

In other responses reviews useful detail. In Denmark baseline targets are set to assess the current situation which is followed by a further ex-ante assessment. It is common practice to assess and define the expected outcomes of plans during the elaboration of TEAP.

Another method reported was by modelling and forecasting scenarios. In Finland a more systematic approach is described based around detailed modelling of scenarios. This usually involves a transport study, with some basic modelling, forming various alternatives for action (no changes, minimal changes etc.) which can be compared through expert analysis and modelled calculations. A similar approach is employed in Italy, where performance indicators are developed from an option zero / do nothing scenario, where no action is taken. Forecasts

are based on the prediction of mobility trends, environmental impact and the deployment of the PUT timetable.

In Hungary authorities review the current situation, very often using a SWOT analysis approach, with a forecast including transport development, economic growth, land use etc. On this basis they draft a framework for the development of transport solutions - plans which are always checked in terms of compatibility with national plans and potential EU finance programmes.

The review of France focused on the legal requirements of the review and baselines. It was reported that the law requires French authorities to carry out an assessment of the plan implementation 5 years after its adoption or revision. It also requires the establishment of an accident monitoring process focused on pedestrian and cycling accidents. There are not any other legal requirements to quantify targets, build scenarios and carry out monitoring of the plan. However, CERTU has published guidance on monitoring with a substantial number of indicators. Most urban conurbations in France have established a procedure to monitor the effects of their plan.

In the UK review, arguably the most comprehensive approach is described. LTPs are required to analyse local problems and opportunities, including their environmental and social consequences, and to set out policy responses through:

- Clear identification and analysis of problems;
- Clear evidence of a fundamental review of the existing strategy, to ensure consistency with guidance and integrated transport policies more generally;
- Evidence of a robust analytical or evidence-based approach to strategy development;
- Alternative solutions tested, in particular alternatives to major schemes.

In the UK analysis of problems is not restricted to existing problems, but also attempts to anticipate and prevent any emerging or potential problems. Mandatory targets in the new LTPs should, where possible, have a baseline relating to data collected in 2003/04, and take a horizon year of 2010/11. Authorities should also set trajectories, with annual milestones, for all LTP targets. The trajectories set in new LTPs will become the Department for Transport's key reference point for annual monitoring of progress in future, and will enable local authorities to make better assessments of whether or not performance against each target is on track.

Are previous plans evaluated regarding their impacts and effectiveness?

Monitoring and evaluation was one of the five key steps recommended by the EWG in the delivery of SUTP as a practical instrument. The basic premise of this question in the checklist was to establish whether monitoring is done. In about half of cases, reviewers responded that countries did evaluate the impacts and effectiveness of previous transport plans. Most, however, chose to comment on the regularity of evaluation rather than the process itself.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, UK.	France,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Luxembourg, Slovenia, Sweden,

An example with a good level of detail is again the UK review, where local transport authorities are encouraged to learn from each other, share best practice, and compare experiences of planning and delivering projects. Authorities are encouraged to look for ideas and evidence from a wide range of sources in developing innovative solutions that fit the local situation. The DfT recommends that all authorities monitor and evaluate their scheme delivery programmes, and disseminate any useful findings to others.

In the majority of cases where comments were included in the review, the statement was more basically defined. In Lithuania each city with a SUT plan has to evaluate it on a regular i.e. annual basis. Annual assessment also applies in Finland, assessing completed measures and the estimated impacts of transport schemes. In Germany, cities have to evaluate NVPs at least every five years and consider amendments and adjustments. The impact of previous plans on the transport system is analysed for their effect. In Austria a similar longer term approach is observed with the revision of plans every 5 to 10 years. Sometimes monitoring is not legally binding, for example in France.

4.3.3 Definition of a vision, objectives and targets

Is a long-term vision for transport and mobility developed in the entire urban agglomeration?

In the majority of cases where review participants have answered yes to this question the commentary has been based around the question of balance. The balance required to work towards the application of SUTP.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, Finland, France (10, sometimes 15, 20 years) Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, UK.	Greece, Slovakia,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Luxembourg, Slovenia, Sweden,

Half of the reviews conducted found a positive response to the question of long term vision. All of the following comments are in relation to those that responded yes to this question.

In some reviews respondents have been more specific about the overall approach. In the UK, the Government expects every local authority to have a vision for its area - including the way they wish to develop employment, the economy and housing, whilst promoting social

inclusion and enhancing the local environment. LTPs should aim to reflect these wider ambitions for the area, by capturing those ambitions in targets for outcome indicators.

The general objectives typical of municipal Transport and Environment Action plans in Denmark are to provide for a well-functioning transport system while ensuring substantial reductions in threats to the environment and traffic safety through a broad range of measures, including for example land use development, promotion of public transport and cycling, parking restrictions, traffic calming, etc. In Hungary the aim of major long term urban transport policy objectives is to balance economic growth and social development measures, and to protect the environment. On this basis the other short and medium-term plans are developed.

In Finland the long-term scenario “Towards intelligent and sustainable communications by 2025” contains a more extended programme of measures for the implementation of an economically, ecologically and socially sustainable transport system.

In Austria the plan develops a long term vision of transport and mobility described as “intelligent mobility”, including securing present transport options while considering the responsibility for the future. In Belgium, Brussels Capital region, the long term vision of the entire agglomeration is formulated in the mobility and spatial development plan for the region. In Germany at the Länder-level, the Länder decide on transport plans, fixing general goals and outlining the overall development of transport systems on their territory. In Malta the issue is addressed through the Structure Plan and implemented through Local Plans.

In other reviews, some countries have described and highlighted certain elements of the approach within their countries. In Lithuania they give examples of studies related to the public transport sector that address the development of a longer term strategy. In Italy the balance between the shorter PUT and longer term PUM is an important element of their integrated planning system. The main focus is to aim for integrated land use planning in cities and metropolitan areas to address the reduction of emissions from traffic through air quality legislation.

In some other responses, reviewers have focused briefly on the timescales involved. 10 years is seen as the long term in both Belgium, Flanders and in France. However in France, for projects based on scenarios, this is sometimes over a longer period of 15 to 20 years.

Do the plans ensure the sustainability of transport at the urban level as their central goal?

In almost half of cases the plans do ensure the sustainability of transport at the urban level as their central goal. In only one case, Belgium (Flanders region), is the response more negative.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium (Brussels and Walloon region) Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary (Budapest) Italy, Lithuania, Portugal, Slovenia, UK.	Belgium, (Flanders region)	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Luxembourg, Malta, Slovakia, Sweden,

In the following, where reviewers have responded yes to this question, we describe some different approaches adopted by different nation states.

In the UK, the second round of LTPs should develop proposals for making better use of existing infrastructure, including any new infrastructure delivered over the course of the first LTP, and also the rights of way network. Local transport authorities are required to consider how they could deliver progress in all the shared priority areas through policies aimed at changing travel behaviour, and managing demand for transport services. LTP 2 should also identify which proposals have as their primary purpose the delivery of sustainable growth in housing and employment and/or housing market renewal.

In Slovenia, urban policies define key objectives to ensure the sustainability of transport that include improving transport connections between urban and suburban areas and the development of transport information technology and information transmission. In Portugal the focus is on measures of restraint or control of traffic movement and parking, particularly in historic centres. In Lithuania the main goal of the planning system is to ensure the sustainability of transport at the urban level.

In Hungary case study examples are included, based on the Sustainable Urban Transport Policy for Budapest. Public transport in Budapest has several positive aspects that form the basis for long-term, sustainable urban transport development. The network is well developed and there is a strong tradition of public transport usage. All land use and transport initiatives are focused on reducing excessive suburbanisation and traffic congestion. Parking management is used as a means of restraining car usage in city centres. Road pricing is presented as a more effective solution, but only under the requirement of better enforcement and coordination between urban road infrastructure and public transport planning.

In Italy the focus in the PUT is on access through:

- Improvement of urban mobility (movement and parking policies);
- Improvement of safety policies (accident reduction);
- Reduction of noise and air pollution;
- Energy savings.

In Germany the central goal of NVPs is to ensure an adequate public transport system orientated towards the users' needs for mobility.

Are tangible targets defined based on a realistic analysis of problems and objectives?

Objectives and targets are the second step in the EWG's development of SUTP as a practical instrument. In just under half of responses, reviewers said that tangible targets are defined based on a realistic analysis of problems and objectives.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, (Brussels and Walloon region) Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Portugal, Slovakia, UK.	Belgium, (Flanders region), Greece, Malta,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Slovenia, Sweden,

In the cases where positive responses have been made, the accompanying comments are mostly brief and varied in nature. In the UK, DfT guidance states that it is vitally important for authorities to set robust targets and trajectories relating to local transport. The targets are the measures against which the success of local transport planning will be judged.

In Finland, improvements should be made in the conditions, prerequisites and incentives for walking, cycling and the use of public transport such that their combined proportion of the total distance travelled will increase and the dependence on the private car will be reduced.

In some cases responses to the review checklist are rather more succinct. In France the analysis of the SUTP shows that often the objectives are not precise enough (distinct) and not followed by specific measures to achieve them. In Lithuania, the focus is on public transport. The goals of the public transport system are clearly defined. This process is based on studies related to the public transport sector.

In Austria the targets developed are given as a rather general outline for future planning processes within the city. In Slovakia concrete targets are set.

In the case where a comment has been made to explain why no targets are set, the review of Malta states that within any given plan a clear vision and aim is set with policies to achieve this. However, there are no clear, tangible targets set.

4.3.4 Delivery plan / Action and budget plan

Do plans implement policies and deliver actions to achieve real change and meet the specific targets set?

In just over a third of cases reviewers said that plans do implement policies and deliver actions to achieve real change and meet the specific targets that have been set. In some responses it is clear there is variation in the application of plans at the local level in nation states. Furthermore, solutions to problems are seen as needing to be addressed on a case by case basis. However, it is recognised that clear objectives are important.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, UK.	Malta, Portugal,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden,

We will only focus on three selected comments that add value to the analysis here.

In Hungary, the Budapest plan stipulates specific objectives (e. g. specific timetables, concrete solutions for disabled people) concerning transport regulation and development and concrete actions (e. g. individual construction measures), but there are also plans which are limited to general outlines for public transportation.

In Germany it depends on the level of detail required by Länder-level legislation and its concrete implementation within the administrative discretion of the competent authorities. The Cologne plan stipulates specific objectives (e. g. specific timetables, concrete figures for the change in the modal split) concerning transport regulation and development and concrete actions (e. g. individual construction measures), but there are also plans which are limited to only giving general outlines for public transportation.

In Austria some plans, including the Vienna plan, lay out detailed measures including a strict timetable for implementation. Usually, this is done in an additional annexe to the plan. In other cases, the plans only contain more general goals and leave the elaboration of concrete actions to everyday policy in the communities. In this case, transport plans serve more as a basis for explicit action and service concepts. Some communities leave the detailed planning process to land use plans containing concrete measures and actions.

Is a precise description, prioritisation and justification of actions contained within the plans?

Many of the country reviews have found that the answer to this question is yes and make comment about the process. The importance of a clear and defined structure is prevalent here.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, UK.	Greece, Malta, Portugal,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden,

We will only focus on the comments made by those that responded yes to this question as the comment provided otherwise does not add value to the analysis here.

The example from Italy shows 3 levels: general, specific and executive level structures for the production of PUTs (SUTP):

- General level: the General Urban Traffic Plan, G.U.T.P., constitutes the actual plan within the P.U.T., with specific reference to the urban area. Such plans contain provisions that

include vehicle interchange policies and management of pedestrian areas. Whenever two municipalities are involved, the Regions assign the larger municipality the role of leader in the setting up of the G.U.T.P. for the whole area;

- Specific level: The Individual Urban Traffic Plan, deploys the General Plan in particular zones within the urban area (e.g. districts, etc). Such plans are produced according to the general provisions set out in the General Plan;
- Executive level: the Executive Urban Traffic Plan, sets the guidelines for the deployment of the Individual Urban Traffic Plan. The creation of these plans is related to specific actions foreseen by Individual Urban Traffic Plans. The action can then be applied to more specified mobility issues related to a district or a singular street.

In other cases the reviewers have made comment in more general terms. In Austria, transport plans often contain explicit descriptions and a priority list for the implementation of planned actions. In smaller cities, the level of detail in their plans is less defined.

In the UK, LTPs identify and prioritise the schemes and policies that look likely to deliver the best value for money - that is the most rapid overall progress towards the full range of local targets and objectives per unit of spending.

In Belgium, Flanders and Brussels Capital region, after the design and evaluation stages, there is a final phase in which an action plan is produced, with assignment of responsibility to implement measures.

Measures to be taken, including land-use, infrastructure, traffic restrictions, information etc, are included in a typical lay out of a TEAP in Denmark. In Finland, plans usually include a set of measures set on a timeframe. The justification is stated through analysis of problems, development trends and comparing alternative lines of action.

4.3.5 Policies and measures

In the following section we list a series of answers to one question that sought to gather information regarding transport management measures and policies and how they are developed. In the responses to this question, three key policy areas were apparent overall:

- Measures to reduce congestion;
- Mobility management; and
- Road Pricing.

We address the responses to the three key areas that have been drawn out from this question.

How are transport management measures and policies developed?

1. Central, core aims to reduce congestion and rationalise the use of vehicles

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal.		Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Sweden.

2. Mobility Management

Yes	No	NK
Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, UK.	Austria, Greece,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Italy, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden,

3. Road pricing, an example of enforcement –

Yes	No	NK
Belgium, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, UK	Austria, France, Greece, Lithuania, Malta.	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden,

Furthermore, reference has been made to Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) by: Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Hungary (proposed) Lithuania, Netherlands, Portugal, and the UK.

The focus in most of the affirmative examples highlights what is done in member states on the following policies:

- Reducing the need to travel;
- Road hierarchy – the prioritisation for public transport over individual transport i.e. the car in both planning and road management;
- Information dissemination that includes more innovative solutions such as real time passenger information.

At a strategic level the response in the UK review highlights four shared priorities applied in Government guidance. These are:

- Tackling congestion;
- Improve air quality;
- Improve road safety; and
- Improve accessibility.

In addition to the above information the Finnish review details more specific measures including:

- Promoting cycling and walking;
- Driver attitude;
- Road Safety;
- Restriction of traffic growth.

4.3.6 Monitoring and evaluation

Is implementation monitored based on a selected set of indicators?

In approximately a third of cases, at least some implementation was found to be monitored, based on a selected set of indicators. There does seem to be some confusion in the interpretation of what an indicator is or how it should be defined here.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, (Walloon and Brussels Capital regions), Denmark, Finland* ¹ , Germany (on 5 year cycle), Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, UK.	Belgium, (Flanders region) Greece, Malta, Portugal,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden,

Note: *¹ – respondent said no in response but has shown that indicators are applied in some cases.

The most detailed response to this question comes from the review of Italy. In Italy, monitoring activities are carried out to evaluate the effectiveness of measures promoted by the PUT relating to traffic monitoring and analysis of the measure itself.

Traffic monitoring takes place through the analysis of the following 5 parameters:

1. Traffic flow and management;
2. Speed of public and private traffic;
3. Parking trends in the urban area;
4. Number of public transport users; and
5. Accident identification in relation to safety measures.

Comments in most cases are more basic in nature. In Finland, a target is usually set and a suitable indicator applied, for example a rise in modal share for public transport. In both the Walloon and Brussels Capital regions of Belgium, criteria for evaluation are selected and the collection of data is based on a set of selected indicators.

Even where country reviews indicated that monitoring was not based on indicators or it was not known there was evidence to suggest that indicators are considered if not always applied. In the review of Belgium, Flanders, indicators are used, if they are clearly defined. In France the uncertainty about definition has prompted the respondent to put a Yes and No response. There isn't any legally binding requirement relating to quantified target setting and monitoring of the plan, except monitoring of accidents, especially those involving pedestrians and cyclists.

Are regular Progress Reports published?

Progress reports are confirmed as published in approximately half of the countries reviewed. However, the time that lapses between reports varies between annual, biannual and every five years or more in some cases. Although the review of France indicates that progress reports

are not done in fact by law a plan has to be assessed 5 years after its adoption, so probably could be considered as taking place.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Portugal, UK (mandatory).	France, Malta,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden,

Where country reviews found that progress reports were produced it is possible to list the frequency.

Annual reporting: In Finland, progress is recorded at least annually for most plans with a short report to a working group. In Belgium, Brussels Capital and Flanders regions, annual progress reports are prepared, evaluated and where necessary updated. A similar approach is taken in the UK as a mandatory stipulation of the Local Transport Plan process.

Biannual reporting: In Lithuania a progress report is published every two years. This biannual progress reporting is mirrored in Italy, as part of the PUT system there.

Five year reporting: In Germany the time period for revision is every five years, but this varies depending on the resources of individual local authorities.

Varying frequency: In Austria reporting varies from 5 to 10 years. In Hungary they are prepared with varying frequency. In Lithuania, depending on the level on which the plan is developed, the reports are being prepared with varying frequency.

Are the procedures and responsibilities for evaluation clearly defined?

Procedures and responsibilities for evaluation are clearly defined in almost a third of those countries reviewed. Comment is quite limited in this regard and there is some variation in approach.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, UK.	Belgium, Germany, Lithuania, Malta, Portugal,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden,

In Austria, local authorities are responsible for evaluating their transport plans, but there is no uniform requirement for the procedure of evaluation. In France, the urban transport authority is responsible for evaluation after 5 years. In Germany, responsibility for the revision of the plan is clearly assigned to the competent authorities. They are free to choose the methods for revising the plans. In Hungary, the review found that in each plan it is clearly stated that the evaluation shall include who is responsible for carrying it out.

Are budget plans produced including costs and benefits?

Budget plans are produced including costs and benefits in just under a third of responses. There is very little substantive comment that can be included here beyond what is recorded in the table below.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands,	Belgium, Malta, Portugal, UK.	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden,

4.3.7 Adoption, approval and assessment

Are the authorities responsible for the plans permitted to adopt the plan themselves?

In just under half of responses the authorities are permitted and in fact expected to adopt the plan themselves.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Portugal, UK.	Belgium, Malta,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden,

In Hungary the authorities are self-administrated bodies and they are permitted to adopt the plans themselves. However, the Hungarian National Transport Plan is the basis and the main guide for Regional and Local Transport Planning, which also includes minimum requirements. All plans are accepted according to their compatibility with national regulations and laws.

In Austria, authorities are exclusively responsible for adopting transport plans. In Lithuania, the plan is the responsibility of local authorities; therefore they are permitted to adopt the plan themselves. In Finland they are part of the implementation agreement for the plan.

There are some examples of where those responsible for producing the plan cannot automatically adopt it. For example in Belgium, Flanders, the plan is approved by the audit commission. In the Walloon region of Belgium, in the case of the UTP, the regional authority adopts the plan after advice from municipalities and regional advisory commission. In the case of the LTP, a revision is initiated by the Municipal council, guidance commission or recommendations from evaluation reports. In Malta, plans are adopted by the government.

In France the full answer was not defined but the following comments are included. Primarily the urban transport authority adopts the plan project. Then the project is submitted to the

appropriate municipalities, council(s) and Region(s). Then the project is put through a public enquiry, before the plan is modified to account for any changes that are needed.

Is the plan approved by a higher level of government if the provision of national funds depends on the fulfilment of national plan quality criteria?

In two country reviews reference is made to funding requirements. The Belgian responses focus more on the process concerned with adoption of national plans. In Germany, the focus of the comment is made in regard to the legality of the situation.

Yes	No	NK
Austria, Belgium, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, UK.	France, Germany, Malta, Portugal,	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden,

The following reviews make specific reference to funding. In Lithuania, transport is developed as the integrated network by reasonably using EU and national funds. The local authorities are given full financial responsibility for the actions to be taken, but they are subject to state supervision concerning their lawfulness. In Austria, plans need to be approved by state authorities if the community wants to be granted national funds.

The following examples focus more on the process of adopting national plans in Belgium. In the Brussels Capital region, after consultation with the public and local stakeholders, the regional authority approves the plan. The plan should be in line with the regional vision and the guidelines that were set out. In the Walloon region, the UTP is adopted by regional government and the LTP is approved by the regional authority and adopted by the municipal council. In the Flanders region an audit commission evaluates the plan against standards set out in the mobility handbook.

In the following example the review of Germany illustrates why a higher level of government is not involved in this process. NVPs do not need to be approved by a higher level of government but they are subject to state supervision concerning their lawfulness. The local authorities are given full financial responsibility for the actions to be taken, so there is no specific provision of national funds for urban transport planning apart from general financial aid for communities from the state.

4.3.8 Drivers, Barriers and Good Practice in SUT Implementation

In the following we list the significant comments and examples derived from the questions regarding Drivers, Barriers and Good Practice in plan implementation. They are not listed in any particular order at this stage, but illustrate a range of approaches adopted by the various member states.

Drivers: What are the key drivers influencing the process of plan **implementation**?

- The covenant system in Belgium gives access to a wide range of financial support and options, which enables a number of measures to be financed;
- The budget is a major influence in the development and implementation of SUTPs. (Greece);
- Partnerships are very important; the French believe them to be essential. Effective and efficient engagement between stakeholders;
- Political support is seen as a key driver in the Netherlands;
- Choice of methodology for the evaluation, knowing what to implement and where (France);
- Responsibility for air quality is driving cities and communities to become more engaged with the SUTP process and take more of an interest in the impact traffic has at the local level. This includes taking measures to reduce the negative impact of car-borne trips (Germany);
- Accessibility is becoming increasingly important in transport planning with the due consideration of equal access for all, including those with disabilities and special needs (Germany) with the Lithuania review reflecting similar sentiments;
- Car ownership is increasing rapidly in Lithuania. As a consequence, it is recognised that effective traffic management is needed as a preventative measure against the increase of traffic-generated air pollution in cities;
- In the UK the key driver is seen to be central government, leading with policy frameworks such as the White Paper “Future of Transport”.

Barriers: What are the barriers to effective urban transport plan **implementation** in the review country?

- Adjacent communities and the regions are not obliged to cooperate in Austria and this leads to variation and inconsistency in planning standards across the country;
- A lack of coordination amongst stakeholders and the distribution of responsibility (ownership) is a major barrier to progress with SUTPs in Greece which has also been prevalent in Malta;
- Mobility problems are caused by spatial development (Belgium, Flanders);
- Truly integrated projects that apply best practice are still rare (Belgium, Flanders);
- The financing of transport measures is an issue in terms of the needs not being met by the supply. This limits what is possible in terms of implementation of measures (Czech Republic);
- Lack of finance (Finland). Subsidies in public transport are also an issue in Lithuania, in terms of the effective implementation of transport plans. Financing of measures is also seen as the barrier for implementing an SUTP in Slovakia;
- Multi-faceted approach of SUTP may be a barrier to progress. Is it trying to achieve too much? (France);
- The absence of legally binding state control over SUTPs in France is also seen as a weakness in terms of who takes responsibility for the implementation of the process (ownership and legally binding responsibility). They need support and strong leadership to carry them through and the political will to ensure they are delivered;
- Measures are too often not adapted sufficiently when applied to the local context, which weakens their impact (France);

- Transport planning in Hungary has in the past paid little attention to environmental and socio-economic issues;
- The wish and need to achieve results in a short period of time is often subject to delay due to regulations and procedures (Netherlands).

Good Practice: What examples of good practice can be highlighted in **implementation**?

- The public is widely engaged in consultation and given ample opportunity to participate (Austria);
- Significant increases in public transport use are due, at least in part, to a low fare policy (Belgium);
- Investment in public space combined with the introduction of soft measures, e.g. cycling, walking and improved partnerships between user groups and providers, is seen as a successful approach in Belgium (Brussels Capital Region);

At this stage, individual examples from cities, sometimes given as examples in the national reviews, have not been included, as this is not seen to be a reflection of good practice in national approach.

4.4 SUT Aspirations

This section covers an analysis based on the following four questions from the national review checklist:

1. What plans are there at a national or local level to produce SUTPs in the future?
2. How long is it envisaged before SUT plans are realised?
3. Please describe the current position in terms of SUT plan preparations and the next steps in the process of development?
4. What are likely to be the main barriers to implementing SUT plans in the review country?

What plans are there at a national or local level to produce SUTPs in the future?

- Transport policy is driven by infrastructure planning. (Bulgaria);
- Comprehensive mobility strategy will support the decision to build new infrastructure in Bulgaria. This demonstrates a basic need to connect people with places;
- Financial support from external bodies such as the EU and international finance bodies provides a focus on infrastructure, capital projects. (Bulgaria);
- Road safety is a key element of future transport planning in adopting a more sustainable approach through SUTP and will inevitably inform future legislation. (Bulgaria);
- The financing of SUTP at the local level, in the municipalities, may be a future barrier (Bulgaria);
- Transport development programme for 2006-13 and a public transport development programme 2006-10 (Estonia);
- Principles of sustainable development are taken into consideration when developing development plans (Estonia);
- Transport policy 2003-15, National Development Plan 2004-2006 in Hungary;

- Urban Mobility Plans are part of the national strategy on energy saving in Spain that includes special measures for the transport sector. This includes wide level stakeholder participation, monitoring and awareness raising.

How long is it envisaged before SUT plans are realised?

- SUTPs are seen as a long term plan in Estonia, over a 10 to 20 year period, until at least 2013 at present. They should have annual progress reports built in to the process to include monitoring implementation of measures and updating the plans as necessary;
- In Romania they envisage that SUTPs will begin to be developed from 2007, at the conclusion of the PILOT programme;
- In Spain, a roadmap sets out plans for the immediate future including this year, 2005, and the following two years, 2006-7.

Please describe the current position in terms of SUT plan preparations and the next steps in the process of development?

- Preparations for SUTPs are at the inception stage at present. Next steps to include the planning of activities (Estonia);
- Expansion of the Pan European Network in Hungary, to develop a strategic road and rail network across the country, supported by more local measures such as the suburban railway system;
- The coordination of transport modes within the bounds of sustainable development (Hungary);
- Improve safety in all transport (Hungary);
- A series of construction and development programmes is envisaged between 2006 and 2015 in Hungary. It is envisaged this will form the bedrock for sustainable transport solutions nationwide.

What are likely to be the main barriers to implementing SUT plans in the review country?

- Lack of financial resources and political will (Estonia);
- Finance is also a major potential barrier in Hungary in combination with concerns regarding the juxtaposition of commercial enterprise and the social responsibility of public transport;
- The Portuguese summarise the following four key barriers to implementing SUTPs: cost, ownership, political risk/population willingness and a bureaucratic system;
- The Romanians state the following main barriers: Coordination among the priorities/interests of the different ministries which are administrating urban transport services; Low level of the current professional skills, starting with changing the old mentality on what is the significance of an integrated urban transport system; Lack of financial resources for implementing these plans; A negative perception of the citizens and all other partners involved in achieving such plans; Lack of information about the most important indicators which should be taken into account in defining the objectives and the measures to be foreseen in such plans.

4.5 Conclusions

The objective of this chapter has been to summarise the national strategic reviews, make comparisons and quantify the results of national review on a topic by topic basis. Where sufficient information has been supplied, it has drawn out similarities in approach and provided an analysis. Furthermore, we have sought to highlight some examples of individual countries' approach to transport planning, mainly in terms of good examples of approach.

In using the checklist, reviewers have been very explicit in the approach taken in their country and provided a very good level of detail in response to individual questions. In some cases there is a focus on description. In other responses, reviewers have added more detail, or made specific reference to technique, e.g. modelling and forecasting scenarios. Some have based their response around the legal requirements that can in some case add value, or seemingly in others detract or hinder progress in the application of SUTP.

The reviews contain some succinct descriptions of how specific aims and definitions regarding how SUTP is applied by individual nation states. An example of this is the results showing the difference in how transport planning law is applied. In a large number of cases reviewers have referred in some detail to what are quite unique approaches.

4.5.1 SUTP planning and approach

The key results found from an analysis of country reviews on planning and approaches are:

- In almost two thirds of countries reviewed, local and urban plans are not compulsory;
- In approximately half of the countries reviewed, plans are produced using a national framework or national guidance document;
- In over half of cases, competent authorities are responsible for both developing and implementing plans;
- Reviewers reported that citizens were actively engaged in the stakeholder consultation process, albeit with varying approaches;
- In two thirds of countries reviewed, it was reported that there is integration between transport and land use planning;
- In over two thirds of cases, respondents either failed to comment or did not think training was adequate.

This highlights some specific areas of knowledge and possible concern that will need to be taken forward as the PILOT programme progresses. SUTP has evidently been adopted across a number of member states, albeit with varying levels of detail and application. Evidently many countries do demonstrate a good level of engagement with the SUTP process. There is variation in approach to national statutes. The level of accomplishment and application does not seem to be influenced by whether plans are compulsory or not. There is a good deal of variation between member states in terms of who takes responsibility for the SUTP. This responsibility is most acutely demonstrated at the local level, i.e. the local level impact or delivery of plans.

The reviewers highlight that there are some areas that seem to need further attention. Two key areas, namely gender equity and equality and training and dissemination of best practice, highlighted by the EWG in their work will need due consideration in future work packages

within the PILOT programme. Gender equality was highlighted within the Literature Review as an area that has not been widely investigated in research programmes. Training and dissemination of best practice was highlighted as a minimum requirement in the recommendations of the EWG report.

4.5.2 SUT plan contents and design

The key results from the reviews of SUT plan contents and design are:

- In over two thirds of cases there are specific aims within planning law. These are defined and listed in various levels of detail by the reviewers from each country;
- Variation does exist in the individual interpretation of transport planning law in nation states;
- In about half of cases reviewers responded that countries did evaluate the impacts and effectiveness of previous transport plans;
- In just under half of responses reviewers said that tangible targets are defined based on a realistic analysis of problems and objectives;
- In just over a third of cases reviewers said that plans do implement policies and deliver actions to achieve real change and meet the specific targets that have been set;
- In approximately a third of cases at least some implementation was found to be monitored based on a selected set of indicators; and
- Budget plans are produced including costs and benefits in just under a third of responses.

These results highlight some interesting areas that will confirm what was known in some cases and may highlight a need for further investigation in others.

In some responses it is clear that there is variation in the application of plans at the local level in member states. Furthermore, problems are seen as needing to be addressed on a case by case basis. However, it is recognised that clear objectives are important regardless of the application of any given individual element of SUTP. The importance of a clear and defined structure is prevalent here, in particular where reference is made to the application of the process of SUTP.

Two areas stand out as requiring further attention and review as the PILOT programme progresses. Both regard consistency in approach. The first is a matter of interpretation with regard to indicators. There does seem to be some confusion in the interpretation of what an indicator is or the role it should fulfil. This will need consideration beyond this report. Further, there is an issue of measuring or evaluating progress over time and specifically what time should elapse between progress reports. This varies between annual, biannual and every five years or more in some cases. One must allow for interpretation by member states but the variation does underline the different approaches to SUTP. This may seem a relatively minor issue but does serve to illustrate the point that the variety in application of SUTP will need to be considered as the PILOT programme progresses.

5 PILOT CITY BASELINE

5.1 Introduction

This section highlights work undertaken within Task 1.3 up to the submission of this deliverable. The intention is to provide an introduction to the PILOT cities and provide an example from the city of Braila of work undertaken.

Braila (Romania)

Braila is a developing city and has achieved several measures involving both the city council and the local transport authority, in order to catch up with the innovative transport solutions developed at EU level; in particular clean transport, mobility and accessibility for all. Braila underlines that the input from experts from all over Europe, in particular from colleagues from cities, will make possible far-reaching improvements in the capacity of the city council and of the operator and partners in this local project, to develop a local transport plan for improving the mobility of their citizens.

Evora (Portugal)

Evora has an important regional role as a tourist resort, particularly following the granting of World Heritage status on the city by UNESCO in 1986. Just like a number of other medium-sized European cities, Évora is faced with a series of transport challenges. These arise from congestion, which is a natural consequence of its size and the pressures private cars within a restricted urban area. The central area was not designed for public bus services and there is difficulty providing attractive public bus services.

Lancaster (United Kingdom)

Lancaster currently suffers from high levels of traffic congestion, arising partly from its strategic location on a key river crossing, where many of the surrounding suburbs are located across the river from the historic centre. Lancaster is also a key location for freight. Lancashire's transport policies (Lancashire is the transport authority for Lancaster) are aimed at delivering sustainable transport solutions across the whole county area, with packages of measures designed to encourage more responsible car use, improvements in public transport and encouragement of cycling and walking. The County Council has key targets for increasing public transport patronage, moderating growth in private car traffic and for road safety. There are therefore some infrastructure measures for sustainable travel now in place to provide a real alternative to the congestion on Lancaster's roads. They are beginning to offer a choice of transport to car users and open up access to those areas where car ownership is below the national average. Within PILOT Lancashire would however like to develop a sustainable urban transport plan for Lancaster to produce a plan better focused on the local needs of Lancaster: local issues require local solutions. Although there is a Local Transport Plan for the county of Lancashire as a whole, there is not a plan dedicated to Lancaster. Within PILOT, they also want to build on the achievements of the existing Local Transport Plans and share good practice, whilst learning from the experience of other European cities in city transport plan development.

Tallinn (Estonia)

Tallinn is the capital of Estonia and the centre of culture, economy and higher education in the country. With its 400 000 inhabitants Tallinn is also the largest city in Estonia. Tallinn currently has no sustainable urban transport plan, but is very interested in developing such a plan. The city considers it of great importance to train the officials of the Tallinn City Government and members of the City Council dealing with transport issues within the context of the PILOT project. Today, understandings of officials in different structural units vary remarkably and this makes co-operation between them very difficult. Tallinn considers itself as a typical Post-Soviet city and believes that the problems they experience are similar in other Accession Countries. The development of an urban transport plan for Tallinn will be a useful pilot for any city from new member states wanting to make progress towards sustainable mobility policies.

5.2 Methodology for conducting a city baseline analysis

Task 1.3, city baseline analysis, reviews and analyses the current situation and aspirations of the four pilot cities. The key issues include existing strategic frameworks, policy context, thematic issues and current trends. It is planned that the outputs of this task (the baseline analysis) feeds directly into the development of the city roadmaps, for use in subsequent Work Packages in the PILOT project.

To enable this task to be undertaken a comprehensive framework was developed by the WP1 Leader. The framework guides data collected and relies on the PILOT cities to contribute time and resources in providing data, information, plans and knowledge.

The framework consists of four sections:

1. Strategic framework;
2. Policy context;
3. Status analysis; and
4. Problems & opportunities.

The production of the baseline analysis relies heavily on the completion of a SWOT analysis of key areas and themes. SWOT analysis is an extremely useful tool for understanding the decision-making process in each case. It is intended to provide robust results describing the current situation and issues faced by the pilot cities.

Explanatory notes were provided at each stage of the framework to clarify what is required, and examples of completed sections are included to aid the review team to providing the necessary detail and complete the analysis in the manner intended.

5.3 Example analysis - Braila

In the following we include an early example of work carried out using the analysis framework, discussed above.

City of Braila

1. **Strategic Framework** - identification of key actors, their roles and responsibilities etc

KEY ACTORS	DESCRIPTION OF ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
Ministry of Administration and Interior	To assist the process of achieving integrated urban transport plans by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - elaborating the application norms of a new legislation defining the institutional framework for monitoring and controlling the implementation process of an urban transport plan, based on a specific local strategy, both at local and Regional (Braila County) levels - defining the steps to be followed along this process
Braila Municipality	To Integrate urban transport planning within an urban development strategy and plans on short, medium and long terms
Municipality Department for Transport	To coordinate operational timetables among all PT operators mainly for major interchanges (railway station terminal, main crossings within urban area, etc.) To implement the measures foreseen in such plans
Police Department	To involve in implementing an Urban Traffic Control Centre whose main tasks are to assure traffic monitoring, avoiding congestions and encouraging new measures for PT means priority in traffic
Ministry of Education and Research	To cooperate with the other local authorities in organising campaigns for promoting soft transport means among the young generation
SC BRAICAR SA	To promote by all means PT services as an attractive alternative for increasing citizens' mobility and quality of life To cooperate with private PT operators
Teenagers Local Council	To encourage surveys for defining the priorities in improving local PT service' sustainability for the coming generations
Environmental Agency of Braila	To control the pollution levels coming from transport and to sustain non motorised means promotion
Ministry of Health	To sustain soft/active transport measures with a positive impact on citizens health

Core values for Braila are:

- *Partnership* with the above mentioned key decision makers and stakeholders
- *Community involvement* with the support of the local representative ministries (transport, education, health) it is intended to create a citizens needs database (by asking their views on the strategic measures proposed in order to develop and promote local transport in Braila city)

2. **Policy Context** - Identification of key national, regional and local policy and how transport is integrated with other key planning areas;

Existing plans:

National level:

National strategy for accelerating the development of communal services of public interest (Draft Governmental Decision) + legislation for the local transport service (Draft Law) – both end of 2005

These documents will help to define a sustainable development plan for PT services at urban level, on short, medium and long term.

Local transport authorities will thus be able to implement, monitor and control all the investments foreseen within the SUTPs, based on reliable financial (re)sources.

Regional level

The national policy on transport services has a same impact at regional level. County Authorities will have to apply the new legislation at their level, coordinating regional measures with the provisions at local level.

Local level

1999 – Urban development plan (PDU), with as main objectives:

- Rehabilitation of the whole existing road network, including major crossings endowment and urban rail lines for trams
- Improving Traffic flow, by specific measures mainly in those areas where roads are not possible to be enlarged
- reconsidering parking areas, having in view both real needs and available spaces for this
- reactivating naval transportation on Danube, including a new bridge over this European river in order to assure a road connection with Dobrogea county
- promote non motorized transportation (walking, cycling, etc.)

Integration between transport and other key planning areas:

- coordination between the needs or requests for building new living and commercial buildings and PT networks (existing or new lines) since the designing and approval stage for such buildings
- lack of experience in ensuring public participation in the planning process, in order to avoid negative impacts of transport on citizens life

3. Citizen participation and Stakeholder Consultation;

Making known new corresponding Local Decisions, issued by the local Council and Braila Municipality through:

- round tables for discussions among local decision makers and stakeholders, inviting also citizens representatives

- surveys on current policies and priorities for a successful service delivery, addressing mainly employees from different governmental institutions (schools, hospitals, administration, universities, etc.)

Adapting national legislation provisions to specific conditions of the city through:

- public debates of local decisions on different PT issues
- meetings with private transport operators of both passengers and freight
- discussions with commercial companies representatives to better know their needs

In general: very low involvement of citizens: lack of interest from their side, limited financial resources, authorities needs support with the surveys to inform all actors involved in SUTP through best practices (major expectation towards PILOT)

4. Status Analysis - Data availability and key trends

General: all data available (year 2002)

Network: fixed urban transport routes + car parking provision available (recent – year 2005), no data on cycling space

Fleet composition: several data missing for PT fleet and accessibility of PT vehicles

Urban traffic: almost complete, recent data (2005)

Prices: almost complete, recent data (2004/2005) – growing cost of single PT trip

Management: data complete – growing number of company mobility plans + skilled personnel dealing with mobility

Trends

General: general characteristics constant

Network:

- Fixed urban transport routes: Local Council study possibility to re-activate trolleybus public transport
- cycling space is progressing, one of the main avenue is in a rehabilitation process and is very close to have a cycling lane on it
- car parking provision: in general increasing

Fleet composition:

- decrease No. of 2-wheeled private motorised vehicles in urban area; growing No. of 4-wheeled private motorised vehicles in urban area
- low-floor-bus popular

Urban traffic:

- modal split weekday: in general decrease for winter season, except number of one-way public transport trips on an average weekday in the urban area (constant) and number of one-way taxi trips on an average weekday in the urban area (growing)
- Total passengers carried by public transport: in general decrease
- Average speed of traffic: in general decrease
- Service Intervals: in general constant

Prices

- Total public transport fare box revenue: in general stationary
- Cost of single public transport trip: growing
- Cost of car use: growing
- Investment in public transport: growing
- Investment in roads: constant

Management:

- Number of companies with mobility plan: growing
- Personnel working on mobility: growing

5. Problems & Opportunities - major challenges and issues to be addressed.

Major expectations/challenges

- Achieving a Sustainable Urban Transport Plan by involving local stakeholders and citizens,
- Reducing the negative impact of the urban transportation on the environmental features
- Involving citizens in planning local transportation
- Improving the integration of urban transport policies with different sectors policies and at different levels through a realistic and efficient planning process
- Approaching the increasing traffic by reducing car transport demand and by encouraging walking and cycling
- Achieving a realistic non motorized network in our city
- Promoting clean vehicles, including electric public network (trams)
- Implementing some measures for increasing the accessibility of all citizens, including disabled people

6 CONCLUSIONS

This first Deliverable has provided the basis for the remainder of the workpackages. It includes four distinct sections of within the main body of work, supported by extensive material in two Annexes. The report draws on the key findings from the initial tasks completed within Workpackage 1:

- A section on the methodology and approach used;
- A summary of the Expert Working Group (EWG) findings and a literature review on SUTP projects, completed by PILOT;
- A summary of the key findings from national reviews of SUTP in Member and Accession States; and
- A description of methodology and illustrative outputs from the pilot city Baseline Analysis, Task 1.3.

These chapters provide an evidence base for the deliverable, enabling it to draw out key practices, processes, and to develop recommendations that will inform subsequent tasks and key deliverables within the project.

In the following conclusions we will focus on describing the key findings that have come out of the work done. As the City Baseline Analysis is a work in progress this will not be included here. Instead we will focus on the findings of the EWG, the Literature Review and the National Review. This starts with the key findings of the EWG.

6.1 The EWG

An important consideration of PILOT has been to ensure that existing experiences and knowledge are fully integrated into the project. The importance of incorporating the findings and recommendations of the Expert Working Group (EWG) on SUTP into the work plan of PILOT were recognised, and their contribution to knowledge in this area has been acknowledged in this report.

In December 2004 the final recommendations of the EWG were presented. The EWG aimed to provide a balanced stakeholder feedback on what a potential EC Directive to provide a framework for SUTP regulation in all Member States should contain. The Group made a number of recommendations and included a description of the minimum requirements for SUTP, and a framework for defining good practice. The EWG identified that the process (“Planning”) of producing SUTP is at least, if not more, important as the Plans themselves. The EWGs topics of recommendations therefore considered the two main components of SUTP:

1. SUT-Planning: The specific qualities of the planning approach in terms of procedures and actor relations;
2. SUT-Plan: The design of the planning instrument that ensures the efficient implementation of policies and measures, and ultimately target achievement.

The Groups findings lay the foundation for PILOT and were incorporated into several of the tasks undertaken within Work Package 1. The EWGs recommendations acted as the basis for

the development of the National Review framework and checklist developed within Task 1.1. Each of the EWG's recommendations were used in a checklist tool, against which the specific qualities of the planning approach within each review country could be clearly established.

6.2 The Literature Review

The second key source of information that informed the development of the national review framework and checklist, and has informed the study as a whole is the literature review. The conclusions set out below underline the important lessons derived from that work.

The development of Sustainable Urban Transport Plans is complex and can benefit from following strict guidance. When a plan is considered it needs to be viewed and set within a wide context to account for a full and accurate set of measures to be applied. The implementation of those measures should be supported with a fully developed and budgeted action plan i.e. a strategy. The strategy should be given a long-term perspective and requires political support from national, regional and local levels. This requires a good foundation of cooperation and (political) will to progress. Inevitably this will need 'cross border' cooperation at a wider i.e. European, national and regional level, as well as at the local level of application.

The issue of support is reflected in public participation, an essential tool that if used effectively will enable a balance of views to be implemented. A variety of tools are available to aid this process and they should be applied wherever possible. The development of expertise and training is an important precondition for the development of effective policies, both in government and private sector.

With regard to the implementation mechanism itself, four basic elements were identified in the Literature Review in this regard:

1. Status analysis and baseline assessment;
2. Definition of vision, objectives and targets;
3. Budgeted action plan;
4. Monitoring and evaluation mechanism.

Each is considered briefly in turn here.

The baseline assessment serves as the foundation for the development of the plan and will be an important tool that can and should be used in raising awareness amongst local politicians, transport providers regarding the application of SUTP at the local level. It defines a long term vision and sets out the objectives and targets for achieving the plan. Targets should be relevant and follow an outcome based approach. Furthermore, they should wherever possible be challenging but realistic.

The scenario building process should help a local authority to identify best value for money solutions. It should also serve to demonstrate how the targets will be realised. In essence it is a first stage of reality checking. Where local authorities are increasingly scrutinised regarding expenditure and delivery of programmes within constrained budgets, this is a key area that should be given due consideration. It is also becoming progressively more important that

local authorities build on existing infrastructure. This should be a constituent part of what is often referred to as a package of measures.

The budgeted action plan specifies actions, describes measures, sets a reasonable timeframe and allocates responsibility for the delivery of the plan. It allocates a clear budget for each measure. It needs to be flexible, regularly evaluated and supported by a comprehensive communication strategy.

The development of a comprehensive evaluation framework is essential in order to monitor progress. Several methodologies can be applied but the key element is to develop a systematic approach that is clearly defined and understood by all that use it. Benchmarking is a key element that will not only clearly set out the targets or aims of the plan, but may also prove useful in the sharing of best practice and exchanging of ideas.

6.3 The National reviews

The objective of this chapter has been to summarise the national strategic reviews, make comparisons and quantify the results of national review on a topic by topic basis. Where sufficient information has been supplied, it has drawn out similarities in approach and provided an analysis. Furthermore, we have sought to highlight some examples of individual countries' approach to transport planning, mainly in terms of good examples of approach.

In using the checklist, reviewers have been very explicit in the approach taken in their country and provided a very good level of detail in response to individual questions. In some cases there is a focus on description. In other responses, reviewers have added more detail, or made specific reference to technique, e.g. modelling and forecasting scenarios. Some have based their response around the legal requirements that can in some case add value, or seemingly in others detract or hinder progress in the application of SUTP.

The reviews contain some succinct descriptions of how specific aims and definitions regarding how SUTP is applied by individual nation states. An example of this is the results showing the difference in how transport planning law is applied. In a large number of cases reviewers have referred in some detail to what are quite unique approaches.

6.3.1 SUTP planning and approach

The key results from this section highlight and confirm some specific areas of existing knowledge and possible concern regarding SUTP that will need to be taken forward as the PILOT programme progresses.

SUTP has evidently been adopted across a number of member states, albeit with varying levels of detail and application. Evidently many countries do demonstrate a good level of engagement with the SUTP process. There is variation in approach to national statutes. The level of accomplishment and application does not seem to be influenced by whether plans are compulsory or not. There is a good deal of variation between member states in terms of who takes responsibility for the SUTP. This responsibility is most acutely demonstrated at the local level, i.e. the local level impact or delivery of plans.

The reviewers highlight that there are some areas that seem to need further attention. Two key areas, namely gender equity and equality and training and dissemination of best practice, highlighted by the EWG in their work will need due consideration in future work packages within the PILOT programme. Gender equality was highlighted within the Literature Review as an area that has not been widely investigated in research programmes. Training and dissemination of best practice was highlighted as a minimum requirement in the recommendations of the EWG report.

6.3.2 SUT plan contents and design

These results highlight some interesting areas that will confirm what was known in some cases and may highlight a need for further investigation in others.

In some responses it is clear that there is variation in the application of plans at the local level in member states. Furthermore, problems are seen as needing to be addressed on a case by case basis. However, it is recognised that clear objectives are important regardless of the application of any given individual element of SUTP. The importance of a clear and defined structure is prevalent here, in particular where reference is made to the application of the process of SUTP.

Two areas stand out as requiring further attention and review as the PILOT programme progresses. Both regard consistency in approach. The first is a matter of interpretation with regard to indicators. There does seem to be some confusion in the interpretation of what an indicator is or the role it should fulfil. This will need consideration beyond this report. Further, there is an issue of measuring or evaluating progress over time and specifically what time should elapse between progress reports. This varies between annual, biannual and every five years or more in some cases. One must allow for interpretation by member states but the variation does underline the different approaches to SUTP. This may seem a relatively minor issue but does serve to illustrate the point that the variety in application of SUTP will need to be considered as the PILOT programme progresses.

A challenge in producing this deliverable has been how to process the large volumes of information produced in undertaking these tasks. It was decided at an early stage that the best way to proceed was to make this chapter within this report a summary and commentary of the findings of the research undertaken. In presenting a clear and coherent summary of the findings it has been important to focus, as far as possible, more on developing an analytical approach. The main document acts as an interpretation or discussion of the key findings, with the detailed information from the national reviews and full literature review forming technical annexes to the main report.