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Assumptions (1)

Subject matter of a SUMP: strategic, long term plan aiming to satisfy *(quantity and quality)* mobility needs of people and businesses by planning and managing mobility *(of people and goods)* for a functional urban/sub-urban area

- acting on the multi-level system of interactions between attractors and generators, supply and demand, a multitude of actors/stakeholders
- building on existing planning practices
- implementing integration *(horizontal/vertical)*, participation and monitoring/evaluation
Assumptions (2)

Objectives:
- guarantee access
- increase security
- reduce (air and noise) pollution
- make transport (resource-, cost-, time-) efficient
- improve attractiveness of territories + quality of life (liveable city)

Methodology:
vision (shared, strategic) + PCM approach
- context/framework analysis
- identification of problems to tackle > SMART objectives
- choice of measures/actions > implementation (indicators)
- monitoring/evaluation
Questions

• Does typology and size of cities/towns matter?
• Can we use the same methodological approach for ‘larger’ and ‘smaller’ cities?
• Are there advantages and/or disadvantages when involving ‘smaller’ (with less than 100,000 inhabitants) cities/towns?
• What do smaller cities/towns need to achieve effective and satisfactory mobility planning?

Relevant issues:
• ‘compétence’ (FR): power/function/duty of a local authority (Which authority passes the plan?)
• PUM(S) requisite/prerequisite for access to regional / national / international funding
International legislation

**Italy** (Law 340/2000)
PUT (Urban Traffic Plan) mandatory for cities with more than 30,000 inhabitants to be passed by city/town councils;
PUM – recommended (*not mandatory*) for municipalities with more than 100,000 inhabitants *or their aggregations* - to be passed by city/town councils (cooperating with superordinate bodies – provinces, regions) – now undergoing revision;

**France** (LOTI 1982; LAURE 1996; SRU 2000)
PDU (Plans de Déplacements Urbains) mandatory for transport authorities in areas with more than 100,000 inhabitants – area with less than 100,000 inhabitants can choose to develop a PDU on a voluntary basis

**UK** (Transport Act 2000; GLA Act 1999)
LTP (Local Transport Plan) mandatory for local transport authorities (county councils, unitary authorities, passenger transport authority, London Borough councils, etc. – varies in Wales, Scotland N. Ireland)
Does typology and size of cities matter?

**Typology** does matter and influences the overall evaluation of size-related parameters (e.g.: polycentrism/conurbations; small towns - major attractors of traffic; tourist destinations - major seasonal variations, etc.)

The ‘**compétence**’ of the local authority elaborating and passing the plan seems to matter significantly in relation to size depending on the country.

Size matters in terms of **scope and reach** of measures/actions when tackling the same type of problem (e.g.: Traffic congestion reduction - addressed in a smaller city using a bypass and in a larger one resorting to a mix involving parking policies for instance).

Size should not only be considered **in terms of inhabitants**, yet also - and as much – in relation to **territorial, morphological and administrative ( = which and how many local authorities) parameters**, given their crucial impact on viable actions/measures options.
Are there advantages and/or disadvantages when involving ‘smaller’ (with less than 100,000 inhabitants) cities/towns?

**for**

- Increased possibility to share objectives and indicators with the public
- Easier definition of stakeholders and organization of participation
- More focused action and more immediate efficacy on a delimited territory
- Objectives more easily achievable due to less wide scope and less significant financial burden
- Easier to involve different departments within the local authority (horizontal integration)
- Shorter times for the elaboration of the plan and its sharing with stakeholders/citizens
- Easier for political decision makers to reach consensus: a limited number of widely recognized problems and political debate normally focuses on how to tackle them; in a larger city more complex context and political decisions often on which problems to handle
- Easier to conduct preliminary analysis
Are there advantages and/or disadvantages when involving ‘smaller’ (with less than 100.000 inhabitants) cities/towns?

against

• Less resources available and more difficult to find funds
• Sometimes extremely difficult to build a unified planning office dedicated to wide-scope planning (urban, mobility, environment) and fund-raising
• More difficult to make planning choices > political decision makers more affected by individual rather than collective matters
• Less power to influence the surrounding territory and to involve neighbouring local authorities than a larger city has
• Less leverage on complex systems such as
  – public transport (rail to road interchange, connections between public transport in urban and sub-urban areas, public transport and cycling mobility, etc.);
  – social issues (longer distance transport services crossing town boundaries for high school students, transport services for persons with reduced mobility/disability, towards health facilities, etc.);
  – economic issues (home-work mobility for people working in another town/city, desynchronization of work schedules, wide-range car sharing initiatives, etc.)
What do smaller cities/towns need to achieve effective and satisfactory mobility planning?

- **Guidance**: user-friendly (simplified, ready-to-use) models and frameworks + best practices (similar size towns/cities);

- **Assistance**: to adapt national / international experiences (to be tailored for the local context);

- **Capacity building**: to acquire know-how and share expertise;

- **Support**:
  - to raise awareness in political decision makers (at a national and regional/local level) to facilitate processes and make funding available;
  - opportunities to share experiences (technical officers + political decision makers) and promote the uptake of SUMP.
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