



Brussels	Paris
22, rue d'Arlon	15, rue de Richelieu
1050 Bruxelles	75001 Paris
tél : + 32 2 511 74 77	tél : + 33 1 44 50 59 59
fax : + 32 2 511 09 49	fax : + 33 1 44 50 59 60

e-mail : [cemr@ccre.org](mailto:cemr@ccre.org)  
[www.ccre.org](http://www.ccre.org)

CEMR thanks the European Commission for its financial support.  
Sole responsibility lies with the author, the Commission is not responsible  
for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.



CEMR's partner





# [ Achieving sustainable mobility in Europe's towns and municipalities ]



Conseil des Communes  
& Régions d'Europe  
Council of European  
Municipalities & Regions



# [ Content ]

> 1 CEMR Manifesto: "Achieving sustainable mobility in Europe's towns and municipalities"	3
> Executive summary	4
> Introduction	4
> Urban Transport: the main issues at stake	4
> Area 1 : Identifying the barriers which limit the use of public transport	5
> Area 2 : Promotion of public transport and alternatives to cars	6
> Case study 1 : CEMR's European Public Transport Award	7
> Area 3 : Incentive measures	8
> Case study 2 : car traffic restrictions in Bologna and Emilia-Romagna	9
> Area 4 : Quality and safety	9
> Case study 3 : Quality Bus Corridors in Dublin	10
> Area 5 : Privatisation, public procurement, concessions, public service obligations	11
> Case study 4 : Managed competition in the London bus network	11
> Case study 5 : Stockholm bus transport, and incentives for clean vehicles	12
> Area 6 : Economic instruments	13
> Case study 6 : London Congestion Charge	14
> Area 7 : Urban Planning & Spatial Development	14
> Case study 7 : Urban planning and transport modal split in Copenhagen	15

# CEMR Manifesto

## "Achieving sustainable mobility in Europe's towns and municipalities"



*The Council of European Municipalities and Regions (CEMR) and its member associations have been working on the issues of transport and sustainable mobility for a long time. The European Commission is expected to present a thematic strategy on urban environment by December 2005, that is set to have an important transport dimension. The problems of air pollution and climate change are ever present. Air quality is increasingly seen as a public health issue. At the same time, important developments on the regulation and nature of public services are taking place.*

*In light of these current issues, the Transport Committee of CEMR, at its meeting of October 2004, adopted a manifesto on sustainable mobility for Europe's regions, towns and municipalities. Most cities are faced with serious road congestion and pollution problems. Moreover, CEMR believes that urban transport is a key issue for local governments and for the well-being of our citizens.*

*Hence this document calls for sustainable mobility policies to be developed and placed at the core of EU, national, regional and local actions. It also calls*

*for better quality public transport as well as for the promotion of alternatives to the use of private cars. CEMR advocates a better integration, at all levels of governance, between transport and land use policies. We believe economic instruments should also be envisaged. Furthermore, the document recalls our position on the opening of the local and regional public transport market. We also call for more research to be undertaken on the barriers that prevent more use of public transport.*

*As the chair of CEMR's Transport Committee, I am convinced that by reinforcing public transport and by making our towns' and municipalities' transport policies more sustainable, we will reach our dual objective: to improve our citizens' quality of life and to help safeguarding the future of our environment.*

Jacques Auxiette  
President of the Pays de la Loire Regional Council  
Chair of CEMR's Transport committee



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*The Council of European Municipalities and Regions (CEMR) is the representative association of 46 national associations representing local and regional government in 33 countries.*

*It covers approximately 100,000 local and regional authorities throughout Europe.*

CEMR considers urban transport a key issue for local governments and for the well-being of our citizens. Most cities and towns are faced with serious road congestion problems, which lead to significant levels of pollution that damage public health and contribute to climate change. Our manifesto calls for European Union sustainable mobility policies to be placed at the core of EU, national, regional and local actions. CEMR also calls for better quality public transport as well as promoting alternatives to the use of private cars.

CEMR's Transport Committee has identified the following seven areas as deserving of further reflection and action from the European Commission, Member State governments and local and regional authorities.

These are:

1. Identifying the barriers which limit the use of public transport
2. Promoting public transport and alternatives to car use
3. Developing incentive measures to manage demand for road space
4. Addressing quality and safety issues
5. Reviewing and improving the legal framework governing privatisation, public procurement, concessions, and public service obligations in public transport
6. Developing economic instruments to facilitate the above
7. Developing better policy and strategy links between urban planning and transport policy at all levels of governance

## INTRODUCTION

Since 1995, the CEMR Transport Committee, composed of elected representatives and experts from local authorities, has been meeting to discuss problems of urban transport, sustainable mobility, as well as the development of EU policies and European Commission proposals, and to exchange experience on innovative actions at the local level.

CEMR considers urban transport a key issue for local governments and for the well-being of the citizens. Local authorities are in a privileged position to ensure delivery of high quality public transport that satisfies citizens' needs. Local authorities are willing and eager to develop more sustainable mobility schemes, but these require funding. CEMR calls on the EU and member states' national governments to ensure that local authorities have the financial means in order to allow them to contribute effectively to the global objectives of sustainability, notably through promoting more sustainable modes of transport.

## URBAN TRANSPORT: THE MAIN ISSUES AT STAKE

Effective public transport is essential to sustainable urban development and cohesion. The organisation of transport in urban areas shapes not only people's quality of life and the quality of their natural environment, but also the distribution of vital resources such as housing. Moreover, greater congestion in urban areas is a major source of greenhouse gases and contribute to climate change.





Today, most metropolitan areas suffer from congestion caused by increasing personal car use. Among other things, this congestion brings into question the methods used by governments to organise and promote public transport, as well as the way in which citizens perceive public transport.

The problems of congestion and associated urban sprawl also have important social and economic consequences. These include, for example, problems of access to essential services or to the workplace for those who do not own cars and the reduced attractiveness of cities as a location for business investment.

As well as improving the quality of public transport services, authorities must combine more effective promotion of public or alternative modes of transport (car-sharing, bicycle, etc), with measures aimed at limiting personal car use. Measures which introduce pricing elements into road use, as well as car and fuel types, may have a role to play in achieving these goals.

CEMR welcomes the European Commission’s Communication<sup>1</sup> on the Thematic Strategy on Urban Environment and its objective to improve the quality of life in urban areas by tackling major environment and transport issues. However, CEMR and its member associations are not in favour of European legislative measures of a mandatory nature. Existing measures and plans at local, regional and national level should be taken into account and the exchange of experience and best practices should be promoted. The open method of coordination<sup>2</sup> would be an effective instrument to encourage cooperation activities between member states.

CEMR’s Transport Committee has identified the following seven areas as deserving further reflection and action from the European Commission, Member State governments and local and regional authorities. The Committee stresses the importance of cooperating on the development of all transport policies through an open dialogue involving representatives of national, regional and local authorities. Engagement with civil society and the private sector will also help achieve common goals.

### AREA 1: IDENTIFYING THE BARRIERS WHICH LIMIT THE USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT

While it is clear that the increasing use of cars in metropolitan areas causes a wide range of problems such as congestion, air, soil, noise and water pollution, as well as traffic accidents, an essential activity must be to foster a deeper understanding of why people choose not to use public and other alternative modes of transport. Recent studies indicate that barriers to public transport are often psychological and arise from misconceptions and stereotypes, which do not always correspond to reality.

Local, regional, national and European authorities should devote time to conducting further studies regarding the differences between people’s perceptions of public transport and the reality experienced when the system is used. Such studies will allow for a more strategic and coherent approach to both the substantive aspects and image of local public transport.

<sup>1</sup> COM (2004)60

<sup>2</sup> Under the « Open Method of Coordination », launched in 2000, Member States set guidelines, objectives and timetables for meeting them. They draw up National Action Plans and the Commission monitors their progress in reports drawn up each year and agreed with the Council.

## >1 CEMR Manifesto “Achieving sustainable mobility in Europe’s towns and municipalities”

> Area 2: Promotion of public transport and alternatives to cars

Within such a framework, authorities can address an additional obstacle to increased use of public transport: the lack of coordination between transport networks and systems. It is often difficult to co-ordinate pricing, information and route coverage among different networks and systems. Regulations on competition and deregulation should take this fragmentation into account and provide a framework to avoid any problematic segmentation of the transport supply.

In order to increase the use of public transportation, authorities must address the issue of urban sprawl - at the same time a cause and consequence of rising personal car use. The integration of land use and spatial development measures with transport planning is therefore essential.

A lack of financial resources poses an additional barrier to an increase in public transport use. As long as cities, towns and regions offer limited public transport systems, people will continue to favour personal cars. It is therefore essential to provide local and regional governments with the funding necessary for investment in additional public transport services and infrastructure. In member states with largely deregulated public transport systems, local authorities still have a vital role to play in managing service provision in areas where the free market has failed to provide a service of its own.



### AREA 2: PROMOTION OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND ALTERNATIVES TO CARS

Local and regional authorities recognise the pressing need to promote public transport. CEMR supports the actions undertaken at the local level through initiatives such as the “European Mobility Week” and other activities that promote alternatives to the personal car (walking, cycling, car-sharing etc). CEMR organised a European Public Transport Award which rewards European cities that develop sustainable transport initiatives. The initiative ran from 1995 to 2003 and will be repeated in 2006.

We believe that citizen information and participation campaigns are essential in order to promote modal change by raising citizen awareness and modifying behaviour. As a citizens’ forum organised by the GART<sup>3</sup> in France demonstrated, car drivers are more willing to change their mobility behaviour if politicians, along with industry, do a better job informing car drivers of the issues at stake (climate change, environmental damage, increasing journey times, damage to business competitiveness etc.).

Information campaigns should take into account the interests and ideas of groups with specific needs. Consultation with pedestrians, older people, the disabled, low-income families, the long-term unemployed, women and children, will allow authorities to design transport networks and systems which better target the needs of all users; thereby counteracting the influence of the automobile industry in transport policy and the increasing demand for road space.

<sup>3</sup> Groupement des autorités responsables de transport, [www.gart.org](http://www.gart.org)



## Case study n°1

### CEMR’S EUROPEAN PUBLIC TRANSPORT AWARD

From 1995 until 2003, CEMR organised, with other partners including the GART, a European Public Transport Award<sup>4</sup>. The next edition is foreseen for 2006. The main objective is to promote innovation by European local and regional authorities for better and more sustainable mobility, and to promote public transport at large.

The award has five principal aims:

- 1) To highlight innovative and integrated long term actions at the local level that promote sustainable mobility
- 2) To support an integrated approach – promote governance, namely coherence between different policy fields, partnership between spheres of government as well as stakeholder participation
- 3) To modify the behaviour of the citizens by creating greater public awareness of mobility and transport issues
- 4) To make good practices emerge and to encourage the exchange of experiences as well as the dissemination of information about practical solutions to urban mobility problems
- 5) To collect information on existing instruments to decrease congestion and on concrete measures on how to implement them

Selection criteria for the Award include the **transferability** of the schemes to other local and regional authorities. It should be possible to draw lessons from these experiences or to reproduce them by adapting them to the context particular to other countries.

### The 2003 edition of the European Public Transport Award

The theme was :

“Citizens’ support for unpopular policy choices”.

The rationale was as follows. Today, we are dealing with the consequence of urban policies that have throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century promoted the use of the car, which have led to cities being taken over by the car, thus causing congestion, pollution, noise, reducing road safety and diminishing the overall quality of life in cities. The awareness of the need to achieve a modal shift in transport within cities has increased, and a number of tools have been developed, such as better public transport, promotion of cycling, car-sharing (etc.), to help achieve this shift towards more sustainable transport modes. However, congestion is not decreasing and trends for the next years do not seem to indicate any positive changes. This is partly due to the fact that radical decisions to change the logic behind current mobility patterns, are generally unpopular and therefore politically difficult to take. The objective of the Award was thus to help increasing citizens' support for unpopular policy choices, or to make necessary mobility choices more popular.

The first two winners of the 2003 edition were the city of Bologna/Region Emilia-Romagna (see case study n°2) and the Cambridgeshire County Council (“Cambridge Core Traffic Scheme”). Since 1995, other winners have included the cities of Freiburg, Strasbourg, the province of Noord-Holland and the City of Bilbao.

<sup>4</sup> sponsored by the European Commission, and for some editions, by the region Bruxelles-Capitale and other sponsors.

## >1 CEMR Manifesto “Achieving sustainable mobility in Europe’s towns and municipalities”

> Area 3: Incentive measures



### AREA 3: INCENTIVE MEASURES

Promotion and awareness-raising activities should be complemented by measures aimed at limiting car access to cities.

CEMR encourages the European Commission to support measures which better manage the demand for road space such as urban tolls, separate corridors for buses, pedestrian zones, cycle paths etc. and suggests that the results of the pilot actions undertaken within the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Framework of Research and Development Programmes are disseminated in a more systematic way to local and regional authorities. CEMR and its member associations look forward to assisting in such a dissemination initiative. The Commission’s practice of concentrating R&D funding on ‘world class’ partners (in size and in terms of expertise and administrative capacities) has excluded a number of local and regional authorities from researching and implementing sustainable transport solutions. We are concerned that this focus has led to neglecting smaller-scale, but equally essential projects aimed at improving local and regional public transport.

As regards the concept of subsidiarity, CEMR underlines that local authorities will always have a key role to play in implementing transport policies. CEMR urges European institutions to consult with representatives of local and regional authorities, amongst others, before deciding on European-wide mobility policies, whether relating to urban or rural areas.

To this end, CEMR recommends an initial assessment of the following tools to reduce automobile traffic within urban areas:

- Better demand management for road space combined with an increased and more efficient public transport supply.
- Measurement of the impact, in particular the environmental and economic consequences, of ring-roads on inner-city congestion.
- Use of car parking regulations as a tool for managing demand for car use.
- Creation of cycle paths and the development of pedestrian zones.
- Measurement of the impact of car traffic reduction policies on commercial activities.
- Development of mobility strategies for employers in order to change employee behaviour.
- Exchanging of good practice on urban road pricing initiatives in place across Europe.

## Case study n°2

### CAR TRAFFIC RESTRICTIONS IN BOLOGNA AND EMILIA-ROMAGNA

*In 2003, the theme of CEMR’s European Public Transport Award was: “Citizens’ support for unpopular policy choices”. The objective of the Award was to help increasing citizens’ support for necessary mobility policy choices that are perceived as constraining, and to make them more popular. In Bologna, thanks to a strong media campaign, sustainable mobility policies have been made popular.*

*The joint winners of the 2003 Award were the Emilia-Romagna region and the city of Bologna for their “liberiamo l’aria” project. 9 provinces and 81 local authorities were involved in the project. One of the main ideas was to close the city centres to private traffic. Other ideas aimed at reducing traffic congestion by encouraging the use of public transport, reducing gas emissions and giving citizens full information about the measures. The jury was appreciative of the “partnership” spirit of the project that involved all spheres of government (local, regional and national).*

*Furthermore, this regional project reinforced Bologna’s own earlier project: “Vivi Bologna”, launched in November 2001 by the local public transport company ATC Bologna and by the municipality. The scheme included the closure of the city centre to private traffic during the week-ends, the promotion of parking facilities at interchange points, just outside the centre, with buses and railways (and incentives to use these car parks and change transport mode), new ecological buses, as well as social and cultural events. “Vivi Bologna” was supported by a strong media campaign in order to increase citizens support and cooperation and to enhance public awareness of the public health issues surrounding car traffic.*

*(project web address : [www.liberiamolara.it](http://www.liberiamolara.it))*

### AREA 4: QUALITY AND SAFETY

CEMR participated in the benchmarking exercise<sup>5</sup> launched by the European Commission and has disseminated the results of this exercise to a large number of cities and regions.

CEMR considers benchmarking to be a valuable tool to improve the strategic organisation of local authorities and recommends that the Commission continue to support activities in this field.

More generally, the issue of quality is central to growing the use of public transport. This issue should be considered with regards to:

- Equipment quality (evolution of the European industry towards less expensive and better performing vehicles).
- Quality of services (ticket sales, welcome desks, information on a real-time basis, etc.).
- Quality access to public transport, both in terms of equipment and urban planning.
- Reliability and coverage of services (punctuality).
- Improvements in staff and driver training.
- Specific problems linked to low population areas, rural areas, and geographic remoteness.

We emphasize that public transport systems in Europe are very different from one another and that therefore the Commission should respect this diversity when planning legislation relating to quality and safety of public transport.

The results of research projects such as QUATTRO can serve to guide local and regional authorities to ensure quality when organising transport systems, especially with regards to contracting services out.

As public safety becomes an increasingly significant concern for local authorities, additional emphasis should be placed on safety and security within public transportation systems.

<sup>5</sup> [www.transportbenchmarks.org](http://www.transportbenchmarks.org)

## Case study n°3

### QUALITY BUS CORRIDORS IN DUBLIN

Recent developments have made the Dublin bus network one of Europe's best in terms of service quality. The Quality Bus Corridors (QBCs), introduced in 1996, include special lanes restricted to all traffic **except** buses, taxis, emergency vehicles and cyclists. Special junctions also allow for considerable time saving. The integrity of the Quality Bus Corridors is enforced by the police.

Features of QBCs include: direct high frequency bus services operated by comfortable, environmentally friendly buses ; staff highly trained in customer service ; high quality shelters at most stops; improved lane markings ; kerb alignments and traffic signals ; restrictions on parking and turning movements ; bus priority measures.

An important media campaign was launched to highlight to the public the advantages of public transport. Furthermore, the implementation process of a QBC includes data collection and analysis (3 months), a public consultation process (4 months), and meetings with local public representatives. The final design takes 3 months, while the construction takes 18 months.

### OBJECTIVES

Facilitate the provision of a faster, more frequent and more reliable bus service; provide adequate loading and parking facilities for businesses; improve safety for all classes of road users including pedestrians. The overall impact is intended to provide a more equitable balance between competing road users and improved safety for all. This causes some additional delay to private cars at peak hours as general traffic is mainly confined to one lane in each

direction over much of the routes of the Quality Bus Corridors (QBC). This acts as a disincentive to car use.

### RESULTS

In the period from 1997 to 2003 bus capacity has increased by 35%.

In the same period the number of bus passengers travelling during the morning peak period (07h00-10h00) has increased by 60%. In the same period there has been a 25% reduction in the number of cars entering the city centre.

Bus average journey times in the morning peak period are less than the corresponding journey by car in 7 out of the 10 Quality Bus Corridors. (November 2003)

The morning peak period mode share of total travel into the city centre, i.e. the proportion of total travel to the city centre carried by buses has increased from 34% in 1997 to 52% in 2003.

### NETWORK

The first QBC (Lucan) was launched in July 1996 and covers 12.1 km. The latest one (Swords) was launched in November 2001. The longest QBC runs 16.4 km. Today, there are 10 QBCs covering a network of 100.9 km.

Case study provided by : Dublin Transportation Office



AREA 5 : PRIVATISATION, PUBLIC PROCUREMENT,  
CONCESSIONS, PUBLIC SERVICE OBLIGATIONS

A new draft EU regulation on public service requirements in passenger transport, expected in 2005, is a major concern for local authorities. CEMR has expressed its opinion on this subject several times and specifically on the Commission’s draft regulation on public service requirements in passenger transport (COM (2000) 7). Like the European Parliament expressed in its opinion on the respective draft regulation<sup>6</sup>, we believe that the competent authority should have the right to arrange and to provide transport services itself or with its own companies. Direct operation by the authority concerned, by means of a company of its own, has in many cases proved its worth in terms of meeting environmental and urban planning objectives. The right of local authorities to opt for the permanent continuance of such companies alongside other kinds of companies must therefore continue to exist. In accordance with the principles of subsidiarity, proportionality and local self-government, we do not think that competition in the local public transport market should be imposed at the European level, to the exclusion of direct or ‘in house’ delivery models.

CEMR believes that local elected representatives are in the best position to choose the economic model which best ensures delivery of high quality public transport that meets the citizens’ needs. While increased competition may indeed have positive effects, particularly economic, we are concerned that, all too often, such benefits come at the expense of quality and effective coordination between different transport modes. In some cases, quality, innovation and coordination are better guaranteed by either direct delivery of public transport by public authorities, or through a system of ‘managed competition’ such as franchising.

When public transport is open to greater liberalisation, we believe competition should have minimum regulatory standards, by which public bodies can specify strong service criteria, including sustainability objectives, notably through the tendering processes.

## Case study n°4

### MANAGED COMPETITION IN THE LONDON BUS NETWORK.

#### LONDON’S BUS FRANCHISE SYSTEM

*London operates a franchise system for each of its bus routes. Individual routes are put out to competitive tender every five years, and one operator will receive the exclusive right to run the route for the duration of the franchise. Fares are regulated by the transport authority and are fixed at £1.2 (€1.7) for a single adult journey anywhere in London. Timetabling and network coverage issues are also regulated. There are therefore elements of both competition and regulation in the London system.*

*Awarding a franchise also allows the authorities to specify strict service standards. The performance of operators is reviewed on a monthly basis. Staff turnover levels, mechanical failure, passenger volumes and satisfaction are all monitored. Operators who fail to meet standards could lose their franchise before the end of the five year agreement.*

*There are currently 20 different operators running London’s bus services. Bus use has risen 38% since 2002 and London buses are now carrying five million passengers a day. Volumes are at their highest levels since 1969, and many more ‘night bus’ routes have been introduced, running 24 hours a day.*

*As well as single tickets the use of buses in London benefits from generous arrangements through the London-wide ‘Travelcard’ scheme. Effectively, anyone with a Travelcard for any one of the six zones is allowed free travel on buses in all other zones.*

<sup>6</sup> PE A-0365/2001

## Case study n°5

### THE REST OF THE UK

*The approach in London (and also northern Ireland) is in contrast to the system in the rest of the country which is open to full competition: several operators can compete for customers on the same route. The UK's 1985 transport act required all bus services which are not provided by commercial operators but thought to be socially necessary, to be tendered out under a competitive process. The UK's bus network today is therefore run in the vast majority by private sector operators, or in a few cases by 'arms length' municipal bus companies which compete on equal terms with the private sector, and do not receive subsidy.*

*Deregulation outside of London has met with mixed success. In some areas, such as central Manchester, initially a large number of bus operators competed for customers and fares were driven down. In some urban centres there is still a degree of competition, but the trend has been towards consolidation of local markets into near monopolies. Outside of large urban centres, there are many examples of inadequate network coverage, rising tendering costs, poor timetable co-ordination, rising fares, driver vacancies, and poor standards of service, indicating that full deregulation has not served the public well compared to the London franchise model.*

### CONCLUSION

*The franchise system has proved relatively successful in the capital, although relatively expensive for the public authorities to manage. The element of regulation ensures minimum service standards are maintained and that frequent and efficient services are available to all users throughout the day. The element of competition, introduced once every five years, ensures that operators have to innovate and perform well to stay in business.*

*Case Study supplied by Local Government International Bureau [www.lgib.gov.uk](http://www.lgib.gov.uk)*

### STOCKHOLM BUS TRANSPORT, AND INCENTIVES FOR CLEAN VEHICLES

*Sweden has experimented, since the end of the Eighties, a liberalisation of its local and regional public transport system. However, local authorities have kept the right to choose to either contract out services or run them "in house" ("regulated competition" or direct administration). Most local authorities have chosen to contract out their services, with a tendering process in which authorities impose their public service obligations, including sustainability criteria. This is the case in Stockholm. Through strong service criteria in the tendering process, the local transport authority has succeeded to achieve its goal: a bus fleet that uses 100 % renewable fuels. Today approximately 16 % of Stockholm buses run on renewable fuels (253 ethanol, 21 biogas, 3 hydrogen/fuel cell), and by the end of 2006 the transport authority hopes to have reached 25 %, by increasing the share of ethanol and biogas buses. Consequently, emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and of particulates have dramatically decreased. Stockholm transport authority also participates to a project of setting up an international bus buyers' consortium for ethanol buses.*



Moreover, the City of Stockholm promotes the use of clean vehicles (biogas, ethanol or electric/electric hybrids). To increase the uptake also among private companies, Stockholm runs awareness campaigns and has created a clean driver's network. In addition, various incentives are offered to clean vehicles: free residential parking, costfree driving in the Congestion Charging<sup>7</sup> zone, a procurement requirement that 25 % of transport services to the city should be clean by 2006. Through the Trendsetter<sup>8</sup> project, it has also been possible to subsidise about 300 vehicles and 4 biogas filling stations. Today there are almost 3 000 clean vehicles running on Stockholm's streets, there are 18 ethanol filling stations and 8 biogas filling stations.

Another interesting item is that all rail traffic runs on electricity from renewable sources (water and wind).

Case study provided by the Stockholm Public Transport Authority and by the City of Stockholm



<sup>7</sup> congestion charging may be introduced in Stockholm if the trial period (2005) and the referendum (2006) are successful

<sup>8</sup> [www.trendsetter-europe.org](http://www.trendsetter-europe.org)

### AREA 6 : ECONOMIC INSTRUMENTS

We believe that economic instruments – environmental taxes, taxes on energy, taxes on CO<sub>2</sub>, urban congestion charges – can play a very important role in promoting a modal change away from individual car use towards increased use of public transport. Public and alternative transport modes are less attractive because the car is perceived as more convenient, or indeed is more convenient in some cases. Users are not forced to take the social and environmental costs of their car use into account. Instead these costs are currently borne by society as a whole. Some cities have therefore introduced road pricing or other economic measures in order to make alternatives to the car more competitive. For instance, in Denmark, high car registration taxes have controlled levels of car ownership<sup>9</sup>.

CEMR has expressed its opinion on the eurovignette directive<sup>10</sup>, which governs road tolls for lorries. We believe that the tolls should be set at a level which not only allows for the maintenance of the road infrastructure, but also allows for wider costs caused by road use to be recovered (soil, air, water, noise pollution etc).

An approach which includes the full “marginal social costs” of transport (including environmental and congestion costs) would significantly enhance the efficiency and sustainability of the transport system, as suggested by the Commission’s 1998 White Paper on infrastructure charging (COM(1998)466) and the White Paper on European Transport Policy published in 2001.

It should be made clear that this provision allows member states to use the revenue for the development of more sustainable forms of transport, in line with the White Paper on European Transport Policy. Furthermore, we regret that the “Eurovignette” proposal does not include the external costs of congestion and environmental impacts as a basis for setting tolls. We urge the Commission and member states to deepen their reflection on the idea of internalising the full social and environmental costs of individual car use and to take this into account when drafting transport-related policies.

<sup>9</sup> there is a high registration tax on new cars (the tax is 105% for the first 7.600 euro and 180% above, in addition to 25% VAT). In 2001, according to the OECD, the number of cars per 1000 inhabitants was 346 in Denmark, compared to 475 in France and 532 in Germany (while GDP per heads is higher in Denmark than in these two countries)

<sup>10</sup> see CEMR position at: [http://www.ccre.org/prises\\_de\\_positions\\_detail\\_en.htm?ID=25](http://www.ccre.org/prises_de_positions_detail_en.htm?ID=25)

## >1 CEMR Manifesto “Achieving sustainable mobility in Europe’s towns and municipalities”

> Case study n°6: London Congestion Charge > Area 7: Urban Planning & Spatial Development

In order for road pricing to gain increasing acceptability amongst motorists and politicians alike, revenue raised from road tolls should, for the foreseeable future, be spent on the transport sector alone, and not used as a ‘hidden’ tax to finance other government priorities.

We also note that given the recent advances in satellite positioning technologies (such as GPS) certain member states are exploring the possibility of a ‘universal’ charge to cover all vehicles on all roads. While this approach may be some years away, we would encourage the Commission and local authorities across the EU to begin to consider if such an approach is feasible, and the benefits it might bring in managing demand and achieving sustainable transport goals.

### Case study n°6

#### LONDON CONGESTION CHARGE

*Bus use has risen 38% since 2002. About half of the increase in London’s bus use is estimated to be due to London’s ‘congestion charge’ (currently around €8 per car per day). Revenue from the charge is partly invested in new buses and infrastructure. Since the introduction of the charge in February of 2003, congestion has reduced by 30%, and traffic volume by 15%. There is also no evidence of increases in congestion outside the zone, except in a few isolated cases. Bus journey times in central London have improved by 15%, and a small shift from road use to the London underground has also been observed. There have also been significant environmental benefits to the charge. Traffic changes related to the charging scheme are estimated to have led to savings of 19% in traffic-related emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, and 12% in emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> and fine particles<sup>11</sup>.*

Case Study supplied by Local Government International Bureau [www.lgib.gov.uk](http://www.lgib.gov.uk)

#### AREA 7 : URBAN PLANNING & SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT

Spatial planning plays an essential role in ensuring urban mobility. The integration of planning and transport policies is therefore essential.

CEMR and its member associations offer the following recommendations to local and regional authorities. First, the relation between spatial planning and mobility: in designing and implementing development plans, planners must pay particular attention to citizen mobility needs, being aware of the potentially negative effects of town planning on urban mobility. Secondly, effective town planning must be based on an integrated, holistic approach to the area and its residents. Planning methods must address issues ranging from social exclusion and the distribution of economic activities, to the location of residential and cultural districts. Ultimately, the aim should be to develop comprehensive “mobility strategies”, which focus not only on transport, but also on cultural, economic and social dimensions.



<sup>11</sup> “Congestion charging Central London. Impacts Monitoring” Second annual report by Transport for London, April 2004



## Case study n°7

### URBAN PLANNING AND TRANSPORT MODAL SPLIT IN COPENHAGEN

...CAR TRAFFIC EVENTUALLY GOES UP...

*The Danish capital enjoys a good transport modal split. The city has managed to contain car traffic for many years. This is due to a controlled urbanisation in "fingers" throughout the Copenhagen urban area, developing along strong rail infrastructures. For more than 50 years authorities have privileged a strong planning policy, developing housing and activities along public transport infrastructures. This policy is also supported by a strong promotion of bicycle use in the urban area of Copenhagen (2 million inhabitants including 500 000 in the city of Copenhagen) and by a national policy of high taxes on car purchases.*

*The use of local and regional trains increased by 50% between 1970 and the mid-90's. Cycling trips outwards and inwards the city centre increased by more than 60%.*

*However, the trend has recently changed. First of all, since the 60's, the Great Copenhagen Council could not anymore influence the urbanisation between the "fingers", because of the public demand for individual housing. Then, since the 70's, a lot of employment has been leaving the city, contributing to urban sprawl. The consequence is that, over this period, the number of vehicles registered in the agglomeration (outside Copenhagen) increased by 40% whereas the motorisation of households decreased by 20% in the city of Copenhagen itself. However, the car traffic remained stable in the urban area until 1996. Bus use decreased by 10% in the urban area, but train use continued to increase, thanks to network extensions and better train frequency, before stabilising in the mid-90's.*

*Since the mid-90's, car traffic has been increasing in the city of Copenhagen (+5 % from 1996 until 1998) – a new phenomenon. This is mainly due to urban sprawl and to strong economic growth. The City has developed the Orestad project, which will, by 2007-09, equip the agglomeration with an automotive metro (3 lines), and a new semi-circular rail line linking the existing radial lines (the « fingers »). A new motorway going to the airport is also planned, but, overall, the project should shift additional trips mainly towards public transport.*

*In order to contain the car traffic increase, car park policies are also used. Car parking has already been charged for some years. New car parks will be developed, but, in parallel, parking space will be reduced on road space.*

*In spite of this recent increase in car traffic, the Copenhagen transport modal split remains favourable to more sustainable modes. Trips from home to work are shared as follows : 31% by public transport, 30% by car, 33% by bicycle, and around 6% by foot<sup>12</sup> .*

*Case study provided by the GART (Groupement des autorités responsables de Transport) [www.gart.org](http://www.gart.org)*

<sup>12</sup> Figures from 1998, with little variation since. Sources: *Traffic and environment plan for Copenhagen, municipality of Copenhagen; City of Copenhagen, Building and construction administration*