



## **CITIES' DECISION-MAKING REQUIREMENTS** **A Summary of Responses from Core Cities**

### *A APPROACHES TO DECISION-MAKING*

**Responsibility for different policy measures (Q1)** Most cities retain direct control of land use, road building, traffic management and parking control. In some cases the private sector provides and operates public transport, and determines fare levels and information provision. Frequently the national government is responsible for major roads and rail lines.

**Other agencies (Q2)** There are substantial differences in the level of regional control over a city's strategy, ranging from direct control to encouragement to consult. In all cases national governments have a direct influence on strategy, but to date the influence of the European Union is very limited.

**Approaches to decision-making (Q3)** In most of our Core Cities, the strategy is developed through a process which we have styled "Plan-led": the city specifies a series of objectives, identifies the measures which best meet those objectives, and develops its strategy on this basis. However, we are aware from our discussions of at least two other models, which we have styled "Vision-led" and "Consensus-led" as defined in the questionnaire.

**Forward planning (Q4)** All our Core Cities develop long and medium term plans. Long term plans have a horizon of between 10 and 30 years, and in most cities are treated flexibly. Medium term plans are typically for 5 to 10 years ahead, and are often legally binding. They in turn help determine short term plans for the next year or two.

**Modelling (Q5)** All of our Core Cities have their own models of the transport system; in many cases they have land use models as well. Model results are used to inform decision-making, but are not used alone; judgement is also very important.

**Participation (Q6)** This is an area in which practice varies widely between our Core Cities. Some are required to consult with the public and business interests; others do so informally; few do so intensively. Most cities consider that the most important influences on their strategies come from the media and business interests.

### *B OBJECTIVES AND INDICATORS*

**Sustainability (Q7 & 8)** The main focus of PROSPECTS is on increased sustainability, and we have defined a sustainable urban transport and land use system as one which

- provides access to goods and services in an efficient way for all inhabitants of the urban area
- protects the environment, cultural heritage and ecosystems for the present generation, and
- does not endanger the opportunities of future generations to reach at least the same welfare level as those living now, including the welfare they derive from their natural environment and cultural heritage.

This definition is broadly supported by our Core Cities, who agree that it is a fundamental objective.

**Sub-objectives (Q9)** In order to achieve sustainability, a number of other sub-objectives need to be met. In discussion with our Core Cities, we have agreed that the following represent the range of objectives which they are pursuing:

- *economic efficiency* in the use of resources in transport, infrastructure, housing and labour markets
- *liveable streets and neighbourhoods* including freedom of movement for vulnerable road users, and encouragement of social, cultural and recreational activity
- *protection of the environment* including reduced use of non-renewable resources and energy; reduced pollution, noise, health problems and urban sprawl; and protection of cultural heritage, vulnerable areas and biodiversity
- *equity and social inclusion* including improved accessibility for those unable to use cars, fairer shares in the benefits of policies, and compensation to those adversely affected
- *safety* focusing on reduction in the number and severity of accidents
- *support for economic growth* and for cities' development plans and financial and economic stability.

Implicitly we have excluded others, including the sustainability of the global patterns of production and trade of which the city's economy is part.

**Indicators (Q10)** Our Core Cities agree that, to measure the level of achievement of their sub-objectives, indicators may be useful at three levels. Level 1 attempts to quantify and provide a monetary value for the aggregate impacts; level 2 quantifies the impact, but allows the distribution of effects to be measured; level 3 is purely qualitative. The table illustrates these levels; it is still being completed based on our discussions.

Table 1

Sub-objective	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Economic efficiency	Cost-benefit analysis	Time and money costs	
Liveable streets and neighbourhoods		Accidents by location, mode, victim	Feeling of freedom of movement, danger
Protection of the environment	Environmental costs	Energy and land use, emissions	
Equity and social inclusion	Accessibility for those without a car, mobility impaired	Losers and winners by category	
Reduce traffic accidents	Accident costs	Accidents by location, mode, victim	
Support economic growth	Changes in local GDP		

## *C TRENDS AND SCENARIOS*

**Past trends (Q11)** Cities' current transport conditions are determined by a number of past trends. The Core Cities differed in their perceptions of the most important trend factors, but the five most frequently mentioned were population growth; economic growth; changes in car ownership; changes in employment structure; and changes in employment location.

**Future scenarios (Q12)** All our Core Cities specified a range of scenarios for planning over the next 10 to 25 years. They differed in the factors (outside the transport system) which they considered, but the five most frequently mentioned were population growth, economic growth, changes in employment location, changes in car ownership and changes in the size of urban area.

## *D POLICY MEASURES*

**Types of measure (Q13)** We have identified some 70 types of policy measure which our cities are using. Most of these have been listed and defined more fully in a project working paper. We have found it helpful to categorise them under the seven broad headings which are used in Questions 1, 15, 16 and 17. The ten measures most frequently mentioned by cities as ones which they are actively pursuing are those listed in Question 13.

**Combinations of measures (Q14)** All of our Core Cities accepted that they could not tackle their transport problems by using one or two of these measures alone, and that they needed to use them in combination. The combinations which they used, and the reasons for them, however, differed considerably from one city to another. The key reasons for combining measures are to reinforce the effect of a measure; to offset its adverse effects; to compensate losers; to increase public acceptability; and to generate revenue.

## *E BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTATION*

**Legal barriers (Q15)** Several cities identified legal barriers on their ability to implement some of the policy measures identified in (D). The most frequent was lack of legislation, for example for road pricing. Legislation often limited the ways in which a measure could be used. In some cases legal structures of responsibility (see (A)) meant that cities were legally unable to determine fares or frequencies.

**Financial barriers (Q16)** Most cities were constrained as to how much they could do by availability of finance. Usually an overall budget constraint was imposed, but in some cases finance was limited specifically for infrastructure provision or other measures. Some cities could raise revenue from drivers, but were limited as to how it could be used. Few were able to draw on private finance.

**Acceptability constraints (Q17)** While the public generally supports sustainable transport plans, they are often opposed to measures which impose extra financial costs on them. Also there is frequent opposition to new roads and car-based solutions.

For further information please contact  
Professor Tony May [or local contact]  
Institute for Transport Studies  
University of Leeds  
36 University Road  
LEEDS LS2 9JT

Fax: +44-44-113-233-5334  
email: tmay@its.leeds.ac.uk