

York Civic Trust Planning Committee
Transport Policy Developments
Monitoring Group
First draft report
28th February 2018

1 Introduction

In April 2017, York Civic Trust produced a statement on future transport policy in York, based on the findings of two workshops for members held in February 2017. Amongst its recommendations were the following:

1. York's transport policy should focus on the twin over-arching objectives of enhancing quality of life and the economic vitality of the city.
2. Contributing to these, the most important underpinning objectives are achieving improved accessibility for all (and hence equality of opportunity), enhanced air quality and reduced impact on climate change, greater efficiency and reliability of the transport system, and improved safety. These objectives should be treated as being of broadly equal importance, and should be defined in more detail as SMART objectives specific to York.
3. The vision in any revision of York's LTP should reflect these objectives in broad terms and at the same time set realistic targets for achievement in each of them overall and for different categories of user.
4. To this end the Council should establish an agreed set of outcome indicators reflecting each of these objectives, and monitor performance against them.

The Trust's policy statement was presented to City of York Council in May 2017, and welcomed by the cabinet member for transport, Cllr Ian Gillies. The Trust offered to conduct further work in a number of areas, of which one focused on recommendation (4) above: the preparation of advice on a monitoring strategy for transport in York.

The Trust's Transport Monitoring Group was established in October 2017, following an invitation to members to participate. It has had two meetings to date, and this draft report reflects its recommendations to date.

2 The Group's objectives

The Group agreed that its objectives should be:

- to propose to CYC the performance indicators against which the current transport system and possible options for the next Local Transport Plan might be assessed; and
- to review the extent to which data is already available on these indicators, the need for additional data, and the ways in which that data could best be made available to, and understandable by, members of the public.

3 Design principles for a monitoring framework

At its first meeting, the Group considered a summary of research into good practice in monitoring and the resulting guidance. It drew the distinction between input, output,

intermediate outcome and outcome indicators, and stressed the importance, for policy development, of focusing on outcome indicators, such as pollution levels and casualty records, which directly measure performance against the objectives of the policy. The Group also noted that intermediate outcome indicators, such as traffic flows and modal shares, were helpful in understanding how changes in policy were leading to changes in outcome indicators.

On this basis the Group agreed to adopt the following approach:

- I. consider the possible objectives for a new Local Transport Plan,
- II. identify outcome indicators relevant to those objectives,
- III. identify suitable intermediate outcome indicators,
- IV. assess how those indicators might best be disaggregated to reflect conditions in York
- V. review with CYC the extent to which data for the indicators at (II) - (IV) was already available, and the feasibility of collecting additional information,
- VI. advise on how to make this data accessible to, and understandable by, the public.

This draft report covers steps I – IV above, and hence provides the basis for the review with CYC in step V.

4 Possible objectives for a new Local Transport Plan

The Group agreed that the Trust's two high level objectives of quality of life and economic vitality (see recommendation 1 above) provided the appropriate starting point, and that specific objectives should be identified which contributed to one or both of these.

Under these the Group proposes the following objectives (not listed in order of importance):

A. Quality of life

- a. to improve air quality
- b. to increase safety
- c. to enhance physical health and activity
- d. to ensure adequate access to services
- e. to reduce noise
- f. to improve choice and flexibility
- g. to enhance ambiance and public realm
- h. to reduce impacts on climate change
- i. to pursue equity, particularly as it concerns the elderly, those with mobility handicaps, and those who might be considered to be in transport poverty.

B. Economic vitality

- a. to increase reliability
- b. to ensure adequate access to jobs, employees and markets
- c. to provide efficient access for freight and servicing
- d. to increase footfall
- e. to improve connectivity
- f. to achieve resilience.

5 Proposed outcome indicators

The Group next considered the most appropriate outcome indicator(s) for each of these objectives. These were identified in broad terms, on the understanding that they would

need to be defined more precisely in discussion with CYC. In some cases the choice of indicator was clear-cut; in others some discussion was needed. The conclusions of such discussions are set out below for those objectives where discussion was necessary, followed by the resulting list of recommended outcome indicators, listed in the same order as the objectives above.

Physical health and activity Public health statistics will provide data on trends in obesity, heart condition and so on, but these can be expected to respond only slowly to changes in transport policy. Since transport's principal impact is through encouraging more active travel, modal shares for walking and cycling appear to be an appropriate proxy.

Access to services Accessibility can be thought of as ease of reaching, but will vary depend on the household, the services to be accessed and the modes of transport available. It was decided to simplify this analysis by focusing on those services likely to be considered the most important, including hospitals, health centres and major retail centres.

Choice and flexibility The Group noted that choice of means of travel, and availability of alternatives, were largely covered by access considerations, and were otherwise determined by the individual's circumstances, which might best be considered under equity.

Ambiance and public realm The Group's discussion focused initially on public space, including the foot streets, where high quality surroundings with well maintained footways were deemed particularly important. It was noted that green space free of traffic and pollution was also important to citizens' wellbeing. In the subsequent discussion on freight, the problems of servicing times, vehicle size and pavement parking in shopping areas were also added. Thus this objective requires a number of more specific outcome indicators.

Equity It was accepted that this would need to be assessed by considering the impacts of transport policy on different groups in society, and hence by a disaggregation of data. The approach to doing this is considered in Section 7 below.

Access to jobs, employees and markets It was noted that most of the places of employment were in or close to the main retail areas. The most obvious exceptions are the universities and colleges. Thus access considerations should be expanded to cover these.

Efficient access for freight and servicing The Group lacks expertise on the particular needs of business in using freight and services, and suggested that it might be best to seek the advice of the Business Improvement District.

Connectivity This concept is related to access, with the added concern over the ability to interchange between public transport services. Provided that access by public transport includes an assessment of interchange, connectivity can be assessed by the access indicators.

Resilience The principal concern under this heading is the ability of the transport system to operate when disrupted by unpredictable events, such as floods and major accidents. Further consideration is needed of the most appropriate indicators to measure this.

The resulting list of outcome indicators is thus:

A. Quality of life

- a. air quality: nitrogen dioxide and particulates
- b. safety: casualties, by severity, as recorded from reported accidents
- c. physical health and activity: modal shares for walking and cycling as a proxy (see Section 6)
- d. access to services: time and cost to access hospitals, health centres and major retail centres
- e. noise reduction: noise levels as measured at the kerbside
- f. choice and flexibility: no separate indicator needed
- g. ambiance and public realm: access to green space and traffic-free areas; quality of paving in public spaces and intrusion of delivery vehicles
- h. climate change avoidance: energy consumption
- i. equity: an appropriate disaggregation of the above (see Section 7).

B. Economic vitality

- a. Reliability: variability in travel time and bus arrival time (including cancellations)
- b. access to jobs, employees and markets: access to major retail centres and universities and colleges
- c. efficient access for freight and servicing: the Group proposes seeking advice from the BID
- d. footfall: as defined for the City Centre
- e. connectivity: no separate indicator needed
- f. resilience: the Group needs further advice on this.

6 Proposed intermediate outcome indicators

The Group agreed that the following indicators would be of most help in understanding changes in travel and traffic:

- Journeys (“trips”) made
 - By purpose, mode, time of day and area
- Person-kilometres travelled
 - By purpose, mode, time of day and area
- Freight-kilometres travelled
 - By vehicle size, time of day and area
- Traffic flows
 - By mode, time of day and area
 - By engine type and hence emission standard
- Vehicle occupancy
 - By mode, time of day and area
- Pedestrian density (for the city centre only)
- Traffic speeds and delays
 - By time of day and area
 - And delays at key points for pedestrians.

7 Disaggregation of indicators

It was agreed that, with the possible exception of commuting journeys into York, this data should be collected solely for the administrative area of the City of York. It was agreed that

the data could usefully be disaggregated in a number of ways. The general principles of disaggregation are considered first, followed by a table which suggests how each item of data might be disaggregated.

The Group agreed that data could usefully be presented:

- i. by area for the areas within the Walls, within the Outer Ring Road and beyond
- ii. for some specific locations such as the station, hospital and university
- iii. by time of day for the morning and evening peaks, inter-peak period, evenings and weekend
- iv. by mode for walk, cycle, bus, train, car, but excluding motorcycle and taxi
- v. for freight by vehicle size
- vi. for journeys to work, education, retail, leisure
- vii. for residents, students, commuters, visitors, business
- viii. for children, the elderly, those with mobility handicaps or in transport poverty.

The table below suggests the indicators for which each of these might be appropriate.

Indicator	Disaggregation								Notes
	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	
Air quality	√		√						Determined by measurement sites
Safety	√		√	√	√			√	
Access to services	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	
Noise	√		√						
Ambiance		√	√		√				
Climate change									For whole city
Reliability	√		√	√		√			
Access to business	√	√	√	√					
Access for freight	√		√		√				Indicator still to be specified
Footfall		√	√						City centre only
Resilience									Further advice needed
Journeys made	√		√	√		√	√	√	
Person-km	√		√	√		√	√	√	
Freight-km	√		√		√				
Flows	√		√	√	√				
Occupancy	√		√	√					
Pedestrian density		√	√						City centre only
Delays	√	√	√	√					At key points for pedestrians

8 Next steps

It would be helpful at this stage to receive feedback from CYC officers on these proposals, and then to review the extent to which the Council already collects, or plans to collect, data for the proposed indicators.

Acknowledgements This report has been prepared by a group including Mary Brewster, Rupert Douglas, David Fraser, Greg House, Greg Marsden, Tony May, John Mullin, John Stevens and Angela Wheatcroft.