

# CANTERBURY CHRIST CHURCH UNIVERSITY

## THE TRAVEL PLAN STRATEGY

(AS AGREED AT THE MEETING OF THE SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM  
TUESDAY 16 JUNE 2009)

### **Contents**

- 1.0 Introduction and summary
- 2.0 Objectives of the Travel Plan and Targets
- 3.0 Travel Plan Principles
- 4.0 Travel Plan Measures Overview
- 5.0 Travel Plan Strategy Elements
  - 5.1 North Holmes Road and Canterbury Campuses
  - 5.2 Medway Campus
  - 5.3 Salomons
  - 5.4 Broadstairs
  - 5.5 Folkestone
- 6.0 Action Plan
- 7.0 Consultation and participation
- Appendix A Table of actions

## 1.0 Introduction and summary

This paper describes a sustainable transport strategy for Canterbury Christ Church University with the present emphasis on the North Holmes and other Canterbury premises. It is based on earlier drafts considered by the Travel Plan and Parking Consultation group in September and December 2008.

The strategy is a live document and will be subject to continual development, not least from an improving understanding of individual and University business problems and developing potential solutions. As part of developing an improved understanding of the issues, a staff travel survey was carried out in March and April 2009. In addition it is intended that other surveys and/or focus groups will be carried out to provide a better understanding of specific matters such as travel in the course of work. It is also hoped to carry out a student travel survey. Travel data and analysis is included as a separate document Annex 4.

While parking management is an essential aspect of any travel plan, SMT have previously made commitments to progressing parking management systems. For clarity a separate draft document discusses this subject in more detail. While there are obviously severe parking problems at the Canterbury campuses (and developing at some other campuses) for some people the solutions to the problems may be even less acceptable. It is probably highly desirable that as many alternative travel arrangements and systems can be put in place before any major changes are introduced to the present parking systems.

This Strategy now covers:

- The objectives of the Travel Plan and Targets - including planning requirements, solving parking problems, recruitment advantages for staff and students, community and social responsibility (CSR), traffic congestion, air pollution, global warming and health, together with proposed traffic reduction targets – the *'Why'* - Section 2.
- The principles of travel plans – culture change, sticks and carrots, an integrated holistic approach, management support, continued purpose; the steps in achieving change and a transport hierarchy to follow in the consideration of any plans or strategies – the *'How'* – Section 3.
- Travel Plan Measures that can be used – public transport, walking, cycling, car sharing, motorcycling, infrastructure provision (off site), information, flexible working, timetabling, development locations and parking management – the *'What'* - Section 4
- Specific travel plan measures - that could or should be implemented at the different campuses. – Section 5.
- Outline costing and the Action Plan – Section 6, this includes the detailed items and costs as Appendix A
- Consultation and participation - this section presently includes some ideas on possible activities. – Section 7
- Annex 4 to the SMT report covers travel data including home to work/study travel patterns at all campuses;
- Appendix A to this document provides the Action Plan.

## 2.0 Objectives of the Travel Plan and Targets

The overall objective of any travel plan is to increase the options available for travel by any individual and reduce the total number of vehicles requiring to be used to provide for the business of an organisation. This is primarily likely to affect travel to and from work but should also include travel in the course of work, visitor travel and goods vehicles. The sub objectives of a travel plan are as follows:

1. Meet any **planning requirements** - The Augustine House development has an approved travel plan but this was only an outline paper document and is dependent on a more detailed travel plan strategy described in this document.
2. To ration or lower the **parking demand** so that it can be accommodated in the available spaces that can be provided (figures produced for the April 2008 meeting of the Car Parking Consultation Group showed a very substantial excess demand over supply of parking for central Canterbury, a further estimation of the excess demand is included in Annex 4).
3. To allow the **reuse of some land** presently used for parking for the primary business use (i.e. Training and development of future generations and research). St Gregory's facility development planned for late 2010 is a classic example of such use.
4. Meet the **Community / Social responsibilities** of any large business or organisation - a public body such as a University should be setting a good example and helping the future of society generally. In 2008 CCCU were rated in the 'Poor environmental performance category in a 'Green League' (People and Planet Green League 2008); hopefully our efforts in the last twelve months will change this rating significantly.
5. **Reduce Traffic congestion** - the roads in and around Canterbury, and indeed near most of our other campuses, are in a serious state of congestion; any small reduction of traffic in the area would provide a much larger reduction in congestion on the road system. Unless major employers such as CCCU take action to reduce their own traffic, congestion is likely to get worse.
6. Reduce the impact on the **local/world environment** - Motor vehicles cause more than their fair share of pollution and noxious gases and in the UK contribute to over one quarter of CO<sup>2</sup> output. For higher education establishments the CO<sup>2</sup> output from commuting can be 2/3 of the total CO<sup>2</sup> output of the University (Research by University of Hertfordshire) - it is intended to evaluate this for CCCU when possible. In addition motor vehicles cause noise and disturbance, damage the environment for residents and pedestrians, are a major cause of injury and death and facilities for vehicles (such as roads and car parks) damage green areas and natural habitats.
7. Improve **Recruitment and retention** from a wider potential pool of both students and staff with improved alternative transport arrangements to reach the University.
8. **Improve Health** of staff and students by allowing and encouraging greater exercise in travelling.

It is usual practice and a requirement of Travel Plans that realistic, measurable and achievable targets are set for changes in travel habits. From the March/April 2009 survey, the travel characteristics at each site are as follows:

Table 5. Main transport to work, broken down by campus

Travel Method	Percentage of respondents employing method				
	Canterbury	Broadstairs	Hall Place	Medway	Salomons
Bus	6.32	15.00	4.55		
Car/Van as driver	58.77	70.00	63.64	86.21	84.09
Train	5.09	5.00		3.45	4.55
Car/Van as passenger of another CCCU employee	2.28			3.45	
Bicycle	6.84				2.27
Car/Van as passenger of someone going elsewhere	1.93			3.45	
Walk	15.61	10.00	9.09	3.45	4.55
Motorcycle/Moped	0.88		4.55		
Park & Ride/shuttle bus	0.70		4.55		
Multiple methods	1.58		13.64		4.55
Total here	100	100	100	100	100
Total answers from site	570	20	22	29	44

It is suggested that car driver proportions for staff at each site be set as follows:

Target travel modes

	Canterbury	Broadstairs	Hall Place	Medway	Salomons
Car staff % 2009	59	70	63	86	84
Car staff % 2011	50	65	60	75	75

It would be necessary to repeat the travel survey at the same time of year to quantify how we will have met the target. How these figures may be achieved is discussed in section 5.

Targets for students will be developed after the student survey.

### 3.0 Travel Plan Principles

For travel plans to work effectively there are five key issues to drive the required changes, these are:-

- 1) Achieving a ***culture change*** in the organisation and amongst people particularly so there is a reasonable level of support for the measures required to deliver more sustainable travel.
- 2) Providing real incentives or ***sticks and carrots*** to encourage changes in travel behaviour and to ensure that these are continued.
- 3) An ***integrated holistic approach*** to ensure that all measures work in the same direction and are fully joined up with no mixed messages.
- 4) Total ***management support*** for both the measures and to provide leadership example to others.
- 5) A ***clear and continued objective*** to achieve with a clear purpose to maintain focus for the future.

In achieving a change of behaviour the stages can be described in seven steps:-

- 1) Awareness of a problem e.g. traffic congestion, pollution, environmental damage, example to the community etc.
- 2) Accepting responsibility at an individual and corporate level that everybody and every organisation has its part to play.
- 3) A perception that alternatives are possible.
- 4) Evaluation, personally and for an organisation, which are the viable alternatives.
- 5) Making a choice, really intending to modify behaviour.
- 6) Experimental behaviour, trying out new travel choices.
- 7) Habitual behaviour, long term adoption of sustainable modes.

Most people are aware of the environmental, traffic and congestion issues in the Canterbury, Medway, Folkestone and Thanet areas. Most people do not relate a parking space to the propensity of making a car trip and are not aware that each parking space results in extra trips on the road network. Also, for an overloaded road network, each extra vehicle causes a disproportionate amount of congestion - pipes, drains, rivers or roads can flow very happily 95% full but 101% full is chaos. Small reductions in traffic produce big reductions in congestion. It is notable (but also not well known) that during school half term there is typically only 5% less traffic on the roads during peak hours than during normal term time, yet the traffic situation appears totally different.

That is not to say that the problems of environmental damage and global warming are solved by a small reduction in traffic, but a small reduction is a good start, with immediate and visible benefits.

Without a full understanding of the '***Why***' a travel plan is required, the progress with its implementation on the cultural side, and on the acceptance of the need for incentives and disincentives will not be recognised by staff or management. It also has to be accepted that not everybody can change, not everybody can change for all of the time, and, for many, reducing car use will be inconvenient. Nevertheless small changes can have big benefits; a sense of direction and what is trying to be achieved is essential.

A transport hierarchy is helpful; this can be expressed in the following table supported by the image of traffic lights:

<b>Red</b>	<b>Single occupancy vehicle</b>
<b>Amber</b>	<b>Car share or motorcycle</b>
<b>Green</b>	<b>Public transport, cycle and walk or perhaps better still avoid the need to travel</b>

A small change from red towards amber or green, on any day that anybody can make a contribution, is worthwhile.

#### **4.0 Travel Plan measures overview**

This section describes the principles of the Travel Plan Measures that can be used – public transport, walking, cycling, car sharing, motorcycling, infrastructure provision (off site), information, flexible working, timetabling, development locations and parking management – the *'What'*. The sort of measures supporting changes in travel can be described under the following headings:-

##### **Public Transport**

Public transport by train or bus is available to all, providing it reaches the origins and destinations required. The North Holmes Road campus being close to the centre of Canterbury is reasonably well served by train and bus. From staff records nearly 450 of the 1700 staff (26%) with their base in Canterbury live within 2km of a direct train route to Canterbury station and over 750 people (44%) live within 1km of a direct (single) bus route to Canterbury. The comparable figures from the staff survey are 25% within 2km of a direct train route and 53% within 1km of a direct bus route. Interestingly while only 6% use the bus and 5% the train to Canterbury a further 12% suggested bus was an alternative mode and 7% suggested train.

Public bus services to the Folkestone and Broadstairs campuses are fair, to Medway campus are limited and to Salomons are non-existent.

##### **Walking and Jogging**

The walking environment in the North Holmes Road neighbourhood is reasonable and walking in central Canterbury is often faster than a car. From the staff records 470 of the 1700 staff (27%) based at Canterbury live within 2km of the North Holmes Road campus. The comparable figure from the staff survey is 25%. Interestingly 16% of staff at Canterbury responded that walk was their main mode to the Canterbury Campus.

The potential to walk for staff working at other campuses is more limited – Annex 4 shows home addresses plotted on maps for each campus for both staff records and staff survey responses.

Pedestrians should desirably gain priority over all other vehicles as the most available and environmentally sound means of transport. Also those that walk are significantly healthier

(it has been shown that if exercise can be achieved as part of normal daily activities it is more likely to be maintained than carrying out special activities such as exercise in gyms etc.).

## **Cycling**

Nearly 600 of the 1700 Canterbury based workforce (35%) live within 5km of North Holmes Road campus; the comparable figure from the staff survey is 30%. 5 km is usually a relatively easy distance to cycle for those willing and able to do so and will normally be quicker than other modes. Interestingly 7% of staff used cycling as their main mode.

There is some scope to increase cycling for Medway, Folkestone and Broadstairs but not realistically for Salomons. It should however be noted that the survey responses did show one cyclist for Salomons but none at Broadstairs, Medway or Hall Place (Folkestone produced insufficient responses).

There are reasonably extensive cycle networks in the area and the City, District, Unitary and County Councils, along with national organisations, such as Sustrans, are endeavouring to enhance existing routes and develop new ones. Some supporting facilities for cycle use are being provided by CCCU in new developments (changing facilities, showers, secure convenient cycle storage etc) but could be enhanced throughout all the campuses).

## **Car sharing**

For those staff travelling fairly large distances, car sharing could save significant sums in car commuting costs to individual members of staff. The typical marginal cost of using a small/medium car for an extra mile (rather than leaving it parked) is about 25 pence. Just over 1100 of the 1700 Canterbury staff (65%) live over 3 miles (5km) from North Holmes Road campus and while many of these do have a possibility to use the train or bus there are 269 (16%) where driving or car sharing are the only real possibilities. From the survey results the same 16% are beyond 5km and without reasonable direct bus or rail alternatives. 37% of staff reported they did not have an alternative travel mode but this figure could include other reasons and could also reflect a lack of knowledge or even willingness to use alternatives. 11% did identify car sharing as an option.

For the other campuses car sharing is probably the only realistic option for many staff and indeed students. Of the survey responses 15% identified car sharing as a possibility at Broadstairs and 14% at Medway.

If people can match journeys in any practical way there should be some considerable scope to reduce the number of cars. There is often some reticence to car share; however there could be scope for more to do so, given the right support, especially if a larger critical mass of people can be put together by combining with other local organisations. This combination of organisations could be particularly helpful for the Folkestone, Broadstairs and Medway campuses but doesn't apply to Salomons as there are no other businesses nearby. In the case of the Medway campus the other academic institutions on the same campus are obvious candidates for a combined car share system. For Canterbury staff and students going to Canterbury College or the University of the Creative Arts could help create the critical mass. Home addresses need not all match closely as homes en-route can be just as helpful.

Car sharing does not need to take place every day, but a network of car sharers needs to be developed so some people can car share some of the time. This should also apply for business trips to other campuses. A car sharing scheme plus a change in incentives for covering motoring costs could be used to encourage a significant increase in numbers car sharing.

Please note a car share scheme is presently being developed for all CCCU campuses with other academic institutions with premises in Kent. It is planned that this will go live in June 2009 with a full launch to staff and students in the new academic year.

### **Motor Cycling**

Motorcycling is statistically one of the most dangerous forms of travel; however responsible motorcycling can be reasonably safe. Without using excessive speed, traffic congestion can be avoided and the parking and traffic congestion effects of a motorcycle on other traffic is considerably less than a car. Finally a smallish engined motorcycle is much less polluting than most cars.

While travel plans should all be part of personal choice (for people to choose the mode that suits those most), motorcycling is a worthwhile consideration for staff and the University. Improving facilities to make it easier and safer would be appropriate.

Approximately 1% of respondents to the staff survey stated they travelled by motorcycle. From the number of motorcycles parked at North Holmes Road, it appears that either our sample of motorcyclists was under-representative or a number of the motorcycles are owned by students.

### **Infrastructure provision**

Any strategic advantages that can be provided on the road network for buses or high occupancy vehicles (i.e. for buses and car share cars) would certainly encourage more sustainable travel. The progress from Kent County Council in implementing bus lanes is rather slow compared with many other areas but there are now a number of bus lanes in Canterbury and some in Medway, Thanet and Folkestone. So far there are no car share or high occupancy vehicle lanes in Kent.

For pedestrians, Canterbury City Centre is well provided with a decent environment and easy pedestrian access in all directions. It is unfortunate that the Ring Road, despite being more a local distributor than a through route, is very much designed for vehicle priority despite it being very close to the City Centre.

The CCCU as part of its Augustine House development has had to provide a new pedestrian crossing across Old Dover Road and £125,000 to the City Council for transport infrastructure generally. It is hoped that part of this sum can be spent on improving cycle, pedestrian and disabled access, particularly in the vicinity of North Holmes campus and Augustine House for the benefit for students, staff and the general public.

Assistance is required from the City and County Councils give to enhance the pedestrian facilities, and make the pedestrian crossings more responsive to the pedestrian needs with more rapid response. This would be of considerable asset to travel planning not only for

CCCU but for other central Canterbury employers and indeed close to our other campuses in Medway, Broadstairs and Folkestone.

### **Information and General Enablers**

Information on alternative travel arrangements, including bus and train timetables, is normally very poorly presented to the public and staff. Information on opportunities available is particularly important in changing people's travel habits. Internal websites providing a simplified public transport timetable system would be worthwhile along with online car share software and advice on sustainable travel (e.g. the travel plan strategy, the cost of motoring etc).

It is important that no mixed messages are given. There are at present no reserved places for senior staff and this is a definite asset in the CCCU transport system already; similarly there are no leased cars and no car allowances go above Inland Revenue rate of 40p per mile for business use. However there is scope for some further incentives making full use of tax concessions such as an extra 5p per mile for people carrying passengers while on business and 20p per mile for cycle use (presently the University does allow a rate of 10p/mile for cycle use).

In order to ensure people can take advantage of alternative modes, such as bus or car sharing, it is important that staff can make such arrangements with reasonable confidence that they can get home when planned. Managers need to recognise this when arranging meetings etc. Also emergency 'get you home' facilities need to be provided.

Special events, publicity etc. are all important to deliver the cultural change.

### **Flexible and tele-working**

The most effective way of removing traffic and its consequences is to avoid travel in the first place. This can be achieved by home working, telephone and video conferencing. 130 respondents to the staff survey stated that more flexible working arrangements would help to promote greener travel choices.

### **Timetabling and travel between campuses**

While this could be included as 'information and a general enabler' it is a specific issue for Universities which can work against the objectives of travel plans. For example it is understood that students have to hand in work (in hard copy) on days that perhaps they do not need to attend a University premise. This results in an extra trip. Perhaps more can be done electronically rather just by paper at the time to meet the specified dates for submission.

Similarly there may be scope for courses where staff are supposed to move between campus's to start at the same time to allow more car share as part of the business travel. A number of Pool cars could also be helpful.

### **Development locations**

For any business with multiple premises there is inevitably travel between campuses. Diluting staff numbers particularly in out of town areas also reduces the opportunity for

sustainable travel. In any new development proposals travel should be considered as part of the criteria for a building location. It is recognised that property opportunities are often limited and it has been an active part of the University policy to provide as many opportunities for educational advancement within the various East Kent communities. Nevertheless good locations (with respect to transport options) will improve the attractiveness to the student customers and for a wider variety of staff to work for the University.

## **Parking Management**

A common and powerful tool used to manage traffic in towns, and indeed for public or private sector organisations, is to ensure that there is some disincentive for people to make the trip by rationing or pricing the destination (the parking space). Alternatively it would be highly desirable just to level the playing field so that those that did not use a parking space and saved the University's money were rewarded by at least an equivalent level to the present 'subsidy' given to those that park. The larger the differential between the cost of parking and / or the reward for not parking, the larger the potential change in travel behaviour.

At present we are trying to encourage people to travel green but giving them relatively few benefits to do so; while for each person driving the University is 'giving' them about £3 per day to drive (each parking space costs the University £500-£1000 per year which theoretically could otherwise be spent on the core business of teaching). Any way of levelling the playing field by parking restrictions, charges, or rewards for those not driving, especially on a daily basis could reduce car use substantially and would arguably be fairer to all. Nevertheless many people presently believe they have a right to a free parking place.

## **5.0 Travel Plan Strategy Elements.**

Working from the principles of the travel plan outlined above and travel information a series of implementable measures can be developed. The initial ideas for these are described in sections 5.1 to 5.5 below for each campus. A number of general proposals are described under 5.1 which are applicable to all campuses.

From the staff survey, question 30 sought staff views on the ways that greener transport choices could be promoted (please see Figure 57 of Annex 4). The staff comments included more flexible working, improved public transport with reduced fares, car share systems, information and charges for parking at work. A survey of students for the whole Medway campus has also been carried out.

For staff at all campuses we have been able to identify home locations and possible travel modes. We have also looked at business travel of staff based in Canterbury from mileage claims. Annex 4 outlines some results from the analysis using the GIS system and the results from the analysis of business mileage.

Car parking availability and demand are also key data. While spaces, cars parked on site and permits can be quantified, we are aware that, certainly for Canterbury, parking is difficult and occurs in a wide variety of places. Nevertheless from the staff survey, 89% of staff driving to North Holmes Road reported that they parked on campus; for other

campuses this figure is 100%. An estimation of possible latent parking demand for the North Holmes Rd area has been carried out and is also shown in Annex 4.

## 5.1 North Holmes Road and Canterbury Campuses

Of the 565 responses to the survey from the Canterbury Campus 59% arrived as a car driver, 16% walked, 11% arrived by public Transport (train or bus), 7% cycled, 4% arrived as a passenger, the remaining 3% arrived by motorcycle, park and ride or 'multiple methods'. For Hall Place 64% arrived as a car driver, 14% (3 people) used 'multiple methods' 2 people walked and one each used the bus, shuttle bus or motorcycle.

### Public transport

It has already been identified that central Canterbury is reasonably well served by public transport routes but at present only 11% of staff use public transport to travel to work. The only possible additions where the University can positively add to services appear to be:

- An expansion/adjustment of the present University provided mini bus service complete with provision for disabled access - this could link from some convenient point within North Holmes campus to Augustine House, Hall Place and Polo Farm.
- An inter-campus mini bus service serving Salomons, Medway, Broadstairs, Canterbury and Folkestone possibly combined with a post/mailing service.

The existing Hall Place bus service costs £8 per passenger per trip - a very substantial sum to provide a very limited service. The scheduled bus service from the bus station to Faversham passing Hall Place is naturally considerably cheaper with double the frequency. Similarly Polo Farm is on the bus route to Sandwich which is at a relatively high frequency. Nevertheless there is an existing commitment to provide a University service and so for the time being it is suggested that the present service is only enhanced by providing facilities for the physically disabled.

Arrangements should also be explored with Stagecoach or any other operator to see what discounts or additional services could be provided to enhance the existing service. Such services are needed for both staff and students.

Some Universities have developed significant bus services in their own right; the University of Hertfordshire being a specific example where they operate over 80 buses on a wide range of scheduled services throughout Hertfordshire and North London. Since the 1985 Act, which 'liberalised' bus services throughout the country, a few bus companies have established very large sectors of the market and appear to have large profit margins. At this stage it is not suggested that CCCU should go into the bus provision business, however an open mind needs to be kept particularly with the requirements of other colleges and universities in the area and the present near monopoly in East Kent by Stagecoach.

Discount tickets for buses and trains should be explored as could 'Salary Sacrifice' for people needing regular bus journeys and/or points systems. These will be investigated further within the travel plan.

## Walking and jogging

It has already been mentioned that the local authorities will be encouraged to provide better facilities around south and central Canterbury. On campus, signing and routes could be improved. For joggers, changing rooms, showers and lockers would be desirable - these are covered further in the cycling section below.

With about 1000 staff and typically up to about 10,000 students coming regularly to the Canterbury campus on any given day, a substantial number living in walking range or walking from the rail or bus stations and a substantial day time movement of staff and students between buildings in Canterbury city centre area, pedestrian improvements are very well worthwhile.

Meetings have been held with Canterbury City and Kent County Councils and it is hoped that much of the £125k provided by CCCU as part of the Augustine House development will be spent on pedestrian and disabled facilities in south central Canterbury. It is also intended that as part of the Travel Plan work CCCU will request further improvements in line with the principles outlined in section 4 above. This is discussed further under the 'Infrastructure' heading below.

To help the physically disabled move around locally, for those without electric wheel chairs or scooters, consideration will also be given to the possibility of extending a 'Shop mobility' and/ or taxi services to the University. Such a facility could complement the local minibus service discussed above

## Cycling

The potential number of cyclists could amount to 600 or more on any day (5% of staff and students based at Canterbury); the winter 2008 provision for bicycle racks was for approximately 125 cycles at the North Holmes Rd campus. By the end of June 2009 the provision of cycle racks should be for approximately 200 bicycles - the majority being Sheffield stands. Staged increases in the number of cycle racks, as demand materialises, should be provided so that cyclists can leave and secure their bicycles in convenient locations. This should normally be by the use of 'Sheffield' stands and where possible the stands should be covered; however the covered spaces will require far greater capital investment. Provision of the stands is the first priority - the cost per cycle of a secure stand is about £80 installed and under cover this rises to about £500.

For 'keener' cyclists, the Bicycle Users Group (BUG) have identified that individual cycle lockers (similar to those at some stations nearby), to safely store the more expensive bikes and equipment are required. BUG members have expressed a willingness to pay a contribution for their use but, to be fair and equitable; any charges should be commensurate with costs and charges for the provision of car parking. On the other hand very low charges would potentially create a demand which could not be met physically or financially. The costs of the provision of lockers would be typically £700 per cycle.

For cyclists travelling over about 5 km, showers, changing rooms and drying cupboards are highly desirable. There should be sufficient stands and/or cycle lockers located close to showers and changing facilities. At North Holmes campus, such changing facilities are only in the sports hall at present; this is being made more accessible and additional clothes lockers should be provided in the vicinity. For temporary offices in the town centre an arrangement was made with St George's sports centre. With the next building

programme further showers and changing rooms will be provided wherever possible to meet the demand. Augustine House and Rochester House (previously Rutland House) will have suitable facilities and additional changing facilities are being planned for general use when the library area is developed following the move to Augustine House

The University already provides a salary sacrifice cycle loan/purchase scheme. The wording is necessarily cautious for tax reasons. The Bicycle Users Group (BUG) are able to deal with marketing this more effectively. For new cyclists a bicycle 'buddy' system, possibly using a parallel system to the car share system, would be helpful; BUG members could help make this work effectively. Students should be particularly encouraged to cycle due to their large numbers.

Cycle training will also be investigated with the local authority and others to see what assistance can be provided.

### **Car Sharing**

The Kent County Council car sharing scheme is available for all staff and all residents of Kent to log on, however it is not well publicised and the fact that it is Kent wide is a discouragement for some to register. A new car share system is being developed through Liftshare.com with the Universities and other academic institutions in Kent to meet the needs of North Holmes campus and other campuses. It is hoped and expected that the system will go live in July/August 2009. There will be significant publicity and encouragement to register and use the database including possibly prizes. The system will also be used to advise particular individuals of car sharing options; this will be very important for senior staff to encourage them to show an example to others.

To complement the use of the car share system, preferential treatment for people car sharing (over single occupancy vehicles) should be provided in any parking management system. Similarly hygiene factors such as giving assistance to find, and providing financial support, for emergency journeys home – e.g. for a home crisis or if the car driver finds that he or she is not going home for urgent work reasons. Managers also need to ensure that any activity, that may require a member of staff to travel home at a different time than planned, are avoided wherever possible. SMT agreed such arrangements at its meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2009.

### **Motorcycling**

Some parking areas have already been provided for motorcycles, these will be monitored to see their use. In future it would be desirable that motorcycle stands should be on hard surface area (concrete, brick or slab but not asphalt – motorcycle stands can sink into asphalt on hot days and motorcycles can fall over); tie bars will be provided so motorcyclists can lock their motorcycles to a fixed location. Motor cycles will be discouraged from being left in pedal cycle areas. It seems highly desirable that assisted safety training should be provided for staff.

### **Infrastructure provision**

As mentioned above, it is up to the highway and transport authorities to provide the basic infrastructure. However the report prepared by CCCU for disability access and the cycle and pedestrian study done by Canterbury City Council and Kent County Council has been

investigated to compile a shopping list of pedestrian, and disabled access improvements in the area of South/Central Canterbury; no additional workable schemes have been identified thus far for cyclists. Hopefully the sum that CCCU has already contributed as part of its planning permission can be used to fund some of the improvements and/or local signing. These matters are presently being considered by the City Council (from November 2008).

### **Information and general enablers**

A web site is being created linking with other websites which cover all travel information for CCCU split by campus. This will include timetable information or links and the car share database; it will also include locations to park, parking permits, cycle parking and details of training as they are arranged.

Special cycle to work days and other events will be organised and published.

Leaflets will be provided for new starters.

### **Business travel**

There is considerable travel between campuses and to support students on placement. Such trips can be seen in Figures 49-54 of the staff travel survey report (Annexe 4). The majority of such business trips appear to be by car. An analysis of vehicle mileage for Canterbury based staff is included in Annex 4. However where staff travel less miles than from their home to their normal base, then when on such business trips no business mileage can be claimed.

In order to reduce the need for some staff to bring their cars to work it is suggested that up to six pool cars are provided. It is notable that over 200 staff stated that a pool or hire car available would encourage 'greener' business travel; a similar number gave the same view for a car share scheme for business travel. Alternatively, if a 'Car Club' were to be set up in Canterbury for the residential population, a day time business user like the University could make this system work much better. Pool cars can also be used for emergency get you home service for car sharers. The provision of pool cars would mean that only regular car users would be obliged to bring their cars to work (and hopefully not every day).

To provide additional incentives for staff on business trips to use sustainable travel where possible the following measures are proposed:

- Staff will be encouraged to use public transport and reuse travel time for other work, this would particularly apply to London and trips beyond London but could also apply for other more local trips;
- Public Transport incentives such as the availability of first class tickets if booked in advance will be explored.
- Staff would be made more aware that hire cars were available for longer journeys where public transport would be impractical;

- For local trips the cycle mileage rate should be increased to 20p/mile (the maximum tax free rate allowed by the Inland Revenue);
- Car sharing will be used wherever possible when more than one member of staff is travelling at a similar time to another location – the car share system can be used; the 5p additional mileage rate for those taking passengers with suitable advice on the web site should be helpful. Efforts will be made with timetabling as described below.

In addition it is suggested that the possibilities of video and telephone conferencing be explored further not only to try and avoid some intercampus travel but also liaison with, and travel to, other organisations.

### **Flexible and tele-working for all campuses**

The University has a home working policy. There is also scope for remote working where staff can book working space at the most convenient location near their homes rather than travelling to their normal 'base' campus. Staff and managers will be encouraged to make maximum use of these facilities and ensure maximum productivity to deliver the service that we are all charged with. It is of note that more flexible working arrangements were cited by 130 staff in the travel survey as a way to promote greener transport choices.

### **Timetabling**

There are various timetabling issues that need to be investigated; wherever possible timetabling should be arranged to minimise travel by staff or students.

### **Parking management strategy**

Parking demand management has proven to be the most powerful tool that can be used in travel plans. Good travel plans are normally twice as effective when they include parking management as when they just include a full range of all the other proposals. An example being Pfizer where a 10% travel reduction was achieved with bus, cycle, car share and information strategies before its parking cash out system went live and an improvement to 20% traffic car reduction afterwards. Interestingly nearly 60 staff cite charging for parking at work or less parking facilities at work as a way to promote greener transport choices.

For the North Holmes Rd campus a very significant reduction in car traffic demand is needed if we wish business and personal problems of finding a space to be solved. This is to be discussed further in the Parking Strategy Report. It seems likely that a fairly powerful charging system to car users, a reward based system to non-car users, a much stricter permit system or a combination of such measures is needed. It is desirable that this should influence daily travel behaviour.

As noted, to just level the playing field between those that park and those that don't, a £3 daily difference between those parking and not parking would be required. The level of incentive required to deliver the desirable substantial reduction in cars is harder to evaluate.

The Canterbury City Park and Ride service can also provide an alternative for those who need to drive. This is already substantially subsidised by the City Council. Any park and ride system put together only for the University is likely to be expensive and difficult to deliver a quality service.

## **5.2 Medway Campus**

For Medway campus 86% (25 out of 29) of respondents arrived by car, 2 people arrived as car passengers, 1 respondent used the train and 1 walked.

### **Public Transport**

Attempts have been made to provide links to Gillingham station and there are some bus services including those provided by the University of Greenwich. Developing services between Chatham town centre and station, Gillingham station and possibly Strood station to the campus will be explored with the Universities of Kent and Greenwich, Mid Kent College, Medway Council and local bus operators. However it must not be too expensive a service and it should be available for both staff and students.

### **Walking and Jogging**

There are limited opportunities to walk into this campus from any direction. The possibility of improving walking routes has been investigated and Medway Council are planning to introduce a signing scheme in Autumn 2009. Within the campus, improvements need to be made for pedestrians and car speeds better controlled; the possibilities are being considered by the joint Campus Operations Board.

### **Cycling**

There is a cycle shed adjoining Rowan Williams House with three Sheffield stands- this does not appear to be well used. While the road system outside the campus is far from cycle friendly, there are a reasonably comprehensive range of cycle routes in Medway Council area. Cycle facilities, including stands, need to be developed with our campus colleagues. There are facilities for showers in the old gym hall; this needs to be developed and opened up with colleagues to allow keener cyclists to be able to use the mode effectively.

### **Car sharing**

There are nowhere near sufficient staff or unlikely to be enough students in any one corridor, to make this work on our own. However the car sharing system for both staff and students for the Medway Universities is a priority and will be implemented in June 2009 as described above for the Canterbury campus.

### **Motorcycling**

Similar arrangements to those at the Canterbury North Holmes Campus will be put in place.

## **Infrastructure Provision**

The road system in the immediate area has been designed to be far too vehicle friendly so pedestrian routes are severely limited. This is an issue that needs to be taken up with the highway authorities on behalf of all three Medway Universities and mid Kent College and also within the campus with the Chatham Maritime Trust. The three universities Travel Plan teams have also reviewed the campus network and have made some suggestions on speed management and pedestrian facilities to be considered by Campus Management Committee.

## **Information and general enablers**

This will be parallel with the Canterbury campus but obviously requiring links to different bus operators etc. The car share system combined with our campus partners as described above is very important for Medway.

## **Flexible working, timetabling and development locations**

The same considerations as discussed for the Canterbury campus would apply.

## **Parking**

Parking is controlled by barrier at Rowan Williams House and there are about 60 student spaces and 80 staff spaces. In addition there are various private street spaces within the overall campus which are intensively used and even abused. Many students may also use the local shopping outlet centre or other surrounding locations. Presently for most of the time these appear free. As development in the Chatham Docks area increases, and the Chatham Maritime Trust and our campus partners wish to control the present nearly chaotic arrangements, the pressures on parking will become greater. While it seems unlikely that a comprehensive charge or charge reward system will be introduced in the very near future, this will need to be monitored very closely and with our campus colleagues.

## **5.3 Salomons**

Out of the 44 respondents to the survey from Salomons, 84% arrived as a car driver, 2 arrived by train, 2 walked and 1 cycled. To reach Salomons the only real options for most people are by car and the recently provided shuttle bus service (service started Jan 2009) from a local station although it has been reported that a local public bus travels relatively near the site.

A scheduled bus or specific mini bus service running to a half hour schedule and also running off-peak for support for conferencing and has now been provided. This and any future enhancement of such a service is the only realistic alternative travel arrangement for a travel plan for this campus. Re-use of the bus off peak for other services such as inter campus travel and post could make this more viable. The cost of provision of a minibus

including driver is normally about £45k per annum. This could be partially offset by charging or sharing with other users or uses. The potential increased attraction of Salomons for students or for functions should also be considered in the cost benefit considerations of continuing and possible expanded future provision.

There are few car share opportunities; however the multi university car share system (see above) could be of some use to some staff and students.

The terrain and the narrow roads will make cycling very difficult and while provision for cyclists should be included and perhaps with a single shower, it is not expected to be a significant mode.

#### **5.4 Broadstairs**

From the survey, 70% drove, 4 out of the 20 respondents used the train or the bus and 2 walked.

There are a reasonably comprehensive range of bus services to the area from various parts of the Thanet towns. Any discounts, salary sacrifice or other schemes that are applicable for North Holmes Road can be applied to this campus.

Cycling also has a role; racks for 48 cycles in a covered shed, 4 showers (2 each male and female), changing rooms and six clothes lockers are already provided.

Westwood Cross area of Thanet has developed into a major traffic generator and many workers and others visit the area daily. Potentially car share could be effective, however for relatively short distances within the Thanet Towns, where the majority of staff and students live, the benefits of car share to an individual are limited (as there are smaller motoring cost savings to an individual to be made with car sharing).

Parking management may have a role but with a large number of free parking spaces in the area, until these are properly managed any parking management strategy will be difficult.

#### **5.5 Folkestone**

3 people from the campus (representing 30% of the staff based at the campus) responded to the survey so any further analysis would not provide further insight for the development of the travel plan.

As a town centre campus, train and bus are available.

Cycling is possible especially for students; 7 Sheffield cycle racks for 14 cycles are already provided along with shower and changing facilities.

The multi university car share system may be helpful for both staff (but very few in number) and students.

As for other campuses, infrastructure off site for sustainable modes could be enhanced by the District and County Councils.

Parking provision on site is minimal however there are a number of Council car parks close by and a special arrangement has been negotiated with Folkestone Harbour providing cheap parking at £1 per day for staff and students who need it.

## **6.0 Action Plan and Costs**

In section 5 various proposals were described some of which are already implemented or in the process of implementation from budgets already earmarked for work in this financial year. Others will require further development and agreement. A range of proposals is summarised in Appendix A with expected timescales.

## **7.0 Consultation and participation**

The main basis for consultation on measures has been the Travel Plan and Parking Consultation Group combined with visits by the Sustainable Transport Manager to each of the sites and meetings with a number of staff, the setting up and meeting of the bicycle users group, lunchtime presentations and the Management Group meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> October.

Present consultation arrangements already undertaken or proposed are as follows:-

1. Articles in the Fountain – Sept 08 and March 09
2. More detailed articles in 'Watch This Space' – October 08 and April 09
3. Article for students newspaper Unite – when possible
4. The travel survey amongst staff – March/April 09
5. Focus groups on specific aspects that may come from the survey – to be decided later
6. Open lectures /meetings/ Faculty Management meetings/ departmental meetings – to be organised (Education Dept April 09)
7. Further presentations at Management Group
8. A survey of students travel - to be carried out in the next academic year
9. An A5 leaflet for circulation
10. Information included and responses received on the proposed transport web site.

## APPENDIX A

**Action Plan** (Please see list at bottom of table for abbreviations – page 32)

<u>No.</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Timescale</u>
<b>1.0</b>		<b>Surveys, Analysis Monitoring and Targets</b>	
1.1	STM + survey working group	Design and obtain permission for staff survey through TP&PCG, SMT and Ethics Committee. Organise electronic and paper survey and process results.	Carried out in March April 09 processed in May 09.
1.2	STM	Obtain better understanding of 'business' travel by mileage records, survey, interviews/discussions with heads of Departments.	Jan 09 onwards
1.3	STM	Organise and carry out student surveys	Sept 09 onwards
1.4	STM	Develop Targets and monitoring systems	May 2009 onwards
<b>2.0</b>		<b>Public Transport</b>	
2.1.	DFM/STM	Consider and obtain costs for local minibus with disabled access to serve North Holmes Rd, Polo Farm, Augustine's and Hall Place. Costs presently preclude an expansion of the existing service, however disabled access will be provided.	Feb - April 09
2.2.	STM/DFM/ Matthew Salmonson	Investigate possibilities of scheduled bus services and/or mini buses linking Salomons to rail station (particularly Tonbridge)	In operation Jan 09
2.3	STM with UoG, UKC and MKC	Investigate possible bus routes for Medway campus working with Medway Council and local operators:  E.g. Stroud station – campus – Gillingham station	Nov 08 onwards
2.4	STM/DFM	Investigate intercampus service possibly combined with post and others	Sept 09 onwards
2.5	STM/HR	Investigate season ticket loans, possible fare discounts salary sacrifice etc	July 09 onwards

<u>No.</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Timescale</u>
<b>3.0</b>		<b>Walking and Jogging</b>	
3.1	AHP/STM	Identify measures to help Pedestrians, disabled and cyclists in South Central Canterbury and endeavour to obtain agreement and funding	July 08 onwards  (awaiting CCC formal agreement and implementation )
3.2	STM/SMT	Continue to press for greater priority for sustainable transport on road network with local authorities – KCC, Medway, CCC, TDC, SDC, TBC	Continuing
3.3	STM/DFM	Consider alternative travel assistance for staff and students with disabilities in central Canterbury (e.g. 'Shop mobility type scooters and contract taxi services)	July 09 onwards
3.4	DFM/STM	Review routes and safety on North Holmes site	Nov 08 onwards
3.5	STM/UoG, UKC, MKC/Peter Milburn	Review pedestrian safety and speed on Medway campus	Initial note of suggestions produced Nov 08
<b>4.0</b>		<b>Cycling</b>	
4.1	STM /Peter Vujakovic/BUG	Set up Bicycle Users Group to provide sounding board advice and promote cycling	Set up Canterbury Sept 08. BUG website produced April 2009
4.2	DFM/STM/Hugh Roberts	<u>Provide more cycle parking facilities:</u>  <u>Canterbury:</u>  Cadell Walk – lockable shed and racks Replace all channel racks with Sheffield stands adding wherever able  Replace other 'wavy' cycle racks with Sheffield stands  Find additional spaces for more Sheffield	To match demand.  Fully operational early 2009.  From Feb 09.  Implemented

<u>No.</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Timescale</u>
		stands  Remodel parking area by Library to be cycle parking area  Ensure adequate stands in Rochester and Augustine Houses.  Consider locations for additional covered sheds and secure cycle lockers with charging system  <u>Other sites:</u>  <u>Medway</u>  More convenient racks for CCCU and additional racks on campus close to enhanced changing facilities	June 09.  On completion of Augustine's from Sept 09. Required Sept 09.  Only when sufficient stands in place.  By Sept 09.
4.3	Paul Carney / Andy Balsdon/ STM	Provide access to Sports Hall changing facilities and lockers for cyclists at North Holmes Rd	Mar 09 - Information on access on BUG website.
4.4	DFM/AHP/ STM	Ensure adequate changing rooms etc provided in Augustine House and Rochester (Rutland) House refurbishment	By Sept 09
4.5	DFM	Include changing facilities in refurbishment of Library at North Holmes Rd	Aug 09 onwards
4.6	STM/BUG	Investigate safety training possibilities	September 09 onwards
4.7	HR	Set up bicycle hire/ purchase salary sacrifice scheme	Set up mid 2007
4.8	STM/BUG	Negotiate cycle and equipment discounts	Sept 09 onwards
4.9	STM/BUG	Consider bicycle buddy system possibly using the car share system	Sept 09 onwards
4.10	STM/DFM	Investigate possibilities of cycle hire schemes like Paris and Cheltenham with other local employers	Being taken up by City Council from Mar 09
<b>5.0</b>		<b>Sustainable Car Use</b>	

<u>No.</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Timescale</u>
5.1	STM/ Other Academic Institutions/IT	Set up car share system on University web sites and publicise. Gain support and share costs with other academic institutions (UKC, UoG, MKC, CC, UCA); Canterbury College withdrew	Being implemented from March 09, live June 09, full launch Sept 09
5.2	DFM/STM	Consider whether all new parking permits only to be issued after person registered with car share system.	From Aug 09, Agreed in principle by SMT May 09
5.3	DFM/STM	Consider preferential spaces for car sharers	From July 09
5.4	STM/TP&PCG	Consider other incentives for registration and car sharing	From June 09 onwards
5.5	STM/HR/DFM	Develop emergency get you home options for car sharers	Principles agreed by SMT 4 <sup>th</sup> May 09. Develop details from June 09
<b>6.0</b>		<b>Motorcycling</b>	
6.1	DFM/STM	Develop motorcycle parking areas on hard surface with lock bars, in areas away from pedestrians	Continuing
6.2	STM/DFM	Consider safety training for potential motorcyclists	Summer 09 onwards
<b>7.0</b>		<b>Supporting external Infrastructure</b>	
7.1	STM	Please see item 3.1 and 3.4 plus watch for other opportunities	Continuing
<b>8.0</b>		<b>Information and general enablers</b>	
8.1	STM/IT/ Ian Ellery Philippa Spratt, Cherry Williams, Georgina Stein	Set up transport web site to provide information on the Sustainable Travel Plan strategy, bus and rail timetables, the car share system, BUG, Car park permits, cycle salary sacrifice, expenses information etc	Operating by June 09
8.2	STM/Marketing (Marco Kier)	Produce paper publicity and organise meetings lunchtime lectures, Special events (e.g. cycle to work day, no car week etc) on Travel Plan	Continuing

<b>No.</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
8.3	Finance /HR /STM	Change business rates: new rate 5p/mile extra for car passenger, cycle rate increase from 10p/mile to 20p, 26p for motorcycles.  Provide additional encouragement to use trains, buses or hire cars over private cars, including the possibility of first class fares if tickets booked in advance.	From June 09. Car share rate agreed by SMT May 09.  From Sept 09
8.4	DFM, STM	Provide pool cars for those not making very frequent car business trips. Alternatively explore the possibilities of car clubs with Canterbury City Council.	Aug 09
8.5	HR/SMT	Encourage home and remote working	continuing
8.6	SMT/IT	Consider telephone/video conferencing	July 09 onwards
8.7	SMT/ Department heads	Consider sustainable transport in timetabling and academic processes (e.g. electronic submissions and marking)	June 09 onwards
8.8	SMT/DFM/STM	Consider sustainable transport for staff and students in choosing development options/sites	Continuing
8.9	SMT/Department heads	Provide a supportive framework for people with fixed travel times (eg bus, train and car sharers) to ensure they can get home in emergency and events are not introduced at short notice to make travel difficult.	Agreed by SMT May 09
<b>9.0</b>		<b>Parking Management</b>	
9.1	DFM/SMT	Develop parking management infrastructure for Canterbury campus sites.	Report from Currie and Brown available Nov 08
9.2	STM/DFM/SMT	Develop range of possible parking strategies for Canterbury	Considered at TP&PCG Dec 08 – to be considered by SMT June 09
9.3	STM/UoG/ UKC/DFM	Monitor and develop short and long term options to deal with parking situation at Medway	Continuing

Key:

STM – Sustainable Transport Manager (JE)

DFM – Director of Facilities Management (LS)

SMT – Senior Management Team

TP&PCG – Travel Plan and Parking Consultation Group

AHP – Augustine House project team

HR – Human resources

KG/JE/LMS 22-7-09