How to Keep Cities Accessible and Liveable





Duration	Торіс
5 min	Introduction to the programme (Maaike Snelder - TNO + TU Delft)
15 min 10 min + 5 min Q&A	MRDH Identified Challenges (Vincent Joanknecht – Rotterdam Gemeente)
15 min 10 min + 5 min Q&A	Reducing the number of cars in European (Sean van der Lee - Master Research)
15 min 10 min + 5 min Q&A	Active Mobility in Oaxaca: transforming urban dynamics from a car-centric model to a human scale city (Luigi Barraza - Arcadis)
15 min 10 min + 5 min Q&A	Assessing the impacts of creating low car areas within a city (Jyotsna Singh - PhD XCARCITY)
15 min 10 min + 5 min Q&A	Multi-objective Multimodal Network Design (Tygo Nijsten - PhD Research)
10 min	Plenary Discussion Review challenges + general discussion

Question for the audience

Reflections on the

presentations

Name: City/Country:

What challenges do you have in your cities in making your areas

car low?

Challenges you face in your city?

MRDH Challenges







MRDH Strategic Agenda

- Invest in accessibility to facilitate population growth in the region
- Stimulate a future-proof economy
- Renew work locations
- Stimulate active and collective forms of mobility
- Restoring the public transport system
- Strengthen the regional mobility network





HOW TO REDUCE CAR TRAFFIC?

How do we make sure that **the motorist -** who has an alternative - leaves his car but

The automobility that has to be there is affected as little as possible.

With only car restriction measures you hit both the first and the second group.





DILEMMAS IN EXISTING AREAS

- Where do you start in existing environments: with the sour or with the sweet?
- What do you want with shared mobility, how do governments see their role for this? How do we remove possible regulatory barriers to new forms of mobility?
- Is a private **car-free** city or district possible or do we focus on the **second car first**?
- How scalable is this concept, in which neighborhoods and areas will it succeed and which will not?
- Is it known what users want: public transport, bicycle, shared mobility (bicycle / scooter)?
- Which target groups are they?
- How do we do that without too much technology?



ACTIVITIES IN THE REGION

- In the region, several municipalities are working to reduce car use / sometimes ownership. Such as in The Hague, Delft and Rotterdam.
- Examples are: The Hague Binckhorst and South West, Delft Spoorzone, Rotterdam Merwe4haven and the area around Rotterdam Central Station.
- Sometimes also smaller projects such as bicycle parkings and cooperative shared mobility.
- Both sweet and sour measures are taken.
- There is objective measurement, but relation with measures taken remains difficult.



ROTTERDAM MERWE4HAVEN



Immersive VR research by design Urban Community Vehicle (with BMW)

Integration of Rotterdam Open Urban Platform, Digital Twin Federation, Vehicle data (with BMW)

Modeling and optimisation of sustainable mobilty



Reducing the number of cars in European cities

What are the keys to success?

Ir. Sean van der Lee 10/10/2024







Copenhagen Cycle Superhighways



Success factors

Barriers

Strategic communication

Organising responsibility

Showing openness and flexibility

Copenhagen Cycle Superhighways

Resources

Policy & institutional

Bremen Shared Cars



Success factors



Strategic communication

Showing openness and flexibility



Path dependence

Legal

Barcelona Superblocks



Success factors

Barriers

Trials to create legitimacy

Organising responsibility

Timing and windows of opportunity

Barcelona Superblocks

Social

Policy & institutional

Milan Open Squares



Success factors



Trials to create legitimacy

Showing openness and flexibility



Social

Path dependence



Additional success factors



The undeniability of hard evidence

The inarguability of schools





1. Continuously explore new possibilities

2. Be aware of the context and stakeholders' needs

3. Create and identify windows of opportunity

4. Test new measures

Regulations Pricing

Land-use Planning

Infrastructure

Information Campaigns





- 1. Continuously explore new possibilities
- 2. Be aware of the context and stakeholders' needs
- 3. Create and identify windows of opportunity
- 4. Test new measures





- 1. Continuously explore new possibilities
- 2. Be aware of the context and stakeholders' needs
- 3. Create and identify windows of opportunity
- 4. Test new measures



Time

Problem stream Policy stream Political stream



- 1. Continuously explore new possibilities
- 2. Be aware of the context and stakeholders' needs
- 3. Create and identify windows of opportunity
- 4. Test new measures









Additional Lessons for Amsterdam

- 1. Structured and swift interventions
- 2. Focusing on school communities
- 3. Benefiting from windows of opportunity







Reducing the number of cars in European cities

What are the keys to success?

Ir. Sean van der Lee 10/10/2024



Categories of measures





	City	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1	J	ĸ	L	М	Ν	0	Р	Q	R	S	Т
	Antwerp	Х		Х		Х	-	Х	Х	Х			Х		-		Х	Х	Х		Х
	Brussels	Х	X	Х	Х	Х	-	Х	Х	Х		(X)			-	Х	Х	Х	Х		Х
	Ghent	Х	X	Х	Х	Х	-	Х		Х					-		Х	Х			X
	Leuven			Х	X	Х	-	Х	Х	Х					-		Х	Х			Х
	Copenhagen	Х		Х		Х	-	Х	Х	Х					-		Х	Х		Х	
	Helsinki	Х		Х		Х	-	Х		Х					-		Х	Х	Х		
	Paris	Х	(X)	Х		Х	-	Х	Х	Х			Х		-		Х	Х	Х	Х	
	Strasbourg	Х	X	Х		Х	-	Х		Х			Х		-		Х	Х			
	Berlin	Х		Х		Х	-	Х	Х	Х					-		Х	Х	Х		
	Bremen	Х		Х		Х	-			Х					-		Х	Х			
	Hamburg			Х		Х	-	Х		Х					-		Х	Х			
	Heidelberg	Х		Х			-			Х					-		Х	Х			
	Nuremberg			Х			-			Х					-		Х	Х			
Regulations	Bologna	Х	X	Х		Х	-	Х		Х			Х	Х	-		Х	Х	(X)		Х
Pricing	Milan	Х	X	Х		(X)	-	(X)		Х			Х		-		Х	Х	(X)	Х	
Land-use Planning	Venice	Х	X	Х			-	Х		Х			Х		-			Х			
Infrastructuro	Valletta						-	(X)		Х		Х			-	Х	Х	Х	Х		
Innastructure	Amsterdam	Х		Х		Х	-	Х	Х	Х				(X)	-		Х	Х	Х		
Information Campaigns	Groningen			Х	Х	Х	-	Х	Х	Х					-		Х	Х	(X)	Х	
	Houten				Х	Х	-		Х	Х					-			Х			
	Utrecht	Х		Х		Х	-	Х	Х	Х					-		Х	Х	(X)	Х	
	Bergen	Х		Х			-				Х				-		Х	Х			
	Oslo	Х		Х		Х	-	Х	Х	Х			Х		-	(X)	Х	Х	(X)		
	Barcelona	Х	X	Х		Х	-			Х			Х		-	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
	Madrid	Х		Х		Х	-	Х		Х			Х		-	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
	Götheborg	Х		Х		Х	-			Х	Х				-		Х	Х	Х		
	Stockhom	Х		Х		Х	-	Х		Х	Х				-		Х	Х	Х		
	Zurich			Х		X	-	Х	Х	X			Х		-		Х	Х	Х		
	Birmingham	Х		(X)		Х	-	Х	Х	Х			Х	Х	-	Х	Х	Х	(X)	(X)	
	Glasgow	Х		X		Х	-	Х		X					-	Х	Х	Х		Х	
	London	Х		Х		X	-	Х	Х	X	X	(X)	Х		-		Х	Х	(X)		X
	Oxford	X		Х	X	Х	-	Х	Х	Х			Х		-	Х	Х	Х		(X)	X









Active Mobility in Oaxaca:

Transforming urban dynamics from a car-centric model to a human scale city

attisti anna

ARCADIS

Designin g for hew approach to architecture and by backgood



Urban Planner + Designer Places - Arcadis | México.

Assistant Professor Panamerican University | México.

MSc Sustainable Urbanism University College London. 2021 Chevening Scholar*

Architect, BArch Tec de Monterrey. 2014

ARCADIS

Two projects, one goal; a human-scale city.



Pedestrianization and on-street parking management

ARCADIS

Anyways, what is Oaxaca? (waa-haa-kaa)

gen: Plano de la Ciudad de Oaxaca 1790. Fuente: Mapoleca Manuel Orozco y Berra. Autor: F. Arjona Meja.

Imagen: Plano de la Ciudad de Oaxaca 1803. Fuente: Mapoteca Manuel Orozco y Berra. Autor: Juan Manuel Gijón

UNESCO World Heritage site

Understanding the city centre through spatial analysis

Mapa: Ubicación regional del polígono de estudio.

Mapa: Densidad poblacional por manzana.

Mapa: Uso de suelo.

Mapa: Unidades económicas y empleo.

Mapa: Equipamientos existentes.

Mapa: Isocrónas peatonales.
What is the voice and vision of the people of Oaxaca?



	Description	Date	
W1: Site visit and vision	Strategic session designed to facilitate collaboration between different key institutions, focusing on the	February 2024	
workshop with key public	collective construction of a shared vision for the project.	rebruary 2024	
authorities and local			
community			
W2: Strategic design workshop with local community	Participatory meeting aimed at involving citizens in the design of the project, providing a space to collect their visions, aspirations and concerns regarding the integrated mobility system.	April 2024	
W3: Review and validation workshop with key public	Participatory meeting aimed at key agents and members of the local community to review and validate proposals, ensuring alignment with the needs and perspectives of those involved, and	lune 2024	



The people of Oaxaca want pedestrian-oriented streets



How to transfer best practice to a Heritage Site in constant development?





Street typology design for context-based solutions





Different streets for a variety of users and priorities

User matrix and compononets of street typology							User matrix and compononets of street typology								
Users	Street components	Туроlоду							Туроlоду						
		A	В	с	D	D	E	Users	Street components	٨	В	C	с	D	
Pedestrians	Single platform with differentiated materials				\square	\square	\square	Private vehicles	Cycle lane with priority < 3m width		\checkmark				
* *	Sidewalk with > 3 m width	\square	\Box	\Box	\Box	\Box	$\overline{\mathbf{N}}$		Shared lane on local roads		\Box	\checkmark	\Box		
	Sidewalk with > 2.5 m width		\Box	$\overline{\mathbf{N}}$			\Box		Shared lane on transport axis and main roads				\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
	Sidewalk with > 15 m width	\square	\Box	\Box	$\overline{\mathbf{N}}$	$\overline{\mathbf{N}}$	\Box		Not allowed (circulation exclusive for residents)	$\mathbf{\times}$			\Box		
Active modes	Cycling and active modes tolerated		\square	\square	\square		\Box	On-street parking	On both sides of the street = 2.5m	\Box			\Box	\Box	\Box
<u>بة</u> بج ا	Cycle lane with priority < 3m width		$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$		\Box				Not allowed	$\mathbf{\times}$			$\mathbf{\times}$	$\mathbf{\times}$	$\mathbf{\times}$
	One-way cycle lane > 15 m width & > 0.3m protection							Emergency, loading/ unloading platform	4 Bmergency vehicles on shared lane with no timetable						
	Double one-way cycle lanes aligned with								Emergency vehicles with priority on right lane with no timetable				\checkmark	\checkmark	
	street directiion > 15 m width & > 0.3m protection	\cup	\cup	\cup	\cup	\cup			Emergency and service platforms interspersed on both sides of the street		\checkmark	\checkmark			\checkmark
	Not allowed			\Box	$\mathbf{\times}$		\Box		Service vehicles (pipas, gas, mercancías con restricted timetables)				\checkmark	\checkmark	
Public Transport	Shared lane in local roads	\Box	\Box	\checkmark	\Box	\Box	\Box								
	Priority lane in transport axis and main roads		\Box	\Box	\checkmark	\checkmark	\Box								
	Shared lane in transport axis and main roads														
	Not allowed	$\mathbf{\times}$	$\mathbf{\times}$												

Growing the existing pedestrian network



Sección de calle - Estado actual



Sección de calle - Propuesta

Presupuesto paramétrico: \$19,499.84 MXN por metro lineal









Casos análogos

Planta de conjunto

Enhancing streets with pedestrian vocation

Typology B: Pedestrian priority street (30 km / h)



Sección de calle - Estado actual



Sección de calle - Propuesta

Presupuesto paramétrico: \$27,886.66 MXN por metro lineal





Casos análogos

Planta de conjunto

Re-designing strategic streets that work for all modes



Sección de calle - Propuesta

Presupuesto paramétrico: \$26,788.68 MXN por metro lineal





Casos análogos

nagen: Paseo Montejo, Mérida iente: La Jornada Maya.

Planta de conjunto

Providing efficient transit corridors



Presupuesto paramétrico: D) \$13,474.39 MXN por metro lineal D*) \$16,486.85 MXN por metro lineal









Casos análogos

Enhancing microclimate to improve walkability

Typology E: Green corridor (50 km / h)



Sección de calle - Estado actual



Sección de calle - Propuesta

Presupuesto paramétrico: \$26,520.83 MXN por metro lineal





Casos análogos

Selecting endemic species and adequate materials is key

Pata de vaca (Bauhinia

variegata)

Flamboyán (Delonix regia)

Piso pododáctil

Primavera amarillo

Jardineras de infiltración

(Tabebuia chrysantha)



Urban furniture and wayfinding



Xeectacio. avimentos mobili E

A parking management strategy that responds to demand

Five key elements:

1. Polygon of the Historical Monuments Zone of the Historic Center of Oaxaca de Juárez

2. Analysis of pedestrian isochrones from 0 to 5 minutes, 6 to 10 minutes and 11 to 15 minutes.

3. Parking restrictions on public roads by the Security Ministry of the Municipality of Oaaca de Juárez.

4. Spatial analysis of the number of spaces that could be located within the area with the possibility of parking was carried out.

5. Proposal for the pedestrianization program.



Differentiated pricing scheme to promote vehicle rotation

Proposal for on-street parking management polygons and differentiated areas



Interventions that respond to gender-sensitive challenges



ARCADIS



Sustainability benefits for the people of Oaxaca











Thank you





Distribution effects of parking interventions among different income groups





Jyotsna Singh

TU Delft

Parking Interventions



Hard interventions, aimed at *reducing attractiveness* of private car usage



Popular intervention, especially in the Netherlands, however, there is no research studying their *distributional effects*



Predominance of ex-post studies on parking interventions; *Ex-ante* studies are needed to plan the parking policies of low car areas



Aim: Mitigate the risk of increased inequity for different population groups such as lower *income groups*, and contribute to tackle the *social barriers in mobility*

Distribution Effects

across the population

Equity	Equity is a measure of distribution effects Distribution effects measured over different income groups							
Gini's Coefficient	Gini's Coefficient an indicator of Value ranges between 0 & 1; where 0 indicates a scenario of indicates perfect inequality $G = \frac{1}{2N^{2}\mu} \sum_{i} \sum_{j} y_{i} - y_{j} $	social inequality perfect equality and 1 G=Gini Coefficient N= Population groups i = [1,N] j=[1,N] $y_i = Welfare of a user group 'i'$ $\mu = Mean welfare value$	100 65 60 75 70 65 60 75 70 65 60 75 70 65 65 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90					
	Utilised in conjunction with Lorenz curve							
Lorenz Curve	Lorenz Curve is used to visualiz plotting the cumulative distribution	e the distribution effects by on function of an attribute	0% 5% 10% 15%					



Gini's Coefficient- Application

Economic Impact Analysis

Economic equity change as a consequence of change in parking capacities and cost across different income groups

 $dCg_{kl} = dC_{kl} + v_m dT_{kl}$

dCg = *change in genarilsed cost of travel*

dC = change in monetary cost (including parking price change)

v = value of time for a household 'm'

dT = change in travel time

Impact On Mode Shift

Change in car usage across different income groups as a consequence of change in parking capacities and cost

For the Netherlands





Conceptual Framework





Urban Strategy







Traffic Module -

New Mobility Modeller Include parking price effects in traffic assignment stage, within parking assignment
Include different income classes in the traffic assignment stage using Multi-User Class Assignment

Include different income classes in the mode choice stage



Working on better cities with less cars

Urbanism Next

Multi-objective Multimodal Network Design









Reducing Car Usage: Carrot vs. Stick

- "Carrot" measures: encourage other modes of transport, i.e.
 - Improve public transport;
 - Introduce shared vehicles;
 - Build Park-and-Rides (P&Rs).
- "Stick" measures: discourage car usage, i.e.
 - Reduce road capacity;
 - Introduce road tolls;
 - Increase parking fees.





Reducing Car Usage: Carrot vs. Stick

- Literature on combining the two types is limited.
- We aim to fill this gap by combining:
 - The improvement of public transport;
 - The optimisation of parking fees.







Conflicting Objectives

- When we reduce car usage by improving transit and optimising parking fees, this can have some negative effects.
- User or operator costs might increase.
- To take these trade-offs into account, we consider multiple objectives simultaneously:
 - 1. Minimise the number of car users;
 - 2. Minimise user costs
 - 3. Minimise the operator deficit.



Table of Contents

- Research Question
- Solution Method
- Experimental Results
- Future Work and Conclusion







Research Question



Research Question

How do we design the transit network, i.e. how do we choose line routes and frequencies,



Research Question

How do we design the transit network, i.e. how do we choose line routes and frequencies, and how do we select parking fees to



Research Question

How do we design the transit network, i.e. how do we choose line routes and frequencies, and how do we select parking fees to simultaneously minimise the number of car users, the user costs and the operator deficit?







Solution Method


Solution Method





Lower Level

- The multimodal traffic assignment model simulates how people travel given the values of the decision variables, i.e.:
 - Which mode do travellers take?
 - Which route do travellers choose?
 - How do travellers perceive their trip, i.e. what are their generalised costs?
- From the results obtained by this model, we can compute corresponding objective values.



Upper Level: MOOP

- Trade-off between the objectives:
 - 1. Minimise the number of car users;
 - 2. Minimise user costs;
 - 3. Minimise operator deficit.
- Not one single optimal solution.
- Multi-objective optimisation to find a Pareto front.



Upper Level: MOOP





Upper Level: NSGA-II

- Transit network design problem on its own already NP-hard.
- Need for heuristics, as exact methods are infeasible for large instances.
- NSGA-II is an evolutionary algorithm often used for multiobjective optimisation problems.
- Idea: first rank on Pareto dominance for quality, then on "difference" in objective values for diversity.







Experimental Results



Experimental Results: Setup

- We compare three cases:
 - Constant parking fees and frequencies;
 - Constant parking fees, frequencies as decision variable;
 - Parking fees and frequencies as decision variable.
- We use Mandl's network, which is a widely used benchmark in transit network design.



Experimental Results: Setup





Experimental Results









Future Work and Conclusion



Future Work

- Case study.
- Speed up the multimodal assignment.
- Look at more decision variables, i.e. transit fee.
- Consider equity.
- Integrate more modes, i.e. active or shared modes.



Conclusion

- We provide a framework for the optimisation of transit routes, transit frequencies and parking fees.
- We are able to analyse and visualise the trade-offs between our different objectives: minimising the number of car users, the user cost and the operator cost.
- For both policymakers and operators, such a wide variety of solutions can contribute to creating a more sustainable mobility system.



Conclusion

 Combining "carrot" measures to encourage other modes of transport and "stick" measures to discourage car usage potentially more effective than these measures inisolation.





Thank you for your attention!



Plenary: Review the Challenges



Thank you!

