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General Information

• The largest city in the Limassol District, the second largest in Cyprus and the southernmost of Europe
• The largest port of Cyprus and one of the largest in the Eastern Mediterranean
• An world class tourist destination
• Industrial center of Cyprus
• 101,000 inhabitants / >170,000 in the greater area
• Area 34 km²
City Profile

Large and steep population growth

A similar increase in urban activities and functions

Expansion of tourism development

Creating problems
- Strong tendencies of urban sprawl
- High infrastructure costs
- Traffic problems
- Increase of energy consumption
- Environmental quality degradation
- Degradation of traditional city cores

1974
Need for a change?

1. What’s next?
2. Expected results?
3. Next steps?
Limassol SUMP
The SUMP process in Limassol

• STEP 1: Determine your potential for a successful SUMP
• STEP 2: Define the development process & scope of the plan
• STEP 3: Analyse the mobility situation (Phase 1) & develop scenarios (Phase 3)
• STEP 4: Develop a common vision (Phase 2)
• STEP 5: Set priorities & measurable targets (Phase 2)
• STEP 6: Develop effective packages of measures (Phase 3)
• STEP 7: Agree on clear responsibilities & allocation budgets (Phase 4)
• STEP 8: Build systems for monitoring & assessment into the plan (Phase 4)
• STEP 9: Adopt the SUMP
• STEP 10: Ensure proper management & communication (when implementing the plan)
• STEP 11: Learn the lessons
# Field Surveys and Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Surveys</th>
<th>Type of Item</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Typical Season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>H-H Interviews</td>
<td>interviews</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bus Occupancy Surveys (Bus Stops)</td>
<td>locations</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Origin - Destination (RSS)</td>
<td>sites</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Manual Classified Turning Counts</td>
<td>junctions</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Classified Link Counts</td>
<td>locations</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Automatic Traffic Counters</td>
<td>sites</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bus Passenger Counts (Bus Routes)</td>
<td>bus routes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pedestrian Link Counts</td>
<td>sites</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Car journey time survey</td>
<td>routes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Parking Supply within CBD</td>
<td>area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>On-street parking demand</td>
<td>segments</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Off-street parking demand</td>
<td>locations</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The network under scrutiny – Main findings (1/3)

- Usage of personal vehicles exceeds 90%
- Extremely high rate of car ownership indicator (2.5 vehicles / household)
- Car availability: 95% of H-H with 2 or 3 cars (4% has 5-6)
- Average vehicle occupancy 1.42 passengers / vehicle
- Low level of service on road axes leading to CBD
- Parking supply into CBD without restrictions (time, spatial, charging) up to 83%
- Parking balance: Positive into CBD, negative into Core City Centre (only in particular hours) – Limited parking spots for disabled people
- Only a 7.6% of the available parking spots charges occupants (average cost @ 2 Euro for 6 hours in CBD)
- Illegal parking 18%
The network under scrutiny – Main findings (2/3)

- Very low level of PT ridership (2.8%)
- Buses run empty – Capacity in abundance or lack of attractiveness (e.g. lack of comfort, low service frequency, limited working hours)
- 70% of households are within a maximum distance of 6 minutes from the nearest bus stop
- However there are spatial gaps (with acceptable walking time of 7 minutes or 400 meters distance)
  - Some areas are not served at all
  - In densely populated areas the gaps occur rarely & the bus access is convenient
  - In the suburbs larger comparative distances between stops & respective access times
- 45% of bus passengers do not have alternative means of transportation
The network under scrutiny – Main findings (3/3)

• Only a 6% of trips are done on foot mainly for entertainment and fewer times for work - Average trip time @ 14 minutes

• 40% of the people that depend on walking do not have an alternative option

• Only 0.4% of the trips are done on bicycle mainly for entertainment and fewer times for work - Average @20 minutes

• 49% of bicycle users do not have personal means of transportation
Definition of future expectations – Strategic Objectives

“Limassol to be an accessible, safe, functional and friendly city for its residents and visitors, with attractive, green and quiet neighborhoods, a lively city center, numerous spacious and open public spaces, a beacon of sustainable and smart mobility, facilitating economic, business, educational, recreational and cultural opportunities

- Economic efficiency
- Quality of life
- Equal accessibility
- Road safety
- Environmental sustainability
- Innovation
From Strategic Objectives to Operational Objectives (1/3)

• Reduction of black spots
• Road Safety measures and technology for vulnerable users (schools, universities, pedestrians, cyclists, disabled, etc.)
• Increase of PT share and network coverage
• Balance allocation of road network to pedestrians, cyclists and drivers
From Strategic Objectives to Operational Objectives (2/3)

- Increase of sustainable transport modes infrastructure
- Reduction of congestion
- Increase of "green" public spaces
- Reduction of old technology transport modes
- Increase of car sharing
- Increase of the road network length equipped with smart infrastructure
From Strategic Objectives to Operational Objectives (3/3)

- Reduction of GHG emissions & air pollutants
- Growth of businesses involved in the tourism sector
- Increase of the budget spent for sustainable mobility projects (pa/pc)
- Enhancing economic efficiency of PT services operation
Scenario development to match Strategic & Operational Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Urban Policy Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. City sprawl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Improvement of car traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Further improvement of car accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. &quot;The Carrots&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1 &quot;The Carrots&quot; - Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2 &quot;The Carrots&quot; - Advanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. &quot;The Sticks&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1 &quot;The Sticks&quot; - Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2 &quot;The Sticks&quot; - Advanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Combination of &quot;the Sticks&quot; and &quot;the Carrots&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1 Combination - Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2 Combination - Advanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Operational Objectives as a tool in planning & monitoring process

The proposed indicators (more than one for each operational objective) and their target values (2030 time horizon) is the tool for:

1. Alternative scenarios comparative evaluation (initial policy scenarios based on strategic objectives completed by specific measures based on operational objectives)

2. Measuring impact of the preferred scenario through the monitoring & evaluation mechanism