Securing a more sustainable future
Building on the investment in travel planning since 2010

Spring 2015

How we travel to campus and how it has changed from 2010

**Staff**
- 8,681 staff
- 2,442 full-time

- Single car driver: DOWN 49% to 37%
- Walking: UP 16% to 21%
- 48% travel for 30 minutes or less

**Student**
- 20,151 students
- 11,299 undergraduates

- Single car driver: DOWN 9% to 5%
- Walking: UP 56% to 62%
- 83% travel for 30 minutes or less

Source: 2010 Travel Plan and 2015 Travel Survey – University of Leicester

Prepared by
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Considerable progress has been made since the 2010 Travel Plan. The numbers of staff and students driving alone has dramatically reduced. For staff it has dropped from 49% to 37%. For students it has dropped from 9% to 3%. This has been achieved through a consistent and wide-ranging approach to incentivising sustainable travel by the University in parallel with applying a reduction in the number of parking permits and an increase in their costs. With the reduction in the number of single car drivers has come increases in the use of more sustainable travel, most notably walking, up from 15% to 21% for staff and from 56% to 62% for students.

The challenge now is to take this travel behaviour change onto the next level. This will become more demanding as the alternative travel options for those that remain single car drivers will be limited for many. However the 2015 Travel Survey highlights the potential for greater use of sustainable travel by staff and students remains, the ceiling (if one exists) has not been reached. Just over 100 staff, who are existing single car drivers, expressed a willingness to travel more sustainably to work. This represents around 1 in 5 of the current single car drivers. In mode share this equates to 7% of all staff commuting.

To achieve further success in reducing car use and in turn carbon emissions, will not only need the on-going commitment of the University to a range of measures and marketing. It will also need the engagement and commitment of those that shape the wider travel offer; namely the local authority and public transport operators. Engagement with these stakeholders has grown significantly over the last five years. Taking these partnerships to the next level will provide the basis to further reduce single car drivers.
1 BACKGROUND

The purpose of this report is to build on the 2010 Travel Plan. This set the agenda for the University of Leicester as it sought to manage efficiently and effectively all University related travel.

The following approach has been taken:

- Undertake an extensive travel survey with staff and students in 2015, to identify current University related trip-making, opportunities for more sustainable travel behaviours to be adopted and provide an assessment of scope 3 impact
- Compare the 2015 travel survey results with the targets set in the 2010 Travel Plan
- Provide recommendations for developing the travel plan and a toolkit to enable the University of Leicester to meet the HEFCE Scope 3 carbon reporting standards
2 STAFF AND STUDENT TRAVEL IN 2015

2.1 Staff

2.1.1 Background

Between 9th and 27th March 2015 (2 weeks) staff of the University of Leicester were invited to complete the 2015 annual Travel Survey. In total there were 1,453 responses received. This is the second highest figure since travel surveys were commissioned following the 2010 Travel Plan.

In total there are currently 8,681 members of staff at the University of Leicester. Of these 2,442 are full-time. 1,105 (45%) responses were received from full-time staff members, providing a strong base to work from.

Staff were invited to participate through the following ways:
- direct email
- promotion within the Weekly Insider newsletter
- use of an Ad Bike (as on image on the right) with a poster promoting the survey

2.1.2 Profile of survey respondents

In respect of age, it is not possible to easily compare the profile of the staff survey respondents by the known ages of staff, as different age bands are used. However to provide some comparison, here is a profile of staff by age, with that from the staff survey. In addition, further down the page is a chart that seeks to compare the age profile based on actual versus the survey respondents. It is not a precise comparison because of what was stated earlier with the different age bands. For future, consideration needs to be given to having consistent age bands and identifying more effective ways of engaging the younger staff in the travel survey.

In terms of gender, the actual female / male ratio is 53% female / 47% male.
As already commented on, the survey had a high level of response from full-time staff (45%). It is these that will be generating the bulk of current trips to/from the University sites and are the ones that need to be engaged, as the University continues to encourage reduced single occupancy car use, as part of its 2010 Travel Plan.

Below is the current split of staff work hours, reflecting fixed hours remain fairly dominant but almost 1/3rd of staff have a pattern that they would describe as indeterminate i.e. reflecting a flexible work pattern. 89% of those surveyed who described themselves as working indeterminate hours, also described themselves as working full-time.

1399 respondents
Within the UK workplace there is a growth in flexible working practices by employers and appetite from staff to access this opportunity. Almost 1 in 4 staff expressed they were able to work flexibly. Perhaps more of note were the 8% unaware whether they could work flexibly. An analysis has been undertaken of these survey respondents. Their use of the car to commute is actually lower than the overall average, so the ‘Don’t knows’ working more flexibly may not have a positive impact in respect of sustainability. However there may be other benefits to the University and staff from more of their staff having more flexibility.
Staff were asked their days of work and their start and finish times. What follows are illustrations of these. They reflect a traditional pattern of working. 73% of staff start between 08:30 and 09:30 and 59% finishing between 16:30 and 17:30. These are the very times when the local transport network is at maximum load.
1395 respondents

2.1.3 An overview of commuting by staff

52% of staff commute 5 miles or less. Equally there are a relatively high number of long distance commuters (16% travelling 21 miles and over).

1382 respondents

Staff commuting times are a product of distance being travelled more often than not in a city at peak time.
A new question in the 2015 Travel Survey was asked of car sharers and whether they were sharing for the whole journey or were being picked up mid-way. Just 8% (n.10) were being picked up mid-way. This may reflect a lack of awareness on the part of staff upon the ability of the LeicesterShare car sharing service to help identify car sharing journey matches en route, as well as close to the start of the journey.

Staff were asked where they parked their car. 77% were accessing one of the University car parks using the permit system.
The market for low-emission vehicles has grown considerably over the last 5 years. Year on year growth for ultra-low emission vehicles (notably electrics) has year on year growth of over 100%. Within the vehicle profile of staff, there are now 5 staff members who responded to the survey with electric vehicles.

Parking permits
94 staff (6%) stated they held a University parking permit.
Staff were asked about where they parked their bike. 29% indicated they were choosing a non-dedicated facility because of its proximity to their workplace.

![Staff - where do they park their bike](chart)

253 responses
2.1.4 Opportunities for more sustainable commuting

Staff – could more car share to work?

There would appear to be a potential for car sharing to achieve more for the University. Its current share of trip making is 12% (based on predominant mode). This compares to 27% of survey respondents volunteering a response to this question. This reflects there is scope for growth. The responses below reflects what survey respondents said would help them to car share more, with sourcing partners and cost sharing being the highest two factors.

The responses also reflect that information readily available to University staff through the travel plan section of the web site, is not reaching those intended e.g. emergency ride home service.

![Car sharing - what would help](image)

397 responses

Below are plots showing existing car sharers and those that expressed they potentially could switch. What this highlights is that there is that in many places there is a close alignment between the two groups. There would be value in highlighting this to existing car drivers who are sharing. It would be an easier step for them to add a further passenger in their car than for a new car driver to start sharing.
University of Leicester Staff Travel - Staff currently carsharing to work and those that could potentially start carsharing to work

University of Leicester Staff Travel - Staff that could potentially carshare into the university subject to various interventions e.g. help in finding carsharing partner
University call to action

- Investigate scheme to promote/assist with sharing petrol costs for journey sharing by car
- Promote those wanting to car share to those that are already car sharing car drivers
- Undertake a car sharing promotion, raising the awareness of the scale of interest and means to undertake

Staff – could more walk to work?

The opportunity to encourage more walking appears limited. Just 4% of staff stated they do not walk but might do so in the future. Furthermore 21% of staff commute within a walking distance (of up to 2 miles) and already 21% are walking as their predominant mode. Consequently potential for more is limited.

Do staff walk as part of their commute?

- I walk every day: 32%
- I walk regularly, e.g. once a week: 5%
- I walk occasionally, e.g. once a month: 6%
- I don’t walk currently but might in the future: 4%
- I would not consider walking even though it is feasible to walk: 3%
- My journey is not feasible to walk: 50%

1341 responses

Staff – what would encourage them to walk to work?

In isolation there is no measure worthy of significant investment. However improving showers and storage facilities for the different sites will also be of benefit to potential walkers.

What would encourage more staff to walk to work

- Improved showers: 12%
- More lockers and storage: 8%
- More information on walking routes: 10%
- Improved lighting: 6%
- A walking buddy or carpool partner: 3%
- Use of incentives: 3%
- Park & Stride (car park): 10%
- Nothing would: 10%

1115 responses
Below are plots reflecting existing walkers and those that have potential to be walkers within 3 miles and 5 miles of the main campus. The proportion of staff walking has increased significantly. The application of a more stringent parking permit policy has undoubtedly had a positive effect. What could help to strengthen this mode shift is a range of tactical and strategic actions. In the short-term identifying walking champions from locations where there is a cluster of interest, could assist in encouraging current non-walkers to trial walking to work. In the longer term, further investment internally by the University in showers/lockers will only help; externally the case will continue to be needed to made for enhanced safe walking (and cycling) routes.

University of Leicester Staff Travel - Staff that are already walking to the university either daily, weekly or occasionally
University call to action

- Identify walking champions in the areas where there is interest for staff to switch to walking
- Enhance showers and locker facilities
- Campaign for safe walking (and cycling) routes with Leicester City Council

Staff – could more cycle to work?

Based on the responses of the travel survey, there is potential for a significant increase in cycling. 223 respondents to the survey stated they don’t cycle but might in the future. Of these 223 respondents, there were 55 who were sole car drivers. These 55 car drivers (but with a potential to switch to cycling) represent 4% of all sole car drivers, reflecting there is an opportunity here.
Staff were asked to confirm what would encourage them to cycle more. Responses reflect a real spread of reasons; some within the remit of the University to address. However the most significant reason is pretty much outside the control of the University; namely the cycling routes to/from the sites.

A further analysis has been undertaken of the 55 current car drivers who were not current cyclists but expressed an interest in starting to cycle, to identify their motivators. The spread of factors were very similar to the overall reasons expressed though they were stated in relatively higher numbers. The top 3 were:

- 60% Improved cycle routes
- 47% Improved showers
- 40% Discounts on cycles
University of Leicester Staff Travel - Staff that are already cycling to the university either daily, weekly or occasionally

University of Leicester Staff Travel - Car drivers/ Passengers that have expressed an interest/ potential in cycling to the University living within a 3 mile or 5 mile radius
Leicester City Council call to action
➢ For improved cycle routes

University call to action
➢ Enhancing showers/lockers across the sites
➢ Further promotion of the package of cycling discounts
➢ Use the planned changes to University Road as an opportunity to enhance cycle routes/access

In a separate question, staff were asked whether they were aware that the University has a purpose built dedicated cycling storage facility. The responses (n.1327) were:
➢ 8% respondents – n.100 – were not aware
➢ 80% of staff were aware
➢ 12% not interested.

University call to action
➢ Further promotion of the University Bike Park
Staff – could more take the bus to work?

The survey indicated 6% of staff were using the bus as their predominant travel mode, or 8% if you include the Hospital Hopper.

Significantly 18% (n.238) did not use the bus but might in the future. Further analysis of this group reveal that they represent 19% of those that are choosing to drive their alone on the commute. There is a strong opportunity to consider further action as detailed in the next section.

Below are the responses from all staff. Most of these factors are outside the control of the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would encourage staff to use the bus more</th>
<th>1237 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheaper fares</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-date travel information</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More direct bus services</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent bus services</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reliable bus services</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dedicated University route</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better standard of buses</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered bus stops</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More safety features at bus stops</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-time information</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing would encourage use</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A further analysis has been undertaken of the 19% who indicated they could be potential bus users and currently were defaulting to use of the car as their predominant mode. Here are the top 3 factors expressed:

- 58% more direct buses
- 58% more frequent buses
- 55% cheaper fares

The 238 potential new customers represent a commercial value to the bus operating companies. A conservative estimate would place this at £145,000 pa (based on an average season ticket price of £610). Given that the survey sample is 45% of full-time staff, a value of £1/4 million for this business is a reasonable estimate to work with for the bus operating companies (primarily Arriva) that serve the University.

A deterrent from use of the existing network is the limited availability of joint ticketing between bus operators. Currently there is a 1 day £5 Flexi ticket available. Leicester as a multi-operator bus network. For many of the 238 potential new customers, they would need to use two bus operators for their journey. This not only has the deterrent of changing buses (adding to time and inconvenience) but also the need to purchase two season tickets, adding considerably to the cost, making other travel options more attractive.

In 2013 a study was undertaken by the University of Leicester supported by Go Travel Solutions on the scope to enhance bus links to the University. The main campus of the University was then (and is now) served directly by a small number of services that operate between suburbs in parts of south Leicester and the city centre. There are no cross-city bus links. This further detracts from the attraction of using the bus for commuting. The headline recommendations from the 2013 Bus Feasibility Study were:

- Invest in two new cross-city bus links could be commercial long-term from Birstall and Glenfield
- Increase permit parking charges and restrict onsite and offsite parking as a way of helping to pump-prime the two new commercial bus links
- Invest in University Road for sustainable travel, removing through car traffic and enabling buses to turn right from University Road onto Welford Road
Also shown on the plot are the direct bus routes serving the main campus on University Road. The services shown are:

- 47/47A/48/48A (Arriva)
- 80 (Arriva). Also shown with a dotted line is X80 (Arriva) – one journey per day
- 83 (Centrebus). Also shown with a dotted line is 83A (Centrebus) – one journey per day
**Bus company call to action – primary Arriva**
- To be provided with non-confidential data to make the business case for enhancements to the commercial bus network and ticketing options
- For the earliest introduction of smart ticketing, to enable one ticket travel across all bus operators

**Leicester City Council call to action**
- To be provided with non-confidential data to review the market potential of more cross-city bus services
- For the earliest introduction of smart ticketing at a competitive price, to enable one ticket travel across all bus operators

**University call to action**
- To continue to seek to secure travel discounts working through partnerships such as Smartgo Leicester

A question was asked of staff awareness of what buses they could use to travel to work. Overall there was a high level of ignorance – 29% (n.379) were unaware. Of these just n.5 were currently defaulting to travel by car as sole driver. Consequently enhancing information in isolation is not being recommended as a high priority.

Are staff aware of what buses they could travel to work by?

- Yes: 71%
- No: 29%

1307 respondents
Could more staff travel to work by train?

Like for the previous two modes of cycling and travelling by bus, there appears some scope for train travel to increase. 9% of survey respondents (n.116) indicated they did not currently use the train but might in the future.

**Do staff use the train as part of their commute?**

- 75% use the train every day
- 9% use the train regularly, e.g. once a week
- 4% use the train occasionally, e.g. once a month
- 9% don’t currently use the train but might in the future
- 2% don’t use and would not consider using the train
- 10% don’t use the train

**1289 respondents**

As for many travel surveys, cheaper fares is the most popular ask to encourage more train travel.

**What would encourage staff to use the train more**

- Cheaper fares: 66%
- Up-to-date trains: 17%
- More frequent services: 12%
- More reliable services: 7%
- Better standard of trains: 7%
- Better waiting areas: 4%
- Improved bus services: 6%
- Nothing would: 5%

**1102 respondents.**
Could a concerted campaign on rail travel help to reduce car use to the University sites? It could. A further analysis of the 116 people who indicated they did not currently use the train but might in the future, reveals that 67 (14% of SOV for the University) of these are using the car as their predominant mode.

What are the motivators key for this group? Here are their top 3:

- 79% cheaper fares
- 50% more frequent services
- 25% more reliable services

The 116 people represent a commercial value to the train operating companies. A conservative estimate would place this at £150,000 pa (based on an average season ticket price of £1,300). Given that the survey sample is 45% of full-time staff, a value of £1/4 million for this business is a reasonable estimate to work with for the train operating companies that serve Leicester.

To help scope the opportunity for more rail travel, below is a plot of current train and potential train users.

*Plot of current train users*
Potential train users

**Train operator call to action – primary Cross Country and East Midlands Trains**
- To be provided with non-confidential data to review the opportunity to offer stronger commercial incentives

**Leicester City Council call to action**
- To be provided with non-confidential data to be fed into the rail franchise renewal process, to help influence greater train capacity and flexibility on ticketing

**University call to action**
- To continue to seek to secure travel discounts working through partnerships such as Smartgo Leicester
Could more staff work from home?

Staff were asked about the ability to work from home. What is marked is that 78% said they could do this, but only 19% are undertaking this once or more per week. Here there is an opportunity to reduce the trip making and the carbon footprint of the University through a greater embracing of home working.

1312 respondents

*University call to action*

- To review the home working policy and promote to staff
2.1.5 An overview of business travel by University staff

Below is a summary on inter-site travel by staff. The majority (57%) are never or less than once a month travelling between sites. 17% are travelling daily or 2-3 times per week.

How often do staff travel from their main place of work to other U of L sites?

- Never: 25%
- Rarely: 10%
- Once a month: 9%
- 2-3 times a month: 8%
- Weekly: 8%
- 2-3 times a week: 9%
- Daily: 32%

1334 respondents

Inter-site travel occurs all campuses with the Main Central Campus being dominant as both the starting and finishing point. What is different from previous years is the introduction of the new Brookfield site. Below reflects the volume site travel of those staff surveyed.

Inter-site travel - journeys made by staff

854 respondents
Staff were asked their travel mode between sites. 17% (n. 161) stated they were lone car drivers.
There is no table of mode split for inter-campus travel for the hospitals, as there were only eight staff recorded doing journeys from the hospital. The majority of trips were walked.

In relative times for an organisation, there is a high volume of business travel to non-University of Leicester sites (53%).

What proportion of staff undertake U of L business travel to non U of L sites

1318 respondents
The illustration below provides a reflection on the volume of business travel to non-University of Leicester locations. Other sites in Leicester are the most common occurring trips, followed by elsewhere in the Midlands and London.

692 respondents

When it comes to mode of travel, the train is the dominant mode of travel, followed by car driving alone.

661 respondents
Below is a representation on the number of international trips undertaken by staff. It needs to be noted that the sample size is smaller for these questions, so results should not be extrapolated to be representative of all staff.

495 respondents

When it comes travel mode on international travel, travelling by air dominates. However there is almost 1 in 4 taking the train for trips into those parts of Europe closest to the UK.

249 respondents
Staff were asked how frequently they used tele and video conferencing facilities. The responses reflect a relatively low use:

- 17% using telephone conferencing once or more per month
- 2% using a dedicated video conferencing facility once or more per month
- 16% using video conferencing on pc / text once or more per month

1229 respondents
2.1.6 Opportunities for change in business travel

Business travel claims do not provide an accurate portrayal of business travel. 24% of the survey respondents stated they were only making submissions some of the time. Whilst in the short-term this may be saving some expense to the University, it is not enabling the University to provide an accurate assessment for scope 3.

689 respondents

University call to action

➢ To review the policy and process on how business mileage is recorded as part of its scope 3 reporting. See dedicated section in section 3.3 of the report.

Staff were asked on the process of booking business travel. Somewhat alarmingly 14% stated they did not know.

682 respondents
Could more inter-site business travel be undertaken by bike?

Staff were asked if they knew there was a mileage allowance for using bikes for business travel. 26% (n. 341) did not know and were interested in finding out more details. Individual who have supplied their contact details have been responded to.

![Knowledge of bike business mileage allowance]

1312 respondents

Staff were asked about their interest in use of pool bikes. A very strong response was received. 47% (n. 587) said ‘yes’ or ‘maybe’.

There is currently a funding opportunity for ebikes from the Department for Transport. The University have expressed an interest in part of this joint Leicester City Council and Smartgo Leicester initiative. If successful this could provide up to 20 ebikes for shared use.

**University call to action**

- To bid to become part of a shared ebike scheme.

![Staff interest in using a pool bike for business travel]

1310 respondents
Could business travel be reduced by greater use of tele and video conferencing?

Staff were asked to identify what barriers there were for greater use of tele and video conferencing, in turn requiring less need to travel. A significant number n.132 (21%) stated they were uncertain how to use these facilities. Just slightly less people, 20% stated they were unaware how to access these facilities. A further analysis of these reveals that virtually all of the same respondents answered both of these as reasons.

1133 respondents

University call to action
- To promote the conferencing facilities to staff and enhance their accessibility

Further feedback

Running through the feedback on the travel survey were two areas worthy of further attention:
- The importance of cost, as opposed to sustainability, being drivers of behaviour
- The lack of awareness of alternative travel options available, despite the extensive range of information via the web

It is for these reasons that the following recommendations are made:

University calls to action
- To undertake campaigns focused on the cost benefits of sustainable travel
- To grow where possible the campaigns and different approaches to engaging staff. Of particular importance is to seek to embedding sustainable travel within the recruitment and induction process of new staff, to help them adopt pro-sustainable travel behaviour from the outset
- To continue to raise the cost of car parking permits to become benefit neutral to staff
2.2 Students

2.2.1 Background

In total there are 20,151 students at the University of Leicester. The breakdown is 11,299 undergraduates, 6,678 post graduate teachers, 8,751 post graduates and 100 other. There are currently 13,412 undergraduate students at the University of Leicester. 999 students participated in the 2015 Travel Survey. 87% of those that participated in the 2015 Travel Survey were undergraduates. This then means that 6.5% of undergraduates participated in the travel survey. This is a lower than desirable participation level but is representative and is the highest sample size since the 2009 travel survey.

The following approach was taken to the promotion of staff travel surveys:
- Engagement of students via Unitemps to undertake 1 to 1 surveys with students using iPads
- Promotion of the travel survey and free prize draw via advertising screens within the students union
- Use of an Ad Bike with a poster promoting the survey

2.2.2 Profile of student survey respondents

As often the case, there is a bias to female participation.

![Students - gender](image)

978 respondents
The student age profile of those surveyed closely matches that of undergraduates. 82% of undergraduates are between 19 and 24 compared to the survey profile of 84%.

Survey participation matched closely the actual split by residence. There was a slight bias on UK with survey participation at 78% versus the actual split being 71%, Europe was 8% versus an actual split of 5% and outside of EU was 14% versus an actual split of 24%. This in part may reflect a number of undergraduate distance learners.
Here is a representation of the studies being undertaken. Full-time students dominate participation.

87% of students who participated in the travel survey were undergraduates. These represent 6.5% of current undergraduates.
Students were asked their main campus for study. 94% stated Central Campus.

955 respondents

Students were asked what time they were on campus. Not surprisingly Monday to Friday dominated, with a small drop on Wednesday to reflect the different teaching schedule for some students. During weekdays, peak times for students on campus are late morning and early afternoon.

958 respondents
Students were asked where they lived whilst at University. 31% lived in halls of residence, with those in Oadby Student Village being a key location. Most other University of Leicester accommodation facilities are within the same area of the city, 2-4 miles south/south-west of the main campus.

![Students - live in halls of residence?](image)

963 respondents

![Students in halls of residence - their location](image)

298 respondents
2.2.3 An overview of campus travel by students

The distances travelled by students are a lot shorter than those for staff. 82% of them being 5 miles or less; consequently their potential ability to take-up more sustainable travel options is much greater.

684 respondents

The journey times reflect the distance typically being travelled, with many of these journeys not within the traditional peak time. 83% of journeys are 30 minutes or less.

956 respondents
When it comes to mode of travel, 62% of students walk as their predominant mode. The graph below illustrates the choice of mode by distance.

There are relatively few single car drivers (8%). Based on predominant mode chosen, this figure is 5%. Of those car sharing (4% of trips to campus), just over three-quarters share for all the journey.

935 respondents
Of students using cars, not surprising it is cars with smaller engine size and diesel that dominate.

86 respondents

Students using cars - engine size and fuel

18 respondents

Start of journey
Mid-way of journey
In terms of parking, just over half (51%) are using on-street without charges.

82 respondents

Travel by motor cycle
An insignificant amount of travel. There was a single respondent with an over 500cc motor cycle.

Travel by bike
7% of student travel to campus is by bike. 40% of these park their bike on what is closest to their place of study.
2.2.4 Opportunities for change in campus travel

Could more students car share to campus?

Students expressed that a financial incentive would be the strongest incentive to car share. For staff this came out as the second highest motivation.

![Graph showing students' incentives for car sharing](image)

**70 respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help in identifying suitable car share partners</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed ride home for those in the car share scheme</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared petrol costs between car sharers</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated parking spaces for those in the car share scheme</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understanding of the scheme and its benefits</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Could more students walk to campus?

Walking is the predominant form of campus travel (62%). Its potential to increase appears fairly limited with just 6% (n.57), stating they walk more in the future. As to the measures that would motivate them, then it is real mix. When you review purely those driving a car alone (n.4) there is not any measure of statistically significant.

926 respondents

What would encourage more students to walk to campus

820 respondents
Could more students cycle to campus?

The survey indicates there is potential for greater cycling. In the 2015 travel survey, student travel was at its lowest (7%) of all years. Of those surveyed, 28% (n. 240) expressed though not a current cyclist, they might do so in the future. As to the strongest motivator, of all students surveyed, improved cycle routes (28%), cycle discounts (22%) and more lockers (18%) came out as the top three factors.

A closer examination of the survey data reveals that though there is certainly scope for greater cycling, the majority of this would be at the expense of walking and travelling by bus. Only four students surveyed expressed they were not a current cyclist but might do so in the future were currently car driving alone to campus.

**Leicester City Council call to action**
- To enhance cycle routes in and around the campus.

**University call to action**
- Use the planned changes to University Road as an opportunity to enhance cycle routes/access

871 respondents
In a separate question, students were asked whether they were aware that the University has purpose built dedicated cycling storage facilities. The responses (n.846) were:

- 9% respondents – n.74 – were not aware
- 68% of students were aware
- 24% not interested.
Could more students travel by bus to campus?

14% of students (n=120) stated they did not travel to campus by bus but might do so in the future. Of these, just six of these are driving alone by car. Of the measures to encourage mode shift, cheaper fares (63%) dominate as the measure to encourage more bus travel. More frequent buses (26%) and reliable buses (24%) are the next two most important measures to generate greater use of buses by students.

Students were also asked on their awareness of buses to campus. 18% said they were not. Of these n=12 are driving alone to campus. Though not a big number, this does represent 20% of those surveyed who travel alone to campus.

University call to action

- Continue to campaign for enhanced bus links and discounts for travel to campus.
- Promote the current bus network to help address the current lack of awareness

---

**Do students use the bus for travel to campus?**

- 22% use the bus every day
- 5% use the bus regularly, e.g. once or twice a week
- 7% use the bus occasionally, e.g. once a month
- 14% don’t currently use the bus but might in the future
- 53% don’t use the bus and would not consider using the bus

887 respondents

---

**What would encourage more students to use the bus to travel to campus?**

- Cheaper fares: 63%
- Up-to-date travel information: 7%
- More direct bus services: 11%
- More frequent bus services: 26%
- A dedicated University bus: 24%
- Better standard of buses: 16%
- More safety features on buses: 8%
- Real-time information: 10%
- Nothing would: 15%

830 respondents
Are students aware of what buses they could use to travel to campus?

- Yes: 82%
- No: 18%

857 respondents
Could more students travel by train to campus?

7% of students (n. 63) stated they did not currently use the train but might do so in the future. Of these just n.6 are driving alone to campus. Of the measures to encourage greater train travel, cheaper fares (33%) was stated as the strongest motivator. No other measure recorded a response over 10%.

848 respondents

What would encourage more students to use the train for travel to campus

770 respondents
2.2.5 An overview of travel between campuses

There is not a lot of inter-campus student travel. 74% of students travel less than once a month or not at all between campuses. Where there is inter-campus travel, then the main campus is the primary start and finish location. The next location for inter-campus travel is the Oadby Student Campus.

In terms of the form of travel used for inter-campus travel, then walking dominates (59%). This compares to 62% as the walk mode split for primary travel to campus for students.

904 respondents
292 respondents

Inter-site travel - journeys made by bus

- Brookfield
- Knighton & Stoneygate
- Glenfield Hospital
- Leicester General Hospital
- Leicester Royal Infirmary
- Multiple Other campus locations
- Oadby Campus Student Village
- South campus
- North campus
- Main Central campus

200 respondents

Inter-site student travel - mode used

- Car driver (travelling alone)
- Car driver (with passengers)
- Car passenger
- Motorcycle / scooter
- Public bus (not Hopper)
- Hospital Hopper
- Cycle
- Walk
- Taxi
- Other (please specify)

477 respondents
2.2.6 An overview of travel to home by students

In this final section, is a summary of travel home by students. The headlines are as follows:

- 53% of students who are based outside the UK travel no more than 1 journey per academic year
- 60% of students travel 3 or less journeys home per academic year
- Eurostar / train is the most popular form of travel home with 38%, followed by plane travel with 25%

For students based outside the UK - number of journeys home in the last academic year

For students - the number of journeys home in the academic year

204 respondents

817 respondents
Running through the feedback on the travel survey were two areas worthy of further attention:

- The importance of cost, as opposed to sustainability, being drivers of behaviour
- The lack of awareness of alternative travel options available, despite the extensive range of information via the web

It is for these reasons that the following recommendations are made:

**University calls to action**

- To undertake campaigns focused on the cost benefits of sustainable travel
- To grow where possible the campaigns and different approaches to engaging students.

Though there will be some common elements with staff campaign activity, it will need to be undertaken separately.
2.3 Carbon reporting

As part of the commission to develop this Travel Plan update report the University requested some baseline emissions calculations, based on the data gathered as part of the Travel Plan baseline surveys. These emissions figures are intended to inform future Scope 3 reporting, and to serve as a broad brush baseline for future CO2 (and associated emissions) reporting.

The consultant calculated the full range of emissions based on the current latest DEFRA guidance and to a EuroCAT 6 standard by engine size and fuel type. A summary of the process can be found in the process chart presented below, a full and detailed step by step breakdown of this process can be found as an appendix to this report.

In work trips, together with trips made by bus and rail have had a standard case multiplier applied to the overall passenger kilometre figures - this is essential to close gaps in the data captured as part of the main Travel Plan baseline and monitoring survey methodology. Working within work trips and more efficient mass transit modes to produce emissions figures beyond what is presented in this report will require a specialised survey to capture the granularity of information required to make a more tailored calculation. The methodology employed by the consultant for these portions of the emissions calculation follows the Defra methodology employed by the university in its specialist paper into transport emissions dated 2010. This allows direct comparison of these results. In the case of to/from work ‘grey mileage’ this figure has been calculated to a greater degree of accuracy by employing the latest Defra approved method.
University of Leicester Travel Survey Results 2015

Modal Split

Motor Cycle
Staff: 2%
Student: 1.1%

Car
Staff: 52.4%
Student: 9.7%

Cycling
Staff: 20.5%
Student: 17%

Walk
Staff: 43.4%
Student: 82.4%

Stage 1

Inputs from Travel Survey;
- Mode
- Distance
- Duration
- Fuel type
- Engine capacity
- Vehicle reg. year

Stage 2

- Fuel type and engine capacity multiplied by emissions co-efficiencies according to EuroCAT rating by speed (assumed total trip speed averaged over journey).
- Results multiplied by frequency information.

Stage 3

- Results for all EuroCat ratings and fuel types aggregated and multiplied to give annualised emissions.

Discounted sustainable modes

Registration Year

Frequency of trip

Trip Length (mins)

Trip Length (mins)

Euro Cat rating (DEFRA approved carbon emission factors (2009))

Distance/Time = Speed

Emissions Calculator

DEFRA co-efficiency

Frequency of trips multiplier

RESULTS (All pollutants)
Staff: 419,304,130.2 g
Student: 3,467,547.668 g
RESULTS University of Leicester – Annualised figures by emission class and trip mode;

Staff

Car:
Total annual mileage to/from work: 3,285,280 m
Pollutants (based on length of journey and EuroCAT rating):

- CO2 (g/m) – 647,409,091.3
- NOx (g/m) – 67,892,090
- HC+NOx (g/m) – 86,085,476
- PM (g/m) – 4,904,510.8

In-work trips – ‘Grey fleet travel’:
Total Annualised Mileage: 122,394.5 m
Total Annualised Emissions (ALL CLASSES): 26,351,826.02 g

Main Campus – Oadby Student Village:
Total Annualised Mileage: 115,070.5 m
Total Annualised CO2 Emissions: 24,830,301.96 g

Bus:
Annualised Mileage: 25,340 m
Annualised Bus emissions (CO2) (per/m) (Technical note 2010): 4,548,910.1 g

Train:
Annualised Mileage: 25,930 m
Annualised Train emissions (CO2) (per/m) (Technical note 2010): 2,550,760.03 g

Staff emissions results table to/from/work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>All Vehicle Types</th>
<th>Annual (x mileage)</th>
<th>Converted to miles</th>
<th>Petrol Cars (per/km)</th>
<th>Annual (x mileage)</th>
<th>Converted to miles</th>
<th>Diesel Cars (per/km)</th>
<th>Annual (x mileage)</th>
<th>Converted to miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All pollutants</td>
<td>79.27401</td>
<td>260437347.9</td>
<td>419304130.2</td>
<td>55.44030741</td>
<td>182136933.1</td>
<td>293240462.4</td>
<td>23.83286602</td>
<td>78297638.08</td>
<td>126059197.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nox</td>
<td>0.129459</td>
<td>425311.3708</td>
<td>684751.307</td>
<td>0.03216155</td>
<td>105659.6844</td>
<td>170112.0918</td>
<td>0.09692448</td>
<td>318424.0445</td>
<td>512662.7116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM25</td>
<td>0.009329</td>
<td>30650.55478</td>
<td>49347.39319</td>
<td>0.00529759</td>
<td>17404.05719</td>
<td>28020.53208</td>
<td>0.00394525</td>
<td>12961.23999</td>
<td>20867.59638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>0.016120</td>
<td>52959.46691</td>
<td>85264.74173</td>
<td>0.00976178</td>
<td>32070.17756</td>
<td>51632.98587</td>
<td>0.00618856</td>
<td>20331.167</td>
<td>32733.17888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>79.10388</td>
<td>259878425</td>
<td>418404264.3</td>
<td>55.38016453</td>
<td>181939346.9</td>
<td>292922348.6</td>
<td>23.72372567</td>
<td>77939081.48</td>
<td>125481921.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>0.015219</td>
<td>50001.52807</td>
<td>80502.46019</td>
<td>0.01292197</td>
<td>42452.28214</td>
<td>68348.17424</td>
<td>0.00208206</td>
<td>6840.151855</td>
<td>11012.64449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Car:**
Total annual mileage to University: 271,520

Pollutants (based on length of journey and EuroCAT rating):
- CO2 (g/m) – 61,571,165.6
- NOx (g/m) – 4,636,671.2
- HC+NOx (g/m) – 6,379,914.8,
- PM (g/m) – 242,627

**Bus:**
Annualised Mileage: 41,810 m
Annualised Bus emissions (CO2) (per/m) (to methodology set out in Technical note 2010):
7,505,522.15 g

**Train:**
Annualised Mileage: 6,480 m
Annualised Train emissions (CO2) (per/m) (to methodology set out in Technical note 2010):
637,444.08 g

**Student – Emissions results table to and from main site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>All Vehicle Types (per/km)</th>
<th>Annual (x mileage)</th>
<th>Converted to miles</th>
<th>Petrol Cars (per/km)</th>
<th>Annual (x mileage)</th>
<th>Converted to miles</th>
<th>Diesel Cars (per/km)</th>
<th>Annual (x mileage)</th>
<th>Converted to miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All pollutants</td>
<td>7.93221978</td>
<td>2153766.316</td>
<td>3467547.668</td>
<td>7.09856822</td>
<td>1927403.244</td>
<td>3103119.2226</td>
<td>0.83356787</td>
<td>226330.34</td>
<td>364391.8584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nox</td>
<td>0.00716117</td>
<td>1944.400009</td>
<td>3130.484015</td>
<td>0.00380600</td>
<td>1033.404697</td>
<td>1663.7815619</td>
<td>0.00332629</td>
<td>903.15522</td>
<td>1454.079918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM25</td>
<td>0.00072388</td>
<td>196.5467016</td>
<td>316.4401896</td>
<td>0.00058302</td>
<td>158.3018614</td>
<td>254.86599678</td>
<td>0.00013134</td>
<td>35.661762</td>
<td>57.4154321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>0.00129669</td>
<td>352.0771352</td>
<td>566.8441877</td>
<td>0.00107339</td>
<td>291.4459511</td>
<td>469.22798135</td>
<td>0.00020544</td>
<td>55.781077</td>
<td>89.8075327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>7.92127118</td>
<td>2150783.55</td>
<td>3462761.515</td>
<td>7.09144244</td>
<td>1925468.452</td>
<td>3100004.2080</td>
<td>0.82982866</td>
<td>225315.07</td>
<td>362757.2734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>0.00176687</td>
<td>479.741899</td>
<td>772.3844574</td>
<td>0.00166337</td>
<td>451.6391245</td>
<td>727.13899051</td>
<td>0.0007613</td>
<td>20.672111</td>
<td>33.28209971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **TOTAL AGGREGATED ANNUALISED EMISSIONS TOTAL (ALL CLASSES)** 33,451,496.15 g
- **TOTAL ANNUALISED GREY FLEET MILEAGE COST (at HMRC standard rate of 0.45p per mile)** £55,077.53
3 EVALUATION OF THE 2010 TRAVEL PLAN BASED ON THE 2015 TRAVEL SURVEY

3.1 Objectives of the 2010 Travel Plan

- To capture commuter and business travel data for carbon foot printing purposes in order to satisfy the Planning Process and set the baseline for future reductions;
- To improve the choice of transport options and facilities available to staff, students and visitors travelling to, from, and between University sites;
- To implement travel initiatives through behaviour change that reduce transport-related emissions and thus meet our strategic targets to reduce the environmental impact of the University’s travel demand locally, nationally and globally;
- To reduce the use of single occupancy vehicles by staff travelling to and from and between, University sites and increase the use of cycling, walking and public transport use;
- To promote more sustainable ways of working;
- To improve the health and fitness of staff and students through the promotion of walking and cycling;
- To make changes to University vehicles to reduce their environmental impact.
3.2 Specific targets of the 2010 Travel Plan and progress made

By the end of 2015, with the proposed initiatives, the University in the 2010 Travel Plan will:

- Raise awareness of sustainable travel options open to University staff, students and visitors;

  The results of the 2015 Travel Survey, with the reduction in single car drivers, is testimony to awareness levels being raised. A visit to www.le.ac.uk/offices/estates/environment/travel reflects the wealth of information and options for staff and students to travel more sustainably.

- Reduce the carbon impact of University travel by 35%;

  It is impossible to provide a definitive measure on carbon generated by University staff students on travel between the two years. When it was measured in 2009 for the 2010 Travel Plan, the focus was on staff commuting and the methodology was more simplistic. Five years on there is a greater understanding on all pollutants, not just CO₂.

  The approach taken in 2015 reflects a more advanced approach to measuring those pollutants from travel impacting adversely not only on global warming but also on local health through vehicle emissions. However, the methodology employed to calculate emissions in this document has remained directly comparable as all CO₂ calculations are based on the same DEFRA endorsed methodology.

  - The 2010 result for CO₂ analysis placed annualised CO₂ emissions at **2477.30 tonnes** per annum. Calculated from a baseline of 2408 respondents (un-factorised – the result of 3870.78 given in the 2010 technical note is factorised for the entire University Staff population).

  - The 2015 result for CO₂ analysis placed annualised CO₂ emissions at **647.41 tonnes** per annum. Calculated from a baseline of 1370 respondents.

    The difference in response rates between 2010 and 2015 is 54.95% in favour of 2010. Therefore, when we factorise our CO₂ results by 54.95% in order to produce comparable figures.

      **1003.16 tonnes** is the 2015 factorised figure for comparison (equalising the two response rates). This represents a **40.5% reduction** in staff commuting emissions for CO₂. This could be due to a number of factors – including the introduction of EuroCAT 6 rated vehicles in September 2014 and the large difference in sample sizes between the two studies.

- Reduce single occupancy vehicle trips amongst staff to 34% (from 49%) and students to 3% (from 9%) (a target set by Leicester City Council);

  Single occupancy trips by staff have reduced to 37% and for students to 5%. Though the stretching targets have not been reached, the results show the progress made and the potential to reach and exceed these figures based on further travel behaviour change.

- Increase regular bus users;

  Bus use has increased for both staff and students. If you include the Hospital Hopper, 18% of staff use the bus and 18% of students as their predominant mode.
• Increase the number of staff cycling and walking to our sites.

For staff, cycling and walking to work, has never been higher with 32% of staff (from 25%). For students, 69% for students (from 67%).
### 3.3 2015 compared to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>2608</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor bike</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car - solo</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car - with pass</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car - as pass</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus (not HH)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Hopper</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff - main mode of travel for commuting

- 2009: Walk 16%, Cycle 49%, Car - solo 20%
- 2011: Walk 18%, Cycle 45%, Car - solo 23%
- 2012: Walk 11%, Cycle 38%, Car - solo 20%
- 2013: Walk 18%, Cycle 45%, Car - solo 21%
- 2015: Walk 11%, Cycle 37%, Car - solo 20%

- 2009: Car - with pass 9%, Car - as pass 9%
- 2011: Car - with pass 6%, Car - as pass 9%
- 2012: Car - with pass 5%, Car - as pass 9%
- 2013: Car - with pass 6%, Car - as pass 8%
- 2015: Car - with pass 6%, Car - as pass 8%

- 2009: Bus (not HH) 1%, Hospital Hopper 0%, Train 0%
- 2011: Bus (not HH) 1%, Hospital Hopper 0%, Train 0%
- 2012: Bus (not HH) 1%, Hospital Hopper 0%, Train 0%
- 2013: Bus (not HH) 1%, Hospital Hopper 0%, Train 0%
- 2015: Bus (not HH) 2%, Hospital Hopper 0%, Train 0%
Students - main mode of travel to campus

- Walk
- Cycle
- Motor bike
- Car - solo
- Car - with pass
- Car - as pass
- Bus (not HH)
- Hospital Hopper
- Train
What trends have there been on staff business travel

There have been some significant changes on business travel between 2009 and 2015. They are as follows:

- Inter site travel – there are two trends to report:
  
  o Trip making has increased. For staff surveyed in 2009, 73% stated they ‘never’ or ‘rarely’ undertook inter-site travel. In 2015, this figure had reduced to 57%. Why the change? A key factor will have been the opening of Brookfield in the last year as a new centre for where staff are based. Previously many of them worked on the main campus. Brookfield, a new staff location for 2015, generated the 3rd largest volume of any university location of inter-site trips. Of trips made from Brookfield, 69% of these were to the main campus. In 2009 these journeys were not needed to be made, as the staff were already based on the main campus. To further reinforce the impact of Brookfield on staff, just 11% in the 2015 survey stated they ‘never’ or ‘rarely’ undertook inter-site travel. The sample size at Brookfield was reasonable (n. 79).

  o There has been a reduction in the number of solo car drivers from 31% (2009) to 17% (2015) with compensating increases in walking and cycling. Part of this reduction will indirectly be due to the opening of Brookfield. Though Brookfield has generated more inter-site travel, many of these are of a length to the main campus which are walk and cycle friendly. Consequently the mode split will have been favourably impacted upon.

- Impact of Brookfield on time cost and carbon cost – the relocating of some University staff and functions to Brookfield from a travel perspective will have had an adverse impact on time and carbon cost, given that they are now undertaking trips to the main campus that in 2009 did not incur these costs. It is impossible to place precise figures on these as once you start to drill down into the data, the sample sizes are small. However here is a summary from the 79 Brookfield staff who participated in the 2015 travel survey:
  
  o They are making an estimated 47 trips per week to the main campus.
  o 89% of all the trips to main campus were walked or cycled. Consequently the carbon impact is fairly minimal.
  o What is more significant is the time cost. The 47 trips per week (assuming return journeys between Brookfield and the main campus) equate to around 560 hours over the course of a year i.e. 1/3rd of the hours of a full-time employee. In reality the amount of time and cost will be greater, as these estimates are purely based on staff participating in the travel survey. They have not been scaled up to reflect the total staff count at Brookfield.
• Business travel within Leicester to non-University sites – reduction in number of solo car drivers from 38% (2009) to 24% (2015)

• Business travel (Midlands) – reduction in solo car drivers from 42% (2009) to 27% (2015)

• International business travel – reduction in number of staff travelling internationally from 21% (2009) to 18% (2015)

A lot of these positive changes will have been assisted by a more restrictive car parking policy and greater support for more sustainable travel e.g. pool bikes at Brookfield

Is the travel distance of non-hall based students changing?

There is a change from the 2009 travel survey. Based on extracting those based in halls of residence from all the students surveyed, you can compare travel distances between the two years. Here they are for non-hall based students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from main campus</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 miles</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 miles</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 miles</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distance travelled by non-hall based students is showing an increase in the distance travelled, particularly between 2 to 5 miles. This in part will have impacted on travel options chosen and provides part of the explanation for why a decrease in cycling.

Why has student cycling decreased?

7% of travel to campus represents a decrease from 2009 (when it was 11%). In Leicester as a city, cycling has been increasing in popularity by around 10% each year for this period. Why has the reduction taken place in student cycling? Here are some factors to consider:

• There has been a transfer to more walking from cycling – walking is now 62% of student travel to campus. It was 56% in 2009.

• Average travel distances to campus have increased, in part influenced by more dispersed journey origins. Some of this is detailed in the section above. 38% of student journeys for those not in halls are journeys of 2 miles or more in 2015.

• Appetite and opportunity for cycling has decreased – the proportion of students that would state they cannot or will not cycle has increased from 46% in 2009 to 56% in 2015

• Perceived quality of infrastructure – when students were asked what would encourage students to cycle more the number 1 response in 2015 was ‘improved cycle routes’. In 2009 this was the 3rd choice. In the eyes of students, the quality of the cycle network has deteriorated, perhaps influenced by the heightened awareness of safety concerns.
3.4 Travel Plan Initiatives from 2010 to 2015

3.4.1 Car

Available in 2010:
- Contractors’ permit scheme
- Car share scheme
  - Lift Budi register to enable staff to find a match – Now Liftshare and myPTP
  - Free car share permits for passengers
  - Dedicated car share spaces
- Additional off-campus car parking – originally 180 spaces provided close to Main Campus

Secured:
- Car share spaces in priority locations
- Pay & Display car parking – probably going to increase with the pedestrianisation of main campus
- Increased & improved motorbike parking
- Flexi-permits
- New permit scheme in September 2011
- Member of LeicesterShare, the car share scheme across Leicester and Leicestershire

To be developed / not progressed / about to go live:
- Car hire discounts with Europcar and Sixt (via Smartgo Leicester)

3.4.2 Cycling / Walking

Available in 2010:
- Green travel map – we now use the Leicester bike map
  - Bikeability map showing colour-coded routes around the University sites
  - We have a walking map around and from Oadby for students
- Interactive online map showing bike and shower facility locations – being updated
- Cycle to work scheme - Tax-free bike scheme for staff
- Bicycle Users Group re-launched
  - Now a vibrant, active online community of cyclists sharing information, advice and discussion
- Dr Bike Sessions
  - Once per term – making bikes safer and swifter for staff & students
  - Continuation of cycle coding scheme and discounted D locks for staff and students – could be discontinued due to cutbacks. I’m trying to persuade otherwise

Secured during last 5 years:
- Bike Park (beneath the David Wilson Library) – with 300 bike spaces
- Bike discounts with local bike shops e.g. eBike Centre, Billy’s Bespoke Cycles
- Pool bikes for Brookfield
- Improved shower facilities – yes in new builds/refurbs
  - Additional bike storage at MSB, Hodgkin, Adrian, Percy Gee and North Campus
  - Bike maintenance workshops for staff
To be progressed:
✓ Cycle discounts of 10% with Cycle Solutions online shop
✓ Pool bike scheme at main campus with complimentary ebike bid through Smartgo Leicester

3.4.3 Bus
Available in 2010:
• Bus discounts for staff - on multi-trip tickets on Arriva and Centrebus
• Additional bus services
  o number 80/81 buses, including the bendy buses to cope with high demand
  o University logo on buses (Fresher friendly)

Secured during the last 5 years
✓ Free Hospital Hopper for all staff
✓ Arriva introduced wifi on buses

3.4.4 Rail
Available in 2010:
• Rail discounts - 10% discount on East Midlands Trains annual season tickets

To be progressed:
✓ Rail discounts with 10% off CrossCountry Advance tickets (via Smartgo Leicester)
✓ Discounted railcards with 15% off 16-25, Two Together, Family & Friends and Senior (via Smartgo Leicester)

3.4.5 General
Available in 2010:
✓ Travel website - Regularly updated with the very latest travel offers, initiatives and advice
✓ Travel Options Booklets
✓ Travel Plan partnerships established - First meeting of the area travel plan group taken place
✓ Green Fleet audit

Secured:
• Improved pedestrian and cycle access for Central Campus – with redesign of area around Mayors Walk
• Part of Local Sustainable Transport Fund 2 Leicester programme – securing inclusion in the programme area now provides access to additional travel planning support and resources (including grants) through to 31st March 2016
• Smartgo Leicester – key member of network and new Central Travel Hub (grouping of major employers in and around centre of Leicester with Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Councils). There are now 181 staff members who are registered users of Smartgo Leicester. Two years ago there were none. The plans going forward, with enhancements to travel offers and stronger promotion, should result in continued growth.
• Free use of MyPTP – a tool to assist personal journey planning via Leicester City Council
• Sustainable Travel Challenge – a rewards programme for travelling sustainably promoted to staff and students. The scheme is co-ordinated by Leicester City Council.
• New University strategy for main campus to be pedestrian-priority
4 RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Carbon reporting

Additional data and calculation steps can be employed to increase the accuracy and granularity of the calculation. These are the recommendations:

- Increase accuracy of in work mileage claims through fuel carding, mandatory reporting or car club telematics. This could then provide an absolute measure on distance travelled or fuel burnt.

- Increase purity of information fed into the working model through breaking single occupancy car journeys into link types (i.e. local urban/country/trunk/etc. routes) and applying speed limits to each section (assume free flowing conditions) throughout trip routing for each staff member. This will provide greater accuracy of both distance and speed – these results are multiplied against the Defra fuel type co-efficiencies and EuroCAT ratings of vehicle age and engine capacity.

- Conduct speed surveys along example link types and use these average speeds to perform calculation based on routing and link type of staff to work journeys. This will provide even more accurate ‘real world’ journey time data and therefore by inference speed data for the Defra co-efficiency multiplication methodology.

4.2 Asks of the local authority

To continue the success of the University of Leicester Travel Plan, buy-in from other key stakeholders will be required; namely Leicester City Council in its role as transport authority and the public transport operators, both bus and rail. Engagement with these stakeholders needs to be mindful of the objectives they are seeking to achieve.

Leicester City Council through its Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2011-2026 ‘Planning for people not cars’ expresses objectives that resonate with the University of Leicester Travel Plan. Here are the transport objectives of the LTP:

- To reduce congestion and improve journey times
- To improve connectivity and access
- To Improve Safety, Security and Health
- To improve air quality and reduce noise
- To reduce carbon emissions
- Manage to better maintain transport assets
- To improve quality of life

Engagement with Leicester City Council needs to focus on how their support of the University of Leicester can help them achieve their objectives. This can be reinforced by the sheer scale of travel generated by the University and its strong engagement with other major employers through the Smartgo Leicester network.

What now follows is a summary of the ‘asks’ generated by this review.
**Leicester City Council call to action**

- To be provided with non-confidential data to review the market potential of more cross-city bus services
- For the earliest introduction of smart ticketing at a competitive price, to enable one ticket travel across all bus operators
- To be provided with non-confidential data to be fed into the rail franchise renewal process, to help influence greater train capacity and flexibility on ticketing
- To enhance cycle routes in and around the campus.

4.3 Asks of the public transport operators

Transport operators, as in many parts of the UK, operate as commercial entities. Bus operators deliver services in deregulated environment; there are indications that this may change with local authorities, particularly those with a City Mayor like Leicester, having the opportunity to more directly influence local transport provision. However the current reality is bus operators such as Arriva, Centrebus and First have a freedom to operate services where they wish and with a high level of control on fares charged. Dialogue with bus operators need to focus on the commercial opportunity and understand they come from a position of being risk averse. This disposition is in part based knowing that annual costs of running just a single decker / double decker are typically £150,000 per annum. Their default in any discussions will be to have any financial risk removed.

**Bus company call to action – primary Arriva**

- To be provided with non-confidential data to make the business case for enhancements to the commercial bus network and ticketing options
- For the earliest introduction of smart ticketing, to enable one ticket travel across all bus operators

Train operators do operate in a more regulated environment. The two train operators that serve Leicester, CrossCountry and East Midlands Trains, do so because they were successful at the last round of franchise bidding. Fares to a large extent are controlled through the rail regulator though there is a little flexibility, as demonstrated through their provision of discounts for Smartgo Leicester.

**Train operator call to action – primary Cross Country and East Midlands Trains**

- To be provided with non-confidential data to review the opportunity to offer stronger commercial incentives
4.4 Internal priorities

Much has been achieved by the University of Leicester over the last 5 years since the 2010 Travel Plan. To maintain progress, it will need to sustain much of what is currently in place and build on it. Here are a summary of the actions based on the results of the 2015 Travel Survey and reflections on the 2010 Travel Plan.

**University call to action**

**Infrastructure / resources**
- Enhancing showers/lockers across the sites
- Use the planned changes to University Road as an opportunity to enhance cycle routes
- To review the opportunity for a pool bike scheme
- Investigate scheme to promote/assist with sharing petrol costs for journey sharing by car
- Enhance the accessibility of conferencing facilities
- To enhance future carbon reporting, provide a travel option for business travel not reliant on grey fleet e.g. car club, pool bikes

**Marketing / communication**
- Further promotion of the package of bus, cycling, car hire and train discounts
- Further promotion of the University Bike Park
- Promote the current bus network to help address the current lack of awareness
- To undertake campaigns focused on the cost benefits of sustainable travel
- To grow where possible the campaigns and different approaches to engaging staff and students. With new staff, this to include the recruitment and induction process
- To promote the conferencing facilities to staff
- Undertake a car sharing promotion for staff, raising the awareness of the scale of interest and means to undertake
- Promote those wanting to car share to those that are already car sharing car drivers
- Identify walking champions in the areas where there is interest for staff to switch to walking

**Policy and procedures**
- For a pro-active approach to sustainable travel in the recruitment and induction of staff
- To continue to raise the cost of car parking permits to become benefit neutral to staff
- To review the home working policy and promote to staff
- To review the policy and process on how business mileage is recorded as part of its scope 3 reporting
- To enhance future carbon reporting, introduce use of fuel cards, mandatory reporting and in-car telematics

**Partnership**
- To continue to seek to secure travel discounts working through partnerships such as Smartgo Leicester
- Continue to campaign for enhanced bus links and discounts for travel to campus
- Identify collaboration opportunities with like-minded nearby employers
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