



**Innovative design and operation of new or upgraded  
efficient urban transport interchanges [Theme: SST.2012.3.1-2.]**

## City-HUB Project



### City-HUB Fact Sheet N° 5:

#### Accessibility

Good and bad practices revealed by the City-HUB pilot case studies

## Introduction

Within the City-HUB project, five pilot case studies have been used to assess good and bad practices and improvement potential: Moncloa interchange in Spain, Ilford railway station in the United Kingdom, New railway station of Thessaloniki in Greece, Kamppi terminal in Finland and Kőbánya-Kispest interchange in Hungary. An overview of the pilot case studies is presented in the 2<sup>nd</sup> City-HUB Fact Sheet, entitled: “The City-HUB pilot case studies: An overview”.

For the data collection, a reporting template was designed and developed, enabling comparable answers across cases, but also ensuring that additional topics could be addressed. In order to complete the template, information was gathered using different approaches, such as semi-structured interviews with relevant stakeholders (i.e. terminal owners, transport operators, etc.) and site visits/audits for the calculation of transfer and waiting time between modes and the illustration of good and bad practices (Christiansen et al., 2013).

The scope of this fact sheet is to present good and bad practices, under the topic “*Accessibility*”, as they were revealed by the investigation of the five pilot case studies.

## Good practices revealed by the City-HUB pilot case studies

Table 1 presents selected examples of good practices regarding **accessibility** under three pillars: “accessibility for walking and cycling”, “accessibility for public transport” and “access for all”. A representative good practice for each pillar is given below.

**Table 1: Selected examples of good practices** (Christiansen et al., 2013)

Practice	Case study/studies that the practice was revealed by	Why is it a good practice?
<i>Bike and ride</i>	Kőbánya-Kispest offers bike and ride facilities which are covered and also have signs along cycle paths. On weekdays the utilization is about 50%. Ilford also has some cycling parking options within or close to the interchange. For instance, they have eight spaces for cycle parking which is under cover and monitored by closed circuit television systems.	A cycle journey starts and stops with parking. It is therefore of great importance to provide and then promote facilities for cycle parking. Lack of secure parking for bikes is often a barrier for promoting cycling. Establishing cycle paths that separate cycles and cars also promotes cycling and is an important supplementary strategy for intermodal journeys.
<i>Dedicated tunnels for buses</i>	Moncloa interchange in Madrid has dedicated access tunnels for buses that ensure fast access to and from the interchange for those travelling by bus. This has increased the attractiveness of buses compared to cars, and it has also increased the interchange's ability to attract bus companies to the interchange. The Kamppi interchange in Helsinki also provides public transport lanes while access by car is limited.	Fast access for public transport to urban interchanges increases the joint level of service level of trips performed by the different modes.
<i>Access for all</i>	Moncloa has implemented a range of measures in order to promote an interchange which is convenient, safe, rapid and free of obstacles. Such measures cover design, signs, evacuation, vertical movement between floors and special measures for the visually impaired. At Kőbánya-Kispest interchange, signs and information are made accessible for people with visual impairments. For example boarding buttons emit a low frequency sound which indicates that the bus is ready to load passengers.	Making transport systems accessible for all people is an important part of achieving an inclusive society. In many countries it is also a high political priority to design transport systems for all. An accessible transport system for all is important because it will benefit all user groups, contributing to equality for all.

## Bad practices revealed by the City-HUB pilot case studies

Table 2 presents selected examples of bad practices regarding **accessibility** that were identified when investigating the pilot case studies. The first example regards “accessibility for walking and cycling” and the second “access for all”.

**Table 2: Selected examples of bad practices** (Christiansen et al., 2013)

Practice	Case study/studies that the practice was revealed by	Why is it a bad practice?
<i>Insufficient cycling facilities</i>	Cycle parking facilities on the platform at Ilford are seemingly covered by closed circuit television systems, but still may be unsecure. Moncloa has space for only ten bicycles and these are not protected from weather. In addition, there is only one cycle path to the interchange.	Transport interchanges play a significant role in the whole network along with the spatial urban development. The absence of facilities promoting soft modes of transport, such as cycling and walking, scant the update of the interchanges and the promotion of sustainable urban development.
<i>Lack for access for all</i>	Ilford currently has particular challenges for people with disabilities. Travelers need to walk downstairs in order to reach the platforms. There are lifts to the platforms, but these are all broken and cannot be fixed due to a lack of parts currently being available. Kőbánya-Kispest faces a slightly different challenge, with only partial barrier free access, since the railway station was not refurbished and therefore is not accessible by those with mobility issues. In addition, there are some missing lifts and escalators to a number of the bus platforms.	An interchange should be accessible by all. Barriers affecting the smooth physical movement of people with disabilities, as they were observed in Ilford and Kőbánya-Kispest interchanges, should be eliminated.

## Conclusion

Five European pilot case studies have been used to assess good and bad practices regarding accessibility, in terms of walking and cycling, public transport and access for all. The evaluation results showed that specific issues should be considered when designing, developing and operating an urban interchange, such as (Christiansen et al., 2013):

- Providence for people with reduced mobility, i.e. in the case of the Thessaloniki railway station.
- Provision of sufficient cycling parking and consideration of the design of the surrounding area as part of a master planning process, i.e. in the Ilford railway station.
- Provision of better multi languages facilities, i.e. in the Moncloa interchange.
- Provision of audio services for visually impaired people, i.e. in the case of Kamppi terminal.
- Establishment of barrier free access, i.e. in the Kőbánya-Kispest interchange.

## References

Christiansen, P. , Andersen, J., Hernández, S., Di Ciommo, F., Monzon, A., Sánchez, N., Su, T., Sanchez, X., Harmer, H., Millard, K., Jones, J., Nathanail, E., Adamos, G., Tsami, M., Kostianen, J., Järvi, T., Vilkmán, A., Keserű, I., Pusztai, A., Vörös, A., 2013. City-HUB project, Deliverable D2.3 Lessons from descriptive case studies – recommendations for City-HUB model.