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Information sources for the analysis

“Country Reports” submitted by partners are not complete or uniform

- Contents clearly reflect professional background or interests of reporter or organization
- The whole country report was considered and not only the specific section (pedestrian situation)
- Other sources (web, various docs, personal knowledge) used to fill gaps
- Impressions are subjective and qualified
Pedestrians’ annoyances are universal

- **Pavement** condition- uneven, slippery, puddles
- Refuse or dog droppings on the pavement
- Pavements too narrow
- Street furniture and utilities clutter or partially block the path
- Intrusive trading
- Parked cars, bikes on pedestrian pavement
- Street / road works, building and maintenance
- **Difficulty of crossing** –too much too fast traffic, street too wide, no visibility, obstacles to direct crossing, inconvenient under / over passes
- Drivers do not slow or stop at pedestrian crossings
- Cars park on a pedestrian crossing
- Traffic lights- interrupted crossing, long waiting, short green
- **Walking inconvenienced** by lack of amenities, lack of lighting
- Lack of walking- specific guidance

---

What matters to pedestrians compared to pyramid

**Definition of needs**
Common issues of concern to professionals

- Discontinuity of walking networks
- Suburbia and spread rural communities dependent on cars
- Lack of high standard PT, hindering walking
- Sharing space or time with bicycles on paths or at junctions
- Motorcycles, mopeds (& bicycles) safety risk to pedestrians
- Aging population requires upgrading infrastructure for pedestrians
- Attitude and behaviour of drivers (speed, right of way, intimidation)
- Backlash of drivers against restrictions because of “too much” pro pedestrian policies
- Demographic and social shifts may reduce the interest in walking or biking or both
- High rise dwellings may cause a lifestyle less attracted to biking or walking
- Walking still takes back seat on transport / economic agenda

Addressing annoyances is not sufficient

The “common pedestrian” has narrow perspective?
Or perhaps not asked?
The promotion of
walking / cycling network,
integration with public transport,
quality walkways and amenities,
attractive public space,
people focused urban / community plan,
good access to cars and parking without disrupting pedestrian space
requires
professional vision,
government policies,
organized interest- groups
linking with other objectives and their supporters
Synergy with other policies & interest groups

- Disabled, children need protection, old people
- Environment & Energy - emissions (clean air, global warming), sustainable, noise reduction
- Land use and planning policies
- Public Transport, cycling, inter-modality
- Education or health - walking to school, walking is healthy
- Urban renewal projects - social and urban cohesion
- New Urbanism, architects and planners
- Tourism promotion, preserving historic centers and old towns
- A pedestrian group lobbying a local issue may stand better chance than promoting a general issue

One should choose partners wisely
### Nature of official policy guidelines & Concerns of national pedestrian action groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Action groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement, crossings, control devices, road- user regulations, concern with safety, right-of-way, pedestrians’ basic needs</td>
<td>AT, BE, CH, HE, CZ, FR, FI, DE, IL, NL, NO, SE, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility, walking is transport, traffic calming, car-free zones concern with pedestrians needs, preferences &amp; rights, walking and cycling networks,</td>
<td>AT, BE, CH, FR, FI, DE, NL, NO, SE, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Transport Planning policies Concern with quality of public space, urban landscape, beyond</td>
<td>AT, BE, CH, FI, DE, IT, NL, SE, UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrian situation according to “Rob criteria”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator level</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture of walking and live streets</td>
<td>CZ, FI, HE, IL</td>
<td>BE, FR, NL, SE, UK</td>
<td>AT, CH, DE, IT, ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position in traffic and transport</td>
<td>CZ, HE, IL, IT, ES</td>
<td>BE, FR, NL, SE, UK</td>
<td>AT, CH, FI, DE, IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial and environmental conditions (infrastructure)</td>
<td>CZ, HE, IL, ES</td>
<td>BE, FI, FR, IT, SE, UK</td>
<td>AT, CH, DE, NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position in the official &amp; political arena</td>
<td>CZ, HE, IL, ES</td>
<td>FR, IT, NL</td>
<td>AT, BE, CH, FI, DE, NL, SE, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount and variety of active practitioners advancing walking</td>
<td>CZ, HE, IL, IT, BE</td>
<td>FI, FR, ES</td>
<td>CH, DE, NL, SE, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media attention and public opinion</td>
<td>HE, IL, IT, ES</td>
<td>CZ, CH, DE, FI, NL</td>
<td>AT, BE, FR, SE, UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subjective Overview of Pedestrian Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work in pedestrian safety countermeasures, RS education, black spots, may have model towns, may promote walking as a rightful transport mode</th>
<th>HE, CZ, IL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic crossing and walking needs recognized and largely satisfied, many communities have calmed zones, provision of walking &amp; cycling paths, beginning of local land use policies sensitive to walking</td>
<td>BE, FR, IT, NO, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking recognized as important mode of transport and human need, infrastructure accommodating in many communities, traffic calming very popular, planning policies consider walking, more public and political support needed</td>
<td>AT, CH, FI, DE, NL, SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors influencing perceived “pedestrian situation”

- Extent of effective application of traffic calmed zones (20-30 km) +
- Implementing of calmed zones beyond residential areas +
- General speed reduction in areas where people walk and cross +
- Actions or resistance by other interest groups and lobbies + –
- Pedestrian / bicycle conflicts over space –
- Competing mobility trends e.g. shopping malls, private schools –
- Perceived threat of traffic and personal security of walking –
- Many “nice” policies and plans are not implemented for lack of political or public support and, consequently, lack of funding –
- Pedestrians, walking, public space are on the political agenda and in the media +
- Subjective assessment may be more critical when actual standards are high and so are expectations (e.g. FI, CH, NL)
It's all relative