

*COST Action TU 1002 - "Accessibility instruments for planning practice in Europe"
Torino, Italy, the 16th and 17th of February, 2012*

Turin, 23rd February 2012

Scientific Report

The management Committee meeting of the COST Action *TU 1002 - "Accessibility instruments for planning practice in Europe"* held several sessions for scientific, strategic, operational and administrative discussion.

On the first day (16th of February) Cecília Silva, chair of the Action, and Cristina Pronello, chair of TUD domain Committee, welcomed all participants and introduced the discussion.

During the first session Franco Corsico (former alderman of the City of Turin responsible of planning and transport) presented the on-going transformation on the urban and railway system in Turin.

The scientific session, chaired by Cecilia Silva, started with a presentation titled "From Mobility to accessibility planning: the role of evaluation tools" held by Jonathan Levine, invited keynote speaker, who described the big misunderstanding in urban planning: considering mobility a synonymous of accessibility. At the opposite, mobility is just one mean to reach accessibility: planners must also considerate proximity and connectivity. The intervention was followed by a short debate.

Angela Hull (manager of WG2) introduced the upgrades and the progress from the Edinburgh meeting (Oct 2011) concerning WG2 and the tasks to be tackled by 2013.

Saleem Karou and Johannes Kelller illustrated the Literature review and some study cases concerning the use of accessibility instruments in planning.

Cecilia Silva and Enrica Papa defined the general characteristics of the accessibility instruments developed within COST Action TU1002, showing the results of the online survey.

Luca Bertolini introduced the afternoon session focused on the practical application of accessibility instruments.

Ron Bos, invited keynote speaker, presented some experiences regarding the use of accessibility instruments in the Netherlands and detailed how accessibility instruments can help decision makers to answer political, economic and popular issues. The intervention was followed by a large debate.

Marco te Brömmelstroet, Manager of WG3, illustrated the work of WG3 and proposed to tackle usability of accessibility instruments in planning practice: the WG3 will concentrate on developing protocol on how to (interactively) present the instruments to local practitioners and on developing protocol to collect perspectives on usability of these instruments.

Retracing the experience of Kuopio, in Finland, Raine Mäntysalo illustrated issues and proposals for structuring workshops.

Carey Curtis got into the workshop organization, defining the 3 phases: pre-workshop survey, participant observation, participant debrief/semistructured focus group.

A large discussion followed the interventions.

The second day (17th February), held parallel working sessions for WG2 and WG3 in the morning.

The WG2 had a common discussion followed by work in thematic sub-groups; the WG3 shared progress on the protocol and took decision on the next steps in a unique general session.

During the afternoons, both on Friday and on Thursday, the MC discussed and decided several administrative issues, such as the choice of the leader of WG4, the participation of new Countries (Austria and Turkey) in the Action, the creation of Junior Research Network and a summer training week, next year's venue etc...

Matteo Tabasso
(Local Organiser)