



Accessibility Instruments  
for Planning Practice

## Working Unit

**The implications of the development of  
a new mega-leisure facility on the  
accessibility of South Madrid**

Madrid  
Spain



POLITÉCNICA

- **Workshop already done. Date: 17 May 2013**
- **Working Group members:**
  - Enrique Calderón                      Rosa Arce
  - Emilio Ortega Pérez                  M<sup>a</sup> Henar Salas-Olmedo
- **Participants:**
  - Silvia Villacañas (Madrid City Council)
  - Manuel Lázaro (Fuenlabrada City Council)
  - Ramón Cuvillo (Consultant on Urban Affairs/UPM)
  - Domingo Martín (Madrid Regional Transport Consortium)
  - Floridea Di Ciomo (TRANSyT: Research Center)



POLITÉCNICA

# Workshop development

- 09.30 Welcome and introduction of the participants.
- 09.40 Explanation about the workshop and research context, and presentation about the local planning context
- 10.00 Presentation about the concept of accessibility mapping
- 10.30 Elaboration of accessibility criteria in relation to the local planning context
- 11.00 Coffee break
- 11.30 Elaboration of accessibility criteria in relation to the local planning context
- 12.30 Plenary discussion
- 13.00 Conclusions and evaluation of the workshop
- 13.45 Post-Workshop Survey
- 14.00 End of workshop



# Conclusions

- Maintenance and eventual improvement of current accessibility levels should be a key goal. This might imply adding new lanes, modifying public transport fees, take advantage of new railway investments, and so on.
- The project will impact accessibility in all modes of transport, thus actions should consider all modes jointly.
- There would be a large variety of uses, which makes transport planning particularly difficult. Intersectorial planning will be a must, and GIS are seen as an adequate tool to integrate information from different sources.



# Conclusions

- Accessibility improvements should be negotiated with prospective developers prior to granting development permits.
- The analysis of accessibility could be enhanced with the inclusion of additional development options planned at a metropolitan/ regional scale in the study area.
- Alternative soft solutions: BUS-HOV lane along A-5 and tourism-linked road pricing.



POLITÉCNICA

# Conclusions

- The suggested indicator (i.e isochrones) is deemed useful, albeit subject to improvements. The main strength is its simplicity and ability to be integrated with other datasets in a GIS. It should have been used prior to making the final location decision, and in relation to urban and regional planning strategies.
- Isochrones must be included in a particular sustainable mobility plan for this development, and it is also a useful tool for other urban sustainable mobility plans as well as for urban and regional planning. It is also useful to identify low accessibility areas.
- There is a need of a better integration of data sources from different departments in order to better analyse land use and mobility needs through a transverse perspective



POLITÉCNICA

# Conclusions

- The suggested indicator (i.e isochrones) is deemed useful, albeit subject to improvements. The main strength is its simplicity and ability to be integrated with other datasets in a GIS. It should have been used prior to making the final location decision, and in relation to urban and regional planning strategies.
- Isochrones must be included in a particular sustainable mobility plan for this development, and it is also a useful tool for other urban sustainable mobility plans as well as for urban and regional planning. It is also useful to identify low accessibility areas.
- There is a need of a better integration of data sources from different departments in order to better analyse land use and mobility needs through a transverse perspective



# Summary of responses to post-workshop survey (I)

- About the session
  - No “strong disagreement” with any question
  - No “disagreement” with any question
  - Three out of four respondents said they “neither agree nor disagree” to question 5
  - Most other respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” to questions





# Summary of responses to post-workshop survey (II)

- About the instrument
- No “strong disagreement” to any question (although I fear a few questions must have been misinterpreted . #32?)
- Responses were rated from “agreement” to “Strong agreement”
- A few questions were responded as “not applicable” by 2 respondents
- Generally speaking the greatest discrepancies came from the representative of a “peripheral” municipality not directly influenced by the proposed development



POLITÉCNICA

# CONCLUSIONS

- Responses may be considered positive towards the usefulness of the session and slightly less so towards the instrument itself
- Isochrones were not considered a highly innovative instrument but some participants admitted they would try to use it in the future



POLITÉCNICA

Gracias  
Thank you