## Project-Level Event Report

The individual event reports are available separately as part of D 3.3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of the events:</th>
<th>☐ D 3.3.2 – Training course to a wider audience</th>
<th>☑ D 3.3.3 – Interactive workshop to a professional audience</th>
<th>☐ D 5.3.4 – Final interactive workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>Development Centre of the Heart of Slovenia, Municipality of Nyíregyháza City with County Rank, Municipality of Oradea, SRC BISTRA PTUJ, Regional Development Agency of the Pilsen Region, City of Valjevo, City of Varaždin, Municipality of Varna, Municipality of Weiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the cities:</td>
<td>Kamnik, Nyíregyháza, Oradea, Ptuj, Stříbro, Valjevo, Varaždin, Varna, Weiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries:</td>
<td>Slovenia, Hungary, Romania, Czech Republic, Serbia, Croatia, Bulgaria, Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of events:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants:</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agenda of the workshop and methods used:

The workshops took three main forms:

- **Presentations** about
  - the CityWalk project (main objectives, target groups, key activities, expected results, etc.); and
  - the current traffic situation in the city (i.e. the present state of pedestrian, cycling and public transport infrastructure);

- **Interactive discussions** to find the most pressing problems in the city and also appropriate solutions to them; and

- **Field work** (e.g. walkshops, walkability audits). The approach was different compared to the awareness-raising workshops due to the target group: the goal was to invite **professionals** in the field of architecture, urban design, road construction, traffic security, spatial planning and communication – and as many local policy- and decision-makers as possible. Their gathered input served as a counterpoint to the local citizens’.
### Key findings and conclusions:

| **Traffic barriers** | narrow and low-quality sidewalks, with parking cars taking up a lot of space;  
| | low level of accessibility for the disabled; and  
| | a need for traffic calming measures (e.g. speed limits – 30 km/h).  
| **Traffic safety** | too many shared spaces (and potential spaces for conflict) between pedestrians and cyclists;  
| | fast-changing green lights at pedestrian crossings (with long waiting times); and  
| | a need for local and regional campaigns about traffic safety and responsibility.  
| **Public transport** | outdated schedules and routes, not conforming to the changing city structure;  
| | lack of passenger information (e.g. no easily manageable mobile application);  
| | lack of a P&R and B&R systems; and  
| | a need for procuring new environmentally friendly vehicles.  
| **Transport culture and mindset** | awareness-raising and education to change the behaviour of people; and  
| | no local rules to determine what kind of concept a new transport investment should adhere to (with a focus on walkability).  

All in all, on the local and regional level, the main issues regarding walkability are of an infrastructural nature. Based on the above-mentioned problems and solutions, the **Local Walkability Strategies** were outlined in every partner city.

### Methodology

| **What worked well?** | The framework of the workshop worked really well – communication was effective among all participants. The experts had a lot of useful comments and they were actively involved in the discussions about the Local Walkability Strategies of the cities, sharing their ideas freely in the friendly atmosphere. |
| **What could be improved?** | Regarding the participants, it would have been a good idea to: |
| • **confront** the solutions proposed by the experts with **the local citizens** in another meeting; and  
| • engage **more media representatives** to make the workshops and the CityWalk project more visible. |