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Introduction

- Autonomous mobility is a precondition for social inclusion
- The transport system and the design of public space has to meet the requirements of various user groups
- 25 to 40% have a reduced access to the mobility system in Austria
Objectives

- Comparison of mobility pattern of potentially mobility impaired persons
- Information on:
  - experiences in outdoor environment
  - problems and subjective perceived degree of impairment
  - needs and requirements concerning mobility
- Implication for transport and urban planning
Methodology

In 450 personal interviews persons with one of the following characteristics were surveyed:

- Physical or sensory impairment
- Difficulties in reading and/or writing and in understanding the national language
- Risk of poverty
- Single parents and families with 3 or more children
- Aged over 74 years
Methodology

Selection of groups (n=12)

Recruitment
Mix of methods

Personal in-depth Interviews (n=450)

Information on trips of 2 days

Subjective perception of impairment

Restraints and barriers
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Mobility Pattern – Trips per day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Trips per working day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair users</td>
<td>2.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired ability to walk</td>
<td>3.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>3.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually impaired</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired hearing</td>
<td>2.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>2.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing language knowledge</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents with 3+ children</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parents</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor or in risk of poverty</td>
<td>3.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria 1995</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* marked figures are significantly different to those of Austrian Population
Mobility Pattern – Trip length and duration

with * marked figures are significantly different to those of Austrian Population
Mobility Pattern – Modal Split

with * marked figures are significantly different to those of Austrian Population
Conclusions

- Mobility behaviour is different from the behaviour of average persons
- Less trips per day, lower distances but travel time is longer
- High share of public transport
- Persons with less differing mobility patterns feel subjectively impaired
Problems

- Barriers in the build environment
- Missing boundaries between areas of different usage
- Street crossings
- Mobile or unexpected obstacles in public space
- Long distances
- Other traffic participants
Fields of action

1. Planning processes

2. Improvement of information and its provision

3. Awareness raising
Planning processes

- Spatially inclusive and comprehensive infrastructure following the principle of short ways;
- Implementation of the principles of barrier-free access,
- Participation of people with mobility impairing characteristics in planning processes;
- Adjustment of street design, pavement size and lowering, ramps, construction side safety, traffic signals, etc.
Information and its provision

- Information on public transport and unexpected obstacles,
  - Easy understandable,
  - Standardised signs, signals and guidance systems,
  - Reliable, real-time and multilingual information,
  - Pre-trip and on-trip information,
- New technologies have a high potential to help persons in focus of the study,
Awareness raising

- Awareness campaigns for policy and decision makers,
- Participation of the groups concerned in the development of standards and in planning processes,
- Raise the public awareness on the needs of disabled people and help to reduce fears and distances
- Training disabled people to communicate their needs self-confidently to other citizens as well as to policy and decision makers.
Conclusions

- Differences in mobility indicators show disparity in chances to participate in everyday life
- Problems are well known and measures and standards exist
- Implementation of measures has to be fostered
- Consider all groups with problems in mobility
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