

Kalmar peer review report

Reviewed city: Kalmar Kommun

City representatives: Mr. Robert Dahlström Project Manager, Ms. Fanny Ramström Urban Planner, Björn Strimfors City Architect, Mr. Johan Wendell Head of Department Community Planning and Development, Mr. Thomas Eidrup Bicycle strategist

Reviewers: Michael Abraham observer from TUB, Esther Kreutz observer from UBC, Kasper Alev City of Tartu, Kristina Gaučė city of Vilnius, Aušra Sičiūnienė city of Vilnius, Max Müller and Martin Steensrup Guldborgsund municipality

Date of the peer review: 16-17 January 2019

Short description of the scope:

Kalmar needs to respond to the challenges that recent years' rapid growth has caused the city infrastructure. In Kalmar there is a great demand for sustainable transport modes which could decrease car usage and support efficient mobility solutions in a densifying city centre.

As a part of the cities.multimodal project, Kalmar needs to develop a mobility point (MP). The original MP idea of a bike garage at the central station became too expensive and was taken out of the municipal budget. Therefore Kalmar is in a situation where they need to reconsider and investigate new alternatives for a MP.

As a result of the current situation there is an ongoing project which will facilitate the development of a commuter parking near the central island of Kvarnholmen. The peer review focused on the location of the commuter parking with the idea of making it into a MP with a bike sharing system. There is no overarching mobility plan or sustainable urban mobility plan (SUMP) that can facilitate the planning process of a MP.

Description of the site visit

The site visit started with a social dinner on day one where a fair amount of discussions around the history and background of Kalmar was explained and discussed. Day two started with 1,5 hours of theoretical run through of conditions, pros-cons and current status of urban and mobility planning in Kalmar. This was followed by a two hour site visit of the town and discussions circled around both the MP and SUMP. These informal sessions were extremely



The peer review group on site visit
(by Esther Kreutz/UBC)

useful and contained a lot of advice, thoughts, suggestions and solutions. Main outcome concerned the fact that the current plan for MPs needs to be thoroughly revised, such as its purpose, location, equipment and function. As a conclusion of the site visit it was clear that no single above-mentioned parameter meets sufficient quality criteria of cities.multimodal.

The afternoon session was held at the office with a workshop including four more members of staff from Kalmar. The session's targets were to summarize the input that had been given previously during the day also to develop some of the concepts and thoughts.

Description of the peer review workshop

The WHY-question was repeated a lot. The peer reviewers provided Kalmar with a lot of food for thought, the main issue raised was the location of the planned MP. Here follows some of the comments made:

- Location is not great, neighbours get nothing in return but traffic so they need to be a lot more involved in the development.
- No obvious or intuitive way to proceed from here to town, the bus stop is in the opposite end of the parking and in the "wrong" direction when going to town.
- The bike shed of the MP does not protect the bikes from vandalism or theft which reduces citizen's willingness to place their own bikes here.
- Kalmar is probably too small for bike-sharing.
 - Tartu argues that a bike sharing system does not solely depend on an insufficient number of inhabitants, more important is the number of destinations. Would the destinations be equally distributed around Kalmar it would make sense to have a bike-sharing system. By gathering all of the university venues into one campus, it would reduce the number of destinations and could potentially create a clutter of bikes and demand at one destination.



Robert Dahlström presenting the city model (by Esther Kreutz/UBC)

Feedback and recommendations to the host city:

- Adjust parking fees to market level (3-5 times increase)
- Political understanding and support for mobility management is necessary.
- MPs will benefit from constant scrutinizing, question why this and that...
- Big data has been perceived as overrated in other cities.
- Invest time and resources in stakeholder involvement.
- Kalmar should strive to go from good to great in terms of mobility.
- Relocate the central station only if it foments an increase in the amount of commuters.
- Strive for an MP that can realize a change from a less sustainable mode to a more sustainable mode. Avoid change from bus to bike or train to cable car, etc.
- It appears as if the MP is not integrated into the city planning but more so as an add-on to the commuter parking.
- The planned location insufficiently answers the two questions:
 1. Why would anyone change transport mode bus/bike/car/others at the suggested location?
 2. What is the benefit of doing so?
- Specify the reason and role of the current bus stop. It is too close to city centre for change of transport mode. Understanding and specifying the bus stop could be a good method for citizen involvement.
- A bike shed can't provide safe overnight storing of bikes.
- Vilnius argues that it would benefit Kalmar to first develop a SUMP and only then locate an appropriate place for a MP. Having a common vision for the city will help to then decide on concrete measures to reach this vision. The MP should not be built for the purpose of just building a MP → the big picture counts!
- Vilnius suggests:
 1. To bring to the common vision of city planners and to agree that building new parking lots, bridges and etc. leads to even better conditions for cars, is that the goal?
 2. If the location, style and scope of the MP needs to be defined before a SUMP for Kalmar can be realised, the actual benefits of the MP need to be investigated. Should the MP cover the issue of:
 - Transit traffic through certain area or,
 - User needs in the car-free zone (almost car-free) – i.e. the historical part of the city, university campus, new developments in the north with no public transport.
- If the MP would aim at decreasing transit – when parking could be bigger and bike sharing together with PT could work well.
 - If the aim would be to avoid having car traffic in a certain area and using variety of suggested sustainable transport modes, the MP could be quite small, as these in examples below or the ones presented by Angelo Meuleman during the project meeting in Riga:



Examples of mobility points

Learnings for the host city

- A peer review is a fantastic opportunity to swiftly present concepts to people with immediate understanding and with the ability to provide insightful feedback on the spot.
- Third party scrutinizing is purely objective feedback leaving internal disputes aside and focus solely on the topic at hand.
- Combining the two bullet points above provides an enriched discussion within our own organization that will improve the end result of our MP, SUMP and our urban planning process.
- The MP, wherever located, will be a fantastic opportunity for Kalmar to reach out with cities.multimodal's methods for citizen involvement.
- The outcome of the peer review is not a product or an end result, it is the beginning of new ways of working, ideas to test, concepts to consider and evaluations to be conducted – all a result of the fruitful and inspiring discussions.

Learnings for the reviewer cities

Vilnius argues that this was a surprisingly interesting experience, they did not anticipate that a peer review without knowing local context in advance – could be so interesting, exiting and useful for both sides (organizer and visitor). Secondly, a peer review motivates and encourages visitors very much. It is good to see that everyone in fact are facing some similar problems and can share valuable practical expertise. Thirdly, the site visits are great as you can get unexpected inspiration. Vilnius brought home various small ideas how to increase walkability and accessibility in the historical (heritage protected areas).



Photos from the heritage protected area
(by Robert Dahlström/Kalmar kommun)