4. Cedos (2023). Реінтеграція ветеранів у цивільне життя: виклики та потреби. URL: https://cedos.org.ua

5. Програми підтримки ветеранів. *IREX в Україні*. URL: https://irex.org

6. Програма «єРобота». *Портал «Дія»*. URL: https://diia.gov.ua

7. Impact of the war on employment in Ukraine. URL: https://ilo.org

8. Transition Assistance Program (TAP). URL: https://benefits.va.gov/tap/

9. Services and Support for Veterans. URL: https://www.canada.ca

10. Український ветеранський фонд. Аналітика та проєкти. URL: https://veteranfund.com.ua

Anastasiia PROKHORENKO
3-rd year student of the educational program
"Public and Private Governance"

NEW URBANISM IN URBAN TRANSPORT POLICY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF EUROPEAN PRACTICES

Keywords: New Urbanism, transport policy, transport, urbanism, smart city.

Research aim: research how the principles of New Urbanism have been implemented in the transport policies of several European Union cities and define challenges and opportunities for integrating New Urbanism principles in Kyiv to foster a more sustainable and people-centric urban environment.

Main part. New Urbanism emerged in the United States in the 1980s as a direct response to the negative consequences of post-war urban planning, which prioritized automobiles and led to suburban sprawl, the decline of historic city centers, and increased car dependency [1]. This movement advocates for a return to traditional, compact, and walkable urban forms. Its core principles, codified in the Charter of the New Urbanism by the Congress for the New Urbanism, include walkability, connectivity, mixed-use and diverse communities, high-quality urban design, and environmental sustainability [2]. A central principle is transit-oriented development, which organizes communities around high-quality public transport hubs, placing essential services within a 10-minute walk [3].

The most visible application of New Urbanism principles in Europe is the prioritization of active mobility, particularly cycling. Amsterdam and Copenhagen stand as world-leading examples of how cities can fundamentally

shift from car-centric to people-centric transport systems. Historically, both cities faced a surge in automobile ownership after World War II, leading to urban planning that favored cars at the expense of cyclists and pedestrians. In Amsterdam, the share of cycling trips plummeted from 80 % in the 1950s to just 20 % by the 1970s. A turning point came in the 1970s, driven by two critical factors: the 1973 oil crisis, which exposed the vulnerability of car dependency, and widespread public protest against rising traffic fatalities, especially among children, exemplified by the "Stop de Kindermoord" (Stop the Child Murder) movement [4]. In response, Amsterdam initiated a long-term strategy focused on creating a comprehensive, city-wide network of physically separated and protected cycle paths. This was complemented by policies to reduce car dominance, such as creating car-free zones, lowering speed limits, and establishing fietsstraten (bicycle streets) where cyclists have priority [4]. Crucially, cycling was integrated with public transport, with massive investments in secure bicycle parking at train stations to facilitate seamless multi-modal journeys. Copenhagen's journey mirrors Amsterdam's, with the 1973 oil crisis also serving as a major catalyst for change [5]. The city's landmark achievement was the pedestrianization of its main commercial artery, Strøget, in 1962. Initially a controversial experiment, its success in boosting business and public life led to its permanence and expansion, creating one of the world's longest pedestrian-only zones. This commitment to reclaiming space for people aligns perfectly with the core goals of New Urbanism. Like Amsterdam, Copenhagen invested heavily in a network of high-quality cycle paths and traffic-calming measures to enhance safety. A key element of Copenhagen's success is its data-driven approach. Since 1996, the city has published a bi-annual "Bicycle Account" to track progress, identify infrastructure gaps, and engage citizens. This analysis has quantified the socio-economic benefits, demonstrating that each kilometer travelled by bicycle yields a net societal gain, whereas car travel results in a net loss [6].

A core principle of New Urbanism is reducing the need for private vehicles through high-quality, integrated public transportation. Copenhagen's "Finger Plan" of 1947, which directed urban growth along five rail corridors separated by green wedges, stands as a foundational example of transit-oriented development, long before the term was created [3]. This legacy continues with modern developments like the Ørestad district, a linear city built around an above-ground metro line, intentionally designed to be sustainable and limit car use. The city's transport policy emphasizes the seamless integration of its metro, S-trains, and buses, ensuring high frequency, reliability (the metro runs 24/7), and easy transfers, often facilitated by co-located bike parking. Tallinn, the capital of Estonia, offers a contrasting yet equally insightful case study from a post-Soviet context. Soviet-era planning left a legacy of functional zoning, with

large housing estates separated from commercial and industrial areas, and a public transport system that was often underdeveloped. After 1991, the city experienced rapid suburbanization and a sharp increase in car ownership. In a bold and unique policy move, Tallinn introduced fare-free public transport for all registered residents in 2013, making it the largest city in the world with such a scheme. While the primary goals were to increase mobility for lower-income groups and incentivize resident registration for tax purposes, the impact on shifting modal share was moderate. Studies showed that the fare-free policy itself contributed to a 1.2 % rise in ridership, with much of the overall growth attributed to simultaneous service improvements, such as increased frequency and dedicated bus lanes [7]. This highlights a crucial lesson: while financial incentives can play a role, the quality and integration of the infrastructure itself are paramount. Tallinn continues to invest in this area, extending tram lines and participating in the high-speed Rail Baltica project, which aims to better connect the Baltic states with the rest of Europe by rail [8].

The transport system of Kyiv, Ukraine, presents a stark contrast to these EU examples and illustrates the profound challenges in applying New Urbanism principles within a system shaped by a Soviet past and rapid, unregulated post-Soviet automobilization. While Kyiv possesses a strong foundational public transport network, with the metro serving as the high-capacity backbone, the system as a whole is fragmented and struggles to compete with the private car. Unlike the integrated systems of Copenhagen or Amsterdam, Kyiv lacks a universal ticketing system that covers all modes of transport (metro, municipal buses, marshrutkas), making transfers cumbersome and inefficient. The quality of service is often low, with an ageing vehicle fleet, inconsistent schedules, and severe overcrowding during peak hours, which incentivizes those who can afford it to opt for private cars. Furthermore, the infrastructure for active mobility is critically underdeveloped. In sharp contrast to the comprehensive networks in Dutch and Danish cities, Kyiv's cycling infrastructure is fragmented, poorly maintained, and often unsafe, forcing cyclists to share roads with heavy traffic. Pedestrian infrastructure suffers from similar neglect, with poorly maintained sidewalks, a lack of accessibility for people with limited mobility, and dangerous road crossings. These conditions create a hostile environment for non-motorized transport, directly contradicting the New Urbanist ideal of a walkable, people-friendly city.

Conclusions. The comparative analysis of Amsterdam, Copenhagen, and Tallinn demonstrates that the successful implementation of New Urbanism in transport policy is a result of long-term, holistic, and politically supported strategies. The key to their success lies in a fundamental shift in priorities: from moving cars to moving people. These cities have shown that investing in high-quality, integrated public transport and creating safe, continuous networks for

cycling and walking are not merely amenities, but essential components of an economically vibrant, environmentally sustainable, and livable city. For Kyiv to move towards this model, a comprehensive transport reform grounded in New Urbanist principles is necessary. The immediate priority should be the creation of a fully integrated transport system with a single electronic ticket valid across all modes, including private operators. Public transport must be given priority on the roads through an expanded network of dedicated bus and tram lanes. Following European best practices, Kyiv should strategically reduce car dominance. This includes comprehensive parking reform with stricter enforcement, the development of Park & Ride (P+R) facilities on the city's outskirts and exploring the implementation of a congestion charge for the central districts. A massive investment in creating a safe, connected, and high-quality network of segregated bicycle lanes and accessible, well-maintained pedestrian infrastructure is crucial to providing a viable alternative to car travel. Kyiv should also adopt design concepts like Barcelona's "superblocks" or the "15-minute city" to reclaim street space for people, creating more green areas, public squares, and recreational zones, particularly in dense residential areas.

References

1. Duany, Andres, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, and Jeff Speck. *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2000.
2. The Charter of the New Urbanism | CNU. Accessed June 8, 2025. URL: https://www.cnu.org/who-we-are/charter-new-urbanism.
3. Transit Oriented Development in Copenhagen, Denmark: From the Finger Plan to Ørestad. ResearchGate, October 22, 2024. URL: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2012.01.009.
4. Dekker H.-J. (2022). Citizen Expertise: Urban Activism Shapes Local Cycling Policy in the 1970s. In: *Cycling Pathways: The Politics and Governance of Dutch Cycling Infrastructure, 1920-2020*, 217–66.
5. Gössling, S. (2013). Urban transport transitions: Copenhagen, City of Cyclists. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 33: 196–206.
6. The Bicycle Account URL: https://www.scribd.com/document/805956386/The-Bicycle-Account-2022-2420.
7. Cats, O., Yusak O. S., and Triin R. (2017). The Prospects of Fare-Free Public Transport: Evidence from Tallinn. *Transportation*, 44, no. 5: 1083–1104.
8. Rail Baltica. URL: https://www.railbaltica.org/