

GENERAL INFORMATION

PETUS description of tool in use						
Name of the case		Open Space Planning				
Name of the tool		Policy on "Open Space Planning"				
Country		Austria				
City / region		Municipal area: 127km ² Population appr. 225.000 Density (people/km ²) appr. 1770				
Tool user's profile		<p>a. Organisation name (municipality, NGO, national or regional department, company, etc.)</p> <p>a. Spatial planning unit –Graz municipality</p> <p>b. Field of activity</p> <p>b. Land use planning</p> <p>c. Detailed contact/feedback (project website, e-mail, address, tel., fax)</p> <p>Leads also associated topics such as the development of the open space in the city.</p> <p>c. Stadtplanungsamt Graz Europaplatz 20, 8011 Graz, Austria Heinz Rosmann Tel: ++43 316 872 4700 Heinz.rosmann@stadt.graz.at Robert Wiener Tel: ++43 316 872 4713 Robert.wiener@stadt.graz.at</p>				
Reviewer, date		Norbert Plass, October 2003/Amendments: March 2004				
Short description of the case						
<p>The open space policy paper was meant to support the dynamic spatial planning and development processes, by coming after the stated goals of the spatial development program and other topic-specific programs and policy papers. In addition it formed also the basis and provided the formal framework for the planners to decide on the future development of the open spaces in the overall urban context.</p> <p>First steps in this direction have been taken years before, after having realised that recent developments have had massive effects on the open spaces in the city. As a consequence protective measures have been taken up into the "urban development program", being the starting point for more stringent steps to gain advantages for the environment, the people and for the developing economy as well.</p> <p>The policy includes a number of objectives which aim at nature protection and ecology, social green (accessibility and mounting), the arrangement of green spaces in the living areas and local recreation.</p> <p>In addition some measurements have been defined considering the above objectives, both for the different city districts and for the whole urban area.</p> <p>Furthermore the necessary instruments and strategies for implementation, what regards the relevant legal backgrounds, the required financial means, public address and participation including affirmative activities to start private and official co-operation.</p>						
<p>Why was the case chosen? To which PETUS key-problem is this case study related?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green-blue space quantitative aspects and their ratio in urban areas • Green spaces' qualitative aspects – conflicts between the provision of facilities and maintenance of ecological life • Efficient management of green spaces 						
Sector	Waste	Energy	Water	Transport	Green/blue	Buildin g & Land Use
					X	
Scale of project	Component	Building	Neighbourhood	City		Region
			X	X		
Status of project	Starting up	Ongoing	Finished	Start date	End date (exp.)	

			X		
Key words					
<i>Green space, open space, policy, spatial development, protective measures, public space, social green, participation, ecology, recreation, nature protection</i>					
Project					
a. Object (building, city park, wind farm, etc.)			a. Municipal area – including the surrounding green areas		
b. Type of activity (regeneration, renovation, new development, etc.)			b. Preservation and redevelopment of green areas		
c. Type of product (plan, scheme, design project, etc.)			c. Policy paper and thematic maps		
Tool					
a. Character (according to WP3final0704.doc)			a. Policy and planning tool		
b. Benchmarks (qualitative or quantitative)			b. Qualitative/ Quantitative evaluation criteria are mainly qualitative quantitative criteria are related to figures about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • open and private green areas (parks) • available green space/inhabitant • amount of woods in the urban area • number of playgrounds per district 		
c. Availability (paid/ free)			c. The policy programme is available from the spatial planning department		
Decision-making process					
a. Stage of the tool implementation (preliminary, midterm, etc.)			a. The implementation is part of the preliminary planning process.		
b. Level (political, technical, etc.)			b. The political level signed the policy paper, however its implementation is carried out by the planning unit and by other municipal departments (gardening department). Supervision comes from the nature protection department.		
c. Public participation			c. The public has been involved during the preparation of the policy paper and have been invited to give contributions what regards their personal interests in the several districts.		
Other (<i>optional, if needed</i>)					

DETAILED INFORMATION

A. Detailed description of project and tool	
1. Description of context (existing strategies, laws, policy, action plans, etc.): EU, national, regional, municipal	<p><i>The urban development programme</i> comprises a policy paper for the overall municipal development. <i>The Land Utilisation Plan</i> is the tool to implement the urban development programme.</p> <p><i>The Development Plans</i>, these include detailed information about the planned project on the site, illustrate the creative elements for the land utilisation and describe in more detail the planned utilisation of the urban area.</p> <p>Local Agenda 21 ideas have been regarded in the open space programme.</p>
2. Description of project	
a. Background (What caused the initiation of the project?; What was the problem? Who initiated	The instigation of this policy came from the increasing pressure on the remaining green areas in the city and in

<p>the project?);</p> <p>b. Objectives/aims (sustainability statement – what issues of sustainability were attacked);</p> <p>c. Time interval and stages of project realisation</p> <p>d. Financing – amount, sources, institutions involved, partnerships, levels.</p> <p>e. Other sectors involved in the particular project/problem (conflicts and/or links)</p>	<p>addition lacking coordination and management. The drivers have been the spatial planning unit, nature conservation unit, the public and administration.</p> <p>The overall objective of this policy is <i>to link open space development more closely to land use planning and to those sectors which would have an impact on the development of the green areas in the city</i>. Concrete measures, to achieve these goals, have been addressed to thematic areas:</p> <p><u>Nature protection – urban ecology</u> Green areas (green ring) around the city Protection and connection of habitats Vegetation cover Water bodies and groundwater <u>Social Green – mounting and accessibility</u> Parks Playgrounds Public sports facilities Allotments Accessibility – pedestrian and cycling paths <u>Green areas in living areas</u> Green in housing areas Inner court yards and front gardens <u>Leisure and local recreation</u> Local recreation in the urban area Local recreation in near surroundings</p> <p>Realisation of measures was scheduled for a 10 years period, being implemented step by step and in parallel with the spatial development of the city.</p> <p>The provisions of financial means have been allocated to the different measures (see above). Due to the complexity and multitude of measures, the estimate of costs should give a frame to set up further actions. However, its realisation depends strongly on the real availability of financial means.</p> <p>During the programming period of the policy other departments, e.g. transport, have been contacted and informed since infrastructure developments are in direct conflict with the open space development. Therefore, a central aim for the policy is to avoid conflicts with other, “space-consuming” infrastructure development projects.</p>
<p>3. Description of tool</p> <p>a. Character (according to WP3final0704.doc) - calculation tools, process tools, assessment methods, generic tools, simulation tools, guidelines, framework tools, schemes, indicators and monitoring, checklists, case-specific tools;</p> <p>b. Availability of the tool (web-based / paper, paid / free, etc.)</p> <p>c. Based on existing tool or newly elaborated;</p> <p>d. Adaptation of the tool to the local context (are there local experts involved in tool’s development?)</p> <p>e. Other tools implemented to support the project</p>	<p>The open space policy can be considered as a guideline.</p> <p>b. The policy document is available in paper format (booklet) and includes thematic maps.</p> <p>c. The policy has been newly elaborated and been developed in order to provide additional protection for open green spaces.</p> <p>See above, however pointing out, that public’s opinions have been included.</p> <p>Planning procedures and objectives from land use planning</p>

development	flew in.
B. Tool implementation	
1. Argumentation for choosing the tool a. What were the reasons for the implementation of the tool? (voluntary or requested by what local, national, etc. regulation) b. Who took the initiative for choosing /elaboration the tool? c. What were the criteria for choosing the tool? d. Was there knowledge of other tools and were they considered?	The need and awareness to protect and maintain the open spaces in the urban landscape has been the main driving force to realise this policy. In addition, legislation and public interest seconded to this. The initiative was started from the spatial planning department, local political levels and the citizens. Protection of the urban green areas. There was information of comparable policies from other cities.
2. Barriers for the tool implementation What were the main problems in the tool implementation? (Regulation, information available, public awareness, lack of clear SD definitions and benchmarks, communication etc.)	The realisation of measures is dependent on the financial means, which detained activities and implementation measures.
C. Influence of the tool on the decision-making process	
1. Description of the decision-making process/ procedures a. Stages b. Levels (political, technical, etc.) c. Sources of information used during the decision making process; d. Who are the decision-makers? e. Who made the final decision for the project implementation? Was it political or technical decision?	The decisions to develop this policy were taken by the political level. Overall, the implementation of the policy as well as the proposed measures are targeted to different departments and their responsibilities. Therefore, competence is linked to set targets which have to be fulfilled by the planning authority and responsible municipal departments (such as forest department, environmental unit or the municipal real estate unit) but is also linked to public and private development interests. The planning level was requested to prepare the baseline for the policy development, by collecting information and data, consulting internal and external experts and the public. <u>Legal basis and relevant programmes:</u> Urban development programme Regional development programme Local Agenda 21 / Eco-city 2000 Technical programme about Housing <u>Technical basics:</u> Habitat mapping Climatic situation GIS data / aerial photos Experts from administration and from external sources (universities) as well as the political level, who adopted the policy programme. Both the political and the technical levels decided on its implementation.
2. Tool in decision-making process a. At what stage was the tool implemented? By whom? (experts, politicians, etc.)	The policy should be regarded in the forefront of projects and is designed to go with spatial development planning activities.

<p>b. How did the tool output influence the process (added or skipped levels/stages in the existing decision-making process, etc.)?</p> <p>c. Quantitative goals or benchmarks defined? (If YES, which – and what were they compared to?)</p> <p>d. Was the tool used to support argumentations?</p>	<p>The main idea was to exert influence on the spatial development in the city. Though the success depends strongly on the available financial capacities.</p> <p>The quantitative goals in the policy relate to the set of measures, listing monetary allocations which are necessary for maintaining or purchasing green areas and any mounting.</p> <p>This has been one of the major objectives (see also above).</p>
<p>3. Transparency of decision-making process</p> <p>a. How was the information of the dmp disseminated? - directly (decision makers – public) or indirectly (decision makers - NGO, PR company, etc. - public); sources of dissemination used (mass media, internet, brochure, etc.)</p> <p>b. How was the public involved?</p> <p>c. Was there a public discussion over the project and at what stage of the project development?</p>	<p>The development of the policy has been in close co-operation with different stakeholder, including the public. Also its implementation has been designed to have private initiatives included. Additional information has been provided through brochures and public events in the districts.</p>
<p>D. Expert assessment/analysis/comment of the tool effectiveness</p>	
<p>1. Assessment by tool users</p> <p>a. Were there measurable improvements as a result of the tool implementation? If YES, what? If no: why not?</p> <p>b. Were there any spun-off's or unintended consequences?</p> <p>c. General view on the tool? Lessons learned?</p> <p>d. Potentials for further use of the tool?</p> <p>e. Will the actors recommend it or use it in other cases - why / why not?</p>	<p>There are improvements, which resulted in some protective measures for urban green areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •renaturation of the river banks and its green belt •maintaining and mounting of public open green <p>However, economic pressure and lack of financial contributions are a set back for the policy's implementation.</p> <p>The policy has high potential, especially what regards the defined tasks and measures. Nevertheless, the major lesson displays that political commitment is the real driving force behind.</p> <p>The potential's there, the readiness to implement it is missing.</p> <p>The incorporation of different stakeholders and the overall positive notion while preparing the policy is a very positive feature herein. Again, potential restrictions need to be regarded.</p>
<p>2. Reviewer's assessment of the tool (usefulness, sustainability relevance, who are the actors excluded? etc.) Suggestions and needs for further development of the tool</p>	<p>Raising awareness is one of the most important aspects, awareness for both the high potential of the policy tool and for politicians and decision makers who actually benefit from it.</p> <p>Another fact is that money allocations are a limiting factor for the realisation of proposed measure, even more so, when they collide with other sectoral programmes or policies. From here, we can conclude, that there is also potential to optimise to collaboration between sectors.</p> <p>Since open space almost always interferes with economic development, preventive measures and new forms of dialogue are needed, where one argumentation could be based around the fact that "economy needs a healthy environment", though it is to provide and prepare evidence that urban and economic development relies on a sound environment.</p>
<p>E. Additional information on the case study available</p>	
<p>Websites</p>	

References concerning the case but also the key words or problem (papers, articles, reports, laws, etc.)	Green Paper on the impact of transport on the environment - A Community strategy for "sustainable mobility" (COM(92) 46). SEA Directive: http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/l28036.htm
Other sources (Interviews, conferences, discussions, etc.)	
Contact details for further information	Dipl.-Ing. Heinz Rosmann Stadtplanungsamt Bahnhofcenter, Europaplatz 20 8011 Graz, Austria Tel.: ++43/316/872-4701 Fax: ++43/316/872-4709 email: stadtplanungsamt@stadt.graz.at