

GENERAL INFORMATION

PETUS description of tool in use

Name of the case	URBAN I Graz and URBAN II link Graz West: Social and economic renewal of urban districts
Name of the tool	URBAN Graz procedure
Country	Graz, Austria
City / region Total area (km ²) Population Density (people/km ²)	City of Graz 60km ² 260.000 Project area: up to 750 ha, 32000 residents concerned (URBAN II)
Tool user's profile a. Organisation name (municipality, NGO, national or regional department, company, etc.) b. Field of activity c. Detailed contact/feedback (project website, e-mail, address, tel., fax)	Alexander Ferstl , City department for urban development and planning, Graz, Austria. Ferstl is responsible for both projects at the communal city department for urban development and planning. urban@stadt.graz.at Daniel Kampus , KAMPUS Regional planning raumplanung@kampus.at http://graz.at/urban/
Reviewer, date	Gudrun Lettmayer, June/July 2003

Short description of the case

abstract up to 300 words

The case describes two city district revival processes in Graz, Austria, carried out one after another by the planning department under the framework of EU projects. The two processes address several thematic aspects of development and may be considered holistic. The processes focus on different aspects in two different districts: the first one concentrated on supporting many private initiatives in an inner city area with high social pressure; the second one supported mainly big infrastructure projects in a former industrialised area.



No dominant guiding tool has been used in planning or carrying out these processes; the main decision making has been done on administration level without public participation (especially in the second process) although some small scale participation tools have been used. Processes are being documented via evaluation reports. Despite the absence of dominant tools, the case has been chosen to demonstrate usual top-down planning and decision making processes in urban planning.

Sector	Waste	Energy	Water	Transport	Green/blue	Building & 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			UI 1995 UGW 2000	UI 1999 UGW 2007

Key words

each reader (author, expert, non-expert) may add his/her own suggestions

<i>district renewal</i>	
Project a. Object (building, city park, wind farm, etc.) b. Type of activity (regeneration, renovation, new development, etc.) c. Type of product (plan, scheme, design project, etc.)	a. The case study concerns two city districts. b. The project aim to create revival of former industrial areas/buildings and socio economic development of those districts. The project focuses on the implementation of revitalisation plan.
Tool a. Character (according to WP3final0704.doc) b. Benchmarks (qualitative or quantitative) c. Availability (paid/ free)	a. The tool is a process tool b. The benchmarks in the tool are qualitative and quantitative. c. The tool is available for free (via process documentation in evaluation reports)
Decision-making process a. Stage of the tool implementation (preliminary, midterm, etc.) b. Level (political, technical, etc.) c. Public participation	a. Not available. b. Decision making is mainly at the political and technical (administration) level c. Public involvement occurred in the decision making on micro funds.
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	EU-URBAN development programmes initiate economic and social revival of urban areas.
2. Description of project a. Background (What caused the initiation of the project?; What was the problem? Who initiated the project?); b. Objectives/aims (sustainability statement – what issues of sustainability were attacked); c. Time interval and stages of project realisation; d. Financing – amount, sources, institutions involved, partnerships, levels. e. Other sectors involved in the particular project/problem (conflicts and/or links)	<p>The Community council of Graz initiated two URBAN EU projects: URBAN I Graz (=UI) and URBAN II linkGrazWest (=U GW)</p> <p>The aim of U I (1995-1999) was to initiate and support development processes (consisting of several "key projects" and additional "single projects") in the town district of Gries, with the higher aim of improving the housing and economic quality. Gries is a town district characterised by a high percentage of foreign population, unemployment, traffic and night life problems (prostitution, bars). U I wanted to encourage private initiative of all residents and strengthen identification with the local areas.</p> <p>U I worked in three particular fields of support:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><u>-District development and district renewal:</u> Improvement of housing situation and the environment; revitalisation of a public city swimming pool; reduction of individual heating systems etc..</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Forms of (individual and public) mobility that are considered environmentally friendly and socially acceptable such as cycling, walking, public transport: Remodelling of public places; construction of footbridge;...</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Intensification of social infrastructure: Open geriatric district centre;...</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Support for local economy: Promotion programme for SMEs; economic model for Gries; settlement programme for technology oriented businesses,...</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><u>-Job creation and intensification of the social grid:</u> Socio-economic projects; social work</p>

	<p>focussing on the problems of the area; employment projects; intercultural language service; youth council; streetwork for teenagers;...</p> <p><u>-Participation of residents:</u> Info desk;communication plan; events; participatory park planning;opinion poll</p> <p>UI included more than 50 individual urban development projects in the municipal district of Gries and around 11,000 residents.</p> <p>As a follow up initiative UGW was launched in 2000. The overall goal of UGW is to develop the formerly industrial zone of Graz West (covering three city districts) in an economically interesting but sustainable way. This zone is characterised by a heterogenous spatial structure; monofunctionality, partially inaccessible areas, social problem zones (U GW=750 ha, 32000 residents). UGW will continue until 2007 and has three main aims:</p> <p><u>-Development of the potential of the information society:</u> Extension of a senior technical college centre (to be opened to the population to a certain extent); creation of a start-up centre for future technology entrepreneurs; creation of a start up centre for human technology; development aid for operational investments; qualification of (local) workforce.</p> <p><u>-Fit for future district development:</u> Mobility, sustainable construction, living and working; construction of a new event centre with photovoltaic system; railway underpass, extension of footpath and cycle path network</p> <p><u>-Communication to accompany the process:</u> Assure participation of citizens in decision making processes; URBAN info point</p> <p>Both projects are being co-financed by the City of Graz, private business, the department of Styria and EU funds</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 development</p>	<p>The tool consists of a process description that is being documented by evaluation reports. Its experiences may serve as guide for similar district redevelopment projects. No specific tools have been created or applied during the entire process; several existing single tools that contribute to decision making have been combined for the process such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Citizen information events - Festivities: Social initiatives festivity; Midterm festivity, both combining party atmosphere in a public place with information and possibilities for personal contact making, - Information point (URBAN Info-Box) at a central site in the district for information, discussion, deposit of ideas and single project proposals, - Marketing: regular newsletter; information to the press. - Special meetings with political representatives of the districts. - Regular meetings of the URBAN steering committee (political decision making group). This steering committee did not include members of the public. <p><u>Evaluation as important single tool element:</u></p> <p><u>The evaluation steps in UI included:</u></p>

	<p>-<u>Mid term review</u>, where the state of the art of each single project has been described (collected via project documents, interviews, questionnaire) and indicators of the project plan have been discussed and partially revised. Also, attitudes and experiences of persons included have been discussed.</p> <p>-<u>Accompanying Monitoring</u> consisted of meetings of single project responsibilities on the one hand, and programme responsibilities (administration) on the other hand. Discussions of strengths and weaknesses took place in these two groups.</p> <p>Results were presented in an internal report (Preliminary conclusions)</p> <p>-A representative <u>poll</u> on knowledge of the aims of the URBAN programme and its appreciation was carried out among the inhabitants of Gries This work was subcontracted to a marketing institute.</p> <p>- In cooperation with the University, several specific studies on detailed aspects of the URBAN process have been investigated and documented (scientific accompanying evaluation). http://www.urban-link.at/objects/application_pdf/UG%20Zwischenevaluierung1998.pdf (German)</p> <p>-The target of the <u>Post evaluation</u> (the only obligatory step) was to develop recommendations for future URBAN projects.(http://www.urban-link.at/objects/application_pdf/URBAN%20I%20Graz%20Endevaluierung%202001.pdf)</p> <p><u>For UGW</u>, the EU prescribes two evaluation elements: a) mid term reviews and b) post evaluation. Additionally, a monitoring concept accompanying the project process, has been agreed by the programme management.</p>
B. Tool implementation	
<p>1. Argumentation for choosing the tool</p> <p>a. What were the reasons for the implementation of the tool? (voluntary or requested by what local, national, etc regulation)</p> <p>b. Who took the initiative for choosing /elaboration the tool?</p> <p>c. What were the criteria for choosing the tool?</p> <p>d. Was there knowledge of other tools and were they considered?</p>	<p>The EU had requested participatory elements in the project framework. No clear participation concept, covering elements of participatory planning, participatory decision making, implementation and participatory evaluation was established before starting the processes. Broad knowledge of participatory planning tools does not exist at the administration level. The tool/procedure was developed in a learning by doing procedure</p> <p>Other methods, such as PLANNING CELL (PLANUNGSZELLE), have been discussed but not applied for UGW.</p> <p>Planungszelle is a procedure to encourage step-by-step dialogue. It aims to define propositions for action for concrete problems of the society. It tries to bring out as many ways of interpretation of reality as possible by the people concerned and looks to integrate knowledge of the local population.</p> <p>1st step: INVESTIGATE: Interviews (guidelines for interviews) are carried out on the subject with people concerned in the city or district). People are selected by random sample. The goal is to get different points of view of the situation.</p> <p>2nd step: EVALUATE: Representatives of society groupings (up to 15) or institutions evaluate the situation/conflict from their point of view and present</p>

	<p>their solutions.</p> <p>3rd step: ACT: Citizens (25-200) are chosen by random sample and invited to work out possible solutions, considering the results of step 1 and 2. Usually, these citizens are paid by public funds for this job or at least released from work. During this time, they are assisted by process managers and have access to further required information. They finally formulate and argument recommendations in a so called "citizens' opinion". This opinion should be considered in the final decision. The procedure lasts for several weeks to months and includes up to 300 persons.</p> <p>http://www.planet-thanet.fsnet.co.uk/groups/wdd/99_planning_cells.htm http://www.wegweiser-buergergesellschaft.de/politische_teilhabe/modelle_methoden/beispiele/Reinert.pdf</p>
<p>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.)</p>	<p>Certain participatory planning techniques have been discussed (e.g. "district conferences"). None has been used so far primarily for fear of citizens' potential resentments and anger and consequences such discussions might have on the project. On the other hand, some parts of the administration are aware of the fact that these methods could bring out the "real" problems of the people.</p>
<p>C. Influence of the tool on the decision-making process</p>	
<p>1. Description of the decision-making process/ procedures</p> <p>a. Stages</p> <p>b. Levels (political, technical, etc.)</p> <p>c. Sources of information used during the dmp;</p> <p>d. Who are the decision-makers?</p> <p>e. Who made the final decision for the project implementation? Was it political or technical decision?</p>	<p><u>U I</u>: Planning was done top-down at the administration level. Several key project ideas that had existed long before were included as main axes of intervention. Complementary to this, there were calls for single projects, hoping for a snowball effect.</p> <p><u>U GW</u>: The main decisions on the project orientation were taken TOP DOWN at the moment of development of the EU proposal (by the community administration). Once the project had been granted by the EU, the community administration presented these general orientation lines and invited stakeholder groups to present concrete projects fitting into these lines. Most infrastructure projects had already been agreed before.</p> <p>The project trend and intention is to finance and co-finance big single projects (mainly infrastructure) within the framework of the URBAN GW goals. Many of these projects are given basic funding and are expected to be economically viable (or set clear economic impacts) within a few years. Many of these projects had to fulfil clear criteria of economic viability and were selected on the basis of these criteria by the community administration. The remaining part (25% of the funding) is used to finance mainly social orientated projects and communication with citizens.</p> <p>The roles in the decision processes are clear: there is a steering committee, composed of the lord mayor and representatives of the province and all elected parties. This steering committee is advised by individual experts and the project manager. The steering committee takes pre-decisions and submits these pre-decisions to the community council for approval.</p> <p>There is also a controlling committee for the work of the steering committee. This controlling committee has to be consulted in case of important project changes.</p>

	<p>A so-called micro project fund has been installed. This fund is being co-financed and managed by the three districts themselves. They decide on (and finance) bottom-up projects, that are proposed by citizens. This should result in the stronger identification of the citizens with the whole project via such small concrete measures.</p> <p>The jury (controlling committee) for micro projects is composed by 4 political representatives of the 4 districts, four "active citizens"(one per district) and one advisor (representing UGW project management).</p> <p>There have been 13 micro projects submitted up to date (2005), 8 out of them have been co-financed (16000 EU totally). The overall budget in the first year was 1 EU per habitant (50 cents covered by UGW, 50 cents covered by the districts). Micro-Projects were co-financed up to 50% (300,00-3.000,00EU). Micro-Project duration is one year with option to be extended. Most projects up to date had cultural character.</p>
<p>2. Tool in decision-making process</p> <p>a. At what stage was the tool implemented? By whom? (experts, politicians, etc.)</p> <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 single tools described above did not clearly influence the decision making process.</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>No information dissemination Public only punctually involved by small project financing (UI) and micro project funds (UGW) No public discussion</p> <p>Generally, a lack of transparency towards submissions was stated concerning the approval criteria of the single bottom-up project proposals. This was due to the workload of all personnel in charge of URBAN projects (city department and consulting agency).</p>
D. Expert assessment/analysis/comment of the tool effectiveness	
<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>-U GW still seems to be a complex program focussed on infrastructure and technical education and training. Its positive outcomes are expected mainly on the long term. Therefore, its usefulness is not fully understood and appreciated by the citizens.</p> <p>-As for the lack of participation elements in all steps of the process, especially in UGW, the solution planned is to consult a specialist in participatory urban planning and to choose adapted participatory planning techniques. Another solution is the micro project fund to encourage local citizen involvement.</p> <p>-Very often, decision makers do not share evaluation culture, that is, they do not really take evaluation results seriously.</p> <p>Evaluations have positive side effects: on the one hand, they provide necessary support for politicians (Quantifications of results) -this aspect was specifically illustrated by the scientific accompanying evaluation. Also, the evaluation process encouraged cooperation and exchange between administration departments.</p> <p>-The aspect of informal new ties built by common planning and evaluation process is considered as one of the most important experiences. Ties between administration</p>

	departments; ties between administration and single project responsibilities (such as the organisation of small informal events, e.g. Christmas drinks), ties between the single project responsibilities, created by the common evaluation meetings→Network building.
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>This example illustrates how urban planning and decision making may function by following a strict top-down scheme without essential participatory elements (target groups are "beneficiaries" of final results and not included in any main decision step). Target groups may keep themselves informed using the project homepage or visiting the Info-Box (top-down information). The micro-project fund is the only bottom-up process, but restricted by the political orientation of the jury and the marginalized budget.</p> <p>Hopefully the evaluation of UGW will bring out if and to what extent the absence of participation influences the results of the project and their sustainability</p>
E. Additional information on the case study available	
Websites	http://graz.at/urban/ http://www.urban-link.at
References <i>concerning the case but also the key words or problem</i> (papers, articles, reports, laws, etc.)	http://www.planet-thanet.fsnet.co.uk/groups/wdd/99_planning_cells.htm http://www.wegweiser-buergergesellschaft.de/politische_teilhabe/modelle_methoden/beispiele/Reinert.pdf http://www.urban-link.at/objects/application_pdf/UG%20Zwischenevaluierung1998.pdf (German) http://www.urban-link.at/objects/application_pdf/URBAN%20I%20Graz%20Endevaluierung%202001.pdf
Other sources (Interviews, conferences, discussions, etc.)	Interviews with A.Ferstl, City planning department Graz, June 2003 D.Kampus,KAMPUS Regional Planning, Graz, June 2003
Contact details for further information	See interview partners and website