PETUS description of tool in use	
Name of the case	Spatial planning – a holistic approach
Name of the tool	Indicators and procedures for Spatial Planning
Country	Austria
City / region Total area (km2) Population Density (people/km2)	Graz Municipal area: approximately 127km² Appr. 220, 000 Appr. 1770
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)	a. Spatial planning unit – Graz municipality b. Land use planning; preparing policies and programmes in respect to land use planning and urban development 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
Reviewer, date	N. Plass, 13.10.2004

Short description of the case

The planning procedures within the land use planning unit need to regard other planning programmes and laws from both higher and lower level planning. Several planning and programming documents, such as the *urban development programme, the land utilisation plan and development plans* have to come after this requirement. These represent relevant planning procedures and programmes for the municipal level. Each municipality is in principle called upon to provide such documents. Moreover, their contents need to comply with higher level programmes, e.g. the Styrian Regional Planning Act. These documents include not only regulations but also *procedural steps and indicators* for the planners core work. Because of its holistic nature, the planning procedures, the preparation of policies and the development of technical programmes (e.g. open space plan) need to refer to important cross-cutting issues (e.g. climate, noise etc.).

A set of indicators and criteria support the decision making process. They are designed to comply with the legal framework and to meet the requirements for dealing with other stakeholders. The motivation to use and update supportive tools is to try to arrange with changing situations (changes of the urban pattern, interest groups) and to achieve new argumentation to come after the ever-growing enquiries about environmental and spatial development concerns.

Given the incremental stages for a development plan the necessary steps include an analysis of the situation and with respect to that a description of intentions and aims for the planned project. At that stage different data and information comes in as well as indicators to do an evaluation.

Major *motivations for using and adapting existing tools and procedures* are to:
- provide a tool to plan in a more holistic and sustainable way,
- have the possibility to act rather than react, and
- establish flexibility in decision making and
- provide additional argumentation

There is also growing demand to provide participatory approaches to inform and exchange with the public. The requirements from the planning side are to provide comprehensive information made available by the planning unit, gathering feedback from the public and including it in the decision making process. In the near future provisions for development plans are to be changed, namely the participation in the planning process. The idea is to be prepared to react on exceptions. One recent example has been a case about introducing a new stakeholder participatory process, the "public opinion / planning cell" (more information on the planning cell and participation on the following website: http://www.graz.at/buergerinnenbuero/).

Why was the case chosen? To which PETUS key-problem is this case study related?

This case study was chosen because of the holistic nature and cross-sectoral approach, and due to the nature of the planning process in that it refers to sustainable development.

The case study relates to the debate on participatory processes which is contained within many of the key problems.

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				

Key words
sustainable development, spatial planning, land use planning, indicators, holistic, tool, participation, cross-sectoral, evaluation, assessment, policy,

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. Municipal area b. Spatial planning procedures and the development of related policies c. Indicators, planning and participatory procedures
Tool a. Character (according to WP3final0704.doc) b. Benchmarks (qualitative or quantitative) c. Availability (paid/ free)	a. It is an indicator-based planning tool b. The tools benchmarks are qualitative indicators. c. The tool is free – it is available at the office (see above).
Decision-making process a. Stage of the tool implementation (preliminary, midterm, etc.) b. Level (political, technical, etc.) c. Public participation	a. The stage of application ranges from preliminary planning to midterm / continuous planning. b. Decision making takes place at the technical and policy level. c. Public participation is part of the planning procedure.

DETAILED INFORMATION

A. Detailed description of project and tool	
1. Description of context (existing strategies, laws, policy, action plans, etc.): EU, national, regional, municipal	The "*Regional Planning Act*" and the "*Provincial Development Programme*" are two principal laws that need to be considered when developing long - and mid term policies and programmes. At the local level, the *urban development programme (UDP)* comprises a policy paper and the *land utilisation plan* is the tool to implement the urban development programme. The municipality accounts for the UDP. The UDP has to describe the intended ecological, economic, social and cultural developments of the municipality, including • the necessary aims and measures to safeguard natural capacity and environment; • orientations about the population development; • economic development ; • housing; • education, culture, leisure; • health and welfare; • aims and measures regarding energy supply; • traffic; • spatial and functional development. So this policy has to integrate cross-sectoral issues in a holistic sense and to refer to both higher level planning and programming as well as regarding developments from neighbouring communities. Further on, the *development plan,* which includes detailed information about a planned building project, represents the creative elements for land utilisation and describes in more detail the planned utilisation of the urban area. This plan has not only to regard the legal context but also consider on-site characteristics

	(e.g. landscape features, drainage of water, fauna and flora) and needs to include acceptable solutions in the proposed development plan. Additional support comes from the "*open space plan*" which has been set up to manage and plan the green areas in and close to the city limits. The *"spatial mission statement"* evaluates the projects influence on the natural as well as the existing construction situation. The spatial mission statement distinguishes different "urban area types" according to their spatial and functional characteristics. It has been set up to avoid interference in the existing spatial structure. Therefore, it aims to visualize remaining areas with a certain potential for further development.
2. Description of project a. Background (What caused the initiation of the project?; What was the problem? Who initiated the project?);	a. The development of the tool dates back to the early 70s and 80s, with the aim of providing a common basis for continuous planning and decision making. The idea is to regularly update tools and procedures in use, to take into account changing circumstances. The tool is based on a number of indicators, such as: • Climate (air exchange, wind situation) • Air pollutants / traffic infrastructure • Soil permeability / water drainage • Landscape / urban morphology • Existing access to energy supply • Existing access to sewage system • Site / urban density • Green areas / protected areas • Areas for flood protection / run-off • Protected blue/green areas This information is supported by GIS-based maps
b. Objectives/aims (sustainability statement – what issues of sustainability were attacked);	b. The objectives of the project are: *The urban development programme* constitutes the policy for urban land use planning. It includes a number of goals, which try to follow the idea of sustainability through: • Strengthening the city's position as an economic and cultural centre, • Improving regional co-operation, • Nature protection and the environment through considering air quality, reducing noise pollution, open space development, biotopes and their connection, social improvement (green in living areas, accessibility), recreation facilities, pedestrian and cycling zones, • economic potential, improving living conditions, education, culture, sports facilities, infrastructure improvement (energy, water, sewage), traffic, functional classification of the urban landscape
c. Time interval and stages of project realization; d. Financing – amount, sources, institutions involved, partnerships, levels. e. Other sectors involved in the particular project/problem (conflicts and/or links)	c. Planning is a continuous process. d. There is no specific funding since it is the main duty of the department. e. The core work demands co-operation with relevant sectors as well as with the public. Improvements that regard communication and exchange between departments as well as to the citizens are still to be made.
3. Description of tool	

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; b. Availability of the tool (web-based / paper, paid / free, etc.) c. Based on existing tool or newly elaborated; d. Adaptation of the tool to the local context (are there local experts involved in tool's development?) e. Other tools implemented to support the project development	a. The planning tool is of a holistic nature and links to a cross sector planning policy. The main tools, indicators and checklists, are used for the planning process to plan, evaluate and have support for conflicts between stakeholders. b. The planning tool is available as a paper version, at the planning unit. c./d. The indicators have been continuously developed and updated. The updates are done in co-operation between the department and with local experts (university, research centres). e. Procedures for public participation are in use, which try to comply with the legal obligations.

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)	a. The tool is implemented in order to meet the main objective that is to serve the purpose of the planning unit and to achieve the set aims of the policy and planning documents which comprises the overall aim and task of the planning unit (see objectives under 2.b). Therefore it is essential that the indicators and checklists are up-to date. and, the criteria used have to explain decisions and planning efforts.
b. Who took the initiative for choosing /elaboration the tool?	b. The planning unit has been the initiator.
c. What were the criteria for choosing the tool?	c. The criteria for choosing the tool were to support the planners work, increase their efficiency and provide additional argumentation.
d. Was there knowledge of other tools and were they considered?	d. Information about other tools was available, however due to lack of time and resources there is limited space for extra efforts.
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 implementation of the tool is routine, however when introducing new indicators a certain hesitation in applying them can be noticed, mainly due to time constraints of the personnel for additional capacity building.

C. Influence of the tool on the decision-making process	
1. Description of the decision-making process/ procedures a. Stages	a. The decision making process in land use planning is an ongoing procedure with regular updates (every 5 to 10 years). The decisions are taken at the local level, while regarding the higher level planning interests. The provincial government takes a controlling role.
b. Levels (political, technical, etc.)	b. The call for updates comes officially from the political level. The implementing body however is the spatial planning unit, which provides information for the political sections as well as for the public. A project group, consisting of internal and external experts, is responsible for collecting information, inquiries, and exchanging information between interest groups.
c. Sources of information used during the decision making process;	c. The information required to carry out the tool includes a description of the current situation, (re-) defining goals, gathering and distributing necessary (technical) information as well as providing GIS-based information, PR-measures such as leaflets and public discussion for

	citizen's information. This procedure represents the normative approach for spatial planning projects
d. Who are the decision-makers?	d. The executive group, representing the local level, is represented by members of the spatial planning unit. They are responsible that the legal requirements are fulfilled. However, political decisions need to be regarded in this context, which are not necessarily congruent with the planning level.
e. Who made the final decision for the project implementation? Was it political or technical decision?	e. Officially political decision makers make the final decision, however implementation is carried out by the technical staff of the planning unit.
2. Tool in decision-making process a. At what stage was the tool implemented? By whom? (experts, politicians, etc.) b. How did the tool output influence the process (added or skipped levels/stages in the existing decision-making process, etc.)? c. Quantitative goals or benchmarks defined? (If YES, which – and what were they compared to?) d. Was the tool used to support argumentations?	a. The tool can be used for preliminary-planning but also for the continuous (routine) work of the technical staff. The tool is being adapted by experts to allow the tool to be used in this way at any time. b. Indicators are needed for planning and for argumentation to realise planned projects as well as for answering public requests. c. Within the tool quantitative measures are translated into qualitative terms, and as a result indicators are mostly qualitative. An indicator set for the neighbourhood scale includes: • potential influence / effects on the climate • potential influence / effects through the climate • green areas - leisure activities • habitats - connection between biotopes • visual impact on the neighbourhood (harmony) • local wind corridors • areas with bio-climatic compensation effects • surface sealing / the kind of surface sealing • permeability of the soil, subsoil and geological strata • function as biotope for plants and animals • closeness to nature / naturalness - with respect to quality for recreation, defined by its recreational value Additional indicators which do not apply in all situations • permeability of the soil, subsoil and geological strata • potential influence because of waste sites • nature and landscape - protected elements on the test-site d. The indicators should add up easily and to use for argumentation. See above.
3. Transparency of decision-making process a. How was the information of the decision making process disseminated? - directly (decision makers – public) or indirectly (decision makers - NGO, PR company, etc. - public); sources of dissemination used (mass media, internet, brochure, etc.) b. How was the public involved? c. Was there a public discussion over the project	a. The procedure of the decision making process is regulated by law and is published in a local official newspaper. The requirements are - to provide comprehensive information made available by the planning unit, and to gather feedback (from posted letters, internet, email, personal communication) from the public and include it in the decision making process. b. The public are involved through the collection of planning requests and objections, which are made available for public information through different sources (internet, flyers, letters, personal consultation, road shows etc.). The evaluation of both the planning interests and the objections from the public comprise a central activity in this planning phase.

and at what stage of the project development?	c. Consultation of the public usually starts when a development (housing or business) project has been proposed. Therefore the public is not involved in the early planning phase, but information is compiled by the planning unit and presented when a first planning draft has been developed. After the project's scale is revealed to the public, there is an opportunity for the public to comment on the projects scale.
D. Expert assessment/analysis/comment of the tool effectiveness	
1. Assessment by tool users a. Were there measurable improvements as a result of the tool implementation? If YES, what? If no: why not?	a. The tool users believe that the standard set of indicators seem to be sufficient for the purpose of serving the planning process. The recent evaluation step in the planning procedure comprises the "spatial mission statement", which evaluates the projects influence on the natural as well as the existing building situation. This step has led to an improvement with regard to environmental aspects (for example the obligation to include urban green space in the plan).
b. Were there any spun-off's or unintended consequences?	b. One of the results of using the tool relates to participatory procedures which occurred due to the increasing interests of the citizens and has lead to testing new forms of public involvement. Furthermore, the public interest in urban development increased distinctly and has resulted in extensive information provisions. In this respect a new form of public participation procedure "the planning cell" has been tested, where the basic idea to this is, to include a randomly chosen number of people, at a very early stage of the planning process and collect and discuss their notions on planning topics.
c. General view on the tool? Lessons learned?	c. In the near future provisions for development plans are to be changed, namely the role of participation in the planning process. Therefore the planning unit wants to be ready and set up to deal with these new requirements. However, limits for the planning unit are: • Lack of time and personnel for "new approaches or non-routines" • increasing pressure from higher planning levels and from economy.
d. Potentials for further use of the tool?	d. A potential for further use of the indicator set, would be a link to a GIS-system which would seem to be a proper tool for the planning procedure as well as an information tool (e.g. different thematic maps).
e. Will the actors recommend it or use it in other cases - why / why not?	e. The tool has the potential to be used in other situations, provided the technical equipment is (GIS) available (see above d.). Principal requests, from the planners' point of view, relate to the introduction of participation and communication procedures.
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.	One of the principal requirements of the tool is to have a "ready tool" for the different development projects. The tool and its procedures are designed to be used in future projects. Requests for improvement have been stated from the users, with regard to the operator's convenience in using the different information sets, especially when it comes to

	incorporating thematic maps.
	Self evaluation / improvements:
	Day-to-day work of the *planning staff,* which comprises work on development plans mainly and long-term strategic planning, could somehow be improved and enriched by increasing the planners personal notion on "*environment*" or "*awareness of natural quality*". At present different factors concerning nature, recognising nature and its potential are not regular practice. Staff training for the future could include:
	• Capacity building
	• Shaping Awareness and ideas
	• Training on certain items
	The commencement of the SEA Directive will afford new procedures in participatory processes as well as in elaborating future plans and programmes which might have an effect on the environment.
E. Additional information on the case study available	
Websites	http://www.graz.at/planen_bauen/
References *concerning the case but also the key words or problem* (papers, articles, reports, laws, etc.)	**Key words and obstacles:** There are numerous examples which give an insight on planning procedures. Below are some links for further reading and information: Urban planning in Austria: http://www.wien.gv.at/stadtentwicklung/links/index.htm?S0=governance#P0 City of Salzburg http://www.salzburg.gv.at/themen/bw/sir_haupt.htm
Other sources (Interviews, conferences, discussions, etc.)	Other interesting links to this topic: Staedte der Zukunft: Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung http://www.staedte-der-zukunft.de/Eingang/frmset.htm www.bbr.bund.de Analytical Strategic Environmental Assessment (ANSEA): http://www.taugroup.com/ansea/links/LINKS%20OK.htm