



ADDRESSING KEY CHALLENGES OF SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY PLANNING

---

**First CH4ALLENGE Training Workshop on  
Stakeholder Involvement and Citizen Participation  
2-3 July, Gent, Belgium**

**Minutes**

Work Package	WP6: SUMP take-up, training & exchange
Authors	Aljaž Plevnik (UIRS), Daniela Stoycheva (POLIS), Ivo Cré (POLIS)
Review	Susanne Böhler-Baedeker (RC), Miriam Lindenau (RC)
Date:	22-Jul-2013
Version	Final – external use

## Agenda

### Day 1<sup>st</sup>: 2 July 2013

Oostenrijks Salon, City Hall, Botermarkt 1, 9000 Gent

13.00	<p><b>Participants' welcome and introduction</b> by Patty Delanghe, City of Gent and Susanne Böhler-Baedeker, Rupprecht Consult</p> <p><b>CH4LLENGE, SUMP, participation... and you!</b> Introduction round: Participation challenges in your city (Ivo Cré, Polis)</p> <p><b>CH4LLENGE and the role of follower cities</b> (Susanne Böhler-Baedeker &amp; Miriam Lindenau, RC)</p> <p><b>SUMP Mapping:</b> What are your city's strongest points, and points for improvement in the field of SUMP? (Polis)</p>
15.00	Coffee Break
15.15	<p><b>The Participation Clinic: What works, what works not?</b> (Polis) Break out Session moderated by Gent (Patty Delanghe), and Brno (Iva Machalová)</p> <p><b>Definition of specific tasks/problems/cases for two working groups</b> divided by SUMP experience</p> <p>Participation tools and methods that would work, and those that are doomed to fail, leading to a white board of potential solutions, and a black board of challenges.</p>
16.30	<b>Summarizing and discussing common solutions and common challenges</b> (Polis)
17.15	<b>Reaching the Citizen: Findings of participation processes</b> (Susanne Böhler-Baedeker, RC)
17.35	<p><b>Gent: Linking public involvement for large projects and public involvement for SUMP</b>s (+ a few words about St.Pieters station)</p> <p>(Patty Delanghe, City of Gent)</p>
18.00	<b>End of 1st day</b>
19.30	<b>Dinner</b>

### Day 2<sup>nd</sup>: 3 July 2013

Meeting Point: entrance of Gent-Sint-Pieters Station, Koningin Maria Hendrikaplein 1, 9000 Gent

9.00	<p><b>Participation in practice: Site visit Gent station area</b> Presentation by Gisèle Rogiest, Visit of the site</p>
10.30	<p><b>Debriefing and Learning from the Gent example</b> Group discussion (Polis)</p>
11.00	<p><b>Looking forward: Targets and visions for participation in your city</b> Group discussion (RC)</p>
12.00	<p><b>Homework</b> Introduction to the self-assessment procedure to be performed by follower cities (Aljaz</p>

	Plevnik, UIRS)
12.30	<b>Reflection of the workshop and feedback</b> (Polis) <b>Information about the next workshop in Leeds</b> (5-6 November 2013) (METRO)
13.00	<b>Official end of the workshop</b> <b>Farewell lunch</b>
13.30	<b>Bicycle excursion</b>
15.00	<b>End</b>

## 1 Day 1: 2 July 2013

### 1.1 CH4LLENGE, SUMP, participation... and you! Introduction round: Participation challenges in your city (Ivo Cré, Polis)

The introduction round showed that the group of Follower cities varies a lot in terms of size, geographical position, experience in SUMP and their expectations from the workshop and the project. Their motives for participation were also very different; some of the cities are beginners in SUMP and would like to get more information and knowledge about the topic. Others are in the middle of the preparation process and would like to get practical hints about the preparation and implementation of SUMP. Some of the follower cities already have some kind of SUMP and would like to improve their document and/or its implementation; or would like to improve their performance related to the project's challenges. The results of the SUMP mapping can be found in the Excel sheet 'CH4LLENGE\_cities\_SUMP' and the document CH4LLENGE – SUMP\_mapping \_per city.

### 1.2 CH4LLENGE and the role of follower cities (Susanne Böhler-Baedeker & Miriam Lindenau, RC)

Please see respective presentation. No comments or questions.

### 1.3 SUMP Mapping: What are your city's strongest points, and points for improvement in the field of SUMP? (Polis)

After all cities self-assessed their progress in terms of SUMP in place and defined where they are doing best and where worst in the SUMP cycle, some cities were asked to share their decision. Below are their testimonies.

- Madrid (Spain) – has recently started with the SUMP preparation through a participatory process, established a Forum with the main stakeholders, organise thematic workshops about main SUMP topics.
- Gostyn (Poland) – doesn't have any kind of transport plan, they would like to catch the moment and prepare one.

- Ljutomer (Slovenia) – has a plan as a result of a national project, where SUMP concept was tested on a smaller municipality. They were shortlisted among the 3 finalists of the 2013 EU SUMP award for their achievements in public participation.
- Nova Gorica (Slovenia) has SUMP since 2006, though with missing elements. They are preparing a Joint (regional) SUMP within the PUMAS project.
- Skopje (Macedonia) – prepared the SUMP with 8 measures as part of the CIVITAS RENAISSANCE project,
- Coimbra (Portugal) – has a plan, but not a comprehensive, it is focused on a list of projects, national SUMP guidance exists.
- Vienna (Austria) – has a transport master plan (renewed every 10ys), doesn't contain all SUMP elements, has different separated plans (PT, cycling, e-mobility etc.), challenge to integrate them into one document, the City has a strong planning department with enough capacities.
- Utrecht (Holland) – has approved SUMP, prepared on own initiative.

#### **1.4 The Participation Clinic: What works, what works not? (Polis) Break out Session moderated by Gent (Patty Delanghe), and Brno (Iva Machalová)**

The participants were split in two groups following the outcomes of the SUMP mapping exercise. Group 1, moderated by Iva Machalova (city of Brno), were cities that do not have a SUMP in place or are just starting one. Group 2 were cities that are more advanced in the SUMP cycle and it was moderated by Patty Delanghe (city of Gent). The two groups discussed the issue of 'participation' in SUMP, not the overall SUMP planning process.

The target of the session was

- to receive an overview about the most important participation strategies which are in place and what tools would generally be interesting for the cities but which are not yet applied
- to get an impression about the most important problems to realise participation and if cities are aware of the benefits of participation
- To get information how cities cope with problems to create effective and efficient participation procedures

Each group addressed three steps of participation strategy development:

- a. Stakeholder identification
- b. Stakeholder / citizen constellation
- c. Set up a strategy for stakeholder involvement and citizen participation: timing and choice of activities and tools

Rupprecht Consult assisted the moderator of Group 1 and Polis assisted the moderator of Group 2 to report back on the 'challenges' aspects and 'what works' aspects from the break-out sessions. The results are summarised in PPT presentations and can also be found below.

## Group 1 – SUMP Starters:

	<b>What works well?</b>	<b>Challenges</b>
<b>Stakeholder identification</b>	Beneficial to... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• integrate expert groups into the participation process and use the know-how and skills of e.g. research institutes</li> <li>• have a moderated process by an independent external</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to raise awareness among stakeholders?</li> <li>• Some stakeholders are overrepresented but the majority is passive – how to activate and integrate those that might want to have a say at a later planning stage?</li> </ul>
<b>Stakeholder constellation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep and consult your stakeholder groups through the entire SUMP process!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many stakeholders to integrate into your planning processes?</li> <li>• How to achieve a balance between powerful and less powerful stakeholders?</li> </ul>
<b>Timing and tools</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present benefits of SUMP!</li> <li>• Media campaigns for informing citizens and other stakeholders</li> <li>• Communication with stakeholders means different interest groups = different languages</li> <li>• Important role of social media</li> <li>• Step-by-step to a participation routine (e.g. try out participation tools for small-scale measures first before starting a comprehensive large-scale consultation in your city)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness raising required: both stakeholders but also decision-makers need to be convinced why SUMP is a benefit for their city</li> <li>• Some countries lack a culture of public involvement</li> </ul>

## Group 2 – SUMP Advanced Cities:

	<b>What works well?</b>	<b>Challenges</b>
<b>Objectives of participation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create trust</li> <li>• Obligations to be met</li> <li>• Participation takes place within a defined policy framework and participants understand room of maneuver</li> <li>• Capacity building</li> <li>• Building consensus on concepts (Madrid, Gent)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SUMPs are too strategic to discuss</li> <li>• Expectations Management</li> </ul>
<b>Stakeholder identification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools</li> <li>• Chambers of commerce</li> <li>• Citizens</li> <li>• Neighbourhoods</li> <li>• Universities</li> <li>• Politicians</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-identification (open call)</li> <li>• Too many stakeholders</li> <li>• Stakeholders without common interests</li> <li>• Continuity of commitment as people change places</li> <li>• Media</li> <li>• Reaching decision makers in business community</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach of media (landline surveys, social media) to specific age groups: do we reach everybody?</li> </ul>
<b>Stakeholder constellation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dresden Board model with limited number of representatives</li> <li>• Local enterprise partnerships (UK)</li> <li>• External moderator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to allocate weight to stakeholders in forum/board setting</li> </ul>
<b>Timing and tools</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difference in approaches: Strategic vs implementation</li> <li>• Online platform: general input</li> <li>• Direct dialogue for concrete projects</li> <li>• Think along approach (Gent)</li> <li>• Infobox (Dresden)</li> <li>• Communication campaign</li> <li>• Press release</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For some, we come too early, for others too late!</li> <li>• Delays</li> <li>• Cost</li> <li>• Social media (proprietary tools or open tools?)</li> <li>• The right mix</li> <li>• Using marketing tools and principles</li> <li>• Changing role of forum after plan is adopted (implementation or evaluation?)</li> </ul>

### 1.5 Reaching the Citizen: Findings of participation processes (Susanne Böhler-Baedeker, RC)

The assessment of transport planning processes shows that stakeholder involvement and also coordination between decision-makers is frequently poor. This session aimed to present findings of participation processes in transport planning and to highlight the necessity of having thoroughly planned participation processes. The European urban mobility projects GUIDEMAPS (Gaining understanding of improved decision making and participation strategies) and CIVITAS produced manuals and guidance documents which can assist in developing and implementing participation strategies and tools (links see below). These projects showed that the involvement of stakeholders is a permanent and long-term activity and that degrees of development of participation are related to a variety of factors such as the economic situation, the development of the democratic experiences as well as to history and culture and to the emancipation of the individuals over the power of government.

Participation best-practice examples from Germany were presented starting with the City of Bremen which re-launched its Transport Master Plan with a strong participation approach. The main elements of the participation process were a project advisory board, decentralised organised citizens' forums, a consultation of the regional committee and of the bodies with a statutory consultative role as well as an internet survey/online dialogue. An external consultant was contracted for supporting the entire transport plan's re-launch through a Europe-wide tender which also included stakeholder and citizen participation. The city of Berlin, in contrast, organised an Urban Mobility Round Table for its Transport Master Plan 2040. In a series of meetings representatives of identified stakeholder groups and the local

administration got together to discuss the development of planning targets (Vision 2014) and to achieve a consensus on basic planning principles. The round table was moderated by an external moderator and results of the discussions went directly to the project group, which was advised by a scientific advisory board. As a result of these participation processes a long-lasting commitment among stakeholders has been observed.

Hands-on experience was also shared by the city of Dresden which also initiated a round table for its “Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan 2025+”, a comprehensive, integrated mobility plan. A number of committees were established, e.g. the Steering Committee led by the mayor including also representatives of city council groups, heads of department, City of Dresden officials, councillors, project managers and round table facilitators. At the round table a large number of actors are involved such as the transport providers and associations, business associations, city council groups and others. A scientific advisory board consisting of representatives of transport and transport-related studies as well as the Dresden University of Technology and other German research institutions form another important advising actor. Also regions and neighbours as well as citizens are involved. The round table is the centrepiece of the participation process where stakeholders decide on the main directions of the plan and comment on the drafts prepared by the city. The moderation of the round table by an experienced external moderator is seen to be essential for successful discussions. All committees, groups and boards are in a continuous dialogue process which is fruitful so far. Communication with citizens and stakeholders is of great relevance and it is most important to be explained to citizens why planning processes (decisions, preparation of documents, responses to comments, etc.) take long and are time-consuming. Also the city of Dresden contracted an external consultant through a Europe-wide tender to support the development of the urban mobility plan. However, it is the city administration itself that organises and manages all participation processes.

Further reading on stakeholder involvement and citizen participation:

GUIDEMAPS: [Successful transport decision-making - A project management and stakeholder engagement handbook](#)

CIVITAS: [Involving Stakeholders: Toolkit on Organising Successful Consultations](#)

CIVITAS: [Reaching the Citizen: Toolkit on Effective Communications and Marketing](#)

## **1.6 Gent: Linking public involvement for large projects and public involvement for SUMP (Jan Geldof)**

Jan Geldof from the city of Gent made a presentation about the development of the participation process and techniques in Gent throughout the years, ever since the city started involving stakeholders in 1990s until today. He started by saying that in the beginning the communication was one-way – from the city to the citizens, and around year 2000 it started developing as a two-way communication. Thus, the city began to ask about citizens’ opinion on certain projects, e.g. at special designated discussion evenings or through other communication tools. This led to a change in the mindset of the administration which realised that they do not have the solutions to all problems/situations. The change of mentality of the planners was from “we know what is good for you” to facilitating (not steering) processes. The city administration also needed to learn how to deal with many different opinions. These two processes needed much time to evolve and were difficult to accept.

Other participation tools that Gent has used throughout the years have been workshops, social media and co-creation. Nowadays, Gent is performing more facilitation rather than steering. The speaker finally presented the transition management concept and how they have made use of it in the so-called Transition Arena.

Developing fresh approaches to change urban mobility, public space and people's minds in order to make Gent a more liveable city for their children in 2050 – this is the aim of the Transition Arena, a group of about 25 creative people from various backgrounds including young entrepreneurs, citizens, architects and transport professionals.

The project was initiated by the city's Environmental Department and Mobility Department, however, it was the Transition Arena participants who developed the ideas. After one year of brainstorming ten icon projects were devised showing how Gent could look like in 2050. One of the visions is "The Living Street" which has already been tested by citizens in two streets. For one month the streets were cut from the road network and turned into a car-free zone allowing temporary street furniture and creating places for residents to meet. New forms of mobility were tested such as e-bikes, cargo bikes as well as car sharing and home delivery. All activities were solely organised by the residents themselves. The icon project caught high interest of regional and national media.

"On Wheels" is another of the ten icon projects and refers to a Belgium law stating that a car park may be occupied by any object that stands on wheels. This inspired the Transition Arena to think one step further: why not use car parks for resident-friendly activities and set up objects such as barbecues, picnic tables or urban gardens? Each based on a chassis with four wheels like a conventional car. Ideas from the Transition Arena might appear futuristic at first but are growing bottom-up providing a sense of direction for mobility in the long-term.

## 2 Day 2: 3 July 2013

### 2.1 Participation in practice: Site visit Gent station area, Presentation by Gisèle Rogiest, Visit of the site

Gisèle Rogiest presented the massive project – the renovation of the Gent station area which started in 2007 and will last until 2022. She first presented the changes that will take place and continued with stakeholder participation and citizen involvement in the project. Gent station will not only be renovated, it will be extended and will have an impact on the whole urban space around it. The new project will aim at restricting the use of the car by allowing cars only to drop passengers but not to pass by. The station will, on the other hand, be much friendlier to cyclists and a big bicycle parking has already been built. The overall goal is to maintain the current modal split despite the rising number of citizens in the city.

Due to the big impact of the project on residential areas nearby and on citizens in general, communication and citizen participation has been a core part of the project. Citizens and stakeholders have been consulted and informed by means of workshops, dialogue cafes, emails, newsletters, a monthly magazine, a Facebook page. The aim of these various means has been to involve as diverse groups as possible. In addition, the city of Gent organised targeted consultations for the different target groups – e.g. blind people, children, etc. Gisèle Rogiest explained in the end how they are organising the communication work in the project which is a PPP (public-private partnership). Difficulties were encountered when working with construction companies as they tend /prefer to be quiet and not to communicate too much with the citizens. Thus the city of Gent needed to persuade them to communicate the project by offering them support in getting citizens' acceptance of the new residential buildings that they are constructing. One of the main tasks of the communication team was also the internal communication.

An important conclusion to draw from this example is that the communication of this project has been strongly supported by the Mayor; if this was not the case, communication would be impossible.

Participants then visited parts of the station which have already been renovated to see in reality what the presentation was talking about.

Please see respective presentation to get full information about the project.

### 2.2 Debriefing and Learning from the Gent example, Group discussion (Polis)

Ivo Cré states that the site visit to the Gent station area was chosen because it reflects several issues that reoccur in public involvement strategies related to SUMP.

- The scale of the project could be similar to SUMP in smaller cities.
- The link with land use is very strong, and brings with it a legal obligation for stakeholder involvement.
- The tools used for public involvement can be transferred to SUMP: direct dialogue, visitors centre, social media etc.

The site visit also answered to questions raised on the first day with regards to user involvement in the implementation phase of the plan. Several cities have a clear idea on how to involve stakeholders and citizens in the planning phase, but did not decide how to approach stakeholders in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The Gent station area is a well-developed example of involvement and communication throughout the full planning and implementation cycle.

### 2.3 Looking forward: Targets and visions for participation in your city. Group discussion (RC)

Cities were asked to imagine themselves in 2020. They were asked to position themselves on a graph giving them several options with regards to citizen participation and stakeholder involvement when drafting/revising their SUMP: they remain where they stand at the moment; they make a little progress; they make a big progress and become an example city for SUMP. Some of the cities were asked to explain their choice afterwards and present possible hurdles that they think they will face or opportunities they will grasp. A need to distinguish participation in transport projects and in preparation of SUMP was pointed out. Also the importance of tradition in participation and the age of democracy in the country was stressed. Development of participatory planning is a slow process, especially in NMS, where many problems have to be solved.



### 2.4 Homework - Introduction to the self-assessment procedure to be performed by follower cities (UIRS)

Aljaz Plevnik (UIRS) introduced the self-assessment procedure to the follower cities. The self-assessment methodology was not finalised yet, but the cities were made aware that they will have to work to define their progress in SUMP before the next workshop in Leeds in November.

## 2.5 Reflection of the workshop and feedback (Polis)

Polis had prepared a feedback survey, which the participants filled in. In summary, the results of the survey are the following:

- Generally the workshop received a high level of satisfaction, especially in terms of organisation and presentations;
- The break-out session for advanced and starter cities was evaluated by some of the participants as less useful for their practical work;
- The presentations about participation findings and about Gent as a best practice example as well as the site visit received a high level of approval.

## 2.6 Information about the next workshop in Leeds (METRO)

Steve Heckley (METRO) gave general information about the next challenge training workshop about institutional cooperation to be held in Leeds on 4-6 November 2013. The agenda is under discussion.

## 4. Next steps and timeline

The following next steps were confirmed at the meeting:

1. Reimbursement claim form to be returned to Rupprecht Consult.
2. Minutes and presentations of this workshop available at <http://www.polisnetwork.eu/first-workshop-ch4llenge>
3. Assessment questionnaire will be available by mid-September, to be completed early October.
4. Cities that could not attend the workshop will be asked to do the workshop exercises internally and send the results by 2 September 2013.