



Urban Matrix Third Demand Survey 2008

Rob Atkinson and Eileen Lepine



University of the
West of England

Cities Research Centre
Faculty of the Built Environment
University of the West of England
Frenchay Campus
Coldharbour Lane
Bristol
BS16 1QY
United Kingdom

E-mail: Rob.Atkinson@uwe.ac.uk
E-mail: Eileen.Lepine@uwe.ac.uk

URBAN MATRIX 2008 SURVEY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Urban Matrix (UM) has created a knowledge dissemination platform designed to support European local authorities in addressing Sustainable Urban Development (SUD). This is the third demand survey that has been carried out during the course of the project. These surveys are a key part of Work Package 2, the major objective of which is to:

develop a methodology to chart the demand of information and support on research results, products, guidelines and methodologies in the field of Sustainable Urban Development coming from European cities.

The first and second surveys were in 2006 and 2007. Here we provide the initial analysis of the third survey, carried out in autumn 2008. One point should be made clear at the start. In the Second Survey Report, we made explicit comparisons with the First Survey Report; in this Report we have decided not to make explicit comparisons with the previous two surveys. This is partly because we have added a number of additional questions to the Third Survey (see Appendix 1) in response to the Mid-Term Evaluation carried out in the summer of 2008. As part of our response to the recommendations made by this evaluation, but also as part of the original self-evaluation strategy of Urban Matrix, we have included a number of questions that will be used to evaluate the progress and achievements of the project. (The section below indicates where the new questions have been inserted.) In addition to this, in the spring of 2009 we will produce a cumulative report dealing with all three demand surveys and it is in this report that we will focus on making explicit comparisons between the three surveys.

THE 2008 SURVEY

The survey, in English, was placed on the Urban Matrix web site and its presence primarily publicised by e-mail alerts. Full details of the survey are contained in **Appendix 1**.

The questionnaire was divided into seven levels (or sections) along the following lines.

Level 1, (as in previous surveys) asked for basic information about the respondent (name, organisation, country, etc) and included an open question about the key driver(s) stimulating local authorities' interest in sustainable urban development.

Level 2, (as in previous surveys) sought to identify the particular issues/themes on which knowledge was required, using a series of keywords.

Level 3 asked (new) questions about working with stakeholders

Level 4 dealt with the type of knowledge required - e.g. practice knowledge, research knowledge; and with respondents' preferred means of accessing knowledge; (again, these questions had been included in previous surveys).

Level 5 asked respondents about their use of the internet as an information resource.

Level 6 focused on respondents' attendance at - and their views about - conferences and workshops

Level 7 asked for views about Urban Matrix and contributions to the project

LEVEL ONE – RESPONDENTS: CITIES AND COUNTRIES

2008 – 62 RESPONSES, 20 EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, 49 CITIES

2007 - 62 responses from 54 cities in 21 countries.

2006 -126 responses, from 17 countries across Europe (NB:multiple responses)

As would be expected, given the purpose and methods of Urban Matrix, most of those responding to the survey are employed by public authorities, in a variety of posts (some apparently senior or specialist), in various departments, including planning, economic development and European departments, as well as those with an explicit focus on the environment or sustainable development.

COUNTRIES 2008	CITIES 2008
Austria	Vienna
Belgium	Antwerp (3), Brussels (2)
Bulgaria	Burgas
Czech Republic	Brno, Prague
Denmark	Aalborg
Estonia	Tallinn (4)
Finland	Espoo (2), Helsinki (3), Oulu
France	Nantes
Germany	Leipzig, Frankfurt, Dortmund
Greece	Amaroussion, Thessaloniki
Italy	Bologna, Genoa, Palermo ; and a regional response
Netherlands	Amsterdam (2), Hengelo, Utrecht
Northern Ireland	Belfast
Norway	Oslo
Poland	Lodz, Lublin, Warsaw
Romania	Timisoara
Spain	Gijon, Murcia, Rubi, San Sebastian, Seville, Terrassa
Sweden	Gteborg, Helsingborg, Malmo (2), Stockholm
Switzerland	Zurich
UK	Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Nottingham, Sheffield (2), Southampton, Aberdeen, Edinburgh
USA	Washington DC

LEVEL ONE - KEY DRIVERS

Persistent issues which were apparent in previous surveys are also apparent in responses to this survey, summarised below and in more detail in **Appendix 2 – DRIVERS**. It should however be noted that most cities referred to many of these issues; some were explicit about the links between them and the need for an integrated approach. So, while it is of obvious interest to note persistent and important themes which do emerge from the responses, it would not be correct to conclude that the issue referred to by most cities is the most important driver.

Traffic and transport issues were referred to by 18 cities, in comments concerned with

- traffic congestion and its negative effects, including pollution and noise
- reductions in CO2 emissions
- sustainable /eco friendly alternatives to the car – public transport, cycling, walking
- the need to popularise these alternatives.

Energy issues were referred to by 17 cities; their concerns varied from a focus on decreasing consumption, energy efficiency and/or renewable energy to specific concerns about the operation of local heating systems.

Climate change was explicitly referred to by 13 cities

Sustainable economic development. Economic/ employment issues were raised by 17 cities, in comments about

- employment
- entrepreneurs, support for business projects / enterprise
- competitiveness
- land management for economic activities
- tourism
- the need for infrastructure investments in post communist cities

Urban / city regeneration (including housing renewal) was referred to by 13 cities. Here issues included

- city revitalisation, urban regeneration / rehabilitation
- transformation of old harbour areas
- newly built neighbourhoods
- urban sprawl
- housing – including housing renewal (especially estates), the Sustainable Homes Code, Sustainable Communities Agenda and Housing Market Renewal (UK) and the need for social housing for the young and for immigrants

Diversity, social cohesion. For fourteen cities issues such as integration, segregation, exclusion and social cohesion were of concern.

Planning issues. Nine cities referred to planning issues including

- land use planning
- healthy urban planning
- sustainable and integrated land use planning as the basis for sustainable urban development.

Environmental issues. A smaller number of cities referred to issues connected with ecology and nature in the city, to waste, air quality/pollution and to flooding and coastal protection.

LEVEL TWO – KEYWORD RESPONSES

At Level 2 of the survey, respondents are asked to identify particular issues/themes *on which knowledge is required*, using a series of keywords.

61 of the 62 respondents replied to this question and the responses are summarised in the following table. As in the previous survey, most respondents complied with the request to choose just five key words. (Only five respondents chose more than five key words and only nine chose fewer than five). Together with questions about key drivers and workshop interests, the responses continue to give a good indication of those issues which are important to respondents – and about which they believe they need to know more.

	Numbers selecting each keyword		
	2008	2007	2006
Public-Private Partnerships	18	24	34
Citizen participation	17	20	42
Eco-friendly transport	17	18	22
Compact cities	17	9	26
Benchmarking	16	12	42
Integrated transport systems	16	14	26
Social Cohesion	14	15	44
Urban sprawl	14	0	11
Education/Awareness raising	14	10	19
Traffic management	13	13	13
Urban health / healthy cities	11	0	-----
Regeneration	11	13	43
Competitiveness	10	13	25
Road pricing/congestion charging	10	9	11
Role of ICT	9	7	8
Urban Air quality	9	6	23
Public Spaces	8	8	27
Brownfield sites	8	7	13
Spatial planning	8	10	
Urban demographic change	8	9	-----
Waste Management	8	0	19
Energy management	7	14	24
Local Agenda 21 and similar initiatives	7	3	13
Sustainable procurement	7	10	
Eco-labelling	7	1	2
Noise reduction	6	6	-----
Mainstreaming	6	1	
Shrinking Cities	6	4	11
Water use	6	0	6
Building materials	5	3	7
Evaluation	5	10	19
Urban Biodiversity	5	7	11
Urban Heritage and Conservation	4		12
Urban safety / security	4	0	16
Environmental Impact Plans/Assess	4	13	21
Anti-discrimination	4	4	
Finance	4	8	18
Globalisation	4	8	14
EU	3	8	16
New build	2	2	11

In 2007, an expanded list of keywords was offered (40, previously 33); the same list was used in 2008.

As indicated in the table, in 2007 there were nil responses for a number of issues at the end of the alphabetical list (which we suspect was the result of an unidentified technical glitch) - these included some of the new key words. No such problems arose in this survey, giving a better indication of the interest in these issues – note particularly urban sprawl, chosen by 14 respondents and urban health/ healthy cities, chosen by 11 respondents.

Public private partnerships appear at the top of the table as they did in the previous survey and this is the winter 2008 theme for Urban Matrix (on this issue, see also responses to Level 3 which focuses on stakeholder working). Other issues of persistent interest, which have already been the subject of workshops and or/ template collection, include citizen participation, social cohesion, regeneration and transport and traffic issues. Key words emerging more strongly this time include compact cities, benchmarking, education and awareness raising and, as already noted, urban sprawl and urban health / healthy cities.

LEVEL 3 – NEW QUESTIONS ABOUT WORKING WITH STAKEHOLDERS

Question 3.1. Which local stakeholders to you think it is most important to work with in developing SUD policies / action?

As the table below indicates, internal communication was emphasised by many respondents and work with other public organisations was also seen as important by many. In spite of strong interest elsewhere in public private partnerships, few saw the private sector as their most important partner. What is also interesting in the table below is the relative lack of importance given to working with local residents. Taken together these two responses suggest that while local authorities have taken on board much of the wider European rhetoric about engaging with the private sector and local residents (particularly with regard to sustainability) their primary focus remains on their own organisation (i.e. the local authority) and then somewhat behind this other public sector organisations. This may imply that in the first instance establishing integrated working (i.e. coordination) within the local authority is their primary target. It could also be taken as an indication that despite an emphasis on this issue for the last decade there is still some way to go before such working relationships are achieved in practice.

	1 most	2	3	4	5 least
Other depts in your local authority	33	14	8	6	7
Other public sector organisations*	12	19	10	12	12
Local residents	11	4	10	21	13
Private sector organisations	7	10	21	11	16
NGOs	5	15	12	9	12

*one respondent specified universities here

Those choosing other were limited to the following

OTHER					
Politicians /political parties	2				
Independent (foreign) experts		2			

QUESTION 3.2 Respondents were asked to provide a short description of the organisational arrangements developed in their city for working with stakeholders, in relation to sustainable urban development.

There were 53 responses to this question; nine of these gave limited information but offered web links. Of course, responses were very varied. Six of the seven UK respondents referred to their overall, city wide, partnership – the local strategic partnerships which are now a feature of all UK cities. For example:

- The main partnership facilitation mechanism is the Leeds Initiative, the Local Strategic Partnership for Leeds which has produced the local Community Strategy, Vision for Leeds, based on widespread public consultation. The partnership operates via a series of theme based partnerships
- The main forum for interaction with public, private and voluntary sector organisations is the Local Strategic Partnership - Sheffield First.

Some responses described how sustainability matters were dealt with within a local authority. A number of other cities gave details of city wide forums, with an explicit sustainability focus. (About half a dozen made some reference to Local Agenda 21. For example:

- ... “The Sustainability Forum Zurich” (TSF) ... an independent, non-profit, non-partisan association ... initiated [in 1999] by leading representatives from business, science and the public authorities. It ... serves as a dialogue platform striving to promote sustainability in and through the financial markets.
- Two years ago, the municipality created the “Environment Forum” in order to have an space where local administration and public organisations could discuss ... issues such as energy ... waste, water consumption, natural resources, etc...

A number of the responses focused on planning and the consultation associated with the development of plans and strategies. For example:

- In the framework of the new Urban Traffic Plan, online forums and public meetings have been opened to stakeholders, to show and discuss actions scheduled in the Plan, to share new ideas and proposals and to debate directly with public servants the new rules introduced
- Seville has complete two important processes: Seville 2010 Strategic Plan: the city’s development strategy which, among a broad range of city institutions, designs a Seville which is more sustainable, prosperous and habitable for its citizens and for those from outside. New General Urban Development Plan. This instrument links a number of actions in the territory to a city project. Both plans define the city model and set up mechanisms for participation in its development by all players

Many responses were specific about particular situations, or simply said that the arrangements involved depended on the issue or project concerned. Details of all the responses can be found in **Appendix 3** Partnership working.

QUESTION 3.3 Do you require knowledge / information to support work in partnership with stakeholders

There were 27 responses to this question. A few respondents said they did *not* need additional knowledge or information in this field – for example, because they had enough experience (Gijon) or through their involvement in various networks already had more as much or even more information than they could handle (Helsingborg).

Responses focused on different stages in the process of public involvement and/or partnership working. For some, public participation was a key issue and there was interest in new community involvement techniques and successful participation structures and in the experience of other cities – for example:

- I would [like to] know [about] some other experiences about involvement of local residents in welfare policy and how to manage different approaches and cultures

For others, gaining and then maintaining, wider stakeholder involvement and managing the partnership process appeared to be the central concerns – for example:

- It would be useful to have information on alternative ways to engage stakeholders and encourage wide participation in developing new plans and projects
- It would be very helpful to see how other cities deal with their private sector stakeholders and with the local residents and their organisations.
- Skills, guidelines and knowledge for improved working with private sector actors, as well as public participation.
- A toolbox in psychology on how to deal with "difficult stakeholders" in areas in need of transformation.
- How do others undertake successful and meaningful stakeholder engagement to ensure delivery of plans and projects that have stakeholder buy in
- how to implement ...joint projects, how to manage them and fund them
- One important question is to establish more permanent forms of corporation and still guarantee the different stakeholders to remain independent. What work is going to be paid, what is to be voluntary and free
- Making stakeholders sensible to each others needs
- Public - private partnerships

Three respondents expressed interest in monitoring and evaluation of stakeholder processes – in evaluation methodologies, impact measurement tools and benchmarking methods.

LEVEL 4 - KNOWLEDGE NEEDS AND HOW BEST TO MEET THEM

QUESTION 4.1 - KNOWLEDGE TYPE

This question has been asked in all three surveys – see table for comparisons with previous surveys. The differences are not large, but here network knowledge moves up from 4th to 3rd, and policy knowledge down from 3rd to 4th – a change from both previous surveys. However, practice knowledge remains the top choice – chosen by all but a few respondents in all three surveys

	2008	2007	2006
PRACTICE	54	53	100
RESEARCH	38	33	64
NETWORK	33	24	34
POLICY	24	27	59

Only two people chose 'other' - one referred to academic literature on specific subjects and the other to access to networks and receipt of newsletters

QUESTION 4.2 – KNOWLEDGE ACCESS PREFERENCES

	2008	2007
WEB	50	58
PERSONAL	45	47
PAPER	16	14

The **web** was selected by 50 of the 61* respondents who answered this question. As in the previous survey **paper based forms** were the least popular. However, as noted in 2007, **personal interaction** is clearly valued by respondents, alongside the growing importance of the web.

LEVEL FIVE – NEW QUESTIONS ABOUT INTERNET USE

QUESTION 5.1 – HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE THE INTERNET AS A TOOL TO ACCESS KNOWLEDGE ON SUD

FREQUENCY	
2-3 TIMES PER MONTH	23
2-3 TIMES PER WEEK	18
ONCE A MONTH	10
DAILY	8
ONCE EVERY 2-3 MONTHS	3

Responses here suggest that people seek knowledge and information via the internet quite regularly. Although few turn to it on a daily basis, infrequent use (less than once a month) is even less common.

QUESTION 5.2 WHAT KIND OF INTERNET SOURCES TO YOU USUALLY CONSULT TO SEARCH FOR THIS TYPE OF KNOWLEDGE – AND HOW OFTEN

Information source	often	sometimes	never
Official EU / international websites	18	39	3
Official national or regional websites (own language)	40	21	1
Dedicated websites on urban research (e.g. EUKN, MATRIX)	8	42	12
Networks and mailing lists	12	31	15
Forums, blogs wikis	22	30	4
Other *			

Responses here show that most sources are used on at least some occasions. Unsurprisingly, people look most often to sources in their own language – the official national and regional sites. Respondents report using official EU and international sites more frequently than dedicated sites such as EUKN or Urban Matrix itself – but more encouragingly for Urban Matrix, a majority do make some use of such sites. Only a minority *never* use even the less popular sources.

QUESTION 5.3 WHAT KIND OF INFORMATION TO YOU USUALLY LOOK FOR – AND HOW OFTEN

Responses show the strong interest in case study material that is typical of our respondents, but also suggest that most types of information suggested in our question are looked for quite often

Information looked for	often	sometimes	never
Policy framework on a specific topic	32	25	2
Case studies / best practice	28	32	1
Research studies	38	19	3
News and events	27	29	2
Contacts / experts	35	8	9
Other*			

QUESTION 5.4 - QUALITY, RELIABILITY, ETC, OF INFORMATION FOUND

The information I find on the internet is usually

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree**
Sufficient	3	39	16	4	
Comprehensive	2	26	26	8	
Reliable	2	26	29	5	
Up to date	5	20	28	8	
Accessible In own language	16	12	18	15	

It seems from the responses that few are entirely satisfied with the information they find via the internet and the number of 'neither agree nor disagree' responses may reflect different experiences with different sites and so on. On the other hand, significant numbers of respondents report finding sufficient information and regard it as comprehensive and reliable. In spite of the potential it offers for up to date information, slightly fewer people find it so.

QUESTION 5.5 DIFFICULTIES IN INTERNET USE

Please explain your main difficulties when looking for information and knowledge on SUD on the internet

There were 30 responses to this question; 2 of these reported no particular difficulties. For at least a third of those responding, the problems were to do with competing pressures on their time and especially the difficulties of finding the information they needed, as people complained about having too much information and finding it difficult and time consuming to filter it and get to what they really needed. For example:

- Often there is quite a lot of chaos in websites concerning SUD. You have to spend much more time on [the] searching process, because essential information is usually hidden in deeper parts of web services.
- There must be an efficient way of organising the flood of information. Different organisations send out newsletters, conference invitations swamp your e-mail system and when you finally know what you want it's hard to find

* No-one selected 'strongly disagree' in 5.4; this is surprising, but the data has been checked

There were also comments about the limitations of the information available. Several respondents complained about out of date and unreliable information. Two referred to language difficulties. There were also problems with information which was too technical – or lacked the practical detail or critical approach people were looking for. For example:

- Sometimes documents are too technical and aimed at an audience other than planners
- Language - structure of websites are sometimes too complex
- Information on case studies and policies is often not sufficient, very much focused on institutional aspects, with little detail on the most practical issues. Regarding research studies, it's hard to find the complete texts sometimes.
- Sometimes I also think I need more critical information, meaning not only info about best practice but also more critical analysis of EU policies, etc

One respondent referred to difficulties in accessing the information because access to specific topics was not possible for non registered users, or downloads were not free of charge.

LEVEL 6 – NEW QUESTIONS ABOUT CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS

Responses to questions 6/1 and 6.4 indicate quite frequent participation in some kind of workshop or conference among respondents, which is more likely to be at the local or national than the European or international level.

QUESTION 6.1 How often do you participate in workshops and/or conferences?

Less than once per year	2
Once a year	9
2-3 times per year	40
Once a month	8
More than once a month	3

QUESTION 6.4: IN WHICH TYPE OF EVENTS DO YOU USUALLY PARTICIPATE? (Local, National, European / international)

LEVEL	
Local	28
National	20
European / international	14

QUESTION 6.2: WHAT WAS THE THEME OF THE LAST CONFERENCE YOU ATTENDED?

There were 57 very diverse responses amongst which the most common themes were climate change and mobility.

QUESTION 6.3: WHICH CONFERENCE FORMAT DO YOU PREFER?

FORMAT	
Large-scale (100-200 participants)	7
Small- scale (20-50)	38
Workshop or training (10-15)	15

Of interest here, is a strong preference for the medium sized event, larger than some Urban Matrix workshops to date; the third, Helsinki workshop was of about this size.

QUESTION 6.5 WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FOR / BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATING IN WORKSHOPS / CONFERENCES

	1 MOST	2	3	4	5 LEAST
Knowledge gained through key note speakers	12	17	20	7	5
Knowledge gained through practical case studies	26	15	10	5	6
Knowledge gained through technical presentations/demonstrations	7	13	15	15	10
Networking with other practitioners	12	18	12	11	7
Papers and material available	6	7	9	16	22

There is a clear preference here for case studies and networking is also considered important. This is consistent with other responses to this and previous surveys

LEVEL 7 – VIEWS ABOUT AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO URBAN MATRIX

QUESTION 7.1 – USE OF THE URBAN MATRIX WEBSITE

17 of the 62 respondents had used the website – this compares with 10 out of 62 in the previous survey. Comments from those who had used it frequently enough were generally positive. For example respondents said that final reports on the workshops held are useful, that other e-library documents are also helpful and that it is a useful source of information from other cities. The site was seen as well structured and easy to use (by several respondents). Suggestions for improvement included more signposting of the e-library and more information overall. One respondent commented that templates gave a useful overview, but not always sufficient information – this is consistent with some of the comments re other internet use.

QUESTION 7.2 – ATTENDANCE AT MATRIX SEMINARS

Two respondents had attended Workshop 1, 4 had attended Workshop 2 and 6 had attended the most recent Workshop (3). Of course, it is not surprising to find attendance at the most recent workshop to be more common amongst current respondents. Those who attended earlier workshops may by now have changed jobs or responsibilities, for example. These are low numbers overall, however.

QUESTION 7.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR DISSEMINATION THROUGH URBAN MATRIX

Respondents offered a number of suggestions which, taken together with other responses, can inform both future planning and evaluation of Urban Matrix.

- The case studies would be more useful if there was a clear 'before and after' section showing what difference the intervention made

- ... a kind of web forum for exchanging practices and ideas ...could be useful. And maybe from time to time or maybe for all time - a kind of interactive debate would be quite a good idea.
- ... another way to report the workshops. Maybe more interactive thru a wiki.
- Blogs and Forums can help in join people and allow cultural exchange.
- less technical language . think about simple people.
- Internal knowledge sharing eg presentations to other staff on knowledge gained at conferences etc
- I find newsletters with (only) headers and a short summary (linked to more information on the website) the quickest way to gather the information.
- perhaps some "national events" linked to national agencies? In the regions away from the capital cities?

QUESTIONS 7.4 / 7.5 – KNOWLEDGE OFFERS

As in 2007, many (about a third) responded positively to the request for information which could be shared via templates for the web site. As in 2007, follow up work will be needed. This summary is included to give an idea of the range of input available – much of it connects to themes and issues of interest to respondents, as indicated by other responses.

- Relationship between heritage conservation and sustainable development (Washington)
- We have a well developed decentralised energy network in Southampton providing Combined Heat & Power to a number of energy users, saving a significant proportion of carbon emissions every year. (Southampton)
- Environmental Management Systems (Leeds)
- Information about experiences of The City of Lodz concerning achieving SUD goals - mainly in Urban Planning - but enough contacts in other areas of the city to offer input in a wide range. (Lodz)
- A partnership public/private at a local level for improving the network of social inclusion (Genoa)
- Public-private partnerships - evaluation (projects in the frame of the European Employment Strategy) (Gjon)
- Regional road charging, city toll ring, Urban Ecology program, city-wide environmental management system (early in developing this) Peer review techniques (developed within ICLEI) Implementing agency-level environmental management - eg. ISO 1401 & eco-lighthouse, Environmental procurement, eg low emission car fleet, Environmental programming of development projects (Oslo)
- Brownfield revitalization, public transport (Nantes)
- Intelligent Transport System used to ensure observance of traffic regulation and to favour implementation of traffic management strategies (Bologna)
- SUDS, understanding pressures on developers, formulating renewable energy/carbon reduction policies, increasing sustainability of existing housing stock (Sheffield)
- Spatial Planning, especially Brownfield regeneration and urban sprawl issues (Tallin)
- Public participation (Brno)
- Public participation in urban regeneration and urban planning; cultural aspects for urban development; (Lublin)
- On Urban Policy - Prague Strategic Plan; On Preservation of Historic City Quarters - Prague Management Plan (after approval of Municipal Assembly and translation into English - applies to both documents) (Prague)
- Energy and climate (Utrecht)

- Issues ranging from city-wide to local Mobility planning and Comprehensive city development planning (Antwerp)
- About innovation and cluster development Support of SME-s (Tallin)
- Installation of CHP[?] in city centre developments ...new partnership arrangements (Birmingham)
- Case studies based on my city's experiences (Bristol)
- After concluding the Pepesec Project, we would be able to contribute the Thessaloniki experience in Energy Planning (Thessaloniki)
- Sustainable Urban Development in Historical Cities (Seville)
- Energy, transport, redevelopment, cooperation within the city administration, communication to citizens (Malmo)
- integrated urban regeneration, spatial planning, citizen participation, periphery and peri-urban local development (Italy – regional response)
- Efficient and effective use of water; Urban noise maps (Murcia)
- Sustainable public procurement; supporting eco business by an EcoBusinessPlan (Vienna)
- Sustainability Reporting, Citizen Participation (Zurich)

CONCLUSION

Once again there has been a good response to the survey. It has given helpful information about stakeholder working and has shed more light on how those working in this field get access to information and support and how they would like to do so. The additional and up-to-date information it provides will direct the project's work in its final year and contribute to evaluation of the project. Taken together the three surveys will also help Urban Matrix to make recommendations to the European Commission regarding how knowledge is disseminated, the types/forms of knowledge cities need and the manner in which it is presented. More speculatively we might also suggest that the activities we have noted represent an element in cities' 'networking' activities which in turn may be seen as part of a wider Europeanization process in which cities are active participants.

Eileen Lepine
Rob Atkinson

UWE
12.02.09

APPENDIX ONE – THE SURVEY

LEVEL ONE

- 1.1 Name: Organisation: Department/section: Position: Country:
E-mail Address: Postal Address: Phone: Fax:
- 1.2 What are the key European/national/regional/local issues driving your interest in sustainable urban development?

LEVEL TWO

- 2.1 Please click on no more than five particular issues on which you require knowledge. If you want a definition of an issue please refer to the [glossary](#)

Anti-Discrimination

Benchmarking, Brownfield Sites, Building Materials

Citizen Participation, Compact Cities, Competitiveness

Eco-Friendly Transport, Eco-Labeling, Education/Awareness Raising, Energy Management, Environmental Impact Plans/Assessment, EU, Evaluation

Finance

Globalisation

Integrated transport systems

Local Agenda 21 and similar activities

Mainstreaming

New build, Noise Reduction

Public-Private Partnerships, Public Spaces

Regeneration, Road pricing/congestion charging, The role of ICT

Shrinking Cities, Social Cohesion, Spatial Planning, Sustainable Procurement

Traffic management

Urban Air quality, Urban Biodiversity, Urban Demographic Change, Urban Health/Healthy Cities, Urban Heritage and Conservation, Urban Safety/Security
Urban sprawl

Waste Management, Water use

- 2.2 If there are other issues, not included in this list, on which you require knowledge describe them in the box below.

LEVEL 3

3.1 Which local stakeholders do you think it is most important to work with in developing sustainable urban development policies/action? Please indicate in the table below by numbering from 1 to 5 (1 - most important, 5 least important)

Other departments in your local authority					
Other public sector organisations/bodies					
Private sector organisations					
NGOs (non governmental organisations)					
Local residents and their organisations					
Other(s) not included above - please specify					

3.2 In the box below, please provide a short description of the organisational arrangements developed by your city for working with stakeholders (in association with sustainable urban development policies) Please give hypertext links to any relevant policy documents.

3.3 Do you require knowledge/information to support work in partnership with stakeholders? If so, please use the box below to indicate the key issues on which such knowledge would be helpful.

LEVEL 4

Your answers to these questions will give us more information about your knowledge needs and the best ways to meet them.

4.1 Please select the type(s) of knowledge you require. Please place a tick in the relevant box(es).

Research knowledge: Research outcomes/project outputs	
Practice knowledge: Implemented practices/SUD solutions	
Policy knowledge: Policy drivers/legislation	
Network knowledge: Human resources/Staff exchange/Training	
Other: e.g. Newsletters/Academic literature	

4.2 If you have chosen other, please specify the type of knowledge/information you are interested in using no more than 250 characters

4.3 Please specify your preferred means for accessing knowledge. Please place a tick in the relevant box(es)

The web	
Personal interaction through workshops/conferences	
Paper based forms	
Other (If you clicked on other please describe it in the box below using no more than 250 characters)	

LEVEL 5

5.1 How often do you use the internet as a tool to access knowledge on Sustainable Urban Development? (Please note! - we are interested in use of the web as a knowledge tool, not in all, everyday, routine uses) Please place a tick in the relevant box

Once every 2-3 months	
Once a month	
2-3 times a month	
2-3 times a week	
Every day	

5.2 What kind of internet sources do you usually consult to search for this type of knowledge? Please indicate in the table below how often you use these different sources

	often	sometimes	never
Official EU / international websites			
Official national or regional websites (in your own language)			
Dedicated websites on urban research (e.g. EUKN, URBAN MATRIX)			
Networks and mailing lists			
Forums, blogs, wikis			
Other - please specify here			

5.3 What kind of information do you usually look for?

	often	sometimes	never
Policy framework (legislation, national /regional policies) on a specific topic			
Case studies / best practice			
Research studies			
News and events			
Contacts / experts			
Other - please specify here			

5.4 The information I find on the internet is usually:

	strongly disagree	disagree	neither agree nor disagree	agree	strongly agree
Sufficient					
Comprehensive					
Reliable					
Up-to-date					
Accessible in my own language					

5.5 Please explain your main difficulties when looking for information and knowledge on Sustainable Urban Development topics on the internet in the box below.

LEVEL 6

- 6.1 How often do you participate in workshops and/or conferences?
- Less than once a year
 - Once a year
 - 2-5 times a year
 - Once a month
 - More than once a month
- 6.2 What was the theme of the last conference you attended?
- 6.3 Which conference format do you prefer?
- Large-scale conference (100-300 participants)
 - Small-scale conference (20-50 participants)
 - Workshops or training (10-15 participants)
- 6.4 In which type of events do you usually participate?
- Local or regional events
 - National events
 - European/International events
- 6.5 What do you consider to be the most important reason for/benefit of participating in workshops/conferences? Please indicate by numbering from 1 to 5 in the table below (1- most important, 5 least important)

knowledge gained through keynote speakers						
knowledge gained through practical case studies						
knowledge gained through technical presentations/ demonstrations						
networking with other practitioners						
papers and material available at conferences						
Other - please specify here						

LEVEL 7 Your Views About URBAN MATRIX

- 7.1 Have you used the Urban Matrix website? If yes, experience of using it?
- 7.2 Have you ever participated in any of the URBAN MATRIX workshops? If so please tick those you have attended. If you have participated, please tell us about your experience
- Seminar 1: Spatial Planning and Sustainable Urban Development,
Seminar 2: Sustainable Development and Urban Transformation,
Seminar 3: Citizen Participation and Sustainable Urban Development,
- 7.3 Do you have any other suggestions for the dissemination of knowledge through URBAN MATRIX? Please let us know by adding your comments in the box below (you will be limited to 250 characters).

Finally - do you feel able to offer information on 'good practice' or lessons you have learnt in relation to any aspect of Sustainable Urban Development? If yes, on what area(s) of Sustainable Urban Development could you offer information?

APPENDIX TWO DRIVERS

<p>Traffic and transport issues</p> <p>Related key words (number choosing)</p> <p>Eco friendly transport (17)</p> <p>Integrated transport systems (16)</p> <p>Traffic mgt (11)</p> <p>Road pricing/ congestion charging (10)</p> <p>Noise reduction (6)</p>	<p>Referred to by 18 cities in Austria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden and the UK.</p> <p>Comments referred to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic congestion and its negative effects, including pollution, noise • reductions in CO2 emissions • sustainable /eco friendly alternatives to the car – public transport, cycling, walking • the need to popularise these alternatives; (one respondent expressed concern about lack of awareness about traffic/transport management problems in their city). <p>Examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bologna has been involved in a plan to limit the negative effects of traffic - congestion, air pollution and road safety. To this purpose it has to work at two levels: a new infrastructure framework and effective actions to be introduced immediately. • My interest is in transportation and developing and improving our transportation network in a sustainable way, supporting economic objectives at both a local, regional, and national level
<p>Energy</p> <p>Related key words Energy mgt (8)</p>	<p>Referred to by 17 cities in Austria, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden and the UK. Here concerns varied from a focus on decreasing consumption, energy efficiency and/or renewable energy to specific concerns about the operation of local heating systems.</p>
<p>Climate change</p>	<p>Climate change was explicitly referred to by 13 cities in Austria, Finland, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the UK</p>
<p>Sustainable economic development - economic/ employment issues</p> <p>Related keywords Competitiveness (10)</p>	<p>11 cities in Finland, France, Italy, Northern Ireland, Norway, Poland, Spain, Switzerland and the UK referred to issues including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment • Entrepreneurs, support for business projects / enterprise • Competitiveness • Land management for economic activities • regeneration of peripheries, polycentric development, urban sprawl at regional level and related problems of mobility and energy consumption • Tourism • the need for infrastructure investments in post communist cities

	<p>Examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to grow the population of the city of Belfast and promote a sustainable, balanced and compact city model. Develop new industries. Develop the city centre. Deliver an accessible and sustainable city for future generations. • To have a good economic situation, to be able to invest in ecological and social improvements. - sustainable economical development • Successful cohesion policy requires well functioning cities as drivers of development, particularly in new member states • Oslo is peripheral in Europe. The city has high levels of immigration, consumption and mobility in a petroleum-dependent economy. The city's physical growth is limited, with densification and growth in neighbouring communities as a consequence.
<p>Urban / city regeneration (incl. housing renewal)</p> <p>Related keywords Compact cities (16) Regeneration (12) Urban sprawl (14) Brownfield sites (8) Shrinking cities (7) New build (1)</p>	<p>13 cities – Finland, Germany, Italy, Poland, the Netherlands, Romania, Switzerland and the UK</p> <p>Issues included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • city revitalisation, urban regeneration / rehabilitation • transformation of old harbour areas • newly built neighbourhoods • urban sprawl • housing – including housing renewal (especially estates), the Sustainable Homes Code Sustainable Communities Agenda and Housing Market Renewal (UK) and the need for social housing for the young and for immigrants.
<p>Diversity, social cohesion (and other population issues)</p> <p>Related keywords Anti-discrimination (4) Social cohesion (14) Urban demographic change (9)</p>	<p>Fourteen cities in Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Poland, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the UK referred to issues including integration / segregation / exclusion / social cohesion</p> <p>Examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparing a future spatial environment that is a better and more attractive place to live in for a harmonious society in all its diversity • The development of big cities from many different angles. Helsinki and its region is growing fast and international comparison is important. The amount of immigrants is obvious. The social cohesion is a big challenge. Urban sprawl is a risk. <p>Three cities in the Czech Republic, Finland and the UK referred to other population issues, including an aging population and (one city) children in cities</p>

<p>Planning issues</p> <p>Related keywords Spatial planning (10) Envtal impact plans / assessment (5)</p>	<p>Nine cities referred in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Spain, Sweden and the UK referred to planning issues including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land use planning • Healthy Urban Planning • Sustainable and integrated land use planning as the basis for sustainable urban development. <p>For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [the] City of Brno is looking [at]...how to regulate urban phenomena such as sub-urbanization and urban sprawl with the use of strategic governance and innovative approaches in implementation and evaluation of strategic development plans.
<p>Environmental issues</p> <p>Related keywords Public spaces (8) Urban biodiversity (5) Waste management (7) Urban air quality (8)</p>	<p>Five cities in Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and the UK referred to issues connected with ecology and nature in the city, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public (green) spaces • the natural environment • agriculture in peri-urban areas <p>Two cities, both in the UK referred to waste disposal, reduction, recycling</p> <p>Four cities in the Netherlands, Switzerland and the UK referred to air quality /air pollution</p> <p>Four cities in the Netherlands and the UK referred to flooding and coastal protection.</p>

APPENDIX THREE – PARTNERSHIP WORKING

CITY WIDE STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS	
UK	The Council consults about a wide range of subjects. This work is important in helping us to make decisions and deliver our services more effectively. http://www.sheffield.gov.uk/your-city-council/consultation We consult on our planning development framework - see http://www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning-and-city-development/planning-documents/sdf/consultation-on-the-sdf Key stakeholders are engaged through 'Local Strategic Partnership' - Sheffield First. See: http://www.sheffieldfirst.net
UK	Bristol Partnership and topic based sub groups. Local Area Agreement with GOSW and other public bodies. Ward councilors and local NGO's geographically and city wide pressure/interest groups covering communities of interest. see www.bristol.gov.uk Questionnaires and citizens juries.
UK	We work with private, public and NG representatives through the Greater Nottingham Partnership. The Greater Nottingham Partnership (GNP) was formed in 1994 with the aim of improving partnership working across the Nottingham conurbation and attracting more government regeneration funding into the area. The GNP has also created the Greater Nottingham Development Strategy to further the economic development of the sub-region.
UK	The main partnership facilitation mechanism is the Leeds Initiative, the Local Strategic Partnership for Leeds which has produced the local Community Strategy, Vision for Leeds, based on widespread public consultation. The partnership operates via a series of theme based partnerships. More information on the Vision for Leeds and Leeds Initiative is available from the Leeds Initiative website www.leedsinitiative.org .
UK	The main forum for interaction with public, private and voluntary sector organisations is the Local Strategic Partnership - Sheffield First. The Planning department has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement to ensure the public and other stakeholders are actively engaged in the planning process. This can be accessed at: http://www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning-and-city-development/planning-documents/sdf/statement-of-community-involvement
UK	Set up a "Local Strategic Partnership" with dedicated sub-partnership on Environment covering climate change. Local Area Agreements set up for CO2 emissions, adaptation, waste, etc. New protocols being developed with public sector agencies.

SUSTAINABILTY FOCUS / FORUMS	
SWITZERLAND	The city of Zurich is one of the founding members of "The Sustainability Forum Zurich" (TSF). TSF is an independent, non-profit, non-partisan association, which started its activities in 1999 and was initiated by leading representatives from business, science and the public authorities. It has sixteen institutional members. The association serves as a dialogue platform striving to promote sustainability in and through the financial markets.
SPAIN	Two years ago, The municipality created the "Environment Forum" in order to have an space where local administration and public organisations could discuss about several issues such as energy (strategy for the use of renewable energies in the city), waste, water consumption, natural resources, etc... It is composed by a representative of every political group in the council, builder firm associations, green associations, neighbourhood associations
NL	MVO-pact: organisation of companies in Hengelo who want to incorporate sustainability in their conduct of business (support by city of Hengelo) – Various conference groups with housing companies, business area's – Various activities for consulting our local people (depending on project at hand)

SUSTAINABILITY FOCUS / FORUMS	
SWEDEN	In the budget for the City of Gteborg there is a vision of a sustainable city. All the leaders of the local administrations and companies work together to reach the vision, and the implement and coordinate the work in each organization.
N.I.	Within Belfast City Council, sustainable development is managed by the Sustainable Development Manager and the Sustainable Development Steering Group, which comprises representatives from Facilities Management, Waste Management, Human Resources, Conservation and Promotion, Procurement and Fleet Management. The Sustainable Development Steering Group will continue to identify sustainable development issues and will advise on actions that enable Belfast City Council to fulfil its obligations under
ITALY	Local agenda 21 was set up in Municipality, but participation models are not very well applied. This process takes time and require correct knowledge in management of participation process.
	Helsinki Agenda 21

PLANNING FOCUS	
ESTONIA	City Council decides the need for new development plans and strategies. Also the need for consultation with different stakeholders is specified in its decision.
POLAND	The city invites stakeholders to studial meetings and shows the general concept. Then create working groups making a final draft of programme. Then the draft is being send to public sector organisations,NGOs,residents and other depts of city office to give an opinion.When the programme has prepared impact assessment and includes notices from above sources,then there is preparing Draft of Lodz Assemblys Resolution,which is voted.E.g.New Lodz Centre Programme http://www.ec1.org.pl/ideology.php
UK	stakeholders are involved from the start of preparing the development plan and transportation strategies and therefore can influence the policies and actions contained within them. specific project development emerging from the development plan and transportation stratgeis also includes key stakeholder involvement from the outset.
ESTONIA	Within the municipal administration the procedures are set by the Law of Local Governments https://www.riigiteataja.ee/ert/act.jsp?id=12849896 The Planning Law regulates the work with different stakeholders within the field of spatial planning https://www.riigiteataja.ee/ert/act.jsp?id=12991135
CZECH REP	-cooperation with Spatial Planning and Development Department (Brno city) - cooperation with Regional Development Department and Spatial Planning Department (Southern Moravia Region) within the city-region development and metropolitan area - working group for updating Brno City Strategy - working groups for some projects (e.g.URBACT II) - cooperation with universities in the field of city development, research, innovation and knowledge economy - private sector after-care for investors
BELGIUM	In every planning issue stakeholders are contacted in as early a stage as possible in close cooperation with the city's communication and social departments, in a process tailored to the scale of the project
FINLAND	many possibilities for local residents to take part in planning and communicate their opinions
SPAIN	Seville has complete two important processes: Seville 2010 Strategic Plan: the city's development strategy which, among a broad range of city institutions, designs a Seville which is more sustainable, prosperous and habitable for its citizens and for those from outside. New General Urban Development Plan. This instrument links a number of actions in the territory to a city project. Both plans define the city model and set up mechanisms for participation in its development by all players

	PLANNING FOCUS
ESTONIA	For example detailed planning procedure - the plan will be announced and the public has the opportunity to express their opinion about it. Stakeholder involvement is not used as much as it should be but there are opportunities for people who are active and interested in policy making/implementation to express their opinion and get in touch with city officials/politicians.
FINLAND	local area networks, providing meeting place for all authorities in local issues
ITALY	In the framework of the new Urban Traffic Plan, online forums and public meetings have been opened to stakeholders, to show and discuss actions scheduled in the Plan, to share new ideas and proposals and to debate directly with public servants the new rules introduced. Within the Mobility Manager strategy, the Municipality supports the Mobility Manager in his work: at this purpose it has a technical structure addressed to perform and supervise this activity (Area Mobility Manager office).
FINLAND	Our city is preparing a policy paper on preventing the climate change. City council and all committees are asked their opinion for the paper.
SWEDEN	In producing our Plan for sustainable development we work together with boards and departments from the municipality- www.helsingborg.se/hallbarutveckling

	VARIOUS
UK	our division currently works by guidance set out in our Statement for Community Involvement, which forms part of our Local Development Framework, when consulting on planning documents. Other stakeholder engagement is dependent on historic partnership arrangements and new opportunities for joint working.
UK	This depends on the specific subject under consideration
SPAIN	Our Donostia Auzolan conciliation project was held in association with the Gipuzkoa Law College, CEIT (Gipuzkoa Centre for Technical Study and Research), GAIA, CCOO (Comisiones Obreras trade union) and EUDEL (Association of Basque Municipalities), and was co-financed by the ESF, the Basque Government and the Gipuzkoa Regional Council. In the project, technology was linked to a professional and personal reconciliation that offers tangible solutions to employees. www.econcilia.net
AM'DAM	To work together with the other local authorities we invented the 'wards'. This is a interaction platform that focuses on the four directions of the wind. So the city is divided in four areas in which the region comes together and finds holes to fill.
SWEDEN	Different administrations within the City works together in various levels in planning and implementing different policies. Stakeholders "outside" are also invited in to the process at all levels.
POLAND	no specific arrangement is in place; the working contacts are created along the current needs
ROMANIA	The city of Timisoara established consultative district councils in every district. See: www.primariatm.ro
SWEDEN	We have an interdepartmental group working together with different stakeholders
CZECH REP	Participation of stakeholders in preparation of development documents (e.g. workshops); Access of general public to proceedings of supreme city administrative bodies (Municipal Assembly and its committees, City Council and its committees)
NL	A lot of regulations have been provided to protect people and the environment. For environmental issues in which we need to make a step further (climate, health) cities need to seek partnerships with stakeholders. These are different for every aspect of these subjects. So there is a range from round tables with stakeholders, partnerships, gentlemen agreements and public communication in which we can or hope to achieve these steps forward.

	VARIOUS
BELGIUM	steering group sustainable urban development. still in start off.
DENMARK	Stakeholder involvement by 6 concrete planning. Stakeholder dialogue meetings by strategy formulations (visions, strategies and actions)
GREECE	We have just formed our "stakeholder map", as part of our participation in the PEPESEC project (INTELLIGENT EUROPE), that includes representatives of all local and regional authorities, research institutes, chamber of industry and commerce and citizens' organizations
BELGIUM	cooperation agreements, missions, programmes operationnels, partnerships.... for general clients : publications or www.statbru.irisnet.be or www.brustat.irisnet.be
SWEDEN	formation of agreements with private business (PPP), mostly on specific issues, Formation of new organisations to facilitate practical research (i.e. between the university and the city), participation in regional cross-dimensional networks
FINLAND	- regional general planning of land use and transportation system - climate strategy (being drafted at the moment) Probably a lot more around buildings etc. My knowledge is limited to transportation planning -
ITALY Regional response?	Few neighborhood labs, Ag 21 forum no more active, approval of Rules for Participation http://www.urbanistica.comune.roma.it/urbaroma/pages/it/percorsi_partecipazione/
SPAIN	web site: www.murcia.es/medio-ambiente Working groups with other municipal departments or other public administration. Agreements with NGOs and professional organisations. Meetings with local residents and their organisations (Foro 21)
ITALY	take a look at our project named PIANO REGOLATORE SOCIALE GENOVA

	WEBLINKS
SPAIN	Our main experiences working with the stakeholders are the following: - Pacto Gijn por el Empleo 2000-2003 http://www.gijon.es/documentos/Publicaciones/Promocion%20Economica%20Empleo%20y%20Turismo/Pacto%20Gijon%20por%20el%20empleo%202000-2003/PactoGijonEmpleo.pdf - Pacto Gijn Emprende 2004-2007 http://www.gijon.es/documentos/Departamentos/ALE/Otros/Pacto%20Gij%F3n%20Emprende%202004-2007.pdf - Acuerdo Gijn innova 2008-2011 http://www.gijon.es/documentos/Departamentos/ALE/AGENDA/2008/
GERMANY	www.urban-leipzig.de , www.leipziger-osten.de
FRANCE	http://www.nantesmetropole.fr/25973909/0/fiche__pagelibre/
BELGIUM	http://www.prd.irisnet.be/ is the link to the regional development plan.
ESTONIA	Tallinn Development Strategy 2025 - http://tallinn.andmevara.ee/oa/page.Tavakasutaja?c=1.1.1.1&id=96947 Tallinn City Development plan 2009-2021 http://tallinn.andmevara.ee/oa/page.Tavakasutaja?c=1.1.1.1&id=96947 Tallinn Environmental Strategy 2010 - http://tallinn.andmevara.ee/oa/page.Tavakasutaja?c=1.1.1.1&id=111699 ICT Strategy 2008-2013 - http://tallinn.andmevara.ee/oa/page.Tavakasutaja?c=1.1.1.1&id=111699 Tallinn Innovational Strategy 2009-2013 - http://tallinn.andmevara.ee/oa/page.Tavak
GERMANY	www.sozialbericht.dortmund.de
AUSTRIA	Urban Development Plan Vienna see http://www.wien.gv.at/stadtentwicklung/step/publikationen.htm ; participation is one of our principles. For Local Agenda processes in Vienna see http://www.la21wien.at/ . There is also a platform for participation in Aust