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Preface

Urban change spans all ages. Buildings, trees, streets, neighbourhoods and the people living or working there grow older, while elsewhere new houses are built, streets are laid and young people settle. But people can change more easily than buildings and the built environment. Some neighbourhoods do not adapt gradually to changed circumstances, but lapse into deprivation. Urban policies are necessary in these areas to revitalise them. Cities across Europe have deprived areas, and urban renewal policies are carried out in all of them. These approaches are made up of several measures and strategies, including the physical improvement of buildings (often dwellings) and the environment.

This report presents an overview of 50 (mainly) successful urban renewal projects in the EU member states. We focus on physical measures and strategies, largely leaving aside economic, social and other measures.

The report has been written for the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs and will be used for the German chairmanship of the EU in the first half of 2007. The report is written by authors connected with the European Urban Knowledge Network in The Hague (EUKN), an umbrella organisation for knowledge centres in Europe dealing with urban policies. The EUKN Secretariat is housed at the Nicis Institute, Urban Research & Practice. This report has been assisted by an advisory group and by employees from the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning. The following experts participated in this advisory group:
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1 Introduction

Cities change constantly. Urban change can sometimes be seen as a more or less autonomous process – for example when some groups of migrants, businesses or facilities move in and others move out. In other cases urban change is a deliberate strategy of local or national governments or of a set of collaborating partners. Here a decision has been made to carry out an urban renewal or restructuring process, accompanied by clear and concrete measures. The reasons behind such a process and measures are often that the policy makers believe dilapidated urban areas need to be renewed or improved.

By definition, physical renewal leads to new physical structures: new buildings, new roads, new facilities and new public spaces. Physical renewal can be a goal on its own. This is the case when old buildings have to be replaced because they suffer physical problems. But physical measures often have a broader aim. Physical improvement of a specific urban area can be part of the higher aim of improving neighbourhoods in a social and economic sense (for example, creating vital neighbourhoods). Physical improvement of an urban area can also be carried out with an even broader aim: better neighbourhoods can improve the quality or economic viability of a city or even a whole urban region. Finally, physical improvement of a neighbourhood can improve the position of individuals. In this vision, physical measures lead to better individual chances, for example in the labour market. Seen from this perspective, physical measures are clearly regarded as a way to reach broader aims.

Physical renewal in Europe is generally carried out not only for physical reasons. In some cases the effects of physical measures can be seen as an indirect or even unintended effect. But effects can also be intended. For example: the physical demolition of part of a neighbourhood with many relatively cheap homes, replacing them with more expensive owner-occupied dwellings, will most probably effect a change from a poor resident population to a more affluent one. Tearing down dilapidated parking garages is a physical measure, but can also have the deliberate effect of destroying meeting places for drugs dealers.

Urban renewal activities obviously affect these areas themselves, but they may also have implications for other areas in the same city or even beyond. New homes may attract residents from other neighbourhoods in the city for example, leaving dwellings vacant in those areas. The physical improvement of an area may improve its safety situation, but when it merely leads to relocating crime to other spots the net effect may be marginal. Attention should be given to these so-called displacement effects when evaluating urban policies.

Numerous urban renewal or restructuring projects have been carried out in virtually all EU member states’ towns and cities over the past decade. Many of these projects were successful. But not all targets were accomplished, while unintended side-effects have been created in some instances.

Many of these projects have been characterised by an integrative approach. This concept has two meanings. First, it can refer to a combination of measures from different sectors or segments, for example a combination of physical, social and economic measures. Second, the concept of integration can refer to collaboration between different partners, for example a public and a private one, or between governments, housing corporations and inhabitants. The term urban governance is often used for such urban project collaboration.
Main aim of the study

In this report we offer an overview of a number of (mainly) successful physical urban renewal projects. We have collated examples of good practices from EU member states. The main aim is to draw a number of conclusions which may be applicable for formulating new European projects in urban renewal and restructuring. This is done on the basis of the collated examples, and with the help of ideas formulated in other research projects, articles and books. We will attempt to discover why certain projects have been successful and others less so. We will also consider the circumstances under which lessons from the projects could be useful in other (urban, national, political) contexts.

Guiding questions

The objectives above produce a number of questions:

1. How can deprived urban areas be characterised?
2. Which urban planning measures and strategies are carried out in the cases under examination?
3. Which urban planning measures contribute to the enhancement of living standards in deprived areas?
4. How are urban renewal planning policies organised and how do several actors contribute to the process?
5. What is the surplus value of collaboration between actors and the combination of different sectors?
6. In what way are residents involved?
7. What are the results of physical renewal measures?
8. Is it possible to determine what factors contribute to a successful urban planning policy in enhancing living standards in deprived areas?

These questions will be addressed in this report. In its core we will focus on several aspects of the projects, attempting to determine the success and failure factors in various contexts. The conclusions focus specifically on some of the questions raised above.

Choices, methodology and limitations

All (then) 25 EU member states were approached for examples. Several sources were used within these countries, such as municipalities, research groups at universities and housing corporations. We decided to take up an average of just two projects per country. This resulted in a selection of 50 projects, characterised by something new, for example a new combination of goals, a new way of involving partners, etc. This implies that we tried not just to get the most well-known projects in the biggest cities. The aim of the selection was to collect as many ingredients as possible to portray successful urban policies. Given the various types of partners approached and our selection for this report, the examples cannot automatically be regarded as representative for the country, let alone for the whole of Europe. But, to repeat, the main aim was to discover good practices, not to produce a representative report.

1 See Chapter 3 for a more elaborate account of the methodology underlying this research report.
Definitions

In this project we attempt to analyse success factors of physical urban renewal projects. We will not generally focus on physical projects aiming to improve just the physical structure of the city and the neighbourhood. The main aim is to focus on more integrated policies and measures: physical projects intended to improve aspects in other fields such as social and economic. As mentioned, these effects can be intentional or otherwise.

In the various countries, with their own languages, there are many definitions of urban renewal. We consider urban renewal to be the entire process of policy intervention to change part of the city. Our focus on physical measures means we pay specific attention to interventions in buildings and landscapes. Related, but slightly different, concepts are revitalisation (generally referring to the economic improvement of a backward area or city), social renewal (generally aimed at individual development), refurbishment (restoration of buildings), upgrading (making an area attractive for another target group) or gentrification (more or less spontaneous improvement of an area mainly by individual efforts).

Outline of the report

This report starts with a general overview of deprived urban areas and current trends in urban policies. The 50 cases on which the report is based are introduced in section 3. Sections 4-6 cover issues, problems, measures, strategies and the organisation of the process. Section 7 presents results, while Section 8 goes into the 50 projects’ success and failure factors. Section 9 presents final conclusions.

The underlying templates of the cases are available via the EUKN website: www.eukn.org.

2 Deprived urban areas and urban policies against deprivation: a brief overview

Deprived urban areas: a general overview

Cities and their regions can generally be seen as the engines of the national economy. When these cities contain areas that are not faring well, it is important to find out how best to change them, because they exercise negative effects on the city’s image and even on the urban economy itself. Physical decline of urban areas may go hand in hand with social and economic decline.

Almost by definition, cities are characterised by inequalities. They are places for both poor and rich households. Within a city different facets can be distinguished: a thriving or dilapidated city centre is usually surrounded by areas of low-cost housing attracting a variety of low-income households, such as indigenous and minority ethnic groups, old and young individuals, singles and (often relatively poor) families, those with different lifestyles and interests. More suburban environments are found towards the city outskirts and beyond, generally attracting the less-poor family households. Naturally this generalised picture does not apply precisely this way to each European city.
Cities comprise various districts and neighbourhoods, each with its own function, nature, architectural style, attraction, and advantages and disadvantages for residents, businesses and visitors. Deprived neighbourhoods exist in many different forms. Some areas can be characterised by one single problem, such as noise from an adjacent railway track, while other areas are characterised by a multitude of problems. Some areas are made up of multi-family units or even overwhelmingly high-rises, while others are typically single-family areas. Some areas have an over-representation of foreign immigrants, while nationals almost exclusively inhabit others. For an area to become included in a national urban policy programme it is often required that it exhibits a multitude of problems.

Low-cost housing areas are targeted particularly often for a variety of urban renewal policies. Depending on place and time, these policies can be very radical, leading to demolition of the whole area for example, followed by complete reconstruction. Or the measures may be much softer, perhaps aiming only at better social relations between the various groups of residents. Urban areas across Europe are targeted by urban policies.

**Deprived urban areas: the problems**

What problems may there be in deprived urban areas? A general list can be presented based on earlier research:\(^2\)

- Many dwellings show clear signs of physical decay and long lists of physical housing problems can sometimes be produced. These lists may include: problems with the construction of buildings themselves, damp rooms, elevators that do not work properly, etc.
- Relatively cheap housing attracts those households that cannot afford to live elsewhere, leading to a population that is uninterested in the neighbourhood itself, nor in bonding with others living there.
- Many deprived urban areas are characterised by a disproportionate number of the unemployed or those with other disadvantages, such as the elderly with low pensions, etc.
- Deprived urban areas are often characterised by unsafe places and a variety of criminal activities.
- Public space may be dirty, dysfunctional or dangerous.
- An increasing number of cars may cause traffic-jams, parking problems and insecurity on the streets for children.
- Neighbourhood centres are declining and sometimes closed\(^3\).
- Stigmatisation of a neighbourhood can arise from downgrading processes in the area, especially when the processes of decay are broadly covered in the media. Getting rid of these negative images is often very difficult.

Turkington and colleagues (2004) have systematically listed a range of problems identified by several authors across many countries as typical for large housing estates built

---

\(^2\) See e.g. Taylor (1998); Power (1997); Evans (1998); Hall (1997); Social Exclusion Unit (1998); Cars (2000); Wacquant (1996); Musterd et al. (1999); Dekker and Van Kempen (2005).

\(^3\) Nyström (2006) describes the growth and decline of the carefully planned neighbourhood centres of the post-war decades.
in the first three or four decades after the Second World War. With some adaptation they can be used in a more general sense:

- **Structural problems** refer to the usage of building methods and poor quality materials, resulting for example in poorly constructed dwellings and housing blocks.
- **Internal design problems** may refer to the lack of good heating facilities, sanitary equipment and storage space.
- **Urban design or spatial problems** are related to poor location (e.g. distance to the city centre), high building density and problems with traffic (e.g. noise pollution, lack of parking).
- **Internal social problems** have to do with noise pollution from fellow residents or other types of antisocial behaviour, crime, and/or poor neighbour relations.
- **Financial problems** exist both for tenants because of increasing rents and service charges, and for landlords who have to deal with problems of rent arrears, vacancies and maintenance costs.
- **Management and organisational problems** result from inadequate maintenance and insufficient resources.
- **Legislative problems** concern the ownership of flats and blocks and the space around them. When it is unclear who owns what, responsibilities for improving that part of the area will also be unclear. This can be the case in some Central and Eastern European countries where the responsibility for public space around high-rise blocks is unclear.
- **Wider social-economic problems** can have their impact on an urban area, leading to problems such as high unemployment or poor schooling. A concentration of households living in such circumstances is expected to intensify problems.
- All these problems together are to some extent related to the final aspect which can be summarised with the term **competition problems**: due to a low market position or for example a poor image, estates can become less attractive and (potential) residents may prefer to live in another home in another neighbourhood.

The unhappy situation of deprived urban areas is that they generally exhibit a combination of most of these problems, or even all problems together, at the same time. Various developments may reinforce each other, leading to a spiral of decline. For example: when new, attractive housing is built adjacent to a neighbourhood, those who can afford to leave move out. This may produce vacancies in the neighbourhood and to a population that is more one-sided when it comes to income, for example. Gradually the area may become stigmatised as one which is not regarded as a very nice place to live in; it may even become a no-go area. New people do not move in and even more people move out, creating more vacancies in the housing stock, leading to unsafe situations, criminal activities and an even less attractive living environment than before.

In Northern and Western Europe, many problematic urban areas are characterised by the presence of social or public rented dwellings. Such areas are often the only place in the city or urban region where low-income households find affordable housing. But we should beware of drawing too rapid conclusions: not every area with a majority of social rented dwellings is automatically a problematic area. In fact, similar areas or even housing blocks can vary immensely in terms of the presence and character of problems.

---

4 See also Heeger (1993); Wassenberg (1993); Power (1997); Turkington (1997); Skifter Andersen (2003); Murie et al. (2003).
5 See also Van Beckhoven et al. (forthcoming).
6 Such spirals of decline are described for example by Prak and Priemus (1986) and Power (1997).
This variation is possible between countries, between cities, but even between similar areas within cities.\(^7\) In countries with a low number of social or public rented dwellings, the cheap owner-occupied sector is the one in which low-income households (have to) live. These are found more in Southern and, after privatisation, Central and Eastern Europe.\(^6\)

When characterising deprived urban areas as those with a large number of problems mutually interrelated, it becomes clear that a policy aimed simply at attacking only one of the problem aspects is doomed to fail. For example: the assumption that better management in a block of housing will also cause physical failures to disappear along with unemployment, is too simplistic. Almost automatically, integrated urban policies appear as maybe the only solution to the problems in deprived areas. Yet integration between policy sectors and between parties is generally a very complicated job.

**Current trends in urban policies**\(^9\)

Many scientists and governments believe that urban planning and better housing will automatically help to solve all kinds of social problems. Physical interventions would lead to solving problems such as criminality, social disintegration, unemployment and even poverty. Certainly different physical environments may offer different opportunities for human behaviour: nice open, cosy squares may stimulate social contact between people, while dark tunnels may give rise to various types of criminal activity. But the scale of the effect of physical restructuring on social aspects remains to be seen.\(^10\) It could be that the social effects of physical plans are more intense than the social effects of social measures.\(^11\) Physical investments are often the most costly, and could be used as a focal point to attract and group further activities, budgets and key players around them to create synergies and integrated answers to complex problems.

Over recent decades, urban planning has changed from being a merely technical discipline, to a more political issue. Politicians and other stakeholders have started to realise that urban life is indeed an immensely complex issue that can never be solved by physical measures alone. Radical changes in the contents and organisation of the policies have been the result. Urban policies in general\(^12\) can currently be characterised by at least five dimensions or features:\(^13\)

- a development away from sectoral and towards integrative policies;
- a shift from government to governance, indicating participation of a larger number of policy partners;
- an increasing focus on the empowerment of the inhabitants of cities and specific neighbourhoods;
- a shift from more universal to focused area-based policies;
- a growing attention to the effectiveness of policies.

---

7  Van Kempen and Musterd (1991); Rietdorf and Liebmann (2002).
8  Also in Belgium, see Kesteloot et al. (1997).
9  This part is derived from Van Kempen et al. (2005).
10  Van Kempen et al. (2005); see also Andersen and Van Kempen (2003); Murie et al. (2003).
11  As Van der Land and Kleinhans state in their survey of a Dutch city.
12  This does not mean that in every specific country each aspect is equally important.
13  Van Kempen et al. (2005).
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From sectoral to integrative policies

In most Western European countries the tendency is to move from sectoral to more integrative policies. In terms of policy integration, Dutch urban policy is a clear attempt to integrate policy fields to arrive at what is perceived to be a complete city. A city is said to be complete if it has a strong economic, physical, and social structure. Urban policy in Denmark also takes the comprehensiveness of urban problems as its starting point. The world’s most successful cities are integrating approaches to social, economic and environmental issues, as well as addressing governmental issues. It has been discovered that the non-existence of a national urban policy may be detrimental to the integration of policy fields. This is especially the case for the new EU countries, where local governments are far more important for urban developments and urban policies than the national level. The lack of a stimulus from the national level clearly hinders the integration process, leading to a situation where sectoral policies still prevail.

The shift from government to governance

Related to a widespread retreat of the welfare state in Western countries, central governments have devolved many of their duties to other levels of government (provinces, regions and cities). Some cities have shown further decentralisation tendencies within their territories by devolving (some) power to city districts or even neighbourhoods. And starting in the late 1980s and in the 1990s, many of the tasks of central states and local governments were privatised: tasks were taken over by private companies. For example, to an increasing degree urban renewal and urban restructuring activities have been financed in part by construction companies and housing corporations. When it comes to all these deregulation, decentralisation and privatisation processes, some decisions on urban developments, neighbourhood policies and neighbourhood regeneration or reconstruction are often not made by (local) government alone, but by a mix of many different organisations and individuals, especially inhabitants of an area towards which the policy is targeted.

Governments have faced a development towards fragmentation and more differentiated forms of governance: government has become governance. In most cases national governments are not the sole provider of services and financial assets, nor the undisputed leaders of urban renewal processes. In a local setting, local governments no longer play an exclusive role as the leading policy-makers. More than ever before governments are just one of many actors in the policy arena. A type of paradigm change is occurring: from a situation in which a government is making the city, towards more bottom-up cooperation between the public and private sector. Partnerships, defined as coalitions of interests drawn from more than one sector to prepare and oversee an agreed strategy for combating urban problems, have emerged in all European countries, and certainly not only in Northern and Western European countries. Naturally integration does not

15 Kristensen (2001).
16 Kay, 2006
17 See, e.g., Mugnano et al. (2005), Pareja-Eastaway et al. (2004); Zajczyk et al. (2004), Szemző and Tosiics (2004), Plostajner et al. (2004)
18 Elander and Blanc (2001); Healey et al. (1995).
21 See Zajczyk et al. (2004), Pareja-Eastaway et al. (2004) and Mugnano et al. (2005), for an overview of the creation of partnerships in Spain and Italy.
automatically mean all partners have an equal input. In many cases heavy demands are imposed on one partner, such as local government.\textsuperscript{22}

\textit{A more important role of citizens}

In much of the recent literature on urban policy, and especially in literature on neighbourhood improvement,\textsuperscript{23} a principal topic is how to increase the social capital of the targeted area. The question is: how can the population of a neighbourhood acquire an ability to handle its own problems, often in combination with other stakeholders, such as local government and actors in the private sector? This demands a more or less radical shift in government policies, as citizens are not treated as objects of policy actions but as full participants in the policy process. Neither does government only have to listen to the people; it also has to involve them actively in all stages of the policy process. The philosophy is that by providing such competence, the residents are supposed to be capable of managing their own lives and the necessary actions for improvements. Community empowerment has become a key concept in discussions of urban regeneration in the UK, but has also spread to other European countries. The motives differ, but the general idea is that empowerment of the community would create long-standing, better and cheaper results than 'traditional' programmes.\textsuperscript{24} Involvement of citizens may also not only improve programmes, but may influence the positions of the participants themselves: the participation process may increase social contacts and social cohesion between people, thereby decreasing processes of social exclusion.

There are numerous ways of involving citizens in the policy process. Arnstein\textsuperscript{25} listed eight forms of participation in a so-called participation ladder. At the lowest two rungs, those with power are simply manipulative and one cannot speak of local participation (these forms are referred to as 'manipulation' or 'therapy'). Further up the ladder residents are informed or asked for their opinion (respectively 'informing' and 'consulting'). On the four highest rungs residents are increasingly involved in the decision-making process as equal partners; they get an advisory role, are involved in 'partnerships', get 'delegated power' and finally are in control.

An important question is the types of policies and the stages in which participation of inhabitants is appropriate. The answer depends on numerous factors, for example the willingness of national and local governments to include residents in the policy process, the scale of the problem (generally improving a small square in a neighbourhood leads to other decisions on resident participation than when demolishing a large part of the city), and the willingness of residents themselves to assume responsibility. The appropriate forms of participation have been recently been questioned (again) in internationally comparative research projects. In younger democracies, like Spain, the stimulation of resident participation is less common than in older ones like the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{22} See, e.g., Buček (2005). He states that in Slovakia the heavy demands on local governments are a direct reaction to the absence of national state policies on urban development. Petkevicius (2005) states more or less the same for Lithuania.

\textsuperscript{23} Sykes and Roberts (2000); Parkinson (1997); Colenutt (1999).

\textsuperscript{24} Healey (1998).

\textsuperscript{25} Arnstein (1969).

\textsuperscript{26} Van Beckhoven et al. (2005); see for more on local participation in Spain (especially Barcelona): Angels and Gallego (2002).
More area-based approaches

Area-based approaches have gained prominence over the past decade, largely because they create a good framework for concerted action to counteract multiple deprivation. This spatial perspective enables the development of a concrete platform on which cross-sectoral efforts can be co-ordinated. The spatial approach has often also been able to produce visible results within a relatively short time. Naturally this has made it popular among politicians, enabling them to demonstrate the results of their work. Finally the area-based approaches can produce considerable synergy, as they imply direct involvement and co-operation with the local community as well as with various public authorities, businesses and other organisations.\textsuperscript{27}

But a number of critical accounts of area-based approaches have been produced. One of the most significant objections to such a policy is the risk of displacing problems instead of solving them. When, for example, policies are aimed at improving an area by increasing effective policing in a defined zone, the result may very well be that criminality does indeed decline in the affected area. But criminal activity in other areas may rise, simply because criminals move to areas where policing is less intense.

There is a long-standing debate on the relationship between area-based approaches and those which are people-based. In the first view, a deprived area is selected and measures are taken to improve the area, the environment, the buildings and the situation of people within those areas. In the second, individual problems like low incomes, unemployment or antisocial behaviour are the starting point, and measures aim to solve these, regardless of where the people live. We believe a balance between these two points of view is useful.

Effectiveness and monitoring

At least in Western European policies there seems to be an increasing focus on policy efficacy. Effects of any policy can be grounded in a clear expression of policy aims and goals at the start, a clarification of strategies and an overview of means and investments. Evaluation at the end and monitoring during the process are the base for judgements about successes and failures.

Various new urban policy initiatives ensure the parties' commitment through the instrument of covenants. Agreements help to clarify policy goals; in particular as these are often listed in details including responsibilities of the participants. In this sense, they are also accompanied by real targets. For joblessness, for instance, a target can be formulated thus: unemployment in the city should decrease to a level closer to the average for the country as a whole. The same applies to job creation: the relative increase in the number of jobs in the city should be on a level closer to the national average.\textsuperscript{28}

Besides advantages, there are some disadvantages attached to monitoring and measuring effects. Perhaps the most important problem is that it can be unclear whether a result is a direct effect of a measure or not. For example: a decline in unemployment figures in a neighbourhood can be the result of an upswing in the national economy rather than an effect of a local policy. Another problem is that the measure should be clear and indisputable. For example: a target of '10% less crime in the area' is unclear, because it does not specify which type of crime should be included. Monitoring also fo-

\textsuperscript{27} see also: Andersen (2001), Bonneville (2004) 
\textsuperscript{28} Andersen and Van Kempen (2003).
cuses particularly on quantitative (indeed measurable) effects, while qualitative effects are not measured in many cases.

The cases will be introduced in the next chapter.

3 The cases

This report is based on a collection of 50 good practices of integrated physical urban development policy in all EU member states. We requested practices characterised by clear physical measures and by more or less integrated policies. These cases are described in part II. In this chapter we describe the selection process, with a general description of the cases.

Procedure

In the summer and autumn of 2006, all 25 EU member states, as well as Bulgaria and Romania (the two prospective new member states in 2007) were invited to submit examples of integrated urban renewal projects with a physical component. Several actors were approached within each country: contributing partners of the European Urban Knowledge Network, relevant ministries, universities and research centres, municipalities and housing associations. Participants from several conferences were also asked to submit good practices from their countries. Some member states submitted up to seven cases spontaneously, while others needed some urging to obtain at least one example. A total of 103 cases was finally submitted from the 27 countries. All cases were described according to a clear template, as seen in part II.

Selection criteria

We selected 50 cases from an overall list of 103 based on the following criteria:

- The cases should have a clear focus on physical measures. We excluded projects focusing only on economic and social measures, because this report is particularly concerned with the intended or unintended effects and side-effects of physical measures.

- If possible, the cases should have an integrated approach. We use the concept of integrated approach in two different ways. On one hand, integration refers to a combination of policy sectors (such as physical, social, economic), while on the other, the term ‘integrated’ refers to the participation of different stakeholders in the policy process.

- Projects should be focused on the improvement of deprived urban areas. These areas can be of varying sizes, built in various time periods and exhibiting a variety of types and combinations of problems.

- The effects of the measures in the selected areas should be at least partly clear. This does not mean that all effects have to be measurable, but at least some of the results are or could be evaluated. We have excluded plans, ideas, (research) proposals and projects that have only just started or have not been implemented at all.

- The projects should focus on existing town and urban areas. Thus problems of villages and countryside areas were excluded, as were new areas under construction.
• We have tried to select two cases per country. Because only one example was provided for some countries, we have compensated by selecting a maximum of three cases for some countries.
• We have tried to select the examples from different cities and from different parts of the country.
• The cases should have clear points of interest with a possible transferability to other cities and other countries.

Table 3.1 provides a summary of all 50 cases with their major characteristics. We will deal with these cases in the following chapters, referred to with the city in which they are located. They are all mapped in Figure 3.1.

We must mention that the 103 submitted cases, including the 50 selected, may not be representative for Europe as a whole. Each case is unique. But elements of the cases will be applicable to other spatial and political contexts.

Areas

Following the call for cases and our selection, all cases focus on the improvement of deprived areas. The 50 selected cases cover a large range of areas, together presenting an overview of deprived areas at which policies of urban renewal and urban restructuring policy are aimed. Most refer to the renewal or regeneration of a particular area, while only a few deal with a city as a whole. Examples of policies focusing on entire cities are Brussels, Bratislava and Turku. Here strategies focus on overall measures including physical measures to improve the economic situation or the use of methods covering a large part of the city (as was the case in Turin).

All remaining cases fit in one of the five types of urban areas we distinguish below:
• central urban areas (examples: Cadiz, Ercolano, Plock, Tartu);
• old (i.e. pre-WWII) deprived urban areas around the city centre (examples: Vienna, Sofia, London, Athens, Furth, Budapest);
• post-WWII areas, mainly 1945-1965 (examples: Orebru, Rotterdam, Sofia, Barcelona, Glasgow);
• newer housing estates, including high-rise housing estates, mainly built after 1965 (examples: Goteborg, Vsetin, Nitra, Paris, Leinefelde);
• old industrial, harbour, military or railway areas (examples: Antwerp, Lodz, Klaipeda, Luxembourg).

Not all cases can easily be categorised with this area typology. Some contain a mix of neighbourhoods, for example old industrial areas surrounded by old factory buildings, as is the case in Athens, Graz and Klaipeda. Others built up during several decades, containing houses over a century old, 1950s reconstruction dwellings and recently built infill projects.

Scale

Not only are there differences between the types of areas as described above, but their sizes also differ. Small projects can be found in Ljubljana, Tartu, Budapest and Nusfalau, while more general projects aimed at a large part of the city can be found in Paris, Vienna, Amsterdam and Helsinki.
A small and focussed project may have the negative consequence that areas nearby do not profit, or that problems will simply be relocated a couple of streets away. This is called the ‘waterbed-effect’: push the problems down at one side (of town), and they will rise somewhere else. But a large and comprehensive project may have the negative consequence that positive results may not be visible and noticed, and the project will stagnate because it is too comprehensive. Both varieties of scale issues will be dealt with throughout the next chapters, and especially in chapter 8.

Table 3.1 Major characteristics of the 50 selected cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Area name</th>
<th>Area type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goteborg</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Gardsten</td>
<td>newer housing estate</td>
<td>Housing corporations and municipality trying to improve a physically unattractive area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavle</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Oster</td>
<td>newer housing estate</td>
<td>Inhabitants lead regeneration project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orebru</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Markbacken</td>
<td>post-WWII</td>
<td>Physical renovation project which had enormous impact on the problems in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turku</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>several areas</td>
<td>newer housing estates</td>
<td>Community-led project to improve living conditions in several deprived areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>several areas</td>
<td>newer housing estates</td>
<td>Integrated project to enhance the attractiveness of deprived suburbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Brandby Strand</td>
<td>Newer suburb</td>
<td>Integrated project aiming to solve a wide range of problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsens</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Vestbyen</td>
<td>old areas around centre</td>
<td>A deprived neighbourhood is being renewed mainly physically, and partly socially and culturally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Holmladsadegak-</td>
<td>old areas around centre</td>
<td>Integrated regeneration project that decentralises the initiative to local stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>North-East Inner</td>
<td>central urban areas</td>
<td>Integrated project in an area deprived for more than 200 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Ballymun</td>
<td>newer housing estate</td>
<td>Integrated approach; complete replacement but with preservation of the old community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Peckham</td>
<td>old areas around centre</td>
<td>Regeneration of the second most deprived area of the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Crown Street</td>
<td>post-WWII</td>
<td>Integrated project; part of a wider project of regeneration of three districts in Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>newer housing estate</td>
<td>Physical environment regeneration involving citizens’ communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furth</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Western Inner City</td>
<td>central urban areas</td>
<td>Regeneration with the sub-goal of improving social cohesion within the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freiburg</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Weingarten Ost</td>
<td>newer housing estate</td>
<td>Physical regeneration with a social orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leinefelde</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Leinefelde-Sud-Sud</td>
<td>newer housing estate</td>
<td>Socially and ecologically oriented regeneration project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>several areas</td>
<td>old areas around centre</td>
<td>Urban renewal with interdisciplinary approach and public participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Graz West</td>
<td>old areas around centre</td>
<td>Urban renewal in partly a former industrial area, partly a residential area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Nieuw West</td>
<td>post-WWII</td>
<td>Very large urban renewal project with a very integrated approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Zuilen</td>
<td>post-WWII</td>
<td>Public private partnership with very positive results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Pendrecht</td>
<td>post-WWII</td>
<td>Project to create commercial facilities in a regenerated area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Spoor Noord</td>
<td>old railway area</td>
<td>Land was vacant; now developed as leisure area for surrounding deprived areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>several areas</td>
<td>areas around the centre</td>
<td>Partnership programme to redevelop large areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Region</td>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Belval - Ouest</td>
<td>old areas around centre</td>
<td>Project in a former industrial area, to improve mixed-use of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Paris</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Garges les Gones-</td>
<td>newer housing estate</td>
<td>Project led by housing corporation using an integrated approach to regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Paris</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Corbeil Essonne</td>
<td>newer housing estate</td>
<td>Project led by housing corporation to enhance living standards of inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadiz</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>historic district</td>
<td>central urban areas</td>
<td>City centre with deteriorated housing and huge problem of overcrowding was renovated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Trinitat Nova</td>
<td>post-WWII</td>
<td>Restructuring process in which citizens played an important role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascais</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>several areas</td>
<td>central urban areas</td>
<td>Project that focused on demolition of shanty towns and providing new homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Area Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Mirafiori Nord Torino</td>
<td>Project aims at Turin’s economic situation and the deprived neighbourhood of Mirafiori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ercolano</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>central area</td>
<td>Integrated project of which regeneration is one objective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Drapetsona-Keratsini</td>
<td>Integrated project that focuses on a large neighbourhood with a multitude of problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljubljana</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>central urban areas</td>
<td>Abandoned barrack site developed into a residential area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Józsefváros</td>
<td>Social programme which includes physical regeneration measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Kozepsó - Ferencváros</td>
<td>Project that renewed a very deprived neighbourhood consisting of sub-standard housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Andel</td>
<td>Private investor creates commercial centre in former deprived area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vsetin</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Dolní Jasenka</td>
<td>Mainly infrastructure and public space regeneration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratislava</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>several areas</td>
<td>Project to improve physical environment by citizens’ mobilisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitra</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Díty</td>
<td>Construction of social renting dwellings on a former highly polluted area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodz</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Poznanski’s former industrial site</td>
<td>Industrial site transformed into attractive city centre, giving economy an enormous boost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plock</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>old town</td>
<td>Integrated project to improve living conditions and attract tourists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Jary</td>
<td>Renovation of housing stock and creation of new facilities in a deprived area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tartu</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Herne Street</td>
<td>Renovation of infrastructure of a deprived area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riga</td>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Dreilini</td>
<td>Project that finalised a new building project stopped in the 1990s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liepaja</td>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Karosta</td>
<td>Former Soviet military base with many physical, social and economic problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilnius</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>old town</td>
<td>Renovation of historic buildings, deprived due to management and economic reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaipeda</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>University Campus</td>
<td>Renovation and new building on a former military area that also hosted apartment buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Zaharna Fabrika</td>
<td>Estate renovated with the help of a Dutch housing corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Izgrev</td>
<td>Improvement of green areas by citizens’ initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusfalau</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Nusfalau post-WWII</td>
<td>Social housing building in an area with a problematic Roma minority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Issues, problems and processes

All the selected cases deal with renewal policies in deprived areas. In most, deprived housing is the main issue, but in a number there are other derelict functions. Most areas are characterised by a mix of physical, economic and social problems as mentioned in Chapter 2. Problems can be related to a multitude of factors, such as the geographical situation, the location context and the heritage of former urban policies. Similarities in the presence of problems between cities in different countries can be identified. Similar situations and circumstances sometimes lead to comparable policies and actions, but sometimes also to very different ones. The 50 cases together offer a broad overview of contemporary policies of urban renewal. This chapter offers a general overview.

Types of issues

Which issues are central in the cases? Which problems are to be tackled by the different policies envisaged?

One group of cases clearly focuses on improving the situation of deprived city centres. Here, physical measures aim to modernise the centre. This could be to increase local and regional attractiveness and the tourism image (Plock, Cadiz, Vilnius), or to improve overall economic performance (Turin, Lodz).
A second group focuses on the complete replacement of areas that do not function well on the housing market for one or more reasons. These can be old neighbourhoods that have been problematic for a range of years (or even decades) like the cases from Cascais (the demolition of shanty towns), London (the regeneration of one of the top-three most deprived areas in the UK) or Dublin (pulling down all high-rise blocks). Demolition and a complete new start for an area are central in these cases.

A third group deals with the transformation of functions. Most of these cover a transformation of old and derelict industrial functions into new housing or commercial ones. Interesting examples can be found in Graz, Lodz, Luxembourg and Athens. These are exemplary for the global shift of industrial functions, with production functions moving out of parts of Europe to low-wage countries elsewhere on the continent or even farther away. Surrounding areas, once developed for housing the local workforce, suffer from industrial decline in several ways, including an increasing unemployment rate. These types of projects aim to transform the old industrial site and to improve the often poor situation in nearby neighbourhoods. The focus is not always on buildings such as old factories, but also more generally on the transformation of old and redundant harbour areas and railway shunting yards (as in Antwerp).

Related to the type of issue just mentioned is the transformation and re-use of areas which originally had military purposes. Several military barracks have lost their function following the end of the Cold War, in both Western and Eastern Europe. In cities these areas have often been converted into housing areas. Some interesting examples can be found in Ljubljana, Liepaja and Klaipeda.

In other areas housing has been converted into commercial premises. This occurred mainly in Eastern Europe after the introduction of the market economy from 1990 onwards. The result is that some city centres have physically expanded, ‘eating up’ the surrounding living areas.

A particular group of cases focuses on high-rise housing estates. These estates were built as large monotonous housing estates over a relatively short period. In many countries they are not the most popular housing areas, causing many liveability problems. A range of cases illustrates the importance of this issue, among them Dublin, Vsetin, Gävle, Helsinki, Paris and Warsaw. After the political turnaround from 1990, the construction of high-rise buildings has ceased in Central and Eastern European countries (much later than in the Western European countries, where the high-rise wave had already ended in the mid-70s)\(^9\). Two interesting exceptions appear in our cases: in Nitra and Riga high-rise structures have been constructed only recently, finalising the urban developments of the 1980s.

A final group of cases focuses on parts of the local environment. In Sofia, Vsetin and Bratislava projects have been set up to improve the green and public spaces within estates, a topic neglected since the political turnarounds of the early 1990s. For the same reason infrastructure such as roads and parking facilities have been improved in Tartu and Bratislava. In Rotterdam the focus has been on the revitalisation of a declining neighbourhood centre, located in a well-developed area (from an urban design perspective) originating in the 1950s, but now suffering depopulation.

---

29 Turkington et al. (2004); Willinger (2006).
Problems

The projects in the case studies focus on deprived areas. We can conclude that virtually all the types of problems described in Chapter 2 are mentioned in the cases. Areas targeted are described in stark terms, such as: rundown areas; deprived residential estates; areas with deteriorating spirals of decay; the worst site of physical dereliction; underdeveloped districts; degraded cities, where processes of stagnation and decline are prominent, etc. It is clear we are not discussing the best parts of town and it is also obvious that most professionals involved use negative descriptions of the area targeted.30

Problems can be divided into several categories. Here we use the classification of Turkington et al. given in Chapter 2 to discover the types of problems which can be found in our cases.

Structural problems generally relate to the bad quality of the housing stock, while internal design problems refer to the size and lay-out of the dwellings. Often the presence of outdated and small flats and poor housing, along with an outdated design of the area, are mentioned as causes of other problems. In most cases the problematic quality of the housing stock is mentioned – in virtually all practices in Northern and Western Europe, and half of those in Southern and Eastern Europe. Terms used are: rundown buildings, outdated housing, declining quality, progressive deterioration of the stock, small flats, cheap badly-designed dwellings, dilapidated state of buildings, old-fashioned standards, conditions below standard, etc. It is clear that the structural quality has shortcomings.

Similar qualifications are given to the local environment that causes spatial problems. Environments are qualified as poor: wasted spaces, lack of green spaces, bad infrastructure, degraded green areas, environment was neglected, low and declining quality, run-down common areas, chaotic and problematic planning and design, devastated open spaces, etc. These qualifications are appended to at least half the cases right across Europe.

Ageing neighbourhood revitalised

Belső-Józsefváros used to be a declining area in Budapest with a decreasing and ageing population and young families moving out. The urban environment was waning, public spaces were neglected and there were few green areas. The building stock was deteriorating, though it was originally good quality. In 1997 the municipality started a rehabilitation programme to integrate the quarter into the city centre and to increase the area’s status. The aims were to attract a younger residential population, to increase commercial activities and to develop an alternative culture area. Streets, two squares and several houses were renewed, car traffic was reduced and a semi-pedestrian street was implemented. The municipality also renovated and modernised the central library which happens to be located in the area.

The physical developments resulted in upgrading the urban environment and the development of a more vivid cultural and public life. The area’s image has improved, being more part of the city centre. It gained greater prestige as an area to live in, visible in more private housing investments.

30 In some cases the negative terms used might lead to extra negative effects for the area. Stigmatisation easily occurs and is then very difficult to remove.
Ecological problems are also mentioned, often as part of physical problems. Issues of energy loss, pollution and waste are present in several cases, most of them in Eastern and Central European countries. These ecological problems are considered in combination with an overall deprivation of the declining quality of buildings and surroundings.

In most of the cases economic problems focus on the perceived detrimental effects of spatial concentrations of people with a low-income, or on concentrations of unemployment. In two-thirds of all practices high unemployment, resulting in low incomes and poverty, is mentioned as a main economic problem. Many cases refer to housing areas that could once be characterised as working-class areas, where employees of nearby factories and other firms were living. Examples are Leinefelde, Graz, Barcelona, Prague and Glasgow. The consequences of global economic developments are visible in these areas, with many once employed people now being left unemployed and increasing numbers of poor elderly, once working and now on pension. Those with other jobs have left, and have been replaced by new families, often with a low income and also in an unemployment situation.

Integrated urban regeneration to combat migration and vacancy

During the existence of the former GDR, or East Germany, Leinefelde expanded from a village to an industrial city. The Südstadt district was built between 1960 and 1990 using concrete slab construction, the famous ‘Plattenbau’. After German reunification in 1990, jobs in local industries were lost and many people migrated, mostly young. Vacancy rates rose to 27% in 2001, and forecasts showed that only half of the flats would be needed in the long term. The situation in Leinefelde is characteristic of contemporary eastern Germany, where over one million dwellings stand empty.

Since the mid-1990s, politicians, administrators, housing companies and citizens in Leinefelde have been working on a drastic transformation process. The main objective is to transform the mono-functional, old industrial location of Leinefelde through a socially oriented and ecological urban district regeneration. In 1999, Südstadt was integrated as a model area into the urban development programme ‘The Socially Integrative City’ (‘Soziale Stadt’), financed by the Federation and the Länder, or states.

The urban district management started the works in 2001. Leinefelde-Südstadt is now developing into a vital and sustainable urban district, serving as an example for the rest of eastern Germany. Numerous projects have been implemented and have improved the housing and living quality in this district. The image of Südstadt has started to change for the better.

In a number of cases unemployment problems are related to the spatially isolated position of the areas and the functional division of the city or region in which they are located. This is especially true for the post-WWII housing areas planned according to the principle of dividing functions, resulting now in areas without employment oppor-
nities or commercial activity (see for example Paris, Goteborg and Helsinki). From other studies it has become clear that shops and small shopping centres in areas have been replaced by other activities. This has caused jobs to be lost. Specific programmes exist to generate employment in deprived urban areas, such as in France and in the United Kingdom.31 Generally an important question is whether the unemployed are helped more by small employment opportunities within their area, or larger job opportunities elsewhere in town. Employers, for one, will not always be convinced that new firms in deprived areas work out the best.

Social problems – other than unemployment and low incomes – often refer to two issues: insecurity and the presence of different (and conflicting) ethnic groups. Problems with safety, crime and vandalism affect the quality of life in the selected areas and contribute to the deprived living situation there. Crime and safety problems are reported in about a third of all cases, with a focus on Northern and Western European examples, but also some East European cases.

Immigrants often enter a city’s less popular housing areas, since these are most easily affordable. The immigration of a new group may increase lifestyle conflicts. Immigration used to be a topic reserved for Western European countries, where immigrants arrived for economic reasons from the 1970s – followed later by family reunion – and political refugees. In almost all Scandinavian cases immigration is mentioned as a social problem. Immigration was not a topic in Southern and Eastern European neighbourhoods. But conflicts between ethnic groups are now also reported in those countries, such as tensions between original inhabitants and gypsies (Budapest, Cadiz, Nusfalau), Russian-speaking minorities (Liepaja) and Africans (Athens). Sometimes conflicts between groups have a more historic background, as is the case in Belfast where physical strategies have been implemented to create a more peaceful situation.

In many of the deprived areas in our report, both types of social problems – insecurity and conflicts between ethnic groups - tend to concentrate in two types of area: the older (pre-WWII) areas close to the city centre, and the post-WWI high-rise housing estates. These areas also tend to concentrate structural problems. Most of these areas combine a poor housing stock with a population with social and economic problems. These areas also suffer from a poor position on the local housing market, resulting in competition problems. The neighbourhoods take a low position in the local or regional housing market, have a negative image, suffer from high turnover rates, a lack of demand and, in areas with oversupply, a high vacancy rate.

It is important to notice which kinds of areas are not present within the 50 cases. First, all areas that function well and do not show large problems (which happens to be most neighbourhoods in a city) have not been mentioned. Second, areas that have been recently constructed do not appear in our list. This is also a somewhat logical outcome, because it can be expected that new urban areas generally do not exhibit problems, at least not immediately.32 Finally, gentrifying areas, older neighbourhoods around the centre that are improving mainly by individual efforts do not appear in the list of cases.

---

31 Pettersson and Chignier-Riboulon (2006); Nyström (2006); Chignier-Riboulon and Hall (forthcoming)
32 Examples do exist of areas that change to a deprived situation rather rapidly. All manner of circumstances can be responsible for this. A classic example is the Bijlmermeer high-rise area in Amsterdam (Netherlands), constructed for Dutch families in the 1970s. By the time construction was finished, the former Dutch republic of Surinam had become independent and a large number of Surinamese migrated to the Netherlands. Dutch families didn’t choose to live in the high-rise flats, which were then assigned to the new arrived Surinamese. Because this concentration was accompanied by large unemployment rates, low incomes, increasing criminality and a large number of other liveability problems, the area soon became known as one of the country’s most deprived urban areas. Renewal measures have been taken virtually from the beginning (see Wassenberg, 2006).
**Types of processes**

Projects can be categorised in terms of the issues central in policies, or with respect to the main problems. Another type of categorisation is possible on the basis of the process by which the policies are organised. How is a project organised? Who is responsible? Are residents involved? Are private actors triggered to invest?

The involvement of people, specifically inhabitants of the targeted area, is, among others, important in Gävle, Turku, Barcelona, Nusfalau, Copenhagen and Belfast, where specific efforts have been made to involve people. In Copenhagen, Brussels, Turku, Vienna and Bratislava experiments with a new organisation of the renewal process have been central to the projects.

Many cases focus on the role of government at different levels. But these days most of the necessary investments will have to come from private investors, apart from housing associations. Some projects focus on the contribution of these commercial actors, and on the possibilities of public-private partnerships (PPP), as in Utrecht, Prague and Sofia.

In many cases an integrative approach has been an explicit part of the project. Without being complete we can mention Furth, Goteborg, Ercolano, Glasgow, Brøndby Strand and Freiburg.

The organisation and process are further elaborated in Chapter 6.

### 5 Measures and strategies

As with problems, measures and strategies can also be categorised. We regard a strategy to be a series of measures, a bundle of earmarked actions to achieve a specific goal. Again, this report focuses essentially on physical measures and strategies, meaning that we do not elaborate on other types of strategies and measures, now matter how useful or successful they might have been.

Physical measures can have the principal aim of solving physical problems. When the roof is leaking, repairing the roof is a good solution. When children have nowhere to play, new playgrounds can be constructed. But in some cases physical strategies and measures will be used to solve other problems, or are at least aimed at solving them. Within a process of physical renewal, unemployed young people living in the area can be trained to carry out part of the process. So these young people do not have to hang around all day, intimidating passers-by or committing petty crimes. A renewal process may also increase feelings of responsibility for the area people live in. If they have the feeling they have been heard in the transformation from an old to a renewed area, inhabitants may again feel happy in the area, trying to keep it clean and exerting social control to avoid disturbances. Many other positive examples of possible relations between physical and social aspects spring to mind, but negative relationships also exist. For example: socially cohesive neighbourhoods may be destroyed by large-scale renewal operations.

This chapter will analyse several types of measures and strategies.
Physical strategies and measures to improve the environment

Physical measures can focus on the housing stock and environment. For the environment, a range of physical measures is implemented in almost all practices. We list them below with only some places mentioned as examples. The implementation of physical improvements of the environment occurs in almost all cases, giving rise to two comments. The first is that improvements are obviously necessary as the years go by: ‘neighbourhoods in transition’ will need physical transformation one day. The second is that environmental measures are visible to all, and serve as an apparent sign that improvements are on their way. This differs with measures in the management of the estate for example, or those aimed at individual improvements of poor households.

Examples of physical measures aimed at improving the environment are:

- **Improvement of parks, public spaces and playgrounds**: sometimes these areas have become derelict and unattractive, because of wear and tear or a lack of maintenance (examples: Vienna, Utrecht, Sofia, Barcelona, Bratislava, Furth, Horsens, Prague, Helsinki). The renovation of streets and squares (Budapest, Warsaw, Tartu, Nusfalau, Vilnius) fall into the same category.

Ambitious integrated urban development enhances living standards

Greece’s Drapetsona and Keratsini began to develop in the late 1920s with the economic dynamism of nearby Piraeus, the harbour of Athens. A host of heavy industries were attracted, making Piraeus the main commercial and industrial port in twentieth-century Greece. The economic downturn and deindustrialization came in the late 1970s and 1980s, in common with other European economies. This crisis produced long-term unemployment and poverty, while social, economic and environmental problems worsened.

Drapetsona and Keratsini were one of the five Greek areas selected for assistance from the URBAN programme for 1994-1999. The purpose of the physical and planning measures was to improve the built environment and urban infrastructures and to strengthen the local economy, the labour market and social cohesion. The strategy had two parts: a) reinstating the area’s relationship with the seafront and b) achieving an organic connection between the seafront and Keratsini’s considerable street activities.

The project has been effective in enhancing living standards. Public spaces were improved, the sea-front was opened to citizens and old buildings were renovated. But the project’s economic and social goals have not yet been achieved.

- **The creation of parks and public spaces** is a logical policy when areas are somewhat ‘stony’ environments, consisting almost entirely of housing blocks and roads. Although many post-WWII estates can be characterised as areas with many green areas between the blocks of houses, elsewhere the lack of green areas and other public spaces is seen as a serious impediment to good living (examples: Antwerp, Leinefelde, London, Glasgow, Luxembourg, Klaipeda).

- **Putting more green in the streets** can be seen as a serious effort to make streets more attractive (examples: Horsens, Amsterdam, Bratislava, Dublin).
• **Improvement of lighting** can be used as a rather simple but serious effort to improve safety in an area (examples: Orebru, Paris, Plock, Gävle).

• **Site clearance** is a radical measure to make way for totally new functions (Antwerp, Lodz, Prague).

• A large number of housing estates are rather monotonous areas with a focus on housing. The creation of cultural and leisure facilities can make a place more diversified and more attractive for both its inhabitants and potential visitors (examples: Dublin, Ercolano, Liepaja, Graz, Copenhagen, Furth, Brøndby Strand).

• The **improvement of infrastructure** makes accessibility easier and can also lead to safer streets (Budapest, Riga, Turin, Liepaja).

• Most contemporary urban renewal areas were built in times when there were few cars. Policy-makers did not foresee an enormous rise in vehicles, a process which intensified suddenly in the Central and Eastern European countries in the 1990s. The lack of parking seriously threatens the quality of life in some neighbourhoods, where green areas and sidewalks are used for parking. The creation of parking places can thus be seen as a major improvement of an area (examples: Cascais, Nitra, Vilnius, Athens, Ljubljana, Warsaw).

• **Improving the water structure** can make an area more attractive as a place to live (Amsterdam, Riga, Tartu).

• Connecting the neighbourhood to the city can be a major way of solving problems of physical isolation. Post-WWII areas in particular are sometimes located relatively far from the city with its job opportunities and leisure facilities. In other situations neighbourhoods were designed as internally-oriented areas, separated from adjacent areas, where new connections are now being made to open up the area (examples: Freiburg, Belfast, Orebru).

---

**Restoration of the ancient town serves as an economic motor**

The city of Ercolano, south of Naples, has many unexploited resources: the archaeological excavations of the Roman town of Herculaneum, prestigious villas, the famous Vesuvius volcano and national park, the sea and a pleasant climate. But these opportunities were little developed, leading to socio-economic problems. Several major infrastructural projects also split the city into sub areas, barely interconnected.

The local administration decided to develop a new spatial perspective in 2000. The ‘Urban Herculaneum’ project supported Ercolano’s regeneration by enhancing the archaeological resources within a tourism perspective. The first measures were focused on urban revamping, such as the renewal and paving of the city’s main access roads, the renewal of public lighting and construction of a green area and public parking. The restoration of Ercolano’s ancient resources serves as an economic motor to the benefit of the entire city.
Physical measures and strategies to improve the quality of buildings/dwellings

Measures and strategies for the improvement of the built stock’s quality – both housing and other building types – are important in most cases. Again, here are some examples per measure and strategy:

- **Restoration of buildings** to enhance the heritage of historically interesting cities. These strategies are linked to economic revitalisation of a central area to make cities more attractive as a whole. Examples are historical restorations in Plock, Turin, Ercolano, Liepaja and Cadiz.

- **Refurbishment and modernisation**, mainly of housing stock, but also of other types of buildings. This strategy is meant as an update for outdated dwellings and other buildings. There are no changes of functions or groups of population. The dwellings stay more or less as they are, and the same (type of) people will live there, but in improved houses. Examples can be found in Sofia, Freiburg and Goteborg.

- **Upgrading existing buildings.** In these practices dwellings are not only modernised, but also upgraded. Examples are the enlargement of two dwellings into one, or three into two. Another example is the addition of new services or luxury to attract different type of residents. A consequence is that rents often have to be raised or selling prices go up. Sometimes this is an explicit aim to create a more diversified housing stock to produce a more diversified population (examples: Brøndby Strand, Utrecht, Furth, Glasgow).

- **Change of functions.** This can be the classic example of the old grocer shop on the corner which is transformed into a house, but also the conversion of an entire area to other functions. An interesting example on a small scale is the conversion of storage and laundry rooms on the ground floor into dwellings, as in Gävle. These new ground-floor-level dwellings have the additional (and maybe intended) advantage of creating ‘eyes on the street’ the principle Jane Jacobs advocated in the 1960s, followed by Oscar Newman’s ‘defensible space’ in the 1970s, and many others with them. There are still any number of dead facades, blind walls, backstreets and alleys, sometimes creating an unfriendly atmosphere or insecure places.

- **Demolition and rebuilding.** A classic motive for demolition is of course the bad technical quality of a building. Other arguments for demolition are: an outdated layout, urban design arguments (wrong densities, wrong housing types, wrong location of the building), social motives (concentration of ‘wrong’ kinds of population; although this argument is seldom expressed openly), financial reasons (other functions are more profitable) or for housing market reasons (no future prospects for the existing dwellings). Which motives are valid or held to be valid by the decision-makers depends on the local context. New houses can be built for the same population group, or for other groups, to offer attractive alternatives for potential movers, or to attract newcomers. Examples of demolition and new building are found in: Dublin, Amsterdam, London and Paris.
Development from Soviet military base to tourist attraction

When the Russian army left Latvia in 1994 after independence, the military harbour of Karosta in Liepaja became largely uninhabited and most buildings fell into ruin. The area was troubled by high unemployment, street crime and drug problems. The district’s difficulties seemed so big and intractable, that officials turned their backs on Karosta until recently. In 2000, local government decided to revitalise the abandoned district and solve the social and economical problems. The physical measures included the preservation, restoration and rehabilitation of the site’s historic buildings.

Today Korosta’s architectural environment reflects a unique interaction of tsarist Russian military elegance and Soviet militarism building style. It is no longer a closed military base area but a tourism attraction which also provides an inspiring environment for creative people.

- New buildings can be constructed on land which formerly served a different function. This heading covers the transformation of old industrial, railway or harbour areas into housing areas or areas with other functions, such as the transformation or railway shunting-yards into a park in Antwerp. Other examples of function transformation are new office buildings replacing dwellings in Prague, houses on former polluted wasteland in Nitra and dwellings on a former barracks site in Ljubljana, Liepaja and Klaipeda. A particularly notable project is in Riga, with an area where development started in the second half of the 1980s.

Other physical measures and strategies

The physical measures and strategies mentioned above are aimed at improving physical situations of buildings (mostly dwellings) and living environments. Physical strategies can also be carried out aimed at achieving social, economic, psychological, financial or other goals. In some 60 per cent of the selected cases, physical measures and strategies are mentioned with a broader aim than improving buildings and environments. Two groups are most often mentioned. The first is creating or improving the economic situation and decreasing unemployment rates by one or more physical measures or strategies. Measures and strategies vary widely and include:

- the establishment of local job centres (Copenhagen);
- improvement of ICT facilities (Graz);
- enhancing economic and tourism opportunities (Liepaja, Ercolano);
- youth work initiatives and training (Freiburg, Leinefelde, Barcelona, Turin);
- supporting small and medium enterprises (Budapest, Turin, Athens, Budapest, Ercolano);
• new commercial centres (Goteborg, Rotterdam, Vienna, Helsinki);
• improved transport infrastructure (Vienna, London);
• job creation and employment initiatives in general.

The second group is more socially oriented and aims at improving social cohesion between (groups of) people and creating more sense of community. Examples are:
• the establishment of community centres (Gävle, Belfast, Helsinki);
• child-care (Furth, Dublin, Leinefelde, Rotterdam);
• supporting local networks (Brøndby Strand, Tartu);
• safety measures (London, Utrecht, Belfast);
• social facilities in general, unspecified.

Non-physical measures

This report deliberately focuses on physical measures and strategies. Templates were completed for these only, omitting other types of measures. But in some cases interesting non-physical measures were also mentioned. Although these are outside this report’s scope, we will name some briefly: an oral history project (Dublin), supporting local networks (Dublin), budgets for residents (Horsens), empowerment programmes, language courses and poverty relief programmes (Amsterdam).

Combination

A range of physical measures and strategies has been distinguished above, but in most instances a combination of measures and strategies occurs. A range of physical measures is taken, aimed at improving the housing condition or the quality of life in the environment. But a range of measures is also mentioned for enhancing a poor economic or social situation. In most cases, certainly the larger ones, houses have been improved, renovated and replaced in the same neighbourhood. This is also true for the environmental measures: in most areas measures have been combined to enrich the outdoor quality of life, by improving the situation for playing, staying, passing through, living or just being in the environment. Moreover, in over half of the practices physical measures have been taken to improve social cohesion or economic deprivation. Finally, physical measures are often combined with other types of measures which fall outside this report’s scope.

We will shortly evaluate the successes of these combined strategies, but the next section will first elaborate on the process organisation.
Regeneration: not only a housing issue

A decade ago, Southwark was the second most deprived local authority area in England, with Peckham at its heart as one of the borough’s worst affected areas. The Peckham Partnership was created to regenerate this area. From the scheme’s start it was recognised that sustainable regeneration could not be achieved by concentrating efforts on housing alone. Thus the Partnership pursued a comprehensive and integrated strategy covering employment, education, community safety, enterprise, health, culture, sport, accessibility and community involvement and development.

Several partners were involved including selected house builders from the private and public social sectors, private investors, the police, tenants, traders and local councillors. To assist with the overall integration of the programme a Partnership Board – on which all stakeholders were represented – met regularly to review progress.

The Partnership transformed Peckham into a place where people choose to live, work and visit. The Partnership’s social and economic initiatives helped to bring about a dramatic improvement in life chances and opportunities for Peckham residents. The education programme contributed to an amazing 126% increase in literacy. Various employment and training programmes produced a 26% reduction in unemployment between 1994 and 2002, while community safety initiatives halved fear of crime in the area.

6 The organisation

The measures and strategies at the heart of these cases and this report, do not work automatically. Below the surface of the concrete measures and strategies lie organisational issues which are often crucial for success or failure. So this chapter concentrates not on the ‘what’, the product, but on the ‘how’, the process. Who are actors involved? Who initiates the project? Who takes the lead? How are actors involved and how do they work together? These questions are central here.

Major actors involved in the process of urban renewal

Governments always have a role in urban renewal projects, but their influence varies between countries. Remarkably, local government is involved in all 50 practices in this study, immediately making it clear that this level of government is (still) of immense influence in urban renewal processes. Despite the increasing importance of urban governance arrangements, local government is never surpassed and in many cases even takes the lead. The project in Portugal’s Cascais is remarkable, because here the two
major cities in the country, Lisbon and Oporto, have assisted the Cascais municipality. Cooperation between local governments does not often occur.

In many cases other levels of government are also involved. This sets a need for vertical integration. The national government generally provides the legal framework for urban policies, but is only rarely heavily involved in local projects. Its role might be merely co-financing (as in Brøndby Strand, Vilnius or Cadiz), or it might also be involved in implementation (as in Luxembourg, Dublin and Turku).

In some countries urban planning and housing policy is delegated to the sub-country level, the ‘Länder’ in Germany or regions in Belgium, Poland, Italy and Spain. These regions are also involved in the countries mentioned. Elsewhere some larger cities have delegated housing and urban planning to district levels (e.g. Amsterdam and Barcelona). Vertical integration is necessary between government levels, and the indications are that this is not easy. Several aspects are also handled, often meaning that several government sectors or departments are involved. This creates the need for horizontal integration. Logically, the combination between vertical integration (between governments) and horizontal integration (between sectors at the same government level) is sometimes perceived or experienced as an immense problem. This has to do with different cultures between governments and sectors and different rules of accountability. Some representatives of one sector or government may easily feel marginalised, excluded or overruled in these intricate governance settings.

City Council and Housing Corporation work together to improve living standards

La Nacelle and Montconseil are two adjoining neighbourhoods which formed a large deprived area in the banlieue, the suburbs near Paris. It suffered a negative image and an urban blight process. Both neighbourhoods are physically isolated from the rest of the city.

Since 2001, the City and Immobilière 3F (a social housing corporation) have committed themselves to an urban renewal project, which includes improving the quality of life of their inhabitants.

A global and ambitious planning scheme aims to enhance the living environment, the organisation and functioning of the neighbourhood through demolition and rehabilitation, the construction of new housing, and remodelling plots and land tenure.

The social housing corporation contributed about 40% of the urban renewal budget. The strong commitment of various project partners was regarded as a success factor in the project’s implementation.
Another major actor is the owner of the land or buildings. Here we must differentiate between social sector housing areas and other types. In most of the Northern and Western European practices, urban renewal projects are focused on areas where social sector housing dominates. In countries like Sweden, France, the Netherlands or Denmark national urban renewal policy focuses almost exclusively on social sector-owned neighbourhoods. In these circumstances, the owner – in most cases the housing associations, but sometimes also local government – plays a major role in the urban renewal policy for the targeted area.

In urban renewal areas there may also be private or commercial actors. Private owners can be individual owner-occupiers. Here it is sometimes difficult to organise their participation in renewal policies. Commercial parties – building companies, insurance companies, etc. – can also be area stakeholders, and are sometimes interested in financing major operations. Involving those commercial partners is becoming increasingly important in carrying out area plans.

Residents are another major actor, as the end-users of the policies. In an increasing number of countries, residents are regarded as a major party in urban renewal policies. We will return to their involvement shortly.

Between individuals and governments several types of non-profit organisations are active. These often serve as the ‘software’ of all neighbourhood activities, and as a coordination point between top-down and bottom-up initiatives and activities. But in Western countries they suffer from ongoing public funding cuts, while in Eastern countries they are essentially non-existent following the retreat of local governments.

For the rest a range of other actors may participate, depending on the local context. These might be local shopkeepers or businessmen, social workers, police, religious leaders, schoolteachers or general practitioners. In Klaipeda and Athens the local university played a role.

All these parties are also influenced by actors who are not working or living in the area, outsiders who can influence a project’s process and success. Important outsiders are the media (local press, television, Internet) and local and national political parties. Many of the practices in this report concern deprived areas stigmatised for years. The media is able to maintain these negative images, and it is difficult for an area or its people to get rid of such a stigma once set.33

Implementation

How projects are organised and implemented depends on the local context. In a fairly large number of projects, the municipality takes the lead and coordinates the actual implementation. For this purpose some particular organisation is often set up, led by the municipality and staffed by civil servants (examples in Vienna, Vsetín, Liepaja, Horsens).

Large urban renewal projects in Northern and Western Europe focus on social housing, as mentioned, where housing associations or municipalities own the housing stock. In such circumstances it is obvious that these social sector owners are heavily involved. In some cases the housing associations take the lead for the project implementation (examples are Göteborg, Amsterdam, Paris, Warsaw and Orebru).

33 See Dean and Hastings (2000); Wassenberg (2004).
More often, a specific implementation organisation is founded, a so-called Project Office, Project Organisation, or Implementation Office in which the major parties are organised. In Goteborg, London, Leinefelde, Utrecht and Helsinki local municipality and housing companies form the implementation office. When the housing stock is municipally owned, several departments within the municipality generally form the project office.

Sometimes other actors are also part of such a project office. These can be residents, with representatives involved in the project implementation, often as a member of a board. Commercial parties sometimes also play an important role.

Collaboration

Many of the cases centre on deprived areas built in the 1950s and 1960s, when governments played an important role in housing policy. The national government generally set the frameworks, local municipalities planned neighbourhoods and built houses and environments, and housing associations or companies managed them. No-one asked housing consumers about their preferences, as people were queuing for anything built, no matter how it looked. This was the case virtually throughout Europe.

But times have changed. Residents or potential residents are more critical, and can be more critical, because of increased wealth, higher education levels and democratisation processes. The housing market has also changed; overall quantitative housing shortages have been replaced by selective qualitative demands. Of course there are groups of people whose demands cannot be fulfilled, but the overall housing situation of the large majority of Europeans has improved immensely over the past half century. A final change has to do with the role of the government in general. In all countries the leading and guiding role of governments has been replaced by a situation where governments depend on other partners, and are more or less forced to work together with them in partnerships. This has already been labelled in Chapter 2 as the major step from government to governance. Hall and Rowlands describe this process as a change of paradigm from the first four decades after WWII, known in Western Europe in socio-cultural terms as ‘Modernist’ and in economic terms as ‘Fordist’. Several decades ago the development of the built environment was strongly influenced by modernist architects, who maintained the prevailing argument that technological advances held the key to solving urban problems. Urban planners designed estates in a technocratic way. Governments had to implement this process. But from the 1970s this process gradually changed in Western Europe, joined by the sudden political changes in Central and Eastern Europe around 1990. Hall and Rowlands (2005) argue that the new order of urban governance is characterised by three issues:

- diversity, as a wide variety of stakeholders are now potentially implicated;
- fragmentation, as political power is diffused between a variety of individuals and institutions; and
- uncertainty, as social, economic, and political change is an ever-present reality.

Collaboration in policy-making is necessary in this context, following Healey’s concepts of place-making and collaborative planning. This means vertical and horizontal policy-making is a necessity (as described above), while collaboration and cooperation and the involvement of stakeholders become normal in urban policies. It is thus unsurprising

---

34 Hall and Rowlands (2005).
that in most of our 50 cases, the policies are characterised by all manner of partnerships.

**Private investors**

Planners, politicians, civil servants, project offices and residents’ associations can make nice plans, but someone has to invest to turn the plans into reality. Investments can be individual efforts, time priorities and pure money. Currently in a world where welfare states are retreating and constantly cutting back on budgets, along with liberal ideas that the state *should* retreat from all manner of public policies, a significant part of the investment money needed has to come from the market, i.e. commercial parties or housing associations.

In neighbourhoods dominated by social housing, local municipality and housing associations work together in a joint organisation, but the housing associations are generally the main investors (as in Amsterdam, Goteborg, Paris and Freiburg).

In about a third of our 50 practices private investors, not related to housing associations, play a firm role. This can vary in importance and in the position within the planning process. In some instances they are invited to participate in projects and invest financially, as in Ercolano, Bratislava, Vilnius and Helsinki. But they are not involved in the planning process itself, and do take part in the implementation process.

In other projects commercial investors are involved at an early stage of the planning, contributing to the plans themselves (Rotterdam, Copenhagen, Ljubljana, Budapest). In other cases private investors even took the lead in the project, as in Prague, Sofia and Lodz.

The position allocated to, or taken by, commercial actors varies and is related to the situational context. In situations where land is scarce and investment possibilities are thus limited, local governments have a stronger position to negotiate and to impose their own plans. The situations in crowded capitals differ from more remote towns in peripheral regions. There any private initiative will be welcomed. The preferred role for the private sector is obviously also politically related, as some political parties emphasise the role of the government more, while others rely on the market. A final difference lies in the ownership of ground and buildings. In the practices in Goteborg, Orebro and Amsterdam the housing associations possess such a large share of all property, that they can decide whether to give room to commercial actors in their neighbourhoods. In these circumstances the housing associations have a large say on the involvement of other, commercial, actors.

**Partnerships**

Partnerships can be seen as an official agreement about collaboration. As in all cases where local government is involved, partnerships can be public-public, or public-private. Public-public partnerships denote the cooperation between various levels of governments or cooperation between various departments of the same government level, mostly local. Public-public partnerships have been arranged in, for example, Paris, Vilnius, Nitra, London and Turku. Partnerships where housing associations play an important role have already been described, with examples in Orebru, Goteborg, Belfast and Paris.

Public-private partnerships with public bodies and commercial investors are also present. Public and private bodies share risks and invest together. These types of partnerships
are elaborated in more detail to give maximum clarity to the assignment of tasks and responsibilities. But at the same time, confidence in the other partners and flexibility are important factors for success, as we will see in Chapter 8. Public-private partnerships have been experienced in Graz, Riga, Rotterdam, Copenhagen and Ljubljana.

**Private Investor Takes Lead in Regeneration of Neglected Inner City Neighbourhood**

During the industrial boom in the 19th century, various factories and working-class dwellings were established in Prague’s inner city Smíchov neighbourhood. At the end of the 1980s, industrial production started to move away from the inner city, leaving behind a large amount of empty property. It was a working-class neighbourhood facing the lack of investment and deterioration of the housing stock, economic difficulties of deindustrialization and social structure deterioration. But it provided an excellent location in close proximity to the city centre, supported by good transport accessibility.

Local authorities encouraged private investors by setting a planning frame for developments as well as by investing in infrastructure (city ring tunnels) and public spaces (parks, squares). In the early 1990s, a large international real estate operator noticed the Smíchov area’s potential. It purchased the land from the City of Prague and developed the area into a high-quality commercial and residential area. Smíchov is now attracting even more private investors and is a popular business and residential location.

**Resources**

Around half the projects in this study are financed by either 100% public money or a preponderance of public money. Some are financed only by private resources (Bratislava, Lodz, Warsaw, Sofia) or mainly (Prague, Budapest). All practices where private investors pay most or all of the costs are located in Central or Eastern European cities. This can be explained by the limited capacity of those cities in terms of the large tasks at stake. But these countries also have projects paid with public money.

In about a third of the practices, public and private actors both spend a considerable share of the investments. These projects can be found across Europe, but are more prominent in Southern European countries.

**Costs**

There are major differences between the projects, varying from the renewal of some streets to a long term programme for half a city. So it is unsurprising that the investment costs show variation.
Figures for investments and costs are given in about half the cases. Their terms are not uniform, as investments may generate yields. The sale of houses or commercial facilities such as offices or shops generates the highest revenues. Any commercial actor aims to achieve profits, but a local government cannot act this way.

Physical investments are much more costly than most other measures. An example is in Finland. The Helsinki project to enhance the attractiveness of deprived suburbs costs €200 million, while the Turku project, more a model, costs ‘only’ €50,000 a year. In Austria Vienna’s ‘soft urban renewal approach’ is calculated at €3 billion while the Graz renewal project needs an investment of less than one percent of this (€21,000,000). It should be mentioned though, that the costs in Vienna are the total investment costs of the regeneration, spread over a 20-year period.

**The role of the European Union**

The European Union has been active in supporting urban regeneration programmes. The most well known are URBAN I and II, but some projects are also co-financed by the EU’s EDRF, FEDER or ESF programmes. In some cases the type of EU funding is not specified. If we consider all cases, all funding has gone to the ‘old’ 15 EU members. The projects in this study started when there were only 15 EU members. About half the projects in the old EU member states benefit from some type of EU financing.

**Inhabitants demand more say in the regeneration projects in their neighbourhood**

Public consultation plays a key role in the regeneration of Zuilen. In the project’s early years, Zuilen inhabitants demanded more say. Over this period a practice was developed where right from the start inhabitants are invited to participate in the planning process with ideas about possible development projects. Large public meetings are often organised, followed by designing and consulting sessions with groups of more deeply interested citizens. The result is broad support for the development plans.

The Zuilen experience was that inhabitants of Moroccan origin barely participate in the discussions because of language problems. So other strategies were developed to involve them. The development and building of a new mosque for the Moroccan Muslims in Zuilen was a project which gained a lot of support from the Moroccan minority.

**Residents’ participation**

Residents are involved in the renewal process in most projects. But their influence and the ways people are involved vary from situation to situation. An increasing influence of residents on their own living situation is referred to as one of the trends in current urban policies in Chapter 2, where Arnstein’s famous ladder of participation was men-
tioned. Here she ordered the way residents can exercise influence in several steps, starting from manipulation and non-participation, through to delegated power and citizen control at the highest steps.

In only a couple of cases participation can be judged as non-existent or low. Most of these have to do with declining areas where no-one lives (such as upgrading a shopping centre in Rotterdam) or where building took place on formerly unoccupied spots (like in Lodz and Riga).

**Regeneration as a model for residents’ involvement**

Trinitat Nova is a working class neighbourhood in Barcelona, built in the 1950s to house rural immigrants. Many dwellings are in a poor technical state and show deterioration as sub-standard materials were used in their construction. A regeneration plan was developed in 1999. Many dwellings suffering from ‘concrete disease’ were demolished and substituted by around 1,000 new homes. Other houses were renovated.

A Community Plan was established at the same time as the urban regeneration. Neighbourhood associations played an important role in this process. A partnership, consisting of representatives of the associations and institutions in the neighbourhood, managed the Community Development Plan. This partnership facilitates the involvement of different associations in managing the regeneration process. To cope with the various issues – political, economic and urban – predominant in the area, three commissions were created, all of them with citizen participation. Trinitat Nova has now developed into an attractive city location (well connected and with available dwellings) and serves as a model for taking residents’ preferences and partnership into account.

The highest step on Arnstein’s ladder is that residents have the power to decide future plans for their neighbourhood by themselves. This step is probably only theoretical, because there are no examples in practice, at least not in the cases we have analysed. Inhabitants do play a role in most projects. In Arnstein’s ladder these projects and ways of participating can be located somewhere in the middle: residents are involved but not to such an extent that they have the full say about what is going to happen. In some cases, residents’ representatives have a seat in a Steering Group or Board that decides about all stages of the planning process (for example in Goteborg, Glasgow, Copenhagen, Freiburg, Barcelona and Gavle). In Horsens residents have the power to spend budgets for physical and social projects, which activated 250 people in that neighbourhood. In Brussels neighbourhood contracts are set up where residents’ involvement is one of the crucial aspects. In many countries the involvement of residents is legally formalised (Sweden, the Netherlands, Denmark). Here tenants are organised formally per block or street, in neighbourhoods, per housing association and per city.
By law these committees have rights to be involved in the policy process and to serve as a discussion point for decision makers.

By definition committees and boards are smaller than the area’s total population. This means there are sometimes problems of representativeness. Other research projects focusing on residential participation has shown that committees are often dominated by relatively old and indigenous men, while young people and especially immigrants are far less involved. Problems of representativeness most often occur in large areas (with a large number of inhabitants) and in areas with a heterogeneous population in terms of income or ethnicity, for example.

In Amsterdam and Utrecht special campaigns were mounted to involve immigrants. In Utrecht, practitioners, politicians and residents in two buses headed for a two-day meeting to brainstorm on the neighbourhood’s ‘branding’. But non-involvement of immigrants is still reported to be a problem in Utrecht, Brøndby Strand and Goteborg – cases in three countries where representative democracy is organised formally, but problems occur when some groups do not show interest, or have the feeling that they are unwelcome.

It is not only population characteristics which can influence the composition of participating groups and committees. A long time schedule and an information gap (real or perceived) between those directly informed and the general population (or specific committee), make it more difficult to recruit and to retain members for committees. In some cases, participating residents receive assistance from professionals (Tartu, Athens). These professionals may be paid by the municipality or the housing association.

Residents in Management Board of Urban Renewal Project

Gårdstens in Goteborg is a typical example of Sweden’s One Million Housing Programme. Built in the early 1970s, it declined into a physically unattractive area with many social problems, resulting in an economic millstone for the city of Goteborg. In 1997 a new organisation (Gårdstensbosäder) was formed to launch an urban renewal project with new directives including physical changes, new plans and a new commercial centre. It also had to improve the welfare of the residents with employment opportunities, health care and social and commercial services.

Gårdstensbosäder has a Management Board where residents form a majority; they were able to influence the project directly at all stages of the planning process.

Today Gårdsten is more attractive, the houses are better, there is a better population mix, and commercial services are much improved. The success is mainly due to the strong Gårdstensbosäder actor, which took a firm grip on all the problems.
Resident participation asks something from the participating residents. In many cases all manner of meetings, workshops, focus groups, sessions, interactive exhibitions and more were used to involve residents. In a range of practices these activities were intense and took considerable time. In most evaluations it was stated that setting up those activities increased residents’ support and improved the project’s end result.\textsuperscript{36}

Some more unorthodox activities were also used to involve the population in the 50 practices. To name a few:

Focused on better communication:
- setting up special newspapers with frequent issues to inform inhabitants of a renewal area;
- series on local television;
- meetings organised as part of festivals, sports games or concerts. Leisure activities are combined with more serious information in a type of sandwich formula;
- using information stands in libraries, malls or on the weekly market, ordinary meeting places for the local people;

Interesting because of particular methods:
- schoolchildren making drawings, projects, or excursions. Schoolchildren will hopefully tell their parents what they have done, so triggering their interest;
- residents using cameras to photograph good and bad spots in the area: an unusual way to make inhabitants aware of problematic places to be improved, and strong places to be maintained in a neighbourhood;
- settling projects within language courses for immigrants. The renewal project can be the \textit{leitmotiv} in the ongoing course;
- organising visits with all participants to similar projects in other cities. Experiences elsewhere and conversations with other inhabitants and professionals can serve as an example;
- the possibility of voting for several development possibilities for an area (as in Turku, Barcelona and Bratislava). Local people have a direct say in choosing between several future alternatives.

\section{Results}

It is not the intention of this report to give a detailed analysis of results, successes and failures of the individual cases analysed. It is however important to say a few words about the results. In this chapter we offer a general overview, while in the following one our focus is more on the success and failure factors behind these results.

Most of the results of the 50 practices are positive. The projects are generally considered to have been highly effective; expectations or even concrete targets were set at the start of the project, and evaluation shows that these expectations were met or targets were reached. Setting clear targets at the beginning characterises many of the

\textsuperscript{36} Involving residents is no guarantee of better results. There is not an automatic link between the involvement of residents and the success of a project. More in-depth studies are necessary to investigate this link and to answer the question as to which circumstances and contexts resident participation does influence significantly for the success of a project, and the cases where this applies less.
more recent projects in some countries, but it is also remarkable that in about one third of the projects no clear expectations or measurable targets were initially formulated. This makes it difficult to determine the success of a project afterwards. It is even difficult in such cases to monitor progressions during the process. Here opinions about success can be given at the end of the project, but concrete and hard measurements are generally impossible.

A couple of cases are reported to have led to even better results than expected (three of the Scandinavian and three South-European practices). Only a few report overall results as disappointing.

We should offer a few more methodological remarks about the fact that so many cases show success. First, the people who submitted the cases might have been more inclined to send in success stories than failures. In the call for cases it was announced that only a few cases would be selected for this report per country, which makes it understandable that good practices were submitted rather than failures. Some contributors were themselves involved in the projects and might thus be subjective. It was already noted in the first chapter that we could not expect the 50 cases to be representative of processes of urban restructuring in Europe as a whole.

In Chapter 5 strategies and measures have been divided into the following categories:

- physical measures aimed at improving the quality of buildings (often dwellings);
- physical measures aimed at improving the environment;
- physical measures to improve the economic situation and decrease unemployment;
- physical measures to improve social conditions and cohesion;
- non-physical measures (but these are outside the scope of this report).

In all practices the key results have been summarised in a few keywords. The improvement of the housing situation is mentioned in about half the cases. In general this has meant that neighbourhoods have been improved by replacing or renovating old dwellings. As a result the housing stock is currently of a better quality than before, which at least results in better houses, in better facilities in the dwellings and a better appearance of the neighbourhood. In many cases renewal and demolition with replacement also means that the housing stock has become more expensive than before, leading to exclusion of low-income households and to more opportunities for those with higher incomes. In most cases this is an intended result.

In about half the cases the improvement of the built environment is also mentioned. Physical measures resulted not only in an improved physical quality of buildings (see above) but also of the built environment, such as public squares, parks, roads and parking facilities. Attention to the physical environment can be found in projects in almost all countries, but it is specifically Southern and Eastern European countries which have had plans to improve aspects of the area. This has to do partly with the seriousness of the problems (see also below), but tenure probably also plays a role; while housing in deteriorated areas in Western European countries is often in the social rent category (with one or only a few owners), in the Southern, Central and Eastern European estates in particular owner occupation is more widespread in such areas, making it difficult to organise renewal activities focused on dwellings.

Close to physical improvement of the environment, are infrastructure improvements to traffic, parking facilities, traffic reduction measures and public transport facilities. These key results are mentioned in several countries. Where mobility has risen tremendously
since the 1990s, more parking space is provided (Vsetin, Ljubljana), backward infra-
structure is improved (Nitra, Riga) or connectivity with the rest of the city is improved
(Warsaw). Conversely, Vienna is an example where traffic reduction measures were
taken.

Next are ecological improvements, which again occur specifically in Central and Eastern
European countries. Polluted and waste areas have been cleaned and reused (Nitra,
Sofia) and buildings have been insulated to save energy and decrease heating costs
(Warsaw, Sofia).

In about a quarter of the cases economic results are reported as a consequence of physi-
cal approaches. These results are generally intended, and contain a range of measures
and strategies, varying from providing conditions for private enterprises, commercial
areas, job creation and a decrease in unemployment. These economic results are men-
tioned most in Central and Eastern European countries (Lodz, Warsaw, Vilnius) and in
Britain and Ireland (Dublin, London, Glasgow). An adjacent economic result of physical
measures is the rise of the value of property in the area. Because of measures taken in
a part of the area, housing and other property prices have risen across the entire area.
Examples are provided in Budapest, Utrecht and Warsaw.

Social improvements are mentioned in about one third of all practices. Social or com-
munity cohesion is improved (Belfast, Copenhagen, Freiburg, Turin), groups of active
residents are formed (Horsens) and people are more open and cooperative than before
(Tartu). In other cases a more diversified population mix is created (Goteborg, Paris,
Gavle). In some cases facilities such as schools, kindergartens and community centres
are mentioned as a centre for local activities (Amsterdam, Lodz, Brussels, Riga, Lux-
embourg).

All these examples show that with physical measures and strategies it is not only physi-
cal results which have been achieved, but also economic and social benefits. Most of
these were intended at the start of the projects.

A positive and often unintended result – at least, not formulated as an objective of the
approaches – is the improvement of the neighbourhood image. As stated in Chapter
3, most of the neighbourhoods covered in this report suffered from a negative image
before the improvements started. It was also noted that it is hard to get rid of such a
stigma once set. It is remarkable that about a quarter of all cases name the improve-
ment of the image of the relevant area as a key result of the physical approaches. This
means that changing a negative image may be hard, but it is not impossible. Examples
of better images and reputations can be found in Leinefelde, Orebru, Barcelona, Utrecht,
Freiburg and Prague. Other cities refer to increased attractiveness and popularity, terms
that refer more to the overall area (Plock, Vienna, Vilnius, Liepaja, Helsinki).

City-wide regeneration programme – Avoiding the ‘waterbed’ effect

The ‘Neighbourhood Contract’ programme is the main regeneration policy instru-
ment in the Brussels-Capital-Region. The Neighbourhood Contracts, which are imple-
mented in partnership with the local authorities, are intended to create a dynamic of
integrated revitalisation in disadvantaged districts. The objective is to create housing
and to upgrade public spaces, but that is not all. Socio-economic initiatives are also
included at the neighbourhood level, concentrating on building or strengthening in-
frastructure and facilities in the vicinity. Above all, the programmes depend on the
establishment of a partnership between the public authorities (local and regional), investors, non-government associations and the residents in the areas in question.

The project is taking place in many neighbourhoods and in different policy areas because it is regarded as ineffective to concentrate on a single deprived neighbourhood while neglecting the others. So far 24 programmes have been completed or are approaching completion, 16 are in progress and 4 have been in the planning stage. The successive launching of the Neighbourhood Contract programmes allows the Region to cover the whole zone in need of regeneration progressively.

8 Success and failure factors

Successes

Successes are strongly related to key results. These are the positive outcomes of the projects, and successes are described in similar terms as key results. This implies that successes are mostly described in physical terms, in the improvement of buildings, environments and the rehabilitation of the entire neighbourhood. An important question is: who determines whether a project is successful? In our cases success is generally described by people involved in the project or by reasonably independent people (scientists for example) who are not involved. A totally different way of measuring success would be to ask the inhabitants of an area, or even the inhabitants who formerly lived in that area. Evaluations on the basis of a survey among (former) inhabitants might yield another success/failure picture.

Where successes are described in mostly physical terms, describing the practical improved areas, buildings, streets, greens, etc., success factors generally refer to the process. In four out of every five practices success factors are mentioned, and in three of those four the process is mentioned as the basis for success. An overview follows below.

Sometimes the contribution of a specific actor or group of actors is mentioned. In Riga and Liepaja the involvement of private investors has been the key to success, while in Paris and Cadiz the involvement of external urban professionals was mentioned. In a range of practices the interest and involvement of residents is given as one of the key factors behind the success of the project (among others in Dublin, Vilnius, Furth, Brøndby Strand and Gävle). In Nusfalau the project success has been reached by successfully involving part of the Roma population, a group normally quite difficult to persuade to participate.

Another success factor is the project’s organisational structure. Specifically the existence of a central project office has been mentioned (examples in Budapest, Rotterdam, Amsterdam). Such a central office is not only necessary to keep an eye on the project itself, but to determine when different partners have to work together in which way, and to keep time schedules and deadlines. Perhaps even more important is the task of focusing on possible conflicts, problems and the existence of differential power and knowledge of different partners. A strong organisational structure prevents certain partners dropping out or even being actively excluded from (some parts of) the process, which may lead the whole project into a dangerous zone and limit success.
Related to this is the following success factor: *good ways of collaboration between partners*. While a central office may set the framework for collaboration and tries to guard or even guide the process, good cooperation between partners within these limits and frameworks is crucial for a successful project. Most of the fifty practices are large and complicated cases, where hundreds or thousands of people are involved, scores of professional actors contribute and numerous interests play a role. Strong commitment, good interaction and mutual trust are essential elements of good cooperation. Such aspects are mentioned in Lodz (a close cooperation between partners is specifically mentioned here as a crucial success factor), Paris (a strong commitment of partners was one of the success factors), Leinefelde (cooperative interaction), Horsens (the existence a non-hierarchical organisation form), Bratislava (reliable partners) and Ljubljana (good cooperation). All these aspects have to do with the concept of urban governance, as discussed in Chapter 2.

The aspects just mentioned relate to the *personal factor* and are difficult to manage in a project’s organisational structure. Insiders and practitioners refer to the ‘chemistry’ between actors: necessary and useful, but not something that can be forced at the beginning of a project. But because this ‘human factor’ is clearly important for successes, attention should always be paid to it. The same is true for what is called ‘strong leadership’. This doesn’t refer to a totalitarian regime issuing orders, but to charismatic, stable and visionary people in leading positions within the process. A way to success is to appoint this type of individual to positions dealing with the actual implementation of a project, instead of keeping them in the office to produce more paper plans.

Other success factors have to do with the practical implementation of the project. In Leinefelde a flexible modular system was mentioned. For practitioners as well as for inhabitants within an area of some 16,000 inhabitants, such a modular system prevents the total overview being lost. In Glasgow the master plan for three districts was divided into manageable packages. More or less the same occurred in Bratislava: a city-wide project aimed to produce visible results in smaller projects at a reasonable scale. When projects are at a convenient scale, residents and other contributors can see progress more easily, and will thus appreciate it better. Related to this is the need to fine-tune and combine measures; examples are Brøndby Strand, Cascais, Warsaw, Ercolano, London and Brussels.

Some projects have just been lucky by *coincident bonuses*. Some contributors name their geographically favourable position, centrally located in the country, in the region, or within the city. The location of a deprived area can have changed over the years, not literally, but relatively. This can be positive or negative. Some neighbourhoods were once developed in isolated locations which are today very central, amid newly-developed office areas, highways and close to services and shopping centres that have moved from the city centres towards the former outskirts. Other projects have profited from the economy. The Budapest project succeeded because of the economic growth that was beyond any expectations. The 2006 Winter Olympics in Turin gave the regional economy an economic boost and served as a driving force for the city’s image. The Belfast community project succeeds gradually as a result of both the expanding economy and the peace process. In some projects financial bonuses are mentioned. Extra resources appeared, from the EU in Turku and Helsinki.

**Failures and failure factors**

We noted above that while the key results of most projects were formulated in terms of successful physical outcomes, the success factors are dependent on a smoother process. This is also true for failures. Looking at those factors, first we have to conclude
that one-third of the case contributors do not mention any failures at all. This could mean there were no failures, but probably non-reporting of failures is a more reasonable explanation.

The remaining two-thirds of the cases do report a range of varying failures and failure factors. About half have to do with the process. It is difficult to keep the various actors especially residents, involved throughout the whole process (examples: Paris, Turku), especially when the process takes a relatively long time. Particularly in physical renewal policies, the entire process generally takes a number of years.

In some cases the low participation or involvement of specific actors or groups has been mentioned as a failure factor. In some cities immigrants did not participate as expected or hoped (Utrecht, Goteborg, Copenhagen, Warsaw). In others, the involvement of private investors was less successful than anticipated (Klaipeda, Copenhagen, Vilnius). In yet others, reality turned out to be more difficult and lengthy than expected: complaints about bureaucratic and slow processes are heard from Athens, Rotterdam, Turin, Nus-falau, Paris, Ercolano, Dublin and Warsaw. Coordination between departments was a problem in Athens and Copenhagen. Limited financing was a problem in Plock, Paris, Horsens and Nitra.

In some of the projects large re-housing schemes were necessary because of demolitions or intense renovations. Replacement of the ‘old’ tenants was reported to be problematic in London and Budapest. In the latter, this fed discussions about the need to regenerate and rebuild the neighbourhood.

For Cadiz two remarks can be made that may serve as a warning for other projects. The first is the experience that requests and ideas of participants may change over time. This happens particularly in large-scale and lengthy processes. Flexible procedures and breaking up a large project into smaller and less time-consuming processes may be a simple solution here. The second lesson from Cadiz is that after realisation of the measures, the participants in the process demanded a follow-up, to give continuity to the activities. Obviously a process does not have to end when the measures have been carried out.

There have also been some content failures. Not all intended measures have been implemented, or implemented yet. These can be separate projects, such as a footbridge in Ljubljana, crèches in Dublin, offices in Amsterdam, shops in Horsens, public spaces in Liepaja, roads in Tartu or car parking in Vienna and Paris. Reasons for this can be manifold.

Other failures concern the end result. Three main results can be observed. At first some practices show that, despite physical improvements to buildings and environments, social and economic problems often still remain. In Goteborg, Amsterdam, Freiburg, Liepaja, London and Budapest there are still many unemployed, poor residents, often immigrants, and poverty remains a major problem. The physically oriented measures did not solve social problems. It is perhaps also naïve to believe or expect that physical problems would solve these aspects whose causes lie far beyond the physical and the neighbourhood. The seeds for failing to reach an intended goal in this sphere have probably already been planted at the beginning of the project.

Safety used to be a problem in about a third of the cases, before approaches as concluded in Chapter 4 were launched. Some of these issues did indeed improve, resulting in a better quality of life, but not all. Safety issues are still a problem in Freiburg and Helsinki for example. Here too the expectation that physical measures would create social results has probably been over-optimistic.
One of the main aims of a large area approach is to decrease the gap between the unpopular area and the rest of the city. Some projects did succeed, but definitely not all. For Goteborg and Budapest the targeted area is still unpopular, stigmatised and has a low position in the local housing hierarchy. The Glasgow case shows the opposite. Housing prices have risen so extensively that low-income families have difficulty finding housing.

Ultimately, and just as with the coincidental bonuses, there are also coincidental setbacks. These can be human (leading people take another job or otherwise leave, ordinary quarrels), there could be bad luck (geomorphologic conditions in Vsetin), or the economy could collapse (Amsterdam, Lodz) or explode (Glasgow). Not all developments can be calculated in advance.

9 Conclusions

This report has focused on the physical aspects of urban renewal policies and the possible effects of these measures. Its main aim is to discover which elements of these policies could be transferable to the practice of urban renewal in various local, national and political contexts. We have paid special attention to the intended and sometimes unintended social effects of these policies. In many cases the policy-makers have a clear aim of achieving social goals with physical measures. Based on case studies we have tried to identify elements that may be important points of attention. We have deliberately focused on the effects of physical measures, ignoring job programmes, schooling tracks, police actions, integration courses, teenage mother projects etc., no matter how useful and effective these might have been in improving the lives of people or the state of a neighbourhood.

The empirical basis for this report comprises the description of 50 (mainly successful) physical urban renewal projects in Europe. We have considered similarities and differences between these practices, the central problems that have been defined, and the measures carried out to solve these problems. We have also focused on the actors involved and the organisation of the renewal process, and on the results reached. Finally, we have tried to identify the policies’ success and failure factors.

The 50 cases were selected from 103 project descriptions submitted to EUKN. These focus on several types of deprived urban areas, such as city centres, high-rise housing estates, former industrial areas and areas with former military barracks. The cases differ in scale, varying from a few streets to a city as a whole; they also differ with respect to the issues and most important problems. The common denominator in these projects is a physical urban renewal policy carried out in all of them; this can be useful for other practices in other cities.

Manifold approaches for a mix of problems

All projects covered deprived areas which often had an intricate mix of problems typical for urban renewal areas. In most of the 50 cases, structural, physical problems with buildings (mostly dwellings), layouts and environments were highly significant. Most cases deal with deprived, run-down areas, where physical deterioration is unmistakably taking place. Physical measures can obviously do their job here, providing housing and a built environment with a higher quality. This can mean that dwellings have more luxurious amenities (in the kitchen and bathroom), are more spacious and better insulated.
causing less energy loss. Higher quality neighbourhoods may contain more attractive public spaces, better playing facilities for children, more green areas and better parking facilities. These are clear, direct and positive effects of refurbishing, modernising or replacing dwellings and improving housing environments. An important question is however whether physical measures can also solve, or contribute to solving, non-physical issues.

Most declining neighbourhoods exhibit a combination of physical deterioration, a deprived population and poor living circumstances. **Economic problems** often encompass high unemployment and low incomes, while the area itself provides few job opportunities and a lack of services, offices and firms. Some physical approaches aim to improve this situation by providing local job centres, supporting small enterprises, updating commercial centres, enhancing tourism opportunities and improving infrastructure and connections with the rest of the city.

Social problems, others than unemployment and low incomes, often appear to refer to two issues: **insecurity** and the **lack of social cohesion** between different groups. Although many strategies in this field are non-physical, some physical measures have been successfully carried out: specific safety measures, the establishment of community centres, child care, schools, restaurants, the improvement of parks and playgrounds and other communal facilities in general, to provide opportunities for meeting and more social cohesion.

Two groups of problems raised in the literature turn out not to have been very problematic. Legislative problems, important in Eastern European countries in the 1990s, were not mentioned, probably because they are currently less prevalent. And although few people would confess to having plenty of funds, remarkably few practices were reported where funding shortages caused major problems.

A positive and often unintended result is the improvement of the **image** of an area. Although the literature shows it is hard to get rid of a negative stigma once it has been set, quite a number of practices report improvement of a poor image as a key result of the physical approaches.

**Actors in the approach**

Measures and strategies cover the ‘what’ of an approach, while the ‘how’ is related to the way the several **actors implement the process**. In all 50 cases we examined, local government is one of the partners, but several other actors also participated. This automatically necessitates a need for collaboration between partners to combine forces, capacity and funds. This is not always easy: different partners have different expectations and different degrees of power and responsibilities. There is a range of actors, but we single out three important groups.

**Local government** is always involved, but urban planning responsibilities often have to be shared with other government levels, which impels vertical cooperation. This is more the case when several government layers interfere with activities at the local level.

As the issues in the 50 deprived areas are complex, several sectors are involved, leading to a need for horizontal cooperation. Collaboration between various sectors can be difficult because of varying policy cultures. One sector may be used to thorough meetings and long lines of responsibility, while another is accustomed to quick action, giving rise to problems. It is a challenge for the years ahead to integrate the various sector cultures.
The investors, or the potential investors, can be regarded as a second group of major actors. Many of the targeted areas contain social sector dwellings. Housing associations are an important owner in a number of countries, and a major actor in the renewal of deprived urban areas. The local authority can also own rented properties: in that case another local government department is a partner. In a considerable number of cases commercial actors are also involved, sometimes owning property, sometimes willing to invest. Involving these commercial partners is becoming increasingly important in the implementation process. In a third of the 50 practices private investors played an important role, often only in the actual implementation stage, but sometimes also in the planning process. In a couple of cases they even took the lead.

A third important actor is the residents, as most of the areas considered are inhabited. Residents have been involved in a range of ways in all these areas. In some cases only one or a few public meetings were organised, where planning alternatives were discussed. In others, working groups were established to elaborate particular issues. Other projects saw residents’ representatives taking part in decision making boards, or allowed to decide about the spending of budgets within their neighbourhood. In a considerable number of cases commercial actors are also involved, sometimes owning property, sometimes willing to invest. Involving these commercial partners is becoming increasingly important in the implementation process. In a third of the 50 practices private investors played an important role, often only in the actual implementation stage, but sometimes also in the planning process. In a couple of cases they even took the lead.

The involvement of residents and potential residents has to be organised very well. Problems of representativeness easily occur: some groups may feel excluded from the decision making process. Involvement of residents is also vulnerable. Obstacles are easily identified: the project may be too large, the whole process may take too long, results are not visible, or a few representatives are far more involved than the rest of the population. Another obstacle may be that participation may be used for the benefit of those in power: (potential) participants may be given the impression that they are influential in the process, while in practice they are not. Real participation probably only works when there is a certain amount of real co-production of policies, when residents are given the possibility to genuinely work together with local government and private partners.

**Keys to a successful implementation**

Collaboration can be regulated officially in contracts. Public-private partnerships have been arranged in a couple of the cases. From the literature on urban governance it is known that collaboration between partners can raise accountability issues. When there is just one partner (such as a local government), it is clear who is accountable when mistakes are made. In the case of multiple partnerships it is less clear who to blame. We have not found many accountability problems in practice. This is probably inherent to the method we have used: we asked stakeholders to submit descriptions of their practices. Real conflicts, if they exist, are only revealed in a more in-depth study based on interviews.

Collaboration is necessary, but it is *no guarantee of success*. There can be unexpected external developments, coincident bonuses or disappointments; national policy changes, economic cycles or strong leaders who leave or join the project. Not all circumstances can be anticipated. The ‘human factor’ should never be forgotten: there needs to be some chemistry between actors, a common trust to solve the problems and ‘to do the job’, among all actors varying from policy-makers, investors or owners to all manner of residents.

Some conclusions can be drawn about the actual implementation. In some practices it is emphasised how important it is to combine practical and policy people in the process. Practitioners should help to formulate the policies, and policy-makers should also
be ‘on the spot’. The best people should not reside at the top floor of the office, but be in the field.

Another key to success is transparency. Large projects have been split into manageable packages, to be flexible for changed circumstances. There should be an overall vision about where to go, but all manner of detail can be completed later, during the process. Flexibility means that plans can be changed at a later stage during the process, without changing the major goal of the approach. Policy-makers have to keep their promises and act clearly and transparently. Lack of clarity about the effects of decisions in certain meetings, financial arrangements or the further procedure easily kills a policy process and its outcomes.

Transparency may also refer to the results of policies or actions. If the effects of investments are unclear, the usefulness of the policy may be questioned. Residents and other parties may start raising doubts about the need for investments and policies. Before the effectiveness (in terms of outcome and output) can be evaluated, a proper monitoring and evaluation process must be set up. Monitoring and evaluation are not part of every policy or action, at least not when we look at the 50 cases forming the basis of this report.

**Integrated approach: how, what, where and when**

This brings us finally to the concept of an integrated approach. In a number of cases this is mentioned as a key for success, and in some an integral approach was not only a means, but also an explicit aim for the entire renewal process. This concept is often considered as the best way to organise a renewal process and to arrive at sustainable communities. Perhaps this is true, but meanwhile there is no simple panacea or blueprint that can be introduced easily in all practices. The concept of an integrated approach has several meanings:

9. the ‘what’, to the integration of different policy sectors (such as physical, social and economic policies);
10. the ‘how’, the collaboration of different partners (such as governments, residents, commercial investors, owners);
11. the ‘where’, the area, which refers to a size and scale focus;
12. the ‘when’, a time-focus.

The first two aspects have been mentioned and covered frequently. We will therefore elaborate on the two others less mentioned. Most practices are oriented towards a particular neighbourhood, using an area-based approach. The advantage is that several actors can act within a limited area. One aspect of an integrated approach which is sometimes neglected, is to consider the intended area within a wider context. This means not only solving problems in the specific neighbourhood itself, but also in adjacent areas. It means moving up to a higher scale level and considering connections between the area and the rest of the city. And it means being keen on spill-over effects to avoid the ‘waterbed-effect’. Any area-based approach will not solve all problems and will always thin-out and spread some, but when a significant share concentrates nearby, the overall results may be negative. Then a more robust approach is necessary, attacking the more serious problems and preventing negative side effects. Integration on a scale level means working at different levels simultaneously, varying from the direct neighbourhood, the district or the city to the region.
The fourth part of an integrated approach is a time-focus. Most of the areas considered have been declining for years, or even decades, although there are exceptions where deterioration occurred rapidly. Large physical renewal activities take a long time, up to 10 or 15 years or more. Moreover, after completing an approach, a regular follow up is also useful. But not all actors can, or are willing to, wait that long. Complaining residents will have moved away, politicians will not be re-elected, investors cannot wait 10 years for profit, and the media will retain the poor image. Thus a long-term approach should be accompanied by short-term measures. These may be physical as well as non-physical. Complaining residents can regain their confidence through short-term improvements. Short-term and quick measures can be taken when long-term strategies are being prepared. More drastic measures, such as demolition and new construction, have more local support when daily inconveniences, like the dirt on the streets, the drugs dealer on the corner, the burglaries in the park, or the many unemployed, are dealt with properly and at once. It is important to keep the positive people involved. And to keep those people within the area, instead of seeing them moving out.

A final message

Physical measures are now generally part of a broader framework to tackle deprivation, combined with economic and social measures. We have shown that physical measures and strategies do improve deprived urban areas. According to the intentions, buildings which have deteriorated are renewed or improved and poor and declining environments are upgraded. But in many cases non-physical results are also reported, solving or mitigating insecurity, increasing social cohesion, providing job opportunities and improving the image. In many situations these effects have been intended, indicating that physical measures can indeed lead to social results.

Some factors can be recognised as making urban policies improve deprived areas more successfully. The most important seems to be finding the right balance within an integrated approach: the involvement and collaboration between all required actors, a combination of various measures and sectors, working simultaneously at several scale levels, and combining future-oriented policies with today’s urban reality. For some this may be a platitude, for others it may just seem impossible. The trick is to look critically, but with open eyes, at successful projects elsewhere and to find out which successful elements can be used in the situation ‘back home’.
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