

Bavarian State Ministry of the
Environment and Consumer Protection



City of Munich
Department of
Urban Planning



LOS_DAMA! Kick-Off and EUSALP AG7 Workshop

**Enhancing urban and peri-urban Green Infrastructure
in Alpine metropolitan areas**

Proceedings

31.05.2017 – 01.06.2017

Seidl Villa, Munich, Germany



European Regional Development Fund



Agenda 01.06.2017



08:30	Arrival / Coffee at Seidl Villa
09:00	Welcome and Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the day
09:30	Key Note Lecture I <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common understanding of Green Infrastructure in Alpine metropolitan areas; recent research, trends/challenges • Discussion
10:30	Coffee break
11:00	Breakout Sessions (choose one) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why GI in <u>peri-urban</u> / peri-urban <u>Alpine</u> areas? 2. Measures and resources for enhancing <u>your</u> peri-urban Alpine GI 3. How to manage <u>cross-sectoral</u> co-operation for peri-urban (Alpine) GI
12:00	Presentation of results and further input from the audience
12:30	Lunch
13:30	Welcome Note Department of Urban Planning
13:40	Key Note Lecture II <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance of green infrastructure in Alpine peri-urban areas • Invitation to the Fishbowl • Introduction to the “rules of the game”
14:30	'Fishbowl' Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and implementation challenges of Green Infrastructure for cities and regions • Reflection from EUSALP AG7 and LOS_DAMA!
15:30	Coffee break
16:00	Key Note Lecture III <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Infrastructure and social justice in Alpine cities Research from Vienna and Munich, insights from Bozen • Discussion / wrap-up
16:45	Apero with Pilot Poster Exhibition
17:45	MoU Editorial Group and walk to joint dinner English Garden visit and walk to joint dinner
19:00	Joint Dinner at Cafe Reitschule (at own cost)



Key Note Lecture I

Session 1: Key Note Lecture I by Stephan Pauleit / 01-06-2017

Author: Franziska DRASDO (City of Munich)



Aim of the session

Describe contents and issues addressed in approx. 5 sentences.

Stephan Pauleit first of all described meanings of the term Green Infrastructure. Green infrastructure can be understood as a planning approach to develop a network of green and blue open spaces. Therefore it is an entire landscape approach and has mainly 4 functions:

1. Integration: Combining green and grey infrastructures will lead to hybrid solutions. Looking at grey infrastructure might help to also improve green aspects and support their equivalent consideration
2. Connectivity: green infrastructure might support the creating of green space network that fulfils functional, social, ecological and other aspects.
3. Multifunctionality: Green Infrastructure will deliver multiple ecosystem services and serve as an open space strategy. Wildlife as well as Cyclists can gain profit.
4. Social Inclusion: collaborative and participatory planning will enable different groups to participate. Attention should especially be paid to vulnerable groups. The interests of different stakeholders need to be balanced to reach a high level of equal access.

The consideration of peri-urban Green Infrastructure creates a strong regional framework that might help bridging borders and creating a cooperation between municipalities citizens and the economy. In order to enhance Green Infrastructure, a skilful combination between formal, informal an economic instruments is necessary. "GI can become an important strategy for development of sustainable rural – urban relationships"

If applicable, shortly describe the method you applied in your session.

Key Note Lecture with a Power-Point-Presentation and a Question-led Discussion afterwards.

Summary

Name up to 5 key points to sum up the result and discussion

Firstly, what are the specifics for Green Infrastructure in Cities within the Alpine region?

Stephan Pauleit reported, that cities mostly face similar challenges concerning Green Infrastructure. The specific characteristic of cities within the Alpine Regions is, that they are close to an attractive environment which might raises the city's attractiveness. To focus on peri-urban landscapes might raise the awareness on the quality, "backyard" sides of the cities can provide.

Renate Zuckerstätter (Sum Vienna) tells that in the peri-urban area of Vienna municipalities are not strong enough to compete for land on economic markets, so the implementation of Green infrastructure ist quite difficult. Stephan Pauleit stressed, that the combination of different instruments in important and that taking some areas out of competition and increasing the pressure from the bottom might also be helpful. Especially for Francesca La Greca (Piemont Region) the formal instruments are of importance, because the Regional Management is not able to reinforce plans, e.g. talk to farmers directly. Cesare Salvetat (City of Milano) reports, that creating a vision was very helpful for the City of Milano to enhance Green Infrastructure in the peri-urban areas. Along with the enhancement of waterways, there have been incentives for farmers to create recreation areas that attract city inhabitants.

Briefly describe what this session contributes to LOS_DAMA!

To spotlight advantages and challenges when Implementing Green infrastructure

Describe unexpected or inspiring observations you have made during the session.

It was visible, that the lecture topic matched current issues of the audience.



Break out I



Session 2a: “Why Green Infrastructure in peri-urban / peri-urban Alpine areas?” / 01-06-2017

Author: Tina TRAMPUŠ (Institute of Republic of Slovenia for Nature Conservation, EUSALP AG 7 co-lead)

Aim of the session

Describe contents and issues addressed in approx. 5 sentences.

The aim was to look deeper into the issue of green infrastructure, especially in a more general context and on macro-regional level. Participants tried to understand what is important of having (and planning) green infrastructure in peri-urban areas, possibly to connect cities with core Alpine area as well as defining the spatial position of the cities within the Alpine Region. Cooperation between LOS_DAMA partners (cities) and EUSALP action group 7 (ecological connectivity) was recognized as beneficent for harmonization of work and taking advantages of common challenges and synergies.

If applicable, shortly describe the method you applied in your session.

We used a round table discussion with taking notes to the flipcharts. Part of the session was combination of individual work (participants writing ideas on post-its) and joint discussion (sharing of ideas).

Summary

Name up to 5 key points to sum up the result and discussion

Two major points (questions) were addressed and this are the outputs of the discussion.
Benefits of the co-operation between (LOS_DAMA) cities and EUSALP: To get close to the finances (mayor), to exchange techniques for efficient sustainable management; to expand awareness and gain support; to give the cities the opportunity to be heard – to give more power toward regions and EU; to improve cooperation between different levels of government; to transfer the practices from city planning to the regional level; to make policies on regional level more suitable for local/ city level; common understanding of GI issues
Why is Green Infrastructure important (in peri-urban areas)?
For the quality of life (attractiveness for living, work, recreation, clean air etc.); can improve multi-functionality if peri-urban areas support and rise a process of importance of the GI elements; connecting the city with the Alps (different aspects/ types of connections); interconnecting (both ways) city with the countryside; complementary areas /functions for the citizens (added value); identity of /with the landscape; cost efficient tool to provide ecosystem services

Briefly describe what this session contributes to LOS_DAMA!

Insights and working toward common understanding of the basic concepts (green infrastructure).
Promoting the synergies among project and people working for the implementation of the concept of GI in the Alpine Region.

Describe unexpected or inspiring observations you have made during the session.

Even though most of the participants were from the spatial planning sector, common understanding of basic terms can be a challenge. We are assuming that we have a clear picture on what is the meaning of the terms used (green infrastructure, inner urban area, peri-urban, suburban...) but in reality our perception can vary a lot – this can cause misunderstanding during debate or work.
We (as experts) tend to complicate – why talk about peri-urban if we could say the countryside?
Clearance on meaning and simplifications on used terms are in favor of assuring efficient communication with non-experts and general public.



Break out II



Session 2b: “Measures and resources for enhancing your peri-urban Alpine GI” / 01-06-2017

Author: Sylvia PINTARITS (City of Munich)

Aim of the session

Describe contents and issues addressed in approx. 5 sentences.

What (kind of) measures and resources are needed for enhancing Alpine peri-urban Green Infrastructure (GI).
Timeframe: measures implemented / resources used over the next 5 to 10 years.

What is needed? Collecting visionary, concrete, smart, creative ... ideas/needs.

If applicable, shortly describe the method you applied in your session.

Participants have three wishes free to describe how they would like to enhance Green Infrastructure in their own area. Collection and clustering of answers to find common needs for lobbying, policy design, learning

Summary

Name up to 5 key points to sum up the result and discussion

- **People:** a widespread desire in the group to increase (public) awareness for GI and its challenges, a wish that peri-urban GI / different types of landscapes should be better perceived and acknowledged. Effective “labeling” of GI (like “Jakobsweg”) was mentioned to increase attention; also: wish that people and officers would be proud of their area’s GI (as common goods, shared ownership), others for GI projects (agriculture, peri-urban) contributing to social inclusion and to create places with less rules for people to flourish.

Contents and knowledge: connect local to regional GI, increase connectivity (reduce fragmentation), safe and pleasant pathways for non-motorized travelling, pockets of perceived “wilderness”, important role for urban forests and agriculture (local production, biodiversity), adding “volume” to GI (“3D GI”), better data base and increased knowledge of peri-urban GI for reasearch.

- **Finances:** EU funding needs to be substantial (60-80%) and “real” (physical, ..) to reach public appreciation.

- **Government and governance:** More coherent policies of the different administrations responsible for the same area, a tool for inter-sectoral working, enhanced cooperation between “strong” and (seemingly less important) other sectors, integrating the GI approach into green area design, sustainable development, cities which “think bigger” – saving nature, reducing traffic, ...; develop a vision based on the strengths of our urban areas and include citizens.

- **LOS_DAMA!:** please apply as ambassadors for the project and the enhancement of peri-urban GI.

Briefly describe what this session contributes to LOS_DAMA!

Input to policy development and recommendations:

- Make sure you work with and for the people (inclusion, shared ownership, co-creation/participation)
- Contribute to better coherence of policies and improved cooperation between sectors, create a toolkit, a vision and provide good arguments for better EU-funding.
- Test/use “labeling” in local pilot areas as well as other ways to increase attention and appreciation
- Look out for agriculture and (urban) forestry; gain more knowledge of peri-urban GI

Describe unexpected or inspiring observations you have made during the session.

Experience to deal with: Sometimes people / certain groups are pushed out of GI areas. Public versus planning departments: resistance against change



Break out III

Session 2c: “How to manage cross-sectoral co-operation for peri-urban (Alpine) GI” / 01-06-2017

Author: Kerstin LANGER (City of Munich)

Aim of the session
Describe contents and issues addressed in approx. 5 sentences.
The aim of this breakout session was to focus on the question how cross-sectoral cooperation can be managed. Three guiding questions framed the discussion: 1. Which are the most important sectors to include and why? 2. Which strategies are suitable to “get them on board”? 3. Which working formats seem to be efficient and successful to align aims, strategies and implementation measures? The participants were asked either to think of good practice examples they already experienced or intend to test in their pilot action. They were also asked to add questions for further discussion and which topics could be interesting for the transnational exchange.
If applicable, shortly describe the method you applied in your session.
Group discussion in small mixed groups, presentation on the pinboard with colored post-its

Summary
Name up to 5 key points to sum up the result and discussion
According to the three “columns” of discussion it could be summarized - firstly, that all sectors are important to be included because they could take the role either of supporters or of opponents. But during the discussion there was an emphasis of the agricultural sector and of the stakeholder group of politicians and public opinion leaders. Also the sector of strategic landscape planning, water management and the recreation and tourism sector were mentioned as well as the civil society. - secondly, that concerning the strategies it is important to see and realize the different interests, needs and fears in a first step - “to step in the shoes of the others” - to come to common interests and an integrative visioning with common objectives. For this reason it is also important to find mechanisms to share costs and benefits of different development measures. - thirdly, that formats using social media are as important as face-to-face-meetings. New media formats can be used for participative mapping or other online-platforms which have the chance to involve also young(er) people. Whereas face-to-face-meetings can help to transport “good messages”. Also the existing informal formats as design or formative workshops, story telling, advisory boards or citizen juries are suitable for cross-sectoral cooperation.
Briefly describe what this session contributes to LOS_DAMA!
- to have all sectors in mind with special attention to landusers, landowners and politicians - to focus on the role and possibilities of new media as well as having face-to-face meetings in mind - testing random choice invitation procedures to have a heterogenous group of civil society for the discussions - importance to find “good messages” and a positive image for the further development of open spaces - to find mechanisms to share costs and benefits of measures
Describe unexpected or inspiring observations you have made during the session.
- concerning different logics of sectors - importance of real mutual understanding of the concerns and interests of each other - importance to find a common and understandable language to reach the audience: common between levels, sectors and generations, the need for a plan B



Key Note Lecture II



Session 3: Key note lecture II by Olaf Kühne / 01-06-2017

Author: Sylvia PINTARITS (City of Munich)

Aim of the session

Describe contents and issues addressed in approx. 5 sentences.

- To understand **how landscapes are perceived and managed** it is necessary to look at the features and **logics of postmodern societies**. Politics, jurisdiction, economy, science, media: all of these sub-systems of society consider landscape issues (and other) with regard to their own interests and logic.
- The perception of landscape through **people** depends on a variety of **factors** like education, age, place of residence, political attitude. It changes in the course of generations and between different cultures.
- Landscape is (often) perceived as common good (while individual objects are linked to individual ownership)
- Native landscapes might not be “beautiful” (compared to stereotypes), yet they constitute “Heimat”
- Definition of “governance” in short: new forms cooperation to regulate, coordinate and control complex systems which need interaction between state, private and other actors.
- To enhance the **governance of landscapes** it is important to: find the ideal **degree of autonomy** of administrations, to use **appropriate types of relations** (from market to network to hierarchy), to increase the focus on **cooperative development** (vs. regulatory function) → **multi-level and trans-territorial governance** for more democratic legitimacy, economic efficiency and increased capacity for citizen actions.
- **Participation is without alternative**. Yet, it needs considerable effort, inclusion of minors in power, consideration of the different understandings of “landscape”, early involvement, transparent procedures, as not to threaten legitimacy and planning.

If applicable, shortly describe the method you applied in your session.

Keynote with presentation followed by a fishbowl discussion.

Summary

Name up to 5 key points to sum up the result and discussion

- It is important to mind the systemic logic of societies and the factors influencing individual / generational perception of landscapes.
- The feeling of loss of Heimat is linked to the change of native landscapes.
- “Living” new forms of governance might seem consequent and are easily proclaimed but overcoming sectoral silos, bureaucratic inefficiencies, social exclusion, limited resources, resistance against change, etc. are powerful barriers in practice.
- Socio-cultural landscape and physical landscape need to be considered equally.
- Involvement/ participation from early stages on is necessary but needs transparency and mature procedures.

Briefly describe what this session contributes to LOS_DAMA!

The session shows demanding pre- and framework conditions for the enhancement of governance and planning of landscapes. Although it will prove difficult in daily practice to fulfil all demands, it seems without alternative to improve the set-up of management, participation and new forms of governance. These could be partnerships and should be based on scientific insights, empirical evidence, and practical experience. Providing resources (esp. time) to enable practitioners to dive into knowledge pools and link it with their own implicit knowledge will be one of the challenges for public administrations.

Describe unexpected or inspiring observations you have made during the session.

Strong evidence for intergenerational change in the perception of native landscapes.



Fishbowl Discussion



Session 4: “Fishbowl” Discussion / 01-06-2017

Author: Sergeja PRAPER (Urban Planning Institute of the Republic of Slovenia)

Aim of the session

Describe contents and issues addressed in approx. 5 sentences.

The “Fishbowl” discussion was conducted by Olaf Kühne, who consistently introduced the following questions: Are the different sections of public administration able to meet the challenges of peri-urban landscape development? What is necessary to overcome bureaucratic miseries for better cooperation and management for Green Infrastructure protection and development?

What can be the role of a city and city-region’s network in the Alpine Region’s multilevel governance through EUSALP?

Many participants of this WS are keen to deliver “real world” progress on the ground to enhance (peri-) urban Green Infrastructure. What can be your contribution to support this?

How can administrations (and the political level) support learning between partners in the context of green infrastructure and governance?

What are your personal expectations – what would be your added value from LOS_DAMA! and / or EUSALP?

If applicable, shortly describe the method you applied in your session.

The method “Fishbowl” discussion is a group discussion in which 9 chairs were arranged in an inner circle and the audience was placed around it. Three of the nine chairs were left blank, so persons from the audience could enter the discussion at any time. When a new attendant entered the discussion another participant left it. The aim of the session was to include many of the attendants from different backgrounds which worked out well: the discussion began with 6 persons and more than 15 persons took part overall, ranging from a Mayer, project partners, administrative representatives, lecturer and representatives of local associations.



Summary

Name up to 5 key points to sum up the result and discussion

As regards the possibility to govern green infrastructure in the current governance/political systems which are marked by high complexity, the responses of discussion participants were split: (1) affirmative answers were substantiated by observed past positive experience, e.g. with Agenda 21 or EUSALP, trust that there is already sufficient knowledge that only needs to be adapted, belief that there is no other alternative; (2) negative responses were explained by listing long/complicated administrative procedures, lack of knowledge at high/low levels, strong rules of established sectors. Conditions and open issues were addressed, among them inclusion and roles of actors, need to consider governance and administration as processes, resources needed/available at local level and possibilities to shift the topic to the regional level, the time component/need for more long-term perspective.

With reference to the potential role of cities and a city-region network in connection with multi-level governance and EUSALP, expectation was raised that cities should define their role in implementing the strategy. Cities are seen as key implementers, having large potentials and being in the position to provide leverage effects. A problem based approach with defining and comparing the issues and sharing solutions was proposed.

Interaction between the alpine "core" and peri-alpine metropolises was addressed as an opportunity to strive towards balance and shared responsibility for appropriate development. The strong opposition to inclusion of the peri-alpine metropolitan areas into the EUSALP perimeter was mentioned and an anticipation raised that "cities should prove that the decision to include them into the EUSALP area was right".

Of expectations of discussion participants concerning multi-level governance in LOS_DAMA! we would like to especially highlight the following: communication between experts and politicians started, getting good practice examples for public administration, having a learning process and reflection on successes or otherwise, and transnational exchange.

Briefly describe what this session contributes to LOS_DAMA!

A wider view on the relation with, and potential contribution to EUSALP has been achieved. Indication of some potential topics for WP T3 Activity A.T3.2.

Describe unexpected or inspiring observations you have made during the session.

It was unexpected, that even persons who did not feel to secure in speaking English attended the discussion. Although the questions mostly addressed the benefits of European cooperation and the challenges of administrative structures, local representatives from associations and communities felt encouraged to take part in the discussion.





Key Note Lecture III



Session 5: Key note lecture III by Sonja Gantioler / 01-06-2017

Author: Franziska DRASDO (City of Munich)

Aim of the session

Describe contents and issues addressed in approx. 5 sentences.

In her key note lecture Sonja Gantioler addressed controversial elements of Green Infrastructure, she found out during her dissertation and a survey as a part of it.

First the question was raised whether green infrastructure is something new or merely an old idea with a new name. To term "Infrastructure" offers the chance to discuss green open space equally to grey infrastructure such as streets. Furthermore Sonja Gantioler challenges the topic of a just access to green infrastructure. A just access is based on socio-economic factors, but the built physical and ecological space play a role as well, regarding for example the income and the living environment.

In her survey Sonja Gantioler investigated the differences between the expectations the general public has on green urban space compared to the municipalities of Vienna and Munich. One of the outputs was, that the expectations the general public has, do not necessarily meet the expectations of City administratives.

Therefore it is important to involve the general public before a development takes place. Green open space should not just be safeguarded but also managed actively.

If applicable, shortly describe the method you applied in your session.

Sonja Gantioler held a 20 Minutes Power-Point-Lecture

Summary

Name up to 5 key points to sum up the result and discussion

Especially the results from Sonja Gantioler's Survey were of great interest for the audience. While the administrative of both Cities Vienna and Munich found that connected areas are quite important for the quality characteristics of Green Infrastructure, the lack of road noise was more important for the general public. Concerning the governance of open space, extending the use rights for public space was crucial for the administrative as well as the general public, but surprisingly the public also wished for more rule systems for the common use.

It was mainly discussed, how Sonja Gantioler held the survey, and what could be done to better match interests of the public and the City administrative. Furthermore the necessity for more cross-departmental vertical cooperation was emphasized.

Briefly describe what this session contributes to LOS_DAMA!

The session faced challenges that turn up at the implementation of Green Infrastructure. Reflecting critically, which problems might come up helps to pay additional attention to those challenges when every project partner starts to implement their local pilots.

Describe unexpected or inspiring observations you have made during the session.

Many participants took photos auf the charts, in which Sonja Gantioler presented the results of her survey. They became aware, that a planner's expectations of Green infrastructure do not necessarily meet the general public ones.