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'WE SHAPE OUR BUILDINGS; THEREAFTER THEY SHAPE US.'

Winston Churchill
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SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

This report draws together the findings of an eight-week travelling fellowship sponsored by the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust. The study explored the approaches to engaging local residents and businesses in urban planning and development in Cuba, Australia and New Zealand, and considered applicability of the observed methods and tools in the UK.

1.1 BACKGROUND

How and where we build new or regenerate existing buildings and places, and what uses we plan for them affects our quality of life – our feeling of belonging, identity and pride; safety, crime and fear of crime; community cohesion; health; access to essential facilities including schools, public transport, green spaces or shops; as well as economic prosperity of local businesses or entire city regions.

Each urban development affects not only those that invest in it or occupy the buildings and places within it, but the wider community – all those that live and work nearby, simply pass through or visit the area on a regular basis. Therefore it is only right that all the affected parties, including essentially local residents and businesses, should be actively involved in shaping the developments that affect them. Having policies, processes, tools and methods that empower communities to do so is crucial.

1.2 ABOUT ME & MY FELLOWSHIP AIMS

Over the last 10 years I have been involved in many collaborative and community-led design and development projects in the UK as an architect, urban planner, facilitator and policy advisor. I researched existing and developed new methods and tools aimed at enabling communities to play a meaningful and proactive role in shaping their places in a sustainable way.

I saw my 2014 Churchill Fellowship as an opportunity to continue this exploration and study approaches to community engagement in design and development in different political, social and economic contexts, and at different spatial scales. The aim of the Fellowship was to consider the applicability of the observed best practice and apply relevant approaches in my own work, as well as disseminate best practice and my recommendations to others involved in urban planning and development in the UK and beyond.
1.3 WHY THIS TOPIC AND WHY NOW

There are many issues related to the development context and the planning system in the UK (and particularly in England), that make the engagement of communities in urban planning and development difficult.

The UK relies almost exclusively on the private sector to deliver development and has a largely market driven planning system. As a result, the engagement of communities is often conducted in an adversarial context of legal battles with private developers, with statutory planning authorities increasingly playing the role of facilitator or mediator.

There has also been a gradual shift of emphasis away from the policies of integrated spatial planning of the 2000s, reinforcing the division between town planning and other built environment disciplines, particularly urban design. With planning policy development mainly focused on land use allocation (often not considering the spatial or the detail of implementation on the ground), engaging local people in the process is difficult, as for most, it is the shape and feel of development on the ground that they can relate to and that motivates them to engage.

The UK is a country of homeowners, where a person’s home is their primary investment. In many cases it is the perceived negative impact of planning policies and decisions on the value of their home that sets off NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) campaigns. Interestingly it is often the fear of low quality developments, rather than outright rejection of growth, that drives NIMBY campaigns.

However, the role of communities in influencing or leading urban development has gradually being recognised and addressed by central and local government and the development industry. In parallel there has been an increase in community interest and activity in planning and development, caused by two main factors – the global financial crisis and ensuing austerity measures in the UK, which lessened the ability of the public sector to deliver services and development and placed more emphasis on the third sector; and the unstoppable advance of communication technologies, making the dissemination of information and community organising much easier.

In terms of relevant planning and development policies at national level, a major initiative in England (with consultation on similar legislation currently underway in Scotland) has been the introduction of new community rights through the Localism Act (2011). Among them, the Right to Plan (commonly referred to as neighbourhood planning) has created the opportunity for Parish or Town Councils or, in non-parished areas of the country, self-selecting Neighbourhood Forums, to produce statutory planning policies for their own neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood Plans are approved through local referenda, based on a simple majority.
Over 80 Plans have been approved by the end of July 2015, with neighbourhood planning activities underway in over 1,500 areas.

In terms of development management, the UK planning system remains relatively flexible and based on negotiation, with opportunities for communities to engage at different points in the process and more weight placed on community engagement in determining planning appeals.

Finally, there are many community driven development projects in the UK - thousands of Community Trusts, Community Interest Companies and other forms of community-led organisations are regenerating existing, or building new developments and acting as clients, on their own or in partnership with public and private sector partners. These are seen as projects of great importance as they often deliver community facilities that aren’t able to attract commercial developers or are increasingly beyond the financial means of local councils. A number of grant schemes and support systems are in place to make it easier for community groups to start and deliver such projects.

It is the changes to the policy landscape and the increasing importance of community engagement in planning and development in the UK outlined above that instigated my exploration of successful approaches to community engagement elsewhere.

**FOUR COMMUNITY RIGHTS INTRODUCED IN ENGLAND THROUGH THE LOCALISM ACT (2011)**

- **Plan**: produce a statutory plan for their neighbourhood, approved through local referendum. Nearly 1,200 areas designated, and 66 have past referendum. (Jan 2015)
- **Bid**: designate assets of community value, delay the sale and bid to buy those assets. Over 1,800 assets of community value listed. (Jan 2015)
- **Build**: small scale, site-specific developments without planning permission. First 3 Community Right to Build Orders in force, more orders in the pipeline. (Jan 2015)
- **Challenge**: challenge and take over a council service they think can be better run. 51 expressions of interest submitted, 9 procurements triggered. (Jan 2015)
1.4 MY FELLOWSHIP

The first part of my Fellowship included a two week trip to Havana, Cuba in March 2014, where I participated in a tour of key architectural and regeneration projects and an international design workshop that focused on developing proposals for the El Vedado area of the city, to form part of the emerging masterplan for the whole of Havana. During the workshop I worked alongside over 20 architects, developers, architectural historians and community activists from Cuba, USA, Mexico, Norway, Italy and the UK.

The second part of my Fellowship - a five week study tour of New Zealand and Australia - took place in March & April 2015 and included interviews, seminars and workshops with over 250 leading built environment practitioners, local and state government officials, academics and representatives of community groups and third sector organisations involved in community engagement and community-led design and development projects. As part of the tour I visited Auckland and Christchurch in New Zealand and Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane and Perth in Australia.

1.5 APPROACH, METHOD

As part of my Fellowship I examined the following:

- Policy mechanisms related to community engagement
- General attitudes and approaches / views of community engagement from the perspective of policy makers, practitioners, developers and communities engaged both in developing policies / proposals and in delivering projects on the ground
- Methods and tools that are in use.

The tools that enable real community empowerment (see diagram to the right) were the focus of my study.

I have conducted my study through 1-2-1 / small group meetings and site visits, as well as larger seminars and workshops, where I not only received information about local approaches but also gave presentations about community engagement policies and practice in the UK. These attracted a lot of interest and very lively discussions on the importance of community engagement and ways of improving the existing practice.

Overall I spoke directly (through meetings and seminars / workshops) to around 290 people during my Fellowship.

1.6 REPORT OVERVIEW

The following sections of this report provide a summary of my findings, together with a set of conclusions and recommendations aimed at all parties involved in planning and development (from public sector policy makers to developers and community groups themselves) in the UK. Further details of my trip and the people I met are provided in Appendix A.
There are substantial differences between the urban planning and development contexts in Cuba, Australia and New Zealand, that impact the approaches to community engagement. This section of the report outlines the different contexts and includes examples of best practice, methods and tools for community engagement observed in the three countries.

2.1 CONTEXT IN CUBA

The planning and development system in Cuba cannot be more different to the UK’s. All activities are currently undertaken by state owned / public sector organisations, based on a very centralised system. Five year urban plans are produced, but because of the extremely difficult economic situation that the country has been in since the early 1990s, little has been done in terms of implementation and development on the ground.

In the centralised and mono-party system of Cuba, there seems to be little in the way of true community engagement in urban planning and development – they are led by professionals and the central government apparatus.

The exception seem to be the regeneration projects led by the extremely effective and productive Office of the Historian of the City of Havana – a regeneration agency that has undertaken hundreds of projects in the oldest part of Havana since the early 1980s, following the area’s designation by UNESCO as a World Heritage Site. Led by the charismatic and influential Eusebio Leal, the Office has managed to raise initial grants from the government, and successfully transform into a self-funding agency, generating not only enough income to enable a rolling programme of regeneration projects, but a substantial profit based on tourism.

Over years, the Office has grown and now operates 16 hotels, a tour company, restaurants, museums, a radio station and more. Importantly, the Office reinvests half of its profits in new restoration projects and half in social programs, such as establishing health clinics, schools and senior living centres in the historic core of Havana, as well as carefully orchestrating the programme of re-housing families previously living in overcrowded accommodation and under substandard conditions. This has been done in careful consultation with local people and businesses, to make sure that the character and liveliness of the city is not lost. The consultations have often been led by Leal himself, who is widely considered by Habaneros as a local hero. However, this regeneration model exists only in Old Havana, and has not been replicated in other parts of the city or elsewhere in Cuba.

Over recent years Cuba has slowly been opening its borders and improving its international links, particularly with the US. The local property laws, which, since the revolution in 1959 forbid foreign investment, have been relaxed and it is expected that soon the country may become a major investment hub for property investors from the US and elsewhere, focusing on tourism. With the influx of investment, there is a great risk of the local character and richness being lost and local people being left out of the development plans.

It is in this context that the alternative masterplan for Havana, led by Prof Julio César Pérez has been developed, based on the ‘charrette’ model, as described later in this report.
2.2 CONTEXT IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

In many ways the planning and development contexts in Australia and New Zealand are similar to each other and to the UK’s context.

An even greater proportion of development than in the UK is delivered by the private sector and the planning system in both countries is largely market driven. It is based on land use allocation/zoning with a more pronounced division between planning and urban design/architecture, making the engagement of lay people, as in the UK, often difficult.

The negative tone of community engagement in the two countries is also a result of widespread NIMBYism, but, unlike in the UK, this is mainly related to the availability / lower price of land and the opposition to the attempts by local councils and state / national governments to introduce sustainable development policies and densify urban areas. The opposition is strong despite devastating and increasingly frequent episodes of extreme weather or issues such as rising traffic congestion.

Unlike the UK, there do not appear to be significant attempts to introduce statutory community rights in New Zealand and Australia. But, despite that, the rise of the internet and digital communication has, just like in the UK, resulted in greater community activism and, with it, growing engagement in development and planning.

In fact, the absence of statutory community rights in New Zealand and Australia seems to have resulted in innovative ways of engaging and in proliferation of hands-on, tactical / pop-up urbanism initiatives aimed at mobilising communities and instigating conversations about more comprehensive and longer term urban solutions, as described later in the report.

More structured community engagement is mostly facilitated by forward looking councils, such as Auckland and Christchurch in New Zealand, or Melbourne in Australia (see summary of Melbourne’s engagement approach to the right), and developers who have experienced fierce local opposition and had to start again or deal with highly sensitive environmental issues or issues affecting indigenous groups.

Most of that engagement takes place at very early, views & ideas gathering stages of planning policy or scheme development. A wide range of methods, many of which based on digital tools, are in use in both countries (see description later in this section).

However, what seems to be lacking is pro-active, direct engagement of communities in the actual design and policy formulation, never mind in their implementation. A relatively small group of practitioners, clients and community groups engage in collaborative design processes, but this is by no means a generally accepted approach.

City of Melbourne’s Community Engagement Framework

Source: City of Melbourne Community Engagement Team
The ‘World Café’ and ‘Share and Idea’ are just two of the many examples of large scale ideas gathering processes used in New Zealand and Australia. They provide useful engagement models applicable to projects with a very wide community / stakeholder base.

**WORLD CAFE**

A method for large scale public consultations and dialogue called the World Café was first trialled experimentally in mid 1990s in the US. The ‘café’ metaphor describes the informal seating at multiple small tables to encourage conversation. ‘The world’ symbolises how the format is scaled up to include large numbers of people at a time.

In the words of its founder Juanita Brown: ‘The World Café is a way of hosting conversations in groups from 12 to 1200 or larger and it evolves through several rounds in which you begin a conversation about a core question, talk about it for 20 minutes or half an hour, and then people will begin to rotate to new rounds taking the critical ideas from the first round into the next. Over several rounds of conversation core ideas get created, the patterns get noticed and innovative possibilities become available. It is a way that people can discover how to create not only their best ideas together through this network of conversations, but also how to build powerful relationships in order to bring those ideas into actions.’

This method is used in Australia by organisations such as New Democracy Foundation to conduct large scale conversations on ‘issues that matter’.

**Applicability / key learning points**

- Generation, sequential refinement and crystallisation of key issues and ideas within large groups of people.

**Links**

- [www.theworldcafe.com](http://www.theworldcafe.com)
- [www.youtube.com/watch?v=2MUHShsxJE4](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2MUHShsxJE4)

 SOURCE: WWW.THEWORLDCAFE.COM
2.3 FINDINGS – LARGE SCALE IDEAS GATHERING CONT

SHARE AN IDEA

On 22 February 2011 Christchurch, New Zealand was hit by a major earthquake – the third significant quake in six months. It caused 185 deaths and widespread and serious damage. The earthquake’s epicentre was only 10km from the city centre, meaning that 80% of its buildings were irrevocably damaged.

Under the earthquake recovery legislation, Christchurch City Council was given the responsibility for developing a recovery plan for the city centre and its immediate surroundings. The first draft of this Central City Plan was developed over the period of four months, during which Christchurch residents lived through five more significant earthquakes, more than 10,000 aftershocks, continuous stress and disruption.

The Share an Idea community engagement project was conceived as a way of giving Christchurch citizens an opportunity to say how they thought the city should be rebuilt, exchange views and ideas with each other and feed into the emerging Central City Plan.

During the six-week engagement campaign more than 160,000 households received flyers with information about Share an Idea. YouTube, local radio stations, television news items and newspaper articles were used to build awareness. Weekly e-newsletters were sent to 7,000 people.

The campaign was launched with a two day expo attended by more than 10,000 people. During the expo a range of methods and tools were used to encourage as many people as possible to participate, including:

- talks/presentations by international and local speakers
- a virtual tour of the city centre
- computer terminals and video booths for leaving ideas on the Share an Idea web site
- questionnaires
- children’s activity sheets
- a Lego area where children were encouraged to ‘rebuild’ the city centre.
- Facebook and Twitter pages
- Post-it notes and writing directly on an enormous ideas wall.

The expo was followed by more than 100 stakeholder meetings and ten public workshops.

Over 106,000 ideas emerged from the campaign, making it the biggest community engagement initiative ever seen in New Zealand. All of the gathered ideas were read, digitised and classified. Text searches, word trees or tag clouds were used to get an understanding of the key ideas, enabling the analysis of the results to be completed within two weeks.

The draft Central City Plan was then shaped by the tremendous response received as part of the Share an Idea process. The second part of the community engagement – the ‘Tell Us What You Think’ process - involved taking the draft Plan back to the community to find out whether it reflected their hopes and aspirations.
The draft Plan was made available on the internet, at libraries and other public facilities throughout the city. A summary document was delivered to every household in Christchurch, and more than 100 meetings were held with key stakeholders. The Council took the draft Plan on a road show visited by more than 6,000 people who came to see what had happened to their ideas.

Some tough discussions with those most affected by the proposals were expected, but of the 14,000 comments more than 75% were positive. The strongest reaction came from the business community, who feared that some of the proposed regulatory changes would discourage investment and were not financially viable. In revising the draft Plan based on this feedback, the council worked closely with the business sector to ensure that revisions addressed their main concerns.

Following the council hearings, at which 427 groups and individuals asked to be heard, the plan was adopted unanimously by councillors, and received a standing ovation. The revised Central City Plan was then submitted to the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery for approval in December 2011, ten months after the earthquake.

Four months later the Minister announced that he supported the draft Plan in principle, but subsequently used his sweeping powers to heavily revise the plan with a group of chosen experts, to make it ‘investment ready’. The outcome of this process was the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan (CCRP) that was passed into law without any public consultations.

Although the approach adopted by the Minister and the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) can to a degree be justified as an attempt to act quickly and ensure deliverability of proposals, many Christchurch citizens feel resentful of the fact that the enormous energy unleashed through the Share an Idea process resulted in a non-negotiable plan which, in their view, prioritises the values of investors rather than their own.

This is exacerbated by the fact that there is still little visible change on the ground and by a lack of clarity regarding the spheres of responsibility between the City Council and CERA. The ongoing tensions are illustrated by the Victoria Square project (see later in this section).

Applicability / key learning points

• The intensity of engagement, media exposure and variety of engagement techniques that contributed to the success of engagement at such a large scale
• Graphic design / visual identity and coherence
• Engagement in planning as a way of bringing people in distress together and focusing on a positive activity – the process as valuable as the product
• The importance of clear governance and implementation structure as a prerequisite for successful engagement.

Links

www.shareanidea.org.nz
www.facebook.com/shareanidea.org.nz/timeline
www.facebook.com/shareanidea.org.nz/timeline

‘AFTER MORE THAN 10,000 AFTERSHOCKS OVER A TWELVE MONTHS PERIOD, THE DRAFT CENTRAL CITY PLAN HAS PROVIDED THE COMMUNITY WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK FORWARD AND TO CREATE A SHARED NARRATIVE FOR A REBUILT CHRISTCHURCH. IT IS A KEY MILESTONE IN THE CITY’S RECOVERY.’

HUGH NICHOLSON AND FIONA WYKES, CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

SOURCE: WWW.DANWATSON.CO.NZ/SHARE-AN-IDEA
Outdoor events - picnics, BBQs, festivals - are a widely used method of engaging communities in Australia and New Zealand.

UR(BNE), BRISBANE

The UR(BNE) Collective is a non-for-profit organisation created by urban designers and community members passionate about Brisbane's public spaces. The name stands for 'U. R. Brisbane'. The group aims to create greater public involvement and understanding of how urban places are designed, building pride and interest in Brisbane's places and generally livening up the city. Since forming in 2012, UR(BNE) has run an annual community festival including music, live art, street picnics, fashion parades, urban design film screenings, bike rides, walking tours and photo hunts. Embracing the principles of ‘tactical urbanism’ and demonstrating ideas through urban interventions, the group seeks to change people’s perception of urban spaces from that of ‘an uninspiring, one-dimensional offer’, to ‘vibrant, activated destinations’. UR(BNE) believes that ‘the collaborative power of people creates innovative and engaged city stewards and affects lasting change in the urban fabric’.

Applicability / key learning points

- Public participation in temporary events and urban interventions creates engaged city stewards and affects lasting change.

Links

www.urbne.com

SOURCE: WWW.URBNE.COM/ALBERT-ST-PICNIC.HTML
Nearly four years after the devastating earthquake of 2011, the Christchurch Central Development Unit (CCDU) - part of Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) - publicised a plan for remodelling of Victoria Square, a much loved public space in the north western corner of the city centre, on the banks of river Avon. The proposal included fundamental remodelling of the square, including modification to its most historic elements and reducing the amount of green cover, despite the fact that there was no appetite evident in the Share an Idea public engagement process (see description earlier in this section) for modifying any of Christchurch’s existing public spaces. In fact the retention and further expansion of green spaces in the city centre was one of the key ideas that came out of the Share an Idea process.

With that in mind and the quoted cost of around $7 million, it was no surprise that the CCDU’s proposal met overwhelming rejection by the people of Christchurch, who saw little merit in spending a large amount of taxpayer money on an unnecessary project, while many of their fellow citizens remained without a home and many vital civic facilities were still to be rebuilt. The strength of public opposition took CCDU by surprise and led to scrapping of the redevelopment proposal and a decision to start from scratch by undertaking public consultation. As part of that process a mobile consultation unit was set up at the edge of the Square, including information panels outlining the wider City Centre proposals and providing opportunities to contribute views and ideas for the future of the Square via interactive digital stations and paper questionnaires. CCDU staff were on hand to assist with any questions.

The resulting draft remodelling proposal, based on the feedback gathered during the six week process, was based on retaining the Square as a tranquil contemplative and green area, preserving its historic features, while connecting with the proposed Avon River landscaped corridor.

**Applicability / key learning points**

- The need for consistency in community engagement and following through to implementation to avoid community resentment and backlash.

**Links**

- [www.facebook.com/Victoria-Square-No-Need-For-Change](http://www.facebook.com/Victoria-Square-No-Need-For-Change)
It is important that the engagement of different sections of the community is done in keeping with their cultural and social values and protocols.

**HUI / WĀNANGA**

The engagement of indigenous Maori people in planning and development in New Zealand is regulated through the Resource Management Act 1991 and subsequent legislation, especially the Environmental Protection Authority Act 2011. It is now widely recognised by national and local government that Maori have a special cultural and spiritual relationship with the environment and a role in helping to safeguard it on behalf of all New Zealanders so their engagement is required on (but not limited to) all major planning policies and on a number of specific projects. These include proposals that affect statutory areas identified in the Treaty of Waitangi settlement legislation, Maori cultural sites, coastal areas, lakes, rivers, streams or wetlands.

New Zealand’s Councils also recommend the involvement of Maori design professionals in design development from early stages. The use of the ‘hui’ or ‘wananga’ gatherings or forums, where issues are presented and discussed based on specific Maori social and cultural protocols, is recommended.

**Applicability / key learning points**
- The importance of designing engagement processes according to the social and cultural values and protocols of the different sections of the community – ‘speaking the language of the community’
- Engagement of different groups contributes to a better understanding of all aspects of place, its history and identity and to the creation of distinctive, culturally relevant designs.

**Links**
- [www.aucklanddesignmanual.co.nz/design-thinking/maori-design/te_aranga_principles](http://www.aucklanddesignmanual.co.nz/design-thinking/maori-design/te_aranga_principles)
- [www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/EN/ratesbuildingproperty/consents/resourceconsents/Pages/engagingwithhiwi.aspx#benefits](http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/EN/ratesbuildingproperty/consents/resourceconsents/Pages/engagingwithhiwi.aspx#benefits)
- [www.epa.govt.nz/te-hautu/info-applicants/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.epa.govt.nz/te-hautu/info-applicants/Pages/default.aspx)

**MAORI CORE VALUES**

**RANGATIRATANGA**: The right to exercise authority and self determination within ones own iwi / hapū realm

**KAITIAKITANGA**: managing and conserving the environment as part of a reciprocal relationship, based on the Māori world view that we as humans are part of the natural world

**MANA AKITANGA**: the ethic of holistic hospitality whereby mana whenua have inherited obligations to be the best hosts they can be

**WAIRUATANGA**: the immutable spiritual connection between people and their environments

**KOTA HITANGA**: unity, cohesion and collaboration

**WHANAUNGATANGA**: a relationship through shared experiences and working together which provides people with a sense of belonging

**MĀTAURANGA**: Māori / mana whenua knowledge and understanding
The City Road Master Plan aims to transform City Road West into a great central City Street.

1. Transform City Road West into a Great Central City Street

2. Can you tell us why?

3. When travelling along City Road my main mode of transport is typically:

4. Which of the following statements best describes your most common interaction with City Road?

5. Username

6. Email

7. Residential Postcode

8. Year of Birth
The rise of the internet and digital tools is revolutionising community engagement in urban planning and development, in particular the engagement of disinterested or fatigued communities and young people. A number of public and private sector organisations in Australia and New Zealand are at the forefront of this digital revolution.

ONLINE ENGAGEMENT TOOLS

A number of digital agencies in Australia and New Zealand have developed a wide range of online engagement tools, such as surveys, discussion forums, quick polls, guest books, mappers, Q&A and brainstorming tools. They are combined with reporting systems, which allow efficient analysis of responses and integration of consultation results into project planning and review.

Examples of such online engagement products include:
- EngagementHQ, a platform for online community engagement and Budget Allocator, a participatory budgeting solution by Bang the Table
- The online voting, feedback and ideas sharing app by Townhall App Pty
- Social Pinpoint interactive mapping tools for location based feedback and surveys
- CrowdSpot, a map based community engagement and data collection tool by Harvest Digital Planning
- Budget Simulator, Citizen Space and Dialogue online tools by Delib
- Basic, Easy Project and Premium digital tools packages by The Hive, for the creation of projects promotion and public participation web sites.

Applicability / key learning points
- Wide ranging and easy to use digital tools are particularly suitable for gathering local knowledge, views and ideas in early stages of projects, or gathering feedback on emerging design ideas and budgeting proposals
- Most of digital tools are transferable and adaptable for use in different contexts and countries.

Links
http://bangthetable.com
www.townhallsocial.com
www.socialpinpoint.com.au
www.crowdspot.com.au
www.delib.net
http://the-hive.com.au
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AUGMENTED REALITY

Augmented reality is a live view of a real-world environment whose elements are augmented (or supplemented) by computer-generated input such as sound, video, graphics or GPS data. In other words artificial information about the environment and its objects is overlaid on the real world. This is different to virtual reality, where the real world is replaced with a simulated one.

One of the most effective uses of augmented reality is in visualizing architectural/urban design projects. Computer-generated images of a structure can be superimposed into a real life local view of an area or site before that structure is constructed in that location. This can be done using mobile phones, tablets or computers.

According to engagement consultants Articulous, a handful of councils and developers in Australia are using special 2D postcards to consult with community on their proposals. Community members and stakeholders can hold one of these specially designed cards, and by using their mobile phone, tablet or computer, appear to be holding a 3D building or piece of infrastructure in their hand. They can build walls, look through windows and turn the building around to see it from all directions.

IMMERSIVE PANORAMAS

Immersive panoramas provide a 360 degree view of any physical or computer generated environment, including interiors and exteriors. Users simply hold their smart phone or tablet and look through a dedicated website to see an image. By moving their phone or device, they can move around a space, zoom in and through rooms, look up and down. It is similar to navigating with Google Maps street level view. According to Amanda Newbery of Articulous, immersive panoramas are ‘like being inside a scene and being able to control where you walk and what you look at’, which is very different to more widely used computer generated fly-throughs with a fixed path.

GAMING

Gaming is a way for people to interact with a proposed concept in a playful way. Specifically designed online games are now increasingly being used to engage communities creatively with regards to urban planning. An example is the Community PlanIt Gamification tool.

Applicability / key learning points

- The advances in digital simulation and 3D modelling make it easier to engage communities is assessing the impact of proposed developments and forming their opinion
- Digital simulation tools are particularly valuable tools for engaging disinterested and younger audiences or those who are finding it difficult to read 2D drawings / maps.

Links

https://communityplanit.org
www.linkedin.com/pulse/trends-community-engagement-max-hardy

‘IT’S HARD TO EDUCATE OR EXCITE PEOPLE WITH JUST WORDS. YOU NEED TO SHOW PEOPLE WHAT COULD BE A REALITY. YOU NEED A NEW WAY FOR COMMUNITIES TO “SEE, TOUCH AND FEEL” YOUR VISION OR PROJECT.’
For projects affecting all sections of the community, ‘random selection’ can be used to pick a sample of the population and obtain an approximation of attitudes amongst the whole community. This method is used to form ‘citizens’ juries’.

CITIZENS’ JURY

A citizens’ jury is convened to carefully consider evidence and various points of view about certain important issues of interest to the wider community. Citizens’ juries originated in the US and have been regularly used there and in a number of European countries, including the UK, for over two decades. They are increasingly being used by local authorities in Australia, to deliberate over important planning and public budgeting issues.

A citizens’ jury is formed by randomly selecting a group of typical citizens (usually 12-16) from a wider pool of volunteers, to be broadly representative of the wider population. The selection is based on a thorough analysis of the population profile in the relevant area and in relation to the specific issues under consideration. Over the course of up to four days they receive information, cross examine witnesses and discuss the matters fully. They are assisted by independent facilitators.

The jury’s conclusions are compiled in a report that is submitted to the commissioning body. The commissioning body is expected to publicise the jury’s findings and to follow its recommendations or explain why they chose not to. Having clear principles for the establishment and functioning of citizens’ juries is an important prerequisite for their effectiveness. The principles listed below have been developed by Australia’s leading citizens’ jury facilitators Prof Lyn Carson, Lucy Cole-Edelstein and Max Hardy.

Must do
- Participants must be randomly selected
- Facilitators must be involved in planning
- The process must be flexible
- The link with final decisions must be clear
- Information should be linked to the problem
- The jury must be owned by the jurors
- There must be clarity of purpose
- Attention should be given to skills development

Mustn’t do
- Clients must not control the process
- Jurors’ discomfort must not be ignored
- Jurors must not be taken for granted

Maybes
- The jury can be open to the public
- The client might be involved as a witness
- Adequate processing and deliberation time needs to be allocated so that jurors don’t feel pressured to prematurely arrive at a verdict
- The momentum builds if days are consecutive
- Information might be provided in advance
- It can be helpful to develop a values statement
- There could be shared facilitation
- A neutral witness can be used.

Applicability / key learning points
- Importance of ensuring representation from all sections of the community
- Citizens’ juries can be used to make decisions on planning issues, particularly where it is difficult to reach out to all sections of the community.

Links
- www.activedemocracy.net/articles.htm
- www.newdemocracy.com.au
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1. Engaged Community Leadership

2. Rapid Prototyping

3. Community Resource Commitment

4. Improved Physical Places

BENEFITS OF TACTICAL URBANISM
SOURCE: LUCINDA HARTLEY, CODESIGN STUDIO
The use of ‘tactical urbanism’ or ‘pop-ups’ is growing in Australia and New Zealand as a way of engaging communities and reinvigorating places, often while main projects are in development or funding is awaited.

‘PLACEMAKING’ DOWN UNDER

Pop-up urbanism (also referred to as tactical urbanism, guerrilla urbanism, city repair or DIY urbanism) is a movement which focusses on remodelling failing, abandoned or underused spaces to make them more attractive through temporary structures and installations. The tactical urbanism practitioners CoDesign Studio define it as ‘A city and/or citizen-led approach to neighbourhood building using short-term, low-cost and scaleable interventions, intended to catalyse long-term change.’ Changes to the physical structure of places introduced through tactical urbanism projects are usually combined with place activation – organising events, food festivals, concerts, film projections etc. to attract and engage a wide range of people and give them reasons to return. This combination is often referred to in Australia and New Zealand as ‘placemaking’.

An increasing number of private and public sector agencies and practitioners in Australia and New Zealand, such as CoDesign Studio, Village Well, Hello City, Perth’s Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority or Waterfront Auckland, use this approach to improve places and engage communities.

Applicability / key learning points

Tactical urbanism can be used to:
- innovate in the way we go about improving our public spaces using cheaper and smaller scale interventions
- keep places active while more permanent solutions are sought
- intervene quickly in distress situations
- overcome community’s aversion to change and make it easier to visualise what change may look like, by ‘trying it out’
- enable communities to play an active role in shaping their neighbourhoods through engaging in temporary experiments.

Links
- www.planningobserver.com/index.php/temporary-places-pop-up-urbanism
- www.codesignstudio.com.au
- www.villagewell.org
- www.hellocity.com.au
- www.mra.wa.gov.au
- www.placepartners.com.au
In Christchurch, New Zealand, many pop-up/temporary projects were developed following the devastating earthquake in 2011. In disaster situations, the temporary structures such as the city’s main retail centre built out of shipping containers, or the now-famous ‘cardboard cathedral’ are seen as a flexible, fast and low-cost solution to devastated urban environments, keeping the city ‘alive’ until a longer-term solution is found.

The not-for-profit, space finding organisation Gap Filler emerged in the city immediately after the earthquake. According to its co-founder and director, Coralie Winn, what began as a response to the destruction caused by the earthquakes ‘has grown into a city-making initiative with a longer term vision’. For Gap Filler, pop-up is not just a means of recovery but a ‘promising model of participatory organisation and democracy as the city moves forward’. As academic Simon Dickinson says, the earthquake opened up fissures in ‘the cultural and political conservatism of the city’, giving way to ideas which are ‘bigger than disaster recovery itself’.

Gap Filler see the small-scale and short-term projects as a great way to encourage experimentation and develop a different model of city building that can evolve and possibly feed into long-term plans. They started using the term “transitional” instead of “temporary” to describe their projects in an attempt to encapsulate the aspiration to influence what comes next.

Pop-ups are having a transformative impact on how Christchurch and many other cities across the world are imagined and developed. Such projects play an important role not just in providing missing facilities, invigorating abandoned or underused spaces, but also in mobilising communities and engaging them most directly in changing the places they live in and often providing crucial opportunities for community-led businesses and start-ups.

On the other hand the proliferation of temporary projects and pop-ups raises concerns over our increasing reliance on temporary, cheap solutions, potentially diverting everyone’s focus from finding more permanent solutions.

**Applicability / key learning points**
- The temporal and spatial flexibility of pop-ups creates cities of participation, sharing and resourcefulness
- Mobilising communities through hands-on projects can open the way to the development of longer term solutions.

**Links**
- [www.gapfiller.org.nz](http://www.gapfiller.org.nz)
- [www.restart.org.nz](http://www.restart.org.nz)

‘WE CREATE A PROJECT – AN ARTWORK, A PUBLIC SPACE, AN AMENITY – AND PLACE IT IN THE PUBLIC REALM AS A TRANSIENT, SMALL-SCALE, LOW-COST AND LOW-RISK EXPERIMENT. MORE CONSULTATION, SO TO SPEAK, COMES FROM MONITORING HOW THE PUBLIC USES, EMBRACES, IGNORES OR REJECTS THE PROJECT. WE HAVE TO WATCH, LISTEN AND REFLECT, THEN ADAPT IT (OR REMOVE IT) IN RESPONSE TO IMPLICIT OR EXPLICIT FEEDBACK.’

RYAN RYNOLDS, CO-FOUNDER OF GAP FILLER
AUCKLAND WATERFRONT

Regeneration of Auckland’s Waterfront has been a key project run by Auckland City Council’s arms length regeneration agency. Through a series of development projects, including a mix of offices, retail and leisure uses, and public realm improvements, the agency has managed to transform what was once an industrial heartlands of the city into one of its most vibrant and growing neighbourhoods, visited by locals and external visitors.

From the outset the Auckland Waterfront team included urban design and public space specialists, as well as a placemaking (place activation) manager, who developed and delivered in stages a number of pop-up community facilities, playgrounds and public space schemes. The success and popularity of these projects has taken everyone by surprise, so much so that what was originally conceived as temporary, is now adopted as a permanent solution for some of the spaces (for example the children’s playground on the waterfront), prompting the agency to change its plans. Importantly, lessons learned through meanwhile / temporary use projects are now being applied elsewhere on the site.

Applicability / key learning points
• The construction of temporary installations and community facilities and organisation of events in public spaces is an excellent way of engaging communities in large regeneration projects.

Links
www.waterfrontauckland.co.nz/waterfront-auckland/home

EXAMPLES OF THE TEMPORARY USE PROJECTS BY WATERFRONT AUCKLAND, INCLUDING THE CONTAINER LIBRARY (ABOVE TOP) AND CHILDREN’S PLAYGROUND (ABOVE BOTTOM AND RIGHT)
An emerging approach to developing design solutions and directly engaging communities in the process, is based on testing ideas on the ground, prior to developing a final design or spending a lot of money on implementation.

WAITEMATA PLAZA, AUCKLAND

We wouldn’t buy a car without a test drive, but expensive urban changes or developments are often funded without one. In the words of Melbourne’s CoDesign Studio, design by trial is ‘a fast and low-cost way of taking your project for a test drive while building local support’.

This approach was used to develop proposals for the transformation of Waitemata Plaza in Auckland’s Waterfront regeneration area. A number of design options were tested over the course of a summer, to soften the existing hard landscaped and exposed public space. These included:

- an urban beach installation (with moveable loungers and umbrellas)
- an artificial turf area (with an ice cream pod, café tables and chairs)
- shade tree planters and timber decks made from cargo palettes.

The trials provided some basic amenity that attracted public to come to or through the space and linger. The moving of the furniture allowed the Waterfront Auckland team to engage with users and gather valuable feedback. While some of the local residents had concerns over the quality of the installations and the low cost approach, it still allowed them to see the potential for a new soft, green space that people will use and respect.

Importantly, the Waterfront Auckland team monitored the site trials using time-lapse video, website and social media responses and Waterfront communications surveys. The feedback from the site trials informed a new plan for the plaza as a green space with a very strong public art focus and a timber deck adjacent to the water for summer activation uses. The new plan was heavily supported by resident and stakeholder groups.

Applicability / key learning points

- An effective way to test design proposals in a cheap way and engage communities / end users in the process.

Links

www.waterfrontauckland.co.nz/waterfront-auckland/what-s-next/current-projects/waitemata-plaza/?redirect=1
www.waterfrontauckland.co.nz/waterfront-auckland/blog/august-2014/urban-design-fast-cheap-and-easy
This is an idea of how to engage the stakeholders with the constraints and realities in a hands-on way.

Morning: Analysis of constraints.

Arvo: Vision + CityShape Marquette at tables in groups of 3 councillors.

Scribe: Also recording comments and ideas.

Building massings.

Building block 250,000 sq ft.

Library + gallery + public, bids, community.

Residential.

Rise in storey:

4:0 12:16 20.

SOURCE: PETER EDWARDS, ARCHIPELAGO
2.11 FINDINGS – PHYSICAL MODELS AND SCENARIO GAMES

Using physical models for exploring urban development options is a good, hands-on method of engaging communities and producing viable schemes.

‘CITY SHAPE MAQUETTE’

Masterplanning urban areas is a process of addressing physical, social and economic constraints while achieving the desired development output and impact. Community engagement often fails when constraints, particularly financial viability requirements, are not understood and addressed in the design process.

An example of how this problem can be avoided and community engagement in the design process made more meaningful and effective by using physical models or maquettes is the Maroochydore centre masterplanning process facilitated in 2012 by Archipelago. After a series of presentations and a debate on site constraints, city councillors, residents and the technical team worked in small groups to produce different masterplan options. Each group was given the same modelling set, representing the amount and mix of development, open space, water, etc, that would ensure scheme viability. Resulting options were then presented and discussed in plenary, and a preferred scheme drawn up by the design team.

Applicability / key learning points
• By using physical models or maquettes in the design process, lay people can be engaged in a creative capacity while ensuring viability of the resulting proposal.

Links

- 150 00 sqm of commercial GFA used
- 65 000 sqm of retail GFA used
- 2000 residential units used
- 3.2ha SCECCEC site
- 1:1000 scale model of the site
- An opportunity to explore different city shape themes, ideas and opportunities
- A ‘hands on’ approach to land use planning, built form and place making approaches for the future town centre
- An appreciation for the complexity and multiple approaches to urban design and city planning
- The ability to ‘mix use’ and building heights vertically and across the site
- An opportunity to include ‘special uses’ and place making elements into the plan
- The ability to incorporate streetscape design and traffic considerations
- Allowed opportunities to re distribute and reshape open space and water throughout the site

SOURCE: PETER EDWARDS, ARCHIPELAGO
‘SCENARIO GAME’ BY RPS

Similar to Archipelago’s city shape maquette, the RPS Planning and Development team based in Perth uses their scenario game to engage all stakeholders in urban design & landscape architecture projects.

The process starts by gathering all background information including surveys, analysis of briefs, site, key players etc, combined with a series of ‘inventory interviews’ with key stakeholders to gather views, background information and establish relationships. This is followed by identifying ‘core dilemmas’ – key issues that need to be addressed and resolved by design. These key issues inform the design of the process during which the scenario game is used in interactive sessions to develop design options by groups of stakeholders.

Every scenario game is unique to its project and built around specific core dilemmas identified in the preparatory stage of the project. The game is ‘played’ by groups consisting usually of a mix of community members, local authority officers, politicians, developers etc. Groups present their designs to each other and discuss commonalities and differences. The results of the game are analysed and together with the key points raised in the concluding discussion form the basis for the final, amalgamated option. This amalgamated option is presented back and discussed with stakeholders in a final, follow up session.

Links
www.rpsgroup.com.au

‘TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY CONSULTATION IS MOSTLY JUST INFORMING THE PUBLIC OF THE DESIGNS THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN MADE. THIS IS OFTEN FRUSTRATING, BOTH FOR THE COMMUNITY AND FOR THE DESIGNERS. THE DECISIONS MADE IN THE DESIGN, ABOUT PROGRAM, LAYOUT, ATMOSPHERE, MIGHT WELL HAVE BEEN THE SAME DECISIONS THE COMMUNITY WOULD HAVE MADE. BUT THE COMMUNITY WAS NOT INCLUDED AND THEREFORE ARE SCEPTICAL. PRESENTING THE DESIGN RAPIDLY RESULTS IN DEFENDING THESE DECISIONS, WHEN ACTUALLY THEY SHOULD HAVE BEEN MADE WITH THE COMMUNITY ALL ALONG. REAL ENGAGEMENT IN THE PLANNING PROCESS MEANS NOT JUST CONSULTATION, BUT INTERACTION. IT IS NOT ONLY ABOUT THE COMMUNITY, BUT INCLUDES EVERYBODY IN THE PLANNING PROCESS. NOT HALFWAY OR AT THE END, BUT AT THE VERY BEGINNING.’

THREE BASIC INGREDIENTS OF A SCENARIO GAME
SOURCE: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT, A DIFFERENT APPROACH, BY RPS (TOP AND BOTTOM)
ENQUIRY BY DESIGN

The Enquiry by Design (EbD) is a planning and design process that brings together key stakeholders to collaborate on a vision for a new or regenerated existing building, space or place. During an EbD process a complex range of project issues and impacts are addressed in parallel, with as many of them as possible tested by being drawn. The issues addressed include environmental, economic and social matters, ranging in scale from a building to the region.

The process is generally conducted at or near the project site and in collaboration with key stakeholders, including principally local residents and businesses, in order to learn from the site and stakeholders, as well as to determine with them the real place-specific choices available.

EbDs usually last four - six very intense days. One of the main reasons for their short duration is to minimise project costs for the multi-disciplinary team required to solve a complex and controversial urban problem. As an alternative to the conventional project management approach of procuring a number of consultants separately, which can amount to large costs over time, a charrette or EbD fuses all the necessary consultants into one team and one process.

Instead of the conventional approach of sequentially reacting to issues or stakeholders, EbD simultaneously responds to all by means of place-specific design.

The short duration and intensity of EbD induce highly creative, cost-effective, holistic and practical outcomes, usually enjoying wide support from participating stakeholders and statutory bodies.

EbDs generally commence with a site visit and a project briefing which considers the challenges and opportunities, as well as the objectives of the exercise in the context of physical, social and economic constraints. This is followed by several rounds of design sessions, working in smaller groups, and plenary feedback sessions, during which a range of options are developed, discussed and through the process of collective discussion and joint decision making a preferred option amalgamated. EbD processes conclude with a presentation of the outcomes of the exercise.

They require rigorous preparation beforehand by the technical / design team and their clients (usually involving preparation of a comprehensive briefing pack), and end by the production of an outcomes report.
The EbD design team includes a range of professionals, to allow investigation of all issues relevant for the project – usually architects, urban designers, planners, transport & movement, planners and landscape architects, property / development economics specialist, conservation, or housing consultants etc. These are often supplemented by technical experts and policy advisors from local, state or national government, particularly for public sector led projects and in recognition of their pivotal statutory and implementation role.

The design team generally does not commence this process with a design already in mind. While extensive preparation of existing conditions information is necessary beforehand, all designing usually takes place collaboratively with the participating stakeholders, as they almost always inform the outcome in ways that could not otherwise be anticipated.

Some EbDs allow for an interim period of a few weeks midway through a two-stage process, during which decision-makers and stakeholders can reflect on what they have learned, outstanding questions can be researched, and designs can ‘gestate’ prior to finalising project proposals.

The EbD method has consistently enabled stakeholders with sometimes poorly informed or conflicting points of view at the outset to gain wider perspectives, and to become better informed about specific physical constraints and solutions. It frequently enables political ‘log jams’ to be broken and a shared vision to be developed, leading to statutory approval and implementation.
**RANGE OF EbD PROCESSES**

The EbD methodology was introduced to Australia and New Zealand by Wendy Morris and Chip Kaufman of ESD. Together with a number of fellow urbanists, they use a range of EbD processes, which all share the same characteristic of being highly collaborative and design-based, but are different in their purposes, duration, degrees of stakeholder involvement and costs.

The ‘charrette’ is the most publicly accessible and intensive of EbD processes, usually lasting five or more days and being open to the public during key meetings and design sessions. Charrettes are normally used for complex and/or controversial projects. They require rigorous preparation, involve an expert and multidisciplinary charrette team, and deliver a comprehensive set of design outcomes at all relevant scales, along with development controls, generated through intensive stakeholder interaction.

‘Design workshops’ range from one day educational exercises, to ‘in-house’ design initiatives lasting several days, to week long and much more rigorous multi-stakeholder design exercises for extremely complex urban projects. Design workshop formats involve invited stakeholders, who work with the workshop facilitators in mixed professional teams of six to eight people to produce site-specific design proposals.

The key difference between a design workshop and a charrette is that the design workshop usually engages invited stakeholders only, whereas the charrette is wide open to the public during key meetings. Another difference is that design workshops actively engage selected stakeholders in collaborative design sessions, while the large number of participants in a charrette usually limits their collaboration to design reviews and ‘open studio sessions’.

EbDs are often supplemented by:

- **‘Training sessions’** aimed at improving the understanding and practical skills of participating stakeholders, and involving lectures, place-specific analyses and discussions on urban design principles, built examples and statutory mechanisms; sometimes also including a non-binding EbD exercise.
- **‘Scoping workshops’** are used to commence and clarify complex urban projects, with background information scattered and contradictory, and when the best way forward is not well understood or agreed on. In order to address this, scoping workshops convene relevant stakeholders, regulators, leaders and project designers for one to three days, during which participants jointly review available project information, identify and agree on key place-specific challenges and opportunities, identify information gaps and how best to fill them, and agree on an optimal project methodology.

The ‘EbD lite’ and hybrid models

A number of further iterations of the EbD model are in use by practitioners in Australia and New Zealand. The financial crisis and in particular the dwindling public sector budgets have resulted in some using a shorter version of the charrette model, often relying on a very small but highly experienced and versatile design team, supplemented by local authority technical experts. In some cases the design workshop model is combined with elements of the charrette, to allow direct involvement of as many people as manageable in the design process.

Some practitioners consider the involvement of local politicians mandatory, as well as including a time gap between the end of the collaborative design process and the final public presentation of its results, to allow sufficient time for proposals to ‘sink in’, be consulted on with statutory consultees and for more technical details to be verified.

Whatever the specific model though, it is clear that EbDs are highly effective in capturing the imagination and enthusiasm of local people and making them feel a part of the process of urban change. This requires expert facilitation and a design team that is not precious about their own design ideas and are prepared to listen, challenge and help translate the ideas coming from the community into design proposals.

**Applicability / key learning points**

- Participation in a collaborative design workshop an invaluable way of engaging and empowering communities.

**Links**

- [www.ecologicallysustainedesign.com](http://www.ecologicallysustainedesign.com)
- [www.urbanismplus.com](http://www.urbanismplus.com)
- [http://designurban.com/team.html](http://designurban.com/team.html)
- [www.urbanismplus.com](http://www.urbanismplus.com)
- [http://designurban.com/team.html](http://designurban.com/team.html)
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE 'FÁBRICA DE OMNIBUS' SITE ON CALLE LÍNEA WERE PRODUCED BY ONE OF THE TEAMS AT THE INTERNATIONAL HAVANA CHARRETTE 2014
THE HAVANA CHARRETTE 2014

The Seventh Havana Urban Design Charrette took place in March 2014. It was organised by the Cuban and Norwegian Chapters of the International Network for Traditional Building and Urbanism (INTBAU). Architects, urbanists and developers from Italy, Norway, the United Kingdom, Mexico and the United States worked alongside a number of Cuban practitioners and students to develop urban strategies and proposals for the El Vedado neighbourhood of Havana. The event was organised and led by Prof Julio César Pérez Hernández, a prominent Cuban architect and urbanist.

The charrette was structured over five days, starting with a day long walking tour of El Vedado led by Prof Pérez, who followed with a presentation providing background information and setting the context for the charrette. A number of other charrette participants gave presentations, including a representative of the Office of the City Historian and myself talking about heritage regeneration and international best practice in strategic urban planning. Participants were then divided into four teams to commence design work, with one group considering strategic urban design issues related to El Vedado as a whole, and others developing proposals for specific key sub-areas. Design work took place over three days, with a feedback session half way, and finished with a final presentation of the results on the fifth day of the charrette.

The charrette was loosely structured, and many participants felt that the level of background information provided at the start was insufficient. This was to a degree compensated for by the walking tour and the presence of Cuban practitioners who provided local knowledge. The charrette did not include public presentations so it could be said that, using the classification presented on previous pages, it should be branded as a design workshop rather than a charrette. In fact, given that the whole event was conducted outside the official urban planning arena and with little visible support by the city or national decision makers, the event felt more like an opportunity for the international colleagues to work together and to boost the confidence of some of the less experienced Cuban participants.

At the same time the charrette undoubtedly provided additional material for the emerging alternative Havana masterplan assembled by Prof Perez. With the ongoing changes to the investment and development context in Cuba, the masterplan may at some point become a useful framework for developments on the ground.

Applicability / key learning points

• The importance of site tours and thorough briefing at the start of participatory design processes
• The importance of involving decision makers to make the complex design processes purposeful
• Using non-biding, participatory design processes as training for professionals and students.

Links

www.intbau.org

THE WALKING TOUR OF EL VEDADO (TOP); HAVANA CHARRETTE 2014 UNDERWAY (MIDDLE); ONE OF THE RESULTING PROPOSALS (BOTTOM); SOURCE: JOHN H. PILLING
Community-led developments are the ultimate way of engaging and empowering communities, with not-for-profit, community-based organisations acting as clients, from project initiation to delivery, often operating sites post-completion.

ABBOTSFORD CONVENT, MELBOURNE

Abbotsford Convent is a major community hub owned and operated by a not-for-profit organisation The Abbotsford Convent Foundation (ACF). It includes 11 historic buildings, extensive gardens and a car park. With a focus on creativity, culture and learning the Convent is home to over 100 artist studios and offices for small businesses, a radio station, four eateries, an open air cinema, food and craft markets, two galleries and multiple event spaces and workshops.

The original Convent was established in 1850 as a centre for women in need and quickly grew to become the largest charitable institution in the southern hemisphere. From 1975 to 1997 the site was in use as an educational campus. After the University departed in 1997, a property developer won the tender to purchase the land based on a proposal to demolish many of the historic buildings, and develop 289 apartments. This proposal was met with a strong opposition from local residents, who formed the Abbotsford Convent Coalition and started a seven year long campaign for the retention of the Convent’s historic fabric and its transformation into an arts, educational, cultural and tourist hub for the community. In 2004, the Coalition finally won the fight to save the Convent. The State Government of Victoria and the City of Yarra gifted the site to the public; together with $5 million to commence the complex restoration works. At this point ACF was set up as the custodian of the site on behalf of the people.

Thanks to the initial public sector grant and contributions from the general public, local residents and the philanthropic community, 60% of the buildings have been restored and now accommodate hundreds of tenants and attract close to a million visitors per year, making it one of Australia’s most popular cultural hubs. ACF aims to raise funds to continue restoration works and nurture the creativity cluster and cultural platform that exist on site.

Applicability / key learning points
- The strength of community feeling can overcome most entrenched development proposals
- The need for the community organisation to evolve as the project evolves (from campaigning to project managing and operating organisation).

Links
http://abbotsfordconvent.com.au
The residents of Bright Street in Auckland’s Eden Terrace area started working together in 2014 by converting a piece of leftover space at the southern entrance to their street into a small community garden. The success of this project inspired them to start conversations about painting a mural on the large retaining wall opposite the garden and improving the safety and appearance of the pedestrian tunnel that leads to the other side of Dominion Rd – one of major north-south routes in Auckland. The desire to create a more attractive entrance to their neighbourhood was combined with concerns about safety in the tunnel which is regularly used by school kids and many locals heading for the train station and other important community facilities on the other side of the highway. The initial conversations gathered momentum through a design competition run on Facebook. This subsequently kick started an upgrade for the piece of land above the wall too.

To fund the actual painting, Bright Street residents printed and sold tea towels and pillowcases. Local businesses, the Albert-Eden Local Board and Auckland Council provided funds, goods and publicity. Wall owners, Auckland Transport, gave permission. Local people voted for the colour scheme from samples painted on the wall.

The community is enthused by what has been achieved so far and will no doubt continue to work together to further improve the appearance of the pedestrian tunnel. Conversations with locals reveal that these relatively modest improvements have already had a profound impact on their sense of wellbeing and pride in their neighbourhood, and have certainly contributed to a greater community cohesion.

**Applicability / key learning points**

- Community-led projects boost people’s pride in their place and community cohesion.

**Links**

- [www.facebook.com/The-Wall-on-the-Bright-side-212064165604743/timeline](http://www.facebook.com/The-Wall-on-the-Bright-side-212064165604743/timeline)

**IT MAY BE ABOUT A SPECIFIC ISSUE TO START WITH, BUT COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IS ULTIMATELY ABOUT BETTER PLACES, MORE COHESIVE COMMUNITIES AND HAPPIER PEOPLE.**
Harbour Co-op Organic Foods

This shop is owned by 191 members and counting...
The comprehensive overview of community engagement challenges and practices gained through my Churchill Fellowship provided a basis for the recommendations listed below; they are aimed at all those involved in initiating, facilitating and taking part in community engagement processes.

3.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

Go to people where they are and engage them in the way that best suits them; use existing networks and structures to reach out
Engage with each group in the way that is appropriate to their customs and ways of communicating, on their own terms; organise engagement events at or close to the development site under consideration (see the Hui/Wananga workshops example on page 18 and mobile engagement units on page 17).

Make sure to engage representatives of all sections of community, supporters and objectors
Engage people of different gender, age, income level, employment and home ownership status etc, businesses, local government officers and politicians, not just the ‘usual suspects’, (see the random sampling / citizen jury example on page 22, description of EbD on pages 32-34 and Kobus Mentz’s recommendations on page 44).

For community-run processes and projects, make sure there is a robust governance structure in place and a mix of skills in line with project objectives and progress status
Clarify roles and responsibilities, with a proper structure of sub-groups / committees, a constitution and remit; carry out regular skills audits to make sure that the mix of skills is adequate for the tasks ahead (see the Abbotsford Convent example on page 38).

Don’t engage unless committed to following through; focus on delivery from the start
The biggest threat to effective community engagement is the lack of commitment to continuing engagement through the various project phases or to following through to implementation the ideas that emerged through the engagement process (see the Share an Idea example on pages 13-14 and Victoria Square on page 17).
Projects take time, think up ways of engaging people and maintaining the momentum in the interim.

Tactical urbanism / pop-ups / meanwhile uses are a good way of addressing urgent urban problems and engaging people through ‘doing’ and testing design ideas on the ground (see pages 24-27).

Engage people in at least three different ways

Online – ‘have your say’ platforms, social media, online mappers and surveys, mobile apps (see examples on pages 20-21)

Paper - paper surveys, ideas cards, photo competition (see the Share and Idea example on pages 13-14)

Face to face - EbD, World Café, picnics, walkabouts (see the examples on pages 12, 16, 32-34)

By doing - tactical urbanism / pop-ups, design by trial (see pages 24-27).

Build people’s capacity first and set the parameters for discussion, to ensure meaningful engagement, balanced solutions and to manage expectations.

The key issues that should be covered include (but are not limited to):

- The importance of the physical environment, the impact it has on people’s quality of life
- Principles of successful places / good urbanism
- Various constraints related to the site in question - what is possible technically, in policy terms, viability etc.
- Understanding trade-offs
- The role of community vs other stakeholders
- The different mechanisms for achieving community objectives
- The need for flexibility
- The importance of addressing difficult issues head on and having an open and transparent process from the start
- The engagement / design process itself including timescales.

Also always provide background information in advance and a summary during the engagement event; and talk everyone through the rules of engagement at the start. (see the examples on pages 29-30 and EbD section on pages 32-34).

Use engagement tools that enable generation of viable design solutions and informed options appraisal.

Laypeople often find it difficult to relate to 2D maps and drawings, or viability issues. Using 3D models and games is a good way of overcoming this problem (see the examples on pages 29-30).

Make it fun

Community engagement should be enjoyable for all parties involved - use outdoor events, festivals, community picnics / BBQs etc. to engage people in more serious debates on the built environment issues (see the example on page 16).
TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The brief
Ivory tower design team
No recognition of the design decisions
Angry people and possible lawsuits

OUR WAY: INTERACTIVE PLANNING & DESIGN

The brief
Scenario game with multiple groups
Results are base for design
Recognition, it's their plan

SOURCE: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT, A DIFFERENT APPROACH, BY RPS
Face to face engagement in developing design proposals is invaluable
Structured, multi-day collaborative design/planning workshops are an excellent way of developing design solutions with a full community involvement. The advantages of this method are:

- Everyone has a say
- Technical issues are addressed across disciplines and in parallel with the community’s concerns and ideas
- Bringing the community together with a technical team, local government officers and politicians helps build their confidence and decision making skills
- Workshops facilitate consensus building, as all participate in the same process
- People see the results instantly; this in turn generates buy-in
- It is an efficient way of doing things - shortens the timeframe
- Giving people a tight deadline boosts their creativity and turns negative, reactive commentators into positive, pro-active solution seekers.

The various versions of the EbD / collaborative design workshops reflect these values (see pages 32-34).

Independent facilitation and adequate technical support/expertise are necessary to make engagement processes meaningful and effective
Keep everyone involved; heard, all on track and focused on key issues; make sure the technical team works closely with the community and all stakeholders throughout the process (see the EbD section on pages 32-34).

Don’t forget – community engagement may be about a specific issue to start with, but it is ultimately about stronger communities and happier people
Community engagement always starts with a specific issue or problem to resolve; keep in mind that it is ultimately about so much more than addressing that specific issue and that the benefits of successful engagement can be far reaching (see the Kowhai Butterflies Mural example on page 39).
3.2 CONCLUSIONS

‘Proper’ community engagement in urban design and planning benefits all – communities get what they want, they gain the sense of ownership over the resulting proposals and are more inclined to engage in their implementation; developers / scheme promoters and local authorities get a solution that is acceptable to local people, and often in a shorter timescale than they would be able to achieve through ‘traditional’ consultation.

Ensuring that the process is positive and constructive requires adequate technical and facilitation support, and capacity building. The role of (central and local) government in providing this support as an independent facilitator and funder is invaluable and necessary.

In general terms a greater emphasis on design / development quality in planning policy and development management, rather than further deregulation (of the kind currently underway in England) would address key concerns of the communities that reject change or development (NIMBYs); it would stimulate more positive engagement of local people and could speed up many planning applications.

Although there are increasingly sophisticated online engagement tools, nothing can replace face to face communication and joint decision making through structured, collaborative design processes, where concerns and ideas are shared, awareness of wider agendas and a consensus over preferred solutions instantly developed, enabling local people to have a greater understanding and sense of ownership of the resulting policies and proposals. Even though there are a number of practitioners and clients that carry out most of their design and planning work through collaborative workshops, such as Enquiry by Design, we have a long way to go towards encouraging truly collaborative design / planning practices in the UK.

Positive movements on this front have recently been achieved through the Collaborative Planning campaign by Civic Voice and the Direct Planning (Pilot) Bill currently going through the House of Lords. They add a new dimension to the community rights introduced in England through the Localism Act (2011) and should be further supported by government and enshrined in policies, funding and procurement regimes.

Finally, the built environment and the UK citizens would benefit greatly from a better integration of planning and other built environment disciplines through the education system, professional institutes, legislation and practice.

More emphasis should be placed on a holistic approach to shaping of places, as dynamic, inter-disciplinary endeavour, that links aspirations, high level strategies with the reality of development on the ground. It is only then that more citizens will begin to engage in planning in a meaningful and constructive way.

SOURCE: KOBUS MENTZ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>03-07 March 2014</td>
<td>Havana</td>
<td>A five day tour of architectural sites in Havana led by Prof Julio Cesar Perez and Audun Engh</td>
<td>Inbau Cuba</td>
<td>Professor Julio Cesar Perez</td>
<td>Chair / Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inbau Scandinavia</td>
<td>Audun Engh</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09-14 March 2014</td>
<td>Havana</td>
<td>Havana Charrette - a five day design workshop led by Prof Julio Cesar Perez (participated in design work as a group leader)</td>
<td>Around 10 participants</td>
<td>Around 25 participants, including architects, urbanists, developers and students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>16 March 2015</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Meeting 1</td>
<td>Waterfront Auckland</td>
<td>Ralph Webster</td>
<td>Senior Design Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waterfront Auckland</td>
<td>Ashleigh Vivier</td>
<td>Planning and Consent Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waterfront Auckland</td>
<td>Alan Gray</td>
<td>Senior Urban Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frith Walker</td>
<td>Place Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jessica Curnow</td>
<td>Senior Marketing and Communications Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 March 2015</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Meeting 2</td>
<td>Waterfront Auckland</td>
<td>Daniel Khong</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Ludo Campbell-Reid,</td>
<td>Design Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Hayley Fitchett</td>
<td>Manager, Region Wide Design Policy, Auckland Design Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Karen Godomski</td>
<td>Senior Local Board Advisor for Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Helen Dodd</td>
<td>Advisor, Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Rex Hewitt</td>
<td>Relationship Manager - Local Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 March 2015</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Meeting 7</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Yvonne Weeber</td>
<td>Principal Urban Design, Region Wide Urban Design Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Gerald Blunt</td>
<td>Urban Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>John Duguid</td>
<td>Manager, Central Area Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Joao Machado</td>
<td>Team Leader Area Planning, Central / Islands Planning Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catalyse</td>
<td>Denise Bijoux</td>
<td>Network Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A Fellowship Schedule and Contacts Cont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 March 2015</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Meeting 10</td>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>Carolyn Ingels</td>
<td>Unit Manager, Urban Design &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 11</td>
<td>The Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy</td>
<td>Keith Tallentire</td>
<td>Implementation Manager, UDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 12</td>
<td>Project Lyttelton</td>
<td>Wendy Everingham</td>
<td>Chair, Lyttelton Information Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 March 2015</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Meeting 13</td>
<td>CERA</td>
<td>Lizzy Pearson</td>
<td>Planning Manager - Christchurch Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 14</td>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>Nicola Rykers</td>
<td>Director of Urban Design, Christchurch Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>Hugh Nicholson</td>
<td>Principal Urban Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>Miranda Charles</td>
<td>Policy Planner, Suburban Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>Katie Smith</td>
<td>Policy Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 March 2015</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Meeting 15</td>
<td>City of Melbourne</td>
<td>Leanne Hodyl</td>
<td>Coordinator - City Plans and Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 March 2015</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Seminar 1</td>
<td>CoDesign Studio</td>
<td>Lucinda Hartley</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A day long event organised by Municipal Association of Victoria, led by CoDesign Studio (attended as observer)</td>
<td>CoDesign Studio</td>
<td>Jessica Christiansen-Franks</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Better Block</td>
<td>Jason Roberts</td>
<td>Founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Around 25 participants, mainly local authority officers and placemaking professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(including presentation by me)</td>
<td>OVGA</td>
<td>Emma Appleton</td>
<td>Director, Victorian Design Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cara Wiseman</td>
<td>Adviser, Victorian Design Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Alves</td>
<td>Senior Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Islip</td>
<td>Principal Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sophie Patitsas</td>
<td>Principal Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>26 March 2015</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Meeting 17</td>
<td>Ecologically Sustainable Design Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Wendy Morris</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 18</td>
<td>Ecologically Sustainable Design Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Chip Kaufman</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(including a site tour)</td>
<td>The Abbotsford Convent Foundation (ACF)</td>
<td>Maggie Maguire</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 19</td>
<td>Village Well</td>
<td>Gilbert RocheCouste</td>
<td>Founder and Managing Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 March 2015</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Meeting 20</td>
<td>Hello City</td>
<td>Sunny Haynes</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 21</td>
<td>Max Hardy Consulting</td>
<td>Max Hardy</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 22</td>
<td>Design Urban</td>
<td>Steve Thorne</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 23</td>
<td>City of Melbourne</td>
<td>Andrea Kleist</td>
<td>Coordinator, Urban Design and Docklands Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Melbourne</td>
<td>Desley Renton</td>
<td>Program Manager, Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 March 2015</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Meeting 24</td>
<td>Capire</td>
<td>Chris Robinson</td>
<td>Chair, Co-Founder and Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar 2</td>
<td>PIA NSW</td>
<td>Maurene Horder</td>
<td>Executive Officer NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An evening event organised by PIA NSW (attended as the only presenter)</td>
<td>DFP (don fox planning pty ltd)</td>
<td>Ellen Robertshaw</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Technology, Sydney</td>
<td>Gabriela Quintana Vigiola</td>
<td>Lecturer in Urban Planning, School of Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Mark Wisely</td>
<td>Community Relations Consultant, Infrastructure &amp; Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hill PDA</td>
<td>Sarah Hill</td>
<td>Director and Principal Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01 April 2015</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Meeting 25</td>
<td>Place Partners</td>
<td>Kylie Legge</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 26</td>
<td>University of Sydney Business School; newDemocracy Foundation</td>
<td>Prof. Lyn Carson</td>
<td>Professor, Business Programs Unit; Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Government NSW</td>
<td>Jenny Dennis</td>
<td>Senior Policy Officer - Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02 April 2015</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Meeting 27</td>
<td>Elton Consulting</td>
<td>James Evans</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elton Consulting</td>
<td>Kim Anson</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td>08 April 2015</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>Seminar 3</td>
<td>A day long event organised by UDAL Qld (attended as a key speaker)</td>
<td>Deicke Richards</td>
<td>Peter Richards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deicke Richards</td>
<td>Elouise Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deicke Richards</td>
<td>Stephen Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studio Tekton Pty Ltd</td>
<td>John Loneragan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Archipelago</td>
<td>Peter Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Novus Urban</td>
<td>Stephen Bowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gall Architects</td>
<td>Jim Gall</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Senses Foundation</td>
<td>Tobias Volbert</td>
<td>Founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buckley Vann</td>
<td>Shannon McGuire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buckley Vann</td>
<td>Kylie Rolley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buckley Vann</td>
<td>Greg Vann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buckley Vann</td>
<td>Warren Rowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 31</td>
<td>Articulous</td>
<td>Amanda Newbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Articulous</td>
<td>Nathan Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 32 (including a short talk by me)</td>
<td>PLACE Design Group</td>
<td>Chris Isles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLACE Design Group</td>
<td>Amanda Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLACE Design Group</td>
<td>Around 10 PLACE Design Group staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 April 2015</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>Meeting 33</td>
<td>Department of Housing and Public Works (DHPW)</td>
<td>Uktatu (Bob) Naiker</td>
<td>Manager, Strategic Planning Housing Portfolio Solutions, Capital and Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DHPW</td>
<td>Damien Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DHPW</td>
<td>another 10 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 34</td>
<td>Office of the Deputy Premier</td>
<td>Matt Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office of the Deputy Premier</td>
<td>Tess Pickering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>13 April 2015</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Meeting 35</td>
<td>Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority (MRA)</td>
<td>Ryan Keys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MRA</td>
<td>Veronica Jeffery</td>
<td>Executive Director of Place Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 36</td>
<td>Office of the Government Architect, Western Australia</td>
<td>Geoff Warn</td>
<td>Government Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 April 2015</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Meeting 37</td>
<td>ConsultWG</td>
<td>Warren Giddens</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landcorp</td>
<td>Claire Paddockson</td>
<td>Manager, Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 April 2015</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Meeting 38</td>
<td>Bank of Ideas</td>
<td>Peter Kenyon</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 39</td>
<td>Responsive Environments</td>
<td>Evan Jones</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 40</td>
<td>Mackay Urban Design</td>
<td>Malcolm Mackay</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar 4</td>
<td>An evening event organised by PIA WA (attended as the only presenter)</td>
<td>Emma de Jager</td>
<td>Executive Officer WA &amp; NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 April 2015</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Meeting 41</td>
<td>PIA WA</td>
<td>Charles Johnson</td>
<td>PIA State president in WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 42</td>
<td>Taylor Burrell Barnett</td>
<td>Bill Burrell</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting 43</td>
<td>City of Subiaco</td>
<td>Charlotte Carlish</td>
<td>Executive Manager Communications and Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Subiaco</td>
<td>Elyse Maketic</td>
<td>Coordinator, Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘TELL ME AND I'LL FORGET;
SHOW ME AND I MAY REMEMBER;
INVOLVE ME AND I'LL UNDERSTAND.’

Chinese proverb