

# Criteria for Public Participation in the Creation and Revitalization of Public Spaces



**Nadace Partnerství  
Nadácia Ekopolis**



**ekopolis**  
nadácia

**Erfurt, 26th October, 2009**



# Criteria for Public Participation

## Introduction

- Participation as a part of Sustainable Development Concept
- Aarhus Convention
- Knowledge and use of participation technique
- Experiences from project realizations



# Criteria for Public Participation

1. All potential target groups were involved in the project.
2. There was a clear, externally presented public participation plan with clear timeframes.
3. Various manners of addressing the public were used in communication, information dissemination and participation.





# Criteria for Public Participation

4. The project leader (implementation team) was familiar with participation principles and methodology, understood them and accepted them.
5. An external consultant with sufficient experience in public participation, communication and facilitation of public meetings was part of the participation process.



# Criteria for Public Participation



6. Over the course of the project, citizens were able to find out how the project was developing and how their opinions were used.
7. Local sources were used in project preparation and implementation, particularly in terms of local citizens, important players in the area and local technologies, materials, etc.



# Criteria for Public Participation

8. The property owner unconditionally consented to the project aim and accepted responsibility for maintenance.
9. The project did not encompass hidden agendas/conflicts (within the team, relating to the project site, in relations with involved groups).
10. The project implementor puts its own funding/labour/material into project development or implementation.





# Criteria for Public Participation

11. Monitoring of mistakes and problems served to glean lessons for subsequent events and local community development.
12. The project site was locally significant, frequented, accessible and naturally invited use. There was long-term high demand for a change to the site.
13. The proposed site design fulfilled the needs of multiple target groups (it did not offer only one function).



# Criteria for Public Participation

14. The project design was conceived for everyday life and for various times of day and seasons of the year.
15. The initial initiative came from the bottom up, not from (only from) the top down.
16. The local community was already active prior to project implementation.
17. The goal was not simply creation of a place, but creation/strengthening of a functioning team that will endure even after the project is over.





# Criteria for Public Participation

18. The administrative process was well connected, flexible and active.
19. There was a project initiator in the community, best of all a group that has a natural leader with natural authority in the community.
20. The initiating group was diverse.



# Criteria for Public Participation

21. There was good cooperation between the initiating group, (e.g.) non-governmental organization, and municipal leadership.
22. Citizens took part in project implementation.
23. Citizens enjoyed the project.





# Criteria for Public Participation

24. There were many activities in the community before, during and after site revitalisation.

25. The project indirectly led to further activity.





# Criteria for Public Participation

**Thank You for Your attention**

**Martina Paulíková, EKOPOLIS, SK**

**Martin Nawrath, NADACE PARTNERSTVÍ, CZ**



**EUROPEAN UNION**  
EUROPEAN REGIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT FUND

