

- Lieto, L. (2013), Place as Trading Zone: A Controversial Path of Innovation for Planning Theory and Practice, in Balducci, A. and Mäntysalo, R. (eds), Urban Planning as a Trading Zone, Springer, 143-157
- Palermo, P. C. (2002), Introduzione. il ciclo del programma Urban: varietà e tipi di esperienze, in: Palermo, P. C., Savoldi, P. (eds.), Esperienze locali: contesti programmi, azioni locali; Il programma Urban e l'innovazione delle politiche urbane, Franco Angeli – Diap
- Parkinson, M. (1998) Combating Social Exclusion: Lessons from Area-based Programmes in Europe. Bristol: The Policy Press/York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Pirozzi, S., Rossi-Doria, M. (2010), Socievolezza e agency, in: Senza Welfare? Federalismo e diritti di cittadinanza nel modello mediterraneo, 3rd annual ESPANet conference, The future of welfare State: 30 September – 2 October 2010, Naples, Italy
- REVES (eds) (2015), Caso Studio: i Quartieri Spagnoli di Napoli. Documento di inquadramento del contesto ed analisi. Unpublished documents of Progetto pilota di Valutazione locale REVES, focus di validazione del progetto pilota Quartieri Spagnoli, 16th September 2015, Holiday Inn, Centro Direzionale Isola E6, Naples, Italy
- Saporito, E. (2016), Consensus Building Versus Irreconcilable Conflicts. Reframing Participatory Spatial Planning, Springer, UK
- Sen, A. (1992), Inequality Re-examined, Oxford University Press, UK
- Schön, D. A. (1983), The Reflective Practitioner. How professionals think in action, Temple Smith, London, UK
- Uitermark, J. (2014), Integration and Control: The Governing of Urban Marginality in Western Europe, in International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 38.4, 1418-1436
- Wacquant, L. (2008), Urban Outcasts. A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK

ID 1587 | LEVELS AND SCOPE OF PARTICIPATED PROJECTS: CASE STUDIES IN THE PORTUGUESE CONTEXT

Pedro Mendes¹; Susana Gaivoto²

¹ISCTE-IUL; ²A3Astudio

pm.arq@pm.mail.pt; info@a3studio.com

ABSTRACT: In Portugal, there has been a growing concern, in recent years, about the participation of citizens in architectural and political decisions. The ineffectiveness of the traditional processes of participation of the democratic system proves incapable of responding to the contemporary problems of the citizens. In parallel it has been seen in recent years the deepening of the economic and financial crisis of 2007/2008, which, in Portugal, led to a sharp rise in the levels of unemployment in the architecture market. The lack of commissioning of building projects and plans, that had previously generated work, led to new concepts and approaches in particular in newly formed architects. On the one hand, there have been numerous collectives of architects motivated by issues related to political intervention and dynamics of social and territorial innovation. On the other hand, political decision-makers implemented new participatory instruments to support decision, such as Orçamento Participativo (Participatory Budget). This program has been implemented widely among municipalities in Portugal. Citizens' participation in project decisions is a recurring theme in the 1960s and 1970s, which reappears with a new configuration at the beginning of the XXI century. These days are marked by years of economic crisis and the universe of facilitated circulation of information in a wide network system accessed by a large number of citizens. However, some questions arise concerning the levels and scope of participation. Since a conventional project involves a certain level of involvement of decision-makers, architects and users (Carlo, 2010), two questions arise: how can we now achieve a higher level of participation and involvement of stakeholders (citizens, Architects, policy-makers) in the project? How can we achieve a real bottom-up procedure, in which context problems find the best formal solution (Alexander, 1964), during a process implemented in most cases by groups of architects outside the community of citizens for whom they work? Starting from a reflection on SAAL, a housing program promoted by the Central Government in the post-revolution period of April 1974, research is carried out through the assessment of the participation level (Arnstein, 1969) of referred participated

projects. From a different typology, two Municipal programs with relevance at regional scale - OP Cascais and BIP ZIP Lisbon - are analyzed. The study of two exploratory case studies - Casa do Vapor (Almada, Portugal) and "Building Together" (Guimarães, Portugal) - and an investigatory proposal - "City Mosaic Collective" project (Mendes et al., 2017a) – complete this selection. "City Mosaic Collective", which I am a founder member, aims to achieve a higher level of participation, "Partnership" (Arnstein, 1969). The research points to conclude that even for the cases studied that do not reach the highest level of participation (partnership), the initiatives reveal valid potential for their evolution.

KEYWORDS: Participated project; Partnership; Cova do Vapor; Building Together; City Mosaic Collective.

1 INTRODUCTION

The recent financial crisis has underlined the failures of a system of intervention in the public spaces dependent on political power and public investment (Bourdin, 2011). In recent years Portugal witnessed a general reduction in resources available for public works. Following a government commissioned demand, University do Minho conducted a study about municipal investment reduction. The level of municipal investment dropped 74% from 2001 to 2014. During this period the largest investment fall occurred before the Portuguese adjustment program of the troika. Between 2010 and 2014 the lowering of investments situated on 39%, but in absolute terms the reduction was sharper in previous years, starting at the beginning of the decade (Esteves, 2015). The aftereffect repercussions of divestment rely on the lack of commissioning of building projects and plans, which had previously generated work. This situation has led to a sharp rise in unemployment in the area of architectural design. In consequence the largest group most affected demonstrates great availability to explore new paths related to the universe of architecture. New concepts and approaches arise, in particular in newly formed architects. Numerous collectives of architects motivated by issues related to political intervention and dynamics of social and territorial innovation.

The reduction on the available budget has direct repercussions in promoting public works and maintenance of the public space. This fact leads to situations of stagnation and degradation of environmental quality of public space. On the other hand we are witnessing a growing civic consciousness about the limitations of local government capacity to respond to the needs and problems that arise in day-to-day citizen life. This awareness is associated with the economic crisis and the dissociation between citizens and the political power. The difficulties of communication and interaction between citizens and political power are accentuated by the ineffectiveness of planning instruments set. At the basis of this problem there is a representation deficit. Citizens do not identify with their decision-makers and decision-makers are unable to establish effective means of sharing or communicating their decisions. From the holistic design of the map that connects the economic situation and their consequences, the instituted political power, stakeholders, the citizen and the architectural designers, several questions arise about a recent growing participation phenomenon: We face a wide and complex range of issues. In order to focus, this paper investigates on how to achieve a higher level of participation and involvement of stakeholders (citizens, Architects, policy-makers) in the project and how to reach a real bottom-up procedure, in which context problems find the best formal solution (Alexander, 1964). To reach this goal the approach is made analyzing three types of programs involved in participative projects: First SAAL, a program promoted by the Central Government national wide scale. Secondly two municipal programs with relevance at regional scale (OP Cascais and BIP ZIP Lisbon). Thirdly two small scale implemented initiatives (Cova do Vapor and Building Together) and an investigatory proposal (City Mosaic Collective) that aims a higher level of participation.

2. AUTHORITARIAN METHODOLOGY

Before addressing the analysis of case study, it is relevant to go through the methodological process commonly used for the realization of an architectural, in the universe of public entities. We face a participated process, characterized by a reduced participation level, with a reduced variety of agents. This methodology is classified, according to Giancarlo de Carlo, as authoritarian (Carlo, 2010). Design process is defined through different phases of development and implementation of an architectural project. The architectural project is understood, in this article, through a wide scope of view. Urban and built elements, the city structure and its buildings are inseparable universes and part of the whole which is the

city (Rossi, 1977). "An Architecture of the Participation". is the article title of Giancarlo de Carlo (Perspecta: Yale Journal, in 1980). The article approaches the different phases and procedures of project methodology. In a simple and clear perspective the project methodology is addressed on the distinction between an authoritarian planning and a participative approach. According to Carlo (2010), the project methodology is defined in three main phases. The first phase is focused on the problem definition. The second corresponds to the development of the project, and the third relates to the evaluation of results.

The authoritarian methodology is characterized by a rigid sequence of the different phases. The articulation between the different stages is reduced and at the end of the second phase (design) the project is mostly completed. This type of approach is commonly used in the development of architectural projects. It is characterized by being carried out in separate phases in which the results of each phase little interfere with each other. On the other hand the design process is highly centralized in the design phase of the project. The designer, the political power and their technicians assume the central role and monopolize the decision process. This way aesthetic and use issues are taken for granted and imposed to a wider group of citizens. In a certain way the users and the use associated to the project end up having a reduced influence on the final result (Carlo, 2010). It is a level 3 (Informing) of tokenism (Arnstein, 1969). Citizens are just informed of the result. The decision-making is kept in the sphere of the political power and the designers. It is an authoritarian approach, centered on the design process of the project, focusing on policy-makers (Carlo, 2010) and designers.

It is now relevant to detail each stage of the authoritarian methodology. The problem definition phase starts with the order of the project and the subsequent data collection about the context (Alexander, 1977). At this stage the proceedings fall into an intuitive and non-systematic approach of gathering information. The selection of data and the definition of problems is strongly centered on the designer and policy makers' options. The defined goals are taken for granted and the possibility of an expanded discussion with the users is excluded. The issue subject to be discussed is centered on the costs of the operation, technique and aesthetics aspects. The prospect of future users is rarely considered or subjugated to the interests of political power or the designer's idea.

The stage of project design development runs since the presentation of the first intervention proposals to the conclusion of the project construction. Throughout this period the project is regarded as an absolute entity that responds to the principles set out by the designer (technician) and the public developer. The scope for changes is scarce. In case of inadequacy minor changes are introduced or in extreme cases the solution can be rejected and replaced by another proposal. If the promoter accepts the project, the work will be executed and delivered to their users. Sometimes the users who will use the space are different from those that initiated the project process. However the project keeps unchanged. The users have a small share of influence in the drafting of the project and in the final solution to be built. The knowledge potential of all the involved actors in the process is not fully explored.

The third phase focuses on the evaluation. Most often corresponds to a greatly neglected moment. The final work tends to be considered and evaluated exclusively from the aesthetic point of view. The subjective dimension overrides the rational and objective approach. The objective issues accessed focus mainly on financial aspects related to the cost of the work. The overvaluation of the aesthetic and financial components leads to a deterministic perspective. The process as an integrated whole is neglected. The end result is not the result of a broad outlook process, but rather an isolated case that responds to the will of political power and the designer intentions. This corresponds to Giancarlo di Carlo (2010) definition of authoritarian planning.

3. A PIONEER EXPERIENCE FROM THE SEVENTY'S - SAAL

Following the April 1974 revolution, the democratic regime faced the challenge to build a new social, economic and cultural structure. The heritage from the authoritarian regime registers a lack of housing of about 500 000 dwelling. In order to face this problem Nuno Portas, the Secretary of State for Housing and Urban Planning (Ministry of Social Equipment and the Environment, and of Internal Administration of the 1st Provisional Government) decided, in August 1974, to create SAAL - Serviço Ambulatório de Apoio Local (Ambulatory Support to Local Residents). The population target belongs to a social and cultural disqualified sector that inhabited in very precarious and poor conditions.

Before addressing the SAAL program a previous participated project experience has to be mentioned: the project to Associação de Inquilinos Lisbonense (Association of Tenants Lisbonense) led by the Atelier of Nuno Teotónio Pereira with Bartolomeu Costa Cabral. The architectural design developed, from Mid-fifties, involved the participation of the future users. The operation of 100 dwellings developed typologies from T1 to T5. (Bandeirinha, 2007). In parallel, with the objective to replicate the experience, an exhibition was organized. The widespread event exhibited drawings, models and a prototype, in real size of one house. After the visit to the model house, the visitors were asked to fill an inquiry. The inquiry asked about the general impression about the house, as well as more specific issues concerning materials, spatial relations, compartment location, etc. The impact among the media and architects community was significant, but the results from the inquiry were not properly compiled. The character of SAAL pointed to the direct involvement of the future users in the search of solutions regarding the land, infrastructures, technical assistance and financing. The program basis considered the direct involvement of the users and their representatives on a process of deep engagement in planning, and construction of their neighborhood and houses. This process was shared with teams of architects and technicians, social workers, and students. During two years (1974 – 1976) 170 projects for over 2 259 houses were on process. This process involved 41 665 families (Conselho Nacional do SAAL, 1976).

SAAL objectives centered on the empowerment of citizens through the support of the government and technical skills of the involved technicians. We are on the higher levels of the “Ladder of citizen participation” (Arnstein, 1969) where decision and work have a shared relation (Wates, 2014). Although in October 1976 the new constitutional government ended the program, under the argument that self-organized teams and neighborhood representatives surpassed the limits of defined objectives of the program. Somehow the new government considered that SAAL was being used for political intervention and not for solving local house and neighborhood problems.

4. OP CASCAIS

Considering the municipality of Cascais where participative processes have been successfully implemented it turns out that the number of voting citizens for local elections has consecutively decreased from 2009 on. In the other direction the figures for abstention show an increase tendency (Pordata, 2015). Looking for solutions to fill the gap of citizen involvement in decisions about the planning of public spaces, local authorities launched initiatives such as the OP - Orçamento Participado (Participatory Budget). Referring to the case of the Municipality of Cascais, the focus is placed on the idea of strengthening the participation of citizens in the definition of budget priorities. The total budget available for the program is Eur 1,5 million/year to be applied in projects that do not exceed 300 000,00 euros. The case of OP Cascais, the number of presented proposals (from 2011 to 2015) totalizes 891. The winner projects are 65, selected with a total of 160 740 votes, that reach the investment of 11 000 620,00 euros (Cascais, 2015a). Implemented proposals embrace interventions on public space, schools and rehabilitation of buildings.

This instrument, which has been spread by various municipalities in Portugal (In Loco, 2017), aims to create a proximity scale and stimulate civic participation of citizen. It represents an attempt to overcome the problems of communication and involvement of citizen in local governance decisions. The process comprises a collection of proposals presented by citizens to a municipal working committee. The municipality multidisciplinary committee legitimates and selects the proposals to be submitted to popular vote. The voting process is held by mobile phone application, a large range access technology. Citizens are consulted on the solution to be implemented, but the development of the project rests under the domain of political power. We are facing what Arnstein (1969) classifies as tokenism. Citizens are heard and informed but do not have the power to ensure that their prospect will be fully answered. The level of participation is on the 3rd and 4th level, which corresponds to Informing and Consultation respectively. These levels of participation do not introduce significant changes on the status quo. The participatory process is focused on the consultation of the existing problems and informing of the selected proposals to be implemented. Still, development of architectural design decisions still under the control of the local authority. However the popular involvement on the Participatory Budget of Cascais is significant. In 2014 the number of voters for the project proposal selection reached 41 005 votes (Pincha, 2015). Looking at the 2013 municipal election (Cascais, 2015b) there were 65 546 voters of a total of 172 537 registered voters. Considering that the political coalition elected (PPD-PSD / CDS- PP) had 26 455 votes, there is a larger number of voters (plus 14 550) on the Participatory Budget process.

5 BIP ZIP CM LISBOA

Created by the municipality of Lisbon in 2011, Bip/Zip Lisboa (Lisboa, (2017a) is a public policy instrument and an outcome of the Local Housing Programme. This programme aims to recalibrate the public politics on housing, “not focussing only on municipal housing estate but to expand its scope to the whole city, especially in order to include vulnerable areas and neighbourhoods” (Lisboa, 2017b). - Final report PLH, March 2012). Once these vulnerable territories were identified, a map was created – Bip/Zip map - (Lisboa, 2017c). in which 67 territories in the city, with an estimated population of 141,126 residents, are pointed as Priority Intervention Zones and Priority Intervention Neighbourhoods. Each project developed for the improvement of these areas can be financed up to €50 000 and from a minimum of € 5000. In order to add a social dimension to the approach to these territories and to contribute to a wider territorial cohesion of the city, the Bip/Zip Programme supports strategies and actions specifically shaped for these territories. Projects must be local based, created by partnerships, which can bring together the local authority, citizen organizations, informal groups and other local-based stakeholders, which somehow relate to the territory and to its critical issues. This is a way of enhancing local resources and existing knowledge about critical situations, stimulating at the same time, new dynamics and a policy of greater proximity, with the aim of improving the habitability of these places.

The program takes place through a cycle of 7 phases: 1. Preparation; 2. Communication and Empowerment; 3. Application submission; 4. Application Approval; 5. Signature of the protocol; 6. Execution of projects; 7. Evaluation of the program (Lisboa, 2017d). Without exhaustive description of each phase, we will focus on some aspects, in order to describe the level of participation promoted by this programme:

- During phase 2, the programme is publicized and workshops are developed so that, in addition to training potential partners, their network for action increases in their territories.
- The application process includes the presentation of a diagnostic of the territory, a strategy for intervention and its activities, all prepared by the local partnership. In the diagnostic phase, prepared by the partnership and using its diverse knowledge of the territory, the more community elements are heard and engaged, the more valued the application can be.
- From here, the partnership develops a strategy that consists on a set of activities that respond to a greater and a few specific goals, within the themes already predefined by the program itself, for they are structuring for the main goal of territorial cohesion – the themes can go from improving the neighbourhood image, to inclusion and prevention and public space. Nevertheless, there is a considerable degree of freedom for the construction of the proposals.
- The selection of the winning applications is made by an external jury although takes into consideration the level of participation of the project.
- The funding is handed to the sponsoring entities that are part of the partnership; they manage it and materialize the projects in an independent way - although they have to submit reports.
- The evaluation of the application and subsequent monitoring consider several indicators that present the number of involved partners, the number of people in the community to whom the actions / interventions are intended.
- Whatever the amount attributed to each project, its sustainability must be guaranteed for a year or two depending on the amount attributed, ensuring that the dynamics created remain in the territory, as well as its materialization.

The first edition had 77 proposals, with a foreseen cost of 2,5 million euros, far above the available budget. For the 34 intervention territories, 33 projects, from 31 promoters and 53 partner organizations, were selected to complete 50 interventions, totalling 1,249,843.48 € (2011 and 1st quarter 2012. (Lisboa, 2017b) In 2016, 122 applicants were admitted, the requested amount was 5,248,564.00 € and a total of 1,606, 806 € was allocated to 42 selected projects. This involved 186 entities (52 promoters and 134 partners) that will promote about 250 interventions in 53 territories (Lisboa, 2017e).

From 2012 to 2016, a total of 591 applications were presented and 199 were supported. From parishes (local government) to civil society organizations, the bip/zip partnerships network has 528 partners. One can conclude that, in Bip/Zip it's a tool to impulse and activate action and partnerships. From the development of the application, to the signature of the protocol and to the implementation of the actions, although under a monitoring process, there is a great deal of autonomy in decision making and action by the partnership. There is also autonomy in managing the funding that goes directly to the partnership and it's predicted that its capacity for action goes beyond the time subject to funding.

If we consider the participation matrix of Nick Wates (2014), which evaluates the level of community involvement in the various phases of the project, we can say that despite being a programme promoted by the municipality and started jointly between local government and community, unleashes a process of great community control - self-help - in the remaining phases of planning, implementation and maintenance. One can conclude that this programme is designed to be on the higher levels of the “Ladder of citizen participation” (Arnstein, 1969).

6 CASA DO VAPOR / BUILDING TOGETHER

The two following case studies – Casa do Vapor and “Building Together” - integrate an initiative of Capital Europeia da Cultura - Guimarães 2012 (European Capital of Culture – Guimarães 2012). Both are characterized by their ephemeral character. Another common characteristic is their local micro scale type of intervention.

Curator’s Lab was the kick off program for a sequence of experiments characterized by interventions in the field of art and architecture. The initiative integrated in Capital Europeia da Cultura - Guimarães 2012 (European Capital of Culture – Guimarães 2012), occurred at the disused ASA Factory, located 2 km away from Guimarães.

The transdisciplinary collective Ezyzt was invited to lead the public workshop “Building together”, a three weeks collective residency. Around 30 art and architecture students, along with other participants, were involved on the construction of the facilities for the residency: a shelter (with kitchen and sleeping areas), working, meeting and living areas combined with public social spaces. As for the dynamic element of the proposal, an auditorium was built using wood elements and constructive system. During the construction process local community was invited to participate. A survey to the population, some of them former workers from the factory, established the connection with the local community. Construir Juntos (Build Together) was the symbolic name given to the fanzine published by the Lab editorial. Its contents registered the process and the evolution of the project. Through this document the reuse potential and future dynamic of the ASA factory was enlarged. During the workshop the idea of reusing the wood elements of the auditorium configured a desire to be developed in a future collaborative project. (Braga, 2017). The reuse of the wood elements of the auditorium of the former ASA factory (“Building Together”) provided the material support for the project at Casa do Vapor. Another link to the previous project is the leading team - Ezyzt (Ezyzt, 2017)/Constructlab - and their foundational principles: concept and construction merge in specific site action. This approach stands as a contemporary alternative to the authoritarian methodology. Casa do Vapor (Steam house) is inserted at Cova do Vapor (Steam Cove), a small informal neighborhood located in the estuary of Tejo river, 20 km south of Lisbon. Its origins go back to the twenties of XX century, with a spontaneous small fisherman village. Due to its privileged location several threats to its existence occurred. The first in the forties, the second around the post-revolutionary period (after 1974) and the latest dating from 2002. The existing small village is mostly organized by 350 self-built houses occupied by around 200 inhabitants (Ramòs, 2013).

The enterprise is grounded on the analysis of the community expectations and it aims to respond with a material proposal to local needs. The intervention aspirations are based on social issues and points to create a gathering point between the local community and the exterior (Catarina Ferreira). The program implementation - artistic residency, surf school, a common kitchen, a concert venue, an open-air cinema – supported by Cova do Vapor Residents Association, was built around the idea of creating a centrality, where people can meet and develop leisure and cultural activities (Ramòs, 2013). Another significant fact allowed the project to be accomplished: the financial and legal support provided by the Almada Municipality. Casa do Vapor was built with the wood from the workshop at Guimarães Capital da Cultura: Construir Juntos. Although the organizing and financial process came mainly from outside the neighborhood, local community and local associations were involved. Most of the volunteers involved came from outside the community. Nevertheless some residents involvement occurred. In this case the level of participation is somewhere in between “informing” and a “partnership” (Arnstein, 1969) level.

At the end of the time period of the legal permit for the construction, Casa do Vapor was dismantled and the existing public library installed at the facilities of Associação de Moradores da Cova do Vapor (AMCV)

7 CITY MOSAIC COLLECTIVE

Reacting to a liberal urbanism which has characterized the last three decades with a lack of place for a scientific approach, multiplication of actors and power holders, generating too complex, unclear and incomprehensible operations and languages (Bourdin, 2010). “City Mosaic Collective”, which I am a founder member, aims to establish an operative methodology to be implemented. This methodology responds to the current Portuguese context where economic resources are scarce. It aims to answer to local needs and contribute to citizen empowerment through participated projects of streets public space valorization (Fig.1). The process is to be triggered by local and dynamic citizens, associations, municipalities, companies, entrepreneurs, and other institutions. Through a collective architectural design project and IT it is possible to implicate design and IT experts, policy-makers, private and public interests on the support of meaningful social and participative process. Through this form of collaboration it is possible to achieve improvements in the better living on the streets and reach meaningful social changes (Manzini, 2015).

In contrast with the exposed conventional, authoritarian methodology of project, “City Mosaic Collective” (Mendes et al., 2017), proposes the overlap between a conventional architectural design methodology with a participatory process (Bourdin, 2011; Slocum, 2003) and IT knowledge. The intersection of these two components pretends to establish an operative methodology of intervention in the public space. It seeks to establish the foundations of simple and direct instruments to communicate and implement in specific cases. Issues such as programming, architectural design and implementation (Quaroni, 1977) apply and overlap to a bottom-up approach (Mendes et al., 2014). The proposed methodology develops a blend between a conventional architectural design methodology and a participatory process and IT knowledge. The proposed strategy is based on the conventional architectural design phases – analysis, architectural design proposal and implementation on building site - and tools – free-hand sketches, plans, sections, detail and axonometric drawings. The working methodology establishes a systematic perspective for each project. Each project is case-sensitive to a particular context, time and space scale.



Figure 1 – “City Mosaic Collective” methodology.

The project target aims to enhance community quality of participation along with the improvement of public space living. In parallel, individual and group civic awareness will be reinforced by City Mosaic Collective tool. The implementation process will be developed with a flexible pattern and will go through various steps (Fig 1). From the detecting and reporting of a challenge/problem, using a mobile phone or with direct contact, the data will be analyzed and organized through a Web site. Afterwards the solutions are developed with citizen, decision makers and stakeholders. Through a participated process, full of advances and setbacks (Alexander, 1964), the final solution will be implemented. All the agents will be involved in a dynamic and positive process (Mendes et al., 2017b).

8 CONCLUSIONS

With the exception of SAAL, the programs analyzed have been developed in the last 10 years. This is a relatively short period for a definitive evaluation to be made. However it is possible to draw some conclusions namely concerning the levels and scope of participation. The SAAL program was

developed during about two years. However, it is the proposal with a high degree of participation, between partnership and self-help (Wates, 2014). Despite its short duration, it is anational and international reference. The purpose of the program centered on the empowerment of citizensthought the support of the government and technical skills of the involved technicians. Its implementationwas decisive in the housing offer for disadvantaged populations. Due to the program scale the projects andconstruction did not stop with the end of the program. This led to future housing initiatives fordisadvantaged classes being developed along with the completion of the works begun.

For the two municipal programs - OP Cascais and BIP ZIP Lisbon – we face different levels of participation. Concerning the OP Cascais, citizens are consulted on the solution to be implemented, but the development of the project rests under the domain of political power. Citizens are heard and informed but do not have the power to ensure that their prospect will be fully answered. The level of participation is on the 3rd and 4th level, which corresponds to “Informing” and “Consultation” respectively. The participatory process is focused on the consultation of the existing problems and informing of the selected proposals to be implemented. Still, development of architectural design decisions still under the control of the local authority.

We are facing what Arnstein (1969) classifies as tokenism and on the level of “Consultation”, according to Nick Wates (2014). On the other hand Bip/Zip can be placed on a higher level of participation, once it works as a facilitator tool to impulse and activate action and partnerships. From the development of the application, to the signature of the protocol and to the implementation of the actions, there is a great deal of autonomy in decision making and action by the partnership. There is also autonomy in managing the funding that goes directly to the partnership and it’s predicted that its capacity for action goes beyond the time subject to funding. According to the participation matrix of Nick Wates (2014), which evaluates the level of community involvement in the various phases of the project, it is possible to allege that despite being a programme promoted by the municipality and started jointly between local government and community, unleashes a process of great community control - self-help - in the remaining phases of planning, implementation and maintenance. It is possible to conclude that this programme is designed be on the higher levels of the “Ladder of citizen participation” (Arnstein, 1969).

“Building together” workshop should be placed on the specificity of the event. It was an ephemeral event, focused on the experimentation between art and architecture to intervene on an disused factory. The intervention involved a restricted number of direct participants, although the population was called to participate. In a straight sense the level of participation is not high, situated around tokenism Arnstein (1969) and “Information” Nick Wates (2014). Nevertheless the objective to draw the attention, of a local population, to the potential asset of the disused factory was accomplished.

Casa do Vapor is a case where most of the resources came mainly from outside the neighborhood. The majority of the work and decisions was done by volunteers from outside the community. Even though the local community and local associations were involved. In this case the level of participation is somewhere, in an ambiguous position, between “informing” and a “partnership” (Nick Wates (2014) (Arnstein, 1969) level.

City Mosaic Collective has also to been seen on its specificity as an investigatory methodology. It aims to enhance a high participation level, reaching the level of “partnership” (Nick Wates (2014) (Arnstein, 1969). Although it lacks confirmation with concrete processes and experiences. So far the collective has been struggling with difficulties in finding local structures of organized citizens. In the same direction has faced difficulties in financing proposals and implementations outside the systems of organized power. The complexity and effectiveness of design project of public spaces requires a high level of integration of disciplinary insights, stakeholders, political representatives and citizen perspectives combined and developed through time constraints and location conditions. Therefore, more effective decision support methodologies and programs, which are able to improve citizen participation on the construction of a better fit between the context and the designed form are needed.

The research points to conclude that even for the cases studied that do not reach the highest levels of participation (partnership), the initiatives reveal valid potential for their evolution.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Alexander, C. (1964). Notes on the synthesis of form. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Arnstein, S. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35: 4, 216 - 224
- Bandeirinha, J. (2007). O Processo SAAL e a arquitectura no 25 de Abril de 1974. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade.
- Bourdin, A. (2011). O urbanismo depois da crise. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte
- Braga, J. (2017). Participatory Aesthetics and Makeshift Urbanism: Cases of Guimarães, Cova do vapor, and Terras de Ventura. Retrieved from http://www.parturbs.com/anthology/participatory_aesthetics_and_makeshift_urbanism
- Carlo, G (2010). Uma arquitectura da participação. In Rodrigues, José (co. ed.). Teoria e crítica de Arquitectura – Século XX (753- 758). Casal de Cambra: Ordem dos Arquitectos, Caleidoscópio. Cascais, CM (2015a). Orçamento Participativo. Retrieved from <http://www.cmcascais.pt/area/orcamento-participativo-0>.
- Cascais, CM (2015b). Eleições autárquicas 2013, Câmara Municipal. Retrieved from <http://www.cmcascais.pt/sites/default/files/anexos/gerais/aut2013cm.pdf>.
- Conselho Nacional do SAAL (1976). Livro Branco do SAAL - 1974/1976. Vila Nova de Gaia: Conselho Nacional do SAAL.
- Esteves, M. (2015). Investimento das câmaras caiu 74% desde 2001. Retrieved from http://www.jornaldenegocios.pt/economia/autarquias/detalhe/investimento_das_camaras_caiu_74_desde_2001.html.
- Ezyzt, (2017). About. Retrieved from <http://www.exzyt.org/about/>
- Ferreira, C. (2017). Arquitetura e inovação social: interseções no território da Cova do Vapor. Retrieved from <http://www.estudoprevio.net/artigos/50/dossier-teses-catarina-ferreira-arquitetura-e-inovacaosocial-intersecoes-no-territorio-da-cova-do-vapor>
- In Loco (2017). Portugal participa - Oficinas Colaborativas para a elaboração de um roteiro de orientação para uma revisão participada do Plano Diretor Municipal, Guia de disseminação. Retrieved from http://www.inloco.pt/upload_folder/edicoes/6ee4aade-1939-4beb-92d5-2c9643af1700.pdf
- Lisboa, CM (2017a). Bipzip. Retrieved from <http://bipzip.cm-lisboa.pt/>
- Lisboa, CM (2017b). Habitação, documentos. Retrieved from <http://habitacao.cmlisboa.pt/documentos/1334085131X6jRR2xj3Tg43HG4.pdf>
- Lisboa, CM (2017c). Habitação, index. Retrieved from (<http://habitacao.cmlisboa.pt/index.htm?no=2720001>)
- Lisboa, CM (2017d). Bipzip, ciclo regras. Retrieved from http://bipzip.cmlisboa.pt/imgs/ciclo_regras.pdf.
- Lisboa, CM (2017e). Habitação. Retrieved from <http://habitacao.cm-lisboa.pt/?no=273500,141>
- Manzini, E (2015). Design, when everybody designs. An introduction to design for social innovation. Cambridge MA, London: MIT Press.
- Mendes, P, Alves, P & Pita, M (2014). Designing with the People, on the Street, Towards the City. In Smitheran, J., Moloney, J. & Twose, S. In Architectural Design Research Symposium (108-110). Wellington: s.n.
- Mendes, P., Marques, P. & Botelho, P. (2017a). City Mosaic Collective. Retrieved from https://issuu.com/lisboncollectivearchitects/docs/mosaic_december2016.
- Mendes, P., Marques, P. & Botelho, P. (2017b). City Mosaic Collective. Retrieved from <https://vimeo.com/207018305>
- Pincha, J. (2015) Lex Paulson: “Nova Iorque tem muito a aprender com Cascais”. Retrieved from <http://observador.pt/2015/07/11/nova-iorque-tem-muito-a-aprender-com-cascais>
- Pordata (2015). Eleitores, votantes e abstenção. Retrieved from <http://www.pordata.pt/Municipios/Ambiente+de+Consulta/Gr%C3%A1fico>
- Quaroni, L. (1987). Proyectar un edificio: ocho lecciones de arquitectura. Madrid: Xarait Ediciones.
- Ramòs, F. (2013). EXZYT, ConstruaLab: Casa do Vapor (DOMUS 6 August 2013). Retrieved from http://www.domusweb.it/content/domusweb/en/architecture/2013/08/06/casa_do_vapor.html

Slocum, N (2003). Participatory Methods Toolkit, a practitioner's manual [Online] Retrieved from http://www.kbs-frb.be/uploadedfiles/kbs-frb/files/en/pub_1540_toolkit_9_pame.pdf

Wates, N. (2014). The community Planning Handbook. London and New York: Routledge.

ID 1628 | URBAN REGENERATION PROCESS AS AN ASSET TO RISE ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP: THE HUMAN CITIES EXPERIENCE WITH USING PHOTOSTORIES AS A TRIGGER

Matej Niksic¹; Biba Tominc¹; Nina Gorsic¹

¹Urban Planning Institute of the Republic of Slovenia

matej.niksic@uirs.si ; biba.tominc@uirs.si ; nina.gorsic@uirs.si

ABSTRACT: While the rapidly developing world is facing a rapid urban growth, these processes have been in a fullswing much earlier in the s. c. western world. Many of the western cities thus face a need for a redevelopmentand regeneration of the already aged-up urban quarters constructed in the periods of their fast growth. Typicalexamples are the modernist urban neighbourhoods built in the decades after WWII which offered newstandards of living when constructed, but need renewal and up-gradings to cope with the needs andexpectations of contemporary urban population that is much more individualised in its life-styles. The paperputs light on the new approach to participatory urban regeneration process that is developed around revealingresidents' perceptions of their living environments through crowdsourced analytical photography and attacheddescriptions. The approach was developed in Ljubljana, Slovenia, as an experimentation programme of theEuropean Human Cities project running from 2014-2018 in eleven European countries. The project aims toencourage and enable civil society across Europe to actively contribute to urban regeneration of livingenvironments in participatory way.

1 INTRODUCTION

Many European cities that grew very quickly after the second world war face a big need for urbanregeneration nowadays. This does not apply only to some historic parts of the cities or the abandoned industrialareas, but more and more also to the large housing estates that were built to accommodate new working forcein the times of post-war redevelopment of the cities in 1950-1970 period. In many parts of Europe these areasare in a big need for the improvement of the rise of material standard of living in order to be competitive andin line with the expectations of the contemporary urban dwellers. It seems that the advancement of technicalsolutions and development of smart technologies successfully addresses these issues.

However, as an urban anthropologist Lisa Redfield Peattie (1998) argued, for our happiness creativeactivity, empathy and other values of community are of equal or even bigger importance than material standardof living. Her knowledge is created through numerous peace actions about urban planning that seeks socialchange by including all interests and groups in the planning processes. This reminds of the importance tounderstand the community's experience with its living environments. In order to do so, revealing people'sperceptions of their living environments is essential (Sarason, 1974 and 1986, Chavis and Pretty, 1999).This can be partly addressed by research of the shared values that residents of urban environmentshave in common. Knowing these values is important for setting up common visions for the future of localenvironments. Once the collective values of a local community are identified they can backbone the bottomupaction plans of community improvements with the active participation and involvement of the inhabitants.Shared visions for future developments are especially important in the field of urban public spacesas these are the common spaces aimed to address the needs of people of all walks of life. The new approachesto participatory redesign of public space are in the focus of a European project Human Cities that is runningunder Creative Europe program in eleven cities from 2014 to 2018. Its main aim is to test new approaches tourban regeneration by participatory improvements. Project partners are