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The Kosovo Assembly’s 2003 Law on Spatial Planning made municipalities responsible for drafting local and urban development plans and thus for defining their strategic vision.

Many municipalities, however, found the task difficult to implement because they lacked prior experience and because many staff did not have the requisite training. This was exacerbated by problems related to the 1999 military conflict.

In response to the legal requirements, some municipalities hired consultants. Others tried to draft their plans with the support of UN-Habitat, and recently other donor organizations. Yet some 13 municipalities out of 37 are still without these development guiding tools, according to the Kosovo Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning.

Since 2001, UN-Habitat has been working closely with Kosovo municipalities to help them build the capacity for this task in cooperation with civil society and in compliance with the Kosovo Spatial Plan. Over the years of its presence, UN-Habitat trained municipal officials in strategic planning and provided on-the-job assistance in addressing planning tasks.

Most recently, under the Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme, UN-Habitat embarked on the ambitious task of supporting smaller partner municipalities in drafting municipal and urban plans with the use of internal resources and promoting an inclusive, participatory approach to the planning process.

This work draws on years of UN-Habitat experience and cooperation with partners in conducting workshops for a number of Kosovo municipalities. The ten workshops held by the time of publication of this document, broke the stereotype of looking at spatial and urban planning as a highly technical activity best reserved for professionals. It opened up to ideas from ordinary people, citizens - the old and the young, men and women, the fit and the disabled.

Here we present a combination of an analysis of spatial and urban planning in Kosovo, observations and lessons learned from the workshops conducted in Kosovo municipalities, and a collection of planning tools, exercises and ideas for facilitators interested to test this method in their work.

This publication is designed to inspire a new generation of Kosovo planners and civil society activists. It is also to help the public at large plan for better, smarter, greener, and safer towns and cities which offer equal opportunities for all citizens.
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INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the war in Kosovo in 1999, UN-Habitat has been promoting good governance, security of tenure, sustainable human settlements development and inclusive spatial planning in Kosovo and the broader region. UN-Habitat’s interventions were focused on the establishment of institutions to deal with property and planning, such as the Housing and Property Directorate, the Kosovo Cadastre Agency, and the Institute for Spatial Planning within the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning.

Other interventions went to building capacities for efficient management of local governments through capacity building programmes and on-the-job assistance: Local Government Programme, and Municipal Support Programme (2000-2001), Urban Planning and Management Programme (2001-2003), the Governance and Development Planning Programme (2003-2006), Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme, phase 1 and 2 (2005-2011) and the current third phase of MuSPP (2011-2014). The initial programmes were funded by the Government of the Netherlands, while the Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme is funded by the Government of Sweden through the Swedish Development Cooperation.

UN-Habitat introduced the workshops early in 2007 to generate community-based ideas for long and short term urban and spatial planning as input for the Municipal and Urban Development Plans and their implementation. The workshops were set up as a three-way collaboration involving the municipality, civil society, and UN-Habitat as facilitator. Many were co-organized with the Kosovo based group, Cultural Heritage without Borders, and co-funded by the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung. In total ten of these visioning workshops were completed in the period 2007-2011. In November 2010, a conference organised by all involved and with the Kosovo Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning presented successful cases of inclusive visioning and planning throughout the entire process, including the implementation of some capital investment projects.

The conference revealed the need for a better understanding of the role and the process of visioning as a participatory planning tool. As a result, the drafting of a sourcebook and toolkit for visioning workshops was initiated. This toolkit explains a) the role of visioning in participatory planning; b) the methodology of visioning; and c) learning from the experiences in Kosovo.

The goal is to explore ideas and tools for future community visioning activities, to broaden and deepen the inclusive planning approach, and finally to contribute and advise in practical ways to improve the quality of life for all communities in Kosovo and elsewhere.

Using this Publication

This work is divided into seven chapters. The first sets the scene for post-conflict spatial planning for Kosovo, framed within the international literature on participatory strategic planning. The second chapter explores in more depth the notion of ‘community-visioning’ with a set of principles and guidelines, mainly based on international literature and best-practice experiences. The third describes the different ways and steps to set up a visioning project or workshop, including cutting edge methods and techniques with proven results. Chapter four presents the practice of visioning in Kosovo, with a focus on the ten community-visioning workshops organized by UN-Habitat and partners. Chapter five explores the results and indirect impacts of these visioning workshops in Kosovo. Chapter six draws lessons to be learned, including some proposals for ‘Future Visioning’. The last section concludes with a ‘Way Forward’.
More than a decade after the end of the conflict in mid-1999, and more than four years after the Unilateral Declaration of Independence on 17 February 2008, Kosovo still faces a difficult transition process.

The new Kosovo institutions are taking halting but definite steps towards democracy, market economy and European integration. However, it cannot be taken for granted that these steps are also leading to more sustainable development throughout wider society and all its communities.

Chaotic urban development, illegal construction, informal settlements, polluted air and rivers, illegal dumpsites, increasing automobile congestion, and substantive loss of natural and cultural heritage, are just some of the factors posing threats to the quality of life.

Since the end of the conflict, UN-Habitat has been promoting the concept of inclusive, strategic and action oriented spatial and urban planning in Kosovo. Adapting to meet international standards has required new planning legislation, institutions and practices. Kosovo’s outdated spatial planning legislation has been replaced by an inclusive, modern and multi-disciplinary planning approach.

A new Spatial Planning Law was drafted with the help of UN-Habitat and approved by the Kosovo Assembly in July 2003. Also with the help of UN-Habitat, a new Spatial Planning Institute was established, putting the academic theories into practice by drafting a Kosovo-wide spatial plan. The Kosovo Spatial Plan, finally approved by the Kosovo Assembly in June 2011, outlines the strategic vision for Kosovo and its municipalities, assigned by the new Spatial Planning Law with the task to draft their municipal and urban spatial plans.

Strategic planning allows planners and stakeholders to define together an overall development perspective, identify priority areas for action, and focus implementation in these areas rather than make unrealistic traditional ‘master plans’. The culture of ‘master planning’ and ‘land use planning’ is however still deeply embedded in the architect-planner community in Kosovo as well in the broadly understood Balkan region, in general.

In a lecture at an international planning conference in Istanbul in 2006, the author presented some critical ideas on planning and planners in Kosovo. (D’hondt F., 2008, Re-Creating Kosovo Cities). The breakthrough may not have occurred to its full extent, but there are some signs and trends that are pointing towards change. The Kosovo Association of Architects is slowly reinstating itself on the professional scene and a new Kosovo Association of Planners has recently been established. Both are advocating more strategic and participatory planning.

Civil society and local governments are also increasingly aware of the need for participatory planning and action, but they often both fall short in knowing how to affect these beyond the traditional means of information and consultation, little more than tokens in the decision-making process.

Achieving higher levels of engagement by ordinary people, direct and transparent involvement of all relevant stakeholders in the planning activities of local government is not yet a common practice that would accommodate a more collaborative way of strategic and action-oriented planning (see ‘Participation Ladder’ in Box 1).
However, still too often, participatory planning is conducted simply to comply with the law or to satisfy the demands of international donors supporting the planning process. There is a clear need for more authentic and customised participation approaches that take into account local cultures and codes.

Complimentary to the generic training and capacity building efforts by organizations such as UN-Habitat, there is a need for more specific local actions and pilot projects of inclusive and community based planning, as sought by the second and third municipal spatial planning programmes. But a more innovative approach to achieve inclusive planning in Kosovo is also needed at the central level.

The Law on Spatial Planning is based on the concept of participatory strategic planning, but its practical interpretation is often limited to one-way information and consultation, very basic steps of the participation ladder. To be effective, participatory planning needs to engage other methods of communication and civic engagement (as shown in the ‘Participation Ladder’).

Information standards refer to the practice of providing publicly accessible information about the planning process and its deliverables (e.g. Municipal Profile, Stakeholder Analysis, Investment Capacity Assessment, Vision and Strategy, comprehensive draft Municipal and/or Urban Development Plan). The information should be made accessible through different means such as the municipal website, flyers, brochures, posters, public debates, exhibitions, the local media, etc.

The current practice of consultation on key planning deliverables is mandatory, before a draft Municipal Development Plan for consent to the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning. It entails activities such as a public presentation and debate of the draft document, preferably at several places within the municipal territory, in order to reach out to remote areas, and give local residents the chance to comment on the draft document. After closure of the public review, the municipality should make a report of all the remarks and outline how these remarks will be addressed in the final draft.

In case the comments or amendments are rejected, such decisions should be justified. This practice is still in an emerging and transitional phase, partly because the strategic and participatory planning education is still very limited in Kosovo. There is still no Faculty or Master programme in Spatial and Urban Planning at the University of Pristina.

However, well-trained and experienced planners are not enough to secure real civic participation in spatial planning and decision-making.

---

**BOX 1.**

**PARTICIPATION LADDER**

A typology of eight levels of participation may help analyze this confused issue. For illustrative purposes these eight types are arranged in a ladder pattern with each rung corresponding to the extent of citizens’ power in determining the end product. The bottom rungs describe levels of ‘non-participation’ contrived by some to substitute for genuine participation. Rungs 3 and 4 progress to levels of ‘tokenism’ that allow citizens to hear and be heard, but without any commitment that decision-makers will heed their views. When participation is restricted to these levels, there is no assurance of changing the status quo. Rung 5, ‘placation’, is simply a higher level of tokenism because the ground rules allow citizens to advise, but retain for the power-holders the continued right to decide. Further up the ladder are levels of citizen power with increasing degrees of decision-making influence. Citizens can enter into a ‘partnership’ (rung 6) that enables them to negotiate and engage in trade-offs with traditional power holders. At the topmost rungs, ‘delegated power’ (7) and ‘citizen control’ (8), citizens obtain full managerial power.

Obviously, the eight-rung ladder is a simplification - in the real world of people and programmes, there might be 150 rungs with less sharp distinctions among them - but it helps to illustrate the point that there are significant gradations of citizen participation. Knowing these gradations makes it possible to understand the increasingly firm demands for public participation well as the confusing responses from power holders and decision makers. Source, including the participation ladder figure: [http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.pdf](http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.pdf) (Originally published as “A Ladder of Citizen Participation,” S. Arnstein)
making. This is clearly demonstrated by many other European countries with decent planning education, but underperforming public participation.

The main drivers for change from ‘non participation’ towards ‘partnership’ and ‘citizen power’ are not the planners but civil society, together with a section of the political class, whose aim is to empower people and create a ‘culture of participation’.

However, a weak ‘grassroots’ civil society and a political class defending corporate interests, rather than the public interest, are likely to be the most critical factors which to some extent make it difficult to achieve real participatory planning in Kosovo.

As the leading positions in the public administration are often politically affiliated, many civil servants are unable to bridge the gap between civil society and the elected politicians, partly due to this affiliation and partly due to a high turnover of staff following the short cycles of local and central-level elections.

Despite the training efforts by many international organizations such as UN-Habitat, the municipal management and planning capacities in particular require further strengthening to tackle the challenges and tasks ahead.

This is further complicated by flaws in public budgeting and spending: a) there is no clear link between the allocation of budget lines and the capital investment projects selected in local development plans; b) the budget allocated for spatial planning is mostly used to outsource the entire planning process to a private consultant contractor; and c) there is no specific budget line for public participation and involvement.

**LEARNING CURVE**
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Land-use Plans  |  now / later

Projects

Strategic Plans

Non Participation

**Fig. 2**

**BOX 2.**

**PLANNING AND THE LAW**

The Law on Spatial Planning, approved by the Kosovo Assembly in July 2003, can be considered an ambitious law to foster inclusive and sustainable spatial development in Kosovo. Its aim is to “promote an inclusive and participatory process of formulating development strategies and physical plans, which includes all stakeholders and communities without discrimination, men as well as women.” (Article 3b, the Law on Spatial Planning). At central level, it says, “the Spatial Plan of Kosovo shall establish the long-term principles and goals of spatial planning for the entire territory of Kosovo for a period of at least ten years. The Spatial Plan of Kosovo shall be a strategic multi-sector plan, which shall be based on visions and goals proposed by the Ministry of Spatial Planning, through public participation” (Article 11a). Furthermore, “each municipality shall be responsible for preparing a Municipal Development Plan covering its entire territory for a period of at least five years” (Article 13.2). “It shall be consistent with the Spatial Plan of Kosovo” (Article 13.5).

“The Municipal Development Plan contains the required textual and graphic components (Article 1 of the Administrative guideline No. 33), including a Vision for the future of the municipality, Principles and Goals, a Spatial Development Framework and Implementation Strategies and Actions. The Spatial Development Framework expresses the desired spatial structure for the territory of one or more municipalities. The Implementation Strategies and Actions provide a bridge for the transition between the existing situation and the spatial framework.” Article 19 is dealing specifically with public review and participation, but the practical details of the procedure are provided in an administrative instruction.

The Ministry of Spatial Planning and UN-Habitat Kosovo issued a special leaflet to promote and explain the legal requirement of public participation. This short presentation of the Law on Spatial Planning in Kosovo justifies the importance of spatial visioning and the use of spatial concepts to implement the Law. See also: Leaflet on public participation in planning, UN-Habitat Kosovo.
The “learning curve” diagram illustrates the process of learning which is also applicable to participatory planning in Kosovo.

The learning curve starts from the lower, left-side quarter that is primarily characterized by a combination of non-participatory ‘land use plans’ and ‘masterplans’, as the basis for issuing planning and building permits. This was clearly the case in the former Yugoslavia, but remains the main practice today, although sometimes ‘sweetened’ with the flavour of public participation. The learning curve however should move the planning community in particular and the Kosovo society in general to the diametrically opposite quarter, characterized by a truly participatory strategic and action planning. This kind of ‘Strategic Spatial Planning’ is characterized by a ‘four-track process’, which is depicted in fig. 3.

The Local Agenda 21 Programme (see Box 3) adopted the multi-track process as a continuous process of visioning. The first track is leading towards a long term planning framework with a vision of the intended development of the planning area, spatial concepts, a long-term programme and a short-term action plan.

The second track is to manage everyday life, resolve conflicts, score ‘goals’ and create trust by solving problems and implementing urgent and strategic project in the short term. The third track is engaging all stakeholders in the cooperative, planning and decision-making process. The fourth track is to achieve a more permanent process of public and stakeholder involvement throughout all phases of planning, including implementation, monitoring, evaluation and reviewing of plans.

**STRATEGIC SPATIAL PLANNING**

A four-track process

1. Working towards a long term vision
2. Daily policy - solving bottlenecks - actions
3. Engaging actors and citizens in the planning and decision process - dispute resolution
4. Permanent action - civic involvement

**BOX 3.**

**LOCAL AGENDA 21**

Local Agenda 21 is the local version of ‘Agenda 21’, a comprehensive plan of action to be taken globally, nationally and locally by organizations of the United Nations in every area with human impacts on the environment. Chapter 28 states that the participation and cooperation of local authorities will be a determining factor in fulfilling its objectives. The ‘Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide’ has been prepared to assist local governments and their local partners to learn and undertake the challenging task of sustainable development planning. This planning approach is a fundamental first step that will enable them to provide the residents of their communities with assets to satisfy basic human needs, rights, and economic opportunities, and at the same time ensure a vital, healthy, natural environment; in other words, a planning approach that will enable them to manage their cities, towns, and/or rural settlements in a sustainable way. The Guide offers tested and practical advice on how local governments can implement the United Nations’ Agenda 21 action plan for sustainable development and the related United Nations’ Habitat Agenda. Sources: [http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21](http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21) and (including illustration above and diagram at right) [http://www.idrc.ca/openebooks/448-2/](http://www.idrc.ca/openebooks/448-2/)
The LA21 Planning Guide (see Box 3) outlines the different elements and steps to be taken to achieve sustainable development planning (fig 3). This engages residents, key institutional partners, and interest groups, often labeled as stakeholders, in designing and implementing action plans. Planning is carried out collectively among these groups. It is organized so as to represent the desires, values, and ideals of the various stakeholders within the community, particularly local service users. There is remarkable variation in the types of stakeholders whom different communities have involved in planning. In general, the creation of a dedicated structure or Stakeholder Group to coordinate and oversee stakeholder involvement in planning is an important first step in any sustainable development planning effort. Typically, the first task of such a Stakeholder Group is to formulate a ‘Community Vision’, which describes the community’s ideal future and expresses a local consensus about the fundamental preconditions for sustainability.

It is now clear that a Community Vision is a key starting point in Strategic Spatial Planning. This in turn is part of the broader framework of ‘Sustainable Development Planning’ that is needed to steer more sustainable spatial and urban development throughout society. But it should also be clear that the more responsive and dynamic strategic planning approach could only work well through the pro-active implementation of strategic projects, measures, actions, triggers, etc. However, all the projects and actions need to be clearly framed within the vision. The strategic spatial vision serves thus as a frame of reference that steers spatial development.

**BOX 4.**

**NEGOTIATED URBAN DESIGN**

This book deals with so-called ‘trialogues’ between three dimensions of urban planning and development: visions, actions and projects, and ‘co-productions’. Inspired by ‘Strategic Structure Planning’, this approach has been adapted to the specific aims and means of the LA21 process in the cities, including Nakuru (Kenya), Essaouira (Morocco), Vinh (Vietnam), and Bayamo (Cuba).

“Urban design is a powerful tool. It plays a key role in the formulation and realization of strategic urban projects. It is a crowbar for innovation and a gate to unexpected solutions. It has the capacity to serve as a medium for negotiation and consequently leads to strong, stimulating and simultaneously open-ended plans, leaving margins for evolution and adaptation; contradictions can transcend into productive paradoxes.”

(‘Urban Trialogues’, p.196)

The Park-edge Projects – with a light landscape design – contributed to and substantiated the vision of Nakuru as an eco-city. It is one of the many illustrations of the enriching dialogue between vision and action.

**Source:** Urban Trialogues: Localising Agenda 21, UN-Habitat, PGCHS, K.U.Leuven (author), 2004 (see also http://ww2.unhabitat.org/programmes/agenda21/urban_trialogues.asp)
Chapter 1: Planning in transition

The interplay of vision and action is not only the most crucial but also the most difficult to achieve, not only in Kosovo (see Box 4 on ‘Negotiated Urban Design’). Again without any empirical data or research, it can only be stated as a hypothesis that most urban and spatial interventions and projects are designed and implemented on a pure *ad hoc* basis, without reference to a guiding vision. In the few cases visions and plans exist, it is difficult to see the link between vision and action.

**URBAN DESIGN**

Except for the obvious root causes related to poor cooperation between local governments and civil society and the lack of education system, one of the main reasons for this weak interplay between vision and projects is the lack of urban or spatial design.

In this sourcebook, urban design is considered as the art of ‘participatory placemaking’. Urban design can be seen as the bridge between the registers of planning and architecture, between society and people, between abstract spatial visions and real places; and even between the old school master planning and new school strategic planning.

Although urban design is most tangible at ‘street level’ (a square, a park, a building block, a neighbourhood, a city district), it is also applicable at city-wide and regional scales, by incorporating the third dimension (height), and designing more harmonious urban and peri-urban landscapes.

Urban designing and landscape architecture and planning are thus regarded as complementary disciplines, making abstract spatial visions and intended spatial structures more tangible and for that reason also more attractive to public and stakeholder involvement.

Urban design can be used as a tool for negotiation towards a workable synthesis of conflicting realities. Design can help in the formation of agreements between primary stakeholders.

However, urban designs are not ‘designed’ as blueprint plans, but rather as intermediate steps, and means to explore the potential of urban or peri-urban sites, just as visions do at a more abstract level.

Urban designs are not only expressed by glossy artist impressions we know from real estate developers, but also simple drawings, sketches, (‘photo-shopped’) images sufficiently detailed to be atmospheric and inviting, attractive and targeted to trigger public debate.

*Negotiation by design* (see Box 4) should trigger dialogue among urban experts, policy makers, ordinary people and special interest groups.

“The art of urban design fundamentally lies in the maintenance of a productive dialogue achieved through a process of continual revision of visions and projects without sacrificing their essential qualities and characteristics while also strengthening their qualities, coherence and persuasiveness,” says the publication *Urban Triialogues*.

It adds: “Though the step-by-step, negotiating process is undeniably complicated, the basis of agreement is eventually expressed by way of a reference plan — a drawing. Such a plan is neither a cocktail of individual interests, nor an uninteresting grey compromise, but a precise and engaging translation of a collective and coherent development vision with structural and strategic principles.

“The visions developed are translated into a reference plan with ‘consensus’ and therefore legitimacy. In the LA21 Programme, formal ratification by the different actors involved and an appropriate proclamation of its existence was recommended. (...) The reference plan then becomes the basis upon which concrete interventions and real execution plans and strategic urban projects are developed. Of course, in practice the process is evidently not linear, but as already stated an iterative process, which constantly shifts between various scales, concerns, and priorities.

“The design process organizes the interplay between vision, project and co-production, while management of the design process further stimulates the interaction between co-production and the reference plan.”

Thus *participatory strategic spatial planning*, combined with *negotiation by design and placemaking*, are the main planning components to frame the need, importance and quality of ‘community visioning’ as a key tool in inclusive planning, from first steps and throughout the entire planning process.
PLACEMAKING IN KOSOVO

Public space is a major challenge in Kosovo with particular difficulties, partially due to:

- The limited consideration for public space in general;
- The heritage of socialist era spaces that need reinvention and re-appropriation;
- Increasing car traffic and parking needs;
- Private usurpation of public space;
- Lack of public funds;
- Lack of stakeholder involvement and coordination;
- Lack of maintenance strategies.

The Municipal Spatial Planning design tour in 2008 and the guidelines produced in this framework were well received by local urban planners and have given a sense of what can be achieved. Kosovo should build on this positive experience, putting theory into practice and construct examples of positive place making in Kosovo. So-called placemaking is an objective of urban design. It implies a design process that seeks to enable people who live in cities to get more from their surroundings. More opportunities to move around their area, more opportunities to meet people, more opportunities to learn, to grow, to express themselves, enjoy beauty and be moved, to be inspired and to connect with each other and their surroundings. Placemaking does this by intervening in the public realm to create places that facilitate people to interact with each other and their surroundings in such a way, which can better satisfy their needs. In other words placemaking seeks to enable people’s enjoyment of ‘places’ where they spend their time rather than just ‘spaces’ that they pass through. Getting people to value shared space; to recognize its contribution to people’s lives and to provide the democratic mandate for cities to make and pay for improvements is essential. This may seem like a big demand, but visionary leadership and coordinated programmes of information, education and public works have changed the culture of cities, and brought economic benefits in places as diverse as Bogota in Colombia, Copenhagen in Denmark, Melbourne in Australia and Tirana in Albania. Given that urban areas are inherently complex and have both physical (i.e. built form) and social dimensions (i.e. how people act and feel about their surroundings), achieving good urban places requires getting the process and product right. Getting the process right in so far as the social dimension can be adequately considered and getting the product right so the qualities created within the spaces are relevant and helpful to the people who will experience them. For more; see: “The need for Urban Design in Kosovo”, Jenny Donovan, Leaflet UN-Habitat Kosovo, March 2008. (see Annex 2)
Many communities or their leaders allow the future to happen to them, for instance by outsourcing the vision to a professional planner or planning consultancy; or worse still, by not getting involved themselves at all. Successful communities, however, recognize that the future is something they can shape, at least within the given socio-economic framework.

“Coming together is a beginning, staying together is progress, working together is success.”
(Poem)

These communities take time and hard effort to produce a vision of the future they desire and employ in the process that helps them achieve their goals. One of the best ways of arriving at these long-term community goals and for achieving them is through community-visioning projects and processes.

Such a process brings together all interest groups and sectors of a community to jointly identify problems, evaluate changing conditions and build collective approaches to improve the quality of life in the community.

In some cases, community vision relates to a neighbourhood or a specific area; in others to a village, town, city or even a region including multiple cities, towns and villages; it may even refer to non-spatial community development objectives.

Visioning is basically a process by which a community envisions the future it wants, and plans how to achieve it. It brings people together to develop a shared image of what they want their community to become. A vision is the overall image of what the community wants to be and how it wants to look at some point in the future. A vision statement is the formal expression of that vision, while a vision design is a visualized expression of that vision.

The vision statement and design are the first steps for the creation and implementation of strategic action plans (see also The Community Planning & Design Handbook).

The essence of the visioning processes is providing the condition for networking and allowing the diverse groups to come together and interact. This often leads to the discovery of new, formerly hidden, leaders or project champions. There-
fore community visioning is as much about the quality of the process as about the quality of the outcome.

For many participants in a visioning workshop, it is the first, and maybe the only, time when they are involved in such an intensive collaborative process. If the visioning workshop is done properly, it is very likely that many of the participants will stay involved in the further planning and implementation process, and thus contributes to a local culture of participation.

As much as a successful visioning process is a potential and powerful leverage for changing the culture of participation, so can a vision generate a powerful momentum for changing and improving the quality of life in a certain territory.

A vision is a useful tool on which to focus hopes and aspirations, framing project and setting priorities. The vision describes where community members would like themselves to be in the next 10, 20 or 30 years in terms of the key areas relating to the quality of life, such as e.g. education, employment prospects or, infrastructure. The vision statement must reflect the commonly held values of the community and guide stakeholders for the remainder of the visioning and planning process. The concept of inclusive visioning refers both to the ‘inclusiveness’ of the community group and still more to the expected outcome in terms of a more inclusive city or community (see Box 6).

From its origins in the 1970s, collaborative and community visioning has become a widely used tool for participatory planning, for all kinds of territorial entities and for all stages of planning. The success story of Chattanooga is inspiring. Chattanooga was one of the first medium-sized cities in the United States to effectively use a citizen visioning process for specific long-term goals to enrich the lives of residents and visitors.

In 1969, Chattanooga received the dubious distinction of being named the most polluted city in the nation. Citizens, government and industry came together to address and tackle the issue.

On Earth Day 1990, Chattanooga was recognized as the best turnaround story in the country. Motivated by this remarkable achievement, Chattanooga initiated a community-wide visioning process and by 1992 it could already look back on an impressive number of projects implementing the community-vision. Many more remarkable practices followed, mainly in Europe (especially in the Nordic countries, the United Kingdom, The Netherlands and Germany as well in Asia through organizations such as the Asia Pacific Forum, see Landry’s Creative City). Landry classified good examples of Urban Visioning today into three types of cities: a) successful cities wishing to stay ahead in the urban game, b) crisis-ridden cities, most famously in the past and c) opportunity makers, such as emerging gateway cities between East and West (see fig. 4)

**BOX 6. INCLUSIVE VISIONING**

Participatory decision-making is one of the steps towards the ‘Inclusive City’. The ‘Inclusive City’ is a concept promoted by UN-Habitat through its ‘Global Campaign on Good Urban Governance’. An ‘Inclusive City’ is defined as “a place where everyone, regardless of wealth, gender, age, race, ethnicity or religion, is enabled to participate productively and positively in the opportunities cities have to offer.” (UN-Habitat, 2000). The idea of ‘Inclusive City’ can be also illustrated by a number of questions such as:

- Do citizens have equal access to clean water and other basic services?
- Are all ethnic groups given equal opportunities?
- How much are women involved in the citywide planning and decision-making?
- Are the poor given proper consideration?
- To what extent are other vulnerable groups in society such as the disabled, the elderly, the young involved and engaged?

This leads to other and more fundamental questions such as:

- Who controls what in the city and society?
- Who has access to what?
- Who is responsible for what?
- Who earns what?
- Who does what?

The ‘Inclusive City’ concept deals thus with power and power sharing, which can only be reached by truly participatory planning and decision-making. One of the basic criteria to achieve a more ‘Inclusive City’ is to undertake ‘Inclusive Visioning’. ‘Inclusive Visioning’ walks on two legs: one leg is about including all stakeholders and vulnerable groups in the visioning process; the other leg is to make sure that the vision (and the derived strategic action plan and projects) is contributing to a more ‘Inclusive City’. ‘Gender sensitive visioning’ can be regarded as a specific component of the ‘Inclusive Visioning’, aiming at providing equal access to opportunities offered by the city for all men and women, boys and girls in all aspects of society. This approach, often labelled as ‘Gender mainstreaming’ requires reaching for specific goals and objectives for the inclusion of gender issues. For more see the Gender Leaflet (http://www.unhabitat-kosovo.org/repository/docs/genderleaflet_eng.pdf)
Cities and communities that boosted their quality of life through successful visioning, planning and action can teach us more about success factors and guiding principles.

Without active citizen engagement in a visioning process, the community will end up with someone else’s vision of their community. Many municipalities went through this practice, with the vision, as part of the ‘Municipal Development Plan’, fully outsourced to a professional planner or planning consultancy.

Local ownership of the vision is the first ingredient for success, and can only be achieved through an inclusive visioning process. Every community has unique qualities that should help to define and shape the community’s vision.

Pre-formatted plans and planning processes cannot harness this unique variety. Local ownership however does not exclude external planning professionals or other stakeholders, but they have to be part of a community-driven process. Moreover, external planning professionals and stakeholders will be helpful to connect the local vision in both vertical and horizontal ways: vertically to ensure the inter-relationships with other governmental layers (national, regional, local); and horizontally to ensure connectivity with neighboring communities and in providing a regional framework perspective. It is essential that outcomes of the visioning process are not predetermined. The visioning is a learning experience for the community and it is important, if not crucial, that residents and stakeholders come to the visioning process with open minds and that the outcome of the process is not predetermined. For ‘start-up’ visioning, in the early stage of the planning process, the golden rule is that participants are ‘empty-handed’ (thus coming with no old plans, prior visions, reports of any kind; also no laptops or smart phones to surf the web).

These are just a few guiding principles. There are many more and Annex 3 carries a selection from a longer list presented in the comprehensive Community Planning Handbook and its website. Among those, some deserve further attention and exploration, as they are most relevant to the community visioning approach in this toolkit.

Accepting different agendas of visioning participants can be harnessed into different ways of visioning and even into different visions for the same area or topic. By tapping into different forms of creativity, different solutions can emerge and not all ideas can or have to fit into a single vision statement or design.

In the initial phase of the visioning process, participants should be encouraged to develop varied or multiple visions, to enlarge the perspectives. Only later on, in the planning process, there will be a need to merge different elements into one coherent vision that has the best chances for implementation. This can be related to the principle ‘be visionary, yet realistic’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Urban Visions</th>
<th>Frontrunners</th>
<th>Come-backers</th>
<th>Opportunists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classification of successful ‘visiondriven cities’ according to Charles Laundry (‘The Creative City’, 2008)</td>
<td>Successful cities wishing to stay ahead in the urban game. Often using events such as Olympic games to trigger visionary changes.</td>
<td>Crisis-ridden cities, most famously in the past.</td>
<td>Opportunity makers, such as emerging gateway cities between East and West as using new technologies to boost the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cities and municipalities part of the Visioning practice in Kosovo has been categorized indicative.</td>
<td>Barcelona, Frankfurt, London, New York, Shanghai, ...</td>
<td>Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Detroit, St Petersburg, Budapest, Glasgow, Berlin, Bilbao, ...</td>
<td>Vienna, Helsinki, Dubai, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Kosovo Prizren/Prizren, Peja/Pec and Gjakova/Djakovica could be seen as the frontrunners.</td>
<td>In Kosovo Mitrovica/Mitrovicë and Gjilan/Gnjilane could be labelled as crisesridden cities trying to come back.</td>
<td>In Kosovo Ferizaj/Uroševac, Han i Elezit/Đeneral Janković, Gracanica/Gračanica Mamusha/Mamuša and Jnik/Junik could be seen as opportunity-makers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although this is a good principle, realism will take over in later further planning stages, anyway. In other words, if ‘utopian’ ideas are curtailed too early, the process risks to end up with nothing really visionary in the end.

Building local capacity is another very important guiding principle for visioning processes. Although visioning workshops are not designed for capacity building, they do offer good opportunities to substantially increase capacities of their participants - not only for those residents with no experience or knowledge about visioning, let alone strategic action planning.

Local experts, local planning professionals working for different levels of the government, or those working within planning consultancy companies, can also learn a lot during visioning workshops. Very often they come to the visioning workshop with a prejudice that it will be a waste of time and that it does not make sense to cooperate with non-experts - basically with people who have no knowledge about planning and running a municipality. Throughout the workshop, however, most come down from their “ivory tower” and blend into the community, realizing and accepting that ordinary residents can be excellent ‘experts’ of their own neighbourhood or even the city.

Constructive and open-minded planners are listening more than talking. They are posing rather than answering questions, thus enabling the non-expert-visioning process. The guiding role of the facilitator, as well as the reflective role of a very limited number of external experts and animators is crucial for this two-way learning process. External experts and animators have to critically assess the visioning contributions according to the principles of sustainable development and the inclusive city.

A good way to involve all visioning participants is to allow all kind of expressions to illustrate their ideas and contributions to the vision. Most non-planners feel intimidated by the use of planning jargon.

People can participate far more effectively if information is presented visually rather than verbally and if they can also present their own ideas in a non-verbal way. Hidden artistic talent might come to the surface and bring greater quality to the visualization of the visions.

Hold the initial visioning workshop outside the home base. The main advantages from this retreat formula are that the entire community group is very committed to their task and it generates a special environment for positive group dynamics, unleashing fresh ideas and creative proposals, especially when the visioning workshop is spread over more days. workshop, as soon as possible upon return.

Spend money! Effective participation and visioning processes obviously comes at a cost, in time, energy and in budget. However, there are many methods to suit a range of budgets and much can be achieved using only people’s time and energy. But over-tight budgets usually lead to cutting corners and poor results.

It is of crucial importance to budget generously for public participation in general and for specific activities such as inclusive visioning workshops in particular. As it is easier to allocate public budget for planning than for participation, a rule of thumb is to allocate a certain percentage of that planning budget for planning participation purposes. This percentage should be no less than 5 pro-cent; however successful planning participation showed much higher figures, up to 20 pro-cent (see Annex 4 Spoor Noord in Antwerp, Belgium as a best case practice of inclusive visioning, planning and budgeting).

Now is the right time! Asked when is the right time to hold a visioning workshop, this is the only answer. The best time to start involving people is of course at the beginning of any planning process; the earlier the better, even before the data-gathering phase.

Record, document and follow-up. It is obvious, and it has to be done! Recording and documenting is a precondition for successful follow up. The follow up of the initial visioning takes places within the framework of the strategic action planning. During the course of this planning cycle, the vision will also undergo cyclic changes. This visioning cycle is further explained in Box 7. A growing local culture of visioning will go hand in hand with an improved local culture of participation. Planning professionals and consultant companies have their role to play in this respect, but the local community and its representation - the local government - should remain in the driving seat.

Work on location! Wherever possible, base community planning activities physically in the area being planned. This makes it much easier for everyone to bridge the gap from concept to reality. However, certain local circumstances might make it more appropriate to work on a different location. (for more guiding principles see Annex 3)
Visioning will be more successful if it is not undertaken as a stand-alone activity, and if it is also improved, multiplied and repeated over time. The diagram below illustrates the visioning cycle with some milestones. The initial and most crucial step is the creation of a preliminary vision for the planning area or topic, carried out by a representative community group during a visioning workshop. During the visioning workshop, proper recording is needed to safeguard all the deliverables, taking pictures and taking notes on the discussions. This material will ensure proper documentation and the production of a vision workshop report. The first step after the visioning workshop however is organizing a public event to share the process and products of the visioning workshop with all the residents and other stakeholders of the community. A second step is to fine-tune the vision statement and vision design, which could be integrated in the vision workshop report provided that it is made clear ‘what’ has been changed since the initial vision. The third step is to consolidate the vision into the formal planning document, for instance the municipal and/or urban development plan, a regulatory plan or any other kind of plan. This plan will become a formal planning document upon final approval by the competent government(s). The next and most crucial step is the gradual implementation of the vision and action plan. After a fixed term or whenever the changing circumstances require, there will be need for reviewing the vision, which could eventually lead the creation of a new vision, while capitalizing on the initial vision. During this visioning cycle there will also be a need for developing more detailed or specific visions on parts of the planning area or specific elements of the planning topic. For instance, after finalizing a vision for the entire municipality, there will be a need to focus in more detail on specific zones such as the urban centre, a river valley, a new green area with parks and sport fields, a business zone, etc. Additional visioning workshops can be carried out for each focus area or topic, separated or grouped in time and space. However, different visioning techniques and tools can be applied for different kinds of vision focus areas or topics.
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Now that the principles and guidelines are set, different ways and steps to set up a visioning project will be explored. Starting with the steps is more logical, as the different ways of visioning have many steps in common. The most common steps in a visioning project are shown in the diagram below. (fig. 5)

“where there is no vision, people perish”
(proverbs 29:1)

VISIONING IN STEPS

1. Visioning mandate
2. Visioning working party
3. Visioning logistics
4. Visioning participants
5. Visioning workshop
6. Post-Visioning activities

The visioning mandate refers to an agreement between the competent authority (e.g. the municipality, represented by the mayor) and the entity that will conduct the visioning workshop.

This entity could be a local or external non-governmental organization, a community-based organization, a local or external consultancy company, or even an international organization, such as UN-Habitat, or a donor.

In theory, it is possible to conduct a community visioning workshop without consent of the competent authority. This, however, would place this event outside the strategic planning process that is required to ensure that the vision will
be implemented through legitimated public actions. In other words, a mandated visioning workshop includes official public commitment to conduct an entire strategic planning process. This therefore ensures follow up of the initial visioning, more or less according to the aforementioned visioning cycle.

A visioning working party will mostly bring together representatives from both the organizing party or parties and the competent government or public authority. The working party will be responsible for the entire visioning process, including the public presentation and handing over of the visioning report.

The visioning logistics are a cluster of activities that are key for successful visioning workshops. Depending on the choice of location, the timeframe, the number of participants and the kind of resources needed, a detailed budget calculation will be required, as well as clear arrangements about the resourcing and potential need for sponsorship. Referring to the principle of ‘spend money’, the budget allocation should be well balanced with the expected outcomes and benefit.

Identifying and recruiting the visioning participants is one of the key factors of a successful visioning event. Broad community participation is desired, but in case the visioning workshop is designed for a limited number of people, a representative selection of stakeholders is required. The visioning working party should identify, select and brief the participants. Once the participants are selected and informed about their participation, a briefing should be organized to prepare them for the visioning workshop. This also allows selected participants to accept or reject the invitation and be replaced in good time.

The visioning workshop itself will be conducted following a prepared programme and a road map, which also requires flexibility to deal with unexpected factors.

The post-visioning activities entail events such as the public presentation, public relations and information actions, post-visioning workshops to fine-tune the vision and finally the report of the visioning workshop.

**KEY QUESTIONS**

The various steps will be further explored through a series of questions and answers.

**Question:** How to define the planning area and planning period?

**Answer:** In many cases the choice of the planning area might be quite straightforward, in particular if the visioning is intended for the entire municipality. But even in such a case, it is recommended to distinguish at least three levels of visioning: 1) for the entire municipality, 2) for a wider functional region around the municipality and 3) for specific target zones within the municipality (urban centre, villages, river valley, etc.). When the planning area is not so clearly defined, e.g. when the vision aims at the integrated development of a entire river valley, a mountain area, or even a metropolitan area stretching over more than one administrative entity, a preliminary analysis will be needed to justify a proposed planning and community boundary, thus including the identification of potential area stakeholders. Regarding the planning period, it is quite conventional to distinguish a long term (around 15-25 years into the future), a short term (around 5-10 years) and a medium term in between. The vision usually stretches out over the long term, while strategic interventions can be varied over these three timeframes. The planning terms do not necessarily need to be predetermined before the visioning workshop; they can be part of the community discussions as well.

**Q:** How to select participants and how many?

**A:** The importance of identifying and selecting a representative community group can hardly be overestimated. The best way forward is using a stakeholder analysis of the planning area.
The visioning working party should first identify the categories of community groups that should be included in the visioning process. A sample of the categories is showed below, with overlapping clusters of related groups. A more complete checklist is available on the community planning website, for instance. A balance of the ‘old guard’ and ‘new blood’ is just as important as a balance of planning professionals and non-professionals, or of people working for institutional organizations (such as the municipality, the region or the state) and the other residents in the planning area. Furthermore, as the American National Civic League notes, “it is important that participants act as citizens with a stake in the quality of life in the whole community, not simply as representatives of a particular organization, part of the town or issue.” (See The Community Visioning and Strategic Planning Handbook, p. 12). Be sure to target special interest groups such as environmental groups, but do not neglect to include people who are not part of any organized group in the community, such as homemakers. The visioning working party should make the final selection of participants. One way to collect candidates is an open vacancy and a selection based on expressed commitments, respecting the balances in terms of gender, age, educational and professional background, etc. Another way is to involve one or more NGOs or CBOs and let them propose a selection of participants. Yet another decision concerns the number of people to involve in a visioning workshop. Much will depend of course on the available resources but the larger the group, the better the chances for full representation. However, practice has taught that the best results are achieved with groups between 40 and 60 participants. However, there are also successful cases with larger groups involved, as demonstrated in the best-case example of Spoor Noord in Antwerp, Belgium (see Annex 4).

Question: How to select the location of the visioning workshop?

Answer: The facility should be politically neutral, so it should be outside the municipal building and its office space. It can be in the planning area but also outside, provided there is transport arranged to get the participants there and back home. The advantages and disadvantages of organizing the workshop within or outside the planning area have been already noted earlier, but there are additional aspects worth rising. In case of the lack of trust among different ethnic groups in the planning area, it is always advisable to try to locate the visioning workshop elsewhere, on a neutral ground, even outside the national borders if necessary. This was for instance the case with the first multi-day visioning workshop for the divided city of Mitrovica, in the north of Kosovo, with a hotel in Skopje as the most acceptable location for the workshop involving both the Kosovo Albanian and Kosovo Serb communities. The facility should also be large and flexible enough to hold a creative visioning workshop, with tables and chairs that can easily be moved and dragged around according to the needs of the different sessions (working groups, plenary sessions, theatrical presentation). The visioning working party should decide about the final location and facility, taking into account all the local circumstances and parameters such as the available budget or ability to raise necessary funds.

Question: How to choose the necessary timeframe for the workshop?

Answer: Visioning workshops can be done in a time span varying from a few hours to a few days. The ‘fast-track’ visioning workshops are in general only feasible with planning professionals. For mixed community groups, more time will be required to get them to making far-reaching plans for the future. Two days are the bare minimum and three to four days make the optimum for this purpose. A common practice is to plan the workshop including a weekend, starting on Friday and ending on Monday. During the weekend, more people are available and can make arrangement with their professional or household commitments. Once the visioning working group has decided on the timeframe, the second step is to establish the dates, taking into account the ‘community calendar’ so that the dates do not conflict with major school, sport, religious and other community activities. In general it is also better to avoid seasonal holidays breaks. A third step is to plan the preparatory and follow up activities and events, such as a briefing session for the participants, trainers, facilitators and moderators, the public presentation of the results of the visioning workshops and the drafting of the final report, including eventual fine-tuning sessions for the vision statements and designs. The final schedule should be communicated not only to the target participants, but also to the entire community and its leadership.

Question: How to select the equipment and support information?

Answer: An effective process begins with good information. Many or most of the workshop process builds on public input, but a solid base of technical information is critical for quality visioning. Existing plans, historic profiles, studies or reports, statistical information, laws and rules can all be useful but may also have a negative impact on the creative and ‘outside the Annex’ thinking and visioning, especially in its initial phase. Good base maps of the planning area however are essential, as well as additional aerial photos, if available. It is important to stimulate creative representation / reflection of visions through providing colour markers, tracing paper, colour paint sprays and other tools. The Community
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Handbook/Website provides a more comprehensive checklist of items, which may be helpful for all kinds of participatory planning activities. A specific checklist for visioning workshops will be displayed further in this publication, in the next chapter.

Question: How to choose a chairperson, facilitators and animators?

Answer: All these functions and roles have to be chosen and approved by the visioning working party. They are crucial for the success of the visioning process. A formal chairperson could be the chair of the working party, but is not always needed for visioning workshops. A chairperson is often perceived as the leader, while a visioning workshop should rather rely on shared leadership. The basic roles of a chairperson - time management in the first place - can be easily taken over by a facilitator. However, in case of more than one facilitator, a chairperson can be a link between all facilitators and the group.

A facilitator has a lower profile and is often perceived as less intimidating than a formal chairperson. A facilitator will indeed never take part in or influence the decision making process. A facilitator however has an important task to keep the group dynamics positive. The facilitator also must ensure that everyone participates or at least can participate. The facilitator’s main challenge is to ensure that all the essential steps in a visioning process are carried out according to the intended programme and schedule. The facilitator must also give a clear briefing at the start and a debriefing at the end of the workshop, including practical arrangements for the follow up in the further planning process. Finally, the facilitator has to ensure that the proceedings are well recorded (taking notes and photos). All these critical functions and roles require a well-trained person recruited locally or externally. Even better is to have two facilitators: one for the process management and one for the content management.

The content management facilitator must ensure that basic quality standards are met concerning the different steps in the visioning process, including the vision statement and design. The content facilitator should not operate as a master planner with do’s and don’ts, but rather as critical journalist with a large collection of reflective questions. Sam Goldwyn's famous quote “For your information, let me ask you a few questions” nails down the content facilitator's role. As with the process facilitator, content facilitators can be recruited from within or from outside of the community. An external and even foreign facilitator might have a more independent and fresher perception of the situation. In both cases, the content facilitator must be a qualified and experienced spatial or urban planner, with a broad scope of interest and with an in-depth knowledge of sustainable, inclusive, integrated and strategic development and action planning.

Annexes 5 and 6 explores more in detail the commitments of European planners and their vision on the inclusive city, which can be used as a steering guideline throughout a visioning process.

Finally a visioning workshop might also need animators. One type of animator has to keep the group active by using 'ice breakers', at the start of the working sessions and 'energizers', during the day. These process animators must have a good sense of humour, which can also be used in case tensions or emotions are running high. The second type of animator is again more content-related. Active listening and reflective questioning is more effective than imposing views. For more on the art of facilitation, see The Community Planning & Design Handbook and especially Participatory Workshops - a sourcebook of 21 sets of ideas & activities. It offers many valuable tips for facilitators, trainers, teachers and trainers of trainers; and all kind of activities to foster positive group dynamics.

Question: How to identify and find funding?

Answer: It will be clear by now that visioning projects require substantial financial and in-kind resources to cover administrative, logistical, research, outreach and facilitation costs. When all costs are taken into account, community-wide visioning projects can range from several hundred to several thousand euros. Much will depend on the type of visioning workshop and on the local economic environment. A visioning workshop in a developing country will generally cost less than in a developed country, mainly due to lower costs of logistics and lower rates of hiring people such as facilitators. For clarity: community participants should not be paid for their contributions throughout the visioning process. Regardless of the total cost of the workshop, the funding remains a critical factor that has to be solved before starting the process and raising expectations of the community. The first question is what money and in-kind resources can be raised from within the community for the implementation of the intended visioning process. The second challenge is how to cover the remaining costs and where to find sponsors. The first aim should be to find local sponsors such as the Chamber of Commerce, banks or other financial institutions, service organizations and religious or community institutions. If further funding is needed, regional, national or even international sponsors can be approached. However, in developing and/or post-conflict countries, it is often the international community providing the bulk of the funding, combined with in-kind support from local partners. It goes without saying that all sponsorship should be totally unconditional. If
the visioning process is done well, the ‘return on investment’ will be a largely supported community vision that will boost all sectors of society, including the interests of the sponsors.

**Question:** What kinds of activities are needed before and after the (initial) visioning workshop?

**Answer:** An essential key to the success of the community visioning process is an effective community outreach. This is needed, first of all, because not all community members can take an active part in the visioning process. And secondly, because there will always be some gaps in community representation in the visioning group, despite all efforts to recruit a representative stakeholder group. For a variety of reasons, certain groups cannot participate in visioning workshops and a special effort will be needed to reach out to those groups and individuals. The visioning working party could therefore be transformed into a follow up or outreach committee. This will ensure a smooth integration into the regular planning process and ensure that all the follow up steps are taken accordingly. From the start however, the visioning working group should hold a community briefing about the intended visioning workshop, with regard to the entire planning process. This briefing should target in particular the selected candidate participants, but it would be even better to organize a public briefing, so that all community groups could be informed, including the local media. After the visioning workshop, a public debriefing should be organized within a reasonable time of not more than a month. This public event allows the visioning group to present its ideas, vision statements and vision designs. The public should be given opportunities to question and debate the outcomes, while the moderator or facilitator should also highlight the further follow-up process and make it very clear that no formal decisions were taken during the visioning workshop. Local media should also be involved in this public event and be provided with a brief press release and some illustrations of the visioning workshop (images are often more convincing than words). The mayor and other officials should attend this public presentation and ‘accept’ the visioning results as an input to the formal planning process. But, neither here nor during the visioning workshop, should the mayor or any other officials dominate the workshop, or the presentation, and give the impression that this is now the official vision. The last critical step to conclude a visioning workshop is to produce a comprehensive report. Very often there will be a need to fine-tune some elements of the vision, or to elaborate more on the integrated desired spatial structure. This is acceptable as long as the report makes it clear what changes have been made since the visioning workshop and why. Even more important is to ensure that the community members who were part of the visioning workshop are involved in the eventual fine-tuning.

The report on the work of the community visioning process serves many of the same objectives as the public presentation (i.e. reflecting the process, acknowledging contributions to date, building momentum etc.). At the same time, it is a flexible tool that can be used to inspire organizations and companies to embrace the community vision and frame parts of their own strategic planning around it. The report also serves as a reminder to the authorities and the community of their commitments and provides for future efforts with a basis on which to build. The purpose is to use it, and not to have a nice publication left on the shelf to gather dust. But in this digital age, the Internet can also be used as a public platform to inform and discuss the visioning process and products. The government body responsible for the planning tasks could open a project home page on the visioning and the related planning process, but it is also something other stakeholders can do. Online surveys and feedback Annexes can foster a more interactive virtual visioning community, and more innovative approaches can be gradually applied to further increase participation through electronic media.

“**What I need is someone who will make me do what I can**”

Ralph Waldo Emerson
**THE APPROACH**

Now that the elements of the visioning process have been described, an exploration of the different ways of visioning can start. There are many and it is up to the visioning working party to select the most appropriate model, matching the community needs as well as possible degree as well as matching the resources that are available or can be mobilized.

This figure shows a selection of a wide variety of participatory planning methods with a visioning component. Some examples are taken from *Participation Works! 21 Techniques of Community Participation for the 21st Century* by the New Economics Foundation (1997). Others are taken from *The Community Planning Handbook/Website* (up-to-date). Some of the methods are more generic and broad in scope, such as community planning event, roundtable workshop and field workshop; while others are more specific and narrow such as vision fair or electronic mapping. Among the methods, four are more developed and more structured.

The so-called choices method is a systematic way of involving as many members of the local community as possible in developing an urban vision and inspiring them to act accordingly. Chattanooga, which won a UN-Habitat Best Practices award in 1997, undertook ReVision 2000 in 1993 after the original exercise of Vision 2000 had met most of its goals set in 1984. It took a year to plan and three months to implement. It has four steps: generating community ideas through a myriad of community meetings; presenting all ideas to vision workshops led by facilitators; clustering the ideas into goals; and finally the selection of actions at a ‘Vision Fair’ (see also *The Creative City*, Landry 2008).

The so-called future search method generates action by building a shared vision among a diverse group of people. It enrols a large group ideally 64 community members, who form eight tables of eight stakeholder or topic groups. They take part in a highly structured two and half-day process covering five stages: 1) review the past, 2) explore the present, 3) create ideal future scenarios, 4) identify shared vision and 5) make action plans. One of the first future search workshops took place in 1995 in Hitchin in Hertfordshire, which created a Whole Settlement Strategy. Since then over 35 future search conferences have taken place in the United Kingdom alone (see www.futuresearch.net).

The so-called planning-for-real method creates a large ‘3D model’ of the area for which a plan has to be made. The model is taken around several venues for discussion. People can put their ideas forward through suggestion cards. Planning-for-real is used worldwide (see www.planningforreal.org.uk). A similar method is the Participatory 3D Modeling developed for Natural Resource Management in the Philippines – a relatively new communicative facilitation method conceived to support col-

### VISIONING METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Search</th>
<th>Community planning event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Session</td>
<td>Electronic Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charrette</td>
<td>Planning Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Weekend</td>
<td>Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Search</td>
<td>Enspirited Envisioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Vision to Action</td>
<td>Urban Design Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Urban Design Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charrette</td>
<td>Planning Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Weekend</td>
<td>Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Map</td>
<td>Field Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charrette</td>
<td>Planning for Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Day</td>
<td>Participatory 3D modelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Planning for Real | U | 24
Visioning Toolkit

 qualify the process and add it to their planning system. It integrates people's knowledge and spatial information (contour lines) to produce stand-alone scale relief models that have proved to be user-friendly and relatively accurate data storage and analysis device. It is, at the same time, an excellent communication media. Participatory 3D modeling works best when used jointly with GPS Global Positioning Systems and GIS Geographic Information Systems in a participatory GIS context (see www.iapad.org/participatory_p3dm).

The so-called charrette method is widely used of community visioning. The word charrette may refer to any collaborative session in which a group of planning designers drafts a solution to a planning or design problem. There are two basic charrette varieties: Visioning charrettes, with speculative exploration of a possible future not tied to any planned development or project proposal; and implementation charrettes, conducted when there is a need for an implementable plan. While the structure of a charrette varies, depending on the design problem and the individuals in the group, charrettes often take place in multiple sessions in which the group divides into sub-groups. Each sub-group then presents its work to the full group as material for future dialogue. Such charrettes serve as a way of quickly generating a design solution while integrating the aptitudes and interests of a diverse group of people. In urban planning, the charrette typically refers to intense and possibly multi-day meetings, involving officials, developers and residents. Other uses of the term charrette occur within an academic or professional setting, whereas urban planners invite the general public to their planning charrettes. Many municipalities around the world develop long-term city plans or visions through multiple charrettes - both communal and professional. Notable successes include the city of Vancouver (see ‘Wikipedia’ and www.charretteinstitute.org). Similar models are Design fest, Design workshop and Urban Design Studio (see Community Planning Handbook). A common feature of all the charrette models is the design brief—a written explanation for the designer or design team outlining the aims, objectives and milestones of a design project. The charrette model and the technique of a design brief will be further explored in the chapter on lessons learned and future visioning.

However, some lesser-known and/or more specialized techniques might also be helpful to ‘assemble’ the right model for each particular case. Ideas competition for instance is a spiritual technique to undertake “deep imagining” through the creation of individual visions of the future before sharing with others and matching visions into a strategy for action. Guided visualization is a similar approach that takes a group on an imaginary journey into the future. The technique has been widely used, particularly in education and for developing common vision around Local Agenda 21. Numbers of participants have varied from small groups to 160, with several facilitators. A success story is Gloucestershire’s Vision 21 established in 1994 in response to Agenda 21. Its innovative work on community consultation in drawing up Gloucestershire’s Local Agenda 21 has received wide acclaim. Since developing this manifesto, Vision 21 has concentrated on supporting and delivering sustainability projects in Gloucestershire, which address global concerns at the local level. It all started in 1996 with a group of 40 youngsters that were invited to spend a weekend together to envision a more sustainable future for their community, using the format of ‘guided visualization’. Once they had imagined their day in the future, they were asked to identify three ‘balloons’ (wishes) and three weights, or things that might prevent their desired future. They then looked at ways of overcoming these obstacles. They presented their vision to the municipal council officials, business leaders, etc. Five years later, the Vision 21 website is functioning as an interactive community tool with focus on concrete local initiatives to fight climate change (see www.vision21.org.uk).

Using cutting edge computer technology in community visioning and action planning is still in an experimental stage. However, the public seems to be eager to explore virtual city planning and building, considering the success of computer and Internet games such as ‘Simcity’, ‘CityVille’ and ‘FarmVille’. Visualizing your community with Google Earth and Google SketchUp is an article written by Kent Morisson in the journal Main Street Now (edition Jan/Feb 2010).

While Google’s search engine, e-mail, and other web-based services are convenient, the combination of Google Earth and Google SketchUp offers an outstanding application for historic preservation and planning, the author argues. Using these tools, any community can affordably create and use a ‘3D environment’ in which the existing and the proposed can
be viewed side by side, before ever being built. The article introduces Google Earth and related tools and shows how they are facilitating community vision and historic preservation. It also refers to the aforementioned best practice case of Chattanooga. One of its more recent projects is to work with citizens to turn its flat, aerial-view-only presence on Google Earth into a 3D representation of the city they love and are working to improve. To learn more about the project and to watch their progress, visit www.chattanooga3d.com. PICT – Planning Inclusion of Clients through eTraining - was an innovative transnational and EU-funded project using techniques such as SketchUp. The project was designed to modernize training provision across Europe. Local authorities, universities, private consultancies and social partners in four European countries, Belgium, Greece, Hungary and the UK, took part in this project. The project aims to develop innovative ‘e-Training’ for communities and professional planners to help them handle the requirements of e-governance and in particular to serve the participation process. The objectives of the project include the diagnosis of the training needs of planners and the public through empirical research; the active involvement of local communities in participating areas through the establishment of local partnerships to monitor and animate the project activities; the delivery of training through alternative e-media and the comparison of results; the networking of professionals, academics and community groups to encourage wide use of the project products and transferability to other areas; and the cross-fertilization of experience and expertise between the partners (for the practical cases see www.e.pict.hu).

Now varied models of community visioning have been explored, we should also analyze in more detail some of the building blocks, which are commonly used in many of those models. Three building blocks are critical for a successful visioning process:

- The past, or how to harness valuable memories of the planning area in the past as a resource for future visioning.
- The present, or how to make a spatial portrait of the planning area today, including current trends and strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (“SWOT”).
- The future, or how to create a community vision based on the past and the present.
CHAPTER 4
VISIONING IN PRACTICE
KOSOVO’S EXPERIENCE

Following earlier more theoretical description, this chapter describes the visioning process conducted in Kosovo and shares experience collected during this process. For a snapshot on Kosovo, see Annex 7. Since the ethnic conflict ended in 1999, Kosovo has been facing an unprecedented construction boom and growth of urban areas.

This is partly the consequence of the war-time destruction of housing stock, the post-war migration in search of better and/or safer living conditions and employment, as well as the global urbanization trend. Cities within their former boundaries are unable to provide space for new investment, which leads to unplanned and uncontrolled urban development. Informal settlements become a common sight on the city outskirts; illegal constructions proliferate; and the access to services, although improving over time, is still not satisfactory.

The Unilateral Declaration of Independence by Kosovo in 2008 puts on Kosovo’s institutions the responsibility for building democratic and law-abiding structures, passing supporting legislature and building capacities of civil servants. This relates also to spatial development and gradual adoption of European standards and international principles for sustainable urbanization and good urban governance. The resolution of property issues and incorporation of informal settlements into local development plans continue to be an important factor in creating sustainable urban settlements in Kosovo.

The visioning story in Kosovo goes back to the end of 2004 and early 2005, when UN-Habitat’s Governance and Development Planning Programme (GDPP) in Kosovo organized a series of special training sessions on spatial visioning and the use of spatial concepts. The special focus of the Programme, was on capacity building and training of central and local level institutions and civil servants dealing with spatial and urban planning issues. This was coupled with special lectures at the University of Prishtina/Pristina, at the Faculty of Architecture, as part of the learning module on spatial and urban planning. One of the training series aimed in particular at a better understanding and practical use of spatial visions and concepts, as critical leverage for strategic action planning. As a result of the positive feedback from the trainees of the Institute of Spatial Planning, a field trip across Kosovo was organized in January 2005, to explore interest in testing the visioning theories in practice, and to interview municipal and central level spatial planners about their positive or negative experiences with strategic spatial planning, the municipal development plan or the central-level Kosovo Spatial Plan, the use of spatial visions and concepts, and the involvement of stakeholders and the public. Some of the overall conclusions remain valid also today:

- The planning profession in Kosovo is in a transitional phase. Most planners are architects who learn planning by doing. In most other European countries, the spatial planning profession is more diverse and recruits professionals from different disciplines.
- The diagnostic and analytical part of the planning process consumes a lot of time and energy, hampering the more strategic planning phases.
- Due to uncertainty caused by the lack of data and proper surveys, many Kosovo planners are reluctant to envision the future by sketching and conceptualizing.

1 For the snapshot on Kosovo refer to Annex 7
As a consequence of lacking ‘in-house’ planning capacities, the entire planning process is often outsourced to private consultancy. This creates a cycle of the local ‘planning poverty’ through not using opportunities to build local expertise.

Most municipalities, however, showed interest in visioning. In response to this interest, a pilot-visioning project was designed in cooperation with the Institute of Spatial Planning at the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning. The first phase was limited to an internal visioning workshop, and if successful, was to be followed by a visioning seminar with community involvement.

Three municipalities (Peja/Peć, Shkodër/Shtrumy and Mitrovica) were selected to participate in the pilot project through participating in small scale visioning workshops, together with an in-house visioning workshop involving all staff of the Prishtina/Pristina based Spatial Planning Institute of Kosovo. On each occasion, planners mainly conducted the visioning exercise during morning sessions, and then presented their findings to a group of stakeholders, including political leadership, e.g. the mayor.

The planning area at local level was defined as the entire area of the municipality. In the case of the workshop with the Institute, the topic of transport corridors was chosen as a focus and the planning area was defined as a specific topic rather than a spatial dimension. In both cases visioning groups were instructed to deliver thematic visions based on a) a spatial portrait with SWOT analysis and b) goals, objectives and a vision statement. The planners were encouraged to develop strategic vision designs and desired spatial structures.

The initial visioning exercises with the three pilot-municipalities generated very different outcomes, but were highly appreciated by most of the participants. Harnessing the result of the first visioning workshop with the Institute of Spatial Planning, a second workshop was organized with involvement of the Ministry of Transport. For this workshop a more detailed briefing was provided, including instructions and rules on the use of colours and symbols on the maps. This workshop turned out to be very successful and much appreciated by both ministries. The visioning workshop proved its added value in terms of a better mutual understanding and cooperation between the primary stakeholders. The visioning workshops with the Institute came at the right moment, as they were fully engaged in the finalization of an entirely new Spatial Plan of Kosovo, with the first consolidated draft published in December 2005. This plan could be labeled as the first modern style plan and planning process in Kosovo, applying the standards of participatory planning. However, the intended spatial structure, the main vehicle of the strategic development vision, was primarily the outcome of a wide consultation process, rather than the joint result of one or more inter-disciplinary and multi-stakeholder visioning workshops. Very innovative for Kosovo standards however, is the clear visualization of the intended spatial structure and the underlying or derived spatial concepts.

In the period December 2005-January 2006, UN-Habitat Kosovo Office provided technical assistance to the Department of Spatial Planning with the aim to explore the need and method for an urban policy framework. The rationale was the rapid urbanization of Kosovo, especially since the end of the conflict in 1999. This has caused two main trends with negative impacts on the sustainability of the urban environment: uncontrolled urban extensions and sprawl on one hand, and hyper-densification of existing urban centres on the other hand, especially in and around the capital city. Facilitated by an external UN-Habitat consultant, the Department of Spatial Planning explored the possibility and method of a “White Paper” as a first step towards an integrated urban policy framework. A delegation of the Department was assigned to an Urban Task Force and made field trips to record the effects of urban trends throughout Kosovo. The task force was taking pictures, notes, talking to municipal and state officers, as well with civil society representatives and travelled using a variety of urban transport modes, including the train (which was the first time ever for some of the participants). An internal visioning workshop took place to explore the perspective of an advanced urban policy. One of the outcomes was a vision concept called Kosovo City, expressing the vision of a poly-centric city network of the capital and the six regional cities, well connected by a modernized intercity-railway system, with outbound connection to neighbouring cities. This vision opposed the current spatial trend of mono-centric accumulation in and around the capital city.

The Kosovo-City vision formed the basis for the report, presenting an outline of a ‘White Paper on Urban Policy’. The report was presented and handed over to the minister of Environment and Spatial Planning. By way of follow up a proposal was developed for a first ‘Urban Forum’. Unfortunately, due to a lack of funds and the ongoing Kosovo status-negotiations, the Urban Forum and the “White Paper” unfortunately never materialized. However, the exercise again proved
In 2006, UN-Habitat launched a new programme, the Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme (MuSPP –see Annex 1). During Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme 1 (2005-2008), encouraged by the positive results and feedback of the initial visioning exercises, a larger scale project of nine inclusive ‘real’ community multi-day visioning workshops was organized in cooperation with municipal authorities and partners. At the time of this publication, another workshop was organized under Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme 2 (2008-2011) bringing the total time frame of 50 visioning days and more than 400 participants. The matrix above shows all municipalities where an inclusive multi-day community based visioning workshops were organized. Seven out of ten were organized in 2007, between January and September; two were organized in 2008 (April and June), while the final one with the community of the new municipality of Gracanica was organized in November 2010. Six visioning workshops were undertaken in regional cities, while four out of 10 visioning workshops took place with more rural communities. Despite the fact that municipalities of the regional cities also have extensive rural areas, the focus remained slightly more on the urban centres and their surroundings. Half of the visioning workshops were introduced during an early stage of municipal planning, which naturally offers the best chances of taking the outcomes all the way through the strategic planning process. The categorization of the planning stages should be read in combination with the eventual involvement of an external planning consultants. The municipalities processing the municipal development plans ‘in-house’ have been marked in bold. Municipal spatial planning strongly advocates in-house processing as much as possible, while outsourcing should be limited to specific technical tasks, which cannot be tackled by the current capacities of municipal staff or the technical assistant (e.g. UN-Habitat). Community visioning workshops were also considered an important tool to empower the municipal leadership and staff to take primary ownership of the strategic planning process. The municipalities that have outsourced the entire planning process not only lost the opportunity to create

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning stage</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Intermedium</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a strong sense of ownership of the process but also forfeited the chance to build the planning capacities that are required to understand and implement the plans. Visioning workshops were held at different stages of planning, as shown in the diagram. However, the sequence of workshops did not follow the incremental stages of planning.

In the case of Mitrovica, the first community visioning workshop, the planning process for the Municipal and Urban Development Plan was only in a start-up phase, and at that time no planning consultancy was involved. Prizren, however, was in a slightly different planning stage, with an urban plan already drafted and adopted by the municipal assembly, even before the new Law on Spatial Planning was promulgated. However, a spatial Municipal Development Plan for the entire municipality was still missing, and the visioning workshop actually provided a critical input for the terms of reference of the tender for outsourcing the drafting of the plan. In the case of Mamusha, the community visioning could not come at an earlier stage. Mamusha, earlier a village in the municipality of Prizren, is one of the new municipalities created under the decentralization act, with Turkish majority population. The same goes for all other rural municipalities marked in grey. Hani i Elezit/Gen Jankovic and Junik however were part of the first decentralization phase. Gracanica on the other hand, as well as another partner municipality, Partesh/Partes were established on the basis of the Ahtisaari Plan, providing Kosovo Serbian majority population with their own administrative bodies. The reason why Junik is categorized as being in an inter-medium planning stage is that preparations have already started to process an urban development plan. The plan however was processed after the visioning workshop, and was drafted in-house, with the technical assistance of MuSPP.

The picture is quite different for the remaining municipalities. By the time technical assistance started with Gjakova/Djakovica, Ferizaj/Urosevac and Gjilan/Gnjilane, these municipalities had already outsourced their spatial plans to a private consultancy company, and apparently all to the same one. The community visions resulting from the visioning workshops differed quite substantially from the ones pre-drafted by the consultancy company, and a difficult but interesting negotiation process was induced to find a compromise. Involving the consultant in the visioning workshops, as an observer and reflecting on the outcomes in relation to the consultants’ vision also enhanced this process.

The end product in these three cases, however, is less consistent with the community vision than in the cases of the early stage and in-house planning. It also showed that community involvement in these three cases was more of a contesting in nature than in the other cases. Especially in the case of Prizren, the visioning workshop boosted and imported local civil society to increase public awareness and develop ‘watch-dog’ skills related to urban planning issues. The downside is that the visioning workshop might have raised too high expectations. However, changing attitudes and ‘bad habits’ do not happen overnight but require a lot of ‘persistence’ and ‘endurance’. The last case of Peja/Péć was again very different from all previous ones. This municipality had already finalized its spatial plans long before the community visioning workshops started in 2007. Therefore, the visioning workshop in Peja/Péć did not focus on the entire municipal territory, but rather on a strategic area that was identified in the municipal development plan as a regeneration zone. The visioning exercise included all the relevant stakeholders, rather than predominantly ‘residents’. In this regard, the Peja/Péć visioning workshop was a totally different and thus interesting experiment, despite the fact that not all of the publicly acclaimed outcomes have materialized into concrete projects, yet. Both the demonstration projects of MuSPP1 and more advanced capital investment projects of MuSPP2 were also developed within the vision framework. However, only a few of these municipalities really capitalized on the momentum created by the community visioning workshops to push through the planning process into concrete strategic actions. This is undoubtedly partially caused by the lack of public investment budget, but also has to do with many other factors such as the unclear or even disputed status of public land and buildings, the lack of mechanisms for land management, and general lack of capacity to manage strategic planning and projects.

Going back to the matrix, the ethnic factor is not explicitly mentioned but nevertheless important, especially in the case of post-conflict Kosovo. Truly inclusive visioning processes obviously always involve all ethnic communities, although in practice this is not always easy to achieve. The first visioning workshop for Mitrovica – the city divided by the river Ibar into a southern part with a Kosovo-Albanian majority and a northern part with a Kosovo-Serb majority and other minority groups such as Bosniaks and Roma spread over both was one of the most difficult challenges, as it aimed to bring together the communities of the divided city. How it finally worked out before, during and after the visioning workshop will be explored further in this chapter. In other visioning cases, minorities such as Roma-Ashkali-Egyptians (RAE)
or Bosniaks were also represented, but never lobbied for a special treatment of their communities. Mamusha and Gracanica were the most outspoken cases in which Kosovo minority communities took the lead in the visioning process; the Turkish community in the case of Mamusha and the Kosovo Serb community in the case of Gracanica. Mitrovica remained the only case with a 50-50 composition of both Kosovo’s largest majority and minority communities.

In the Mitrovica workshop it was also interesting to see whether the process would benefit from the earlier vision exercise with the municipal planners. It turned out to be the case and it was very encouraging to see that the trained Kosovo-Albanian planners shared their gained capacities with their Serbian colleagues in a very collegial way. To achieve this goal, all architect-planners from both city districts were put together in one working group, called the planners group. This method was only duplicated in the Gjilan/Gniljane workshop, due to the local planning culture. In all other cases, planners and other community members were deliberately mixed, which is by far the favored approach for integrated and inclusive community visioning.

The preparation of the first community visioning workshop took about six months, while the other workshops required much less preparation as they followed approximately the same methodology and programme.

As the workshop for the ethnically divided Mitrovica had to be conducted on the neutral ground, which could not be found within the municipal ‘boundaries’ and even not within Kosovo, the workshop took place in Skopje, in Macedonia, with a time frame of five days including two travel days.

The greatest advantage of this approach is the group dynamics of people travelling together, talking to each other, working together, fun together, without falling back on the daily routines. These group dynamics usually generate more creative ideas than in any other kind of situation. While some people did not always show full commitment, others could hardly stop thinking and working.

This approach requires more logistical effort and larger budget to cover all the travel and accommodation costs. There is no possibility to include field visits and on-site discussions, which increases the risk of ending up with an unrealistic vision. Therefore, it was always highly recommended that this initial visioning workshop would be followed up by smaller visioning meetings to achieve a more integrated and ‘field-proof’ vision as an input to the municipal or any other formal spatial plan. A public presentation of the visioning results soon after the workshop can mitigate the perception that a visioning workshop is just a fun event for a few.

Since the majority of participants were not familiar with planning, a workshop programme was developed including basic training on the essentials of strategic and inclusive planning, the power of visioning; as well more technical training on how to select key topics, how to conduct a proper analysis, how to write vision statements and finally how to design a desired spatial structure. Both the programme format and the training sessions are explained and illustrat-

“Failing to plan is planning to fail”

Winston Churchill
ed in separate Annexes – providing essential tools for organizing visioning workshop (see Annex 8 for the ‘Workshop Format’ and Annex 9 for the ‘Training Sessions’).

**ACHIEVING RESULTS**

Critical for achieving results is a shared understanding of milestones in the past, the present and the future. The methods used to achieve these basic milestones are explained in Annex 9, presenting another essential tool for successful visioning workshops.

As was made clear in previous chapters, that good moderation and facilitation is critical to the success of any visioning workshop. The chosen model worked with:

- An overall neutral moderator fluent in the official languages.
- One or more community moderators to steer the group dynamics in a positive direction - in case of the Mitrovica workshop a community moderator from each ethnic group was appointed by the visioning working party.
- A content-facilitator/trainer to provide the basic training on planning and the instructions for each working session.
- Additional content facilitators to support and assist the different working groups in delivering meaningful results.

A positive development throughout the ten visioning workshops was the increasing engagement and capacity of a co-organizing the local NGO partner, Cultural Heritage without Borders (see Annex 1). By adhering and advocating an integrated and inclusive approach to the preservation of cultural and natural heritage, it became one of the most skilled and experienced NGOs dealing with these aspects in the spatial planning context. Cultural Heritage without Borders was already strongly involved in conservation and development planning in some of the municipalities. The support of Cultural Heritage without Borders was in kind by providing staff, some of them acting as content-facilitators or animators. The most successful case of synergy and cooperation between Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme/UN-Habitat and Cultural Heritage without Borders is undoubtedly the visioning workshop and the planning process of Junik municipality, one of the best practices presented at the Conference on Envisioning as Participatory Planning Tool. But also in the other four municipalities was the cooperation between UN-Habitat, Cultural Heritage without Borders and the local community a win-win operation, especially when cultural and natural heritage was identified as the key issue for future development.

In addition, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES, see Annex 1) provided support to the visioning workshops, but mainly in logistical and financial terms.

The involvement of the Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment also deserves attention. The Institute of Spatial Planning (ISP) was invited to take part in all the visioning workshops. In the first place this was intended at ‘learning by doing’, capitalizing on the earlier visioning workshops within the ISP and with the Ministry of Transport on corridor-development in Kosovo (see earlier). In the second place, the ISP played a useful role in using the Kosovo Spatial Plan as a reference framework and source of inspiration, not only content-wise but also for the use of spatial concepts and spatial designs. After the visioning workshop, the Department of Spatial Planning was gradually more involved to ensure a smooth integration of the community vision into the legally prescribed format of the Municipal Development Plan.

The first community visioning workshop was preceded by a ‘visioning training’ which was organized jointly for the Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme-UN-Habitat staff and representatives of the ISP in September 2006. The training certainly helped the participants better understand the methodology focused on gradually building up a vision in a structured process, but it somehow fell short in dealing with communities, which is of course critical in community visioning. Yet, the training boosted trainees to inspire and mobilize the respective municipal leaders and communities to accept the Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme’s invitation to set up the community visioning workshops. Prior to the visioning workshops, UN-Habitat organized kinds of sessions with local civil society organizations, mainly from the perspective of gender planning; resulting in loosely organized and structured ‘community groups’, labeled as ‘Informal Councils of Civil Society Organizations’ (ICCSO). These ICCSOs often de facto functioned as local ‘working parties’ to co-organize visioning workshops, as well as to select the participants. Their Terms of Reference are presented in Annex 18. The ICCSO was also very helpful in ensuring a follow up process after the visioning workshop, from the public presentation to the pro-
duction of an integrated vision design and statement. The visioning workshops boosted and empowered the ICCSO, which in some cases even took the form of a local ‘counter-power’, opposing municipal planning decisions when they were not in line with the community vision developed during the workshop. Such cases of non-compliance were more frequent in those municipalities where the whole planning process was outsourced to planning consultancies and/or when the planning process has already been running for a long time.

The Ferizaj/Urosevac example is the most representative, where the ICCSO revoked a municipal decision about a central square, which ran against the community vision. The community vision and the ICCSO played a more cooperative role in those municipalities where the planning process just started and/or where the municipality was in the driving seat of the planning process (‘in-house-planning’). However, in all cases, visioning workshops boosted and empowered the local civil society. Nearly all editions of the Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme-newsletters reported or reflected on the visioning workshops, giving a voice to civil society representatives about their experiences and further expectations after they had participated in a visioning workshop (see Annex 11). In addition, two special leaflets were published to advocate and explain community visioning.

Gradually, the UN-Habitat Kosovo-website provided more and more information and has tuned into a kind of virtual library (see www.unhabitat-kosovo.org). The local media (printed media, radio and TV) also reported regularly on visioning workshops and public presentations as part of the municipal planning processes. All this contributed not only to a growing recognition and appreciation of community visioning as a participatory planning tool - it also created growing ‘visioning community’ of planning stakeholders with visioning experience. This culminated in the well-attended conference, held on 9 November 2010 in Prishtina/Pristina.

However, before evaluating the past visioning practices and exploring future visioning opportunities, it is worth to highlight some of the post-visioning activities as well as other actions where visioning has been put into practice.
BOX 8.

THE KOSOVO VISIONING CONFERENCE

The conference on Envisioning as a Participatory Planning Tool was the main topic of a conference on 9 November 2010, organized by UN-Habitat's Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme, and the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning (MESP). It was supported by the municipalities and the NGOs, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung and Cultural Heritage without Borders. In the past four years, visioning workshops took place in 10 municipalities, organized as inclusive planning activities with the active participation of local government officials and civil society organizations. It drew 150 planning professionals from all over Kosovo to discuss and share their experiences on participatory and strategic planning in Kosovo and abroad. The conference started with opening remarks of the Minister of Environment and Spatial Planning, who cited the visible impact of the work conducted so far. In her opening remarks, the Head of UN-Habitat Kosovo office stressed the role of UN-Habitat and its cooperation with municipalities. The first presentation of the conference was made by two Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme officers who described the entire process of visioning and some lessons learned. There were presentations by experts from Sweden, Albania and Turkey, followed by showcases from three municipalities in Kosovo. Representatives of the Department and Institute of Spatial Planning of the Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment, the University of Pristina and civil society also gave presentations. The concluding debate clearly demonstrated that the understanding of, and participation in the planning process is still relatively weak in Kosovo, partly because of the period of transition that Kosovo still is experiencing. For more, see: www.unhabitat-kosovo.org
CHAPTER 5

VISIONING RESULTS

“It is not enough to stare up the steps, we must step up the stairs”, Vaclav Havel

Referring to the ‘Visioning Cycle’ presented earlier, creating the vision makes stage one. Time has come to see if and what kind of follow up the initial community visioning has sparked in Kosovo. Far from aiming at a comprehensive and complete overview, it is worth highlighting relevant features specific for the phases of the visioning cycle.

The first step after the creation of a community vision is sharing the vision. As the visioning is done with only a small group of community representatives, it is crucial to share this vision with the entire community or at least with a more representative number of the residents and stakeholders of the planning area.

There are of course many ways to do it. It already starts during the visioning workshops, as participants are mailing, texting or calling to family and friends, telling them about what they are doing. This word of mouth will further multiply upon return and after the closure of the workshop.

It is particularly important in case of decision- and opinion-makers were part of the workshop sessions or the final presentation. Also writing an article for the UN-Habitat/ Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme newsletter or for local newspapers, magazines, and websites, will contribute to further outreach (see also Annex 11).

WORKSHOP REPORTS

However, essential for effective follow up is to produce a workshop report, reflecting on the process and deliverables of the visioning workshop, illustrated by many photos (see for example the reports from the visioning workshop in MuSPP partner municipalities). The most effective way of sharing the outcomes of the visioning workshop, as shown by experience, is to organize a public presentation of the results of the visioning workshop, preferably including the presentation of the workshop report. This should be done within 4-6 weeks after the workshop, when the ideas are still ‘fresh’, and yet allowing enough time to prepare this presentation.

This event should be prepared and delivered exclusively by community representatives. In order to display all the results at the public presentation, the community should of course take and order the material output of the workshop (from memory map to vision designs, including the SWOT-charts and the vision statements). Clear arrangements should be made with whom and where the originals will go, e.g. the urbanism department or the ICCSO (Informal Council of Civil Society Organizations). Only in the case of divided Mitrovica, the local UN-Habitat-team stored the originals to ensure impartiality of the later process. The ICCSO has
proven to be the best platform to prepare the public presentations, often assisted by the Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme and Cultural Heritage without Borders staff. Except the case of Mitrovica, all other public presentation were hosted by the municipality, offering a publicly accessible place and space, technical equipment such as the screen, projector and laptop if available, as well a sound-system and last but not least a cocktail drink and some snacks. Most common venues are the town hall, a school, a municipal theater or a cultural centre. As a new municipality, Junik could not rely on those conventional places and opted for a more alternative (and creative) location: a restored private kulla located in the middle of this mountain village (see also further).

By adding musical entertainment, locally produced and prepared food and an interesting guided visit to some cultural heritage landmarks, Junik transformed the traditional vision presentation into a cultural event, while ensuring the right of people to question and comment, also critically, on the presented community vision. In most cases, the local media were invited to and attended the public presentations, ensuring further outreach to and beyond the community.

In Ferizaj/Urosevac local journalists were invited to the visioning workshops. Although they were participating in a strictly private capacity as community members, the workshop boosted their understanding and appreciation for the method and its outcomes, which paid off well later, when they reported on the workshop and its follow up. Journalists not directly involved in the visioning tended to either underestimate or overestimate the community visioning: undervaluing by not giving the credit it deserves or overvaluing it by raising overly high expectations that the vision has been ready-made and can be quickly turned into reality. Therefore, a clear media strategy is required to send out the right messages and to correct the wrong or over-simplified ones. It would be very helpful for instance to prepare and provide media with fact sheets about the community visioning as part of an inclusive planning process.

As visions are generally perceived as unrealistic dreams, it is critical to provide incentives for their incremental implementation. The MuSPP1 allocated limited co-funding for demonstration projects showing a participatory planning and visioning approach. The co-funding mechanisms had to ensure that the local authority also allocated budget and time for the ‘demo-project’, as well the commitment to im-

---

**BOX 9.**

**GRACANICA VISION UNITES PLANNERS AND CITIZENS**

“The Municipality of Gracanica, opulent with antique and medieval treasures and natural beauty – modern environment with developed economy and infrastructure where everyone enjoys the same rights and freedoms.” This is the vision statement drafted by a group of citizens and professional planners who participated in a 4-day vision workshop for the municipality of Gracanica. The outcome of the workshop was presented to a wider audience on 3 February 2011; offering the possibility to each citizen of Gracanica to present and introduce new ideas for the future development of this new municipality. In his opening speech, the mayor of Gracanica, thanked all contributors, UN-Habitat, International Civilian Office, and Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning (MESP), for their support to the visioning workshop. The Head of Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme in Kosovo said that the visioning workshop is the initial stage in drafting the Municipal and Urban Development Plans; that it contributes to the capacity building of the municipal staff and civil society; stimulates ideas for capital investment projects and empowers civil society to play a more active role in the development of the municipality. The Multimedia presentation continued with the presentations of working groups for Natural and Cultural Heritage, Infrastructure and Mobility, Economic Development and in Social Services and Housing.

Source text and photos: UN-Habitat/Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme
implement the project in a participatory way paying respect to the community vision.

The Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme conducted six of these ‘demo-projects’ in total, with varied results and impacts, but they paved the way for more structural and complex capital investment projects, initiated during the second phase of the Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme phase (see Annex 12).

In most of these cases, the community visioning technique was applied - at least to a certain extent - to design the desired project. An international design competition for a Mobility Center in Ferizaj/Urosevac conducted in 2008, was a special kind of a demonstration project. A design brief was based on the outcomes of the community-visioning workshop for the municipal and urban development plan. Despite rather modest prize money, the project succeeded in mobilizing local and international architects, planners and designers, who submitted a broad variety of valuable and interesting ideas. A jury awarded three prize winners, but also indicated the need to combine interesting ideas from more than one proposal, as well the need to involve and negotiate with the most important stakeholder, the Kosovo railway company. The project clearly demonstrated the value of urban design but missed the power to initiate a collaborative process of ‘negotiation by design’ as explained earlier.

A special spin-off with regard to community visioning and community designing was the placemaking project under the first Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme. The objective was to develop a greater awareness of the role, benefits and processes of ‘placemaking’ in Kosovo, with general principles and guidelines tested in a total of 22 sites in the six regional cities. The ‘placemaking’ mission was successful in raising awareness about the importance of participatory design and how it can be achieved. The participants in the workshops were selected based on their key roles in the production and maintenance of the public realm. This enhanced the benefits of the workshops by ensuring that the people who can make a real difference were now more aware of why they should value ‘placemaking’. The example projects also demonstrated that a collaborative design process was not that difficult to organize and undertake and provided participants with practical applications of the placemaking guidelines.

By making a quick side step to the phase of implementation through pilot-actions, we omitted two crucial intermediate steps of the ‘Visioning Cycle’: the critical review of the vision leading to its fine-tuning and consolidation. Ideally, the plenary presentation and discussion of the thematic vision designs should already provide the first step to mark the common and diverging elements of the vision components, as at the end of the Mitrovica visioning workshop. This exercise has to be guided by a content-facilitator, if possible with advanced knowledge of the planning area. Planning-experts are also needed to coach the community groups to make a smooth transition to a more integrated vision design, also often referred to as the ‘desired strategic spatial structure’ of the planning area. The most active members of the workshop as well the local expert planners if available usually drive the community group that is willing to sacrifice more spare time than just for the visioning workshop.

In some cases a local and/or international planning expert was hired by UN-Habitat to assist the community group in achieving the integrated vision design. This expert, however, has to “walk a thin line” by adding ‘planning expert value’ while respecting the community spirit of the ideas generated during the initial visioning workshop. The most successful working method is when the planning expert achieves a more integrated vision through a series of additional vision workshops, as was the case in Ferizaj/Urosevac, Gjilan/Gniljane and Gjakova/Djakovica.

This fine-tuning process usually results in an Integrated vision document, the most substantial follow-up result of the community visioning. It ensures that the community vision can be consolidated into the formal planning format, such as the Municipal Development Plan.

The integrated vision document usually opens by reflecting on the visioning workshop process and a short profile of the planning area, based on both the analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats conducted during the vision workshop, ‘enriched’ with statistical and other available data. A more difficult and crucial part is the ‘integrated vision design’ or ‘desired spatial structure’, based on a critical analysis of the thematic vision components. This desired structure for the entire planning area is often detailed for specific areas such as the urban centre or any other specific zone of strategic interest.
The integrated vision statement developed at the vision workshop will also need to be re-adjusted to the integrated vision designs. The next step is to identify and prioritize strategic actions with specific territorial projects as well as generic measures valid for the entire planning area. The prioritization is often accompanied by a phasing of desired projects and actions, often according to the available and foreseeable resources at the disposal of the main planning authority.

Finally, a set of recommendations are formulated for the further planning and implementation process, including raising expectations about the consolidation of this ‘Integrated Vision Document’ in the formal planning process and deliverables. To make this document a genuine reference tool for the community, it needs to be legitimized by the community. In the Kosovo-practices this mostly happened through the ‘Informal Council of Civil Society Organizations’. This ‘legitimization process’ will also ensure true local ownership and stewardship throughout the entire planning and implementation process. The ‘Integrated Vision Document’ will provide a powerful reference for the community to publicly review and if needed revoke the formal planning document once it is submitted to the public review as foreseen by the Law on Spatial Planning. Best practices in taking forward the outcome of the visioning workshop throughout the entire visioning cycle is Mitrovica-South (see Annex 14) and Hani-i-Elezit/Gen Jankovic (see Annex 15). See also example of Junik in Annex 13.
Now that the visioning process has been outlined and the cycle undertaken so far in Kosovo has been presented, time has come to explore lessons learned to further improve visioning practices. Despite the overall positive picture, there are gaps and shortcomings that need to be addressed and overcome to enrich the methodology and strengthen capacities in this field.

Using one of the techniques applied during the visioning workshops, an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats has been applied to the Kosovo practice of visioning workshops, as well. This analysis is presented below and discussed hereafter.

Strengths and weaknesses of the Kosovo practices are often mirrored. The matrix can therefore be best explained by pairs of strengths and weaknesses relating to the past visioning events.

- **On the first pair of ‘tested format’ (strength) versus ‘template format’ (weakness):** the ‘Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme format’ is the visioning method that has been compiled based on a wide range of internationally tested participatory planning tools, adapted to the local needs and constraints. It has proven to be a strong format for two main reasons: a) because the immediate output in terms of community-based ideas and visions were in general very satisfactory and in some cases even beyond expectations and b) because in most of the cases, there was a positive outcome, meaning that the visioning workshops initiated or sparked the visioning cycle as described earlier. It was often accompanied by ‘spin-off’ effects that have boosted community visioning for ‘technical operations’ such as investment projects and ‘place-making’.

However, there is a downside to this successful formula format as well. As it has already been applied ten times in the same way, spanning a period of nearly four years, it has become a template format. In some ways, this is almost contradictory to a basic principle of participatory strategic planning: that it should be adaptable to the specific context and circumstances. Of course, the context and circumstances were very similar in most of the 10
cases, but never exactly the same. And it is also true that the ‘Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme-format’ was designed in a way that it could accommodate small adaptations to specific circumstances, for instance by spending more or less time on each component. Moreover, it remains an open question as to how the format would have developed if for instance Ferizaj/Urosevac would have been the first test-case, rather than the ethnically divided city of Mitrovica.

One of the disadvantages to duplicate the Mitrovica format was undoubtedly the external location of the visioning workshops - once in Skopje and nine times in Ohrid, both in FYRoM - adding not only to the costs but also creating the sense of a ‘luxury holiday’. It is true that all the other community visioning activities following the visioning workshop have taken place within the vicinity of the planning area, but unfortunately none of the multi-day visioning workshops covered by this publication.

- **On the pair of ‘professional organization’ (strength) versus ‘limited local ownership’ (weakness),** the support given by UN-Habitat/Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme and its partner organizations was critical to the overall success of the formula, notwithstanding the genuine commitments of the involved municipalities and their communities. As a locally managed NGO, and Cultural Heritage without Borders, is probably the only one that would be able to take over the organization of the visioning workshop as done so far, although strategic planning is not their core activity. The Institute of Spatial Planning (ISP) was also an active partner in the visioning workshops and has a substantive body of participatory planning experience thanks to the drafting process of the ‘Spatial Plan of Kosovo’.

However, the ISP never undertook a project similar to the 5-day community visioning workshops and it is doubtful if the current ratio between core tasks and available staff capacities would allow it to take over the organization of visioning workshops in the future. Its ability to raise the required funds is another issue. On the other hand, local communities and municipal authorities are clearly not capable to undertake community visioning without external support and funding. This means that the strength of Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme’s assistance may become a weakness and even a threat to the process if UN-Habitat would cease its activities in Kosovo. This should be clearly addressed in the future visioning workshops and recommendations on this issue will be presented further in the text.

- **The pair of ‘trained facilitators’ (strength) versus ‘limited training of trainers’ (weakness) continues to previous narrative.** But even within the cluster of organizing partners there is a need to invest in the replacement and expansion of the pool of facilitators. The lack of a training of trainers programme between the visioning workshops can now be labeled as a weakness, as continuity and innovation is not guaranteed.

- **The double pair ‘from scratch’/‘positive group dynamics’ (strengths) versus ‘no planning brief’/‘no integrated vision’ (weaknesses) also needs some further explanation.** ‘From scratch’ means that it is seen as strength that the community can start the visioning ‘not hindered by existing plans or studies’. This has helped a lot in lowering the threshold and increasing the non-expert participation as well ‘positive group dynamics’ in the process. The downside of such an approach is the risk of creating an unrealistic vision. Although the involvement of expert-planners ensured a reasonable community visioning, it is arguable that the existence of a ‘planning brief’ would generate even better visions. A planning brief is a set of guiding principles that are rooted in the existing body of planning, both locally and beyond. Only in the case of the visioning workshop for the Education and Sport Centre in Peja/Pčë, a kind of planning brief was prepared and handed over to the participants, resulting in more focused visioning results. The lack of a planning brief is also the reason why it is difficult to develop an ‘integrated vision design’. The chosen format of working with thematic groups and visions certainly had its merits, as it stimulated more ideas and creativity, but a planning brief could have helped to reduce the internal conflicts between the thematic visions. However, this ‘weakness’ has been mostly compensated by post-visioning activities to produce an integrated vision, with a visioning report as an intermediate step, and an integrated vision document as the final output and an input to official planning documents).

- **On the last cluster of ‘inter-community cooperation’/‘creative thinking/smart ideas’/‘attitude changes’ (strengths) versus ‘limited implementation’/‘high costs’ (weaknesses):** ‘change of attitudes’ is probably the greatest advantage of this process; towards planning in general (more a social than a technical enterprise); towards plans in particular (easier to understand and explain when drafted by non-
expert community members); and last but not least towards public participation, often resulting in setting a new standard in the municipality where community visioning took place. The disadvantage of the relatively ‘high costs’ of the chosen visioning format is only a weakness in so far that domestic planning authorities allocate little or no budget specifically for participatory planning. As we have seen with the best practice of Spoor Noord in Antwerp/Belgium (see Annex 4), its success is, to a great extent, a result of a substantive public participation budget.

The weakness that few of these creative visions have yet to be implemented weighs less heavily than the merit of the attitude change. Firstly because 'implementation' of a long term vision simply needs a long time. Secondly because 'implementation' has to be framed in the visioning cycle, meaning that follow up steps such as producing a vision report and integrated vision document are crucial stepping-stones for concrete strategic projects. Thirdly, because the vision has served as a generator and catalyst for demo-projects and capital investment projects, which can be seen as successful spin-offs of the visioning workshops and the attitude changes it has provoked.

EXTERNAL OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS

Looking at the external opportunities and threats for participatory planning and project-implementation, following issues are critical:

- The population of Kosovo is still a largely untapped reservoir of dynamism and creativity, which can only be overshadowed by a lack of proper education, such as the missing Masters level education in spatial planning and urban management.
- The European integration perspective is another great opportunity but Kosovo’s pace could be severely slowed by institutional inability to match the conditions for European Union accession.
- As already highlighted, the availability of the international community willing to support Kosovo’s integration is at the same time threatened by its likely gradual withdrawal, while increase in support might also lead to even higher dependency, including its extended financial aspect.
- Local centres with know-how on inclusive planning exist but are probably too few in numbers and too small in scale to cope with the challenges ahead. Just as at a visioning workshop, this analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats is rather indicative and claims no scientific evidence whatsoever. It would however be welcomed if this indicative analysis could be confirmed, enriched or even negated by scientific and independent research.

Perhaps one of the main omissions of visioning practice in Kosovo is the lack of any structured feedback and evaluation. Although it was a deliberate choice not to ask visioning participants to immediately evaluate the workshop, the lack of any formal evaluation makes it difficult to achieve a ‘participatory evaluation’. The conference on Envisioning as Participatory Planning Tool demonstrated an overall satisfaction with the visioning approach, but did not provide a more technical analysis of what worked well and what could work better. It may be too late for an external ‘audit’ for this first generation of community visioning, but should be envisaged for the next round.

However, the indicative analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats allows us to explore some possible strategies for this next generation of community visioning.

---

**SWOT-Analysis Past Visioning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- tested format</td>
<td>- template format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- professional organization</td>
<td>- limited local ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- trained facilitators</td>
<td>- limited training of trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- positive group dynamics</td>
<td>- no ‘planning brief’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- from scratch</td>
<td>- no integrated vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- inter-community cooperation</td>
<td>- limited implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- creative thinking/smart ideas</td>
<td>- high costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- attitude changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPPORTUNITIES**

- emancipating civil society
- learning planning community
- young population
- European integration
- international donors and capacity builders
- domestic centers of know how

**THREATS**

- budget restrictions
- pulling out of international community
- political crises
- lack of planning education

---

Fig. 9
The offensive strategy combines the strengths and opportunities. By combining the first three strengths with the opportunities for a learning planning community and the extended presence of international donors and capacity builders, more ‘advanced’ visioning methods could be explored and customized, such as the planning charrette. The nuts and bolts of a proposed planning charrette are explored in Annex 16, but it essentially means bringing the current visioning practice to a slightly higher technical level, whilst keeping the community in the lead. A planning charrette can be applied at the scale of an entire municipality or city, but is mostly used for a more focused area or a planning topic. A community vision and plan for action for the many informal settlements in Kosovo could be a great challenge and achievement. The second offensive project proposal is the establishment of a community visioning NGO, likely to be part of a kind of national centre for public participation or engagement, as exists in other parts of the world. A visioning centre, would be the public house of the visioning NGO, with facilities and facilitators for visioning workshops, a documentation centre and library, an exhibition centre, a community cafe, etc. The concept of a visioning centre or a visioning house is further explored in Annex 17.

Transformative strategies basically aim at improving or diversifying the tested format by addressing some of the indicated weaknesses. This may relate to area- or group-specific visioning workshops (such as gender-specific workshops or workshop-sessions), setting up a training for (mainly local) workshop facilitators; presenting and explaining a planning brief at or before the start of a visioning workshop; organizing a visioning workshop ‘in situ’, meaning in or nearby the planning area in question; and reducing the costs of visioning workshops by relying more on community services (for locally serviced catering for instance). By combining all these measures and by reducing the number of days involved, many more workshops can be organized than by painstakingly sticking to the same template format. Transformative measures can also be applied to the different components of the visioning. For instance by spending less time on the analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats more time could be saved for strategies needing more strategic thinking and strengthen the strategic dimension of the vision. In addition, by reducing the time spent on designing the thematic visions more time could be available to develop an integrated vision design during the visioning workshop. Transformative measures could also be applied to the post-visioning activities, for instance by stimulating more public feedback on the vision proposals from the visioning workshop (e.g. by using post-its to approve, reject or simply comment vision proposals). The mechanism of drafting a visioning report and an integrated vision document could also be critically assessed and improved.

The defensive and survival strategies are to be considered as keep and fight for what we have if nothing more or else is possible. The defensive strategy also could entail a proper documentation and assessment of the *acquis visionaire* – what has been achieved so far - and to which this manual is a first contribution. The survival strategy applies to the undesirable situation that weaknesses and threats overshadow the strengths and opportunities, for instance in case the international community pulls out, while domestic capacities still fall short and proper budget allocation for participatory planning is still missing. In this case, the survival strategy is to at least preserve the participatory requirements provided by the current legal framework and the Law on Spatial Planning in particular.

In an interesting article in ‘Planning and Design’ (vol. 37, 2010), Louis Albrechts argues that: “without an appropriate vision, a transformation effort can easily degenerate into a list of confusing, inconsistent, and time-consuming projects that move in very diverse and often incompatible directions or nowhere at all.”
While inclusive visions are greatly needed to make dreams and plans come true, not everyone welcomes them as they create expectations that are sometimes difficult to meet.

However, he continues, “visions or frames of reference are not just ‘out there’, waiting to be discovered. On the contrary, we have to construct them... Envisioning is the process by which individuals – or preferably groups – develop visions of future states for themselves, their organization, their city, or their region that are sufficiently clear and powerful to arouse and sustain the actions needed for (parts of) these visions to become reality.”

Since envisioning is also the ‘journey’ and not just the destination, Mr. Albrechts says the process it cannot be limited to a single actor or institution. Rather it should provide views of the future that can be shared: “… a clear sense of direction, a mobilization of energy, and a sense of being engaged in something important.”

The practice of the participatory community visioning workshops in Kosovo can be seen as an important contribution to this transformation process, but the journey is far from complete – and it should never be completed. Similar to the ‘Visioning Cycle’ (see earlier), we can refer to a Participatory Cycle (see United Nations University Participatory Methods Toolkit, a practitioner’s manual). Participation in planning and implementation should be combined with participatory evaluation. Therefore, an important action following the first generation of community visioning in Kosovo should be a process of participatory assessment and recommendations for future visioning, civic involvement in planning and governance.

The conference Envisioning as a participatory planning tool was a first step in a participatory evaluation (Box 8). However, new thinking on inclusive planning demands that monitor-

---

**BOX 10.**

**LEADERSHIP**

The six core qualities of urban leadership today are:

- **Foresight**: the ability to imagine and assess how trends play themselves out;
- **Strategic focus**: the skill of concentrating on the ‘big picture’ and long-term future-oriented perspectives;
- **Understanding urbanism and city dynamics in a holistic way**: this includes understanding the qualities and characteristics that makes cities great;
- **Developing a culture of openness and curiosity**: adopting an ethos which values debate, critical thinking and learning;
- **Organizational agility**: the ability to move from a controlling, centralizing, uniform, high-blame, low-risk culture to one that values responsiveness and flexibility;
- **Determined delivery focus**: the motivation, will and ability to make what is promised happen.

**Source:** Charles Landry, The Creative City, pp.32-33

---

**PARTICIPATORY POLICY PROCESS**

![Participatory Policy Process Diagram](Fig. 11)
ing, evaluation and assessment of the success and failure must be further researched. Continuous and built-in evaluation is necessary to ensure that creativity is an inherent element of planning and project processes.

“Evaluation encourages reflexive learning and continuously revitalizes thinking. It is the capacity to absorb and gain knowledge, to build on the experiences of past lessons and to have a full and active awareness of what is going,” said Mr. Charles Landry in his book, *The Creative City*. “In order to be effective and efficient, learning requires evaluation based on both divergent, generative or convergent as well as analytical and critical thinking.”

This publication is a second step, but the lessons learned need to be shared with the public, including participants of the visioning workshops, as well the relevant decision- and opinion makers, including the media.

Decision-makers are, without doubt, a key target group and stakeholder in participatory planning, implementation and evaluation. Ultimately, the most important community assets are the personal qualities of its leadership. Mr. Landry argues that “there is no simplistic formula to find and maximize urban assets. It requires a sophisticated understanding of urbanism and how cities work globally. It relies on a deeper understanding of what a resource can be and that potential raw materials are everywhere - from the obvious, like a waterfront setting, to what is less apparent, such as turning around the lack of ambition in a city. To harness these resources requires different approaches, from the classic physical regeneration initiatives of older urban areas to appreciating that good thinking on its own can generate potential.”

He sees six core qualities essential for urban leadership (see Box 11) in Kosovo and other places around the world also making the transition from conflict.

In addition to Landry’s six basic qualities, and learning from the first generation of community visioning and strategic planning, the following recommendations could be addressed to Kosovo’s local decision-makers:

- Apply and ‘localize’ generic community planning methods.
- Embrace community visioning as leverage for change to achieve a more sustainable development.
- Benefit from community visioning throughout the entire planning process including the visioning cycle;
- Utilize the available and potential technical assistance by the international community to empower the local planning community.
- Outsource only that, which cannot be done properly “in-house”.
- Allocate budget and find creative ways to fund civic engagement in planning, implementation and evaluation (participation cycle).

For central level decision-makers additional specific policy recommendations can be formulated:

- Raise public and political awareness on the values and benefits of inclusive community planning.
- Encourage and help local authorities make community-planning work.
- Develop a ‘civic engagement indicator’ to assess the inclusiveness of local planning (e.g. Municipal Development Plans).
- Benefit from community visioning for central level strategic planning, projects and evaluation (such as for the new highway, which is planned behind the closed doors).
- Utilize the available and potential technical assistance by the international community to empower the national planning community.
- Invest in proper strategic planning education at all levels.
- Help in co-funding a new Kosovo ‘Vision House’ (see Annex 17).
- Train community-visioning-facilitators within the existing Kosovo Spatial Planning Institute.

In a healthy society, civil society, the business community and the media are not just waiting for and responding to the elected decision-makers and their institutions. The community visioning workshops demonstrated that civil society could participate in shaping the future of their community, albeit in co-production with the institutions. It would be even more successful from the point of view of civic engagement objectives, if civil society, the business community and media would:

- Initiate and organize visioning workshops.
- Fully engage in genuine participation opportunities throughout the formal planning, implementation and evaluation process.
• Undertake strategic actions and projects implementing a shared vision.
• Report and document community visioning, within and beyond the community.
• Create a platform for dialogue and exchange of ideas on visioning and civic engagement in a society in transition (like a World Café, see Annex 17).

Finally, the international community, technical assistance organizations and donors in particular, could also do more to foster and strengthen community planning and visioning, mainly by:

• Supporting a transitional society in directing the transition towards sustainable development.
• Fostering access to cutting edge methods and techniques for strategic planning and civic engagement.
• Document the best practices of community visioning and planning.
• Help to set up a locally managed and staffed countrywide civic centre for public participation in planning, implementation and evaluation.

Now it’s over to you! Let your imagination work and enrich the debate on community visioning as tool for civic engagement.

“So many of our dreams seem impossible, then improbable, then inevitable”

Christopher Reeve
**GLOSSARY**

**ACTION PLANNING**
An approach to planning and urban design involving the organization of carefully structured collaborative events, which produce proposals for action. The term is also used to mean developing an action plan.

**ACTION PLAN**
A result-oriented, time bound and actor-specific plan negotiated among stakeholders within an agreed strategy framework.

**ACTION PLANNER**
A book, similar to a desk calendar, for recording appointments, things to be done or performed.

**AGENDA**
A list, plan, outline, or the like, of things to be done, matters to be acted or voted upon.

**AGENDA 21**
Action plan of the United Nations related to sustainable development at local, regional, national, transnational and global level.

**ANALYSIS**
A method of studying the nature of something or of determining its essential features and their relations.

**SPATIAL ANALYSIS**
Determining the essential features and their relation within a certain area.

**STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS**
A tool to identify and determine whom to engage and involve in the Strategic Planning Process. This analysis identifies and defines the individuals, groups and organizations whose legitimate interests should be represented with respect to specific issues.

**AREA**
A roughly defined space of land; a quantified amount of territorial space.

**URBAN AREA**
A roughly defined space located in a settlement, agglomeration, town or city. This space is defined by the competent public authority for urban development.

**RURAL AREA**
A roughly defined space located in the countryside, outside but complimentary to the urban area.

**CAPACITY**
The quality of being capable; the ability to do something.

**CAPACITY BUILDING**
Developing the skills and abilities of people, groups, or organizations.

**CITY**
A centre of population, commerce, culture and governance; a town of significant size and importance to a local, regional or international population.

**CITY PROFILE**
Basic information about the existing situation within a city, to facilitate a shared and better understanding of issues and to support prioritization of these issues by the stakeholders.

**CITY CONSULTATION**
A participatory process aiming at a common understanding of key issues and priorities and an agreement on the courses of action to be undertaken before drafting the Strategic Development Plan.

**CITY DECLARATION**
A City Declaration is a document issued at the end of a city consultation event; it articulates the consensus of participants with regard to priority issues, basic approaches, next steps and activities, and a public commitment to continue supporting the process (see also Urban Pact).

**CIVIL SOCIETY**
Civil society is composed of the totality of voluntary, civic and social organizations and institutions that form the basis of a functioning society.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY VISIONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organized and constituted groups that are not agencies or departments of government or the profit-making private commercial and industrial sector. It is a loose term that includes nongovernmental organizations and community-based organizations.</td>
<td>Thinking closely about what the future could be. Term used to describe group working processes which help a community to develop imaginative shared visions for the future of a site, area or organization. Approach often adopted by local authorities as part of their Agenda 21 processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATIONS</th>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The exchange of thoughts, messages, or information, such as by speech, signals, writing, or behavior.</td>
<td>A general idea derived or inferred from specific instances or occurrences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATIONS POLICY</th>
<th>SPATIAL CONCEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A definite course of action adopted for the sake of the imparting or interchange of thoughts, opinions, or information by speech, writing, or signs.</td>
<td>A general idea derived or inferred from specific instances or occurrences on the topic of space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATIONS BUDGET</th>
<th>CONSENSUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A plan of operations based on an estimate, often itemized, of expected income adopted for the sake of communication.</td>
<td>An agreement reached through a process of gathering information and viewpoints through discussion, acceptable to all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS</th>
<th>CONSULTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication is a process of giving and receiving information, and valuable techniques and methods of doing so can be learned and put into practice with great effect. The difference between good and bad communication can hugely affect the success of plans and projects.</td>
<td>One who gives expert or professional advice or one who consults another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>CONSULTANCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usually refers to those living within a small, loosely defined geographical area. Yet any group of individuals who share interests may also be described as a community. Also sometimes used to describe a physical area rather than a group of people. It is a local group of residents that identify themselves in some way or other as having a common bond – values, resources and needs as well as physical space.</td>
<td>The act or an instance of consulting. Also a business or agency offering expert or professional advice in a field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS COMMUNITY</th>
<th>CONSULTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body of individuals who manage businesses.</td>
<td>Seeking people's views (but not necessarily involving them in decision-making).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>PUBLIC CONSULTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization operating at a local level to represent a local community or interest group. It differs from non-governmental organizations in that their principal concerns are not cause-specific and their area of operation is geographically defined.</td>
<td>The act or process of consulting with the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY PLANNING</th>
<th>CULTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning carried out with the active participation of the end users.</td>
<td>The totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions, and all other products of human work and thought.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>CULTURAL HERITAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To engage the community as participants.</td>
<td>Something that is passed down from preceding generations; a tradition that reflects the behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions, and other products of human work and thought.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECENTRALIZATION</th>
<th>CONSULTANT BRIEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process of transferring responsibility from central agencies and institutions to lower levels of management and administration.</td>
<td>A condensation or an abstract of a larger document or series of documents from a consultant. It is also the Terms of Reference for a consultancy tender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMONSTRATION PROJECT</strong></td>
<td><strong>ENVISIONING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A relatively self-contained, small-scale capital investment or technical assistance project which is implemented in order to “demonstrate” in practice how a particular type of problem can be addressed in a participatory way.</td>
<td>See Visioning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DESIGN</strong></th>
<th><strong>EQUALITY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To conceive or fashion in the mind; invent, to formulate a plan for; devise.</td>
<td>The state of being equal. Equity may or may not involve equal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DESIGN GUIDELINES</strong></th>
<th><strong>EQUITY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To devise a rule or set of rules giving guidance on how to deal with the design or layout of a certain space or area.</td>
<td>The quality of being impartial and ‘fair’ in the distribution of the benefits and costs of development and the provision of access for opportunities for all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DESIGN STANDARDS</strong></th>
<th><strong>EVALUATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To devise a set of morals, ethics or habits established by authority, customs, or an individual case accepted as a standard, model or pattern regarded as typical.</td>
<td>The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PUBLIC SPACE DESIGN</strong></th>
<th><strong>FACILITATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is the design of an area where anyone has a right to be without being excluded because of economic or social conditions.</td>
<td>The act of making something easy or easier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>URBAN DESIGN</strong></th>
<th><strong>FACILITATOR</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban design is the process of shaping the physical setting for life in cities, towns and villages. It is the art of making places. It involves the design of buildings, groups of buildings, spaces and landscapes, and establishing the processes that make successful development possible.</td>
<td>Person responsible for leading or coordinating the work of a group, as one who leads a group discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DRAFT PLAN</strong></th>
<th><strong>FORMAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A plan that lays out a preliminary form of a final plan.</td>
<td>Executed, carried out, or done in proper or regular form, characterized by strict or meticulous observation of forms. Vs. Informal Without formality or ceremony; casual.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EFFECTIVENESS</strong></th>
<th><strong>GENDER</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives have been achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.</td>
<td>The social, cultural and biological condition of being male or female.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EFFICIENCY</strong></th>
<th><strong>GENDER BALANCE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skillfulness in avoiding wasted time and effort. A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.</td>
<td>A harmonious or satisfying arrangement or proportion of females and males.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EMPOWERMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>GENDER EQUALITY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of confidence and skills in individuals or communities leading to the ability to take more control over their own destinies.</td>
<td>Concept that all human beings, both men and women, are free to develop their personal abilities and to make choices without limitations set by stereotypes, rigid gender roles and prejudices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EMPOWERING</strong></th>
<th><strong>GENDER EQUITY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving authority to an institution or organization (or individual) to determine policy and make decisions. It is about inclusion and bringing people who are outside the decision-making process into it.</td>
<td>Fairness of treatment of women and men, according to their respective needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **GENDER PLANNING** | |
|---------------------| |
| It refers to the processes of planning that are gender sensitive and take into account the impact of differing gender roles, gender relations and the gender needs of men and women. | |
GENDER SENSITIVE (-ITY)
(Being) Susceptible to the attitudes, feelings, or circumstances of men and women.

GOVERNANCE
The process of making decisions and monitoring their implementation. Good governance requires recognizing, respecting and engaging all the potential actors and stakeholders who will be affected by the decisions that are made.

URBAN GOVERNANCE
The act, process, or power of governing of, pertaining to, or designating a city or town.

GOVERNING
The act or process of governing, especially the control and administration of public policy in a political unit (a government).

HABITAT AGENDA
The United Nations’ Summit on Human Settlements’ in 1996 adopted the Habitat Agenda, a Global Plan of Action that focuses on ways and means of ensuring adequate shelter for all and managing sustainable human settlements in an increasingly urbanized world.

HOUSING
Buildings or other shelters in which people live.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Housing assets including buildings or other type of shelters in which people live that are believed to be within financial means of specific social groups.

SOCIAL HOUSING
Social housing is an umbrella term referring to rental housing which may be owned and managed by the state, by not-for-profit organizations, or by a combination of the two, usually with the aim of providing affordable housing.

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
The process of equipping people with the understanding and skills, and the access to information and knowledge to perform effectively.

ILLEGAL
Prohibited by law or by official rules.

ILLEGAL SETTLEMENT
A community where people live on a space or area, which is prohibited by law, prohibited by official rules.

INFORMAL
Not formal or ceremonious; casual.

INFORMAL SETTLEMENT
Human settlements which do not meet requirements for legal recognition and have been constructed without respecting formal procedures of legal ownership, transfer of ownership, as well as construction and urban planning regulations; mainly characterized by informal or insecure land tenure, inadequate access to basic services, both social and physical infrastructure and housing finance.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT
Evaluation of the effect or impression of one thing.

IMPLEMENTATION
The process of achieving an end; an instrument or agent. To put into practical effect; carry out.

INCLUSIVE
Taking into account a great deal or everyone within a community, comprehensive.

INCLUSIVE CITY
A place where everyone, regardless of wealth, age, race, gender, etc. can participate productively in the opportunities that cities have to offer.

INCLUSIVE PLANNING
Planning that includes all relevant stakeholders within its scope.

INTEGRATE
To form a whole by bringing all parts together.

INTEGRATED PLANNING
A framework for planning and development assessment system.

INTERVENTION
The act or fact of interposing one thing between or amongst others.

SPATIAL INTERVENTION
The act or fact of interposing one thing between or among others occurring in space.

INVESTMENT
The investing of money or capital in order to gain profitable returns, as interest, income, or appreciation in value.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT
The money paid to purchase a capital asset or a fixed asset.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROJECT
Allocation of funds to initiate, develop and implement a project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Glossary</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **LAND MANAGEMENT**  
The process of managing the use and development (in both urban and rural areas) of land resources in a sustainable way. |
| **LAND USE**  
Allocation of land for a specific purpose e.g. agriculture, industry, residential development or other use. |
| **LAND USE PLANNING**  
Term used for a branch of public policy which encompasses various disciplines which seek to order and regulate the use of land in an efficient and ethical way. |
| **LEADERSHIP**  
Ability of a person (leader) to develop a vision of future possibilities and to present that vision in a way that others can understand and relate to. Taking responsibility and inspiring confidence is also vital to leadership. |
| **LIVELIHOODS**  
All the assets and resources upon which households can draw in order to sustain their existence and development. |
| **MANAGEMENT**  
Management comprises planning, organizing, resourcing, leading or directing, and controlling an organization (a group of one or more people or entities) or effort for the purpose of accomplishing a goal. |
| **MEDIATION**  
Aims to assist disputants in reaching an agreement. It is a means of resolving disputes. It is often seen as an alternative to using costly legal processes to settle conflicts. In mediation a neutral person or agency helps the different parties to reach a negotiated settlement. |
| **MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS**  
The principal outcome of the United Nations Millennium Declaration endorsed by 147 heads of states and governments in 2000, with 8 goals to be achieved by the year 2015. Of special relevance for planning is Goal 7 to ensure Environmental Sustainability, including specific targets to integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources; to reduce biodiversity loss; to halve the proportion of the population without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation; and to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers. |
| **MITIGATION**  
To moderate, reduce, lessen, or decrease in force or intensity; involves taking actions aimed at reducing the extent of some action. |
| **MOBILITY**  
The movement of people from place to place. |
| **MOBILITY PLANNING**  
Planning and managing the movement of people from place to place. |
| **SUSTAINABLE MOBILITY**  
A transport system that provides optimal access to opportunities for all residents or citizens using a minimum of resources. |
| **MONITORING**  
A continuing function to provide management and the main stakeholders of ongoing development with indications of the extent of progress, achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. |
| **PROGRESS MONITOR**  
A book or log to systematically keep track of a progress toward a goal. |
| **MUNICIPALITY**  
An administrative unit incorporating urban and/or rural areas possessing corporate status and usually its own local government. |
| **MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**  
A spatial development plan of the entire municipality. |
| **URBAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN**  
A spatial development plan of an urban area. |
| **NEIGHBORHOOD**  
The area or region around or near some place or thing; a district or locality; number of persons living near one another or in a particular locality. |
| **NEGOTIATION**  
It is a process of reaching consensus by exchanging information, bargaining and compromise. |
| **NETWORK**  
A system of interrelations between people, services or objects e.g. buildings, offices, stations, etc., especially over a large area or throughout a country, territory, region, etc. |
| **LEARNING NETWORK**  
A network that is cultivated so that knowledge is acquired by systematic study in any field of scholarly application. |
| **NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION (NGO)**  
Term applied to a wide range of organizations which are not established by or operated by a government. Typically, an NGO is concerned with one particular area of activity. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION (NPO)</strong></th>
<th><strong>PLANNING EXPERT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A legally constituted organiza</td>
<td>A person who has spe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tion whose primary objective</td>
<td>cial skills or knowle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is to support or to actively</td>
<td>dge in the field of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engage in activities of public</td>
<td>planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or private interest without</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any commercial or monetary pro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fit purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OBJECTIVE</strong></th>
<th><strong>PLANNING TEAM</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Something that</td>
<td>A group of profes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one’s efforts</td>
<td>sionals employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or actions are</td>
<td>to administer an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intended to at-</td>
<td>entity composed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tain or accomplish;</td>
<td>of a clearly de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose; goal; tar-</td>
<td>fined territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get.</td>
<td>and its popula</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PACT</strong></th>
<th><strong>PERMIT (NOUN)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A formal agreement, a bargain.</td>
<td>Documentation ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ded to allow some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>URBAN PACT</strong></th>
<th><strong>BUILDING PERMIT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A formal agree-</td>
<td>Documentation needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment, a bargain</td>
<td>to construct a build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regarding urban</td>
<td>ing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>framed within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a long-term vi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PARTICIPATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>PRACTICE (NOUN)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The involvement</td>
<td>A learning method,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of people in the</td>
<td>usually through re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning and man-</td>
<td>petition in order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agement of develop-</td>
<td>to improve; a theo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment programmes and</td>
<td>retical term for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects.</td>
<td>human action in so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PARTICIPATORY PLANNING</strong></th>
<th><strong>PRACTICE (VERB)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban or spatial planning</td>
<td>The act of rehearsing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the participation of al</td>
<td>a behavior over and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l relevant shareholders.</td>
<td>over, or engaging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PARTNERSHIP</strong></th>
<th><strong>PROCESS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implies shared</td>
<td>A naturally occur-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility,</td>
<td>ing or designed se-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared risks and</td>
<td>quence of changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared ben-</td>
<td>and/or procedures in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efits – partners</td>
<td>the properties or at-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have equal status,</td>
<td>tributes in a sys-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>though they may</td>
<td>tem, such as in plan-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have different</td>
<td>ning, which converts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles and inter-</td>
<td>it from one form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ests.</td>
<td>to another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PEER</strong></th>
<th><strong>PUBLIC</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A person</td>
<td>Belonging to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who is equa</td>
<td>the people; rela-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l to another</td>
<td>ting to, or affec-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in abilities,</td>
<td>ting, a nation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualifications,</td>
<td>state, or communi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age, back-</td>
<td>ty; as opposed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ground, and</td>
<td>private (space/inter-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social status.</td>
<td>est), such as the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PLACE</strong></th>
<th><strong>PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A particular</td>
<td>A government service or pri-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portion of</td>
<td>vate business venture which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space, of de-</td>
<td>is funded and operated through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finite or indif-</td>
<td>a partnership of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nite extent.</td>
<td>and one or more private sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PLACEMAKING</strong></th>
<th><strong>PUBLIC SERVICE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term to describe</td>
<td>A term usually used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the process of</td>
<td>to mean services pro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creating squares,</td>
<td>vided by govern-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parks, streets,</td>
<td>ment to its citi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and waterfronts.</td>
<td>zens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is often used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in relation to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those charac-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teristics that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make a place spe-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cial or unique, as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well as to those</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that foster a sense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of authentic human</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attachment and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belonging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PLANNING</strong></th>
<th><strong>PUBLIC TRANSPORT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A scheme, pro-</td>
<td>Transport services li-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammme, or method</td>
<td>censed by the govern-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worked out be-</td>
<td>ment to its citi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forehand for</td>
<td>zens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the accomplish-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment of an ob-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PLANNING CYCLE</strong></th>
<th><strong>PUBLIC UTILITY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning requires</td>
<td>A service provided to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a process that</td>
<td>the residents of a cer-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prioritizes ideas,</td>
<td>tain area that sat-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assesses their re-</td>
<td>isfies their needs such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levance and poten-</td>
<td>as water, sewage, trans-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tial, and documents</td>
<td>port, communication, el-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the steps in the</td>
<td>ectricity, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUALITY
An essential or distinctive characteristic, property, or attribute.

SPATIAL QUALITY
An essential or distinctive characteristic, property, or attribute relating to, involving, or having the nature of space or the living environment.

REGENERATION
Reversing the decline of urban or rural areas that is caused by a process of natural wear and tear, lack of private and public investment, and/or negligence.

REGULARIZATION
The act of bringing to uniformity; making regular.

REGULATORY PLAN
The principles and regulations on spatial planning established in a community by an authority and applicable to its people. It is a plan designed to ensure that an organization complies with all the regulations and laws pertaining to their organization.

RESOURCE
A source of supply, support, or aid, especially one that can be readily drawn upon when needed.

NATURAL RESOURCE
Naturally occurring assets that are considered valuable in their relatively unmodified (natural) form as well as those which gain value through processing e.g. raw materials.

CULTURAL RESOURCE
Resources of a country such as the arts and heritage, archaeology, literature, music.

REVIEW
An assessment of the performance of an intervention conducted at regular time intervals or on an ad-hoc basis.

RURAL
Pertaining to, or characteristic of, the country, country life, or country people; as opposed to urban: places outside towns, cities or significant agglomerations; rustic, pastoral, bucolic.

SECTOR
A distinct part, especially of society or of a nation’s economy: the housing sector; the educational sector, a section or zone, as of a city.

SECTORAL PLANNING
A scheme, programme, or method worked out beforehand for the accomplishment of an objective within a section or zone, as of a city.

SETTLEMENT
The act or state of settling or the state of being settled, the act of making stable or installing on a permanent basis; groups of houses/buildings; a community.

SPATIAL
Of, relating to, involving, or having the nature of space.

SPATIAL ORDER
A structure of space according to a predefined order or plan.

SPATIAL FRAMEWORK
A skeletal structure designed to support or enclose something relating to, involving, or having the nature of space.

SPATIAL PLANNING
Planning of physical space, layouts and land use in urban or town planning. It seeks to establish relationships between places and to coordinate activities between spatial scales so as to promote economic development but also territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

STAKEHOLDER
The person or organization who has an interest in a given issue or area. They may be affected by the outcomes or they may have a part to play, in which case they are often referred to as ‘actors’.

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS
Gaining an understanding about who is affected by any proposal and therefore who should be involved in any participation process. A useful first step in most participation processes.

STAKEHOLDER PROFILE
An analysis representing the extent to which a person or organization exhibits various characteristics.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT
The inclusion of a stakeholder as a necessary circumstance or consequence.

STRATEGY
A plan, method, or series of maneuvers for obtaining a specific goal or result.

STRATEGIC
Important in or essential to strategy.

STRATEGIC PLANNING
Organized effort to produce decisions and actions that shape and guide what a community is, what it does, and why it does it.
### STRATEGIC PROJECT
Those projects which are of critical importance to enable the organization to succeed.

### STATEMENT
A communication or declaration in speech or writing, setting forth facts or particulars.

### MISSION STATEMENT
It is a brief statement of the purpose, goals and ambitions of an organization.

### VISION STATEMENT
It outlines what a community wants to be. It concentrates on future; it is a source of inspiration; it provides clear decision-making criteria.

### STRUCTURE
Mode of building, construction, or organization; arrangement of parts, elements, or constituents.

### SPATIAL STRUCTURE
Mode of building, construction, or organization; constituting a certain space.

### EXISTING SPATIAL STRUCTURE
Mode of building, construction, or organization; constituting a certain space that exists.

### DESIRED SPATIAL STRUCTURE
Selected mode of building, construction, or organization; constituting a certain space that exists.

### SUBSIDIARITY
A principle which states that matters ought to be handled by the most appropriate competent authority, if possible at the 'lowest effective level' of decision making.

### SURVEY
To take a general or comprehensive view of or appraise, a situation or an area of study.

### SUSTAINABILITY
The ability of systems and processes to maintain, support or endure; devising and allowing for the evolution of these systems; a complex series of concepts that relate to needs and limitations, now and in the future, within a number of arenas (defined under ‘Sustainable development’).

### SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
Development that supports the ability of future generations to meet their social, economic, and environmental needs, while meeting the needs of present generations. There are five aspects of sustainability that affect and relate to the development of settlements, towns and cities.

### ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY
Relates to the capacity to put local/regional resources to productive use for the long-term benefit of the community without damaging or depleting the natural resource base on which it depends and without increasing the city’s ecological footprint.

### SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY
Refers to the fairness, inclusiveness and cultural adequacy of an intervention to promote equitable rights over the natural, physical and economic capital that supports the livelihoods of communities, with particular emphasis on the poor and marginalized groups.

### ECOLOGICAL SUSTAINABILITY
Pertains to the impact of urban production and consumption on the integrity and health of the city-region and global carrying capacity.

### PHYSICAL SUSTAINABILITY
Concerns the capacity of an intervention to enhance the livability of buildings and urban infrastructure for all city dwellers, without damaging or disrupting the urban region environment.

### POLITICAL SUSTAINABILITY
Concerned with the quality of governance systems guiding the relationship and actions of different actors within the previous four dimensions.

### SWOT
Acronym for the determination of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats relating to an organization or activity.

### SWOT ANALYSIS
A strategic planning tool used to evaluate the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats involved in a project or in a business venture.

### SWOT STRATEGY
To build strategies based on SWOT-analysis

### TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
Technical assistance supports the development of the productive resources of an organization or country by helping to effectively manage their economic policy and financial affairs.

### TERMS OF REFERENCE
Written document presenting the purpose and scope of the evaluation, the methods to be used, the standard against which performance is to be assessed or analyses are to be conducted, the resources and time allocated, and reporting requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Glossary</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **TENURE**  
The act, fact, or condition of holding something in one's possession such as land, real estate or an office. |
| **SECURITY OF TENURE**  
Term used to describe a legal guarantee that a real estate or office-holder cannot be removed except in exceptional and specified circumstances. |
| **TERRITORIAL COHESION**  
A concept of enhancing the capacity of all regions to make the best use of their territorial assets in a sustainable manner through appropriate public policies, investment strategies, spatial and governance frameworks. |
| **TOKENISM**  
Policy or practice of limited inclusion or political representation of members of a minority group, usually creating a false appearance of inclusive practices rather than discrimination, intentional or not. |
| **UPGRADING**  
A process of progressive improvement of the physical, social and economic environment of a settlement. It involves the adaptation of an existing layout to incorporate improved facilities and infrastructure and does not involve major redevelopment. |
| **URBAN**  
Of, pertaining to, or designating a city, town or significant agglomeration. |
| **URBAN DEVELOPMENT**  
The act or process of developing; growth; progress pertaining to, or designating an urban entity. |
| **URBAN MANAGEMENT**  
The act or manner of managing; handling, direction, or control pertaining to, or designating an urban entity. |
| **URBAN PLANNING**  
An act of formulating a programme for a definite course of action pertaining to, or designating an urban entity. |
| **URBANIZATION**  
The social process whereby urban locations grow and societies become more urban in characteristic. |
| **UNCONTROLLED URBANIZATION**  
The social process whereby cities grow and societies become more urban without being under control. |
| **TASK FORCE**  
A temporary grouping of individuals and resources for the accomplishment of a specific objective. |
| **VISION**  
The act or power of anticipating that which will or may come to be. A Vision is the overall image of what the community wants to be and how it wants to look at some point in the future. |
| **VISION STATEMENT**  
A vision statement is the formal expression of the Vision. It depicts in words and images what the community is striving to become. The vision statement is the starting point for the creation and implementation of action plans. |
| **VISION DESIGN**  
A Vision design depicts the spatial expression of the Vision statements. It contains the desired spatial structure on separate key issues and/or on integrated level. |
| **VISIONING (also ENVISIONING)**  
Visioning is a process by which a community envisions the future it wants, and plans how to achieve it. It brings people together to develop a shared image of what they want their community to become. |
| **VISIONING WORKSHOP**  
A Visioning workshop is a one-day or multi-day working meeting of stakeholders involved in the planning process for a specific area or spatial issue, aiming at delivering a Vision statement and Vision design for the planning area or issue. |
| **VULNERABLE**  
Open to moral or physical attack, criticism, social isolation, or temptation. |
| **ZONE**  
Any continuous tract or area that differs in some respect from the others or is distinguished for some purpose, from adjoining tracts or areas. |
| **ZONING**  
Defines the purpose for which land may be used. |
| **ZONING REGULATION**  
It is deciding the kinds of activities that will be acceptable on particular lots (such as open space, residential, agricultural, commercial or industrial). |
UN-HABITAT KOSOVO

Since the end of the war in Kosovo in 1999, UN-Habitat has been promoting good governance, security of tenure, sustainable human settlements development and inclusive spatial planning in Kosovo and the broader region. UN-Habitat’s interventions were focused on the establishment of institutions to deal with property and planning issues, such as the Housing and Property Directorate, the Kosovo Cadastre Agency, the Institute for Spatial Planning within the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning. The other line of interventions went to building capacities for efficient management of local governments through capacity building programmes and on the job assistance: Local Government Programme, and Municipal Support Programme (2000-2001), Urban Planning and Management Programme (2001-2003), the Governance and Development Planning Programme (2003-2006), Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme, MuSPP, phase 1 and 2 (2005-2011), (2005-2008) and the ongoing third phase of MuSPP (2011-2014) implemented through the financial support of the governments of the Netherlands (MSP, UPMP, GDPP) and Sweden (MuSPP), respectively. For details see the Acknowledgements and www.unhabitat-kosovo.org.

CULTURAL HERITAGE WITHOUT BORDERS

Cultural Heritage without Borders was founded in 1995 and is a private Swedish foundation working in the spirit of the ‘The Hague Convention’ from 1954 for protection of cultural property endangered by war, natural disasters, neglect, poverty or political and social conflict. A large part of Cultural Heritage without Border’s activities is funded by Sida (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) and Cultural Heritage without Borders Kosovo is entirely locally staffed and managed. Since 2001, and Cultural Heritage without Borders Kosovo has applied community-based methods for integrated preservation of movable and immovable cultural heritage, framed within a long-term vision that is strongly rooted in the local history. “Knowledge of the past creates strong visions for the future.” This quote is used to label and Cultural Heritage without Borders’s mission in Kosovo, noted in a report from the Danish Interior and Social Ministry (December 2009). The quote also matches with the aims and methods of the visioning workshops, and is best illustrated by the “Memory Map”, as a first step in the visioning process, and Cultural Heritage without Borders has assisted comprehensively in the generation of many of these memory maps and has publicized the so-called “nostalgic map” of Junik as a popular flyer (see Annex 13). Junik is not only a best case practice in terms of participatory action planning, it also represent one of and Cultural Heritage without Borders’s best examples of the integrated conservation of cultural and natural heritage, with a growing number of restored traditional stone houses (kullas), offering Bed & Breakfast and other touristic services. For more see www.chwbkosovo.org.

FRIEDRICH-EBERT-STIFTUNG

The Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung is a non-profit German political foundation committed to the advancement of public policy in the spirit of the basic values of social democracy through education, research and international cooperation. Its mission, both at home in Germany and in over 100 countries, is to promote democracy, social justice and economic-reform through capacity building, policy development and promotion of dialogue, only one year after the Kosovo war. Since the Prishtina/Pristina Office was established in 2000, the foundation is committed to the support of democratic structures and ethnic reconciliation in Kosovo. In cooperation with local partners, it aims to contribute to the establishment of a socially just society and the creation of an active civil society. For more - including a short report on the latest Visioning workshop with the community of Gracanica - see www.fes-prishtina.org.
THE NEED FOR URBAN DESIGN IN KOSOVO

INTRODUCTION

Municipal and Urban Development Plans are urgently needed to guide the urban and rural development in Kosovo. Turning these strategic plans into real interventions that improve the urban environment also requires detailed urban design and landscaping proposals. The Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European cities (EU Spatial Planning Ministers, May 2007), considers “creating and ensuring high quality spaces…to be of crucial importance for strengthening the competitiveness of European cities”. This Leaflet considers this statement from the perspective of Kosovo - why it is just as valid here as elsewhere in Europe and what it means. Recent years have witnessed a rapid growth in the population of Kosovo’s towns and cities, most notably Pristina which has doubled in size since the end of the conflict. This physical change has been paralleled by social upheaval as traditional bonds of clan and family are eroded with urbanization. Infrastructure, such as roads, open space and schools as well as water, sewers and electricity has struggled to cope with the demands of more people with increasing expectations. These demands and expectations are fueling the competition for city space, with a desire to facilitate personal mobility being prominent on the agenda of most decision makers. Perhaps one of the principal expressions of this is the roads of Pristina and other cities in Kosovo which are clogged with traffic that occupies nearly all the space from building wall to building wall. With discontinuous footpaths that are pot-holed, blocked by parked vehicles and with little landscaping they discourage any use other than vehicles moving through them. This is a major issue when you consider that streets and open spaces typically make up around 20% of most cities. They are the principal forum for social interaction, they connect the places we have to get to in order to meet our needs (school, work, healthcare, shops, etc) and are the perspective from which many of our day to day experiences are gained.
BOX - GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING AND VISIONING

In a practical handbook and website, Nick Wates has put together 47 general principles for a wide range of community planning methods and tools, of which the most relevant are selected for Community Visioning approaches. The principles printed bold are further explored in Chapter 2 of this Visioning Toolkit.

ACCEPT DIFFERENT AGENDAS

People will want to be involved for a variety of reasons. This need not be a problem but it helps to be aware of people’s different agendas.

ACCEPT LIMITATIONS

No community planning activity can solve all the world’s problems. But that is not a reason for holding back. Limited practical improvements will almost always result, and community planning activity can often act as a catalyst for more fundamental change.

AGREE RULES AND BOUNDARIES

There should be a common understanding by all main interest groups of the approach adopted. Particularly in communities where there is fear – for instance that others may be trying to gain territorial advantage – it is vital that the rules and boundaries are clearly understood and agreed. In particular it is important to be clear about what can and cannot be changed as a result of any community involvement.

AVOID JARGON

Use plain language. Jargon prevents people from engaging and is usually a smokescreen to hide incompetence, ignorance or arrogance. For necessary jargon, use a glossary.

BE HONEST

Be open and straightforward about the nature of any activity. People will generally participate more enthusiastically if they know that something can be achieved through their participation (e.g. if there is a budget for a capital project). But they may be quite prepared to participate ‘at risk’ providing they know the odds. If there is only a small chance of positive change as a result of people participating, say so. Avoid hidden agendas.

BE TRANSPARENT

The objectives and people’s roles should be clear and transparent at events. For instance, it may seem trivial but the importance of name badges to prevent events being the preserve of the ‘in-crowd’ can never be stressed enough.

BE VISIONARY YET REALISTIC

Nothing much is likely to be achieved without raising expectations. Yet dwelling entirely on the utopian can be frustrating. Strike a balance between setting visionary utopian goals and being realistic about the practical options available.

BUILD LOCAL CAPACITY

Long-term community sustainability depends on developing human and social capital. Take every opportunity to develop local skills and capacity.

COMMUNICATE

Use all available media to let people know what you are doing and how they can get involved. Community newspapers or broadsheets in particular are invaluable. Community newspapers and, increasingly, websites are invaluable. Information provision is a vital element of all participatory activities.
**FLEXIBILITY**

Be prepared to modify processes as circumstances dictate. Avoid inflexible methods and strategies.

**FOLLOW UP**

Lack of follow-up is the most common failing, usually due to a failure to plan and budget for it. Make sure you set aside time and resources for documenting, publicizing and acting on the results of any community planning initiative.

**GO AT THE RIGHT PACE**

Rushing can lead to problems. On the other hand, without deadlines things can drift. Using experienced external advisors may speed up the process but often at the expense of developing local capacity. Get the balance right.

**HAVE FUN**

Getting involved in creating and managing the environment should not be a chore. It can be a great opportunity to meet people and have fun. The most interesting and sustainable environments have been produced where people have enjoyed creating them. Community planning requires humor. Use cartoons, jokes and games whenever possible.

**INTEGRATE WITH DECISION-MAKING**

Community planning activity needs to be integrated with government decision-making processes. Participatory processes are undermined if there is no clear link to decision-making.

**INVOLVE ALL SECTIONS OF THE COMMUNITY**

People of different ages, gender, backgrounds and cultures almost invariably have different perspectives. Ensure that a full spectrum of the community is involved. This is usually far more important than involving large numbers.

**LOCAL OWNERSHIP OF THE PROCESS**

The community planning process should be ‘owned’ by local people. Even though consultants or (inter)national organizations may be providing advice and taking responsibility for certain activities, the local community should take responsibility for the overall process.

**NOW IS THE RIGHT TIME**

The best time to start involving people is at the beginning of any programme. The earlier the better. But if programmes have already begun, participation should be introduced as soon as possible. Start now.

**PREPARE PROPERLY**

The most successful activities are invariably those on which sufficient time and effort have been given to preliminary organization and engaging those who may be interested.

**PROCESS AS IMPORTANT AS PRODUCT**

The way that things are done is often as important as the end result. But remember that the aim is implementation. Participation is important but is not an end in itself.

**RECORD AND DOCUMENT**

Make sure participation activities are properly recorded and documented so that it can be clearly seen who has been involved and how. Easily forgotten, such records can be invaluable at a later stage.

**RESPECT LOCAL KNOWLEDGE**

All people, whether literate or not, whether rich or poor, whether children, women or men, have a remarkable understanding of their surroundings and are capable of analyzing and assessing their situation, often better than trained professionals. Respect local perceptions, choices and abilities and involve local people in setting goals and strategies.

**SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS**

Important groups representing different special interests have a vital role to play in shaping the environment because of its complexity. Decision-makers need to consider evidence which represents best the variety of interests of current and future communities, including taking into account views of specific interest groups with particular knowledge.
### Spend Money

Effective participation processes take time and energy. There are methods to suit a range of budgets and much can be achieved using only people’s time and energy. But over-tight budgets usually lead to cutting corners and poor results. Remember that community planning is an important activity, the success or failure of which may have dramatic implications for future generations as well as your own resources. The costs of building the wrong thing in the wrong place can be astronomical and make the cost of proper community planning pale into insignificance. Budget generously.

### Use Experts Appropriately

The best results emerge when local people work closely and intensively with experts from all the necessary disciplines. Creating and managing the environment is very complicated and requires a variety of expertise and experience to do it well. Do not be afraid of expertise, embrace it. But avoid dependency on, or ‘hijacking’ by, professionals. Keep control local. Use experts ‘little and often’ to allow local participants time to develop capability, even if it means they sometimes make mistakes.

### Use Facilitators

Orchestrating group activities is a real skill. Without good facilitation the most articulate and powerful may dominate. Particularly if large numbers of people are involved, ensure that the person (or people) directing events has good facilitation skills. If not, hire someone who has.

### Use Local Talent

Make use of local skills and professionalism within the community before supplementing them with outside assistance. This will help develop capability within the community and help achieve long-term sustainability.

### Use Outsiders, But Carefully

A central principle of community planning is that local people know best. But outsiders, if well briefed, can provide a fresh perspective which can be invigorating. Getting the right balance between locals and outsiders is important; avoid locals feeling swamped or intimidated by ‘foreigners’.

### Visualize

People can participate far more effectively if information is presented visually rather than in words. A great deal of poor development, and hostility to good development, is due to people not understanding what it will look like. Use graphics, maps, illustrations, cartoons, drawings, photomontages and models wherever possible. And make the process itself visible by using flip charts, Post-it notes, colored dots and banners.

### Work On Location

Wherever possible, base community planning activities physically in the area being planned. This makes it much easier for everyone to bridge the gap from concept to reality.

Source: http://www.communityplanning.net/
At the end of 2006, the City Council of Antwerp, Belgium approved its Strategic Spatial Structure Plan – the result of long and intensive work – now the road map for many strategic urban interventions. This spatial policy determines the vision of the city’s desired development, and is based on careful analysis of the city at various scales, its needs, but also its strengths and opportunities. The structure plan designs tomorrow’s city and translates this into a tangible action plan and urban strategic projects. One of the flagship projects is *Spoor Noord* (Northern Railway Yard). *Spoor Noord* was an abandoned railroad site. For more than a century this 24-hectare site has been a barrier between the surrounding densely built up areas, which has now been entirely transformed into a landscape park. This project became the symbol of a new urban vision based on liveability and sustainable development, based on a clear vision, expressed by an intended spatial structure as shown below. The vision was a pivotal element for more detailed urban designing and technical implementation plans. The project however is also considered as a best practice example of participatory and inclusive planning and visioning. 20 per cent of the planning budget and 3.5 per cent of the total investment budget was allocated for creative stakeholder involvement, including difficult target groups of minority communities living around the site. The illustrations show a variety of participatory activities throughout the entire planning process, from the early start to the incremental implementation. Visioning workshops and planning debates were combined with low threshold cultural events to mobilize all community groups and to foster local ownership of the new park site, which turned out to be very successful.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

- A clear community vision as the stepping stone for successful multilevel cooperation.
- Local government in the driving seat to direct the multilevel cooperation.
- Substantive resourcing for creative stakeholder and community involvement.
The Connected City: A 21st century planners charter for cities.

The European Council of Spatial Planners is confident that in the 21st century Europe will advance decisively towards the goal of integration. Within this developing framework, the council presents a common and widely shared vision on the future of European cities (Part A). This is a vision of a network of cities, which will:

- Retain their cultural richness and diversity, resulting from their long history, linking the past through the present to the future.
- Become connected in a multitude of meaningful and functional networks.
- Remain creatively competitive whilst striving for complementarities and co-operation.
- Contribute decisively to the well being of their inhabitants and users.
- Integrate the man-made and the natural elements of the environment.
- Within the Charter, the vision also includes a framework for implementation (Part B) consisting of:
  - A brief summary of the main issues and challenges that affect cities at the beginning of the third millennium.
  - The commitments required by spatial planners in realizing the vision.

This Charter was adopted in Athens in 2003, 70 years after the modernist Charter of Athens (and therefore also nicknamed as the ‘New Charter of Athens’) is addressed primarily to professional planners working throughout Europe and those concerned with the planning process - to give direction to their actions, for greater coherence in building a meaningful network of cities in Europe connected through time, at all levels and in all sectors. Spatial planning is vital for the delivery of sustainable development. In particular, it concerns the prudent management of space, a critical natural resource, limited in supply, but with growing demands upon it. It also requires trans-disciplinary teamwork involving different skills at various scales in long-lasting processes. The particular attribute of the planning profession is its ability to take a range of issues into account and to translate them into spatial terms. The ECTP is aware of both the variety and the universality of the planning profession in Europe as it takes into account the rich diversity of its cities and regions.

COMMITMENTS

This part of the Charter presents the commitments for professional planners practicing in Europe. It describes a set of values that should be embraced by planners in advising politicians and the public in striving both to achieve the Vision and to apply the principles for city development that are set out in the Charter. Spatial planning is essentially trans-disciplinary teamwork involving different professionals and actors in complex processes. These commitments aim to identify the specificity of the planning discipline that distinguishes planners from other involved parties and, at the same time, to clarify the potential strengths of the profession, thus reinforcing self-confidence, cohesion and solidarity among planners. The planner’s role evolves following the development of society and of planning laws and policies. These vary according to the different political and social frameworks in every country where planners are acting either as visionaries, technocrats, managers, advisors, mentors, or instructors. Compared to other disciplines, the distinctive difference is that spatial planners must focus primarily on the interests of society as a whole, the settlement or the region as an entity, and the longer-term future. It is widely recognized that planning is not solely concerned with plan preparation. It is also part of a political process aiming to balance all relevant interests - public and private - so as to solve conflicting demands on space and development programmes. This points to the importance of the role of the planner as mediator. Now and in the future the mediation and negotiation skills of planners will become increasingly more important.

The planner’s role will thus be more demanding than at any time in the past. It will require increased design, synthesis, managerial and administrative skills, in order to support and guide the public planning process during all its phases: It will also demand a scientific approach, the achievement of social consensus which recognizes individual differences, as well as political decisions, leading to the implementation, management, monitoring and review of plans and programmes. These complex and challenging roles require particular commitments for spatial planners engaged as political advisors, designers, urban managers and scientists in the 21st century.

A selection of the different commitments and tasks of planners are listed in the green Annex.

For a critical territorial assessment of Kosovo vis-à-vis the European Planners Charter, see The Transitional City. Post-conflict Kosovo and The New Charter of Athens, F. D’hondt, Built Environment, 2011
ANNEX 6

A PLANNER IS...

THE PLANNER AS A SCIENTIST IS COMMITTED TO:
Analyze existing features and trends, considering the wider geographic context and focusing on long-term needs to provide full, clear and accurate information to decision-makers, stakeholders and the public. Maintain an appropriate knowledge of contemporary planning philosophy, theory, research, and practice, which includes continuous professional development.

THE PLANNER AS A DESIGNER AND AS A VISIONARY IS COMMITTED TO:
Think in all dimensions, balancing local and regional strategies within global trends. Expand choice and opportunity for all, recognizing a special responsibility for the needs of disadvantaged groups and persons. Strive to protect the integrity of the natural environment, the excellence of urban design and endeavor to conserve the heritage of the built environment for future generations. Elaborate alternative potential solutions for specific problems and challenges, measuring carrying capacities and impacts, enhancing local identities, and contributing to their implementation programmes and feasibility studies. Develop and elaborate spatial development visions showing opportunities for the future development of cities or regions. Convince all involved parties to share a common and long-term vision for their city or region, beyond their individual interests and objectives.

THE PLANNER AS A POLITICAL ADVISOR AND MEDIATOR IS COMMITTED TO:
Respect the principles of solidarity, subsidiarity and equity in decision-making, in planned solutions and in their implementation. Support civic authorities acquainting them with proposals, objectives, targets, impacts, problems, and provide them with plans and solutions aiming at enhancing public welfare. Suggest and elaborate operational legislative tools to ensure efficiency and social justice in spatial policies. Facilitate true public participation and involvement between local authorities, decision-makers, economic stakeholders and individual citizens in order to co-ordinate developments and ensure spatial continuity and cohesion. Collaborate with and co-ordinate all involved parties in order to find consensus or solve conflicts by clear decisions prepared for the appropriate authorities. Strive for a high level of communication to ensure knowledge and understanding among the future users.

THE PLANNER AS AN URBAN MANAGER IS COMMITTED TO:
Adopt strategic management approaches to spatial development processes rather than just plan making to serve bureaucratic administrative requirements. Achieve efficiency and effectiveness of adopted proposals, taking into account economic feasibility and the environmental and social aspects of sustainability. Consider the planning principles and the aims and objectives of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) and other European Union (EU) policy documents - in order to adapt local and regional proposals to European strategies & policies. Co-ordinate different territorial levels and different sectors to ensure collaboration, involvement and support of all administrative bodies and territorial authorities. Stimulate partnerships between public and private sectors in order to enhance investments, create employment, and achieve social cohesion. Benefit positively from European funds by stimulating the participation of local and regional authorities within spatial programmes and projects co-funded by the EU. Monitor plans in order to adjust unforeseen outcomes, propose solutions or actions, and ensure a continuous feedback linkage between planning policy and implementation. Source: www.ceu-ectp.eu
ANNEX 7

KOSOVO SNAPSHOT

Area: 10,908 km²
Population: 1,733,872 (preliminary result Census 2011, the municipalities north of Ibar not included)
Capital: Priština
Languages: Albanian, Serbian, Bosniak, Turkish and Romani
Religions: Islam, Serbian Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism
Currency: euro
International membership: World Bank and International Monetary Fund (since June 2009)

SPATIAL PORTRAIT

Kosovo is a geographical basin, situated at an altitude of about 500 meters, surrounded by mountains, and divided by a central north-south ridge into two sub-regions of roughly equal size and population. A large diaspora, mainly in Western Europe, plays an important role, particularly through remittances and the financing of the parallel structures developed throughout the 1990s. Demographic growth is estimated at about twenty per thousand and average household size is believed to be about 6 people, according to preliminary result Census 2011. Kosovo’s population is by far the youngest in Europe, with about half being below the age of 20. About 60 per cent of the pre-conflict employment was created by agricultural activities (including forestry and agro-business). Unemployment was already high, due to long-term impacts of a regional crisis. This unemployment rate was disproportionately high among ethnic Albanians. Despite substantial development subsidies from all Yugoslav republics, Kosovo was the poorest province of Yugoslavia. Additionally, over the course of the 1990s, poor economic policies, international sanctions, weak access to external trade and finance, and ethnic conflict severely damaged the economy. Kosovo is said to be the poorest economy in Europe, with a per capita income estimated at 1,565 euro (2004). More than 35 per cent of the population lives under the poverty line (1.42 euros per adult per day), while more than 15 per cent live under the extreme poverty line (0.93 euros a day). Most economic development since 1999 has taken place in the trade, retail and the construction sectors. The private sector that has emerged since 1999 is mainly small-scale. The industrial sector remains weak and the electric power supply is still unreliable, and acts as a key constraint. Unemployment remains pervasive, at around 40-50 per cent of the labour force.

The inhabitants living today in Kosovo are distributed throughout more than 1,450 settlements in 37 municipalities. The majority (53 per cent) or 63 per cent of the total population lives below 700 m altitude, while the other part lives in settlements above 700 m altitude, lacking social infrastructure and services. Lacking these basic services, part of the population from these settlements has moved to more developed areas, in search of better housing conditions. The unequal development rate in Kosovo has resulted in population migration from rural to urban areas and from urban to more developed urban areas. The uninterrupted movement of population has burdened urban areas, which in turn are developing without any control of construction and spatial development. The most fertile rural areas, located in low
plain lands, valleys, river and lake terraces, are increasingly being occupied by houses and yards, factories, roads, mines, schools, hospitals and other buildings, all unplanned and often illegal constructions.

The largest city is Priština, the capital, with a population around 200,000. Six other towns have populations in excess of 70,000 and up to 180,000, with Prizren in the south, Gjakova/Dakovica in the south-west, Peja/Peć in the west, Mitrovica in the north and Gjilan/Gniljane and Ferizaj/Uroševac in the south-east.

**SPATIAL PROBLEMS**

- traffic congestion
- lack of public transport
- illegal constructions
- informal settlements
- ribbon development
- environmental degradation
- lack of green spaces

**NON-Spatial PROBLEMS**

- lack of education and other social services
- high unemployment
- increasing poverty
- increasing criminality
- high rate of migration
- social and ethnic disintegration
- weak institutions
- weak civil society

**SPATIAL ASSETS**

- diversity of landscapes
- cultural/natural heritage
- industrial heritage
- old railway networks and stations

- walkable / bike-able short distances
- potential for private investments

**NON SPATIAL ASSETS**

- young population
- lively urban scene
- potential labour force
- strong family ties
- cross-road of cultures in Balkan
- multi religious/multi cultural society
- mercantile tradition

*Source: Re-Creating Kosovo Cities, F. D’hondt, Isocarp publication 2008 (www.isocarp.net/Data/case_studies/912.pdf)*
This programme format was used for 10 visioning workshops in the period 2007-2011. The first workshop was held in Skopje/FYRoM, while all others took place in Ohrid/FYRoM. The traveling time is on average 6 hours and buses provided collective transport for the participants, which also enabled initial socializing.

A typical workshop programme would look like this:

- The first working day starts with a briefing on the programme, working method and house rules, such as ‘respect for each other’, ‘mobiles off or on silent mode’, ‘no smoking during workshops’ (far from easy in this part of the world), ‘no laptops’, and ‘respecting the time frames’. Maybe the most critical ‘rule’ is to step outside official or other representative roles, and think and act as community member with a community sense. The first session is also specially designed to create a ‘level playing field’ by which no individual can be smarter than the other, only different.

- In the first working session, all participants have to select and describe their personal favorite ‘memory place’, if possible a place with a positive memory (“a place where you used to play with friends, or where you met your first girlfriend or boyfriend”). When done, all participants introduce their name, tell their story and pin their post-it at the right place on a map of the municipality. A content-facilitator makes an analysis and synthesis of the memory places in terms of types of places (mostly public spaces and buildings or monuments) and the hits scored by certain types of spaces. The places with the most hits are suggested as landmarks on a memory map, which has to be drawn by a small group of volunteers. This map does not need to be made at once but should ‘grow’ throughout the entire visioning workshop, mostly resulting in a fine piece of ‘community art’ (see also Annex 10).

- After a coffee break, a first training session is provided by the principle content facilitator, entitled ‘The Planning Game’. After giving room for some discussion, a second session is introduced on selecting planning topics that are key for future community development. For more on the content of those crucial training sessions, see Annex 9.

- Session two concludes with a consensus on the 4 to 5 key topics, which will be the basis for breaking down the large group of 35-45 participants into groups of 8-9 persons. The groups can be either composed on an ‘at-random’ basis or by the organizing working party to achieve better balances between people with different backgrounds and capacities. In some cases, it can be useful to make a separate group of municipal planners and planning professionals.

- After a lunch break, a third training sessions explains the “What and How” of the SWOT-analysis - strategies, concluding with practical instructions for the first working sessions in groups.

- The four to five working groups apply the analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats -exercise to their specific topic on a flip chart, followed by a plenary presentation and discussion. In most cases groups were not able to define strategies for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, partly due to time constraints, but also because it requires more advanced ‘strategic thinking’, which is not easy to achieve in such diverse groups (for more on so-called swot – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, see Annex 9).

- The first working day is concluded with a joint dinner and time for relaxation and socializing.

- The second working day starts usually with an “ice-breaker”, an activity to activate the group, usually prepared and guided by one of the local animators. The process-facilitator wraps up the day before with conclusions and asks the trainer to provide a session on the “Power of Visioning”, concluded with instructions for the next working group session.

- In this session, the groups use their SWOT-exercise to formulate spatial goals and objectives for their specific topic, summarized in a (thematic) vision statement and visualized by a logo with a motto.
• All thematic vision statements are presented and discussed plenary, so that groups can start thinking ‘towards each other’.

• If this important exercise can be done in a morning session, the afternoon is often free to allow people to make a field excursion (and to learn something from the relatively well-organized and managed city of Ohrid). It also allows others to work further on the memory map and to integrate the different vision statements into one integrated statement, while the animators can prepare the basic maps for the next day.

• **The third working day** is the most crucial and intense day of all. After a short training session on the design of spatial concepts and visions (see Annex 8), the working groups work for the entire day on visualizing and mapping their goals, objectives and spatial strategies, assisted by the local animators and content-facilitators.

• A joint dinner and party concludes this last working day, often attended by some newly arrived stakeholders to witness the results.

• **The last working day**, the meeting room is transformed into an exhibition hall, displaying all the visions and statements per thematic group. The group-works are presented one by one followed by plenary discussion, often attended and animated by the mayor and other stakeholders. The last session puts the “cherry on the cake”, by presenting the collective memory map, a shared vision statement and a proposed motto and logo.

• After consensual agreement of the shared vision components a family picture is taken showing the memory map, a symbol that there is now a future for this past.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
<th>Day 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td>Packing and Departure</td>
<td>Introduction Briefing and House rules</td>
<td>Ice-Breaker</td>
<td>Ice-Breaker Session10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Session 1 Storytelling/Memory Map</td>
<td>Training 4</td>
<td>Training 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training 1 The Planning Game</td>
<td>The Power of Visioning Instructions</td>
<td>The Power of Designing Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training 2 Selecting Topics</td>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>Session 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructions</td>
<td>Vision Statement/Motto/Logo/Objectives per thematic issue</td>
<td>Vision Design/Desired Spatial Structure and Concepts per thematic issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Session 2 Selecting Thematic Working Groups and Memory Mapping Group</td>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>Session 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plenary presentation and discussion. Formation of the Group on Integrated Vision Statement</td>
<td>Plenary interim presentation and discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PM | Traveling and socializing | Training 3 SWOT Analysis and Strategies | Free Afternoon | Packing, lunch and departure |
|    | Arrival Preparations | Instructions | Memory Mapping Integrated Vision Statement | |
|    |         | Session 3 Thematic SWOT exercise in working groups | Preparation of maps to visualize the statements and objectives | |
|    |         | Session 4 Plenary presentation and discussion | - Continuation Preparation for final presentation Welcoming of external guests | |
| PM | Dinner | Dinner/going out | Dinner/going out | Dinner and social event |
|    |       | | | Arrival back home |
In these training sessions, the basics of planning are explored in a non-academic way, avoiding the use of planning jargon that might intimidate those participants who are entirely new to planning. The first message is that planning is simply defined as the process by which society decides on what will and will not be developed. And as the whole of society is affected by those decisions, the second message is that whole of society should be involved in this planning practice. The third message is about the need for ‘balanced’ development. Reference is made to the ‘sustainable development’ (see Annex 2). Later on, a cultural dimension was added expressing the diversity and identities of communities by which sustainable development is shaped in a different way according to local cultures and the sense of place. However, training experience has taught that ‘balanced’ development is often better understood than ‘sustainable’ development. The famous Taijitu symbol of ‘yin and yang’ is used in Chinese philosophy to describe complementary opposites that interact within a greater whole, as part of a dynamic system. In the training session, the symbol is used to illustrate the required complementarities between a variety of social groups in the community, such as the sexes, the different ages, ethnic groups, interest groups and so on. It can also be used to illustrate the balance between nature and human activities, between the urban and the rural development. Both zones are not separated by a straight line but by a curve, symbolizing the importance of natural borders such as rivers, land contours or forests. The black part of the symbol can be interpreted as the urbanized part of the municipality (or any other planning area), while the white part represents the non-urbanized part (rural and natural areas). The black dot in the white part can be seen as a compact settlement in the rural area, while the white dot in the black part symbolizes the need for open and green spaces within the urbanized part. Acknowledging the over-simplification of the complex realities, the ‘yin and yang’ metaphors provide easy references and reminders for participants while drafting vision statements and designs, also for the content-facilitators and animators to ‘assess’ the degree of sustainability in the proposed planning ideas and visions. Some of the working groups used the Taijitu symbol as basis for the logo expressing the vision motto for their specific topic. The first training session is concluded with a reference to useful sustainable planning guidelines such as Local ‘Agenda 21’ (see Chapter 1) and the practical checklist ‘Try it this way’, the European Council of Spatial Planners guide for local planning (see www.ceup-ectp.eu).

SELECTING TOPICS

The second training session is critical to arrive at a well thought through selection of a maximum of five key-topics that will be the basis to break down the larger group into smaller working groups. Conventional planning topics include economic development (urban and rural working places), transport (mobility...
and infrastructure), green and public spaces, housing (individual and collective), social services (schools, hospitals, etc.) and cultural heritage. The training session however introduces a different way of thinking, called the ‘spatial layer approach’, breaking down the complex reality of space and time into 3 basic layers with different dynamics in terms of changes over time: the so-called natural layer, the network layer and the land-use layer. This approach introduces a different way of planning for each layer, including a hierarchy whereby the networks should be well integrated into the bottom layer with respect to nature and the environment, while the upper layer should be well connected with those networks below it and as well respecting the bottom layer. Although the layer approach has proven to be an additional didactical tool for sustainable or balanced planning, the final selection of key-topics is often a mix of traditional and layered topics.

SWOT ANALYSIS AND STRATEGIES

This is an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats is a business venture or in our case a planning area. SWOT analysis is part of a spatial portrait or profile of the planning area. The third training session briefly introduces this technique in order to make a snapshot of the current situation and trends. As the participants of the visioning workshops cannot rely on any data or survey, it is made clear that a SWOT-analysis at this stage can only be subjective and indicative, albeit a collective community exercise based on valuable collective feedback. It is also made clear that this ‘quick-scan’ of the community and its territorial assets should be verified in the further planning process, including a feedback-loop once the desired situation is defined, serving as a reference to conduct a more comprehensive SWOT-analysis. Special attention is given to the internal character of strengths and weaknesses, explaining that these refer to territorial assets and problems of the planning area that are within the reach of the municipality to respectively use or stop, while the opportunities and threats are external (and often hidden) conditions which the municipality can either exploit or defend. Yet, most working groups keep on struggling with this important distinction, which makes it more difficult to formulate adequate objectives and strategies. The training session also presents one of the more advanced SWOT-techniques, the so-called ‘SWOT-strategies’. The matrix is build up by matching and confronting the SWOT-elements, and translating them into spatial strategies.

As this exercise requires much more strategic insight and thinking, as well because of the ticking clock, only a few workings groups come to this stage. The training session also emphasizes the crucial role of mapping or sketching the existing spatial structure, which is actually a visualization of those SWOT-indicators with a territorial imprint, such as a dangerous transit road, a flooding area with illegal constructions or a derelict factory with toxic waste disposal. However, this requires a more advanced training in order to achieve meaningful results. The session ends with practical instructions to conduct the SWOT-exercises per thematic working group.

PART 2 - THE POWER OF VISIONING

The fourth training session is to prepare the participants for the important task: visioning the desired future for their community. The session starts with an image of the bronze statue made by the Belgian multimedia artist Jan Fabre, called ‘The man who measures the clouds’. It symbolizes the wish to make dreams come true, to make dreams measurable. Whilst this is easier said than done, it shouldn’t prevent us from further dreaming and trying. The statue also symbolizes the planner or visioning participant, with the head in the clouds and the feet on the ground. The image is also linked with the famous Japanese proverb “Vision without action is a daydream. Action without vision is a nightmare.” It sets the tone to be visionary, yet realistic. The session continues by explaining the definition and objectives of visioning, the actors in visioning and the toolkit for visioning. One critical question is further explored: who will benefit and who
will lose out? The participants are asked to answer this question for each idea and proposal they come up with for the vision, in order to achieve a more inclusive society and space. The session is concluded with another famous quote: “When you always do what you’ve always done, you will always get what you’ve always got.” (Anthony Robbins).

Before resuming the activities of the working groups, instructions are given to convert the thematic SWOT-analysis into **vision statements**, consisting of a compact motto and conceptualized in a picture or logo:

- Formulate 5 to 10 goals/objectives for your topic (1 sentence/topic)
- Explain the objectives and quantify/phase if possible
- Make a summary of all objectives in one short slogan/motto
- Visualize the motto with a simple logo.

**MAPPING THE VISION**

The fifth and last training session is a set of instructions to familiarize the participants with visualizing the written vision statements into maps. It is explained that people will work on transparent paper laid over on aerial photos, one for the entire municipality and one for the urban centre. All maps of all groups however are prepared with a minimum of the existing spatial structure such as rivers and main roads. Working groups should not add any other existing structure unless indispensable for the purpose of the vision’s clarity. The instruction is thus to draw only those elements that are an expression of the vision to add or change spatial elements in the planning area. What is drawn on the maps should be clearly explained in a legend, large enough to be readable from a distance of 5-10m. This instruction actually goes for the entire map, which also forces participants to be selective and strategic in the design. The design and legend should use more or less conventional colours and symbols for different spatial functions, as displayed in the slide below. Coloured post-it notes should be used to indicate a phasing in planning: some ideas are projected into the long term, others are deemed to be feasible in shorter terms. Creativity is highly valued in the use of all kinds of graphical symbols and expressions, with some tips given in the slide ‘Mapping’. All groups can make use of markers and spray-paint in different colours, but they are also allowed to use other tools such as pencils and crayons. ‘Self-designed’ pictograms can also be very useful, as long as they are explained in the legend. A critical technique is the use of specific conceptual symbols to express relations, directions, growth (outbound or inbound), etc. In case the group sees different possible scenarios for the same objective, this might be expressed in a more conceptual and abstract way. Finally instructions are provided for the plenary feedback and the presentation of the vision design by each of the working groups (see last slide).
The first step in mapping the past is the storytelling, by which people stick a post-it with their favourite memory of a specific place on the map. This low-threshold activity breaks the ice but also reveals the landmarks of a memory map, assisted by a content-facilitator proposing a clustering of personal memory places into more collective community landmarks. The next step is the formation a mixed group that will design the memory map based on the community landmarks, preferably by scaling up those landmarks and by using markers and paintbrushes. The presentation of the finalized memory map is reserved for the last plenary session, combined with the integrated vision statement, bridging past and future. The memory map is often used as a ‘trophy’ when a group photo is taken at the end of the visioning workshop. In one case, the ‘nostalgic map’ was printed as poster (see Annex 13). The first step in ‘portraying the present’ is the selection of key-issues, through which the large group will be broken down into working groups. The number of smaller groups can vary between 4 and 5. In some cases, a special group can be created with planning professionals, as a kind of reference group. The next step is a thematic SWOT-analysis in the 4-5 working groups. This is the first group activity and a ‘stress-test’ to see how the group dynamics work. External planning-animators help the groups by providing technical assistance. The SWOT must be presented on 1 or 2 flip charts, clearly readable from a distance. The same goes for the SWOT-strategies, if the group can arrive at that point. After completing the task, the flip charts are presented in a plenary session by an appointed ‘rapporteur’, followed by a group discussion. A process-facilitator keeps order, while content-facilitators make critical remarks to test the validity of the SWOT-method.

The first step in ‘mapping the future’ is the formulation and presentation of vision statements for each of the selected topics, including a motto and a logo. Content-facilitators interact to assess the soundness and sustainability of aims and objectives. The next step is the visualization of those vision statements on a map for the entire municipality and a map for the urban centre. Planning-animators provide technical assistance but do not take over the pencil. In parallel, a group is preparing an integrated vision statement based on the thematic statements.

The presentation of the finalized thematic vision designs is reserved for the last day, often attended by additional stakeholders such as the mayor. Again, content-facilitators interact for the sake of coherence and balance, while the process-facilitator has to safeguard the time needed to present and discuss the integrated vision statement and logo, often concluded by signing the statement by each working group and presenting it together with the finalized memory map.
ANNEX 11

CIVIL SOCIETY ON VISIONING

A FLIGHT INTO THE FUTURE OF A TOWN

Impressions from the work on visioning of Petrovic/Unesco involving municipality and civil society representatives

“We would be very happy if we could create a new image for our city. We would be very happy if tomorrow, this image

impressions part of the identity of new Petrovic/Unesco”

During three days of our stay in Obilj, we went, perhaps, its weakest residents. Whereas the people of Obilj decided to their daily activities, we

ill, see, a group of people from Petrovic/Unesco to talk about the

breath of our town by creating visions for it. We should have been good

knees to sit in the imagination space that opens up in front of us. We knew

that it was not going to be that easy for us, however, we felt that sometimes

being raised, such a feeling you go to Obilj, or “how, how you want to

be architects, huh?”

But we broke the ice and we opened the memory book of the town. In

cases of forgotten memory we started noting the emergence of images of

park, swimming pool, street bakery, etc., we started understanding that

we are the bearers of information and we were willing to tell the story of

two, three brothers, and the branches of their family houses and we were

straining to tell the stories. We were

in an attempt to create a new identity. Our

inconsistency as a town has become the

very morning hours. They were com-

prising humanity, full of emotion and were

sometimes uneasy.

From a very long distance we were doing lots of things in the town according to the

conception, locating new neighborhoods, looking for solutions to the

problems, looking for solutions, looking at cultural heritage. We wondered if it is a

major question, we put the rubber under the rubber, we were grasping an

unbreathing space for the city.

On the maps, everyone was drawing a part of the whole. Capital visions of

the town had to be divided in couple of lines that we were not drawing

correct enough. Somewhere late in time

and space, we understand the sense

of creating maps, of having, something very definitive. In fact, we became part

of a collective effort, part of a constant

curious process of the dream being par-

ticipant in the construction and plann-
ing of the town. “Making Better Cities

together” it is the shape of the concept

proposed by the UN-HABITAT pro-

grammes.

Plans, one after another, were shaping us on the map for the town. As a town

between two cities, we wanted it to

have a totally different skin from the

one we have today we wanted it to be a

glorious emblem in the dream of

tomorrow. Everyone had their own idea

of their town, people had different ideas, different drawings.

We put the rubber under the rubber,

for couple of days, but upon our

return we were surprised by visions of

visions, wondering whether we had

expected so much. The town emerged gristy as it was expected, but “how? We are

Stefan Dzunic

Member of the NGO Inter-Governmental Council (I-GC)

Source: MusPP Newsletters No. 3-5, June/October 2007, February 2008
(see www.unhabitat-kosovo.org)

Lessons learnt during Visioning Workshop for “ESTi” zone

Participants in this workshop had various approaches to the discussed issues, and without hesitation we can say that good results were achieved which could be used in the interest of municipality.

Weather this good experience and results from the workshop going to be used, it depends

first of all on the competent musical institutions. Let’s see!

In my opinion, success learnt from this workshop include:

Understanding that working in groups gives sustainable results

The necessity of participation of the wide spectrum of participants involved in the related issue

The importance of being tolerant in working groups

Accepting arguments at a value not as an accusation or criticism

All participants in the workshop were equal

We learnt how to organise a workshop

The importance of discipline, politeness and the serious approach of the organisers

The important role of the logistics and technical equipment in a successful workshop

The professional level of moderation, guiding and good impression on cooperation with the organisers of the workshop

Rastan Harbaica,

head of the WCO, Kosovo Citizens League in Peja/Peil

Visioning Toolkit
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“Putting Vision into Action” was the motto of the latest World Urban Forum (Vancouver, 2006). With a series of Visioning Workshops (see Focus last Newsletter) we tried to enhance the co-production of good planning visions and ideas. From far-away dreams to implementable measures to improve the living conditions of inhabitants in the six secondary cities. These visions and ideas have to be translated into sound musical and urban development plans, which are currently drafted (or already approved as in the Piotr/Her case). To demonstrate that the implementation of long term visions can start with small actions, a so-called “Demo-project”. Demo-projects are small projects demonstrating the mission of MuSPP, which is “putting vision into action!”. Demo-projects should thus be action-oriented, with tangible and even “visible” results achieved before the end of the MuSPP phase 1 in April 2007.

Within its programme 2005-2006, funded by SECO, MuSPP has a small budget of 100,000 USD to cofinance demo-projects. As MuSPP is active in five municipalities (MuSPP South and North, it was aimed at least seven demo-projects. That means that the average available cofunding is limited to 14,300 euros per project, but one of the criteria was to seek co-financing by the municipality, also other partners (public and private) can be involved to multiply the budget, the visibility and the ownership of the project. Other more qualitative criteria used to direct the demo-projects towards a “model” should be a “small but strategic” (in time and space), creative and innovative (not just an addl. “refurbish” project), feasible (implementable in one or two years) and fast but not least participatory and involving other stakeholders. The visioning workshops provided excellent opportunities to identify possible demo-projects in each municipality. This other activities in the planning process of Municipal and Urban Development Plans served as a source of ideas for projects, framed by the municipal vision and planning process.

A special Selection Committee, composed of representatives of Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning, the Association of Municipalities of Kosovo and Serbia, selected following seven demo-projects:

- Pijaca/Piaca: Streetscape in the Football Stadium
- Ferizaj/Fierzaj: Spatial design competition for the Mobility Centre
- Gjakova/Gjakova: Upgrading the Municipal Cemetery
- Gjakova/Gjakova: Upgrading Central Park
- Priročani: Upgrading a schoolyard in the City Centre
- Mitrovica (South part): Roundabouts in the City Centre
- Mitrovica (North part): Pedestrian crossings in the City Centre

You can read more about the state of play of the demo-projects in the next Newsletter. The results of the demo-projects will be presented in the next edition.

After a rather hesitating start we can clearly see the interest for and from the demo-projects. In most cases there was a need to “breakthrough” the political will, in order to incorporate a science-based approach, by framing the project in a socially acceptable way (not pointing only to the “right class” of the problem and to identify possible (better) alternatives than the proposed one, and most importantly of all to involve the relevant stakeholders and the citizens. It also took some time to deal with the co-funding mechanism, but now this is clarified and we hope to move ahead with this implementation. In the case of Mitrovica, both parts (North and South) were keen on implementing the project proposal, that they already realised the first phase of the project without our co-funding. You are invited to have a look at the new roundabout near the Green Market in the centre of Mitrovica South, as well as the roundabouts for pedestrians and disabled people using wheelchairs as the “model” of the project in Mitrovica North. This shows that there is a real interest in small-scale projects to improve the quality of urban life.

The real challenge is to set up and develop local planning processes and cultures that are able to work at the same time on visions and projects. The teams should work on planning documents like the Municipal and Urban Development Plan in one hand, with a sound long-term vision on the future and definable spatial structure of the municipality and at the same time start up (and long-term) strategic projects to demonstrate the benefits of the visions and the plans. As both can only be done weekly through co-production between local governments, other institutions, the business community and fast but self-help civil society, we would like to refer to the recent World Planning Conference of IODAIPA held in Antwerp, Belgium, 10-20 September, with the slogan “World Urban 2007 - 21st Century City and Beyond” and for the World Planning Conference 2009 in Istanbul Turkey, with the slogan “Urban Strategies between Plan projects and People into Practice.”

Source: MuSPP Newsletter October 2007

“Vision without action is merely a dream. Action without vision just passes the time. Vision with action can change the world.”

Joel A. Barker

ANNEX 12

PUTTING VISION INTO ACTION
IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC SPACE THROUGH CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROJECTS

As a living organism, which should grow in regards to the needs of its inhabitants, the city, or part of the city, requires mechanisms and tools to maintain control of the development and expansion. These mechanisms should always consider the socio-economic development of the area, the quality of life of the city’s inhabitants.

According to the Kasawo Law on Spatial Planning, these mechanisms are Municipal Development Plans (MDP), Urban Development Plans (UDP) and Urban Regeneration Plans (URP), in compatibility with national spatial plans (Kasawo Spatial Plan). Implementation of MUDP is the last step of the strategic planning process, in which a plan’s strategies, policies, priorities and vision are put into action. This is realized mostly through Capital Investment Projects, identified from the vision of the MUDP.

Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme – phase 2 (MUP2), US-HABITAT Kasawo, in co-finance with the Municipalities, is developing various CID through cities or towns, addressing different issues and themes, but always in compatibility with the MUDP.

The list below presents themes of CID and cities where the CID is being developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>CID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban living</td>
<td>Jinja, Masaka, Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage sites and conservation areas</td>
<td>Kampala, Jinja, Masaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public spaces and open spaces</td>
<td>Jinja, Kampala, Masaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure developments and connections</td>
<td>Jinja, Kampala, Masaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and nature conservation</td>
<td>Jinja, Kampala, Masaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban development</td>
<td>Jinja, Kampala, Masaka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the above list shows, CID through the cities of Kasawo are planned mainly in public spaces squares, waterfronts, mobility nodes, landscape, transportation routes, and heritage zones of public-use spaces (schools, parks, and sports areas). The primary objective of this being to revitalise part of the urban area used by the inhabitants, by making city streets and public space more vibrant and pedestrian friendly.

However, the intention of developing CID isn’t just to improve, revitalise or connect an area but to engage municipal councilmembers in the process of inclusive planning, community engagement, capacity building for municipal staff to properly manage and develop further CID in the future.

Notes of all CID are “putting the people first”, based on simple principles:

- Use of public outdoor space improvement as the catalyst for city area revitalization
- Build up the connection to neighborhoods, waterfronts, and urban open spaces
- Build up the existing strength of the area, such as adaptive reuse of heritage structures and highlighting the natural geographic context of the city (spaces – cultural elements)
- Make city living attractive by initiating, designing, and improving, and encouraging private investment and use development and management
- Generate retail and commercial activities within diverse neighborhoods (economic growth)

These principles can be achieved through initiatives such as:

- Road and safety improvements
- More trees with continuous green boulevards
- Public accessibility for all age and user groups (i.e., buses and other accessibility standards)
- Better light standards
- Road improvements including special treatment (intersections)
- Enhancing existing character with the use of design themes and adornment of public spaces with public art

Included in the list of CID are the ones being explored and developed throughout various cities of Kasawo, currently these are the detailed design project proposals that have been developed and one is under construction work. They are mostly improvement works developed in conjunction with other construction on the street, see pg 7.

Source: MuSPP Newsletter October 2010
JUNIK: A UNIQUE MOUNTAIN VILLAGE WITH HIGH AMBITIONS

Junik, a mountain village in the west of Kosovo, famous for its kullas (traditional stone houses) and the highest mountain in Kosovo (Gjeravica, 2,656m), officially only became a municipality in 2007. Junik immediately started the planning process, with the support of and Cultural Heritage without Borders, by drafting a Conservation and Development Plan. After this project, a five-day Visioning workshop supported by UN-Habitat was organized from 17 to 22 October 2007 to initiate the process of drafting a Municipal Development Plan. The Junik group was one of the most committed and thus successful community groups, which developed an ambitious vision statement (see illustration below in a group-photo). The vision statement was backed by an expressive memory map, which was shortly afterwards published as poster. The public presentation in one of the kullas - restored by and Cultural Heritage without Borders and now used as a unique Bed & Breakfast - was also an expression of a great belief in a better future for a village that had suffered heavily during the 1998-1999 conflict. The Visioning workshop provided valuable inputs for the municipal and urban spatial plans. In August 2008, with support from and Cultural Heritage without Borders, Junik decided to draft the Urban Development Plan (UDP) as well an Urban Regulatory Plan (URP) for the centre of Junik. A ‘Municipal Development Plan’ (MDP) would later complement both, and Cultural Heritage without Borders supported the municipality in strengthening the role of institutions in the integration of cultural heritage into the spatial planning process in Kosovo as well as treating cultural heritage as a development opportunity for society. The MDP of Junik will complement the focus on cultural heritage with a focus on its outstanding natural heritage. The MDP of Junik is the first in Kosovo drafted ‘in-house’, by municipal planners with the support and technical assistance of UN-Habitat/Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme. The process involved multiple public consultations, community workshops and study visits to other municipalities. It also led to the establishment of a women’s NGO as an element of gender equal economic development. Of all MDPs, the MDP of Junik best reflects the spirit and outcomes of the visioning workshop, and represents probably one of the most participatory planning processes in Kosovo so far. Junik was one of the best cases presented at the ‘Envisioning Conference’ held in Pristina on 9 November 2010, after a successful presentation of the case at the 15th ‘REAL CORP Conference’ in Vienna (Austria) on 18-20 May 2010. As with the best case of ‘Spoor Noord’ (see Annex 4), Junik would not be a best case without putting planning into action. Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme co-funded and technically assisted a capital investment project to improve a publicly accessible school yard, while and Cultural Heritage without Borders has a long standing record in restoring and re-valoring cultural heritage and kullas in particular, and Cultural Heritage without Borders and UN-Habitat also co-organize together a yearly ‘Tour de Culture’ - a recreational and cultural bike tour during the ‘European Mobility Week’ and ‘European Heritage Days’ - with Junik as lunch-stop in 2008 and starting place in 2009 (see poster). This places Junik in a regional perspective and makes people from all over Kosovo aware of the unique touristic potential of Junik and its surroundings. Despite its limited population number and human and financial resources, Junik became an active player in the emerging regional cooperation and networking in the west of Kosovo (‘Dukagjini’/’Metohija’), e.g. by participating in a regional meeting of ‘Dukagjini’ mayors, organized by UN-Habitat in July 2008, in the kulla in Dranoc, restored by and Cultural Heritage without Borders.

Lessons learned
- A committed community can achieve a lot of progress in a short time.
- A clear community vision gives direction and substance to the formal planning process.
- ‘In-house’ planning creates or keeps local ownership.
- A culture of participation enables better planning and actions.
- Sustainable use of cultural and natural heritage for community development is possible.
MITROVICA: A DIVIDED CITY WITH A SHARED VISION

The city of Mitrovica once developed around mining exploitation of gold, silver, lead and zinc. Since mining industry ceased its activities, the city now faces economic, physical, environmental and social problems. It is divided by the Ibar river with the Mitrovica bridge over it, an iconic symbol of the Kosovo division. Many organizations and authorities have tried to create multi-ethnic projects to re-develop the city, but Mitrovica is still divided along ethnic lines with Kosovo Serbs mainly in the northern part and Kosovo Albanians in the southern part, with other ethnic groups such as Roma and Bosniaks living in both parts of the town. Maybe no other place in Europe combines the consequences of deindustrialization, pollution and ethnic tension to the extent characteristic for this area. Efforts were taken by different organizations to improve the grave conditions but more than a decade of uncertainty have resulted in low levels of investment and lack of vision regarding the future of the city. Yet, against all odds, it was Mitrovica that inspired UN-Habitat/Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme to initiate the first community-visioning workshop, in early 2007. It was co-organized by committed civil society organizations representing Kosovo Albanians and Kosovo Serbs. The workshop was intended to initiate municipal and urban planning and help resolve planning issues that affect both parts of the city and the two communities. The aim of the visioning workshop was to develop an inter-community vision for one city, even if two different administrative bodies (municipalities) will have to manage it. The event served the double purpose of empowering civil society and local media and improving their dialogue with professional planners, whilst strengthening the dialogue and cooperation between the north and the south. A common motto was adopted by both communities, summing up the key elements of their common vision (see insert in photo on top). However, due to political context, it took more than six months to deliver a Workshop Report (see previous page) and organize a public presentation of the visioning results. On May 4th, 2009, the Municipal Assembly of Mitrovica adopted the Municipal and Urban Development Plans, prepared by the consultants of Kosovo-based Lin-Project and ‘Metron’ from Switzerland. At the Envisioning as Participatory Planning Tool conference, the representative from Mitrovica municipality demonstrated that both plans took on most of the vision proposals of the visioning workshop, while strategic projects (of which some with co-funding from UN-Habitat-Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme) were already being successfully implemented or were underway (see one of the two Capital Investment Projects presented in Box). However, due to institutional problems in the North, only a little follow up was provided there, as it does not recognize the legitimacy of the MDP/UDP. It remains to be seen if and when the new municipality for ‘Mitrovica North’ will be established and if and when it will develop its own MDP/UDP. It can only be hoped that the common inter-community vision will as well be used as input and basis.

Lessons learned

- Community visioning can overcome ethnic divide.
- Appropriate (planning) institutions are needed to take the vision forward.
- Strategic projects are key to make planning happen.
- A sense of place is key to build up a community.

On Tuesday, 25 January 2011, the mayor of Mitrovica and the Head of Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme (Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme) exchanged the ‘Agreement of Cooperation for the implementation of the Capital Investment Project (CIP)’ for Mitrovica, named “Lushta-river Green Corridor”. Green corridors along the rivers are the most significant concept for the improvement of the living environment, and as such are featured in the Municipal Development Plan. The Lushta-river cuts the city centre south of the Ibar-river and its connections with the urban road.
and the city centre are difficult to use. The aim of this capital investment project is to make a strong contribution to the creation of the Lushta-river green corridor, by strengthening its function as a non-motorized transport corridor through the improvement of its interconnection with the urban road and path network. With the improvement of the path, it will serve as an important link for non-motorized transport, providing a safe, quick access to the centre for the residents of the southern neighbourhoods and for those living in the centre to reach the pastoral, semi-rural landscape around the Lushta in the south as well as the countryside beyond. The largest intervention will take place at the Teuta/Selaci crossroad in the city centre, where the Lushta-river vanishes under the central avenue. Other interventions are the improvement of connections to the city footpath network at the Southern end of the riverbank, the removal of obstacles on the riverbank, creating of new public realm with various urban features. The project has been developed and conducted jointly with the municipality in close cooperation with residents and civil society organizations also representing people with special needs and public utilities, in the series of consultation meetings and workshops. “Lushta-river Green Corridor” project will be implemented on a cost-sharing basis by Municipality of Mitrovica and the Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme, Phase2, of UN-Habitat in Kosovo, funded by the Swedish Government through the Swedish Development Cooperation.
The visioning workshop came at the right time for Hani i Elezit/General Jankovic, shortly after it gained the status of new municipality. A dynamic community group developed an ambitious vision to reconcile three potentially conflicting development trends: a town developing in and cherishing natural setting, the long standing tradition of the place for the cement industry and the new opportunities as border gateway at the corridor between the two capitals Prishtina/Pristina and Skopje. Obviously, central level involvement is required for the latter planning challenge but the community offered a sound vision. For the second challenge however, the visioning workshop itself offered for the first time a platform for a dialogue between the CEO of the heavy polluting cement factory and the community, which has been taken forward throughout the further (‘in-house’) planning process and in the prioritized strategic projects (see article in Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme Bulletin 01/2011).

Lessons learned

• A committed local community can take leadership of planning challenges that are stretching out far beyond local competencies.
• A clear community vision gives direction and substance to the in-house planning process.
• A culture of participation enables better planning and actions.
• Planning can only work when all key stakeholders are involved.
The French word, charrette means ‘cart’ and is often used to describe the final, intense work effort expended by art and architecture students to meet a project deadline. This use of the term is said to originate from the ‘École des Beaux Arts’ in Paris during the 19th century, where proctors circulated a cart, or charrette, to collect final drawings while students frantically put finishing touches on their work. A so-called planning charrette is a collaborative event that lasts four to seven days, in a series of meetings and design sessions that would traditionally take months to complete. This time compression facilitates creative problem solving by accelerating decision making and reducing unconstructive negotiation tactics. It also encourages people to abandon their usual working patterns and think outside the Annex. The goal of the charrette is to produce a feasible plan that benefits from the support of all stakeholders through its implementation. A multidisciplinary charrette-team, consisting of a wide range of planning consultants, designers and sponsor staff, produces this plan in co-production with the community and key stakeholders. It takes place in a charrette-studio at or near the project site. During the charrette, the team first conducts an open public meeting to solicit the values, vision, and needs of the stakeholders. The team then breaks off to create alternative plans, testing and refining them with the goal of producing a preferred plan. The charrette is organized as a series of feedback loops through which stakeholders are engaged at critical decision-making points. These decision-making points occur in primary stakeholder meetings, several public meetings, and possibly during an open house throughout the course of the charrette. These feedback loops provide the charrette-team with the information necessary to create a feasible plan. Just as importantly, they allow the stakeholders to become co-authors of the plan so that they are more likely to support and implement it. The charrette needs to last at least four days for the simplest of projects, and six to seven days for a standard project, in order to accommodate the required feedback loops (see figure). Some cases have successfully developed processes lasting less than four consecutive days, which is usually done by breaking the longer charrette into several three-day events about a month apart. Lasting agreement is based on fully informed dialogue, which can only be accomplished by looking at the details and the big picture concurrently. Studies at these two scales also inform each other and reduce the likelihood that a fatal flaw will be overlooked in the plan. To create a feasible plan, every decision point must be fully informed, especially by the legal, financial, and engineering disciplines. The focus on feasibility brings a level of seriousness and rigor to the process for everyone involved. Design is a powerful tool for establishing a shared vision. Drawings illustrate the complexity of the problem and can be used to resolve conflict by proposing previously unexplored solutions that represent win-win outcomes. The design-brief, a set of instructions given to the design team, is a crucial component of the charrette. It provides aspects such as the policy base and legal framework, specific numerical requirements, communicates opportunities and constraints, contains rules for drafting goals, objectives, targets and assumptions, rules for designing (colours, symbols, etc.), methods to engage a broad range of stakeholders and clarifications of ‘rules of play’.

A planning charrette different to a visioning workshop
Charrettes are often confused with visioning workshops. According to the National Charrette Institute, a nonprofit education institution based in Portland, USA, a visioning workshop or session prepares a community for a charrette:

- As with a visioning workshop, a charrette is a creative burst of energy that builds momentum for a plan or project and sets it on a course to meet its goals.

- Whilst visioning workshops usually focus on the ‘bigger picture’ (of a particular planning area), part of the ‘planning charrette-strategy’ is to focus on both the big picture and the details of a plan or project to produce collaborative agreement between primary stakeholders, on specific goals, strategies and project priorities.
Whilst visioning workshops usually focus on generating ideas and visions from non-planning expert community members, planning charrettes are usually set up round a expert-planning team with feeding lines to all involved stakeholders, including the community residents.

A ‘planning charrette’ is less about capacity building and empowering and more about capacity harnessing and technical assistance and performance.

As with visioning workshops, a ‘planning charrette’ is at its best when spread over more days, usually at least four but often more and up to seven days, allowing time to complete the entire planning cycle (see elsewhere). The more difficult the problem, the longer the charrette.

Whilst visioning workshops can be held (far) away from the site, ‘planning charrettes’ are usually held on or near the site. Working on site fosters the design team’s understanding of local values and traditions, and provides the necessary easy access to stakeholders and information. Therefore, the planning or design studio should be located in a place where it is easily accessible to all stakeholders and where the designers have quick access to the project site.

Whilst visioning workshops can end up with many different ideas and (thematic) visions, a planning charrette needs to come up with an integrated vision and design for the specific area or project.

Whilst visioning workshops can afford to think freely, not hindered by existing plans and regulations, a ‘planning charrette’ has to work within a given planning and legal framework (as part of the planning-brief), although it can recommend changes and amendments to the framework in place.

Notwithstanding the substantive differences, there still remain many similarities between setting up and conducting visioning workshops and planning charrettes. Therefore the main text of this Annex will only focus on the additional features of planning charrettes.

**Required Resources**

- Design facilitators (recommended ratio of 1:6 to stakeholders)
- Comprehensive design brief including relevant policy documents
- Meeting roster (name list), name tags
- Base maps at different scales, tracing paper
- Note-blocks, post-its, pencils, markers, paint-brushes, pins, tape, ...
- Photos of the selected site
- Official recorder for meeting minutes
- Open minds

**Suggested Cases for planning charrettes in Kosovo**

- Informal Settlements (provided funding is available for implementation)
- Mobility Centre
- Management Plan for sites and zones with cultural and or natural heritage
- Capital Investment Projects
- Regulatory Plans
- Regeneration plan for (historic) city centre
The second strategic project of the Future visioning strategy (see Chapter 6) is to set up a vision house. This civic centre can have many names and there are many existing centres for civic engagement in Europe and elsewhere as a source of inspiration, such as the European Institute for Public Participation (www.participationinstitute.org), a relatively young German-based and -led non-profit organization, launched in 2009, and the ‘National Civic League’, the United States’ oldest organization, “helping communities thrive since 1894” (www.ncl.org). The European institute recently published Public Participation in Europe - An International Perspective, a research-study describing the state of art in public participation in Europe with a focus on the United Kingdom, Germany and Italy. The American National Civic League is a non-profit organization founded in 1894 “to discuss the future of American cities”. The league “envisions a country where citizens are actively engaged in the process of self-governance and work in partnership with the public, private and non-profit sectors of society, and where citizens are creating active civic culture reflective of the diversity of community voices.” This civic participation vision can be read in the excellent Community Visioning and Strategic Planning Handbook, published in 2000 by the National Civic League Press. The first of seven key activities presented on the home page of their website is “to help you dream, create a shared vision and a specific and achievable action plan”. Examples how it worked out in practice are presented on their webpage “Success Stories”. As USA is an important role model for many young Kosovars, the league might well inspire the setting up of a similar non-profit organization in Kosovo, albeit more modest in start-up of course. The league might be even asked for support, preferably together with similar organizations in Europe, such as the European institute for instance. The multicultural and multi-ethnic aspirations of the country should be mirrored in the vision and mission of the Kosovo Vision House, as well in its staffing and management, which should be entirely local to ensure local stewardship. The example of and Cultural Heritage without Borders (see Annex 1) illustrates this is as a viable option.

The Vision House should be more than just another non-profit or non-governmental organization. It could become a ‘house’ and a ‘café’ as well. A house designed for community visioning, providing the required working spaces for visioning and fully equipped with ‘old school’ and ‘new age’ stationary, from post-it-notes to ‘sketch-up’. As a café it could provide space to discuss, evaluate, innovate, initiate and experiment with different tools and techniques of civic engagement and involvement: a café in both real and virtual meaning (see Box). The ‘Vision House’ should of course welcome every citizen but should keep party politics at its doorstep. The House would need a strong code of conduct to draw clear lines that cannot be crossed without jeopardizing the credibility of an independent civic centre. Funding by local and central level governments should be clearly conditioned by the ethical code. More important than a nice office is the recruitment and training of trainers and facilitators. An embryonic core-group of 2 or 3 facilitators can be trained outside Kosovo but all the others should be trained and certified in-house. A core team of full-time staff can be expanded with trained and certified free-lancers.

The Vision House should remain independent from existing domestic and international organizations, but its viability will greatly depend on the establishment of good working relations with all relevant stakeholders and potential clients such as municipalities. There should however also be the possibility of ‘advocacy support’, helping communities in need
Kosovo is not only famous for its macchiato coffee, but even more for the conversations coming along with drinking and sharing coffee, since many generations. Coffee is far from the only beverage consumed in cafes and bars nowadays, but the culture of conversing remained the same. Therefore, civic engagement will be more successful in a lively cafe than in a run-down municipal theatre. World Café, a global participatory method could root well in the local cultures of Kosovo and the wider Balkan. The World Café is an innovative yet simple methodology for hosting conversations about questions that matter. These conversations link and build on each other as people move between groups, cross-fertilize ideas, and discover new insights into the questions or issues that are most important in their life, work, or community. As a process, the World Café can evoke and make visible the collective intelligence of any group, thus increasing people’s capacity for effective action in pursuit of common aims.

- Source text and web-frames: www.theworldcafe.com
Municipal Spatial Planning Support Programme supports six secondary cities in Kosovo in the drafting of municipal and urban development plans while following the approach which puts particular emphasis on participation various social and ethnic groups in the process. For the process to be successful, both civil society organisations and municipal officials have to understand benefits of such cooperation and agree on principles which will be guiding such a cooperation.

The establishment of an Informal Council of Civil Society Organisations is a successive step in the process and follows earlier meetings with municipal officials dealing with civil society organizations, the promotion of collaboration with civil society organizations during the Regional Conference on Good Governance, and orientation workshops for civil society organizations.

The Informal Council of Civil Society Organisations will open to a broad variety of civil society organizations and citizens willing to participate in the process on a voluntary basis.

The tasks of the Informal Council of Civil Society Organisations will be targeted at promoting civil society participation in public debates, public review sessions and other forms of communication between citizens and local governments with a view to strengthen dialogue between the parties and contribute to an increased participation of civil society in consensus building and decision making processes.

These will include, but will not be limited to, the following

- Promote the concept of civil society participation in communication with local governments in the spirit of cooperation and support, and constructive resolution of differences,
- Assist local governments to mobilize civic participation in public debates, public reviews, urban consultations and other forms of dialogue,
- Initiate such meetings, through cooperation with local governments, on the issues which are vital for the municipality and its residents,
- Facilitate active participation of civil society in inclusive strategic planning and policy development process in municipality,
• Support and actively participate in the activities aimed at empowering civil society organisations and citizens to participate in specific urban consultations and consultative meetings for planning and development policy formulation, and assist in facilitating those meetings,

• Support the establishment of sustainable cooperation mechanism between civil society organizations and local government,

• In cooperation with other stakeholders including business community help identify priorities for municipal development and actively support their implementation.

**BENEFITS**

Members of the Informal Council of Civil Society Organizations will be invited to participate in workshops, seminars and other events aimed at strengthening capacities of CSOs in understanding the process of local development,

Members of the Informal Council of Civil Society Organizations will have an opportunity to network with members of other organizations across Kosovo and within the region,

Members of will regularly receive Newsletter of the Municipal Spatial planning Support Programme and will be invited to contribute to its production.
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Visioning is a powerful planning tool which brings together different stakeholders for projecting future development. Used in a post-conflict society it holds the potential for bridging ethnic and social conflicts. Sensitivity to specific needs of men and women, girls and boys, the fit and the disabled placed against the background of reconciliation, adds value to a vision of a city, town or a neighborhood.

This publication intends to inspire and encourage local planners, politicians, civil society and mass-media to engage in designing the future of human settlements in a collaborative way with the use of visioning.