ARLEQUIN’S URBAN RENEWAL

COMBINING INHABITANTS’ EXPERTISE WITH PROFESSIONALS’ EXPERTISE FOR AN URBAN DESIGN STRATEGY

LA VILLENEUVE NEIGHBOURHOOD, GRENOBLE, FRANCE

HÉLÈNE BOURGEOIS

MASTER THESIS SPRING 2014

MASTER DESIGN FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
Arlequin’s urban renewal
Combining inhabitants’ expertise with professionals’ expertise for an urban design strategy
La Villeneuve neighbourhood, Grenoble, France

Hélène Bourgeois

Contact: helbou@student.chalmers.se
bourgeois.h@laposte.net

Date of presentation: 2014-05-15
Tutor: Paula Femenias
Examiner: Björn Malbert

Master thesis 30 credits spring 2014
Master programme Design for Sustainable Development
Department of Architecture
Chalmers University of Technology
SE - 412 96 Göteborg
Sweden
ABSTRACT

Today, the co-production of urban renewal projects with inhabitants is claimed to be a necessity in France. These projects concern working-class neighbourhoods and aim at triggering their development. This master thesis studies how the involvement of inhabitants improves the quality of an urban renewal project. The study is based on the case of La Villeneuve neighbourhood, in Grenoble, France. A focus is on the Arlequin’s buildings where an urban renovation project is carried out today in a top down approach. In reaction to the lack of consultation with the inhabitants, a bottom up initiative has been organised in the neighbourhood through an Urban Workshop for the People.

First, a tool to involve a broad range of inhabitants in the production of an urban renewal project is explored. Therefore, a participatory intervention is carried out within the Urban Workshop for the People. The inputs from the inhabitants are translated into a strategic programme and design guidelines. These outcomes are then used to define a design strategy. Improved participatory tools are proposed, reflecting on the contribution of the participatory intervention and the quality of its outcomes.

Secondly the added value of the outcomes of the participatory process in an urban renewal project is studied. To do so, the outcomes from the participatory intervention and the analyse of the ongoing urban renovation project are combined in order to define a design strategy for the urban renewal of the Arlequin. The design strategy shows that a combination of the professionals’ and the inhabitants’ expertise produces an urban design paying attention both to the larger and the detailed scale. Furthermore, the combination of expertise permits to synchronise the social and the renovation dimensions.

The conclusion is that a combination of the inhabitants’ expertise and the professionals’ expertise seems useful to improve the quality of an urban renewal project. A participatory process managed by a neighbourhood Management Group and relating to the Participatory Action Research model can reach a broad range of inhabitants. A participatory process can give outputs to improve urban design and it can trigger the development of the neighbourhood.
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In France, a first National Program for Urban Renovation (PNRU1) was carried out with a top down approach from the year 2003 to 2013. Urban renovation projects were done in working-class neighbourhoods in order to trigger their development. These projects were designed by experts and driven by the elected representatives. The participation of inhabitants was mostly limited to consultation and a few ranges of inhabitants were participating. A second National Program (PNRU2) is starting in 2014. It is advised to modify the approach: to produce urban renewal projects, synchronising the renovation and the social dimension. The projects must be co-produced with the inhabitants.

So far, the inhabitants participation was not developed because the professionals do not understand the added value of such process for urban renovation. Furthermore, the institutional participatory processes are not able to involve a representative part of the inhabitants. The urban renovation projects are therefore driven by elective representatives. Because today co-production with the inhabitants is required, a methodology for their involvement in the project process needs to be studied.

Today, there is a discussion in France about giving power to the inhabitants in the decision-making process of the urban renewal projects. It seems there is a need to have inhabitants as a counter-power in the project process. The aim would be to favour the autonomy of the civil society and to empower inhabitants.

Participatory intervention in a French urban renewal context is the subject of this master thesis. The Arlequin is the chosen case study. It appears as a rich case study because both a bottom up initiative and a top down project are carried out at the same time. Furthermore, the Arlequin is a very original architecture which needs a contextualised response.

The Arlequin’s buildings are located in a neighbourhood called La Villeneuve, in Grenoble, France. The design of the Arlequin has been influenced by the international utopian movement led by the British group Team X and presents from 1950 to 1970. Today, an urban renovation project, part of the first National Program, is carried out in the neighbourhood with a focus on the Arlequin. This PNRU1 renovation project is designed by the reputed Paris based Yves Lion Agency. It has a top down approach and can be considered as the result of a regular planning process. In reaction to the lack of consultation from the municipality, a bottom up initiative has organised an Urban Workshop for the People in the neighbourhood. It enables the inhabitants to make propositions for the renewal of their neighbourhood.

My personal education is composed of a bachelor in architecture within La Villette National School of Architecture and master studies within the Design for Sustainable Development Program at Chalmers University of Technology. My bachelor taught me urban design taking into consideration the site’s history as well as being based on a broad scale analysis and a fine knowledge of urban typology. These tools are the ones used in France in regular
planning processes; they seem to lead to top
down projects. My studies within the master
Design for Sustainable Development have
taught me other tools: participatory tools,
local context analysis and system analysis. This
thesis tries to combine all these tools in order
to define a design strategy for the Arlequin’s
urban renewal.

Aim

The thesis aims at exploring a tool for involving a
broad range of inhabitants in the production of
an urban renewal project. It tries to understand
the possible outcomes of a participatory
process of such a project. It also studies as well
which type of documents should be produced
in order to support the dialogue between the
inhabitants and the professionals.

Approach / research design

In order to explore a tool for a broad involvement
of inhabitants in an urban renewal project, I have
carried out a participatory intervention within
the ongoing Ateliers Populaires d’Urbanisme
(APU) translated as Urban Workshop for
the People. The APU has unconventional
methods and is able to reach a broad range
of inhabitants. I have been on site for one and
a half month. The participatory intervention
lasted three weeks and is composed of a stand
for a few hours a day along with two half days
of workshops. The participatory intervention
has collected inputs from the inhabitants
which are first translated into design guidelines.
Secondly, the inhabitants’ inputs and the APU’s
preliminary work are synthesized into a strategic
programme.

Then, the urban structure and the public
spaces of Yves Lion’s PNRU1 top down urban
renovation project are analysed. The strengths
of Yves Lion’s project and the outcomes of
the participatory process are combined into
a design strategy for the Arlequin’s urban
renewal.

Then, the urban structure and the public
spaces of Yves Lion’s PNRU1 top down urban
renovation project are analysed. The strengths
of Yves Lion’s project and the outcomes of
the participatory process are combined into
a design strategy for the Arlequin’s urban
renewal.

Analysing the proposal for a design strategy,
the added value and the disadvantages of
the outcomes of the participatory process are
understood.

Finally, reflecting on the contribution of the
participatory intervention and the quality of
its outcomes, tools to involve a broad range
of inhabitants in the production of an urban
renovation project are proposed.

This master thesis focuses on the social
dimension of sustainability. The co-production
tools proposed are designed within a reflection
of a democratic process for an urban renewal
project.

Outline

The master thesis has five parts. The first one
describes the theoretical framework: the last
recommendations for the improvement of the
French urban renewal projects; the criteria for a
democratic process for an urban project; and
two co-design examples in an urban context.
The second part explains the context: La
Villeneuve’s features; the Arlequin’s features;
the Yves Lion’s project part of the First National
Programme for Urban Renovation; and finally
the Urban Workshop for the People, its features
and first outcomes.

The third part concerns my participatory
intervention within the Urban Workshop for the
People. My field work, the translation of the
inhabitants’ inputs into a strategic programme
and design guidelines and then the description
of these outcomes.

The fourth part defines a design strategy for
the Arlequin’s urban renewal. First the urban
structure and the public spaces of Yves Lion’s
project is analysed. Then a design strategy
for the urban structure, the gallery and the
public spaces of the Arlequin area is proposed.
Finally, the possibilities of the outcomes of
the participatory process are developed
by drawing in more detail some parts of the
Arlequin’s public spaces.

The fifth part concludes the two research questions and opens up on the sustainable development issue. First there is a reflection on the participatory intervention. Second the added value and disadvantage of Yves Lyon’s project and the proposal for a design strategy are described. In this way it is understood how complementary a regular planning process and a participatory process are. Then improved participatory tools are proposed within a hypothetical democratic process for an urban renewal project. Finally there is a reflection on how the process of a urban renewal project can be democratic and how a democratic process supports the social sustainability of a project.
The theoretical framework describes:
- the last recommendations for the improvement of the French urban renewal projects
- the criteria for a democratic process for an urban project
- two co-design examples in an urban context
1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FRENCH URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

1.1. PNRU: National Programme for Urban Renewal

ANRU: National Agency for Urban Renewal

“The ANRU is a public body created in 2003 as part of the National Programme for Urban Renewal. It controls the development of urban renewal projects, from Projet de Développement social des Quartiers (Local neighbourhood Social Development projects) to Grands Projets de Ville (Major City Projects). The ANRU was created to simplify and speed up the control of urban renewal projects on the part of local collectives and rented social housing management bodies that wish to undertake urban renewal projects in priority areas.” (Druot 2007)

The ANRU finances urban project with public and private funds. These projects have to take place in neighbourhood classified as sensible urban zone (ZUS), meaning neighbourhood with social and economic problems (ANRU 2012) The frame to the right shows what can be the finances for an urban renovation project with the example of La Villeneuve.

PNRU 1 (2003 - 2013)
Ten years after the start of the National Programme for Urban Renovation (PNRU 1) in 2003, the ANRU’s Evaluation and Monitoring Committee (ANRU’s Evaluation Committee 2013) has done an assessment and has given advices for the start of the National Programme for Urban Renewal (PNRU 2).

PNRU 1 objectives
- to make the neighbourhoods a common place
- social diversity
- reduction of social inequalities

The idea behind making the neighbourhood a common place was to “break the ghetto” and to “normalise” the neighbourhoods. Social diversity has been then the second objective. By diversifying the physical structure, the population would be more diverse and this way social inequality between territories would reduce.

Results
Living environment and housing conditions have improved but the PNRU has not reduced segregation in France. The population of working-class neighbourhood has not changed radically and we can even observe increased inequalities between these neighbourhoods and their surroundings.

PNRU 2 (2014 - ...)

Now, the ANRU’s Evaluation and Monitoring Committee asks to change the guidelines for the second National Programme for Urban Renewal. It should:
- accept the existence of working-class neighbourhoods as well as their social role in the city, in order to give them the means to play efficiently this role.
- to consider the neighbourhoods as asset and potential holders.
- to evolve from a temporary and exceptionally PNRU to a cohesive territorial policy which takes place in the long term.

Objectives
- to respond to the needs of the inhabitants and to take into account their uses and potential.
- to improve the residential and day-to-day mobility.

Method
- to co-produce the urban renewal project with the inhabitants.
- to synchronise the social project and the renovation project of the urban renewal projects.
- to articulate the endogenous development (constructing on the local assets) with the exogenous development (using the potential of the city’s environment).

Budget for the PNRU 1 of La Villeneuve of Grenoble (Grenoble city website 2014)

Cost /finance: around 75M€ (subsidies)
- habitat: 33.2 M€
- public spaces: 30 M€
- public functions: 4.4 M€

Payers
- Grenoble city: 18.6 M€ (25% of the subsidies)
- social housing bodies: 18.1 M€ (24%)
- ANRU: 18 M€ (24%)
- region Rhône-Alpes: 9.7 M€ (13%)
- conurbation body: 5.2 M€ (7%)
- Isère department: 4.8 M€ (6%)
1.2. A neighbourhood management group for the participatory process

**Bacqué - Mechmache report**

The French city ministry François Lamy asked to the sociologist Marie-Hélène Bacqué and the associative responsible Mohammed Mechmache to study how participation of inhabitants could be improved in city policy. To do so, they have met managers of bottom up initiatives from the all country. The results of the mission have been published in July 2013 in a report called in a common way “rapport Bacqué - Mechmache”. The report has a radical approach: it advices to give power to the inhabitants in the decision-making process of the urban renewal projects in order to empower inhabitants to affect change. Some of the report’s propositions concern the process of the urban renewal projects. Amongst others, a proposition is to create a neighbourhood Management Group managing the participatory process with inhabitants. (Bacqué 2013, p 40 - 42 : Faire des instances de la politique de la ville des lieux de co-élaboration et de co-décision: profiter de la négociation des contrats pour engager une démarche de co-construction)

**Neighbourhood Management Group**

The urban project should respond to the inhabitants’ needs and take into consideration their potential. To do so, a neighbourhood Management Group should be created six month before contract is signed for the project. This group will have the responsibility to elaborate a cross-disciplinary diagnose and to define the orientations and the priorities of the project. The diagnose will take into consideration the different dimensions of the local development: education, employment, health, urban layout, and habitat.

The formed Management Group will be composed of around 30 persons. Minimum 50 % of them have to be inhabitants: 25 % representing the local associations, 25 % chosen randomly with quotas. The other 50% will be the economical stakeholders of the neighbourhood. The president of this group must be an inhabitant.

The neighbourhood Management Group is an authority for discussion and for making propositions. It will have means in order to produce studies, to organise the participatory process, to defray the volunteer and to hire professionals not holding local stakes who can manage the participatory process.

In order to involve a broad range of people, the Management Group will organise different types of action: gathering, public workshop, and thematic work-groups. Professional, political and citizen expertise will be used. The results from the debates will be presented for the public.

During the whole urban project process, the Management Group will organise the participatory process, evaluate the process and manage a Participatory Budget. It will also propose ways to inform the whole population about the on going urban project.
The architect, planner and researcher Avitabile proposes in the publication “La mise en scène du projet urbain” (Avitabile 2005) a method to carry out an urban project. He explains that an urban project process has three phases: a specification phase, a conception phase and a realization phase. In order to be democratic, the urban project process should respect the following criteria:

- the objectives and strategies of the project should be defined collectively
- public debate should be favour by involving the civil society at all steps of the process.
- the stakeholders should be able to agree on clear choices
- the decision-making process should be clearly defined.
- the organisation of the project process and the distribution of responsibilities must be explained.
The “Aires de rien” project is a co-design project experienced in the 13th arrondissement in Paris (Conseil de quartier 8, 13ème arrondissement de Paris 2011). The neighbourhood council asked the architect Jean-Marie Hennin to manage a participatory intervention with inhabitants in order to produce instructions for the improvement of the public spaces of the arrondissement. The inhabitants have selected public places and then produced with the help of the architect prescriptions for the improvement of the public spaces. First, the inhabitants described the place in detail: typology, address, motivation for action, surface, volume, existing planning rules, features, activities, colours and materials, uses, advantages, constraints, permanent or temporary action, comments, imagination. Secondly, the inhabitants proposed actions, installations and a layout for the place. These two exercises have resulted in place identity cards which were passed to the local council. The local council will take them into consideration for the future interventions in the public spaces of the neighbourhood.

### Proposition of installations for a public space within the “Aires de rien” project.

(Fig.2)

### Identity card of the public space called Patay Tolbiac (features part).

(Fig.3)
Malmö municipality asked the design and engineering company Sweco to redesign Claesgatan street with a collaborative method. Johanna Eriksson, Jennie Fagerström and Sonia Andersson carried out a Design Dialogue process with the users and the stakeholders of the street (Eriksson 2012).

**Method**

The Design Dialogue method enables the users and stakeholders to formulate goals, to identify spatial needs and to develop and test ideas. The Design Dialogue has a structured process with an explicit aim, content and expected outcome for its five steps: introduction meeting (purpose, game rules, mission for the workgroup), first design workshop (identify and formulate qualities and issues, develop ideas, stimulate dialogue), second design workshop (implement goals and qualities, inspiration, build outline), third design workshop (discuss and evaluate, revise and complete, follow up the goals) and completion meeting (recapitulate, discuss and evaluate, possible revise or complement).

**Participants**

Residents, real estate owners, municipality representatives, politicians living in the area, shop/restaurant owners, local organisations and other interested locals were participating.

**Design workshop 1**

A movie kicked off the discussion. On a board, participants placed sticky-notes about issues and qualities in the area. Then, they were formulating goals and visions for the area. The workshop managers helped the discussion in order to prioritize the ideas and to formulate questions.

**Design workshop 2**

The discussion from the first workshop was synthesised into these questions: How can Claesgatan be an attractive meeting place for everyone? How can building support the street life (and vice versa)? How are practical functions and well-being achieved through a combination of traffic, playfulness and vegetation? In small groups, participants placed images, stickers and coloured papers on a map and a model of the street. Then, the different groups presented to the others the result of the discussion.

**Design workshop 3**

Architects and planners presented an inspirational slideshow and two scenarios for the redesign of the street. Both scenarios responded to the questions. Then, with the help of a plan and a model, participants developed alternatives from the two proposals.
The context part describes:

- La Villeneuve’s features
- the Arlequin’s features
- the Yves Lion’s project part of the First National Programme for Urban Renovation (PNRUI)
- the Urban Workshop for the People, its features and first outcomes
Even though La Villeneuve neighbourhood is placed at the border of Grenoble city, it has a quite central place in the conurbation. Inside the ring road, not in the suburbs, the neighbourhood is ten minutes from the very centre of Grenoble by taking the tramway.

Grenoble Urbanism Agency has made a study of the neighbourhood (L’agence d’urbanisme de la région grenobloise 2003). La Villeneuve of Grenoble had 10,692 inhabitants in 1999 and 4168 dwellings. The Arlequin’s buildings, on which the focus is, hosts 44% of La Villeneuve’s population. It is a working-class neighbourhood: 2/3 of the dwellings are rental social housing.

La Villeneuve is characterized as a working-class neighbourhood but in fact there are as much executive as in the whole Grenoble city. Yet, there are more labourer and employee, and less retired and student. La Villeneuve’s population is quite diverse.

Actually, differences are more visible within the neighbourhood where 86% of the Arlequin’s buildings are rental social housing. The Northern Arlequin has a lower presence of white collar and an over presence of labourer.

The social housing of the neighbourhood hosts families with lower income. The unemployment rate of the neighbourhood is the same as the rate of Grenoble City, but the employment is more unstable. Between 1996 and 1999, the families in the neighbourhood became poorer. The view expressed by some inhabitants is that the impoverishment of the neighbourhood has intensified the last ten years.
4.2. Diversified neighbourhood

La Villeneuve is organised around a 120 hectare park. The park is not “conurbation function”, this means it does not attract people living outside the neighbourhood. Today, it is mostly the inhabitants of the neighbourhood using the park. (BRAUP 2010, P 17 - 49: La mégastructure au risque de la ville). It is surprising because the park is of high quality and offers diversified spaces: broad lawn, pond, shaded pathways, squares and hills.

The architecture is diversified and original. There are high rise buildings, low-rise buildings and towers, standing in the park or on a concrete slab. La Villeneuve has been constructed in the 70’s.

The neighbourhood is composed of different set of buildings. This master thesis focuses on the Arlequin area and its relation with the park. The density of the Arlequin area is moderate: 100 dwellings per hectare, including the park.
4.3. Neighbourhood’s components

1. neighbourhood management office
2. social centre’s administration
3. business area / area of activity
4. youth centre
5. social care institution
6. community centre with a library, a café, local associations premises, social care services and public administration services.
7. Trade gallery and market place with a pharmacy, a bakery, an optician, a muslim shop, a “bazar”, a phone-internet place, a wedding dress shop, a tobacco-newspaper store, a café - sandwich shop and a café - second hand shop.
8. sport hall
9. swimming-pool
10. schools
11. multi-storey car parks
5. THE ARLEQUIN
5.1. 20th century cultural heritage

The BRAUP and PUCA research institutes did a research workshop about the urban structure in the south of Grenoble. (BRAUP 2010, P 17 – 49: La mégastructure au risque de la ville) It studies three types of urban structure. One of them is the Arlequin’s megastructure. The research workshop’s report explains the following:

The Arlequin is a megastructure. It tries to reproduce the complexity of the traditional city into an architectural element. The circulation and the organization of the different spaces are very particular.

The design of the Arlequin has been influenced by the international utopian movement presents from 1950 to 1970. The utopian movement tried to renew the way to produce city. Linked to the British group Team X, some architects reacted to the modern movement’s functionalism. They refused the functional hierarchy and the zoning, enhanced mixed functions and used an organic metaphor instead of a machinist one.

The design of the Arlequin has been inspired by the Cluster City concept. This concept, develop by A. and P. Smithson, reconciles infrastructures and neighbourhood scale within a new urban form. The public functions and the offices are plugged to a “street-building” containing the dwellings.
5.2. Arlequin’s gallery

Arlequin’s gallery is 1465 meters long, 15 meters broad and 6 meters high. The gallery was conceptualised as a street: a meeting place and a trade place. (BRAUP 2010, P 17 – 49: La mégastructure au risque de la ville) The gallery gives access to the flats and the public functions. The gallery delimitates the north creek, the central creek, a market place and the south creek. From the north tip to the market place, the gallery is more or less at the ground level. From the market place to the south tip, the gallery goes up to reach four floors height. The gallery continues in the surrounded neighbourhoods. Direction north, it leads to a concert hall. Direction south, it leads to an attractive shopping mall in the conurbation.

The gallery was planned to be modular. It can be filled with premises. Attachment points placed on the pillars permit to easily install a mezzanine.

Left: Arlequin’s urban composition plan (1977) (Fig. 9)
Below: Arlequin’s section at different places in the gallery (Fig. 10)
Pictures from the south creek gallery: from one tip to the other
5.3. Arlequin’s buildings

**Complex building**

The Arlequin’s internal organisation is very particular.

There are two elevators per entrance. The two elevators don’t serve the same passageways. On the contrary, the staircase serves all the passageways.

One passageway serves three floors of dwellings. Therefore, most dwellings have to be accessed by a flight of stairs.

**Dwellings’ qualities:**
- functional layout
- broad surfaces compared to what is built today
- terraces on the south façades. Loggias on other ones.
- diversity of sizes: from the studio to the 6 rooms flat
- many dwellings have a great view

**Dwellings’ weaknesses:**
- because of stairs, most of the dwellings are not accessible for handicapped people and elderlies
- poor sound insulation
- average heat insulation
- at some entrances of housing unit, the elevator takes long time to appear
- there is no bicycle and pushchair premises in the common space
- some entrances of housing unit are not directly accessible by car

View from a dwelling’s terrace placed above the market place
As part of the PNRU1, an urban renewal project is carried out in La Villeneuve Neighbourhood. The ANRU convention, guaranteeing the subsidies, was signed in 2008. The project is designed by the reputed Paris-based architecture agency Yves Lion. The constructions started in 2012 and should last till 2015. The Arlequin area was the focus for this PNRU1 urban renovation. A PNRU2 urban renewal with a focus on an other set of buildings should start in 2014.

La Villeneuve’s PNRU1 urban renovation project has these objectives:
- to open the neighbourhood into the city
- to reinser the Arlequin’s flats in the local estate market, by making the flats more attractive and by heightening social diversity
- to develop the quality and the diversity of the activities and services available for the inhabitants

The strategies to open the neighbourhood into the city:
- continuous public spaces: direct relation to the ground, simplify the access to the housing units, give back quality to the entrance floor.
- to link the neighbourhood and its surrounding: network the big parks and the broad landscape spaces, improve the pedestrians links, develop structural landscape spaces.
- diversity: install activities, services, shops, offices in the entrance floor.
- the interventions should favour openness, links, diversity, and avoid to create distance, barriers and homogenisation.

Concerning social diversity, the aim is to diminish the social housing rate from 78% to 50% in ten years by privatising some parts of the Arlequin. Functional diversity is developed by favouring proximity between the dwellings and the employment. Small city centres in the neighbourhood must be developed, in order to shorten the travels and to make the neighbourhood a place for everyday life. The PNRU1 project is part of a broader development project for the south of Grenoble. This project, called “Polarité sud de l’agglomération grenobloise” tries to integrate two working-class neighbourhoods with economic and social difficulties into a dense, active and attractive urban centre.

(Grenoble-Alpes métropole 2012)
6.2. APU: Urban Workshop for the People, a bottom up initiative

**ORGANISATION**

**Associative work**
The “Ateliers Populaires d’Urbanisme” (APU) translated as Urban Workshop for the People, is a collaboration between the inhabitants association “Villeneuve Debout” and the non-profit experts association “Planning”. The inhabitants association is the organiser of the participatory process. It uses his local network to involve inhabitants in the project. The experts association is the manager of the process. It does field work, organises actions and develops a network of inhabitants and stakeholders. Both associations’ leaders composed the APU’s management committee.

**Means**
The APU is funded by the Abbé Pierre foundation. It has an employee working full time. It has no premises but uses the association premises in the neighbourhood. Meetings are also done in inhabitants’ flats or in the public space. It has an association cupboard in the community centre for storage purpose.

**Collaborations**
The APU collaborates with other organisations and professionals on specific projects. For instance, it has collaborated with the CAUE (Advice Agency for Architecture, Urbanism and Environment) for the definition of La Villeneuve’s educational project. More, a researcher working in the Grenoble Architecture School has carried out a workshop with a card game making understand the stakeholders’ interest in an urban project.

**ACTIONS** (Breynat 2013, p42-57: les ateliers populaires d’urbanisme de La Villeneuve)

**Thematic work-groups**
Groups of inhabitants met every month. The groups work on different themes. The group Environment organised an action in the public space. Planting flowers with a “?” shape. Kids were participating. This action attracted new inhabitants to the process.

**Gatherings**
An assembly gathers every month all the work-groups. Presentation of the work-groups’ propositions, debate and synthesis.

**Events**
Inhabitants have been discussing the park’s pond. Planning association has organised a beach event: umbrella, deck chairs, volleyball field. The inhabitants were invited to enjoy and discuss what can be the future of the pond.

**Public Workshops**
For example, planning association has organised a scenario workshop: how to imagine the future of the neighbourhood? Futurist, fertile, rebellious and young, retro... The aim was to extract the inhabitants from their everyday life and trigger their imagination.

**Presentations**
(a) Poster announcing a gathering (Fig.13)

(b) Poster announcing a workshop (Fig.15)

(c) Some pictures used during the scenario workshop
6.3. APU's propositions

**Themes**

Since its start in 2012, the Urban Workshop for the People has gathered many propositions coming from the inhabitants. These propositions were published in October 2013 in a PDF report with the title “Villeneuve, projet urbain stratégique et démocratique”, translated as “Villeneuve, strategic and democratic urban project”. The report describes around 50 propositions classified by themes: Governance regarding the associative life, the public services, the community facilities, and culture; The built environment regarding the dwellings, the passageways, the gallery and the façades; Environmental issues regarding urban farming, the park, health, greenery; Education regarding the schools and the educational project; Economy regarding services, employment, professional education, cooperative enterprises. These themes represent approximately the inhabitants’ workgroups.

The propositions were presented during public gatherings especially during the event celebrating the 40 year of La Villeneuve. They were also sent to the authorities in Grenoble. (Fig. 16)

**Extracts**

Here below some extracts of the propositions list are translated. The image to the right represents the board with the list of propositions used during my participatory intervention.

The propositions are written as:

**HABITAT: OUR PROPOSITIONS**

- TO MAKE LA VILLENEUVE’S FLATS ATTRACTIVE
  - to create a cooperative real estate agency
  - promotion of the high quality of the flats (website, flyers …)
  - to organise public visits to the flats

**ENVIRONMENT: OUR PROPOSITIONS**

- TO DEVELOP THE PARK’S POTENTIAL
  - to organise events all year long ( Villeneuve beach, festivals, urban culture contest …)
  - micro-installations in the park ( redesign the surrounding of the pond, playgrounds, boule-field, barbecues…)

EVERYBODY IN THE PARK LET’S IMPROVE OUR LIVING ENVIRONMENT!

Board with the list of propositions used during the participatory intervention (see bigger size in the appendix)
6.4. APU: a process triggering development

Nabeel Hamdi, a professional and researcher in urban participatory development proposes in the publication “Small change: about the art of practice and the limits of planning in cities” (Hamdi 2004) a definition for development: the power people have to organise themselves as a community and to give scale to a first small initiative improving everyday life.

While working within the APU, I have observed that the APU’s process triggers this development. Here below is described an example of first initiative taking scale. The second example shows how the APU’s network allows the creation of groups of interest.

**URBAN GARDENING DEVELOPMENT**

**Group work**
Some gardeners are part of the Environment al issues group work. They propose: what about developing gardening in the park?

**Event**
In order to know if more people are interested in the idea, they organise an event in the park. Flowers are planted with a “?” shape. Attracted by the event, more people are now supporting the idea.

**Support from authorities**
After a discussion, the municipality supports the idea. Allotment gardens are going to be installed in the park. Inhabitants are able to apply for one of the 60 plots in the future garden area.

**COLLECTIVE PASSAGEWAY DEVELOPMENT**

**Field work**
The APU’s managers meet many inhabitants during the field work. Some of them say that they are interested in participating in a collective housing project.

**1st project built**
Now, 60 people have the right to garden in the park! Yet, 200 people are in a waiting list to have a garden... Today, at the sight of the garden, even more people are getting interested.

**Networking**
The APU’s managers organise a meeting between all the persons interested. The inhabitants are then designing a collective housing project in an indoor passageway.

**1st project**
The project groups activities, common facilities and dwellings in a small indoor semi-private passageway. Three floors of flats are linked to one passageway. In this project, some flats are converted into premises for activities: a day-care, a gym, the local media office and a sewing workshop. One flat is converted into common premises for all the dwellings: laundry, a big kitchen which is used by the families but also by the day-care and a cold room to store the day-care food as well as fresh milk sold directly to the Arlequin’s dwellings. The seven other flats are kept as dwellings.

**Taking scale**
The APU’s managers know other people who are interested in this kind of project. If this project is realised, it opens a path for other collective passageway projects.
6.5. APU’s method

In order to explore a tool for a broad involvement of inhabitants in an urban renewal project, I have carried out a participatory intervention within the APU. I have worked with the APU as a trainee. My work had to be based on the APU’s existing work. I was free to chose the subject of study and the method of my participatory intervention. My field work in the neighbourhood has lasted one month and a half. Through my experience, I have understood in more detail what roles plays the APU and what its method is.

Roles

The APU’s management committee plays different roles:

- Organiser of the coproduction of the urban project (by enabling the inhabitants to formulate concrete propositions for the urban renewal project)

- local development agent (by supporting project holders, by creating a network)

- defender of the rights and interests of the working-class (for example, by organising a rallying against the sale of social housing)

Neighbourhood Management Group

The APU is inspired by the Bacqué-Mechmache report about participation of working-class inhabitants in the city policy. It shares features with the neighbourhood’s Management Group described in the report. Diagnose of the neighbourhood is managed by inhabitants.

The APU triggers discussion and enable the inhabitants to make propositions. It collaborates with professionals not holding local stakes in order to manage the participatory process. It organises diverse actions in order to reach a broad range of people. The results of the process, the list of propositions, were presented during public events.

Participatory Action Research (PAR)

Henry Sanoff lists in the publication “Community participation methods in design and planning” (Sanoff 2000) different participatory methods in design and planning. Based on this publication, it seems that the APU relates to the Participatory Action Research model. The PAR model "reflects the view that people who use the environment, who are the traditional subjects of research, should be active participants in the research and equally active participants in changing the environment. This idea is based on the belief that user groups have an expertise equal to, but different from, the expertise of the professional. Participation thus becomes a central component of the research approach. Users are then involved in evaluating research results and, subsequently, in developing recommendations about how to address problems that have been identified.” (Gaventa 1993 quoted in Sanoff 2000) The goal of PAR is to empower people to affect social change. The research has political and social relevance.
Here is explained my participatory intervention within the Urban Workshop for the People. First is described the stand and the two workshops I have carried out: what have been the communication, the range of people the interventions have reached, the exercises done by the inhabitants and the proceeding of the interventions. The inputs from the inhabitants need to be interpreted. Secondly, is explained how the interpretation is done with examples of dialogue with inhabitants. The examples show that the inputs from the inhabitants can be interpreted into a strategic programme and design guidelines. Third is described the strategic programme and the design guidelines produce with the outcomes from the participatory interventions and the fieldwork.

NOTE!

The outcomes of the participatory intervention, meaning the strategic programme and the design guidelines, have not been checked yet by the inhabitants (June 2014). Therefore, the material present in this master thesis can only be considered as a testing. It is not a real representation of the inhabitants’ voices for the future PNRU 2 urban renewal project.
7. FIELDWORK

7.1 Participatory interventions

Field work

I was on field for one month and a half. My immersion, my observations, my encounters and meetings with inhabitants, my discussions with the APU’s managers and my participatory interventions composed my field work.

Interventions

- one workshop at the community centre, Tuesday 25th February, from 16.30 to 18.00
- one workshop at the market square, Thursday 6th March, from 14.00 to 17.00
- a stand at the community centre, during three weeks, from Monday to Friday, from 16.30 to 18.00.

Communication

- sending e-mail to the APU’s contacts (more than 300 inhabitants)
- pinning up posters at the entrances of the housing units
- distributing flyers during the stand

Number of participants

Stand: in average 3 persons per day, so around 45 persons in total.

Workshop 1: 10 (12) persons

Workshop 2: 5 persons have done the exercise (+2 children); we talked to approximately 30 persons about the APU project.

Participants’ profile

The population met during the intervention is quite diverse: young mother, elderly, student, former young trouble maker, people having done upper studies, people with different origins… I have met people living for years in the neighbourhood, newcomers and people who used to live there. The population is mixed but women are under-represented.

Poster pined up at the entrances of the housing units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-10 years</th>
<th>10-20</th>
<th>20-30</th>
<th>30-40</th>
<th>40-50</th>
<th>50-60</th>
<th>60 and +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
<td>15 (30%)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children, teenagers and people full time worker are also under-represented. Full time worker are too busy to take time to participate in the APU, even though they say that they are interested in it. Elderlies are over-represented because they are the one having time to hang out in the neighbourhood.

ATELIER POPULAIRE D’URBANISME

Participe à la carte du PROJET URBAIN !

PERMANENCES
du lundi 17 février au vendredi 7 mars
de 16h30 à 18h au Baratham (patio)

ATELIERS
25 février (16h30-19h30) au PATIO
6 mars (14h-17h) Place du Marché

Poster pined up at the entrances of the housing units
7.2 Exercises

Exercise 1: place a proposition

A first exercise was carried out during the first two weeks of stand and in the first workshop. With the help of a map, pens, coloured stickers and a board with APU's list of propositions, I asked: look at the propositions, which one would you like to support? Where would you place it on the map? Why there? A sticker with the proposition's number was placed on the map and I was taking notes of the conversation.

Exercise 2: draw a place and develop a place

A second exercise was carried out during the final week of stand and the second workshop. I used the same materials but this time the map was full of stickers from exercise 1. The exercise has two phases. First, I asked the inhabitants: can you name a place of the neighbourhood? Can you draw it and describe its features? We were then producing a “place card” (A5 format) with the name of the place and its features. Secondly, I asked: having a look at the propositions situated in this place, could you tell if the position is relevant? Which propositions would be relevant in this place? We were then producing a “propositions for the place” card (A4, format) with the development of the propositions: worries about a proposition, who use it, who build it, who manage it. Stickers were also placed more precisely on the map.

Outputs

The first exercise gives a lot of information to define a strategic programme. The second exercise produces more outputs to define design guidelines: naming, drawing and describing the places indicate what their value is. In this way, the inhabitant’s mind map of the neighbourhood can be understood. Once this is done, the communication is easier, people know exactly which place is discussed. The “develop propositions for a place” exercise has been done for the area around the pond only.

Both exercises are useful to define a strategic plan and design guidelines. The next pages explain how the interpretation into strategic programme and design guidelines is done.

It is necessary to find a way to involve the participants deeper in the process in order to define more detailed design guidelines.

Tools

The stand and the workshop area were organised so it does not look like a reception desk which creates a distance. It is important that the inhabitants feel free to enter the area and speak. The chairs were organised around the table with no hierarchy. Pens, stickers, maps, papers, propositions board were easily accessible.

A children’s area was organised so the kids were busy playing when the adults were concentrating on the exercise.
7.3 Workshops and stand

Workshop 1
One of the APU's managers and myself were managing the first workshop. Two others managers from the APU helped at the beginning of it. It was planned as follows: after welcoming the people, a presentation of the APU should be made as well as the first exercise. The people were planned to choose a theme (governance, built environment, environmental issues, education, economy) and sit down in small groups around different tables with the list of propositions. They should then brainstorm together for 15 minutes. Next, the five groups should gather around the main table with the map. Group after group, they were supposed to explain to the others where they place the propositions and why. The placement is then discussed with the others. The workshop ends with a conclusion and we ask for feedback among the participants. Before leaving, we ask for their contact information and they are informed of the next workshop and the stand.

What happened was that few participants were present at the beginning, so instead we sat directly together around the main table. We discussed the placement of the propositions, theme after theme. People arrived little by little, so after a time we were twice as many around the table. It was challenging to manage the discussion: some were monopolising it, others were keeping quiet, the word had to be distributed among the participants. When the discussion was diverging from the exercise, we asked them to come back to the list of propositions and place the following one. The workshop was chaotic but rich in information, many propositions were placed. At the end, we asked for feedback: people were pleased by the exercise! They said it feels good to talk about a common project for the neighbourhood.

Workshop 2
Three APU managers and myself were managing the second workshop. By organising it in the market, the idea was to reach people that usually don't show up at meetings. The market is not an ideal place for a workshop. People arrived one by one so there was little collective discussion in the workshop. The second workshop proceeded more like a stand. However, it is a good communication event; it could have been done at the beginning of the intervention process in order to inform the inhabitants about it.

The stand
The presence took place in the central space of the community centre. An APU manager was informing the people about it at the entrance of the community centre by distributing flyers and discussing the list of propositions. People showing up were of three kinds: some were approached by my APU colleague, some were informed by the e-mail and some were passing by in the community centre. Comparing the amount of information and the time spent, we could say a workshop is more efficient. Yet, the presence permits to reach a broader range of people. The inhabitants who didn’t talk much during the first workshop came back the following days to the stand to discuss more. Some inhabitants need to come several times to participate actively in the exercises: first day they talk about an issue, another day they give a new proposition, another day they draw a place, describe its features and place precisely the proposition. The stand gives people time to think about the exercises.
8. INTERPRETATION WORK
8.1. Inhabitants’ inputs

**Dialogue**

Gwenaëlle d’Aboville explains in the article “Concevoir l’espace public avec les habitants : la concertation comme gage de délicatesse urbaine” that the expert managing the participatory process needs to listen, analyse and interpret the talks. His role is to point out what make sense in talks which seem banal at first sight, by going into the dialogue in depth and by cross-checking the opinions. (D’Aboville 2012)

Dialogues with inhabitants are full of signification. What we can interpret from them are: needs and issues, objectives, strategies, site’s potential, inhabitants’ potential, conflicts.

During my field work, I have received information in many ways: thanks to dialogues during the workshops, the stand, my observations in the neighbourhood and discussions with the APU’s managers.

After receiving information, I was then questioning other inhabitants during the stand: is it really true people are throwing trash through the windows? I heard the social life in the passageway is not what it used to be? Somebody has proposed to place the barbecue units here, what do you think about it?

When the conversation starts by asking what the issues are, people complain and the discussion stops quickly. Asking to place a proposition or to make a new one is a more positive approach. It permits creative talks; the issues come later in the discussion or can be deduced.

**Examples**

**Reacting to the proposition “to develop the park’s potential”**

“It is a good idea to develop events. It will attract people from outside. The park is beautiful, it is a pity nobody knows about it. But we should not only organise “ghetto event”, but also, for instance, classical music concerts.”

**Of course! Go on!**

“A slope arriving in the lake, here, the water is deeper. (…) My mum one day got very upset; because somebody was letting his dogs swim in the lake.”

**Outputs**

Issue: few non-resident frequent the neighbourhood
Objective: to make the park attractive by developing its potential
Strategy: to organize events all year long
Potential: the park’s high quality
Conflict: fear to have only the Hip Hop Culture representing the neighbourhood’s identity

**Potential: the lake has different depth.**

Conflict: between the dog’s owners and the parents. Fear about kids’ security.
8.2. Interpretation of inhabitants’ inputs into a strategic programme

Objectives and goals:
This strategy responds to several objectives:
- to develop the social life in the passageways
- to favour entrepreneurship by allowing activities in the passageway
- to improve neighbours’ relation

These objectives respond to the goals:
- to favour social cohesion
- to develop La Villeneuve’s economy
- to make Arlequin’s flats attractive

Issues:
- youths making noise in the passageway
- youths squatting the passageway the evenings. Feeling unsafe.
- the buildings’ common spaces get quickly dirty.

Opportunities:
- social life can be dynamic, even today without the large common spaces
- one dynamic passageway is enough to develop the social life in the staircase
- neighbours interaction improves the buildings ‘maintenance and can prevent the squat of

Reacting to the proposition “to develop the social life in the passageways”

““This is a good idea (...) it used to be much better.”

How did it work? Were all the passageways dynamic?

“No, not all of them. But that one was dynamic in the staircase was enough. The inhabitants were organising friendly meals and inviting the whole building. Neighbours get to know each other well. It was easier to manage the building.”

I heard the social life in the passageway is not what it used to be?

“Well really? No, some passageways work very well today. Mine is great.”

Why did it stop?

“Mine used to be nice, but the people have changed; now it is less dynamic (...) but I know other passageways working well.”

I don’t understand why people don’t just ask the youths to go away. I used to live in a working-class neighbourhood in Paris, and the fact to ask them to leave was enough. They don’t want to have problems with inhabitants; it would be a great opportunity for the cops to have a motive to catch them.

““But here they bum people’s car if they argue with them. (...) No, but you are right. Pressure from inhabitants can be enough. When I was living in the Arlequin, we had youths squatting our passageway. They were rude with people, noisy, we didn’t feel safe. So, with a neighbour, we had squat our own passageway every evening! We placed a table and were drinking tea until 23h! We had inform the police of our action and they told us we could call them if anything happened. The youths, seeing us, didn’t squat anymore the passageway. We never had any more problems after that.”

Strategic Planning:
We know that a group of inhabitants is interested in creating a “collective passageway” (see 6.4.). During the stand and the workshops, other inhabitants have expressed their interest to live in such a passageway.

Strategy:
- to promote a “collective passageway” for each staircase, on the first floor.
It is better to place the collective passageway on the first floor. In this way, people going to the activities can take the stairs and so they don’t monopolise the elevator.
8.3. Interpretation of inhabitants’ inputs into design guidelines

Trying to place the micro-installations in the park

“It would be nice to have a bread oven as well.”

“Yes, good idea.”

What else would we need for the garden area?

“A compost area, here, next to the future recycling bins. (...) The compost should be close to the block of flats, or people will not bring their waste.”

Where would we place it?

“At the market place? It is a meeting place. But it could be dangerous for kids, isn’t it? There is the school here.”

“No, I don’t think this is dangerous...”

“Wouldn’t it be better placed in the garden area?”

Where exactly would we place the table and oven?

“We need a rainwater collection as well. Placed close to the garden.”

“At the opposite side of the bins!”

This discussion has taken place during the first workshop. It is translated into the following functional layout for the garden areas:
9. OUTCOMES

9.1. Strategic programme for the Arlequin and the park

9.1.1. Method and purpose

Method

“A strategic plan is a method of developing strategies and action plans necessary to identify and resolve issues.” (Sanoff 2000, p 39: strategic planning) It consists of defining goals responding to needs and issues, then to translate the goals (desire general result) into objectives (desire specific result). The method to reach the objective is the strategy. The strategies are then detailed into action plans.

Interpretation

The APU made a list of propositions organised by theme: governance, built environment, environmental issues, education and economy. These themes represent approximately the inhabitants’ work groups. In order to make a strategic programme, I have reorganised these propositions and classified them by goals, objectives and strategies. Issues and other informations are deduced from my field work. The full strategic programme is in the appendix. In the next page are two examples of strategy from the strategic programme.

Respond to real needs

In order to define a strategic programme, the issues and needs are identified. This way, there is a guaranty the project responds to the inhabitants’ real needs and so supports the development of the neighbourhood.

Synchronise the renovation and the social dimensions

The definition of a strategic programme permits to synchronise the renovation and the social dimensions. Renovation and social propositions are combined to respond to the same goal. For instance, promoting a collective passageway for each staircase can develop social life in the passageways, and so improve the neighbours’ relation. This can favour a better safety and maintenance in the building. Combined with the renovation of the dwellings and the passageways, it participates to the goal to make attractive the Arlequin’s flats.

Synergies

The definition of a strategic programme permits to pin-point potential synergies between different activities. For instance, there is a need for more playgrounds. One issue is that, early in their life, the children meet drug dealers in the public space. One strategy is to favour the adult presence in the public space. One initiative from the inhabitants is the development of allotment gardens. A proposition is to install sport installations in the park. A synergy is done when placing the adults’ activities next to the playgrounds.

Structure of a strategic programme
9.1.2. Examples of strategy

Garden and playground synergie

- **Issue** -
  Children mixed with drug dealers in the public space.

- **Goal** -
  To improve the education of the children.

- **Objective** -
  To improve the children’s free time.

- **Strategy** -
  Adults' activities next to the children by placing the gardens next to the playgrounds.

Collective passageway strategy: a strategy responding to many goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to make attractive Arlequin’s flats</td>
<td>to develop social life in the passageways</td>
<td>to promote a “collective passageway” for each staircase, on the first floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to favour social cohesion</td>
<td>to improve neighbours’ relation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to favour entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2. Design guidelines for the Arlequin and the park

Design guidelines

The inputs given by inhabitants during the stand and the two workshops are interpreted into design guidelines. These design guidelines concern the renovation dimension of the urban renewal project while taking into consideration the strategic programme.

The design guidelines concern:
- places to protect and put in value
- allotment gardens
- local associations' project in the public space
- playgrounds
- the gallery

Places to protect and put in value

By drawing the places of the neighbourhood, the inhabitants have described the places which they value today. These places are the ones situated on the following map.
9.2.1. Places to protect and put in value

The market place

Features:
- a meeting place, the Arlequin’s landmark for the inhabitants
- local shops, café, market
- passage to the tram stop by a trade gallery
- shops have hard time to survive today

Guidelines:
- to develop local shops in the trade gallery and around the market place
- to remove some premises for better light and view in the gallery
- to make more noticeable the trade gallery and the market place from the tram stop
The beach

Features:
- where many circulation paths meet
- leisure: meeting place, swimming, picnic, sun bathing...

Conflict:
Dogs swimming in the lake, polluting the water. Kids are playing in the lake.

Guidelines:
- design the area between the swimming pool, the lake and the sport hall
- make visible the interior of the sport hall from outside (glass). Create an access to the sport hall.
- 2 options for the development of the place: a beach event each summer / add permanent urban furniture: picnic tables, water games, barbecues...
The beach

The beach is a cross point between the tram stop, the market, the shopping mall, the Constantine street and the Giants’ square.
The event area

Features:
- where most of the events take place: concerts, La Villeneuve’s birthday, festivals, theatre ...
- open spaces and the shaded lime trees path

Guidelines:
- the place should be kept free of constructions
- design the place so it can host big events: terraces on the hill, power points, removable football goals, move street lamp.

Remark:
“open the park to the city” can be done by inviting people from all over the city to outdoor events in the park. The park is the best one in town, superb views, big space.
The relaxing place

Features:
- Quiet, free open space, hot in summer but shadow in the grove.

Guidelines:
- Not construct or organise the place
- A big chessboard in the grove, a good place to concentrate and think
The meeting place

Features:
- Meeting place of the Giants' area: square, playground, open space for games, boules.
- the meeting place moved from the Giants' square to the park because a drugs dealer group have scared the atmosphere in the square.

Guidelines:
- add picnic tables under the trees
- allotment gardens along the path
9.2.2. Allotment gardens

Some inhabitants were already gardening in the neighbourhood. The APU has triggered the development of this initiative. Today, it is 60 allotment gardens that are installed in the park. We also know that 200 other inhabitants would be interested in gardening.

To the right is mapped where are the existing gardens and where the inhabitants wish the new ones. The functional layout here below was defined during the first workshop.

Functional layout of the gardens' area

Location of the gardens in La Villeneuve

- **Allotment gardens**
  - Individuals garden a small plot

- **Collective garden**
  - A group gardens a broad plot

- **Existing gardens**
  - Today, people are already gardening there

- **Gardens being installed**
  - The municipality is installing 60 allotment gardens
9.2.3. Local associations’ project

Some local non-profit associations would like to be able to use the public space. Here below is listed their project. Such projects are assets that can be included in the planning of the neighbourhood.

- Barathym café’s terrace
- KIAP’s terrace
- Boules’ shed
- Poucet garden’s extension
9.2.4. Playgrounds

There is a need for playgrounds next to the dwellings. Children also like the extraordinary playground in the middle of the park (with the big slide here below). This playground is an occasion for outing. Extraordinary playgrounds can also be a way to attract people from other neighbourhoods. Like so, water games can be installed in the lake. The families and the schools express the need of an outdoor covered playground. Different options were discussed:
- One big playground in the middle of the park, accessible to all the schools and families.
- Some small covered playgrounds in the schools' courtyard and one in the Arlequin's gallery.

![Diagram of playground locations]
A playground for teenagers and adults or/and sport installations.

Up the hill, an intimate area and a sporty way to reach it. Down the hill, not far from the children’s playground, so the parents can take care of their children when going out for sport.

The youths often annoy the others because they are “bored”. Providing activities for young people can then be a way to reduce delinquency acts.

An health-round (free running, park-tour...) in the park will complete the sport installations. Such activities can also attract people from the area around the neighbourhood.
9.2.5. The gallery

**Features:**
- the gallery as a circulation area
- the entrance to the housing unit is opened

**Guidelines:**
- keep the continuous circulation in the gallery
- the area along the gallery is dangerous: trash is thrown away from the windows
- cross circulation: have to be highlighted and organised with some urban furniture (benches, bins)
Fill the gallery with premises:
- premises for hand-craft as well as design and art offices.
- the continuous circulation in the gallery has to be kept
- There are different options to fill the gallery while keeping the continuous circulation

The cross circulations to be highlighted and organised with some urban furniture (benches, bins)
In this fifth part a design strategy for the urban renewal of the Arlequin is defined. First is analysed the urban framework and the public spaces of Yves Lion’s urban renovation project. Then, a design strategy for the Arlequin based on the strengths of Yves Lion’s project and the outcomes from the participatory intervention is proposed. The design strategy concerns the urban framework, the gallery and the public spaces of the Arlequin area. Finally, in order to develop the possibilities of the outcomes of the participatory process, some parts of the Arlequin’s public spaces are drawn in more detail.

**Note!**

The design strategy proposed in this master thesis cannot be considered as a proper strategy for the future PNRU 2 urban renewal project. It can only be considered as a material for analysis within the master thesis work. The design strategy proposed in this master thesis is based on a strategic programme and designed guidelines which are not yet validated by the inhabitants (June 2014). Furthermore, the complexity of the Arlequin area needs the expertise of an experienced and multi-disciplinary design team.
10. ANALYSE OF THE EXISTING PNRU1 URBAN RENOVATION PROJECT DRAWN BY YVES LION

10.1. Existing urban structure

Arlequin’s area is today isolated from the street network of the city because no road serves it on all its length. Only two hooks serve the car park area of the housing units. And so, it is so not a passing area for the drivers.

The two tram stops of the neighbourhood are assets. The public transports can be reached quickly from the Arlequin’s buildings. Yet, the public space around the tram stops and the entrances to the park from the tram stops are poorly designed. Nothing invites the pedestrian to have a look at the Arlequin’s gallery and its park.

At the level of the southern tram stop, the gallery is filled with shops. This trade gallery leads to the market place. The rest of the gallery is mostly empty. Public functions, such as schools, sport hall, community centre, are plugged to the gallery.
10.2. Yves Lion’s strategy for the urban structure

Yves Lion’s project has two scales of intervention. The first one, from the outside, works on the blocks of the neighbourhood’s ring by improving their readability and by making them more permeable. The blocks are rectangle and the buildings’ façades respect this structure. A building is demolished in order to create a street linking the broad avenue and the Arlequin’s central creek. Another street is created above the northern multi-storey car park and a new street links the north Arlequin to the south Arlequin. Two multi-storey car parks are rebuilt into new multi-storey car parks with facilities in the ground floor. There is only one tram stop, placed between the new blocks and serving the new market place.

The second scale of intervention, from the inside, reorganises the urban structure of the Arlequin. The gallery is completely filled with premises: entrances of the housing units, public functions, activities and new dwellings. The Arlequin’s buildings become regular buildings standing in a park, with no circulation in the ground floor of the buildings. New entrances for the housing units are created in order to have smaller passageways. The multi-storey car park of the central creek as well as two slices of the Arlequin are demolished in order to make the park visible from the street. By locating the market place in front of these two park’s entrances, the idea is to “open the neighbourhood into the city”. A third park’s entrance is placed at the northern side of the Arlequin. Leading to an existing tree-line path in the park, it creates a structural landscape space (Grenoble-Alpes métropole 2012).
10.3. Yves Lion’s public spaces

Regular planning has the merit of taking into consideration a scale of analysis exceeding the limits of the neighbourhood. This permits to reorganize the urban structure of the neighbourhood and its surrounding so as to integrate the neighbourhood in the general urban functioning of the city. By organizing the circulation along a trade area, the economic development can be triggered. Organizing circulation along the neighbourhood places it in the city mental map of Grenoble inhabitants. However, regular planning can take a radical approach and change deeply the neighbourhood’s balance. By moving the market place, demolishing slices of the Arlequin’s building and deleting the circulation in the gallery, the uses in the public space are completely disturbed. With no information about uses in the space, it becomes tricky to design a good quality public space. The result for La Villeneuve’s project is some standard public spaces around the new market place, with parking and tree line on both sides of the roadway and some public spaces with too less intention in the space in-between the Arlequin buildings. The space of the current market place illustrates this issue well. The drawing of the pathways shows the difficulties to imagine how this space could work. The pathways and passages in the gallery respect today’s uses, but because the market place’s activities do not exist anymore, these circulations seem irrelevant.

In order to use the outcomes of the participatory intervention, the design strategy for the public spaces proposed in this thesis is built on the current uses and site’s assets.
The proposal for a design strategy for the urban structure is based on the strengths of Yves Lion’s plan and uses the outcomes of the participatory process. The Yves Lion’s intervention on the blocks of the neighbourhood’s ring is followed. However, the two tram stops are kept and the existing market place is developed.

The intervention on the urban structure of the Arlequin’s area is less radical. The Arlequin’s initial principles are kept: the gallery works as a street, with a continuous circulation and activities organised along it. Two third of the gallery is filled with premises. The last third is kept free for the pedestrian circulation. Keeping the continuous circulation implies to keep open the entrances of the housing units. These entrances are extended with bicycle premises. All parts of the Arlequin are kept. The main entrance to the park are through the gallery. The public space in front of the entrance is designed in a way so the passer-by is invited to cross the gallery and access the park. There is one entrance in front of the northern tram stop, a second one in the prolongation of the street lining the broad avenue and the Arlequin street and a third entrance in the market development space.

A drop-off road close to the entrance of the housing units is accessible permanently by car. Bicycles are also taken into consideration by organising specific premises all along the gallery. The multi-storey car park of the central creek is kept in order to respond to the lack of parking close to the dwellings.
11.2. Strategy for the gallery

11.2.1. Activities in the gallery

A design strategy for the gallery needs to be defined because the design of the gallery and the entrances affects the urban structure of the Arlequin.

**Entrance's premises**

The entrances are kept open. Bicycle premises are organised next to the staircase and the two elevators.

**Premises for shops or handicraft**

On the ground floor, one storey high premises can be constructed. They can suit shops or handcraft.

**Premises for handicraft or art and design offices**

On the ground floor, duplex premises can be constructed. They can suit handcraft or art and design offices.

**Premises for offices or art and design offices**

On the first floor, premises for offices or art and design offices can be constructed. These premises are accessible through the entrance of the housing unit.

**Collective passageway**

The collective passageway gathers dwellings, a common area and activities. The activities will attract many people. In order to not monopolise the elevators, the collective passageway is placed on the second floor. In this way, it encourages people to use the stairs when going to the activities.
11.2.2. Entrance of the housing units

The design criteria take into consideration the design guidelines and the strategic programme.

**Design criteria**

- keep the continuous circulation in the gallery
- create a sequence in the gallery so the entrance of the housing unit is visible
- do not make people stay in the “dangerous zone”
- enhance the access to the park
- preserve the volume of the elevator’s tube.

The activities’ storage area alternates with the shop front, creating a rhythm in the gallery.

The entrance of the housing unit is open in order to keep the continuous circulation in the gallery.

In the circulation path, the first floor is built around the elevator. It permits the access to the first floor with the elevator and it produces a sequence in the gallery, indicating the entrance.

Garbage is placed in underground containers. It is thrown away through the openings alongside the road.

Bicycle premises are organised in the entrance. They extend in the park, blocking the circulation in the dangerous zone and opening the entrance to the park. There is approximately one bicycle place per dwelling.

Duplex premises can be constructed in the gallery.
11.3. Strategy for the public spaces

**Entrances**
- entrance to the park and the market place.
  Two trade galleries lead to the market place.
- market place
- entrances to the park

**Attractions**
- theatre’s entrance. Attractive facade.
- Barathym café’s terrace
- the beach
- extraordinary playground
- event area
- sport installations linked to a sport path
- leisure attraction: climbing wall
- relaxing area

**Activities for inhabitants**
- allotment and collective gardens
- playground. Preferable close to the gardens in order to have adult presence next to the children.

**Status of the public spaces**
- square
- short term parking
- backyard: inhabitants’ parking, bicycle premises, shops’ delivery area, access by car to the entrance of the housing units.
12. DETAILED PLANS OF PUBLIC SPACES

12.1. Development of the market place

In order to show how a project can be based on the existing uses and site’s assets, the market place development is drawn in more detail. The market place is a key element of the proposal. The inhabitants value it and consider it as a landmark. Its development will offer every-day facilities to the inhabitants and lead the passer-by to the lake and therewith the park. The space is developed along two trade galleries.

A temporary parking in front of the trade gallery makes the shops accessible to drivers.

The central creek is treated as a backyard on the ground level. It is the space for deliveries, bicycle premises, outdoor permanent parking and the entrances to the multi-storey car park. On top of the multi-storey car park, there are allotment gardens with its public space and a playground for children.

A direct pathway links the market place and the tram stop.

A premise defines the border between the market place and the garden area in front of the tram line.

The southern gallery is filled with new premises. The circulation in the gallery is placed in the south and permits to organise the bicycle premises and the drop-off roadway alongside it.
12.2. Gardens on the multi-storey car park

Today, the roof of the multi-storey car park is already occupied by some gardeners. This initiative could be developed. The space is sunny and has a domestic atmosphere with all the windows of the dwellings encircling it. The layout of the roof follows the guidelines defined during the participatory process.

The example of the gardens on top of the multi-storey car park shows how building a project on the current uses and the inhabitants’ initiative can add complexity to the design of a public space. The space can be designed in more detail because the uses can be imagined. The section below shows how dense in uses a space can be when following this method. Furthermore, it avoids designing standard spaces and so gives the neighbourhood an interesting diversity of spaces.

AA’ section of the backyard (scale 1/500)
The fifth part concludes the two research questions and opens up on the sustainable development issue. First there is a reflection on the participatory intervention. Second the added value and disadvantage of Yves Lyon’s project and the proposal for a design strategy are described. In this way it is understood how complementary a regular planning process and a participatory process are. Then improved participatory tools are proposed within a hypothetical democratic process for an urban renewal project. Finally there is a reflection on how the process of a urban renewal project can be democratic and how a democratic process supports the social sustainability of a project.
Exercise 1: place a proposition

The first exercise consisted of placing the propositions on the map. The inhabitants had to look at a board with the list of propositions. The propositions were organised by theme (governance, built environment, environmental issues, education and economy). Some inhabitants were confused in the beginning because it was so much information all at once. The information should be hierarchized so it is easier to understand the main information quickly. To organise the propositions through a strategic programme would improve the urban renewal project process and make it more easily readable for the inhabitants. When mapping the propositions, the inhabitants should then have a board with the strategic programme.

Some people had a hard time understanding the map, a model would have helped them. Yet, the details drawn in the map enriched the discussion. The most suitable way to carry out the exercise would be to have a detailed map combined with a model.

Exercise 2: draw a place and develop a place

The second exercise was too broad and actually, it has been experienced as two exercises. First, inhabitants have drawn the neighbourhood’s places on the map, described their features and then discussed the relevance of the propositions’ position. The exercise “to place a proposition” and the exercise “to draw a place” were fruitful together. Secondly, inhabitants had developed a specific place by describing more in detail their features and developing the propositions in the place. This exercise has only been fully done with the “beach”. It is a fruitful exercise if the inhabitants take time to sit and discuss together. This “develop a place” exercise should therefore be organised as a workshop.

Scale

The APU’s managers proposed to me several topics to study: the new location of the mosque, the design of the collective passageway, the design of the entrance of the housing units, etc... The topics were all interesting but they had few urban dimension. The subject of my master thesis is about urban renewal. The subject is relevant regarding the evolution of the objectives of the National Programme for Urban Renewal. I wanted to study participation of inhabitants in the context of an urban project, that’s why I have chosen to work with the scale of the neighbourhood. Mapping the propositions of the inhabitants in the neighbourhood was then the starting point of my intervention.

Reflecting on the outcomes of my intervention, I understand that an intervention must be adapted to the scale addressed. It seems that the broader the scale is, the bigger the number of participants must be and so bigger the interpretation and cross-checking work of the expert is. The scale of the neighbourhood is relevant to define a strategic programme and design guidelines. With this scale, it is possible to involve hundreds of inhabitants and all the profiles of the population. Yet, it is worthy to define more careful instructions for places with strong stakes. A co-design workshop for the scale of a place produces more detailed guidelines and so addresses more carefully the complexity of the place. With this scale, there is no need to involve as many inhabitants. Forty participants can permit a co-design workshop with good quality outcomes if the participants are selected carefully. For instance, the co-design of the market development should involve residents, real estate owners, municipality representatives, shop owners, local organisations and other interested locals.

To conclude, the participatory process of an urban renewal project needs to combine different participatory interventions adapted to different scales.

During my intervention, exercises were done with a map of the neighbourhood. And so, the outcomes mostly concern the public and semi-public spaces. If a section or plans of the Arlequin buildings were present during the participatory intervention then maybe more outcomes about the building would have been produced.

Assessment

The participatory intervention should be organised in a way that it gives means to do an assessment. After an inhabitant did an exercise, I noted the gender and the guessed age of the inhabitant. Data about the inhabitants’ profile must be collected more carefully. In order to have a democratic project process, the participants should be
representative of the population. Relevant data about the participants would permit to compare their profile with the population of the neighbourhood. This means a study of the population of the neighbourhood should be done before starting a participatory process.

The inhabitants’ input has been translated into a strategic programme and design guidelines. It was a lot of information to manage. The interpretation I have done can be wrong. That’s why it is really important to ask feedback from the inhabitants after defining a first version of the strategic programme and the design guidelines. Recording the discussion with the inhabitants could be interesting. It would permit to study further how to interpret the inhabitants’ input.

**Scenario workshop**

Today, inhabitants walk along the gallery. So, their proposition is to keep the continuous circulation in the gallery. Such a decision has large scale effects on the neighbourhood’s urban structure. It implies that most of the entrances have to be kept open. The inhabitants may not have been aware of the consequences of their choice. The issue should be more discussed with them with the help of different scenario for the use of the gallery and the entrances. This type of key element should be discussed more in detail during a specific workshop.

**Children, youth and full time worker**

The participatory intervention has reached few children, youths and full time workers. The children need a specific intervention. The intervention can be done at school. For instance, the children can be involved in the design of their school yard or in the design of an extraordinary playground. They should be involved in the mapping of the educational project for the neighbourhood. The youths can be reached with an intervention in the youth centre. In order to reach the people having a full time job, the stand should last until 20:00 o’clock or be done during some week-ends.


**Compromises in urban design**

Existing uses and inhabitants’ propositions do not take into consideration urban design principles. When looking closer to the proposal based on the participatory process, compromises in urban design are visible. For instance, Yves Lion’s project places the northern entrance in the prolongation of the treeline path in order to create a structural landscape space. Because the proposal based on the participation process takes into consideration existing pedestrians circulation, the entrance is placed differently and the access to the treeline path less evident.

Another example is the street along the Arlequin. Yves Lion’s project can design a broad street with parking and tree line because it demolishes three dwellings in the Arlequin. The proposal based on the participatory intervention can only design a narrow street with a one-way road and a pavement because the inhabitants refuse any demolitions of dwellings.

**Heavy or soft actions**

A regular planning process leads to heavy actions while a participatory process proposes soft actions. For instance, in order to improve the maintenance and the safety in the passageways, the Yves Lion’s project proposes to make shorter the passageways and to close the entrance of the housing units. These propositions need heavy constructions and make radical changes in the urban structure. For the same objective, the proposal based on the participatory process proposes to favour a collective passageway for each staircase. This proposition needs light construction and uses the social potential. A weakness of the proposal based on the participatory process could be that a better relation between neighbours is not enough to ensure better maintenance and safety in the passageways. The
collective passageway proposition would need to be combined with a heavier action, as for example closing the entrance of the housing units. Yet, some inhabitants have hard time to believe it is possible to close the entrance of the housing units. They think the entrance will be vandalized. Heavy actions are then not necessary more efficient.

The Yves Lion’s project and the proposal based on the participatory process have different strategies to attract pedestrians into the park. Yves Lion’s project demolishes some part of the Arlequin in order to make visible the park from the street. The market place is also moved in front of an evident entrance to the park. The other project does not demolish but instead redesigns the public space in front of the entrances to the park. Furthermore, activities attracting non-residents are developed in the park. One could say the strategy of the proposal based on the participatory process is too weak. Others would say the same for Yves Lion’s project. The debate between heavy and soft actions has no response in this master thesis but this debate shows that a disadvantage of the participatory process could be to refuse heavy actions and so to reduce the efficiency of the urban renewal project.
15. ADDED VALUE OF THE PARTICIPATORY PROCESS

Regular planning outcomes for urban design

By analysing a scale exceeding the neighbourhood’s limits, regular planning permits to reorganise the urban structure; prolongation of existing surrounding streets, netting in order to open up the neighbourhood. Regular planning works with structural landscape spaces: an entrance leading to a tree-line path in the park, a trade street leading to the park via an opening in the Arlequin’s building. These tools lead to more radical changes which can deeply disturb the neighbourhood’s balance. Public spaces are then designed in a standard way because they cannot get inspired by current uses.

Participatory process outcomes for urban design

The participatory process gives useful outcomes to improve urban design. The participatory process informs about the site’s assets, the local uses and the inhabitants’ initiatives. Inhabitants are also able to give detailed propositions for actions, constructions and arrangement. These outcomes permit to design a project leaning on the local assets by developing the places which work well today and they also permit to add complexity and diversity for the design of the public spaces by taking into consideration the current uses and by supporting local initiatives.

Complementarity

The professionals and the inhabitants’ expertise are complementary. The professionals are able to take into consideration a scale of analysis exceeding the neighbourhood’s limits. They are also able to consider structural changes. As for the inhabitants, they are able to point out the site’s assets and the potentials for change as well as informing about current uses. The professionals analyse the broad scale, the inhabitants attract attention to the small scale. The combination of the two expertises should produce a good quality urban design, paying attention both to the detailed scale and the larger scale. The inhabitants’ participation provides outcomes not only for the urban design but also for the development of the neighbourhood.

To synchronise the social and the renovation project

An urban renewal project is a great opportunity to trigger social development. Using a participatory process relating to the Participatory Action Research model permits to empower the inhabitants to effect change. The participatory project is “a way to liberate energy, to move forward a common objective. It is a tool to trigger the development’s dynamic. (...) it opens paths, awakens desires, and suggests other projects.” (Permis de Vivre la Ville association 2002) The collective passageway and the allotment gardens are examples of these sub-projects which can be initiated by the participatory process of the urban renewal. By integrating them within the planning and design of the neighbourhood, the synchronisation of the social and the renovation project is achieved.

Comparison

The Yves Lion’s plan has poor intentions for the space in-between the Arlequin. On the contrary, the market development plan is more complex and takes into consideration a diversity of uses.
Conclusion on the added value

A participatory process:
- gives inputs for the design of the public and semi-public spaces
- inform about the site’s assets
- inform about the inhabitants’ initiative
- inform about the existing local uses

An urban renewal project based on these inputs has added value:
- designed in more detail, the neighbourhood has diverse spaces with a high density of uses.
- the social and the renovation dimensions are synchronised
16. PROPOSAL FOR IMPROVED PARTICIPATORY TOOLS

16.1. Hypothetical democratic process for an urban renewal project

Urban project process

The improved participation tools proposed are designed within a reflection on a democratic process for urban renewal projects. According to Avitabile, an urban project process has three phases: specification phase, conception phase and realization phase (Avitabile 2005). The democratic process imagined here respects these three phases. Each phase has different steps. Here, we focus only on the renovation dimension of the urban renewal project.

Documents

The urban renewal process is organised so that the inhabitants have a strong influence in the project. The steps 1, 2 and 3 are composed of exercises and ends with the production of a concluding document. This document is produced by professionals managing the participation process and describes the outcomes from the exercises done by the inhabitants.
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inhabitants. After producing the document, the professionals present it to the inhabitants and ask feedback. The document should be improved until the inhabitants agree with it.

The documents (strategic programme, design guidelines, instructions for a place) are material for discussion between the inhabitants and the design team.

**Design process**

At the end of the first three steps, the documents are passed on to the design team. The design team defines a design strategy for the neighbourhood based on the documents and its own professional analyse of the situation. This way, the inhabitants’ expertise and the professionals’ expertise are combined. The design team ask feedback from the inhabitants about the design strategy. The design strategy should be improved until the inhabitants agree with it.

Once the design strategy and the general programme defined, the design team starts the design of the urban renewal project. The design is an iterative work between urban scenography, operational conception and detailed programme. The design is then realise into actions and constructions.

**Participatory budget**

Some actions and constructions can be managed by inhabitants thanks to a participatory budget. The beach is an example of place that could be developed through a participatory budget. It has no need in heavy infrastructure and there are few divergent interests about this place among inhabitants. A beach event could be managed by inhabitants every summer or permanent urban furniture could be installed.
16.2. Tool 1: strategic programme

**How to involve the inhabitants**

During the whole urban renewal project process, a neighbourhood’s Management Group organise the participatory process, evaluate the project process and manage a Participatory Budget. Inhabitants are part of the Management Group. They use their local network in order to trigger involvement in the participatory process: family, friends, neighbours, local non-profit associations...

A public event could announce the beginning of the participatory process.

**Actions**

The Management group organises events, gatherings, workshops and encourages the formation of thematic work groups in order to enable the inhabitants to make propositions. These actions are managed by professionals in participatory intervention. The actions should trigger cross-disciplinary discussions: education, employment, health, urban layout, built environment, environmental issues... Because inhabitants are part of the research process and their expertise is considered as equal but different from the professionals’ expertise, the actions relate to the Participatory Action Research model.

The Management Group is also able to order studies in order to know about the feasibility of some propositions.

**Document**

The result of the actions are presented and debated during public gathering. The debate is concluded with a decision about the orientation and priorities of the urban renewal project. The goals, issues, objectives and strategies told by the inhabitants are organised into a strategic programme. From this document is deduced the next work plans: urban renovation, educational project, local media project, university for the People ...

**Example**

- Some gardeners participate in the environmental issues work-group. They propose to develop gardening in the park. They organise actions in order to know if other inhabitants are interested. It seems that many inhabitants are interested!

- Gardening is integrated into the strategic programme for the urban renewal of the neighbourhood. Placed next to the children’s playgrounds and the youth centre, it will favour adult presence next to the youth in the public space. This way, drug dealers will not be the most frequent group the youth meet in the public space.

- The Management Group order a study to know if the soil is polluted. The study explains the soil allows gardening.

(Fig. 19)
Conclusions

16.3. Tool 2: design guidelines

How to involve the inhabitants

A stand during the market announces the beginning of the step 2. Posters are pinned-up in the neighbourhood and e-mails are sent to the Management Group’s contacts. The professional managers of the participatory process organise a stand a few hours a day in an indoor public space along with some half day workshops.

Materials

- detailed map of the neighbourhood (scale 1/1000 in the case of the Arlequin)
- model of the buildings placed on the map (same scale than the map)
- model representing a section of the key buildings (the Arlequin for example)
- several boards with the strategic programme. The strategies are organised with colors.
- stickers with the colours of the strategies
- pens with different colours

(Fig. 20) (Fig. 21)

Exercise

Based on the strategic programme, the inhabitants place the propositions on the map of the neighbourhood and on the models. Then, they draw and describe the neighbourhood’s places. They finally discuss the relevance of the position of the propositions in a place.

Document

The professional managers of the participatory process interpret the discussions with the inhabitants. The interpretation results into design guidelines. The design guidelines describe:

- the name and features of the places with value to protect and develop
- the position of the propositions (actions and installations)
- the local associations’ project in the public space
- the inhabitants’ initiatives (for example the existing gardens)
- a mapping of needs (for example location of the future gardens)
- guidelines for key elements (for example the gallery)

From the design guidelines are deduced which places or issues should be developed in the next step. Because new propositions have come up during the exercise, the strategic programme is completed and checked by the inhabitants.

Assessment

The inhabitants participating to the exercise should describe in a form their profile: age, gender, profession. The form should be placed in a closed box in order to make the form anonymous. At the end of the step 2, in order to study how representative the participants are, their profile must be compared to the profile of the population in the neighbourhood.

During the stand and the workshops, discussions with inhabitants could be recorded. This way, the interpretation of the talks could be studied.
16.4. Tool 3: instructions for a place

The places or key elements to develop within the participatory process are deduced from the design guidelines and chosen by the Management Group. The participatory tool should be adapted to the place. For instance, a scenario workshop would be adapted to discuss the gallery. Co-design workshops would be adapted to design the beach and the market development. The workshops are concluded with a document describing the instructions for the place.

Event workshop

An event workshop is carried out on site, in the public space. Passer-by can be attracted by the event and integrate the on-going exercise. This way, the participatory intervention involves a broader range of people. Furthermore, a discussion about propositions is more efficient on site because the propositions can be imagined and tested easily.

The gallery

Because the design of the gallery shapes the whole urban structure of the neighbourhood, a scenario workshop is needed. Scenarios show the different options to design the gallery and the consequences of them for the urban structure. These questions must be answered: Do we want to keep the continuous circulation in the gallery? Do we want to close the entrance of the housing units? How do we organise the facilities and the bicycles premises so people don’t stay in the dangerous zone?

Inhabitants who have expressed interest about the gallery during the step 2 should be invited to the scenario workshop. The scenario workshop can be carried out in the public space, for instance in the gallery. The workshop area could be placed next to the entrance of a housing unit. A table surrounded by chairs and sofa could defined the workshop area.

The beach

The inhabitants value the beach. It is a leisure and meeting place. The development of the beach needs no heavy intervention and there are few contradictory interests about the place among inhabitants. That’s why its development could be managed by inhabitants within a Participatory Budget process. Today, the inhabitants discuss two ways to develop the place: to organise a beach event every summer or to install permanent outdoor furniture. If they decide to install permanent furniture, the instructions for the place could be defined through a co-design workshop as the ones experienced within the Aires De Rien project (Conseil de quartier 8, 13ème arrondissement de Paris 2011).

Market development

The market place is a place with high stakes that’s why instructions should be defined in more detail. The market place should offer everyday services to the inhabitants and help the economic development of the neighbourhood. From the tram stop, the pedestrians should be lead to the trade gallery, and so to the market place and so to the beach and the park. There are many different interests about this place, that’s why the collaborative design of the place should be manage by professionals not holding local stakes. The co-design could be done with a Design Dialogue method as experienced for Claesgatan in Malmö (Eriksson 2012). The workshops should be carried out in an indoor public space.
16.5. Combining inhabitants' expertise with professionals' expertise
Democratic urban renewal process
A participatory process gives added-value to an urban renewal project. First, it enables to take into consideration both the detailed scale and the broad scale when designing. Secondly, it also enables to synchronise the social and the renovation dimension of the urban renewal project. Furthermore, there is an extra added-value: it could allow the process of the urban renewal project to be democratic.

A participatory process permits to define the objectives and strategies of the project collectively and to favour public debate at all steps of the project process.

A participatory process managed by a neighbourhood management group permits to reach a broad range of people. The case of the APU shows it can attract inhabitants who usually do not show up in the regular consultation meeting. A stand should also be organised along with the workshops in order to reach a broader range of people. The Participatory Action Research model permits to define original and local-based objectives and strategies by letting the neighbourhood management group organises the research process and chooses the themes studied. The theme work done by the APU (governance, built environment, environmental issues, education, economy) has produced diversified propositions leading to many improvement axes (urban design, educational project, local media project, university for the people...). Because inhabitants manage the research process, topic usually avoided can be debated: what is the priority, education or renovation? Do we want to reduce the rate of social housing in the neighbourhood? Do we want to close the entrance of the housing units?

In order to have a democratic urban renewal process, the decision-making process of the project should be clearly defined and the stakeholders should be able to agree on clear choices.

The hypothetical democratic process for an urban renewal project proposed above has different steps producing documents. These documents permit to make clear choices for the renovation of the neighbourhood. It must be defined who decide the final content of these documents: inhabitants, users, economic actors, elected representatives? Is the content decided by consensus or is there need for a vote? Are these documents just a consultation reference for the design team or are they guidelines which must be respected? A scenario workshop permits the inhabitants to make clear choices because the different scenario explained the consequences of each choice. Scenario workshops are relevant when discussing issues having large scale effects.

The organisation of the project process and the distribution of responsibilities have to be explained to the inhabitants.

The hypothetical democratic process for an urban renewal project proposed above can be easily explained to the inhabitants: what are the exercises, what will be the result, what are the different steps. Examples of participatory processes from other urban renewal projects can illustrate the process proposed. The inhabitants should understand the utility of their expertise and understand its complementarity with the professionals’ one. The inhabitants must know the professionals work in service of them. What’s more, the manager of the urban renewal project should have no local interest. The project manager has to make sure the project follows the objectives defined collectively. When the urban project is finished, the inhabitants should participate in its evaluation.

To conclude, a participatory process managed by a neighbourhood Management Group and relating to the Participatory Action Research model allows a democratic urban renewal process. Furthermore, the participatory tools proposed in this master thesis strengthen the democratic process for the renovation dimension of the urban renewal project.

Social sustainability
Rosenland explains in the publication “Towards sustainable communities” (2005) that in general, sustainable urban strategies are designed with extensive public participation. This way, equity, equality and empowerment can be increased. Democracy is usually recognised as an inherent part of the sustainable development processes. It enables civil society to define real visions for change. Participating as competent citizens in the decisions and processes that affect their life is necessary for people to prosper.

In conclusion, a democratic process supports the social sustainability of an urban renewal project.
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Fig. 19: Joseph, W. People [icon] The Noun Project. http://thenounproject.com/


Fig. 21: Nate Eul. Building [icon] The Noun Project. http://thenounproject.com/

Fig. 22: DonBLC. Magazine 123 [icon] The Noun Project. http://thenounproject.com/

Fig. 23: Lock, J. Brainstorm [icon] The Noun Project. http://thenounproject.com/
PROPOSITIONS FROM THE APU (ATELIERS POPULAIRES D’URBANISME)

**PROJET URBAIN**

**VILLENUEVE**

**PROPOSITIONS :**

- Éduquer les citoyens, gérer l’environnement et la santé publique
- Créer des logements sociaux
- Réaliser des projets de développement économique
- Promouvoir la culture et l’art

**ATTÉLÉRISATION, ÉDUCATION ET DÉMOCRATIE**

**GOUVERNANCE**

- Créer une ville durable
- Promouvoir la participation citoyenne
- Établir des réseaux de partenariats
- Mettre en place des politiques éducatives

**ENVIRONNEMENT**

- Développer un territoire pilote en agriculture urbaine
- Créer des zones de résidences pour les agriculteurs
- Mettre en place des politiques de transport alternatif
- Éduquer les citoyens à l’environnement

**HABITAT**

- Créer des logements sociaux
- Promouvoir la construction d’habitations à loyer modéré
- Éduquer les citoyens à l’hygiène
- Créer des zones vertes

**ÉCONOMIE**

- Développer l’économie locale
- Éduquer les citoyens à l’économie durable
- Créer des zones de résidences pour les agriculteurs
- Éduquer les citoyens à l’économie participative

**EDUCATION**

- Éduquer les citoyens à l’éducation participative
- Créer des zones de résidences pour les agriculteurs
- Éduquer les citoyens à l’éducation durable
- Créer des zones de résidences pour les agriculteurs

**NOS PROPOSITIONS :**

- Créer des logements sociaux
- Promouvoir la construction d’habitations à loyer modéré
- Éduquer les citoyens à l’hygiène
- Créer des zones vertes

**NOS PROPOSITIONS :**

- Éduquer les citoyens, gérer l’environnement et la santé publique
- Créer des logements sociaux
- Réaliser des projets de développement économique
- Promouvoir la culture et l’art

**NOS PROPOSITIONS :**

- Créer une ville durable
- Promouvoir la participation citoyenne
- Établir des réseaux de partenariats
- Mettre en place des politiques éducatives

**NOS PROPOSITIONS :**

- Développer un territoire pilote en agriculture urbaine
- Créer des zones de résidences pour les agriculteurs
- Mettre en place des politiques de transport alternatif
- Éduquer les citoyens à l’environnement

**NOS PROPOSITIONS :**

- Créer des logements sociaux
- Promouvoir la construction d’habitations à loyer modéré
- Éduquer les citoyens à l’hygiène
- Créer des zones vertes
In **black** is written the propositions in the APU’s report. In **purple** is written outcomes from my field work. In **red** is written my professional input, it does not come from the inhabitants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>to improve the neighbourhood’s identity</th>
<th>to make attractive Arlequin’s flats</th>
<th>to develop La Villeneuve’s economy</th>
<th>to improve La Villeneuve’s kids’ education</th>
<th>to favour social cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues</strong></td>
<td>- it is impossible to sell an Arlequin’s flat today.</td>
<td>- it is impossible to sell an Arlequin’s flat today.</td>
<td>- high unemployment rate for young people.</td>
<td>- the secondary school’s pupils’ scholar results are low.</td>
<td>- many neighbours don’t know each other well. It results in the lack of attention for the common spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- finding a job with a CV indicating the Arlequin’s address is very difficult.</td>
<td>- the flats need to be renovated (roof, windows, heat insulation).</td>
<td>- many people have a precarious job.</td>
<td>- Some instable kids are hard to handle at school and during lunch time. They spoil the class‘ atmosphere and become delinquent when growing up. There is a real need for individualized attention for these kids.</td>
<td>- associative life miss support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- few non-resident visit La Villeneuve neighbourhood.</td>
<td>- the buildings ‘common spaces get quickly dirty.</td>
<td>- it lacks some everyday life services: hairdresser, pub, grocery.</td>
<td>- some youth fall into drug gangs. They get to know the drug gangs in the public space. After “having tasted “easy money making”, it is hard for them to go back to a normal lifestyle.</td>
<td>- there is a lack of understanding between the youth and the elderlies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- some young people sit in the passageways and make noise.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- some youth fall into drug gangs. They get to know the drug gangs in the public space. After “having tasted “easy money making”, it is hard for them to go back to a normal lifestyle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- flats are not adapted for elderlies and handicapped people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>to favour social cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>to develop meeting places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>- to develop the existing meeting places (market, beach, extraordinary playground...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to redesign the gallery’s intersections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>to improve the neighbourhood’s identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STRATEGIC PROGRAMME FOR THE ARLEQUIN’S URBAN RENEWAL

#### Stratégies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>to develop La Villeneuve’s economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>to install attractive premises in the gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>to develop the urban renovation economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>to develop special package for employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>to favour entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>to develop the tourism, youth, culture economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- to develop the trade gallery and the market place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- creative premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- handicraftsmen premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- offices premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- to install fiber optics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- material subvention in order to favour auto renovation of the dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- to form and employ unemployed inhabitants when renovating the buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- seasonal worker house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- business incubators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- formation for services employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- to organise the service economy (syndicates, cooperatives, charter...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- to favour collective passageways with dwellings and activities, for each staircase, on the first floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- make visible the activities at home (hairdresser...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- special package (entrepreneurship in La Villeneuve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- innovative education services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- production of toys (handcraft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- urban museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- urban sport adventure (Tyrolean traverse rope, climbing wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- organisation of events in the park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>to improve La Villeneuve’s kids’ education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>improve school time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>improve after school time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>improve free time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- elaboration of a shared diagnose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- setting up of an investment plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- to valorise educational projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- renovation of the school (respecting security norms, roofs, floors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- reconstruction of the youth center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- to preserve the access to the schools via the park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- street animation in the gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- adult presence in the public space (allotment gardens, sport installations...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>- improve and / or add playgrounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STRATEGIC PROGRAMME FOR THE ARLEQUIN’S URBAN RENEWAL

### Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>to make attractive Arlequin’s flats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flats’ renovation</td>
<td>gallery’s renovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>- material subvention in order to favour auto renovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- overall renovation when changing the façade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to replace the facade with a more energy efficient one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to change floor and remove asbestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to install new balconies on the curtain walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to keep the Arlequin’s colours in some facade and introduce new patterns on others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>