Tackling process barriers to placemaking

Placemaking, as a collaborative approach to strengthening the connection between people and the places they share (PPS, 2007), has grown in awareness and popularity significantly over the past two decades (Friedmann, 2010). However, as CoDesign Studio has observed, when it comes to community-led placemaking, a number of barriers exist (CoDesign Studio, 2019e). Through practice working on dozens of neighbourhood improvement projects across Australia (Hartley and Lydon, 2014), we have seen that local residents and community volunteers often find it difficult to deliver place improvements in their own neighbourhoods, due to a prevalence of red tape such as permits, fees, and licenses.

In response, CoDesign Studio created The Neighbourhood Project, a practice-based program that worked with community groups and local governments in Australia to tackle process barriers while concurrently activating underutilised public land and developing a model for community-led (CoDesign Studio, 2019b). This chapter offers a summative case study overview of the experiences and outcomes of The Neighbourhood Project, a four-year community-led placemaking program undertaken by not-for-profit organisation CoDesign Studio, in Melbourne, Australia, from 2015 to 2019. It will discuss The Neighbourhood Project as a practitioner case study, and sets out the People, Process, Place (PPP) framework as a tripartite model for placemaking professionals, local governments, and community leaders to adopt to improve their understanding and implementation of community-led placemaking. Our hope, as placemaking practitioners, is that the experience of The Neighbourhood Project program in Australia can provide inspiration and insight to community-led approaches in a global setting, and through its practical implementation work towards refining the global understanding of collaborative models of city-making.

The context

Human settlements around the globe are becoming more crowded (UN Habitat, 2016). With 200,000 people moving to cities every day (WEF, 2016) there is increasing pressure on local governments to provide sufficient public space to meet the needs of residents as neighbourhoods become denser. In Australia, social isolation and loneliness are reaching epidemic proportions (Kelly,
This is becoming an increasing concern as rapid urbanisation unfolds (ibid.), coupled with the fact that up to 30 per cent of land in Australian cities is vacant or underutilised (The Economist, 2015). Underutilised space offers an untapped resource to meet local needs for public space and social connection. However, local government resources struggle to keep pace with growth.

In this context, placemaking – defined here as a collaborative, human-centred approach to designing, activating, or managing places offers the opportunity to both activate underutilised space and strengthen communities; while tactical urbanism – short-term action for long-term change (Lydon and Garcia, 2015) – creates pathways to accelerate public space creation. Placemaking and tactical urbanism have grown in Australia over the past decade as approaches to transforming underutilised space (Hartley and Lydon, 2014). The challenge is that the majority of these projects are led by practitioners or governments, rather than community leaders and local residents, limiting their scalability and therefore impact.

Participatory approaches to public space improvement offer enormous benefits where they can strengthen social ties as well as improve aesthetics and physical places (Cilliers and Timmermans, 2014). Community-led placemaking (as differentiated from the understanding of placemaking, as above) is defined here as a participatory approach to placemaking where the projects are initiated, led, implemented, or managed by local leaders – local residents, volunteers of community organisations – to impact their own local places. There is potential to activate local communities to take a greater role in leading, delivering, and managing placemaking projects. Furthermore, this further benefits local governments and urban developers in the long-term as in this model local leaders take greater responsibility for sharing the load of public space improvement and management (Healy, 1998).

The problem

CoDesign Studio’s work across 132 placemaking projects since 2010 working with local leaders across Australia, often utilising the tactical urbanism approaches depicted in Tactical Urbanism 4: Australia and New Zealand (Hartley and Lydon, 2014), revealed that community members were actively trying to establish local neighbourhood improvement projects (such as murals, community gardens, or main street beautification projects) especially in urban areas facing rapid urbanisation. However, they were repeatedly prevented from executing their ideas by certain types of process barriers. These varied from strict permitting procedures and not knowing who to talk to at their council (in the case of community members) to not having appropriate resources or culture to guide people through the process (in the case of councils.)

Some examples include a local business organisation who had been waiting six months for approval for a two-week temporary parklet, and eventually had the permit denied. Another was issued with a fine for drawing with chalk outside their shop in an inner Melbourne suburb. Other community groups trying to build a community garden ran out of steam due to a lack of committed volunteers. Countless other community groups have simply given up due to the complicated or convoluted process of submitting permit applications for even the simplest events and public open-space activities.

The three common categories of barriers identified were: process barriers, knowledge barriers, and network barriers (CoDesign Studio, 2019c). Process barriers include red tape, paying project fees, and land access.

Knowledge barriers includes a lack of practical know-how, from navigating permit applications and liaising with council to practical small-scale construction skills. Lastly, network barriers consider a lack of social capital or not knowing enough neighbours, which may make it difficult for projects to gain traction. Not only did these three types of barriers consistently present a
block to local groups, but they are embedded into the systems of council such that they are difficult to overcome on a project-by-project basis. Councils were not willing to change systems to adapt permits as a one-off for a small project, while local leaders (active local residents, local volunteers, and community organisations) didn’t have access to tools and resources to help. This led CoDesign to create *The Neighbourhood Project*.

**The Neighbourhood Project**

In 2015, CoDesign Studio pitched for – and was the successful recipient of – a philanthropic grant from the Myer Foundation for their proposal to improve local neighbourhoods throughout urban areas in Melbourne, using a community-led approach. The proposal was to bring together councils and community members to activate underutilised public space, while concurrently identifying, reviewing, and removing process barriers. This practical program was called *The Neighbourhood Project*.

The program was designed around three key Pillars of People, Process, and Place (PPP). The People Pillar was based on mobilising local citizens to lead community-led placemaking, working with councils to evolve internal systems to enable community-led projects by citizens, building citizen capacity, and mentoring them to mobilise and solve local problems. The Process Pillar facilitated an enabling environment within councils and community governance structures that support communities to take action. The Place Pillar aimed to improve local neighbourhoods thorough community-led projects. Drawing on tactical urbanism (Lydon and Garcia, 2015) as an approach, the program used prototyping and short-term activations as a low-risk testing environment through which councils and communities could work together on practical place-based projects. This was coupled with a six-step workshop program developed by CoDesign Studio to strengthen the capacity of community volunteers and local government to design, construct, and manage small-scale placemaking projects and events. Over the four-year period, CoDesign Studio worked with 8 local governments and over 25 community leaders, their organisations and volunteer networks, on 14 neighbourhood placemaking projects such as community gardens, pop-up parks, street events, community murals, and local art projects. Collectively these projects involved over 60,000 residents and provided early insights into a model for community-led practice by which barriers to community-led placemaking were identified, reviewed, and adapted. As a result of the program, participants noted boosts in neighbourhood pride, social connection, improved land utilisation and local trade, while local councils tested new processes for permit applications and communication (CoDesign Studio, 2019e).

**A managed program of training, information, resources, and support**

*The Neighbourhood Project* itself was a managed program that saw council participants and local leaders build their capacity, skills, and knowledge of community-led placemaking through bootcamps, training sessions, expert mentoring, and practical workshops. CoDesign were the program organisers, in partnership with *Resilient Melbourne* of The Rockefeller Foundation’s 100 *Resilient Cities Program*, and from the Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV). The program furnished participants with fact sheets, templates, and project management collateral to equip them through each step of the program to learn and to deliver projects. Within the program, community-led placemaking projects were delivered by local leaders in partnership with local council staff, alongside the support and guidance of urban practitioners and professional community development staff from CoDesign Studio. Each project within the program took a tactical approach to placemaking (Lydon and Garcia, 2015). For *The Neighbourhood Project* this meant...
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a human-centred approach to designing, activating, or managing places by means of prototyping and testing iterations of community-led projects for engagement and place intervention. This approach mitigates risk through avoidance of large-scale financial or asset investment up-front.

Local leaders were supported through a six-step iterative cycle of project development, with the aim of refining, scaling, building capacity, and ultimately catalysing longer-term systemic change. For each project, local leaders would undertake Step 1, ‘ideate together,’ creating a project visioning coupled with an ideation process to address how to give underutilised local space a second life, e.g. dog park, playground, or gathering place, create a veggie patch, throw a block party, or commission an art mural. Step 2 is to ‘create an enabling environment.’ For community leaders this means setting up group governance and project management structures. For councils this means setting up the resources and systems to help Step 1 ideas come to fruition. For example, councils could offer grants or funding specifically aimed at small neighbourhood-based improvement projects; provide a dedicated Placemaking Officer who can help navigate or fast-track permits and processes to allow the idea to happen; create an online application process that is streamlined and user-friendly to submit an idea. Step 3 is to ‘mobilise community.’ Community leaders reach out and connect with neighbours, volunteers, or a community organisation to support in the project delivery; leading on to Step 4, ‘locate resources.’ This involved a stocktake of the materials and resources available that might be necessary to implement the project idea. The next stage, Step 5, is to ‘test it out’ by piloting the project on a small scale and engage the surrounding community response. Lastly Step 6, is ‘evaluate and scale’ – to reflect on the successes and challenges of the project pilot or trial, assessing how it could be improved and if it is worth replicating. Then return to Step 1 to reiterate and grow the size of the project.

Councils and community leaders were inducted and trained by CoDesign Studio practitioners on how to deliver local projects according to this six-step process. Success of the projects was measured according to the PPP framework. Each group ran one to three iterations of this cycle. Starting with ideation, they co-visioned together as a leadership team to document what they hoped to achieve in their local neighbourhood, highlighting the opportunities and needs. Then they were guided through workshops and training to establish group governance and project management practices as part of creating an enabling environment. Next, project leaders reached out laterally to their community to recruit support, add team members, and generate early interest, as a first step towards mobilising their community. This was followed by an assessment of the resources available to them which included up to 10,000 (AUD) seed money from The Neighbourhood Project. Locating resources includes assessing the skills in the team that help shape what is possible and achievable for the project, as well as physical supplies such as reusable goods within the community that can be used for the project. Testing out the project idea is a vital next step in order to ascertain how the team works together, gauging the community uptake of the idea, and receiving early feedback from the broader community through community engagement led by their peers and locals. Finally, the team would evaluate the first iteration of the project and repeat the cycle with the view of scaling the size and impact of the project. Evaluation was conducted according to the Pillars of People, Process, and Place.

People, Process, and Place (PPP) evaluation

The structure of each project and its evaluation was designed to align with the pre-existing CoDesign Studio Pillars of placemaking known as People, Process, and Place (PPP) (CoDesign Studio, 2019b). To create and measure change in a place, PPP was developed to be used as a schema for categorising place conditions, outcomes, and impacts. To validate the PPP model as being fit for purpose for The Neighbourhood Project the team sourced local and global...
best-practice case studies in community-led placemaking and analysed them according to the PPP framework. Additionally, we reviewed the framework through targeted engagement with councils, placemaking practitioners, and community organisations. As indicators of each project, People measured whether the project improved the activation and motivation of local leaders; Process measured whether the project created an enabling and supportive environment at a council level; and Place measured whether the project improved the physical place as well as the softer elements of place attachment such as cohesion, safety, and pride connected to that place.

Surveys and interviews were conducted with council participants, local project leaders, and general community members who attended the projects. These surveys occurred at the conclusion of workshops, on-site at project events and online throughout. In partnership with Melbourne-based social impact consultancy, Think Impact, responses were categorised within the PPP framework according to the following categories, called ‘domains’: People, including agency (motivation, confidence, influence), connection (to locals, to networks), capability (skills to act, access to resources), and mobility (depth of involvement, willingness to mobilise others); Process, including capability (skills and increased knowledge), systems-(related policy, embedded systems, and inclusion in formal planning), and culture (responsiveness to community, recognition of success, advocacy and leadership for community-led placemaking at council); and Place, including, physical place (amenities, positive feelings, utilisation), cohesion (safety, local connections, belonging), pride (sense of neighbourhood pride), and perceptions (sense of wellbeing). These Pillars were measured at multiple intervals including before, during, and after placemaking projects were delivered. Think Impact was engaged as an independent assessor to assist with designing the specific survey and assessment measures for each Pillar.

The projects

The Neighbourhood Project contained two distinct rounds of community-led projects. While both rounds delivered real-world placemaking action led by local community members, there was a decided difference between whether The Neighbourhood Project program was instigated by the council (Round 1) or by the community members themselves (Round 2). Round 1 ran for 12 months across 2015–2016 with three participant council groups who engaged their local citizens to run eight placemaking projects. These were: City of Cardinia – Community Arts Project, Cardinia Lakes Movie Night; City of Whitehorse – Greening the Mall, Town Hall Front Lawn Festival, Community Art Project; and Hobsons Bay Council – Brooklyn Movie Night, Pop-up Dog Park, Laneway Art Project. Round 2 ran for 12 months across 2017 to 2018 with six community groups running multi-iteration projects in partnership with five local councils. These were: Fawkner Food Bowls – Moreland City Council, Edithvale Collective – Kingston City Council, Williams Landing Community Garden – Wyndham City Council, Point Cook Pop-Up Park – Wyndham City Council, Strathmore, Let’s Make A Park – Moonee Valley Council, and Thomastown Walk ‘N Talk – Whittlesea City Council.

Changing the approach to achieve self-sustaining outcomes

In Round 1, CoDesign Studio ran an Expression of Interest application process and selected six councils. The aim was to work directly with the councils and empower them to enable their own citizens to deliver local placemaking projects. The three participating councils were the instigators to participating in The Neighbourhood Project and then sought community participants from their municipalities to deliver placemaking projects on public land as a secondary action. These projects were sought through an open call for ideas where projects could be proposed
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and voted on by local residents. Three projects were selected in each area, by popular vote. From public planting initiatives, to community-inspired photography exhibitions and a pop-up dog park trial, these three local councils worked closely with their local community members to deliver a series of prototype projects for place improvement. Places were turned green, parks became activated with art and events, and wider community buy-in was effectively gauged by council in order to validate investment in more expensive set ups.

In the evaluation of this first round of projects, The Neighbourhood Project organisers noted that community leaders did not continue these events and place interventions after the program ended. It was observed that the ideas and programming had been primarily coordinated at a council level, rather than a local citizen level, and identified this as the possible reason the events and pop-ups did not continue after the initial series was rolled out. The Round 1 projects did however highlight red-tape process barriers for council to address, and saw significant improvements to organisational capability, systems, and culture for community-led placemaking. Participating councils took practical steps to remove process barriers through the program (see below.) While local leaders and councils participated equally in the project, program organisers suggested that because of a perceived ‘top-down’ influence on the part of council, there was a lower level of license to act perceived on the part of the community.

To address this observation, CoDesign Studio decided that the second round of projects should specifically seek to work with community members directly who already wanted to run local projects in the first place, and then subsequently seek permission from the council. The Round 2 Expression of Interest application process received 91 applications from citizens across the state of Victoria, of which 6 were selected as participants of The Neighbourhood Project by a panel of experts from urban design, placemaking, and local government in Australia. As a result of this choice, Round 2 of the program prioritised projects that were both community-led and community-initiated. The Round 2 program maintained the agile and tactical approach of enabling local citizens to run small-scale iterative activations with seed funding, training, and support from CoDesign Studio. It also maintained the aim of highlighting red tape to improve the placemaking process at a council level through a collaborative framework for council–community partnership. In Round 2 community members instigated their participation in The Neighbourhood Project and by design were imbued with greater agency to lead the projects for themselves. The councils would still be still actively involved, but the projects themselves were fully ideated, run and ‘owned’ by the community leaders. This time, by engaging and equipping local community leaders directly through the program, in partnership with their local council’s support, five of the six Round 2 community projects continued on after the program concluded in 2018.

The change in approach for Round 2 meant that the program produced a greater number of projects that were self-sustaining and continued after the program ended, while still delivering physical place improvements and increases to social cohesion, community connection, neighbourhood pride, and local economy activation, as measured by the PPP framework (CoDesign Studio 2019e, July). As exemplified in the selected project examples below; this continuance has looked different for each specific group and ranges from the community group becoming an incorporated organisation; securing grants and external funding; becoming a blueprint for larger-scale programs in the community; to being included in council strategies for health and wellbeing plans, pedestrian and street upgrades, community garden planning, and urban design frameworks.

**Project Case Study: Fawkner Food Bowls**

Fawkner is a fast-growing northern suburb of Melbourne transitioning from a predominantly industrial neighbourhood to a thriving and diverse community in need of family-friendly
public spaces. Two local community members applied for Round 2 of *The Neighbourhood Project* with the idea that land located at an underutilised local lawn bowls green might be transformed into a community garden. With support from Moreland City Council and from the bowls club, the duo was accepted into the program and began the six-step process from ideating together through to evaluation and scale. The pair was able to grow their project team, locate local resources, collaborate with council, secure $9,460 (AUD) of seed funding, and conduct trial events and construction days as a part of the program. As a result, the bowling green was transformed into a community garden, market, and urban food source where local people grow and share locally grown produce, interact with each other, attend workshops, and learn about sustainable food growing practices. The early activation built a case for greater financial investment, triggering $44,000 (AUD) of external capital works funding after the program concluded. At a council level, the output of the program prompted an internal process review with the aim of putting a more accessible process in place for community project approval in the future, thereby cutting red tape. The project has also been included in the documented Moreland City Council Food Strategy. *Fawkner Food Bowls* is now an incorporated group of eight people, and holds partnerships with Moreland Council Food Network, Merri Health, and local businesses.

**Project case study: Strathmore, Let’s Make A Park**

The power of youth-led placemaking is exemplified by the Round 2 project group known as *Strathmore, Let’s Make A Park*, located in Melbourne’s north-west suburb of Strathmore, which has a rapidly expanding population base under the age of 25. Two university students identified an opportunity to create a new green space near the Strathmore train station by reclaiming a large roundabout, and home to a single tree. They were especially passionate to address growing social isolation in the area and a lack of youth-focussed public space. Through *The Neighbourhood Project* the young leaders recruited a team of peers aged 12–25, quickly establishing a committee of 8 members and a volunteer group of 20. The six-step process helped them to establish group governance, highlight diverse skill sets and existing resources within the team, and run small-scale pilot projects. Through the project iterations, the team planted new greenery, created community artwork to make the space appealing to youth, engaged their community through pop-up engagements, built a street library full of books in partnership with a local Men’s Shed, and assessed safety issues around accessibility. The activated space utilised native plants and recycled goods to deliver the lowest costing project of all *The Neighbourhood Project* rounds to date, spending $4,082 (AUD) in program seed funding. They went on to secure an additional $5,000 (AUD) grant from external funding. The resulting new park provides a welcoming green space on the previously underused roundabout land that has endured – when guerrilla gardening techniques may not have – because it was conducted in collaboration with their local Moonee Valley City Council. After the program concluded, the group’s analysis of local walkability triggered state government roads agency VicRoads to redesign a master plan of the intersection to increase safety. Later the youth leaders were engaged by their council to contribute to their 20-minute Neighbourhood Strategy.

**Project case study: Williams Landing Community Garden**

The existing Williams Landing Residents Association applied for Round 2 of *The Neighbourhood Project* with the idea to convert an 80 metre by 20 metre patch of vacant land into a green community garden with a sustainability focus. A key desire of this group was to use the agile approach to community-led placemaking to build social connection in addition to creating a
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greener physical space. Williams Landing has been experiencing rapid urban expansion with a high level of diversity as exemplified by the more than 60 cultures represented at the local primary school. The land itself is located atop an 1890s decommission pipeline stretching 27km in length through Melbourne’s western suburbs, which also physically divides the suburb and separates residents from each other. After participating in The Neighbourhood Project, the vacant land became a vibrant community garden, complete with a program of local events, picnics, and workshops. By using the PPP framework, social connection and social cohesion was measured to reveal a boost in community connection. Program organisers observed that having a physical task to do at pop-up events was an effective way to help diverse community members to meet and interact. The 27km pipeline forms part of the Greening Pipeline Master Plan run by Melbourne Water to create a linear park in its entirety. As a result of the community-led garden, the process of The Neighbourhood Project has been adopted as a ‘best-practice standard’ to guide the development of the remainder of this piece of public infrastructure to serve communities. The already incorporated Residential Association spent $10,000 (AUD) in seed funding and used the evidence of The Neighbourhood Project to secure an additional $7,000 (AUD) from outside sources after the program concluded.

Project findings

The Neighbourhood Project was evaluated in partnership with Think Impact (2019), using online and face-to-face surveys conducted with council workers, community leaders, and project event attendees. The community-led groups also undertook place assessments utilising urban design tools now included in a community-led placemaking manual and the PPP framework. In terms of People outcomes, local leaders and council workers became more active, mobilised, and connected throughout the program. For Process, councils increased their knowledge of placemaking and took practical steps to remove process barriers. All the while, in terms of Place, 14 low-cost low-risk projects were delivered, which resulted in community perceptions of pride around these places becoming more positive.

People outcomes

The People Pillar is used to understand how effectively local leaders and council workers were mobilised to lead community-led placemaking projects by looking at their activation, participation, agency, connection, capability, and mobility. For instance, council workers became more willing to engage with – and developed more connections with – people in their community and within their organisation. At the same time, community leaders became more capable in the delivery of practical place interventions and grew in the number of connections they had with peers, local traders, and other local community organisations. All the while, the delivery of projects through pop-up events and practical engagements meant that the broader community was reached and welcomed into participating in the design and activation of their own local public spaces.

Process outcomes

Overall, council participants across the eight councils noted that they gained improved knowledge and skills (capability) of placemaking and community-led practices across the program; they also had a greater willingness and desire to implement community-led placemaking projects (culture). All of the councils implemented at least one system change. This included one
council establishing a central placemaking point of contact, another established a neighbour-
hood placemaking team to continue to use community-led placemaking projects, and two of
the councils created community-led placemaking resources for their constituents.

Place outcomes

The Place Pillar looked at the number and type of projects created, as well as how these low-
cost projects influenced participants’ social connections, and sense of neighbourhood pride
and belonging. Across the projects, 88 per cent of participants felt that the spaces made them
feel proud of their neighbourhood, while 86 per cent believed them more friendly, and 87 per
cent felt the places were more positively utilised. An important evaluation factor was whether
the community groups continued to manage the projects or continue other community-led
projects after the program had finished. Participants in Round 1 did not continue, while
five out of the six groups in Round 2 did continue. This highlights that having community
groups initiate contributes greatly to the sense of ownership and long-term investment in
the projects.

Full case studies on individual projects can be found in ‘Neighbourhoods made by neigh-
bours: case studies from Round 2 of The Neighbourhood Project’ (CoDesign Studio, 2019a). For
highlighted statistics on project size, participants, and PPP measures see ‘The Neighbourhood
Project: outcomes and impact at a glance’ (CoDesign Studio, 2019e).

Conclusion

The lessons of The Neighbourhood Project offer early evidence for a model of practice for placemaking practitioners and local governments who want to establish more community-led prac-
tices. For local leaders, tools and resources have been consolidated into a set of online resources
to make it easier to design and deliver placemaking projects. As placemaking grows as an increas-
ing focus for local governments and the property market, there is a risk that activation programs
will bring a place to life temporarily, only to leave a space empty and underutilised once the
initial investment in programming has come to its natural conclusion. A way to mitigate this
is to adopt a community-led approach, using the activations as a means to build community
capacity which will be more likely to be self-sustaining in the long term. The People, Process,
Place (PPP) model can be adopted as a set of questions by practitioners and local governments
in the design of placemaking projects, the objective being to maximise not only the impact of
the project on each place but also on the capacity of local people and through the improvement
of processes. Put simply, placemaking projects would be much improved if we could simply ask:
how will this project create agency (People), what is the placemaking capability of my team
or organisation (Process), and how can this project improve amenity as well as perceptions of
wellbeing (Place)?

The Neighbourhood Project demonstrated that to increase the likelihood of community-led pro-
jects being successful in the long term, it is essential that the projects are initiated by local leaders
and funded directly through these local community organisations (Charley, 2019). However,
practitioners and authorities can amplify the impact and efficacy of these projects by offering
fewer barriers, more resources, and active support. The program highlighted the importance of
having a supportive enabling environment within the local government or governing authority.
This includes having simple communication – such as through a single point of contact within
council, simple forms, and low or waived fees for small-scale projects. The Neighbourhood Project is
a practitioner case study, yet our hope is that it offers practical insights into evolving approaches
to improving community-led placemaking that in turn work towards creating neighbourhoods with more abundant and active public spaces for all.
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