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I Introduction

This report is about the working process and results of the land-use planning workshop, which was held on 14th September 2010 in Oulu, Finland within the framework of B-Team Brownfield Policy Improvement Task Force project that is a part of the EU Interreg IVC program.

The workshop was planned and conducted by the University of Oulu, Department of Architecture and involved 43 participants from eight partner cities and it was organized in connection with the Oulu Brownfield week 13th-16th September 2010. The first part of the one-day workshop comprised of an overview of the Oulu project area as well as the various participatory planning tools in the context of Brownfield redevelopment. The second part of the workshop was the implementation of different methods of participatory urban planning. The workshop consisted of multicultural working groups (4 groups) where various participatory planning tools were tested, discussed and evaluated in the context of Oulu project area. In each group, there was a university representative coaching the event. The tools that were tested were the virtual walking tour and the future workshop customized for the event. The groups were asked to create ideas for the case study area by using different participatory planning tools as well as to evaluate the usability of the various tools.

1.1. Background

The research project is a part of the B-Team – Brownfield Policy Improvement Task Force project. The main objective of B-team is the improvement of regional policies influencing Brownfield redevelopment through the transfer of best practice. The project is co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund by means of the INTERREG IVC Programme 2007-2013. The project will be implemented in years 2010-2012.

Brownfield site is an industrial or commercial property that remains abandoned or underutilized in part because of environmental contamination or the fear of
such contamination.

Sustainable brownfield regeneration deals with environmental, economic, social and cultural aspects. Many old industrial regions and cities are shrinking and the excess land of the industry is expensive, if it remains unused. Brownfield regeneration contributes to the economic regeneration since it creates new jobs and stimulates investment and affects the property markets. It also contributes to the urban space, since the poor environmental and spatial qualities of brownfield are converted into new public spaces, healthy environments which offer good quality in urban life during the regeneration process. (RESCUE, 2005)

1.2. Aim of the study

This research project of Participatory Urban Planning: Best Practices (PUP) aims to compare and develop various participatory planning methods in the context of B-Team project. The research project PUP contributes in knowledge building and knowledge transfer among the 14 B-Team project partners. Participatory planning approach benefits regions and cities in navigation through the complex Brownfield redevelopment cases.

Contemporary approach in urban development and management involves stakeholders in project conceptualization; design, implementation and management in order to attain sustainable urban development. The number of active parts in an urban planning process has increased therefore the rational planning approach which comprises a one-way communication from professionals to other stakeholders is not any more the best possible solution in planning. In communicative planning theory (e.g. Forester, 1989; Healey, 1997), planning is handled as a procedure in which the planning knowledge is produced through a communicative learning process between the planner, stakeholders and local community in general (Taylor, 1998). Stakeholders include landowners, developers, local authorities, planners, designers, contractors and advisors, regulators, policy makers, citizens, organizations and companies.
II Case Study – Toppila Shore II

Toppila Shore II area is situated four kilometres from the city centre of Oulu and is surrounded by an intensive urban housing area, the sea and the Toppila power station. Toppila shore is a part of former industrial area. Next to the area, there used to be a cellulose factory which started to function in 1931 in a complex which was designed by Alvar Aalto. The cellulose industry lasted for about 50 years in the area. The factory stopped its production in 1984. The area has become one of the main infill development area of the city of Oulu. At the end of the 90’s, Meri-Toppila residential district was built over a 20 hectare-area which was composed of mostly 5-storey apartment buildings. In the centre of the residential area, there are redbrick old industrial buildings which are partly taken into re-use. The area has a shopping centre, a school and a nursery school as well a community centre. The silo building of Alvar Aalto is a landmark of the entire area.

The planning of Toppila shore area has started with the outline plan, which was approved by the Technical Committee in 2006. According to the plan, it was decided that the existing heating plant in the area would be kept and the infill development would take this fact into account. The Toppila shore I and II would serve residence to a total of 3500 inhabitants. (Hentilä & Soudunsaari, 2009)

The city plan for area I was approved by the City Council in February 2010. Guidelines for construction were approved by the Construction Committee. The city planning of area II started in the autumn of 2010. The goal is to create a new housing, service and leisure area that will be connected to the water landscape. The area will include an area for maritime housing, a marina and a Sea Centre with cultural functions. Cultural heritage (e.g. tar, fishing, shipbuilding) should be the origin of the new functions and structures. The Sea Centre will be the main attraction, activity and event point of the area. It should connect people, functions and events as well as marine activities and should be active all the year round – in spring, summer, autumn and winter.
Fig. 1 Case study area, Toppila shore II (Map: City of Oulu).

Fig. 2 Case study area and the outline plan (Plan: City of Oulu).
The case study area is the second stage of the Toppila Shore planning. There had already been an outline plan of the area. However during the participatory urban planning workshop PUP this interim plan was not taken into consideration, but the task area was approached by a rather open minded manner.

2.1. Workshop Part 1: Virtual Walking Tour

Walking tour is a method to evaluate the existing situation of the environment. It is based on the GÅTUR method developed in Denmark (Ambrose, 1996) and Sweden (de Laval, 1997). It is a guided walking tour during which the participants write down their observations, opinions and ideas of the area. It is a method to maintain different observations of the planning area from different interest groups such as residents, planners etc. in order to utilize the observations in planning. This method creates premises to a more open communication and less opposition to the outcome of the planning process. The walking route is planned in advance by the team leader. The stop points on the route are picked up in order to give the opportunity to the participants to write down their observations. Stop points are chosen in order to bring out the different features and places of the area. This method was further developed in such a way that the walking route can be followed virtually by the help of photographs. (Soudunsaari, 2004; Kuikka, 2004)

The walking tour of the case study area was made virtually among 43 participants from eight different countries. The map and the photographs and video material of the area were shown in the auditorium as a PowerPoint show under the leadership of the researcher. The map of the area had nine (9) marked locations which were reflected on the screen in numerical order with certain intervals. The attendants were asked to write down their observations, opinions and ideas about these places in each stop to the sheets which were delivered together with the workshop folder before the virtual tour session. The sheets included the number of the virtual tour stops and spaces for positive, negative and other observations of the participants. The sheets were collected after the virtual walking tour and the findings were discussed. The moderators of the workshop evaluated the findings of the virtual tour before the second stage of the workshop and this material was used in the next part of the workshop. In the second stage of the workshop, the virtual working tour evaluation was gone through together with the participants.

Fig. 3 Virtual tour map (Map: City of Oulu).
2.2. Workshop Part 2: Future workshop

The workshop continued in the afternoon as future workshop where the participants were divided into 4 groups and each group was consisted of 10-12 participants and a moderator. This method is suitable to implement after the virtual walking tour when the participants had formed new opinions and ideas about the area. At the beginning of the future workshop, a brief overview of the observations of the Virtual Walking Tour was made by the moderator.

The future workshop is a method developed by Robert Jungk, Ruediger Lutz and Norbert R. Muellert in the 1970s. A future workshop requires preparation and support by moderators. Originally, it was used to enable a group of people to develop new ideas or solutions of social problems. It can be also used in spatial planning to involve citizens in the planning process. A future workshop is particularly suitable for participants who have little experience with processes of creative decision making (for example children and youngsters). In this workshop, involvement of these different groups of people was simulated by the role play.

2.2.1. Role play

The moderator had a pack of role play cards which included a group of different participant roles that would be involved in the spatial planning process. Each participant of the workshop was given a different role. The quality of the new development area was investigated critically and thoroughly through these characters. A visualized brainstorming was performed and a general and critical question concerning the problem was framed.

Roles available:
- Young dweller (teenager)
- University student
- Adult male dweller (in active work life)
- House wife with small children
- Elderly dweller (retired, 65+)
- Mr. / Ms. Nimby (“not in my backyard”)
- Environmental activist
- Foreigner (immigrant from different culture)
- Local businessman/woman (shop/service near the area)
- Dog owner
- Boat owner (active yachtsman)
- Mr. / Ms. Historian (Industrial heritage-fan)
- Investor
- Unemployed person
2.2.2. Brainstorming

Each role player named at least three ideas or important aspects (in separate paper sheets) related to quality of the development area from the viewpoint of the given role. The aspects could be related to e.g.:
- Positive/negative places in the area
- Visual elements potential for establishing local identity
- Connections of the area to surrounding neighbourhood and the sea shore
- Mobility (light traffic routes, public transport)
- Spatial formation – public/semi-public/private spaces
- Handling of the landscape
- Accessibility
- Density and housing/building types
- Recreation possibilities
- Service structure, cultural activities etc…

These ideas were written on paper sheets by black drawing ink and put on the wall (pin board). Each member explained and justified their selections.

2.2.3. Fantasy Phase

In the fantasy phase of the workshop, each member was asked to vote for the three best ideas on the pin board from the viewpoint of the role (by red drawing ink). The results were grouped under main topics and important and repeated ideas were collected to the pin board and discussed. All participants tried to work out a utopia or a vision, to draw an exaggerated picture of future possibilities of the target area, from the viewpoint of the given role.

2.2.4. Implementation of ideas and presentation

The accepted ideas were checked and evaluated by the participants and these ideas were gathered on the map. Afterwards these maps photographed for presentation. All the participants gathered in the same auditorium and the findings of each group were presented by a team member.
III Findings of the workshops

3.1. Discussion on the virtual walking tour stops

Stop 1

- Cultural heritage of the area is observable, the history of harbour and ships gives a lot of potential for various activities, projects, performances.
- Old industrial heritage and buildings are the identity makers, they can also work as landmarks of the area.
- Pedestrian connections are needed.
- The green horizon against the water is unique.
- It is a peaceful and quiet area.
- The area is empty, an opportunity to be used freely.
- The smoke chimney is disturbing the area.
- Exposed to elements, lacking shelter.
- Strong wind
- A bridge is needed.
- The old industrial buildings should have temporary uses.
- Polluted, expensive to regenerate

Stop 2

- Oulujoki river is the heart of Oulu, how to continue the delta feeling in Toppila, how to make the area popular and positive.
- Linking factor of the river between the two sides.
- Potential to link old and new city structure.
- A railway bridge, railway not any more in use.

Fig. 4 Stop 1 (Photos: Leena Soudunsaari).

Fig. 5 Stop 2 (Photo: Leena Soudunsaari).
Stops 3 & 4
- A countryside feeling, wooden storage buildings, potential. These kinds of buildings are well used in the marketplace area.
- Local traditions, positive values.
- A museum about culture and tradition could be here.
- Cross-country skiing possibilities.
- Pigeons are dirty. How to attract people instead of birds.
- A place for cultural events.
- Old railway station has now an architectural office, promising new functions.
- A sudden change of scale, a challenge to ground level, human scale / public space.
- Silos are technically demanding to adapt to new uses.
- Open ground, no people, a possibility for temporary uses like a local marketplace. People should get to know the area.

Fig. 6 Stops 3&4 (Photos: Leena Soudunsari).

Stops 5 & 6
- Reaching the edge of the city.
- Noise and wind, perhaps it is possible to have sound installation.
- Where’s the city?
- The small river is used as a cooling system for the power plant.
- Remarkable examples of good city planning on the other side, Topplansaari.
- Topplansaari is spatially loose.

Fig. 7 Stops 5 & 6 (Photo: City of Oulu).

Stop 7
- Jungle in the middle of the urban structure, a challenge. No use, no visitors at the moment.
- Not even used by the local people.
- Suggesting removing some of the trees might be possible, for example in Dublin this is not possible.
- Islands in the forest might be created, small connected islands of woods.
- It is good to concentrate the development first around the woods.
- An educational area for children to learn about the forest and cultural heritage could be here.
- A good place to build, we have plenty of forest in Oulu. Better to build next to the existing city structure, enables living without cars.
- The area is close to Meri-Toppila, shouldn’t be too separate, has an influence there.

Fig. 8 Stop 7 (Photo: City of Oulu).
Stops 8 & 9

- The road hasn’t been designed for cyclists, mainly for cars.
- Students are using the bicycle connection a lot, potential for cycling.
- What kind of a gateway / landmark could be created for the area?
- Now the view is dominated by the power plant which can’t be removed.
- A need to develop the existing industrial buildings.
- The road doesn’t give good access to the residential area, only an industrial feeling.
- The road is undefined, small industry, not attractive.
- The power plant area could have more attractiveness, e.g. gyms and other recreation for employers, might have more employers later on.

3.2. Findings of the future workshop

The future workshop was consisted of four groups. Each group produced a plan of the area.

3.2.1. Group 1

In this group there were six participants and the roles that were given were Mrs. Nimby, a dog owner, a historian, a foreigner, an unemployed person and a housewife with small children.

3.2.1.1. Brainstorming phase

During the brainstorming phase each character identified their needs. According to the unemployed person, the area should serve cheap flats, good cycling roads to the city centre, free outdoor facilities, corner shops, possibilities for voluntary work and premises for doing one’s own hobbies e.g. wood work.

Housewife with small children stressed on the fact that the house should have its own garden. Good public transportation should be attained in the area. There should be a school and a kindergarten as well as local heath services in the area. Playgrounds should be available and they should be on safe routes. There should be a good connection to the seaside.
Dog owner demanded that the area should have safe places for walking the dog where there are no children, elderly or cars. Services for pets such as a veterinary clinic should be available in the area.

Mrs. Nimby demanded for big one family houses with own yards. The area should be peaceful and quiet with a view of the strait or the forest. The road connections should be good for approaching by own car and the housing should have own car parking lot. Connection to the nature should be good and outdoor facilities should be available.

Historian stressed on the fact that the existing industrial heritage should be given temporary use such as spaces for alternative arts. The maritime history of the area should be brought to life for instance by arranging the transportation to the city centre by sailing and steam boats through the Toppila strait.

The foreigner longed for ethnic groceries and connections to the society and other people, also to local people. A place to learn Finnish and for cultural interaction such as a library was mentioned.

During the discussions it was noted that all the mentioned issues are relevant for all new housing areas. An actual topic was the policy for densifying and tolerating people nearby. It was noted that immigrants are an emerging challenge in Finland. In Oulu many of them are concentrated in Meri-Toppila which is the district next to Toppila shore II.

### 3.2.1.2. Fantasy / vision phase

Based on the brainstorming phase five clusters of ideas were identified.

- Transportation and connections
- Housing
- Recreation
- Services
- Social environment

*Transportation and connections*
- Good transportation arrangements; boats can be used in summertime; internal connections of the area such as safe routes to seashore.
- Rowing boats could be a temporary solution before the bridge is built to connect the area to the opposite shore.
- The bridge cuts off a part of the strait. Could a tunnel be built instead?
- A rising or turning bridge could be built instead of a normal one.
- Strong limits to driving speeds on the area internally could be made, e.g. 30 km/h.

**Housing**
- A variety of housing types in the wishes: safety, no noise, big houses, cheap flats, not too much new housing.

**Recreation / outdoors**
- Free of cost outdoors facilities which are close to the housing area.
- Skiing / fitness path in the forest, skiing on the ice.
- Nice parks, peace & quiet, preserving the trees and making the recreation area useful.

**Services**
- Local services are often a problem nowadays, only big markets, here should be smaller units.
- Corner shops, which can be arranged in the old industrial buildings.
- Public services: school, kindergarten.
- Third places (for doing own things outside home), places to be creative and express oneself.
- A library connected to the school.
- A community centre.
- Industrial heritage gives space for ‘dirty hobbies’, e.g. motorcycle repair or a bakery.
- In Toppilansaari (on the opposite side of the task area) there are no shops therefore there is a need for good connection.
- Also the tourists, camping guests etc. from Nallikari could use the shops and other services here.

**Social environment**
- Voluntary work could include looking after children, dogs and elderly people.
- A connection to the third places: let people take over existing houses for doing own things, they are cheaper than new ones.
- A school for immigrants might function on a voluntary basis, learning Finnish etc.

**3.2.1.3. Implementation phase**

The points were localized on the map.
- A skiing path is planned on the artificial hill on the shore near Meri-Toppila. Currently the hill stops the visual connection to seashore.
- Sailor pubs in silo buildings.
- A lift bridge for light traffic, a tunnel for cars and buses over and under the Toppila strait
- The entry to the area from Koskelantie is very industrial looking. Next to the school would be a good place, and the entrance should be emphasized e.g. with a new library building as a landmark.
- Local services shall be supported.
- The boulevard in Meri-Toppila should be continued towards the shoreline and housing built beside it.
- A pedestrian connection on the shoreline is important.
- The marina for small boats and ships should be close to the light traffic bridge.
- A dog park / animals on the park areas.
- The boulevard towards Terva-Toppila Manor should be kept.
- The manor should be a part of the public and bus routes, and shops could be added to the area.
- Third spaces should be located in the industrial buildings, e.g. silos, and boat storage as well.
- Sailing and ships would be a good way to make the area interesting for visitors and improve the image.
- The Sea centre should be located close to the light traffic bridge.
- A characteristic harbour, like in Marseilles, could be created.
- Boat rental and ice skating.
- Housing near the school and towards the shore.

Fig. 10 Group 1 /Plan of Toppila shore II
3.2.2. Group 2

In this group, there were 10 participants and the roles were composed of an adult male, a boat owner, a university student, an unemployed person, a teenager, an environmental activist, a housewife with small children, a historian, a local businessman and a foreigner.

3.2.2.1. Brainstorming phase

The power plant of the case study area has generated the most active discussion in the group.

A businessman and an environmental activist had totally opposite opinions. According to the environmental activist since there is another place for the power plant in Oulu in Vihreäsaari, the power plant in the planning area could be demolished. However the opposing idea was that Oulu is a growing city and there is a need for extra energy in the future. Industry is the reason why people have moved in Oulu. Besides the power plant in the area was the landmark of the case study area. Old chimneys are beautiful. At the moment there is no access to the power plant area, but in the future around the factory there could be a nice public park. The chimney of the power plant needs a 400 meter large safety area around it. Inside this safety area housing is not allowed, however some other functions are possible to arrange.

Local businessman longed for plenty of customers. Recreational premises, boat traffic, harbour atmosphere, boat maintenance shops and restaurants would generate potential customers.

Historian would preserve the old industrial buildings and convert them into ship building workshops, which would serve also employment opportunities and premises for learning traditional skills. New buildings should be designed in similar style with the existing buildings and respect the old.

Housewife with children would preserve the forest in the area, which would serve her children the possibility to explore the nature. She also wanted that the bicycle connection to the city centre would be a good one and the route would follow the strait to provide an attractive and convenient alternative to reach the centre. She also looked for ownership based housing in the area and a shopping centre as well as more social infrastructure.

The teenager hoped for sports activities and well organized leisure time, places for multifunctional facilities.

The university student longed for areas near the sea for different events where
local people could meet. Good transportation to the university and rental housing for students were mentioned to be important.

The boat owner wished to live in a less dense housing area and have a detached house with a large garden. He also longed for a good access from his yard to the seaside. Besides the environment should be a peaceful and far from the industrial buildings. The services should be good and high level and within a walking distance.

Male adult wanted to live in a detached house with a big yard in the area. Good services such as kindergarten, schools, shopping and working places should be attained in the area. Recreational activities should be included in the area.

Unemployed person looked for small housing at reasonable price and places for meeting others.

Foreigner longed for a multicultural centre and good transportation possibilities to the city centre and to surrounding districts. Foreigner wanted to live in an area where diverse social activities are available.

Environmental activist suggested geothermic heating as an alternative to the power plant. The green environment should be preserved. Contaminated soil should be cleaned.

3.2.2.2. Fantasy / vision phase

All the above mentioned ideas were put on the pin board and each member of the group voted the three best ideas. The moderator grouped the results according to the topics.

• Preservation of cultural history
• Connection and Services
• Architecture
• Recreation
• Social environment

The main topics of group 2 were similar to the group 1 with the difference that the preservation of cultural history roused as an important issue.

Preservation of cultural history

Cultural history of the area is important and old industrial buildings play an important role in preserving the identity of the place. Local artists could create
something interesting to point out these buildings. Social and cultural happenings and premises for these happenings are important to vitalize the area. Tervatoppila manor is very important part of the history of the area therefore it has to be preserved. Tervatoppila is suggested to be the centre of the new housing area. Wooden docks could be designed in a modern way.

Connections and Services
Connecting the nearby district Meri-Toppila to the case study area (Toppila shore II) and to form a strong unit was an important issue of the discussion. By doing so the existing commercial and cultural services of Meri-Toppila would serve the new area. The connection of Toppila shore II to the opposite shore by a tunnel was deliberated also.

Architecture
The architecture of the new area could follow the style of the old harbour buildings. The new area could be a garden city because forest should be preserved. Toppila shore II can become a cultural garden city.

The outlook of the power plant needs to be ameliorated as a landmark for instance by re-colouring it or by creating a multifunctional use of the power plant area.

3.2.2.3. Implementation phase

The main issues of the previous part were marked on the map.
- Traffic to the housing and the factory traffic could not be in the same route.
- The street which is leaving from the corner of the area to the old Mansion house is beautiful and it could not be the main street of the area because this would kill the atmosphere of this street.
- There can be only one main entrance to the area.
- The water canal which is coming from the factory could be larger, thus the boats could use it.
- There could be a small lake.
- The sauna area has to be near by the water.
- It is good to have a building for dancing in the area.
- There could be a storage for the boats in a winter time and a summer time it could be place for the happenings.
- The new housing area is continuing from the Meri-Toppila area until the shore line.
- All the shore line has a public wooden dock and along this you can find the restaurants.
- The area won’t have any services but use the services of Meri-Toppila district.
- The green connections through the area are important.
- There is the area for the small industrial activities.
- The Tervatoppila manor with its boulevard is preserved.

**Fig. 11** Sketch from the seashore

**Fig. 12** Group 2 /Plan of Toppila shore II
3.2.3. Group 3
In this group, there were nine participants, however each participant had more than one role and the roles were composed of a foreigner, dog owner, working adult, boat owner, housewife, teenager, elderly, historian, investor, university student, unemployed and Mr Nimby.

3.2.3.1. Brainstorming phase
The emigrant longed for a multicultural centre and some ethnic shops and restaurants in order to introduce different cultures to Finland. Multicultural centre would serve premises for learning Finnish language. Places to practice different religions would be a good idea. Public spaces for sport activities would work to create interaction between the incomers and the local people.

Dog owner wished to have outdoor spaces for dog training, coffee shops, sitting areas and sport places for the area.

Working adult stressed on the fact that the area was suitable for a business park for high tech and starting companies as well as for young professionals since its location is good for such activity. High quality housing area at the shore would reinforce the image of the area.

Boat owner hoped to have a centre for culture and boats at the shore where there can be arranged boat exhibitions. The building would also have halls for fixing the boats. A small marina with services for tourists, a small size hotel would function as a meeting point for sailing people.

House wife wanted to have a kindergarten, with safe traffic connections. The housing area should also serve good activities for children and school of the area should be a small one with activities after school. Shops and pizzerias are very welcome to the area.

Teenager longed for free activities and outdoor spaces since he did not have much money. Cinemas, a music centre where festivals can be arranged could be situated in the old factories. The area should include a school, shops, a library and good connections to the city centre by bike and by bus.

The elderly longed for good local services and a low density housing with connection to nature and good public transportation.

Historian stressed that the old houses must be saved and restored as a core of area. The marina would be the functional heart of Toppila area, therefore it had to be
retained. Old factory buildings were the symbols of Toppila and could function as the gate to area. These buildings remind of the history of Toppila.

The university student hoped to have a place for students to gather. Also housing and studios for students should exist in the case study area. Old buildings had to be used for different activities, exhibitions and fashion weeks and should include clubs and design centres. The area also should take the social aspects of housing into consideration and should serve the possibilities for co-operation between elderly people and schools and kindergartens.

Investor would build a high density housing area with high buildings on the sea shore. The houses would be ownership-based and high quality. Old buildings were not needed in the area. Good connections and the marina were necessary for the area.

Unemployed person needed rental housing in the area. The area had to keep the forest and old buildings and had to have a nature centre for schools, a culture and handcraft centre as well as coffeehouses and shops.

Mr Nimby would keep the area like it is now and wanted to live near the nature.

3.2.3.2. Fantasy / vision phase

Based on the brainstorming phase there were four clusters of ideas.

- Housing
- Services and transportation
- Public spaces
- Building heritage and nature

**Housing**
- High quality block of flats at the water front with a view
- 5-6 storey or even higher houses
- Ground floor of the block of flats should have bars and restaurants
- Dense area with small flats

**Services and transportation**
- Services should be within a walking distance
- Restaurants and shops
- Kindergarten
- Small marina
- Good traffic solutions, barrier-free pedestrian routes through the area and a bus route which goes through the new housing area
Public spaces
- Centre for culture
- Public places where people meet each other
- Places for recreation and hobbies

Building heritage and nature
- Old buildings must be preserved and restored to have new functions of the marina
- Old industrial identity of the area should still be recognizable after the area is built
- Nature and forest
- Urban park

3.2.3.3. Implementation phase
The main issues of the previous part were marked on the map.

- Old buildings must be preserved as landmarks and memory of the past, they help orientation and are the heart of the area. New functions and users for old buildings can be found.
- Old industrial buildings of the entire Toppila area (Toppila shore II and Meri-Toppila district) should have new functions which accommodate public activities, public and commercial services like a dance club, pubs, theatre, shops, cafés, museum of sea and boats, music centre, multicultural centre, maybe also some temporary use. All the cultural establishments have visual contact with each other.
- Connections are created through urban parks and by bicycle and pedestrian roads, so that there will be the network of activities which create synergy with each other.
- There are more activities in the centre of Meri-Toppila (Halpahalli’s and Aalto silo’s neighbourhood)
- Connection of Meri-toppila area to the sea should go through a public park and Toppila shore II.
- Small marina for inhabitants, visitors and tourists, public sea shore for walking and cycling.
- Parks and other public outdoor spaces for recreation. Sport is a very natural way for people of all cultures to interact with each other. Dancing clubs do the same, and the shy Finns get a little wilder…
- Connection to the opposite shore would be by bridges. The bridge will be a landmark bridge. Through this connection the areas will be bound and thus the activity network of the area will be enlarged.
- Housing area will be of higher density near the sea shore with sea view, about 5
storeys. Behind that there will be a park and behind the park there will be a low density, quiet housing area with big gardens.
- There is a need for a visual gate for Toppila shore II. The gate could be a statue or a monument at the cross-roads.
- Connections to the city centre will be by bike and by bus, minibuses between marine and the city centre.
- Co-operation and activities between elderly people and youngsters and children, and between different social groups

Fig. 13 Group 3 / Section of the area

Fig. 14 Group 3 / Plan of Toppila shore II
3.2.4. Group 4
In this group there were eleven role players and the roles that were given were Mrs. Nimby, a dog owner, a historian, an unemployed person and a housewife with small children, working adult, teenager, investor, university student, environmental activist and a local businessman.

3.2.4.1. Brainstorming phase
University student
The student longed for a housing area with parks and lots of green. The student stressed on the fact that the existing Meri-Toppila area had some social problems and therefore suggested that the new housing area should be linked to the old in order to decrease the problems. The shoreline had to stay public.

Environmental activist thought that the new area should have the minimum carbon footprint and therefore it has to have good light traffic connections. Also the buildings solutions had to be ecological and the electricity consumption of the power-plant could be lower. He stressed on the fact that old buildings in the area and the forests should be preserved.

Housewife with children hoped to have good services and possibilities for free time and cultural activities which are within a walking distance. Safety and security of the environment is important, therefore she saw the problems in Meri-Toppila as a threat.

Unemployed person wished to have places for free-time activities such as cultural activities, sports etc. in his living environment. He also found it important to have places to meet people and be socially active in the housing area. Cheap housing was an important necessity for him.

Ms. Nimby did not want any extra construction in the neighbourhood and she thought that people should live where they work. She opposed the idea of high-rise buildings in the case study area. She also stressed that the new housing area should have its own traffic-system. In her opinion the forest had to be preserved and the area had to stay calm.

Dog owner longed for an easy access to the beach and good network of pedestrian routes as well as easy parking possibilities.

Investor found it crucial that the area is easily accessible with public-transportation, by cars and by light-traffic and parking must be easy. The area should be dense with high buildings. The area had to include also commercial
functions and offices.

Historian thought that building a Sea Centre by the shoreline is a very good idea to exhibit the harbour history. The old silo could also be an attraction point of the area. Around the Sea Centre there could be a recreational area with a historical theme. Housing should be further away from the shore and be in small scale. The area had to be easily accessible and suitable for public-transportation. Public boat-transportation to the city centre with the old tar boats which refers to the history of the place would be good attraction for tourists.

Adult working male wanted to create a gate structure at the entrance of the area which would be good combination of old and new. He also longed for a recreational area for active men on the area such as golf, surfing and other activities.

Business woman wanted to have high buildings in the area to inhabit a big amount of people. The area had to have diverse business possibilities and lots of networks for people and companies.

Teenager wanted to have nearby leisure activities in the evenings and a night café for young people as well as a skateboarding park.

3.2.4.2. Fantasy / vision phase

All the ideas of the previous stage were put on the pin board and each member of the group voted for the 3 best ideas. The moderator grouped the results according to the topics.

• Services
• Nature
• Transportation and connections
• Recreation/ leisure activities
• Preservation of cultural history

The main topics of group 4 were similar to the other groups, however local services and preserving the nature were the most stressed topics of the discussion.

Services
There had been a lot of discussion whether the services should be on or nearby the site.

- Services should be nearby
- Public services: school, kindergarten
- Corner shops
- Places for creativity or to have physical exercise or other activities
- Commercial services
- Marina services for maritime activities

Nature
- The forest should be kept.

Transportation and connections
- Good connections inside the new residential area, such as routes to the seashore which also connects the Meri-Toppila district to the shore.
- Connection to the city centre, both by public transportation arrangements and by pedestrian routes where accessibility is taken into consideration.
- Accessibility is an important issue.

Recreation / leisure activities
- Sports and playgrounds
- Places for cultural activities

Preservation of cultural history
- Preservation of the old industrial buildings
- New functions for the old industrial buildings, such as establishing a museum for the industrial and maritime heritage

3.2.4.3. Implementation

- There is a strong spine of the area.
- There should be a gate of the new residential area.
- Public transportation connects Meri-toppila and Toppila shore II to the city centre.
- Tarboat route in summertime from Toppila shore to the market place in the city
- Developing the shoreline for public use with more light-traffic solutions rather than car access.
- No intense housing by the shore
- Connecting Meri-Toppila to the seashore through the case study area.
- Connecting Meri-Toppila to the new area will brighten the image of Meri-Toppila district.
- Combining the old and the new buildings and areas
- The buildings should not be too high because they should not compete with the landmarks of the area.
- Alvar Aalto’s silo building is the landmark of the area.
- The new area will use the services of Meri-Toppila.
- The Sea Centre: marina services for maritime activities, such as boat rent, sailing courses, building and fixing boats.
- Old industrial buildings will be preserved and will have new functions.
- Terva-Toppila mansion is historically important and will be preserved on the site as a restaurant.
- The forest will be saved and create a link through it.
- In order to avoid the wind the streets of the new housing area will be parallel to the Toppila strait.

Fig. 15 Group 4 /Plan of Toppila shore II
3.3. Summary of the findings of the workshops

In all groups local services and transportation were brought as the important issues in planning.
Both commercial and public services should be within a walking distance either on the site or nearby the case study area. As public services, a school and a kindergarten as well a community centre and a library were listed. Besides the public services, all working groups listed a number of commercial services which should be included in planning, such as restaurants and pubs, a marina and corner shops.

For those groups which were satisfied with the nearby services, the connections to the neighbourhood were important. For groups 2 and 4 connecting the existing housing area, Meri-Toppila to the case study area was brought strongly. Thus the existing services of Meri-Toppila would serve the new housing area and the new services of the case study area would bring a diversity to the whole area. Also the connection of the case study area to the opposite shore was an important issue. Some groups were for having a new bridge over the Toppila strait and some of them even thought about having a tunnel under the sea.

Public transportation was a must for all groups. Group 4 suggested that the public bus would go through Meri-Toppila district and reach the new housing area. Light traffic and pedestrian routes to and from the area were important and they had to be accessible for all user groups. Good traffic solutions in general were listed in all groups priority list.

Preservation of cultural history of the area was handled in three groups as a separate issue. Preserving the old industrial buildings and getting them new functions was considered to be an important means to preserve the identity of the place. Old industrial buildings were suggested to be the places for a maritime museum or atelier for hobbies which require large spaces. Also the Tervatoppila manor and its historical milieu was considered to be an important value for the case study area, therefore improving the recreational activities around the manor were suggested.

The wind and sun situation of the area was also deliberated in some groups and group 4 planned the area so that streets were parallel to the Toppila strait in order to avoid the cold northern wind and maximize the sun shine.

Recreational areas were considered to be important in the area. All the groups stressed on the fact that there should be free outdoor spaces for sports, but also
the importance of indoor activity spaces were mentioned. The existing forest area served the location for arranging these outdoor recreational facilities, but also the surroundings of Tervatoppila manor was suggested for recreational activities, especially group 2 had concrete suggestions for improving this particular area. Cultural activity centres were suggested and the old industrial buildings were suggested as places for these activities.

The waterfront was considered to be an important element of the case study area. In all groups the waterfront was open to public and served as an arena for different recreational activities. In order to emphasize the maritime history of Oulu and this particular area, a marina, a maritime museum and sea centre were suggested. Also as touristic attraction, a tar boat connection in summertime was suggested from the marina of Toppila shore II to the city centre through the Toppila strait.

All the groups agreed that the case study area should have a variety of high quality housing types for different income groups. However the opinions about the density of the area differed. Group 3 made concrete suggestions about how the housing should be arranged in the area. According to this group, 5-6 storey or even higher houses should be near the sea shore. Behind these high buildings there should be a park and behind the park there should be a low density housing area with big gardens. On the other hand in group 4, it was discussed that the block of flats should not be too high in order not to compete with the landmarks (e.g. old silo building) of the area.

The architectural language of the area was suggested to respect the heritage buildings of the area. The need for a visual gate for the case study area was stressed. The gate could be a statue or a monument or even a new building like a library etc. at the cross-roads. Since the entrance of the area at the moment from Koskelantie was considered to be too industrial looking, it was suggested by group 1 that the entrance would be next to the school building.
IV Conclusion

4.1. Experiences and evaluation of the method
At the beginning of the workshop, attendants were given evaluation forms where they were asked to comment on the methods of the workshop. According to the feedback of the participants, the workshop day was inspiring and successful. It was considered to be a rapid way to generate ideas on a planning area. It was especially considered to be a positive idea to involve the students to the workshops. The methods brought different perspectives of diverse groups on the planning area which is the case during the planning process. According to some participants, although diverse groups expressed their opinions on planning area, the outcomes of the workshop were not profound. The reason for this was mentioned to be the short duration of the workshop.

4.1.1. Virtual walking tour
According to the feedback of the participants, the virtual tour was successful in giving an overall idea about the area, apart from the fact that it was too fast to follow properly. The participants did not always notice the changing of the image on the screen, since they were concentrated on writing their impressions about the site and there was no sign to attract the attentions to the changing image and stops.

Positive parts of the method
- It is possible to evaluate the area easily without taking the weather conditions into consideration.
- The presentation of the area runs in a scheduled time so that the pictures change automatically and thus the tour is carried out within the planned duration.
- Different perspectives are presented and the immediate interaction between these perspectives takes place. As the discussion continues, the opinions and perspectives of the participants can change as the observations are expressed by different participants.
- It gives the opportunity for everyone to express their opinions about the area, such as ordinary people as well as the professionals.
- It is possible to get a big amount of data within a short time.
- This method gives the possibility to the stakeholders to communicate with the planners

Negative parts of the method
- The participants do not necessarily represent all the interest groups
- It is possible to manipulate the results of the tour by choosing purposeful participants
- During the virtual tour the time for writing was not enough and the participants did not realize the change of the images since there was no sign (sound or comment) to emphasize that the virtual tour continued. Therefore some of the participants missed some of the stops.

4.1.2. Future workshop and role play
According to the feedback of the workshop, role play was considered to be a fun idea, but some of the participants thought that the groups of 13-14 people were too large and time was too limited for producing any reasonable idea to implement. Also in the feedback it was mentioned that the opposing ideas were not discussed long enough to have a compromise and implement on the map because of shortage of time.

Positive parts of the method
- It is possible to get information about the needs of different users.
- The functional and social features of the area come out during the session.
- It is easy to participate and express the ideas through another character
- It is a democratic way to handle the ideas, since everyone is asked to write down what they think or want for the area.
- An intensive way of producing ideas and generating discussion.
- The aim is to implement the ideas of planning to a concrete map, therefore the production of the workshop is usable and compact.

Negative parts of the method
- The method need a lot of preparation before the workshop
- It also needs time and effort to gather the ideas and collect them as a report.
- The working groups might include dominating persons, who impose own ideas strongly
- Discussions are based on the short impressions of the participants about the area based on the virtual tour, therefore the real features of the area are not necessarily taken into consideration thoroughly.
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List of participants and the group division

Land Use Workshop – Ideas and Policies, Oulu, Tuesday September 14th 2010
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Pitkänen-Koli Taina  City of Oulu, Technical Committee
Rissanen Antti  University of Oulu
Saari Päivi  City of Oulu, Technical Centre
Sutherland Keith  Belfast city council

Group 2
Moderator: Suikkari Risto  University of Oulu
Secretary: Vasu Eini  City of Oulu, Technical Centre
Buzás László  Hajdú-Bihar County Council
Davison Pamela  Belfast city council
Frehill Jason  Dublin City Council
Herm Thomas  City of Dresden
Kaskela Heini  University of Oulu
Noskaitienė Audronė  Vilnius City Municipal Government
Puhakka Kaija  City of Oulu, Technical Centre
Ribotta Laura  City of Torino
Heikki Aronpää  Council of Oulu Region
Tolppanen Janne  University of Oulu

Group 3
Moderator: Soudunsaari Leena  University of Oulu
Secretary: Repola Sisko  City of Oulu, Technical Centre
Fennelly Robert  Dublin City Council
Heikkilä Jari  City of Oulu, Building Supervision Office
Heikkinen Jorma  City of Oulu, Technical Centre
Huotari Tiina  University of Oulu
Kälke Sabine  Belfast city council
Miettinen Jenny  University of Oulu
Paddar Elen  University of Oulu
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Ylinampa Jaakko  City of Oulu, Technical Centre
Group 4

Moderator: Özer-Kemppainen Özlem  University of Oulu
Secretary: Keränen Jaana  City of Oulu, Technical Centre
Aizpuru Mikel  University of Oulu
Csukás Endre  DIPA Ltd.
Fahey Fidelma  Dublin City Council
Hintsala Henna  University of Oulu
Karhula Matti  City of Oulu, Technical Centre
Kokkinen Jukka  City of Oulu, Technical Centre
Koston Tadeusz  City of Ruda Slaska
Matilainen Kati  University of Oulu
Mikkola Riitta  University of Oulu
Skuta Anna  City of Ruda Slaska
Vuoria Risto  City of Oulu / Culture