

UNIVERZITA J. E. PURKYNĚ V ÚSTÍ NAD LABEM

Fakulta sociálně ekonomická



Regional Development and Planning

Volume 2. (2010)

Issue 2.

Faculty of Social and Economic Studies

Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem

**ÚSTÍ NAD LABEM
CZECH REPUBLIC
2010**

Edited by Miloslav Šásek

**PROCEEDINGS
OF THE 10th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ÚSTÍ NAD LABEM 25. JUNE AND 26. JUNE 2010
CZECH REPUBLIC**

Reviewed by: Doc. RNDr. Milan Víturka, CSc.

Doc. RNDr. Václav Toušek, CSc.

© Copyright by Faculty of Social and Economic Studies, Jan Evangelista Purkyně
University in Ústí nad Labem, Czech Republic

Design & Layout: Petr Hlaváček, Petra Olšová

ISBN: 978-80-7414-355-7

HOW TO MEASURE TOWN REVITALIZATION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION EFFECTS

Andrzej Sztando

Abstract:

In the initial part of the article the author covers the problem of reasons underlying towns' degradation. In the following parts he refers briefly to revitalization processes and concentrates his considerations on these which are carried out within the framework of programmes created and implemented by town authorities. From this point on further discussion is devoted to problems of effects measurement which, owing to these programmes, are accomplished. To start with, there are presented mistakes made most frequently in this field, followed by explanations how to construct the correct system of revitalization effects measurement. The process of the above system construction is discussed in detail and divided into stages such as: correct definition of operational objectives of the due revitalization programme, describing the effect indicators, opinions and activities, as well as listing the requirements for descriptive analyses. The overall content is supported by numerous examples which make up the significant part of the study. The article is concluded by information on the application of the discussed system, referring to the organization of revitalization effects measurement, obtaining numerical data, public opinion survey, preparing periodical assessments, correcting revitalization project and presenting the final evaluation as well as recommendations.

Keywords:

town, revitalization, revitalization programme, measurement of revitalization effects

1. Degradation, revitalization and problems of its effects measurement

There are numerous examples of economic, social and urban-spatial degradation of town structures in Poland. It rarely refers to the whole town area, however, in many cases it covers its major or even dominating part. There are many factors resulting in such degradation and they have successively facilitated the current negative state of affairs in the long run. Some of them are or were of nationwide nature or even an international one. Others are of local significance. The problem refers mainly to the situation after World War II and ways of removing its material and nonmaterial effects, as well as the factors characteristic for socialist economy conditions such as: subjecting the social sphere to national industrialization, low quality of construction industry, marginalization of private property, low level of expenditure spent on maintaining and modernizing residential estates, giving up the application of economic calculation of investments, using outdated technologies and finally shortages of materials. Among these factors one may also currently list the ones resulting, to a great extent, from systemic transformations, such as disproportions between functional structure and the structure of towns management, poor financial situation of the town substance owners, irrational legal regulations, insufficiency of social capital, mistakes in the field of spatial management, as well as the application of inefficient methods in public property management.

In line with social and economic development of the country many urban areas, the condition of which has been deteriorating in the course of the past decades, have been undergoing the processes of reconstruction carried out by private capital. It refers mainly to the most attractive, from the point of view of economic entities owners, town centres and also

these residential areas which are the favourite ones among inhabitants who have at their disposal an income level significantly exceeding an average one. On the other hand local authorities who aim at the improvement of municipal buildings and technical parameters of constructions keep performing numerous projects focusing on renovations and modernizations and supplement them by infrastructural investments. However, these by all means desirable processes are frequently accompanied by the persisting or even extensive degradation of other town areas. Additionally, the improvement of technical condition of material objects, even a highly advanced one, does not mean the revitalization of urban structure which, by definition, is the process opposite to degradation. Revitalization itself is related to obtaining many, quite diversified economic, social and environmental objectives, among which one may enumerate the following examples: decreasing unemployment, social pathologies, social exclusion, pollution emissions, as well as achieving the high level of public safety, social and economic activity, spatial order, aesthetics, availability of facilities for the disabled in a town or reconstructing relics of the past and revoking historic values. It is also hard not to emphasize the objective of providing economic and social grounds for maintaining and intensifying the accomplished effects, so that - with no external assistance or with its accepted share – the revitalized urban structures were not undergoing degradation again.

In order to achieve these objectives it is necessary to perform a coordinated and multidimensional public intervention. It is carried out by means of towns' revitalization programmes which have been prepared and implemented more and more frequently by local authorities in recent years. This phenomenon undergoes development in line with an increase of local authorities' awareness regarding their role in stimulating town's development, growing social expectations in this field, increased financial capacity of local authorities, the extensive local research and development back-up and consultancy services closely related to towns' revitalization, the transfer of foreign knowledge and experiences in the field of revitalization, including especially Western European countries. Its strong catalyser (according to many specialists the core one) becomes the cash stream flowing from the European Union structural funds, which can be taken advantage of on condition the revitalization programme has been presented.

The construction and application of revitalization programme for a given part of urban structure is a complex procedure. It requires conducting numerous activities of diagnostic, consulting, negotiating, planning, legal, implementing and monitoring character. It also demands the correction of projects and actions while working on them, as well as an overall, complex assessment following their finalization. Professional literature provides limited support in this area and concentrates not mainly on detailed organizational, financial or legal solutions, but on general information such as the core notion and objectives of revitalization or broadly understood statistics referring to this type of initiatives. Among the important and still open research areas of both theoretical and practical nature there is placed the measurement of revitalization results, i.e. the results obtained in the course of revitalization activities. It is an especially significant domain since the concept of revitalization results refers to all stages of the overall undertaking, starting from its initiation and programming, through operational activities and finishing at ex post assessment. Therefore, it influences in a crucial way the broadly understood quality of these activities. On the other hand, the analyses of municipal revitalization programmes conducted by the author¹⁶³ and his practical

¹⁶³ Local Revitalization Programme for Wrocław for the period of 2004-2006 and 2007-2013, Local Revitalization Programme for Sopot for the period of 2006-2013, Local Revitalization Programme for Aleksandrów Łódzki for the period of 2005-2007, Local Revitalization Programme for Toruń for the period of 2007-2013, Local Revitalization Programme for Pyrzyce for the period of 2007-2013, Local Revitalization Programme for Lidzbark Warmiński for the period of 2005-2013, Local Revitalization Programme for

experiences¹⁶⁴ point to the fact that the entities performing revitalization programmes encounter numerous problems in this respect. Among the frequently occurring irregularities one may specify:

1. incorrect adjustment of the substantive scope of revitalization results measurement methods to the substantive scope of the planned, carried out or performed revitalization processes.
2. application of methods based on the phenomena attributes values which are independent or dependent, to only a marginal degree, on revitalization activities.
3. application of methods based on data, sources of which are not credible or are difficult to identify or implement. In exceptional cases the authors of revitalization programmes even declare the application of methods using data sources of which do not exist or are covered by legal protection.
4. application of methods implementing data which in order to be obtained correctly require financial outlays and spending the time not scheduled in the revitalization programme.
5. application of methods characterized by the level of complexity which exceeds analytical skills of an entity implementing the due revitalization programme.
6. imprecise specification of the respective methods as the result of which the entity which applies them performs it contrary to the intention of the entity which designed them.
7. unjustified desire to quantify all revitalization effects, even these which are of typically qualitative or relative nature.
8. neglecting methods of revitalization processes effects assessment, which will occur or may occur in the period following the finalization and evaluation of these processes.
9. approaching all methods as equally useful from the point of view of the assessment of revitalization processes effects, despite major differences with regard to phenomena they refer to and in spite of diversified level of credibility and accuracy of the applied information.
10. application of numerous methods which are based on the same or strongly correlated data, which may result in false, over intensive outcome and, what follows, their incorrect interpretation.
11. extreme dependence of methods on the guidelines defined in aid programmes in relation to which the revitalization programmes are the subject of application for financial means, even if as the result of such dependence they do not meet both the needs and conditions of the entity which carries out the revitalization programme, as well as the needs and conditions of the subject of revitalization.

As it has been pointed out there are many mistakes which can be made while choosing and applying the measurement methods for urban structures revitalization results. Their nature is not something unusual. Similar or identical mistakes are often made while studying many different social and economic phenomena and processes. Therefore, can one expect from the authors and performers of revitalization programmes that while putting into practice the output of such sciences as e.g. economic diagnostics, econometrics, statistics, forecasting,

Hrubieszów for the period of 2007-2015, Local Revitalization Programme for Skarżysko Kamienna for the period of 2007-2020, Local Revitalization Programme for Opole Lubelskie for the period of 2007-2013, Local Revitalization Programme for Głubczyc for the period of 2005-2006, Local Revitalization Programme for Małogoszcz for the period of 2007-2013.

¹⁶⁴ Local Revitalization Programme for Tomaszów Lubelski for the period of 2006-2013, Local Revitalization Programme for Maków Mazowiecki for the period of 2006-2013”, Local Revitalization Programme for Bielawa for the period of 2006-2013.

local economy and town management they will manage to construct a flawless system of urban structure revitalization results measurement? Unfortunately the answer is no. There are barriers for obtaining such state of affairs owing to conditions in which the entities undergoing revitalization function and which are created by local governments. Among the most important conditions one should enumerate financial, legal, information, human resources and time limitations. In spite of the presented above difficulties one should aim at improving due measurement tools, since it is not only possible but also highly recommended owing to the influence of measurement results on the revitalization process itself, both at the stage of its designing, implementation and assessment. Correct measurement of revitalization results also facilitates the presentation of conclusions which may be utilized in the course of other revitalization processes. Further part of the article is, therefore based on the author's practical experience and professional literature studies, proposal for constructing and conducting the procedure of urban structures revitalisation effects research, which on the one hand meets substantive and formal requirements resulting from the output of the mentioned above scientific fields and local government legislation, and on the other presents a suggestion adjusted to actual opportunities and needs of local governments.

Work on the system for revitalization effects measurement should commence at the stage of revitalization programme construction. It should be composed of five stages carried out in the following sequence: defining operational objectives for revitalization programme, as well as effect indicators, opinion indicators, activities indicators and specifying the requirements for descriptive analyses.

2. Defining operational objectives

The system for effects measurement, which were obtained owing to the implementation of revitalization programmes, should on the one hand depend on its aims, while on the other should co-define them. It is so because the scope of effects monitoring should at least be identical with the scope of effects which a given entity, undergoing revitalization, plans to accomplish combining its activities into an integrated programme. It is, however, recommended that it covers some phenomena outside the scope of revitalization objectives, since it may generate additional effects, unexpected for the entity undergoing revitalization, including side effects of a significant, negative outcome. Co-defining consists in presenting some revitalization objectives in the form which facilitates the measurement of their accomplished level or even in a quantitative form, which determines itself their indicative definition. In such a case the objective defined in value or in quantity becomes, at the same time, the measure for the effect of revitalization processes. The author finds it helpful to illustrate the above interdependencies by examples.

The typical structure of revitalization programmes objectives is generally made up of general objectives, also called the main or strategic ones and operational objectives most frequently called fractional or indirect ones. General objectives are in most cases similar to the following:

1. halting marginalization process of the revitalized parts of a town and, what results from it, an increase in their significance in an overall town structure;
2. improvement of living conditions and running business activities in the revitalized town parts;
3. change in the functional structure¹⁶⁵ and development¹⁶⁶ structure of the revitalized town parts;

¹⁶⁵ Functional structure refers to the set of functions performed by a given object (in this case the town part undergoing revitalization processes) as compared to its immediate and more distant environment. It may be

and in most cases it is just one main revitalization objective which is defined, since in its merits it is most frequently so extensive that introducing more general objectives would mean expressing the same intentions, however, by means of different wording. Operational objectives are, on the other hand, the composite parts of strategic objectives or/and stages on the way towards accomplishing them. They are also an indirect link between general objectives and specific projects, which are supposed to be taken up within the framework of a revitalization programme. The typical operational objectives referring, of course, to the area undergoing revitalization, put forward in the discussed programmes are as follows:

1. reduction of social pathologies and social exclusion;
2. improvement of demographic situation;
3. increase of population density in the area undergoing revitalization up to the level of an average population density in a town;
4. increase of inhabitants' access to services provided by means of technical infrastructure and an increase in the quality of these services;
5. increase of inhabitants' access to services provided by means of social infrastructure;
6. improvement of the technical condition of buildings and constructions;
7. improvement of the safety level;
8. optimal level of logistic systems;
9. ensuring spatial order and high level of aesthetics;
10. reconstruction of historic and artistic attributes;
11. optimal level of utilizing buildings and constructions;
12. ensuring access for the disabled;
13. diminishing costs of functioning;
14. providing optimal systems for financing investment outlays, as well as current buildings and constructions maintenance costs;
15. development of public activity involving inhabitants of the town parts undergoing revitalization and, as the result, enhancing this revitalization;
16. development of entrepreneurship;
17. decreasing the existing level of pollution and reduction of the occurring one;
18. change in the features of these town parts that do not undergo revitalization, which influences obtaining revitalization objectives.

Subordinating the system of revitalization effects measurement to the objectives of revitalization program and co-defining them by this system has to be related to operational objectives, since the general objective or objectives are too synthetic. Besides, one of the reasons for including operational aims into revitalization programme becomes combining them with the system of its monitoring. Firstly, the above subordination concept has to be explained. It means that the methods for revitalization programme measurement results have to be selected in such a way that their scope would be in agreement with the merits of operational aims, which will facilitate an opportunity for assessing the level of their accomplishment. In other words, the levels of these phenomena have to be measured, the improvement of which was taken up by the revitalization programme. Table no.1 presents scopes of the merits of revitalization results measurement methods related to the selected and presented above operational objectives.

composed of such functions as e.g.: residential, recreational, educational, production, commercial, service, administrative function.

¹⁶⁶ Development structure refers to the set of material objects (buildings, constructions, technical equipment) and intangible ones (knowledge, qualifications, experience, people's ideas, culture, traditions, legislation, customs) aimed at serving a given function.

Table 1. Scopes of the merits of revitalization effects measurement methods for particular operational objectives

| Objective | Scope of the merits which should be covered by the methods of revitalization effects measurement |
|------------------|---|
| 1. | social phenomena occurring in the area which undergoes revitalization: pauperization, unemployment, addictions (alcohol, drugs), family pathologies |
| 2. | population inhabiting the area of revitalization; migrations into and outside the area of revitalization |
| 3. | population density and constant population movement in the area of revitalization |
| 4. | attributes characteristic for the area undergoing revitalization: accessibility and quality of water supply pipelines infrastructure, sewage system, rain-water drainage system, electric and energetic system, thermal and gas infrastructure, telephone lines, visual monitoring, fire protection, information technology, road, side-road, parking, rail and other transport infrastructure |
| 5. | factors characteristic for the area undergoing revitalization like: accessibility and quality of social care, education, information technology, culture and entertainment institutions, health care, sport and recreation facilities |
| 6. | buildings and constructions in the revitalization area: thermal-insulation properties, technical equipment, the condition of construction elements, the condition of finishing materials |
| 7. | events and accidents occurring in the area undergoing revitalization like: fires, traffic, sanitary-epidemiological occurrences; territory annexations, private or public property damaging; violating personal immunity in the revitalization area; levels of the above events occurrence threat in the area of revitalization; the revitalization area inhabitants' knowledge of the ways to reduce threats and conduct procedures in a situation of possible danger occurrence |
| 8. | traffic, rail and pedestrian movement organization in the area undergoing revitalization, the system of communication connections between the revitalization area and its environment |
| 9. | target orientation, economizing, functionality, safety, aesthetics and perspective orientation of spatial solutions in the area undergoing revitalization |
| 10. | technical condition of parts of buildings, constructions and infrastructural facilities covered by conservator's protection and situated in the revitalization area, technical condition of part of technical infrastructure covered by conservator's protection and located in the area of revitalization |
| 11. | forms and the level of utilising buildings and constructions in the area of revitalization |
| 12. | for the disabled in the area undergoing revitalization: accessibility of means of transport, accessibility of accommodation, accessibility of services performed by means of social infrastructure, accessibility of services performed by means of technical infrastructure |
| 13. | in the area undergoing revitalization: costs of infrastructural services, costs of transport services, costs of energy, costs of regular damages repair, cleaning costs, costs of services performed by means of utilising social infrastructure, |

| Objective | Scope of the merits which should be covered by the methods of revitalization effects measurement |
|-----------|---|
| | management costs |
| 14. | sources of financial outlays and current costs of revitalization area maintenance financing, financial potential of the revitalization area users, the revitalization area capacity for generating means for its users, legal regulations related to investment outlays financing as well as current maintenance costs of the area undergoing revitalization |
| 15. | active engagement in the revitalization area: associations, unions, clubs, organizations; voluntary workers, social and youth boards; participation of the revitalization area in local government meetings, workshops, consultations, surveys; applications, petitions, cooperation offers addressed for public institutions by the inhabitants of revitalization area |
| 16. | economic entities with an official seat in the area of revitalization; economic entities' subsidiaries or outlets situated in the area of revitalization, headquarters of which are located outside the revitalized area; functional structure of revitalization area economy; willingness of revitalization area inhabitants to take up economic activity on their own; institutions supporting the development of economic entities functioning in the area of revitalization; local legal regulations referring to starting and running economic activity in the area undergoing revitalization; local, infrastructural conditions for taking up and developing economic activity in the revitalization area; local social conditions for economic activity undertaking and developing in the area of revitalization |
| 17. | in the area undergoing revitalization: air, soil, surface and underground waters pollution, noise |
| 18. | technical infrastructure located outside revitalization area and exerting an influence on this area; social infrastructure located outside the area of revitalization and having an influence on it; pollution created outside the revitalization area and effecting it as well as its sources; outside threats for the area of revitalization, the source of which is located outside this area |

Source: Author's compilation.

The above scopes of merits are just the examples which in practice should be adjusted to the attributes of the area undergoing revitalization, to outside conditions, as well as the indicators for programme implementation. Nevertheless, they prove that the verification of meeting almost any of the operational aims requires the monitoring of numerous, often very complicated phenomena and processes taking place in the area of revitalization and outside it. This, on the other hand, determines the necessity of applying many, purposefully selected and adequate, for the entity undergoing revitalization, diagnostic methods and techniques.

The mentioned above co-defining means the necessity for defining operational objectives in such a way, in revitalization programmes, that they are easy to measure. In other words, operational objectives should be defined in such manner that they facilitate easy and precise choice of indicators and descriptive methods allowing for the assessment of the degree of their accomplishment. Obviously, the objectives cannot depend on the system of revitalization effects measurement. They should be designed in the way as easy to measure as it is only possible, however, it must not alter their scope of merits and their result must not stay in contradiction to revitalization goals. In the presented example these objectives are e.g. the goals no. 1, 2 and 13. On the other hand, the objectives which could not have been defined according to this requirement are the goals no. 8, 9 and 14.

It may seem that in case of objectives, which can be constructed, without any detriment to their content, in such a way that they are easy to measure, a good solution would be to define them in the form of values related to revitalization area attributes, which are supposed to be accomplished. In practice, however, it is difficult, unnecessary or even impossible to achieve for three reasons. Firstly, because the changes in the area undergoing revitalization represent a set of stochastic processes, i.e. the processes occurring not only as the result of revitalization activities taken up by the revitalization subject, but also under the influence of large number of other factors, of which most change in time and space, as well as are independent from the will of the revitalization subject. The factor of coincidence is also of significant importance here. Therefore, there is no chance to define precisely all effects of revitalization programme implementation, even after such programme finalization, not to mention at the stage of its construction. Secondly, defining operational objectives in the form of values of revitalization area attributes would result in losing by the revitalization programme its aesthetical advantages and its variant structure, as well as cause its extensive complexity. Thirdly and finally, not all attributes of the area undergoing revitalization may be presented in a quantitative form. The typical example of such attribute becomes the quality of the system regarding costs financing sources of the system functioning. As the result, operational objectives usually have to be defined as the directions for desired changes, but – as it has already been mentioned – in the way which best facilitates relating them to indicators and descriptive methods. Does this mean that operational objectives never are or should be defined in a quantitative form? The answer is “no”. In spite of the presented above difficulties, some of them can or even should be defined in such a way because in this way a high level of precision and substance of a revitalization programme is accomplished as the result of which its monitoring becomes extensively simplified. Additionally, the quantitative goal determines the object of the programme for such long lasting and intensive activities that the assumed level of a given attribute, characteristic for the area undergoing revitalization, will be obtained. Among the objectives described above this requirement meets the goal no.3. There does not, however, exist a universal recipe for such way of operational objectives defining, since everything depends on the properties of a given revitalization area and its determinants.

3. Defining effect indicators

The second stage in revitalization effects measurement system construction becomes the phase of effect indicators defining. As the name itself points out, the effect indicators play the role of measuring events and processes, the change of which is a planned or unplanned effect of activities taken up by the town authorities or its partners within the framework of a given revitalization programme. Coming back to the, already mentioned, stochastic nature one has to emphasize that, to some extent, the changeability of the above phenomena and processes is almost always the result of other factors' influence, such as business entities, natural persons, different institutions and organizations or even outside entities and events. For example, decreasing the functioning costs of the town part undergoing revitalization may be the result of not only such activities performed by town authorities as e.g. thermo-modernization of municipal objects, subsidizing thermo-modernization of private objects, the construction of central heating systems, fixing energy-effective lightening or curbing vandalism, but also the result of decreasing prices of energy carriers or inhabitants' pauperisation and its consequences taking the form of energy consumption reductions. Another example may be the improvement of safety level, which is not as much the result of diminishing social pathologies, better communication system and crime reduction, but stems from the town part undergoing revitalization being depopulated. Therefore, where does the right for applying the

above measures come from? Firstly, the activities planned in revitalization programme are, or at least should be, selected in such a way that they exert an important influence on phenomena and processes, the change of which becomes one of revitalization objectives. The subject of revitalization activity, therefore, has the right to assume, that changes occurring within these phenomena and processes result from its activities, at least in their major part. Secondly, if a favourable level of a given group of indicators is obtained, even without or with small influence of tools used by town authorities, it would mean that the planned goal was met and further activities in this field are not necessary.

Each of effect indicators should meet four conditions. The first of them is simplicity. A simple indicator is the one for calculating which data are available. The second condition is called the capacity condition. It means that the subject of revitalization must possess the knowledge regarding the range of phenomena and processes described by the indicator. In other words, it must be aware what phenomena and processes influence the value of the indicator. Otherwise it will not be able to interpret its value correctly. The third condition is the one referring to the decision process and is related to the capacity condition. It can be met only when the subject of revitalization obtains information which part of phenomena and processes presented by the indicator is under or may be under its exclusive influence, which is under its partial influence and which stays outside the sphere of its influence. The final condition consists in the compatibility of capacity indicators and their scope of the merits, which should be covered by methods of revitalization effect measurement, referred to before.

Having considered the above conditions and the scopes of the merits presented in table 1, exemplary measures for revitalization effects were constructed. They are compiled in table 2. For obvious reasons, if it was not indicated otherwise, they refer exclusively to revitalization area and its inhabitants. Many of them, in order to limit the size of the text, were formulated in such a way that indeed they describe a few similar indicators separated by a comma or by “/”. In practice, however, they should be applied separately.

Table 2. Examples of effect indicators.

| Objective | Effect indicators |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | number of individuals receiving permanent social benefits; average value of monthly, permanent social benefits; number of temporary social benefits provided in previous calendar year; average value of temporary social benefits provided in previous calendar year; number of unemployed; unemployment rate measured as the number of registered, unemployed persons ratio to the number of individuals in productive age; average period off work of an unemployed person; estimated number of drug, alcohol addicts; number of interventions by the institutions responsible for public safety and order, taken up in relation to alcohol and drug addiction; number of individuals receiving public aid as the result of alcohol or drug addiction; number of interventions by institutions responsible for public safety and order, taken up in relation to family pathologies |
| 2. | number of inhabitants; age structure of inhabitants; inhabitants' structure by gender; natural growth rate of inhabitants; number of inhabitants who permanently left the area undergoing revitalization; number of new, permanent inhabitants of revitalization area; migration balance; directions of migration |
| 3. | population density in revitalization area; population density in a town in which the revitalization area is situated; estimated number of individuals staying in the area of revitalization on a daily basis in connection with performed job, undergoing education, doing shopping or using services, but not living permanently in the |

| Objective | Effect indicators |
|-----------|---|
| 4. | <p>revitalization area; estimated number of individuals living in the area of revitalization and leaving it every day in connection with performed job, undergoing education, doing shopping or using services</p> <p>share of buildings equipped with water supply system; annual number of water supply system break-downs; share of buildings with sewage system network; annual number of sewage system network break-downs; share of buildings with rain water pipeline system network; area of revitalization covered by rain water pipeline system; annual number of rain water pipeline system break-downs; share of buildings equipped with electro-energetic network; annual number of electro-energetic network break-downs; share of buildings connected to the common heat-generating network; annual number of heat-generating network break-downs; share of heat-generating network requiring thermo-modernization; share of buildings equipped with gas network; annual number of gas network break-downs; share of buildings equipped with phone network; annual number of phone-network break downs; area covered by vision monitoring; annual number of vision monitoring break-downs; share of buildings equipped with fire protection installations; share of buildings equipped with computer information network; length of road network; length of road network requiring repairs; length of pavements; length of pavements requiring repairs; length of roads equipped with lightening; number of lightening points at roads requiring electro-modernization; number of parking spaces; length of rail infrastructure; length of rail infrastructure requiring repairs</p> |
| 5. | <p>number of kindergartens; number of children attending kindergartens; level of kindergarten units disinvestment; number of primary schools; number of primary school students; level of primary school units disinvestment; number of lower secondary schools; level of lower secondary school units disinvestment; number of secondary schools; number of students attending secondary schools, level of secondary school units disinvestment; number of colleges; number of college students; level of college units disinvestment; number of libraries, number of volumes in libraries; number of books borrowed from libraries; level of library units disinvestment; number of culture, entertainment units; number of individuals permanently visiting culture, entertainment institutions; number of individuals who, in previous year, participated in projects organized by culture, entertainment units; number of health care units; number of consultations provided by health care units; value of examinations and surgeries performed by health care units; level of health care units disinvestment; number of sport/recreation organizations; number of sport, recreation organization members; number of sport, leisure centres; number of individuals permanently using sport, recreation units; level of sport, recreation units disinvestment</p> |
| 6. | <p>number and cubic capacity of buildings, constructions which do not meet thermo-insulation standards specified in construction law; number and cubic capacity of buildings of which the condition of construction components limits or does not allow for their utilization according to their purpose; number and cubic capacity of buildings of which the condition of construction components does not comply to construction law; number of buildings requiring façade renovation and the size of façade surface requiring renovation, number of buildings requiring roof renovation and the size of roofing surface requiring renovation</p> |

| Objective | Effect indicators |
|-----------|---|
| 7. | number of fires; value of fire damages; number of traffic accidents with no injuries among people; number of traffic accidents involving injuries among people; number of traffic accidents' victims; number of interventions by entities responsible for sanitary-epidemiological safety; number of thefts; number of personal immunity violations; number of events resulting in public or private property damage; number of arrests related to law breaking; level of the danger of flooding; level of industrial catastrophe danger |
| 8. | average driving speed along main roads; number of places at which pedestrian or traffic accidents occurred; number of places where rail and traffic accidents occurred; number of places where pedestrian and rail collisions occurred; average, total, daily time of traffic jams occurrence; number of Police and Town Guards interventions related to traffic problems; number of roads connecting revitalization area with its environment; hourly capacity of roads connecting revitalization area with its environment; share of free parking spaces at the times of their highest demand |
| 9. | scope of revitalization area requiring spatial reorganization; scope of revitalization area not used and not planned to be used in the nearest future; particularly extensively used scope of revitalization area; number of accidents resulting from incorrect spatial solutions; number of objects which do not meet architectural requirements and result from the local plan of spatial management; number of unlawful constructions; number of construction supervision units' interventions related to spatial and architectural management |
| 10. | number of historic buildings, constructions requiring rebuilding, renovation; estimated outlays needed for rebuilding or renovation of historic buildings, constructions; length (or some other basic technical parameter) of particular types of technical infrastructure covered by conservator's protection and requiring rebuilding, renovation; estimated outlays needed for rebuilding, renovation of particular types of technical infrastructure covered by conservator's protection |
| 11. | share of the area of buildings and constructions used for running business activity, residential accommodation, social services; share of unused area of buildings and constructions; number of individuals using social infrastructure buildings and constructions on regular basis; number of individuals who used social infrastructure buildings and construction in previous year; frequency of using social infrastructure constructions; average, daily time of using social infrastructure constructions |
| 12. | share of public communication points not adjusted to the needs of the disabled; share of residential buildings not adjusted to the needs of the disabled; share of public utility buildings not adjusted to the needs of the disabled; share of service/trade centre buildings not adjusted to the needs of the disabled |
| 13. | cost of delivering m ³ of water; value of annual water waste; annual cost of water supply system infrastructure break-downs repair; cost of m ³ municipal sewage reception; annual costs of sewage system infrastructure break-downs repair; annual cost of providing public transport services; annual cost of electro-energetic infrastructure break-downs repair; annual cost of damage repair resulting from acts of vandalism; annual cost of cleaning; annual cost of one service performed by means of social infrastructure facilities; annual cost of public real estate management and supply of services |

| Objective | Effect indicators |
|-----------|--|
| 14. | structure of sources of investment outlays for revitalization; structure of sources for financing current maintenance of residential buildings, technical and social infrastructure; share of individuals who do not take advantage of social benefits; value of rent debt; number of families threatened by eviction due to rent debt; value of obtained real estate debt; value of rent charges for municipal objects and business premises; value of business entities' tax arrears |
| 15. | number of associations, unions, clubs, affiliations and similar non-government organizations; number of associations, unions, clubs, affiliations and similar non-government organizations; number of voluntary workers active in revitalization area; annual number of meetings, consultations, workshops and similar meetings as well as their members, devoted to revitalization area and its inhabitants; annual number of applications, petitions, enquiries by inhabitants addressed to local authorities |
| 16. | number of business entities; shares of particular types of business entities in their overall set (according to value of turnover, size of employment, property); development (profits, value, scope of activities, competitive position, employment, investments, influence on the environment) of business entities; structure of revitalization area economy functioning; willingness of revitalization area inhabitants to take up economic activity on their own (measured by an indicator of willingness towards taking up entrepreneurial activities as the ratio of small business units number to the number of inhabitants); number of institutions supporting the development of economic units running their business activity in the area undergoing revitalization |
| 17. | average concentration of particular components of air pollution; maximum concentration of particular components of air pollution, period of particular pollutants occurrence; average concentration of particular soil pollutants; average concentration of particular ground and underground pollutants; estimated, annual volume of particular pollutants' emission; average volume of noise in the area most vulnerable to noise; maximum volume of noise in most vulnerable areas, time period of noise occurrence in most vulnerable areas |
| 18. | efficiency of particular types of technical and social infrastructure located outside revitalization area and influencing it; annual number of break-downs related to particular types of technical and social infrastructure located outside revitalization area and exerting an influence on it; level of particular types of technical and social infrastructure disinvestment located outside revitalization area and influencing it; estimated, annual volume of major pollutants reaching revitalization area from its environment; frequency of outside threats occurrence (flooding, fire, industrial catastrophe) in revitalization area, the source of which is placed outside revitalization area |

Source: Author's compilation.

4. Defining opinion indicators

The third stage of revitalization effects measurement system construction becomes defining opinion indicators. The beneficiaries of every revitalization programme are the inhabitants of the area undergoing revitalization, entrepreneurs running business activity there and also other persons taking advantage of goods and services offered in the area. Therefore, there is no doubt that the beneficiaries' opinion about revitalization effects should be

followed, in great detail, by the subject of revitalization. Town authorities have to perform an in-depth monitoring of inhabitants' opinions, in relation to which their role is a servicing one. Introduction of opinion indicators also has another aim. Part of revitalization processes effects cannot be measured by means of effect indicators. Another part could be measured, but such measurement would carry the burden of the following drawbacks: long time period, high cost and low level of precision. The measurement of culture institution functioning may serve as an example here. Even though there is an opportunity of describing the above activity by a number of indicators, the high level of culture offer attractiveness dependence on personal attributes of its recipients probably makes such measurement highly imperfect and the conclusions resulting from it could be contrary to its users' opinions.

Defining the values of opinion indicators requires obtaining information directly from the beneficiaries of revitalization programme. The most frequently applied technique in this case is a survey. Therefore, it is natural to phrase the survey questions and answers to them in such a way that there is a possibility to define, on their basis, the values for due indicators.

Exemplary opinion indicators, respectively for each of the discussed above scopes of the merits for revitalization effects measurement, are presented in table 3. Just like before, if it has not been indicated otherwise, they refer exclusively to revitalization area and its inhabitants.

Table 3. Examples of opinion indicators

| Objects | Opinion indicators |
|---------|---|
| 1. | share of individuals who claim that the inhabitants are less/more/equally wealthy as the other town inhabitants; share of individuals who declare that they are unemployed and are not registered as such; share of individuals who claim that drug, alcohol addiction are less/more/equally frequent as in other parts of the town; share of individuals who claim that the occurrence of unemployment is less/more/equally frequent as in other parts of the town; share of individuals who claim that family pathologies (violence, lack of parents' concern about their children etc.) are less/more/equally frequent as in other parts of the town |
| 2. | share of individuals who claim that revitalization area is a poor/average/good place for family development; share of individuals who claim that they are looking for a different place of residence due to poor living conditions in the area of revitalization; share of individuals who claim that they have already taken up the decision about permanent moving from the area of revitalization, share of individuals residing outside revitalization area, who claim that they are willing to move into and live in revitalization area |
| 3. | share of individuals who claim that they leave the area of revitalization regularly in order to take advantage of services not provided in the area of revitalization; share of individuals residing outside revitalization area who regularly travel to this area in order to use the services which are not provided or their standard is lower in other town parts |
| 4. | share of individuals who claim that water supply system, sewage system, gas, electro-energetic, heating, telecommunications, computer information, road, parking, transport networks do not meet their expectations; share of individuals who claim that joining the water supply system, sewage system, gas, electro-energetic, heating, telecommunications, computer information network does not/did not pose any problem for them; share of individuals who claim that the quality of drinking water is poor/average/good; share of individuals who claim |

| Objectives | Opinion indicators |
|------------|--|
| 5. | that public transport services are poor/average/good shares of individuals (or whose children, foster children, persons under their care) who take advantage of public, non-public health care units, culture or entertainment institutions, sports and recreation facilities and centres, kindergartens, schools, libraries and claim that their functioning is poor/average/good; shares of individuals who cannot use the services of particular social infrastructure types due to their full load; shares of individuals who cannot use the services of particular social infrastructure types due to their unavailability |
| 6. | shares of buildings or apartments owners or tenants who claim that these buildings/apartments require thermo-modernization, exchange of technical equipment, complex renovation, renovation or changing elements influencing their aesthetic presentation; shares of buildings or apartments owners or tenants who claim that in the coming 2-3 years they plan to renovate them; shares of buildings or apartments owners or tenants who claim that in the recent 2-3 years they have renovated them |
| 7. | shares of individuals who claim that the level of traffic, fire, sanitary-epidemiological threats is low/average/high; shares of individuals who claim that the level of personal immunity violation danger and the danger of being subject to theft or robbery is low/average/high; shares of individuals who claim that cases of damaging public and private property are rare/frequent; shares of individuals who claim that they know/do not know how to behave ¹⁶⁷ in case of most common threads occurrence |
| 8. | shares of revitalization area users who claim that road, rail and pedestrian traffic are badly/average/well organized; shares of revitalization area users who claim that public communication servicing revitalization area provides insufficient/sufficient/good frequency of connections; shares of users of revitalization area who claim that the lines of public communication servicing revitalization area are unsatisfactory/satisfactory; shares of revitalization area users who claim that public means of communication which service the revitalization area run punctually/unpunctually |
| 9. | shares of revitalization area users who claim that the level of its aesthetics is poor/average/good; shares of revitalization area users who claim that its spatial organization is good/average/poor |
| 10. | shares of revitalization area users who claim that historic objects are in poor/average/good condition |
| 11. | shares of buildings and constructions owners who claim that they use them to a low/partial/full degree; shares of revitalization area users who claim that buildings and constructions within the area are improperly/properly used |
| 12. | shares of the disabled using the area of revitalization who claim that public means of transport, transport infrastructure, public utility objects, residential buildings in which they reside are unfit/fit for their needs |
| 13. | shares of inhabitants who claim that costs of infrastructural, transport and social services are inadequate/adequate in relation to their quantity and quality |
| 14. | shares of individuals who claim that their financial situation, within the recent 2-3 years has worsened/improved; share of individuals who claim that they are ready |

¹⁶⁷ It also refers to their children, foster children and persons under their care.

| Objectives | Opinion indicators |
|------------|--|
| | to purchase the rented apartments; shares of individuals who rent municipal apartments and claim that the offered conditions for their purchase are poor/average/good; shares of individuals who claim that within the recent 2-3 years the rent for their apartment has gone down/up; share of individuals who do not reside in revitalization area and claim that if they were to buy an apartment or a house they would consider a real estate within the area of revitalization; shares of individuals who claim that within the period of the coming 2-3 years they plan to sell their house or apartment |
| 15. | share of individuals who claim that social activity in the area of revitalization is low/average/high; share of individuals who claim that they take part in regular social activities; share of individuals who claim that local authorities consult with them insufficiently/sufficiently/well the decisions referring to them; share of individuals who claim that local authorities badly/average/well manage the revitalization area |
| 16. | share of individuals who claim that they plan to undertake business activity; shares of individuals who claim that they plan to close down the business activity they have been running so far; shares of individuals who run a business and claim that the market, infrastructural, spatial conditions for running a business are poor/average/good; shares of individuals who run business activity and claim that public aid addressed to them by local authorities is improper/proper; shares of individuals who run business activity and claim that local legal regulations limits/does not limit their business activity; shares of individuals who run businesses and claim that local residents are unfavourable/indifferent/favourable towards business activities conducted by them |
| 17. | shares of individuals who claim that air, water, soil pollution and noise present unacceptable/acceptable levels |
| 18. | shares of individuals who claim that particular objects of technical and social infrastructure are located outside revitalization area, however, they influence it significantly and function badly/average/well |

Source: Author's compilation.

5. Defining activity indicators

Further stage of revitalization effects measurement system construction consists in the selection of activity indicators. They refer to activities taken up by the subject of revitalization and aim at obtaining revitalization objectives. Activity indicators are the favourite ones for authorities representing different levels, including local authorities, since these indicators define the outlays of time, work, financial and intangible assets spent by these authorities, which in their opinion should become the proof of scope of the needs covered and problems solved by them. Unfortunately such interdependence is frequently only partial and in extreme cases even nonexistent. For ages the practice of public management has been offering numerous examples of activities taken up by public authorities, the implementation of which did not result in a declared outcome. Due to the above, one should apply activity indicators only in the situation when three conditions are met simultaneously. Otherwise the system of revitalization effects measurement may provide false data, resulting in an incorrect assumption that the area in question has been revitalized, while in fact it is not so, or when revitalisation was an incomplete, partial or a short-term activity.

The first condition for activity indicators application becomes the situation in which the accomplishment of the set operational objective of revitalization means conducting a given activity by the subject of revitalization. As an example one may quote the following goal: “the decrease in share of public ownership of residential apartments by 50%”. Conducting by the subject of revitalization such privatisation activities which would result in the sale of a half of apartments which it previously owned means therefore accomplishing the set objective. The second condition for activity indicators application consists in the lack of possibility for performing a satisfactory measurement of revitalization effects by means of effect indicators and activity indicators. Such situation may take place e.g. when data for defining the value of effect indicators cannot or should not be disclosed to the public and the surveyed respondents deny answers to questions related to a given subject matter. The third condition is an undisputable and immediate influence of the taken up activity on the level of accomplishing revitalization objectives. As an example of such indicator one may quote the number of closed individual heating systems which, when high, may be regarded as meeting the operational goal i.e. “curbing low emission”. If just one of the mentioned above conditions is not met the activity indicator may be looked upon as just a complementary one at the most, as compared to effect, opinion and descriptive analyses indicators. It means that it may not be used and interpreted on its own and every interpretation of its value must be compared to the interpretation of the other indicators and analyses.

The examples of activity indicators are presented in table 4. Following the accepted convention, if it was not indicated otherwise, they refer exclusively to the area of revitalization and its inhabitants. Whenever the issue of outlays is brought up, it should be understood as outlays spent by the subject of revitalization, unless stated otherwise.

Table 4. Examples of activity indicators.

| Objectives | Opinion indicators |
|-------------------|--|
| 1. | value of outlays spent on job searching institutions; number of unemployed who took advantage of public trainings aimed at upgrading or changing their qualifications; value of outlays for prevention programmes referring to alcohol and drug addiction ; value of outlays for family pathology prevention programmes; number of local investigations aiming at disclosing incidents of family pathology |
| 2. | value of outlays for promotion of encouragement to move to the area of revitalization |
| 3. | value of outlays for promoting services and wealth offered by revitalization area and directed towards people living outside this area; value of outlays for promoting services and wealth offered by revitalization area and directed to people living in this area |
| 4. | value of outlays spent by the subject of revitalization or other subjects on construction, renovation, modernization and infrastructure functioning such as: water supply system, sewage system, rain water pipelines system, electro-energetic, heating, gas, telephone, vision monitoring, fire, computer information, road, side-road, parking, rail and other transport network; value of outlays for the promotion of using heating, computer information, parking and public means of transport infrastructure |
| 5. | value of outlays for the construction, renovation, modernization, functioning and promotion of such infrastructure as: social care, education, information, cultural, entertainment, medical, recreational and sport |
| 6. | value of outlays for thermo-modernization of public buildings and constructions; |

| Objectives | Opinion indicators |
|------------|---|
| | <p>cubic capacity of public buildings and constructions covered by thermo-modernization; value of surcharges for thermo-modernization of non-public buildings and constructions; cubic capacity of non-public buildings and constructions covered by thermo-modernization; value of outlays for renovations, modernizations and exchanging technical equipment of buildings and constructions; value of outlays spent on renovations, modernizations and exchange of structural elements of constructions; value of outlays spent on renovations, modernizations and exchange of buildings and constructions' finishing elements</p> <p>7. value of outlays spent on fire protection and prevention; value of outlays for traffic threats reduction</p> <p>8. value of outlays spent on setting up, modernizing traffic lights system; value of outlays spent on the construction and modernization of traffic monitoring; number of connections joining the area of revitalization with its closer and more distant environment by means of public means of transport, value of outlays for the construction and modernization of peripheral road system in the area undergoing revitalization; value of outlays for the construction and modernization of pavements, overpasses and underground passes; value of outlays for transport infrastructure horizontal and vertical markings</p> <p>9. value of outlays for preparing and updating the study on directions and conditions for spatial management and local spatial management plans; outlays for buying out real estate in order to change their management forms; value of public real estate sold in order to change their management form; number of accidents resulting from faulty spatial solutions; value of losses resulting from wrong spatial solutions</p> <p>10. public outlays on renovation of buildings, constructions and infrastructural facilities covered by conservator's protection; outlays spent on public surcharges for the renovation of buildings, constructions and infrastructural facilities covered by conservator's protection; number of permissions issued by the institutions of conservator's protection for conducting renovation works</p> <p>11. outlays spent on changing the form of buildings and constructions utilisation; outlays spent on increasing the utilization of buildings and constructions</p> <p>12. outlays spent on adjusting transport infrastructure to the needs of the disabled; outlays spent on public surcharges for adjusting private buildings to the needs of the disabled; outlays spent on adjusting public utility objects to the needs of the disabled; outlays on the promotion of public services for the disabled; grants for non-public organizations aiming at assisting the disabled residing in the area of revitalization</p> <p>13. outlays spent on activities cutting the costs of infrastructural, transport, social infrastructure; outlays on protecting public and private utilities subject to regular damage; outlays on curbing pollution resulting from municipal waste; outlays on activities which result in decreasing energy consumption in public places</p> <p>14. value of means for revitalization obtained from the European Union funds; outlays spent on adjusting buildings and constructions for business use; value of public surcharges for rents; value of public aid granted to business entities</p> <p>15. value of grants for associations, affiliations, clubs, unions, voluntary workers and social boards; value of outlays spent on social consultancy conducted in the form of meetings, workshops, advisory activities, surveys by local authorities; value of</p> |

| Objectives | Opinion indicators |
|------------|--|
| | taken up projects related to public and private partnership; value of outlays spent on public interventions taken up as the result of applications, petitions and inquiries by the inhabitants |
| 16. | value of public aid granted to enterprises; value of outlays spent on the promotion of entrepreneurial activities; value of outlays spent on job training for the unemployed; value of public outlays spent on the promotion of goods and services provided in the area of revitalization |
| 17. | value of outlays spent on the reduction of air, soil, surface and underground water pollution which penetrates the area of revitalization; value of outlays spent on soil, surface and underground water purification; value of outlays spent on the reduction of noise; value of outlays spent on the isolation from noise |
| 18. | outlays on technical and social infrastructure located outside the area of revitalization and exerting an influence on this area; outlays on the reduction of pollution created outside the area of revitalization and penetrating this area; outlays on the reduction of outside threats endangering the area of revitalization and the sources of which are outside the area of revitalization |

Source: Author's compilation.

6. Defining the requirements for descriptive analyses

In spite of a broad, joint scope of the merits related to the three presented groups of indicators, the need may arise to perform revitalization effects measurement by means of detailed analyses applying econometric, statistical, inductive, deductive, prognostic, descriptive and other methods. Definitely it is not possible to put forward any universal set of such analyses, adequate for the content of all and any program of revitalization. What is more, in most cases it is not at all necessary to perform them, since the described above indicators are absolutely sufficient to measure revitalization effects in a correct way. Nevertheless, in case of complex and long-lasting revitalization activities such need usually arises. If it is noticed as soon as at the stage of their programming, then it becomes indispensable to define at least the basic requirements to be met while preparing such analyses.

As an example one may use: analysis of changes in transport connections network in the area of revitalization and pressure on its main elements, analysis of daily demand for public services structure and dynamics in the area of revitalization and also the analysis of changes in business entities effecting natural environment and located in revitalization area.

7. Application of the system for revitalization effects measurement

Effective, timely and efficient implementation of revitalization programme requires creating or appointing the body, by the subject of revitalization, which will be responsible for this activity. In case of Polish local authorities, a commonly applied solution in this matter is appointing the Revitalization Programme Implementation Team (RPIT), which carries out numerous, diversified, conceptual, organizational, coordination, evaluation and information activities related to the programme. RPIT also works on monitoring tasks which cover the area of revitalization effects measurement.

It is not necessary to place RPIT in an organizational structure of a Town Office, as a separate organizational body, since it is mainly made up of individuals coming from different, already existing units. Most frequently they are: Vice Mayor (as the Chairman), City Board Member, City Treasurer, Heads of selected Town Office Departments, as well as the expert for revitalization represented most often by an outside co-author of revitalization programme.

The composition of RPIT is changeable, since representatives of revitalization partners (e.g. entrepreneurs, social leaders) are appointed or invited to it on permanent or temporary basis, it is also assisted by specialists in different domains (e.g. town planners, historians, ecologists). The application of revitalization effects measurement system performed by RPIT consists in six stages. They are as follows:

1. obtaining numerical data,
2. public opinion survey,
3. preparation of descriptive analyses,
4. performing periodical assessments,
5. correcting revitalization project in the course of its implementation,
6. final assessment, conclusions and recommendations for further revitalization activities.

Obtaining numerical data refers to effect and activity indicators. There are many sources of these data. The first one becomes the subject of revitalization itself, i.e. town authorities and specifically its registry systems, such as e.g. population register, business activity register, process, environment, material and accounting register. The second is composed of public institutions such as: district authorities or even regional ones, local Police or Fire Brigade Units, sanitary, environmental, medical, conservator's and construction services. The third source refers to state data bases which monitor not only the incidents at macro- or mezzoeconomic level, but also the typical, local ones. Such data base is e.g. Regional Data Bank serviced by Central Statistical Office covering thousands of annually updated data on all Polish communes and their urban parts. Sometimes the need arises to purchase data from companies specializing in them or obtaining them directly from business entities running their activities in the area of revitalization. This is the fourth source.

As far as public opinion research is concerned, it is most frequently performed by means of surveys ordered at consultancy companies specializing in them or conducted by Town Office workers, or an organizational town unit appointed for this task. Less frequently applied solutions are consultancies, workshops and direct interviews with revitalization area inhabitants, as well as its other users.

Descriptive analyses are almost always ordered at consultancy companies specializing in them.

On the basis of collected data the values for effect, opinion and activity indicators are defined and later interpreted. They also present the substance for descriptive analyses. They are performed both while carrying out revitalization activities and after their completion. In the first case it consists in periodical assessment, of which the basic aim becomes possible correction of revitalisation activities, so that they are more effective and efficient. Periodical assessment aims at providing answers to many crucial questions. Firstly, it is indispensable to define which part of revitalisation programme has already been carried out, which is currently being worked upon and which one will be implemented in the future, as well as what is the level of preparation for it. Another significant component becomes verification of the degree to which operational objectives have been accomplished and what results from it – the general ones. It is also important to state whether the so far performed implementation activities of programme revitalization have been satisfactory. Despite its broad scope of merits, the evaluation of revitalization effects cannot stop at defining the above issues. It is also necessary to support it by constructive proposals of changes in revitalization activities or methods for their application, so that following their implementation the objectives could be accomplished faster, more effectively and efficiently.

In the second case the goal is to summarise the effects of revitalization process and the prognosis of their durability, as well as the synergic and multiplying effects. This stage, owing to the fact that it is the last one, frequently becomes subject to partial or overall elimination. This, however, must not be allowed. The goal of final assessment is not only to verify whether revitalization objectives were fully achieved or not. Its aim is also to evaluate the durability of the accomplished state of the matter and mainly the durability of financial background for the revitalization area functioning and development. Its another goal is to take up the decision about possible prolongation of revitalization activities and their designing. It obviously occurs only when the level of meeting revitalization objectives cannot be regarded as satisfactory. Another major reason making it necessary to perform the final assessment is to register all good and bad experiences which may be taken advantage of while constructing other revitalization programmes.

8. Conclusion

As it may have been noticed, both the construction and application of revitalization effects measurement system is a complex task. In spite of this, however, owing to its importance and mainly due to its influence on effectiveness and efficiency of revitalization processes in most cases it is implemented. The research performed by the author indicates that despite numerous, initial difficulties, Polish local authorities keep gaining experience in this domain and the quality of revitalization effects measurement seems higher and higher. The requirements put forward by the European Union aid programs are of immense significance here, since they state that the revitalization programme, for which financial support was granted, must be covered by both ex ante, ex post monitoring and current monitoring referring to evaluation procedures.

Literature:

- [1] CZYŻEWSKA A.: *Finansowanie programów rewitalizacji z Funduszy Strukturalnych. [Financing of Revitalization Programmes from Structural Funds]*. Świat Nieruchomości nr 39/2003
- [2] HALCROW F.: *Poradnik mieszkaniowy, t. 1 [Housing guide, vol. 1]– Strategia mieszkaniowa i programy rewitalizacji [Housing strategy and revitalization programmes]*, Konsultingowe Biuro Usług Habitat, Brytyjski Fundusz Know-How i Program Wspierania Samorządów Lokalnych, wyd. II, Warszawa 2000.
- [3] KACZMAREK S.: *Rewitalizacja terenów przemysłowych. Nowy wymiar w rozwoju miast [Revitalization of industrial areas. New dimension in the development of towns]*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź 2001.
- [4] CZYŻEWSKA. A.: *Lokalne strategie mieszkaniowe [Local housing strategies]*, red. Municipium S.A., Warszawa 2000.
- [5] *Odnowa miast. Doświadczenia brytyjskie i francuskie oraz wybrane materiały Urzędu Mieszkalnictwa i Rozwoju Miasta [The revival of towns. British and French experiences and the selected materials of the Housing and Town Development Office]*, Instytut Gospodarki Przestrzennej i Komunalnej Oddział w Krakowie, Kraków 2000.
- [6] PĘSKI W.: *Zarządzanie zrównoważonym rozwojem miast [Sustainable development of towns and its management]*, Arkady, Warszawa 1999.
- [7] POLKO A.: *Miejski rynek mieszkaniowy i efekty sąsiedztwa [Town housing market and neighbourhood effects]*, Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej w Katowicach, Katowice 2005.
- [8] *Rewitalizacja – Rehabilitacja – Restrukturyzacja – Odnowa miast [Revitalization – Rehabilitation – Restructuring – The revival of towns]*, red. Z. ZIOBROWSKI, D. PTASZYCKA-JACKOWSKA, A. RĘBOWSKA, A. GEISLER, Instytut Gospodarki Przestrzennej i Komunalnej Oddział w Krakowie, Kraków 2000.
- [9] *Rewitalizacja miast w Polsce. Pierwsze doświadczenia [Revitalization of Polish cities. First experiences]*, red. P. LORENS, Biblioteka Urbanisty, Warszawa 2007.
- [10] *Rewitalizacja terenów mieszkaniowych. Doświadczenia polskie i niemieckie [Revitalization of residential areas. Polish and German experiences]*. Materiały seminarium zorg. przez Urząd Mieszkalnictwa i Rozwoju Miast oraz Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH w Warszawie 18-19. 12. 2001.

[11] SKALSKI K.: *Problemy rewitalizacji [Problems of revitalization]*. W: *Gospodarka przestrzenna gmin. Poradnik T. III*, Fundusz Współpracy - Brytyjski Fundusz Know-How, Kraków 1998.

[12] TERTELIS M.: *Pozyskiwanie funduszy unijnych przez wspólnoty mieszkaniowe: rewitalizacja miast, procedury, uchwały, umowy, wytyczne do wniosku [Obtaining EU funds by housing cooperatives: revitalization of towns, procedures, resolutions, agreements, application guidelines]*, Wydawnictwo C. H. Beck, Warszawa, 2005.

Contact:

PhD Andrzej Sztando

Wrocław University of Economics

Faculty of Regional Management and Tourism in Jelenia Góra

Chair of Regional Management

3 Nowowiejska Street

58-500 Jelenia Góra

Andrzej@Sztando.com

**Regional Development
and
Planning**

Volume 2. / Issue 2.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 10th INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE

Faculty of Social and Economic Studies
Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem

2010

ISBN: 978-80-7414-355-7

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Editor | RNDr. Miloslav Šašek, CSc. |
| Nakladatel | Univerzita J. E. Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem |
| Edice | sborník |
| Vydání | první |
| Náklad | 100 kusů |
| Počet stran | 243 |

ISBN 978-80-7414-355-7



9 788074 143557