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The field of urban regeneration is probably among the most challenging ones for urban planners. Dealing with existing urban structures and communities in a sensitive way and balancing necessary interventions for improvement with social, economic and environmental factors are complex tasks that require multi-disciplinary perspectives and innovative ideas. It is the attempt to minimize negative impacts while at the same time maximizing the positive effects of improvements that has provoked a constant revision of concepts and instruments throughout the history of urban regeneration. Hence, the international experience shows a multitude of approaches that have evolved throughout time providing valuable lessons learned. A special challenge in this context is the conservation of built heritage and the protection of monuments. This task adds yet another dimension to the complexities of urban regeneration and requires even more innovative approaches of urban management.

It is this very topic that received special attention during the 2010/2011 class of the post-graduate Master Program of Urban Management at the University of Technology Berlin (TU Berlin). Several courses were dedicated to dealing with various aspects within the field of urban regeneration. However, outstanding importance was given to a practical project, which was organized in collaboration with GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH) – namely the project on Municipal Development and Rehabilitation of the Old City of Lviv in Ukraine. In this context, seventeen international Master Program participants had the opportunity to work as young expert consultants. Collectively, the students possess multidisciplinary professional backgrounds (e.g. university degrees in architecture, urban planning, social sciences, civil engineering, public administration, business management, hydrogeology, etc.) with substantial work experience in public and private sector institutions in their home countries in Asia, South and North America, Africa and Europe.

Cooperation between GIZ and the postgraduate Urban Management Master Program at the TU Berlin dates back to 2003. In the past, projects have been conducted in Aleppo, Syria (2007, topic: informal settlements), Montenegro (2008, topic: sustainable tourism), Bangladesh (2009, topic: urban governance in secondary towns), Cairo, Egypt (2010, topic: informal settlements). These experiences have shown that theoretical training combined with practical on-site project work enables a vivid exchange of innovative ideas and unconventional thinking about appropriate strategies between students and local project partners – a win-win situation for both sides. However, the fruitful cooperation between GIZ and TU Berlin goes well beyond field work. The Urban Management Master Program benefits from the regular involvement of GIZ staff members in teaching courses and from the nomination of a GIZ senior expert, Prof. Günter Meinert, as an honorary professor especially assigned to the program. Furthermore, over the years, numerous short-term training courses on different topics in the field of urban management have been conducted for staff members of GIZ cooperation projects and experts from their local counterparts. Last but not least, GIZ’s intense involvement in the Urban Management Program has resulted in the successful recruitment of graduates as high-profile staff members and interns on GIZ cooperation projects and at the Centrum für Internationale Migration und Entwicklung (CIM) posts worldwide and has made an irreversible impact on all those who returned to work as experts in urban development in their home countries.
As already mentioned, this year’s project dealt with the topic of urban regeneration in the City of L’viv in Ukraine, which is an outstanding case as it comprises multiple challenges of urban development in a transformation economy. Having experienced a turbulent history, the city has found itself under different rules – Polish, Austro-Hungarian, Ukrainian, German, Soviet – and belongs to the independent State of Ukraine since 1991. Although the changing powers had dramatic consequences for the urban population and eventually led to an almost complete exchange of residents, the physical structures of the historical center remained largely intact. Hence, the city holds an enormous value in terms of its architectural heritage in the historical center and has been listed as a World Heritage Site since 1998. However, the task of urban regeneration and architectural conservation is massive and not made easier by a chronic lack of capacities and resources.

In this context, the GIZ cooperation project Municipal Development and Rehabilitation of the Old City of L’viv provides support to the municipal administration in order to manage the urban regeneration of the old city of L’viv in a sustainable and efficient way. The project aims to strengthen the local government and other stakeholders in the urban renewal process with the aim of improving the living conditions of the residents as well as strengthening the city’s economic development. So far, the immediate city center has received most attention by local decision makers leaving more peripheral neighborhoods neglected. Outshined by the near historic center, the neighborhood just north of it is actually the cradle of the city as it was here that the area was first settled. Several valuable monuments located here bear witness to the historical significance of the area. However, its former importance is hardly acknowledged – not by residents, the local administration or visitors. Consequently, the physical, economic and social condition of the area is rather poor and there is an urgent need for urban regeneration.

Hence, this neighborhood was chosen as the main focus for the collaboration project between GIZ and TU Berlin. The assignment for the young professionals was twofold: firstly, a field study of the major problems of the area was to be realized. Secondly, and based on the field study, proposals for intervention were to be developed. Prior to the stay in L’viv, a preparation phase was held in Berlin. In-class sessions comprised research, literature review, presentations and critical discussion of relevant issues such as history, local identity, administrative structures and current urban development tendencies in L’viv. During the first week of the stay in L’viv in May 2011, students conducted rapid field assessments of the physical condition of buildings, the social structure, open space, mobility and local economy in the study area. The final outcome were SWOT analyses on the basis of which visions for future development of the area were formulated. This provided a framework for the conception of six strategic pilot projects during the second week, focusing on the most relevant issues identified. The pilot projects are to be understood as very first steps on the long road of sustainable urban regeneration in the neighborhood. The outcome of this work was successfully presented to a broader audience including representatives from the public administration, local residents, Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), universities and the local press on May 27, 2011.

In this publication the results of the project are documented. The first chapter introduces the project by providing an overview of the history of the city and discussing the topic of world heritage as well as the GIZ approach to intervention followed by a short description of the study area. The second chapter
documents the results of the five thematic SWOT assessments as well as the visions for development. Finally, Chapter 3 gives a detailed description of each of the six strategic pilot projects. This report aims for extensive dissemination of the project’s results and their integration in follow-up activities through the GIZ, contributing to awareness-raising on relevant issues of urban regeneration in the area. Understanding the ideas that have been developed in the pilot projects as initial interventions and creative steps, the further follow-up processes are of crucial importance in order to create consistency and establish permanent institutionalization of innovative strategies for urban regeneration in L’viv. We are looking forward to continuing the interesting debates between TU Berlin, GIZ and their counterparts in the public administration of L’viv.

TU Berlin owes a great deal of thanks to Iris Gleichmann and the entire GIZ staff for their trust, time and endless efforts they put into making this project a success. Furthermore, we would like to express our deepest thanks to the Vice-Mayor of L’viv, Mr. Vasyl Kosiv and to Mrs. Lilia Onyschtchenko, head of the Heritage Department, for their strong support and valuable insights.

Moreover, we are grateful to the Mayor Mr. Andrij Sadovyj, Mrs. Iryna Maruniak, head of Halyzka area administration, Mr. Oleksandr Kobzarev, head of the City Institute, Mr. Yuri Stolarov from Mistoproject, Mr. Armin Wagner from the GIZ-Project Climate-friendly Mobility as well as Mr. Ben Kern for their time, insights and honest interest in the project. We also want to thank all the students, Eleonora Provozin, Olya Savchynska, Olya Meshcheryakova, Lidii Fedchuk and Pavlo Skolozdra, who assisted us with the fieldwork.

All the local experts who dedicated their time to answer our questions deserve our deepest gratitude. Our special thanks goes to the residents of the study area who received us with much hospitality and openness – we hope to contribute with our ideas to an improvement of your beautiful neighborhood. Last but not least, we want to thank all the young professionals of the Urban Management Program for their incredible commitment, impressive dedication and great inspiration – it was a real pleasure to work with you!

Especially, we owe a sincere thanks to Maria Cecilia de Carvalho Rodrigues, Renata Goretti Piedade and Anthony Guadagni who greatly supported and coordinated the writing process. This report holds a lot of their energy, efforts and commitment.

Lukas Born,
Lenka Vojtová,
Carsten Zehner
Foreword

by Iris Gleichmann

The Municipal Development and Rehabilitation of the Old City of L'viv is a joint project of the City of L'viv, Ukraine and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (the German Organization for International Cooperation), the GIZ. When we at the project were approached by the Technische Universität Berlin (TU-Berlin) with the idea of cooperating with Urban Management students on a study of a part of the city, we immediately saw this as a great and mutually beneficial opportunity. There is an important historical quarter north of the City Center that has, until now, been a low priority in terms of its development within the city as a whole. The GIZ project has yet to analyze the area in detail because it was, and still is, intensely involved with ongoing challenges in the inner city. This northern area was chosen for the study, the results of which we hoped would benefit the students and be a significant contribution to the GIZ project.

Seventeen postgraduate students, accompanied by their supervisors, Carsten Zehner and Lukas Born, and supported by Lenka Vojtova of the GIZ, worked hard and for long hours during a two-week excursion in L'viv. Local residents and city officials were consulted, and public awareness-raising events were organized. Using highly professional research methods, information was gathered and compiled as a basis for suggestions and recommendations. It was interesting to see how these students, coming from some 13 different countries and with backgrounds in different disciplines, brought refreshingly new approaches.

This report summarizes the results of the one semester long work of the students – the preparation, the fieldwork and the follow-up analysis. The methods and ideas shown here will serve as a reference for the further urban development of the study area. The input of local residents and stakeholders was actively sought throughout the study - we hope that the good results of the students’ work will now encourage them to become more involved in the development of their part of the city.

We thank all who were involved.

Iris Gleichmann, GIZ
Director of the Ukrainian-German project
Municipal Development and Rehabilitation of the Old City of L'viv
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Explanation of Ukrainian Terms

Halyzka district  Administrative division where the focus area is located
Pidzamche  ‘Under the Castle’
Rynok  Market
Staryi L’viv  Old L’viv
Staryi Rynok  Old Market
Vysoki Zamok  High Castle
1 Introduction
There was a time when the *Pidzamche* neighborhood of Lviv was the jewel of the City. Lviv’s fortune depended on merchant trading in a large market just east of the modern day Vysokyi Zamok, and, as the market grew, the city entered its first age of prosperity. Wealthy patrons from the area commissioned ornate churches and lavish buildings, the beauty of which were largely unparalleled in Central Europe at the time. But, as the neighborhoods wealth grew with the market, it declined with it as well. By the 15th century, the City’s central market function had shifted just a short distance to the south, and the once great neighborhood of *Pidzamche* had begun a slow decline, still evident nearly 600 years later.

Today, there are only few indications of the neighborhood’s historical significance. Despite its location less than one kilometer from the *Ploshcza Rynok* (central square in the City Center), the neighborhood has become a marginalized central-periphery.

Though the neighborhood is partially included in the UNESCO World Heritage Site, it is overshadowed by the urban fabric and grandiose churches of the City Center, and only a few of the 1 million tourists that visit Lviv annually (Tillman 2011) ever find their way into the area. In modern Lviv, the name *Pidzamche*, once so closely tied to the City’s preeminence in Central Europe, is rarely understood to refer to this neighborhood ‘Under the Castle’ as local residents associate very different spatial areas with that name. Due to these controversial associations and its obviously undefined denomination the neighborhood is referred to as *focus area* (or similar) throughout this report (and not as *Pidzamche*) as the decision about a common name for the neighborhood is up to the residents.

---

1 The name *Pidzamche* translates roughly to ‘Under the Castle’, so named because it sits at the foot of the hill on which the City’s first fortified outpost was built.
1.1 History

The history of L’viv is characterized by almost countless changes in political leadership, each of which has imparted a distinct impression on the City’s urban topography. The following section outlines and offers insights into the tumultuous 750-year history of human habitation of the City, beginning with its first appearance in the historical record in 1256 and continuing through the creation of the modern state of Ukraine in 1991.

1.1.1 Foundation of the City (13th Century)

The City was given the name L’viv in honor of Lev, the son of its founder, Prince Danylo Halitsky, in the middle of the 13th century. Over the course of its history, the city has been known by a variety of names – Lvov, Lwów, Löwenburg, Lemberg, Leopolis – that were chosen to better suit the ruling power’s native tongue, but generally paid tribute to the original name. In modern times, the various names of the City are still commonly used in other European countries as translations of the Ukrainian name2 (Czaplicka 2005).

In the mid-13th century, an existing settlement on the slopes of the modern day Vysoki Zamok hill was fortified to defend the town against Tatar attacks. Situated at the crossroads of historically important trade routes, the settlement rapidly developed into a prosperous city. The City’s early inhabitants were predominantly Orthodox Ruthenian, although King Danylo himself was allied through marriage to the Catholic institutions of Central Europe (Czaplicka 2005).

1.1.2 Polish Rule (1340 – 1772)

Around 1340, the Polish King Casimir III took over the City of L’viv during the Galicia–Volhynia Wars of Succession (Czaplicka 2005). This was the beginning of a lengthy period of Polish Rule, cementing the City as a Catholic stronghold as early as the 15th century (Czaplicka 2005). Following the passage of the Magdeburg Rights in 1357, the City gained an unprecedented degree of autonomy and was quickly established as a multi-cultural merchant city with a thriving trade industry (Czaplicka 2005). A large, rectilinear central Rynok (market) flanked by a town hall became the focal point of local businesses, and quickly became dominated by Western European Catholic traders (Czaplicka 2005).

This period of Polish rule witnessed a dramatic diversification of L’viv’s population, as foreign nationals were granted the legal right to settle in the City’s periphery (Czaplicka 2005). This ethnic diversity, and competition between different cultural groups, ultimately led to the construction of many non-catholic churches in the City, many of which still hold significance today. The Orthodox Dormition Church (Figure 1.3), built on Ruthenian Street, and the Armenian Cathedral of the Dormition, on Armenian Street, are visual testaments to the ethnic divisions within the City during the period (Zhuk 2005).

---

2 For example, the City is commonly referred to as Lwow in Poland, and Lemberg in Germany and Austria.
1.1.3  The Austro-Hungarian Empire (1772-1918)

Following the first Partition of Poland in 1772, the City of Lviv became the capital of the Habsburg province Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria, the largest province of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Czaplicka 2005). Under Habsburg rule, the City experienced rapid population growth and was transformed into a modern imperial center, serving important administrative and military functions. The newfound prominence led to the establishment of Lviv as a major cultural center and transportation hub within the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Czaplicka 2005). As a result of its largely Germanic urban landscape and its important administrative role in the Kingdom of Galicia, the City was affectionately referred to as the ‘little Vienna of the East’ (Hrytsak 2005).

In the 19th century, the Habsburgs began to liberate settlements of Ruthenian peasants within the City walls in order to undermine the increasing Polish influence over the City. The increased autonomy of various ethnic groups within the city led to the development of parallel administrative institutions and fierce competition for power between its Jewish, Polish and Ukrainian inhabitants (Czaplicka 2005). Each ethnic group fought to establish their own cultural and educational facilities as symbols of place-based identity, leading to the construction of many of the most prominent cultural institutions in the City today3 (Czaplicka 2005).

1.1.4  Lviv - 1918 to 1991

Following World War I, Lviv experienced a brief period of Polish rule. Census statistics from the inter-war period indicate a wide ethnic diversity in the City, with inhabitants of Polish, Jewish and Ukrainian ancestry making up the largest proportions of the population, respectively (Bechtel 2006). In 1941, Nazi troops gained control of the City, ending a short period of Soviet rule that began with the onset of World War II. During the period of German power from 1941 to 1944, nearly all of the City’s Jewish inhabitants fell victim to genocide, and all but two of the 42 synagogues were destroyed (Bechtel 2006), virtually erasing all physical remnants of the strong Jewish influence on the City’s history.

Following World War II, Lviv was incorporated into the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. The mass murder of Lviv’s Jewish population by the Nazis and the forced eviction of Poles by the Soviets led to a near complete loss of the City’s multicultural character and a majority of its population (Tscherkes 2005, Bechtel 2006). Immediately following the War, the City was repopulated by an influx of rural immigrants from the surrounding Ukrainian countryside (Hrytsak and Susak 2003). During the era of Soviet rule, the city was redeveloped as an industrial center, with many large Soviet prefabricated apartment blocks erected in the periphery of the historic City, and advertised by the Soviet administration as ‘the New Lviv’ (Hrytsak and Susak 2003, p. 143).

1.1.5  Lviv Today

In 1991, Lviv became part of the independent Ukraine. Despite centuries of multi-cultural influences, contemporary Lviv can be considered a homogeneous Ukrainian city with a decidedly Western orientation. Despite its new European values, Lviv is thought of as a declarative, nostalgic reconstruction of the ‘golden age’ in the minds of its inhabitants (Czaplicka 2005). With independence and the ongoing transition to a market economy, most of the large industrial sites have been abandoned. The City’s current development strategy is to establish Lviv as a scientific, cultural and tourist destination to spur economic development (BUS 2008).

Today, Lviv is home to approximately 725,000 inhabitants, with nearly 88% of residents identifying themselves as ethnically Ukrainian (State Statistics Committee of Ukraine 2004). Since 1993, Lviv has

3  For example, the Lviv Theater of Opera and Ballet (the Opera House) and The Maria Zankovet’ski Drama Theater were both built during this period.
witnessed a population decrease of nearly 10% (BUS 2008), placing the city in a problematic situation familiar to many other transitional cities: attempting to replace a formerly industrial economy amidst a shrinking population.

**EURO 2012**

As one of the eight cities in Poland and the Ukraine to host the matches of the 14th Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) European Football Championship (EURO 2012), L'viv will receive a degree of international exposure that is unprecedented in the City’s recent history. While being at the center of the European spotlight for the nearly one-month duration of the tournament is certain to have some positive impacts on the City, hosting the tournament itself is not without its costs. In preparation, the municipality has made enormous investments in the City’s physical infrastructure, including the construction of a new stadium, development of roads and the extension of the airport; the stadium construction alone cost an estimated cost €200 million, with the majority of funding guaranteed by the City (Tillman 2011).

1.2 **L’viv and UNESCO World Heritage**

The idea of creating a movement to protect the physical representations of the world’s most significant cultural achievements entered the international dialogue in the wake of the destruction of the First World War (UNESCO 2011a). However, it would be more than 50 years until, in 1972, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) established the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (The World Heritage Convention). The ratification of the Convention represents the first international charter with the aim of safeguarding properties that represent outstanding values to the international community (Widmer 2008).

The World Heritage Convention defines Cultural World Heritage as: monuments, groups of buildings, and sites ‘of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science and from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view’ (UNESCO 1972, p. 2). To be eligible for inclusion in UNESCO’s Cultural World Heritage List, sites must meet at least one of the first six criteria established by the World Heritage Convention.4

1.2.1 **The UNESCO Criteria for L’viv**

In December 1998, L’viv was included in the World Heritage List based on criteria (ii)5 and (iv)6 of the World Heritage Convention (Figure 1.4). In its justification for the City’s inclusion, the World Heritage Committee cited the fusion of architectural and artistic traditions of the Eastern Europe with those of Italy and Germany throughout the historic center, as well as the continuing evidence of different ethnic groups with different cultural and religious traditions that formed independent communities within the city (UNESCO 1998). L’viv’s unique heritage is also recognized on the national level, with 11% of the Ukraine’s architectural and cultural heritage sites located within the City (BUS 2008).

---

4 For a complete documentation of the criteria for inclusion in the Cultural and Natural World Heritage Lists, refer to UNESCO 1972.
5 Criterion (ii): ‘to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design’ (UNESCO 2011b);
6 Criterion (iv): ‘to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history’ (UNESCO 2011b).
1.2.2 Concerns Regarding the Overall State of Conservation

After more than 10 years on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee expressed ‘deep concern regarding the overall state of conservation of the property, and in particular, serious changes to the urban fabric and considerable threat to the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property’ (UNESCO 2010, p. 148). The decision urges the State of Ukraine and the City to adopt the necessary measures to safeguard the integrity and authenticity of the property, including developing more substantive guidelines for the restoration and conservation of the urban fabric (UNESCO 2010). The committee further warned that, should effective measures not be taken to address the concerns described above, the site could be included in the List of World Heritage Sites in Danger as early as 2011 (UNESCO 2010, p.149). As of July 2011, the Historical Ensemble of L’viv has not been listed as endangered (UNESCO 2011c).

1.2.3 Public Awareness and Current Status of Built Heritage in L’viv

According to a socio-economic survey conducted in 2009 as part of the Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)’ cooperation project Municipal Development and Rehabilitation of the Old City of L’viv, 79.1% of L’viv residents have heard about the City’s UNESCO World Heritage designation. This level of awareness reportedly rises to nearly 100% for those respondents living in the City Center (GTZ 2009). Although all respondents in the survey considered the rehabilitation of the historical districts to be important, the condition of many buildings leaves much to be desired.

After the much-proclaimed independence of Ukraine in 1991, the ownership of most apartments in L’viv was transferred from the state to the residents. However, communal spaces within the buildings, such as staircases, facades and roofs, remained in public hands (BUS 2008). The resulting complex ownership structure and unclear responsibilities with regard to maintenance, combined with ‘post-Soviet’ mindsets of certain groups in society, inadequate administrative structures, insufficient financial resources and a lack of a consensus regarding the importance of built heritage, have led to a backlog of necessary repair work, inappropriate and insensitive interventions, deteriorating living conditions and, ultimately, a severely endangered cultural heritage (Figure 1.5).
1.3 The GIZ cooperation project: “Municipal Development and Rehabilitation of the Old City of L'viv”

The GIZ cooperation project: “Municipal Development and Rehabilitation of the Old City of L'viv” is the result of an official agreement between the Ukrainian and German governments in 2008. It is being implemented by the City of L'viv and the Heritage Department of the City of L'viv in partnership with the GIZ.

The overall objective of the project is to manage the urban renewal of the old city of L'viv sustainably and efficiently. Project aims are: (i) to strengthen the local government and other stakeholders in the urban renewal process; (ii) to improve the living conditions of the residents in the focus area; and (iii) to strengthen the economic development of the city. The project is divided into two phases. The first, and current phase began in June 2009 and is to end in December 2012. The results and lessons learned during this phase will be the basis for the program of the second, follow-up phase.

The first phase focusses on the following topics:

• To ensure the sustainability of the project, the development of new instruments for urban regeneration is crucial. The project is advising municipal officers on how to improve procedures that make sure that work in heritage areas is historically sensitive and is carried out in efficient and sustainable ways.

• With support from the project, the City administration has set up an Action Committee involving all municipal departments in order to coordinate the regeneration of the historic parts of the town. In April 2011, the City Council adopted an ‘Integrated Development Concept for the Old City of L'viv’ (in greater detail below); furthermore, the development of design guidelines regulating building measures is about to be completed. Since September 2010, owners can apply for a program to co-finance restoration works.

• In order to strengthen citizens’ awareness of and involvement with L'viv’s historical built heritage, the project informs residents how historically sensitive repair and renovation is vital to preserving this nationally and internationally recognized cultural treasure for the benefit of present-day citizens and future generations. In addition to flyers and leaflets, press conferences and television interviews, the team organizes citizens’ workshops to provide local residents with information and a platform for voicing concerns and opinions on the development of the historic inner city. The project also supports municipal and other local institutions in organizing international symposia and architectural competitions concerned with the rehabilitation of the historical city.

• The project has initiated a series of programs to increase the stakeholder engagement. Project-trained local architects offer free-of-charge advice to owners and residents on the technical, financial and legal aspects of renovating historical buildings. The establishment of homeowners and tenants associations is being encouraged to promote effective long-term cooperation between building occupants.

• To overcome the shortage of relevant expertise, local craftsmen are offered training in restoration skills. Trainees ‘learn-by-doing’ by carrying out pilot restorations under supervision. So far, participants have been involved in the on-site restoration of historical doors, gateways and staircases, the repair and restoration of historical window frames, the restoration of historical murals, and the repair and preservation of stonework facade features. After training, several of the participants have established businesses offering specialist historical building renovation services. In addition, participants are offered courses on business management and on passing their learning on to others (‘training of trainers’). The introduction of building restoration courses in local vocational institutions is also being encouraged and supported.
As mentioned above, part of the GIZ’s involvement is the elaboration and implementation of an Integrated development concept for the historical inner city of Lviv (IDC). The IDC specifies certain pre-existing general objectives and planning strategies of the urban development, particularly the ‘Sustainable Development Strategy of the City of L’viv’ and the ‘Strategic Plan of the Preservation of the Historic City of L’viv’, on the basis of the General Master Plan of L’viv. The IDC describes all the important actions and projects to develop the Historic City for the next 10 years. It distinguishes between ongoing projects, short, medium and long-term measures, as well as elaborating on project ideas. The implementation of these projects is then a function of available funding and support by the City Council, other public institutions and additional local stakeholders. The IDC identifies projects and activities in the areas of: (i) cultural heritage; (ii) public space; (iii) transport and technical infrastructure; (iv) tourism and culture; (v) business and retail; and (vi) social issues and education (City of L’viv and GIZ 2011).

1.4 The Focus Area of the TU-GIZ Collaboration Project

The primary restoration efforts undertaken by the City of L’viv are focused in the City Center, primarily around the Rynok (market) Square surrounding the City Hall. The neighborhood in which this case study was carried out (hitherto referred to as the focus area) is situated immediately north of the City Center, and is considerably less visited despite its historical importance (Figure 1.10). The area is often referred to as Pidzamche, meaning ‘below the castle’, so named because it sits at the base of the Vysoki Zamok, the former location of the first fortified settlement in L’viv. However, there is some disagreement regarding the exact geographic boundaries of the Pidzamche neighborhood and the name is not ubiquitously applied to the focus area.
The urban fabric of the focus area is characterized by gently sloping hills, especially in the east. 

Photo credit: E. Linderkamp (2011).
Upon first glance, the area differs dramatically from the surrounding cityscape. The urban fabric is diverse and less dense, with the layout of streets defined by the hilly topography (Figure 1.11). The irregularity of the landscape provides more green and open spaces than in other parts of L’viv’s inner city, creating a suburban or almost village-like atmosphere throughout much of the neighborhood. However, the buildings are becoming dilapidated and the inhabitants are largely living on or near subsistence level incomes. Although the focus area is home to some historically significant points of interest and roughly half is included in the UNESCO Heritage Area, inadequate physical connections to the oft-visited City Center inhibit more widespread tourist traffic. Strategies for improvement of the area are lacking and funds are scarce. Generally speaking, the area is neglected and currently suffers, rather than benefits, from its proximity to the City Center.

For the reasons mentioned above, the neighborhood was selected as focus area for this collaborative study between the Technische Universität Berlin (TU Berlin) Urban Management Program (UM) and the GIZ cooperation project Municipal Development and Rehabilitation of the Old City of L’viv. The primary goals of the research project were to develop an understanding of the specific characteristics of the focus area as a whole and develop strategies for its sustainable urban regeneration.
1.5 Research Timeline of the TU-GIZ Cooperation Project

The work detailed in this report was conducted in four phases: (i) preparation; (ii) fieldwork; (iii) strategy development and (iv) documentation and report writing. The outcomes of each step are based upon knowledge acquired during the previous stages of investigation. Section 1.0 serves as a summary of the preparatory phase of the project, while fieldwork analysis and the elaboration of strategies and pilot projects for urban regeneration are documented in Section 2.0 and Section 3.0 of this report, respectively.

Preparation (April 18 - May 3, 2011 - Berlin, Germany)

The preparatory phase was used to investigate several critical topics to provide a basis for subsequent phases of field research. The preparation consisted of secondary research and discussions with external experts concerning the topics of urban demographics and economy, history and identity, urban planning and administrative structures and international best practices for the urban regeneration of historical sites. Also during this phase, research teams were formed consisting of 3-4 young professionals with different disciplinary backgrounds. Each team developed the research methods and approaches for the forthcoming fieldwork.

Fieldwork (May 15 - May 22, 2011 - L’viv, Ukraine)

During the fieldwork phase, all teams conducted primary research focusing on five thematic topics (buildings, open space, residents, mobility, local economy) relating to daily life and historic regeneration within the focus area. Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected, and used to compile a detailed SWOT analysis for each of the thematic research topics. On the basis of the thematic fieldwork and analysis, an integrated SWOT analysis combining all relevant issues was made within the context of a broader, inter-sectoral framework.

Strategy Development (May 23 - May 28, 2011 - L’viv, Ukraine)

During the conceptual strategy development phase, a general framework of objectives for urban regeneration of the focus area was developed and ultimately incorporated into an integrated development vision. Based on the generalized framework set out in the integrated vision, detailed strategies and activities for urban regeneration were developed as potential pilot projects to be employed within the focus area. Altogether, six pilot projects were developed by newly formed, mixed groups, and relate to the topics of: (i) management of new physical interventions; (ii) improvement of non-motorized mobility; (iii) improvement of governance for neighborhood rehabilitation; (iv) improvement of the Dobrobut Market; (v) creation of a community platform in Sv. Theodora Square; and (vi) historical remembrance in Staryi Rynok (old market).

Documentation and Report Writing (May 30 - June 30, 2011 - Berlin, Germany)

During this phase the analytical and strategic work conducted in L’viv was documented and this report was written.
2 Field Work and Analysis
Prior to arrival in L'viv, five research themes were established with the assistance of the GIZ as a means of dividing the fieldwork and initial analysis equally among the researchers. Care was taken to select thematic topics that were both manageable within the project’s limited temporal scope and broad enough to be reasonably comprehensive when the findings were integrated. Research topics were divided into the groups of: (i) **buildings**, analyzing general condition and usage and contribution to the urban fabric; (ii) **open space**, examining the uses and quality of public and communally owned spaces; (iii) **residents**, evaluating resident perceptions and identity within the city; (iv) **mobility**, considering vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns and general connectivity to the rest of the city; and (v) **local economy**, assessing the types and functions of local businesses.

From May 18 through May 20, groups of three to four researchers conducted fieldwork related to one of the five thematic topics described above. Research was conducted within and directly adjacent to the focus area utilizing research methodologies appropriate for the topic of interest, including interviews, surveys, inventories, rapid assessment and participatory mapping activities. Interviews and surveys were conducted primarily using Ukrainian language translation provided by local student volunteers.

The fieldwork was followed by a period of rapid data processing that was used to formulate some initial determinations about the focus area and to develop tools to assist in further analysis. Perhaps the most crucial outcome of the data processing was the development of thematic **SWOT Analyses**, assessing the focus area’s **strengths**, **weaknesses**, **opportunities** and **threats** with regard to the research theme. Following the analysis, all thematic results were combined into an Integrated SWOT Analysis, which was subsequently used as a basis for formulating a vision for the urban regeneration of the area.

---

**SWOT Analyses**

Developed in the 1960s, the SWOT Analysis is an initial assessment tool used widely in strategic planning as a means of identifying strong and weak points within a given area. The SWOT is designed to simultaneously interpret and balance the internal factors and external quality and characteristics of the field of study. The internal analysis, represented by **strengths** and **weaknesses**, are those factors that can be seen as an asset or obstruction to the achievement of goals. The external analysis, namely **opportunities** and **threats**, considers untapped opportunities and existing threats from the environment and generally makes some grounded generalizations about future development trends and outcomes. The results of the SWOT are then used as a launching point for developing strategies that use existing strengths to exploit opportunities, minimize weaknesses and effectively cope with threats.

Source: Groenendijk (2003)
2.1 Buildings\(^9\)

The physical structures that make up the urban topography of historic L'viv were a critical element in the City’s 1998 inscription on the World Heritage List (UNESCO 1998). The existing urban fabric is a rare reflection of the City’s unique multi-cultural history and imparts a positive image on visitors and residents alike. The authors of this report have conducted a study of the physical structures within the focus area, generating an overview of the different uses, conditions and architectural typologies present.

2.1.1 Research Methodology

The study was conducted using a variety of methodological approaches, including a reconnaissance survey, semi-structured interviews and mapping. The reconnaissance survey utilized the researchers’ architectural and planning expertise to make critical observations regarding the architectural typology and condition of the structures within the focus area. The findings from this survey were then combined with the results of interviews to confirm observations and add a first-hand, qualitative assessment to the research.

---

\(^9\) Written by Poonam Amatya, Seyyedeh Hoda Nabavi and Julita Skodra

Figure 2.6
Land-Use Assessment.
2.1.2 Outcomes

Following the fieldwork, data and observations were placed on maps, to create a generalized visual representation of the built environment of the focus area. These maps were utilized as an analytical tool to draw further conclusions about the quality and significance of structures in the area of study. Results of this analysis and many of the original maps resulting from the fieldwork are included in the section below.

Land Use and Density

The focus area is a predominantly mixed-use neighborhood with a relatively high-share of residential properties. While the distribution of large institutional facilities is disproportionately concentrated in the northwest of the area, other services are more evenly distributed in mixed-use structures (combining commercial and residential space) throughout the neighborhood. Institutional complexes in the area include primary and secondary educational facilities, the Faculty of Law from the Lviv State University of Internal Affairs, government institutions and an in-patient hospital (Figure 2.6).
Ownership

The ownership structure was fundamentally altered following Ukrainian independence in 1991, when the Government of Ukraine launched the Land Reform and Privatization Program (USAID 2006). As a result, property that was state-owned under the Soviet regime was transferred to private property in the hands of respective residents. Generally, three types of building ownership exist within the city: (i) communal buildings with mixed ownership, under the maintenance of ZhEKs (2,200 in Halyzka district); (ii) private buildings, such as hotels and shopping malls; and (iii) condominiums (associations of individual apartment owners from one building, locally referred to as OSBBs), an emerging ownership-management structure in Lviv that remains unimplemented in the focus area.

Building Conditions

In general, the overall condition of the buildings within the focus areas is quite poor (Figure 2.7). The building facades, especially along the southern border with the City Center, reveal the deteriorating state of the neighborhood (Figure 2.8). There was no discernible difference in quality between those buildings located within the World Heritage Area and those to the west.

Ownership

The ownership structure was fundamentally altered following Ukrainian independence in 1991, when the Government of Ukraine launched the Land Reform and Privatization Program (USAID 2006). As a result, property that was state-owned under the Soviet regime was transferred to private property in the hands of respective residents. Generally, three types of building ownership exist within the city: (i) communal buildings with mixed ownership, under the maintenance of ZhEKs (2,200 in Halyzka district); (ii) private buildings, such as hotels and shopping malls; and (iii) condominiums (associations of individual apartment owners from one building, locally referred to as OSBBs), an emerging ownership-management structure in Lviv that remains unimplemented in the focus area.

Most residential buildings have a mixed ownership structure, with individual apartments owned by the residents, and the municipality maintaining ownership of the common areas such as the roof, facade and staircases. This complex ownership structure has had negative impacts on the physical condition of the buildings and restoration processes. Residents generally feel as if they have fulfilled their responsibilities towards building maintenance by paying monthly dues to the ZhEK, but both the ZhEKs and
the municipality lack the available resources to maintain the City’s large building stock. Courtyards, also owned by the municipality, are largely neglected residential spaces within the focus area, with only a few well-maintained examples identified by the researchers.

Maintenance
The ZhEKs, communal enterprises inherited from the former soviet regime, are responsible for the maintenance of public property within buildings\(^1\). Seven different ZhEKs provide service to the Halyzka district, the administrative unit in which the focus area is located. The ZhEKs are supposed to regularly inspect the buildings within their coverage area and maintain a database of prioritized repair needs, taking residents’ notifications into consideration. Buildings with maintenance issues, such as water leaks, that could quickly lead to increased property damage are listed as high priority repairs. Those buildings that pose a less immediate threat are placed on a waiting list.

The restoration budget is distributed based on the priority list; however, the current annual financial allotments for restoration work covers only 5% of the financing actually needed for the Halyzka district as a whole\(^2\). The majority of the World Heritage Site, including the eastern portion of the focus area, is maintained by a single ZhEK known as Staryi L’viv (Old L’viv). The large burden for historical renovations carried by a single ZhEK has two rather undesirable consequences: (i) the required restoration works are too extensive for one minimally staffed unit; and (ii) the City Center is the dominant draw for renovation investment, leading to the substantial neglect of the focus area.

2.1.3 SWOT Analysis

The findings of the field research were used to formulate a SWOT analysis. The thematic SWOT analysis provides an overview of the critical issues relating to the buildings and urban fabric within the focus area, and reflects the potential for restoration and improvement of physical structures. For a complete description of the SWOT analysis developed specifically for the residential components of the focus area, please refer to Table 2.1.

**Strengths**

One of the main strengths of the focus area is its cultural significance, developed primarily as a result of the rich historic, aesthetic and social heritage interwoven into the urban fabric. The roots of the city of L’viv are in the focus area, making the neighborhood a place of exceptional importance in the City. The area also presents wonderfully preserved urban blocks with historic buildings, maintaining a veritable snapshot of the City’s history. An overlap of a map of the neighborhood produced in 1844 with a present urban layout shows that the urban

\(^1\) The ZhEKs have several additional responsibilities within the City, including collecting service fees for utility usage and cleaning the streets.

\(^2\) Information obtained in a May 23, 2011 interview with Ms. Iryna Maruniak.
fabric of the neighborhood has remained reasonably unchanged (Figure 2.9). The architecture of the study area strongly reflects the various styles, historic periods and cultures of the different ethnic groups who have dominated the city’s development over the last several hundred years.

The medieval urban layout and well-preserved religious complexes (notably St. John the Baptist Church, St. Nicholas Church, St. Onufriy’s Monastery, Church of All Saints and Church of Maria the Snowy) currently draw some tourist activity to the area. The medieval layout has developed into a compact urban layout, with widely diverse public and private land-use. Overall, the charming urban fabric combined with an appropriate ratio of built and open space present significant opportunities for future development, especially for the central part of the focus area. In addition to the rich urban fabric, this area has very good access to the City Center in the south of the focus area.

**Weaknesses**
The complex ownership structure of buildings seems to have led to considerable neglect, especially of residential units within the focus area. This continued
neglect has led to a number of buildings outside the heritage protection zone falling into dilapidated states and losing their monetary and historical value. The sites of the destroyed Synagogues have been transformed into green spaces or playgrounds; although the City has mounted a few plaques, no substantial monuments or memorials have been erected at the sites to recognize the cultural significance of these spaces (Figure 2.10).

Physical barriers, such as the railroad in the north and busy arterial roads in the south and west, hamper access to the neighborhood, creating a feeling of isolation in the neighborhood, despite its geographical centrality. Furthermore, as in all centralized systems, there are difficulties in solving localized problems. In this case, restoration regulations and difficulties in securing finances for the required interventions have inhibited the City of L’viv’s ability to implement a comprehensive development strategy for the area.

**Opportunities**
The well-developed mixed-use urban structure and presence of important public and economic institutions in the area present an opportunity to develop new businesses with the potential to enhance the self-reliability of the neighborhood. Though no OSBBs currently exist in the area, they have gained some traction in other parts of the City and represent a certain potential to renovate a number of historic structures. The few positive examples of renovation and the positive attitude of the inhabitants create a reasonable foundation for development projects.

**Threats**
The poor condition of most of the buildings, mainly due to the complicated ownership structure and inefficiency of ZhEKS, may lead to further deterioration if not the eventual collapse of buildings. The lack of concerted renovation activities by the ZhEK has led to a large number of resident initiatives making repairs to the exterior of their buildings; unfortunately, many of the construction methods and materials used for these repairs are contrary to reconstruction principles applied to UNESCO Heritage landscapes.

**SWOT-Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengths</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weaknesses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus area as the birthplace of the city, with significant landmarks and valuable buildings; Unique and attractive urban fabric; Mixed-use planning, with existing public services and economic functions within the area; Part of the area on the UNESCO World Heritage Site; Good ratio of built to open space; Numerous, varied green spaces; Proximity to the City Center; Positive individual examples of renovation; and Positive attitude of inhabitants towards development.</td>
<td>Dilapidated condition of buildings; ZhEK cannot meet demand for maintenance and restoration; Island situation created by physical barriers between the focus area and surrounding neighborhoods; Fragmented ownership of buildings; Noisy, obstructive railroad tracks in the north; Bad condition of buildings closest to City Center, which is a deterrent to prospective visitors; Individual home repairs not in accordance with historical conservation guidelines; and Damage to buildings and infrastructure caused by the covered River Poltva.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opportunities**

- Extension of the City Center towards the focus area;
- Tourism development, by linking the Opera and Vysoki Zamok to the area;
- Potential for establishing a condominium ownership structure in residential buildings; and
- Willingness of local government to improve the area.

**Threats**

- Lack of clear strategy and budget for restoration;
- Lack of restoration regulation;
- Lack of interest for private investments in buildings;
- Long, complicated decision-making process;
- Collapse of buildings; and
- Demolition of the Market and surrounding buildings, according to the Master Plan.
2.2 **Open Spaces**

The quality, spatial distribution and maintenance of open spaces should be considered of equal importance to any other feature of the urban topography (Figures 2.15 + 2.16). This section details the fieldwork and findings of an assessment of the varying types, uses and quality of the open spaces within the focus area. For the sake of this report, *open space* is defined as any park, playground, greenery, sidewalk or plaza with potential for public use.

### 2.2.1 Research Methodology

Several methodological approaches were employed during the analysis of open spaces in the focus area. The research team used *observations* to determine different typologies of open spaces, their quality and uses, which were used to create a *detailed inventory* of the open spaces throughout the focus area as a whole. Qualitative data was derived from *interviews* with residents in various open spaces within the focus area and was used to corroborate observations and analyze local perceptions related to open space.

### 2.2.2 Outcomes

**Observation and Inventory**

Open spaces within the focus area were classified according to four criteria: (i) function, analyzed by the physical form and facilities available at each space; (ii) physical quality, regarding the condition of facilities, paving and general maintenance; (iii) connectivity to other areas, based on their potential as connection points to other areas; and (iv) activity, based on the type and intensity of use of the space. The tabulated results of the survey and observations are provided in Figure 2.17.

The outcomes of the observation have been summarized as three main findings. First, many open spaces

---
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within the focus area have no clearly delineated function. It could be said that these plots have the greatest potential to be developed in accordance with local demands. Second, some specific open spaces hold potential as areas of connection with other points of interest within the City, such as the City Center and Vysoki Zamok. Third, the intensity of use and activities in many plots within the focus area indicate potential for the future development of these plots.

Interviews
Data gathered during interviews conducted within the focus area indicates that the catchment area for users of open space reaches well beyond the area of study. The proportion of open space users reportedly living within the focus area was roughly equal to those living outside the focus area. This suggests that the open spaces within the focus area are quite popular amongst residents of surrounding neighborhoods, and act as a draw for the neighborhood as a whole. Reasons for visiting the open spaces ranged from casual meetings with friends, parents and guardians supervising a child’s recreational activities, sport (especially for younger generations) and leisure.

Evidence from the interviews does not point to a clear consensus with regard to the residents’ willingness to contribute to the maintenance of open spaces. Less than half of the respondents expressed willingness to participate in the renovation and maintenance of the parks and playgrounds, with a small but vocal minority asserting that such activities were the responsibility of the Halyzka District Administration, not the citizens. A majority of respondents expressed sentiments that the district office should invest more resources in improving the area’s open spaces. Respondents frequently pointed to the poor quality of benches, absence of waste bins and inadequate tree canopy as being most in need of attention (Figure 2.18). Additionally, a large number of respondents expressed concern regarding the quality of playgrounds and recreational parks, indicating that they should be repaved as a means of beautification and to increase safety for children and the elderly.

Respondents also pointed to the behavior of private vehicle owners as negatively impacting the quality of the public space. Many respondents expressed the opinion that parking, both in registered street spaces (legal) and on the sidewalks (illegal), should be reduced to the minimum level possible in order to lessen pollution and other negative implications associated with motorized vehicles. The suggestion was also made that the installation of speed bumps along the roads adjacent to parks could reduce vehicle speed and significantly contribute to increased public safety.

Furthermore, a large percentage of mothers interviewed during the fieldwork expressed concerns over the issue of security within open spaces. However, there is no official data to support that crime poses an imminent threat to public safety in the area, and no overtly suspicious activities were observed.

![Figure 2.16 Examples of Well-managed Open Spaces in the Focus Area. Photo credit: L. Born (2011).](image-url)
Figure 2.17
Classification of Open Spaces in the Focus Area.

Figure 2.18
A poorly managed playground between Syans'ka Street and Pidmuma Street (left), and a playground used as an informal dump (right). Photos credits: E. Mutuku (2011).
2.2.3 SWOT Analysis

On the basis of available information, a thematic SWOT analysis for open space was made. The current open space situation is not good, mainly in terms of physical condition and space amenity. A compiled version of this SWOT analysis is provided as Table 2.2.

**Strengths**

Despite the relatively low quality, open spaces are quite intensively used in the daily lives of local residents as gathering points, playgrounds, and leisure facilities (Figure 2.19). The high proportion of open spaces in the neighborhood and the proximity of these areas to historic sites is an important asset unique to the focus area. The eastern portion of the area is recognized as part of the World Heritage Site, which has tremendous potential to attract both locals and tourists alike. Meanwhile, the location of open spaces and the willingness of locals to contribute to the improvement of these spaces can be seen as positive factors for the rehabilitation of the neighborhood.

**Weaknesses**

The physical and psychological disconnection between open spaces and the prevalence of underdeveloped open space within the focus area significantly detract from the potential quality of these spaces. Poor paving, physical barriers and lack of universal accessibility within open spaces create difficult access to many of the neighborhood’s public destinations, especially for children and the disabled. Most street furniture is in very poor condition, which prevents its usage. Increasingly, many of the open spaces are being used as disposal sites for solid waste, substantially decreasing their quality.

*Figure 2.19*  
A recently renovated playground in the focus area.  
Photo credit: E. Mutuku (2011).
and potentially leading to public health problems. Some open spaces, especially those located in the northern portion of the focus area, are gated and have no clearly defined use for the community.

As already mentioned in the Building-SWOT, the open spaces that were formed on the sites of demolished synagogues following the Nazi era do not function satisfactorily as places of remembrance.

**Opportunities**

The clearly defined relationship between open spaces and the public transportation system can be advantageous in creating a more congruent network of the open spaces. Certain areas within the neighborhood, notably **Sv. Theodora Square**, with its rich history, human scale architecture and existing greenery, hold immense potential for future development as high-quality, multi-purpose public spaces. Furthermore, the **Dobrobut Market** and the surrounding open spaces hold potential for further development, which can increase the residents’ quality of life, and substantially improve the image of the neighborhood within the City. In particular, the plots of former synagogues have high potential for improvement and consequently achieving more local recognition and eventually future tourist development. Though not universal, the willingness of a large number of members of the community to participate in the improvement of open spaces can be seen as an opportunity to create a network of open space and contribute to the subsequent maintenance of these spaces. In addition, the high share of open spaces, compared to the very dense inner city, and diverse street structure inside the focus area will be an advantage in creating attractive open spaces as a unique feature of the neighborhood.

---

*Figure 2.20*

Open Space in the Focus Area.  
*Photo credit: C. Zehner (2011).*
Threats
The advanced state of deterioration of many public spaces within the focus area can be seen as an indication that such open spaces are undervalued by the Halyzka District Administration. Lack of security in open spaces is perceived as a threat to many residents of the area. In particular, activities associated with the Millennium Nightclub are considered to be especially detrimental to Sv. Theodora Square during the late evening and night. Dilapidated buildings near the Market also negatively affect the neighborhood’s atmosphere. Most residents expressed concern regarding traffic through the neighborhood, which is considered especially threatening to children using local playgrounds.

SWOT-Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Part of World Heritage Site;</td>
<td>• Lack of dedicated bicycle lanes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traces of historical square near the Market;</td>
<td>• Facilities are unaccommodating to physically challenged people;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Popularity of open spaces;</td>
<td>• Lack of child-friendly traffic control;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High-share of open spaces;</td>
<td>• Lack of street furniture, parking lots, and pavement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diverse uses of open spaces;</td>
<td>• Open spaces used as dump sites for solid waste;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historic significance and value of open spaces;</td>
<td>• Fragmented open spaces without appropriate connections;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents’ willingness to use open spaces;</td>
<td>• Gated and restricted open spaces;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intensity of different outdoor activities (commercial, leisure, child care); and</td>
<td>• Diverse but undefined open spaces;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proximity to Vysoki Zamok, the main recreational area in the northern part of the City.</td>
<td>• Deteriorated and unused open spaces;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Squares next to tram or bus stops;</td>
<td>• Further dilapidation of buildings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large underutilized open space next to existing night club;</td>
<td>• Traffic as a hazard to public safety;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvement of connectivity with Vysoki Zamok;</td>
<td>• Illicit activities associated with night club;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents’ willingness to participate;</td>
<td>• Further deterioration of open space;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visualization of history in open spaces;</td>
<td>• Increasing loss of open spaces to vehicle parking; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participatory strategies for maintenance of open space;</td>
<td>• Non-recognition of historical significance and cultural value of open spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvement and re-qualification of open spaces;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of new uses for open spaces;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open spaces integrated into mobility networks;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open spaces as catalysts for positive development of the area. (e.g. development of open spaces of former synagogues will value the importance of the sites and can attract more tourists)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2
Open Spaces SWOT Analysis.

Page 48-49:
Figure 2.21-2.24
Empty lot on the ground of a former synagogue (top left).
Empty lot in the focus area (bottom left).
Playground near Sv. Theodora Square (top right).
Enterance to the Church of All Saints (former Benedictian Roman Catholic Church) at Vicheva Street (bottom right).
2.3 Residents

In order to adequately account for the social aspects of the focus area, a portion of the fieldwork was dedicated to assessing residents’ perceptions of and roles within the neighborhood. A 2009 survey commissioned by the GIZ effectively established a base-line quantitative analysis of socio-economic status and other characteristics of residents within the focus area. The empirical research conducted as part of this report was designed to supplement the existing knowledge base with a more qualitative assessment of quality of living and perceptions of residents about their neighborhood.

2.3.1 Research Methodology

The fieldwork conducted for this section was undertaken with a mixed-method approach (Denscombe 2007). The primary method of resident interviews (35 semi-structured, open-answer dialogues with individuals and small groups, chosen through a non-probability sampling technique) was supplemented with mental mapping (Lynch, 1960). This is done as as a means to provide insight into the respondent’s perception of important features within the neighborhood and as an initial assessment of residential awareness of the neighborhood’s historical

---

Figure 2.25
Location of Resident Interviews
Red and green dots indicate the location of interviews conducted between May 18 and May 20, 2011. Though efforts were made to equally distribute interviews throughout the focus area, the low residential population and high refusal rates in the northwest contributed to poor interview coverage in the area.
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2.3.2 Outcomes

Infrastructure
When asked specifically about the main changes to the neighborhood in recent years, respondents primarily noted improvements to physical infrastructure undertaken by the municipality. Repairs to the roadways, playground construction and improvement of street lighting and waste management systems were regularly identified by respondents as positive changes. Despite the highly visible improvements to infrastructure in recent years, when questioned about what neighborhood changes they would like to see in the future, the great majority mentioned they would improve the condition of streets and buildings and increase the number of parks and playgrounds. Continuous degradation and neglect of buildings and facades are still seen as negative transformations.

Community Meeting Points
When asked about the main places to gather within the neighborhood, respondents consistently mentioned the courtyards and communal spaces of their own residential buildings, Vysoki Zamok Park, other local parks and squares, churches and the City Center. With the exception of the religious organizations, none of the respondents were aware of any community centers within the neighborhood. The most commonly mentioned gathering places seem to mirror those sites associated with the perceived uniqueness of the neighborhood within Lviv. Vysoki Zamok Park, the proximity to the City Center and to other regions of the city and the relative quiet of the area were mentioned as favorable qualities unique to the focus area. Moreover, the historical significance of the neighborhood and the relevance and beauty of the old buildings or historical structures, especially those of religious significance, appear to factor heavily in the neighborhood’s image.

Social Cohesion
Residents were also given a number of questions that sought to assess the relationship between neighbors and identify the existing social networks within the community. A majority of respondents reported having frequent conversations with their neighbors regarding the condition of their buildings. However, a large number of residents cited that these conversations were pointless, as repairs are generally initiated on an individual basis. Perhaps as a result of the former political regime, the sense of neighborhood community remains fairly undeveloped, with only basic reliance on neighbors for day-to-day needs, but no direct cooperative action. Most, but not all, respondents reported good, trusting relationships with their neighbors. Additionally, research also identified recent demographic shifts that have resulted in a more diverse and mixed social configuration, especially due to the incorporation of younger families into the community.

Community Identity
During interviews, it became apparent that the application of the name Pidzamche to the focus area is likely erroneous. Most respondents indicated that Pidzamche is a formerly industrial neighborhood
located immediately north of the focus area, but does not continue south of the railroad tracks (Figure 2.25). Generally, there appears to be limited agreement on the name of the focus area itself. When asked what the neighborhood was called, a majority of respondents reported the name of the street on which they reside, stating that there is no administrative or commonly used name for the area. In the area of Staryi Rynok, a number of respondents reported that the area was called Central L’viv, but did not make any clear distinction with the area south of Torhova Street, despite the dramatic difference in urban fabric.

**Condominium Ownership**

When asked about their opinions regarding the formation of OSBB (owners associations; condominiums) in their buildings, most were aware of the concept and viewed the idea favorably, but reported that they had never openly discussed the idea with their neighbors. A large number of respondents held the opinion that an OSBB in their building would probably function better than the ZhEK, especially with regard to solving the smaller maintenance issues that arise within a building. Primary impediments to the formation of OSBBs were identified as a perceived lack of motivated young leaders required.
for implementation and operation of such association, as well as resistance from the elderly residents. Moreover, several respondents expressed the sentiment that OSBBs were more likely to be successful in new, large structures within the city.

**Renovation Processes**

In general, results point to feelings of powerlessness among residents with regard to neighborhood renovation. Although the younger generation generally expressed a more positive outlook towards the future, the elderly, especially those whose livelihoods are threatened by the rising cost-of-living and their stagnant subsistence-level income, seem skeptical. Despite these feelings of powerlessness, the women’s role in residential buildings deserves special attention, as they appear to effectively organize the repair efforts in the focus area.

**Security**

With regard to neighborhood safety, none of the respondents mentioned crime as a negative aspect of the neighborhood until directly asked. However, when asked, a majority of respondents reported that the neighborhood was not safe. The residents’ perception of crime within the neighborhood seems to contradict the findings of the 2009 GIZ survey, with large number of respondents reporting that the neighborhood was not particularly safe.

**Unesco World Heritage**

The primary outcome from the mental mapping exercises was related to the awareness of the UNESCO World Heritage site boundaries within the neighborhood. Although residents generally displayed a keen awareness of historical structures and places of interest within the city, the *Historical Ensemble of L’viv* was usually identified as the City Center.

The rapid assessment survey was administered to 94 individuals in the focus area. Survey results generally support the 2009 GIZ Survey findings, with a reasonably high percentage of respondents (61%) reporting awareness of L’viv’s UNESCO status. However, a much smaller number of respondents (25%) positively identified the focus area as partially within the Historic Ensemble. Resident awareness of the actual boundaries of the World Heritage Site also appears to be geographically dependent. Interviews conducted in the southern section of the focus area were approximately twice as likely to correctly identify the official boundaries of the UNESCO area (Figure 2.27).

**Observations Regarding Social Determinants**

Critical observation was employed during interviews and during excursions within the focus area. A banner was identified near a sports park in the southeast of the focus area that called for volunteers and donations for the rehabilitation of the sports ground. The call for volunteers is a positive indication of civil engagement within the community in addition to reflecting perceived impotence of local authorities. Instances of graffiti were also noted in various locations throughout the neighborhood. The messages expressed by the graffiti ranged from displays of racism and prejudice regarding sexual orientation to examples of pride in both the Ukraine and in L’viv.

2.3.3 SWOT Analysis

The findings of the field research were used in conjunction with the results of the 2009 GIZ survey to formulate a thematic SWOT analysis. For a complete description of the SWOT analysis developed specifically for the residential components of the focus area, please refer to Table 2.3.

**Strengths**

Bearing in mind results of the fieldwork described in the previous section, one of the main strengths of the focus area is the high rate of ownership, which provides a higher degree of residential stability and encourages individual initiatives to undertake building repairs and renovations. A common sense of pride of *Vysoki Zamok* and awareness among the residents with regard to the historical legacy of the neighborhood is also considered as a positive contribution towards community identity.
Furthermore, several existing residential networks were identified within the focus area, as well as a few examples of residents’ investment in improving both the privately owned and communal parts of their buildings. This last observation indicates existing initiative towards upgrading the physical condition of the neighborhood. Additionally, the neighborhood’s generational diversity is a considerable strength, mainly attributable to the individual initiative of the younger families.

**Weaknesses**

With regard to the residents’ day-to-day life, one of the primary weaknesses identified in the focus area is the lack of a cohesive community identity. Despite its distinct physical borders and widely recognized historical importance, residents do not perceive the focus area as a consolidated neighborhood, nor is there an agreed upon name for the area as a whole.

Neglect of the urban fabric and physical infrastructure, due in great part to the limited capital available for that purpose and the preponderance of subsistence-level income groups of residents, additionally contributes to the generally negative perception of the neighborhood. Moreover, the neighborhood lacks institutional representation and organization among the residents with regard to physical improvement of commonly owned properties such as buildings, which discourages residents’ engagement in neighborhood improvements.
Opportunities
The openness of young generations - especially young families - to be active in the neighborhood has tremendous potential for realigning the decision-making processes within the community. Equally important is the aforementioned organizational capacity of women in buildings and the general neighborly trust between the residents, which are assets for further development of new community associations.

Research suggests that residents are willing to invest both social and financial capital in the renovation of the physical environment, and is therefore indicative of potential for future involvement in restoration programs. For that reason, current resident initiatives represent a major opportunity to improve the quality of the common facilities and could serve as basis to develop bottom-up planning approaches. Religious networks are also a prime opportunity for rapid community mobilization.

Threats
Rising living costs within the focus area are a distinct threat to residential stability and the continuity of cultural identity within the community. Moreover, further physical degradation can lead to cultural impoverishment and eventually force the residents to leave their properties. Ultimately such patterns of neglect could contribute to the continuation of social fragmentation and further degradation of social networks.

SWOT-Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High rate of owner-occupied apartments;</td>
<td>Lack of cohesive neighborhood identity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of pride in Vysoki Zamok;</td>
<td>General neglect of urban fabric and physical infrastructure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of neighborhood’s historical legacy;</td>
<td>Preponderance of subsistence-level incomes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual initiative to undertake residential repairs;</td>
<td>Lack of formal Community Centers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic diversity among residents;</td>
<td>No organization of residents’ renovation activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborly trust as a basis for community organization and participation;</td>
<td>Passive attitude of residents, especially the elderly;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of a self-sustaining community;</td>
<td>Limited capital for structural improvements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to City Center; and</td>
<td>General unawareness of UNESCO boundaries; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing informal residential networks.</td>
<td>Perceived sense of danger due to criminal activity in the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger generation open to institutional changes;</td>
<td>Increasing cost of living;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational capacity of women in the buildings;</td>
<td>Further physical degradation could lead to the eviction of residents and cultural impoverishment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborly trust as a basis for community organization and participation;</td>
<td>Continued social fragmentation and degradation; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing small-scale private initiatives for neighborhood beautification;</td>
<td>Unappealing regional reputation as a basis for further neglect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment of local resources (social and capital) in renovations;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community mobilization through existing religious networks; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical awareness as a basis for action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Mobility

Beyond the dimension of accessibility, urban mobility is a critical issue regarding the social and economic welfare of a city and its citizens. The following section presents the methods used to assess the mobility within the focus area, as well as the subsequent findings of the analysis.

2.4.1 Research Methodology

The analysis of the current mobility situation in the focus area employed three primary approaches: (i) assessment of the physical transportation network (quality of street surfaces, traffic volume and intensity, universal accessibility, parking for private vehicles and pedestrian and cycling amenities); (ii) mapping of pedestrian mobility patterns (pedestrians were followed until they reached their destination with route and final location outlined on a map) and (iii) survey of residents’ mobility patterns (using quantitative interviews targeting residents of the area and qualitative interviews focusing on the behavior of cyclists).

Figure 2.33
Traffic Volume and Public Transportation Routes.

15 Written by Elnur Abbasov, Emilio Berrios Alvarzes, Aline Delatte and Xiaoli Lin
2.4.2 Outcomes

Categorization of Transport Network

Four streets in the vicinity of the focus area can be defined as urban arterial roads\(^1\), supporting a high traffic volume and serving a distributive function for the city as a whole: Prospekt Chornovola, Torhova and Ivana Honty Streets, in the western and southern borders of the focus area and the Zamarstynivska and Bohdana Khmelnytskoho streets, along the north-south axes (Annex 5.4 Focus Area Street Map). Several public transport lines use these main roads, including the tram, buses and marshrutkas (mini-buses). The railroad, situated along the northern border of the focus area, is an additional main axis and a primary connection point to the City’s periphery. However, it is also a clear boundary that divides the area from its northern vicinity. The network of minor access roads\(^2\) throughout the focus area is characterized by a lower traffic volume and can be defined as urban residential roads with an access function (Figure 2.33).

Parking Situation

The parking policy is a critical issue in the focus area. With only one municipal parking lot comprising approximately 20 metered spaces for the whole area, a majority of drivers park their vehicles on the street - a practice which is allowed and free of charge. Virtually the only street parking regulation is that a 1.5 meter corridor is left unobstructed to allow pedestrians to pass along sidewalks. However, even this moderate regulation is not respected and is rarely enforced, resulting in widespread congestion of pedestrian paths. This situation highlights the lack of a coherent private vehicle strategy in L’viv. In the focus area, the use of the area to the north of Dobrobut Market as an informal parking lot for customers appears to be quite problematic (Figure 2.34).

---

\(^1\) Arterial roads serve ‘a distributor function allow[ing] drivers to enter and exit all kinds of urban or rural areas’ (OECD 2006, p.71).

\(^2\) Access roads are generally smaller, residential streets ‘allow[ing] actual access to properties alongside the road or street’ (OECD 2006, p.72).

---

Figure 2.34
Muliarska Street
The poor quality of the road surface and problematic parking situation along Muliarska Street is rather typical within the focus area.
The pink building on the right is one of two remaining synagogues in L’viv.
Photo credit: A. Delatte (2011).
Pavement Quality
The street and sidewalk surface in the focus area is quite uneven and generally in rather poor condition. Whereas some of the residential streets appear to have been repaved over the course of the last decade, a large percentage of the street surface is in need of repair. Cobblestones are a more common road covering than asphalt throughout the entire focus area.

Pedestrian Crossing Facilities
The crossing paths at the primary pedestrian entrance points into the focus area are problematic for the mobility of residents and visitors to the area. The current roadway configuration offers dramatic variability in the safety and convenience of pedestrian crossings. The crosswalks on the western urban arterial road, Prospekt Chornovola Street, are regulated by traffic lights or zebra crossings. The well-organized traffic flow at the intersections allows a secure connection between the focus area and the neighborhoods to the west.

However, the organization of street crossings along the southern urban arterial road, Torhova Street, is not nearly as good. The current pedestrian crossings in this area are insufficient and inappropriate considering the high number of public transport lines servicing the street and the high pedestrian volume in this area. The analysis of pedestrian mobility patterns identified that approximately 50% of all pedestrian paths into the focus area enter from along the intersection with Torhova Street. The lack of pedestrian amenities leads to an informal crossing pattern along the entire length of street (Figure 2.35). The significant absence of crossing facilities in the entire focus area generates a dangerous conflict between motorized vehicles and pedestrians, especially at the intersections of Bohdana Hmelnyckoho and Zamarstynivs’ka Street.

Figure 2.35
Torhova Street
Informal crossing patterns between the City Center and the Dolnoobul market create conflict between vehicular and pedestrian traffic.
Photo credit: A. Delatte (2011).
**Pedestrian Activities in the South of the Area**

The primary finding of the pedestrian paths sequence analysis was the existence of a concentration of pedestrian activities in the southern part of the focus area, nearest to the City Center. High pedestrian flows were additionally observed around *Staryi Rynok*, *Dobrobut Market*, especially in the southeastern corner of the Market, and along the *Zamarstinivs’ka* Street adjacent to the *Faculty of Law* at *Lviv State University of Internal Affairs*. The proximity to public transport stations and the relative importance of these sites in daily life likely explains the increased pedestrian volume. Increased pedestrian flows were also observed between *Staryi Rynok* and *Vysoki Zamok*, and between *Dobrobut Market* and *Danylo Halyts’koho Square* (Figure 2.36).

**Residents’ Modal Share for Various Activities**

The results of the 36 resident interviews indicate that, despite a 31% private vehicle ownership rate, 97% of residents use public transport for daily activities. Together, mini-bus and tram usage accounts for more than 50% of the public transit rides (Figure 2.37). Evidence obtained during interviews suggests that most residents of the focus area commute to the City Center for leisure, work and special purchases, while day-to-day purchases, such as groceries, are usually made within the focus area (Figure 2.38). The most common means of transportation for trips within the focus area is walking (Figure 2.39).

**Bicycle Mobility**

The results of interviews conducted with cyclists suggest that the greatest problem facing bicycle mobility is the poor condition of road surfaces and the absence of dedicated bicycle lanes. Respondents indicated that the intensity and volume of motorized traffic in Lviv makes cycling rather dangerous. Cycling is not a widespread transport system in the area (Figure 2.37).
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Figure 2.37
Modal Share of Resident Transportation

Figure 2.38
Activity Concentration by Area

Figure 2.39
Modal Share for Different Activities within the Focus Area
2.4.3 SWOT Analysis

The thematic SWOT analysis described below provides an analysis of the primary issues related to urban mobility within the focus area as well as between the focus area and adjacent districts. A complete description of the SWOT analysis specific to mobility and transportation is provided in Table 2.4.

Strengths

The strategic position of the focus area, contiguous with both the City Center and Vysoki Zamok, represents a major strength for the neighborhood. These short distances to primary points of interest allow a strong physical connection with the rest of the City and encourage the use of non-motorized means of transport. The prevalence of walking as a primary mode of transport, low private vehicle use and good connection to the public transportation network contribute to a relatively quiet atmosphere in the neighborhood. The recently installed tourist signs indicate the willingness of the municipality to appreciate the historical richness of the area and attract visitors from other parts of L'viv.

Weaknesses

In general, non-motorized transport infrastructure is deficient in the entire focus area. The lack of accessibility for physically challenged people, lack of separated bicycle lanes, non-existence of lowered curbs for crosswalks and lack of services for the visually impaired are critical concerns that require urgent attention.

Figure 2.40

Physical Condition of Roads and Pedestrian Facilities

impaired seriously weaken the overall transportation strategy (Figure 2.40). The poor condition of many street surfaces and sidewalks negatively affects both the flow of vehicular traffic and the overall image of the area. Although cobblestone streets reflect the historical value of the area, they are uncomfortable for cyclists and exacerbate noise associated with motor vehicle traffic. The lack of a well-enforced parking strategy on the city-level directly affects pedestrian safety and the quality of public spaces. In general, pedestrian and cyclist needs are not adequately accommodated in the city-wide transportation plan.

The inadequate connection between the focus area and neighboring districts is hindering the economic development of the area. A majority of commuters treat the area as a transit corridor, rather than a destination. The poorly arranged entrance points at Torhova Street, beneath the railroad tracks to the north and along the streets near Vysoki Zamok, more closely resemble obstacles than enticing access points to a lively neighborhood. Finally, the minimal financial resources available for the development of transportation infrastructure are a critical weakness, severely limiting opportunities for improvement.

**Opportunities**

Exploiting the proximity to the City Center and Vysoki Zamok by improving the connection with these points of interest is the primary opportunity identified during this analysis. The area holds the potential to develop attractive pedestrian pathways, which can steer visitors to the historic churches in the area. Though the informal pedestrian crossings between the Opera House and Dobrobut Market can be interpreted as a threat, they also present an opportunity to employ a *Shared Space Concept*[^18], creating a harmonious symbiosis between the public transportation system, private vehicles and pedestrians. A reconfiguration of this area will also improve the connection between the focus area and the City Center.

---

[^18]: *Shared Space Concept* was elaborated by the Interreg IIIB North Sea Programme in 2003-2008 and intended to develop policies and methods for an integrated approach towards the planning of public space.

---

[^18]: *Shared Space Concept* was elaborated by the Interreg IIIB North Sea Programme in 2003-2008 and intended to develop policies and methods for an integrated approach towards the planning of public space.
The street network around the Dobrobut Market holds potential to improve pedestrian mobility in the area: a rearrangement of the delivery service for the Market could minimize motor vehicle traffic, allowing for the development of a new pedestrian thoroughfare to the east and north of the Market. The growing concern regarding traffic problems on behalf of the residents of the area can serve as a basis for future participatory practices in the proliferation of non-motorized transportation mechanisms. Also, the ongoing development of a comprehensive cycling strategy for the City of L’viv, developed by the municipality in cooperation with GIZ cooperation project Climate Friendly Concept for Sustainable Mobility, presents an opportunity to support the overall improvement of mobility in the focus area.

**Threats**

The increase in motorized mobility represents a significant threat to the focus area. Indeed, the consequences of increased motor vehicle usage will be felt most directly by the pedestrians and cyclists. Moreover, the neglect of the current public transportation infrastructure can lead to the degradation of the whole network, especially the tramway. To overcome these threats, pedestrians’ needs must be considered in the early phases of transport planning. A political willingness to develop a non-motorized friendly transport system is critical in this context.

**SWOT-Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Proximity to the City Center and Vysoki Zamok;</td>
<td>• Low-quality of street and sidewalk surfaces;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well-developed public transportation network;</td>
<td>• Lack of an enforced parking strategy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents’ awareness of traffic problems;</td>
<td>• Unsafe pedestrian mobility infrastructure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Various points of interest within the area;</td>
<td>• Neglect of non-motorized transport in transportation planning;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing cyclists’ organizations; and</td>
<td>• Poor interconnection between the focus area and abutting neighborhoods, especially the City Center and Vysoki Zamok;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low traffic volume inside the focus area.</td>
<td>• Air and noise pollution due to motor vehicle traffic; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of financial resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to improve pedestrian crosswalks between City Center and the focus area;</td>
<td>• Increase in traffic volume;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to improve the connectivity between the focus area and Vysoki Zamok;</td>
<td>• Increase in parked vehicles on footpaths;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to improve pedestrian areas around the Market and the playground to the north;</td>
<td>• Neglect of the public transport system; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proliferation of non-motorized mobility;</td>
<td>• Failure to incorporate pedestrians’ needs in planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Citizen awareness regarding traffic reduction;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GIZ Climate Friendly Concept for Sustainable Mobility support; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Willingness from the municipality to develop a cycling strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 Local Economy\textsuperscript{19}

An assessment of local economic activity is critical to develop an understanding of how the focus area functions within the City. Although mostly residential, the focus area comprises diverse economic activities, mostly satisfying local consumers’ needs. The City’s main strategies for the future involve stimulating economic development\textsuperscript{20}; still, the municipality has not developed a clear strategic plan for addressing the economic characteristics of specific residential areas.

2.5.1 Research Methodology

The economic analysis of the area was approached using a progressive and dynamic process, in which each phase of investigation built upon the last. Three methodological approaches were applied for data collection: (i) expert interviews (e.g. with Alexander Kobsarev, Head of the City Institute; Volodymyr Kharko, Vice-dean of Economics Faculty, Management Department of Ivan Franko National University), (ii) a business inventory (local businesses were observed, photographed, cataloged and mapped) and (iii) an economic activity survey (20 semi-structured, face-to-face interviews with shop owners and employees within the four business concentration zones e.g. in Dobrobut Market).

2.5.2 Outcomes

Evidence collected during the economic activity survey indicated that although the focus area is primarily residential, there is a diverse array of local businesses that largely fulfill residents’ basic needs. Evidence from the expert interviews indicated that basic necessities are easily obtained in the area at affordable prices. The subsequent business inventory, detailing a total of 191 different businesses operating within the area, corroborated this information. The observed activities at each location were cataloged and classified into the following six categories and further displayed on a map: (i) retail; (ii) service; (iii) grocery; (iv) food service; (v) empty shops and (vi) unidentified activity (Figure 2.46).

\begin{figure}
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\caption{Figure 2.46 Economic Activity Functions \textit{Design: M.C. Rodrigues and R. Piedade (2011).}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{19} Written by Maria Cecilia Carvalho Rodrigues, Edwin Linderkamp and Saman Tahmasebi

\textsuperscript{20} Comments made by City of L’viv Vice-Mayor Mr. Vasil Kosiv on May 16, 2011.
**Business Concentration Areas**

Based on the concentration and spatial distribution of businesses and on the characteristics of the area where they are located, with regard to physical structure, availability and diversity of commercial activities, four distinct types of economic zones were identified: (i) Dobrobut Market, (ii) High Business Concentration Areas, (iii) Medium Business Concentration Areas and (iv) Low Business Concentration Areas (Figure 2.47, see further description below).

**Dobrobut Market**

Due to the singular land use and extremely high concentration of economic activities, Dobrobut Market and the area adjacent to it is a category in its own right (Figure 2.48). The category has been further sub-divided into the *formal market*, indicating all businesses formally operating in the designated area, and the *informal market*, referring to the accumulation of small-scale vendors surrounding the formal market.
Figure 2.48
The Formal
Dobrobut Market
Photo credit: M.C. Rodrigues (2011).

Figure 2.49
The Informal
Street Market
Photo credit: M.C. Rodrigues (2011).
The formal *Dobrobut* Market is located near the City Center and offers a wide range of products, from food supplies to manufactured goods. The Market makes up a large number of individually owned commercial units, generally staffed by only one employee at a time. Women make up the highest proportion of workers. The majority of owners and employees interviewed as part of this study live near the market and use public transportation for their daily commute. The Market is open seven days a week from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m., with minimal variation in sales volume over the course of a given week. The Market attracts a high share of consumers from different parts of the city and some tourists. Interestingly, business owners mostly expressed indifference with regard to the possibility of the Market closing to make way for a hotel development tentatively planned for the location.

Attracted by the large gathering of consumers in the area, a high-concentration of *informal vendors* has accumulated in the open spaces surrounding the formal Market. The vendors, predominantly elderly women, sell fresh food items from plastic boxes or on small rugs on the streets or sidewalks (Figure 2.49). While some of the interviewees come on a regular basis, others sell their products only intermittently. Though some respondents indicated they were residents of the area, the informal market seemed to draw vendors from a larger area than the formal market. Some of them sell homegrown vegetables, while others purchase their produce from wholesalers. There is no organizational structure governing the space between sellers, and a majority of respondents indicated dissatisfaction with their informal employment conditions. Many vendors indicated that joining the formal *Dobrobut* Market would be preferable, but the initial investment of setting up a more permanent kiosk and the saturated market conditions limited their ability to do so. The informal vendors are evicted by the police on a daily basis.

**High Business Concentration Areas**

The *business inventory* identified the highest concentration of economic activity along the southern and western borders of the focus area. These *High Business Concentration Areas* have the greatest diversity of shops, where resident and non-resident consumers shopped for their basic daily needs (Figure 2.50). Interviews conducted in these areas suggested that businesses in these areas have longer opening hours than the others.
Medium Business Concentration Areas

The Medium Business Concentration Areas represent a lower volume of daily customers and higher rate of empty shops (Figure 2.51). They are located on the periphery of the High Business Concentration Area, with a few well-established businesses located near Sv. Theodora Square.

Low Business Concentration Areas

Low Concentration Business Areas are located in less developed parts, with rundown buildings, a lower volume of pedestrian traffic, and the lowest rate of economic activity (Figure 2.52). Despite being located in the least ideal business location, the interviewed owners expressed satisfaction with their location and seem to have strategic plans for expanding their businesses. Their customers are targeted, mostly from different parts of the city, and are attracted especially by the hospital, the Vysoki Zamok and the Faculty of Law at the L’viv State University of Internal Affairs.

Rent Prices

The rent prices vary within the focus area. Many of the business owners in the Low Business Concentration Area indicated that they were attracted to their
current location by the low rent. Similar variety in price and rent structure can be found in the Market, where the conditions and location of shops determine the price; for instance, the covered part of the Market has higher rent prices than the stands placed outside. In the Dobrobut Market, a majority of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with high lease rates, especially with regard to the dramatic increase in the last five years.

**Employment Opportunities**

In the expert interviews, the focus area was described as a ‘sleeping area’, with a primarily residential structure and few job opportunities. Despite having a similar rate of unemployment to the rest of the city, the average income of residents in the focus area is lower than the city-wide average. Shop employees in the High Concentration Business Area reported dissatisfaction with their current income and that they often rely on additional sources of income to meet monthly expenses.

**Competition**

A majority of shop owners interviewed in the Dobrobut Market and the High Concentration Business Area indicated that competition between businesses was not problematic despite the large number of shops. The services and products offered by local businesses are differentiated enough to prevent stiff competition. Most respondents indicated that the superior quality of their products gave their business a competitive edge in the market, attracting customers from all over Lviv. The sellers in the informal market are in frequent competition with the vendors of the Dobrobut Market and have to struggle with the daily police evictions. In addition to the low rent, shop owners in the Low Business Concentration Area reported being attracted to the area by the lack of competition.

**Physical Appearance**

The largest number of empty shops was identified in decaying buildings, which were the least renovated in the focus area. The few active businesses where interviews were conducted had attractive interior displays, and often displayed evidence of physical improvements to the exterior, mostly as result of investment on the part of the business owner in renovating the ground floors. However, the renovation works did not consider the physical structures of heritage-protected buildings. In the Medium Business Concentration Area most businesses have an attractive display. In the High Concentration Area, most of the buildings with integrated businesses are close to the City Center or in the most bustling avenues within the focus area and are renovated on the ground floor. The physical structure inside the Dobrobut Market is comparatively better than at the informal market, but could be improved in order to increase consumer frequency and satisfaction.

**Tourism**

In the expert interviews, tourism was viewed as holding the greatest potential for Lviv’s economy and a tourist strategy adopted by the local government on the city-scale was mentioned. Still, despite its heritage monuments and the proximity to the City Center, the focus area has not yet been established as a tourist destination. Other findings from the interviews included the need for creating new tourist attractions, improving the connectivity to the Vysoki Zamok and the possibility of transferring the arts and handicraft market, currently located near the Opera House, to the southeast border of the focus area.

2.5.3 SWOT Analysis

In this section the local economic assessment of the focus area is presented based on the findings of the fieldwork. The current issues identified by assessing the four business concentration areas and reviewing outcomes from interviews support the local economy SWOT analysis described below. A complete summary of the SWOT is included in Table 2.5.

---

21 Comment made by Mr. Volodymyr Kharko in interview conducted on May 17, 2011.

22 Information provided by Mr. Alexander Kobsarev, in interview conducted on May 17, 2011.
**Strengths**
The focus area is home to a wide variety of local businesses. Diverse commercial activities and services cover the local residents’ different needs, all within a comfortable walking distance. The goods and services available within the neighborhood are generally perceived to be of suitable quality. Rent prices are lower than in other parts of the City, providing reasonable opportunities to potential businesses to enter the market. The *Dobrobut* Market additionally offers a wide range of products that satisfy local needs. The Market, as the most important economic center in the neighborhood, acts as a point of entry and a pull factor to this area, especially from the City Center. Other destinations such as the hospital and the *Faculty of Law* attract visitors from different parts of the City.

**Weaknesses**
The subsistence level income of residents, poor physical conditions of buildings and shops, rundown empty spaces and an inefficient building maintenance system inhibit new investments in the area, hindering economic development. Although the number of business activities is considerable, it remains unclear to which extent businesses depend on each other and how much they are cooperating. Although the area houses several important historic sites, its potential for tourism has yet to be realized. This is likely due, in part, to a number of physical characteristics, including a lack of accessibility and weak internal connectivity. Although the *Dobrobut* Market attracts a large number of consumers, the physical appearance of the Market and the shop displays are not inviting, especially around entrance points. Also, the extensive informality around the Market and the lack of structured working places lead to bad working conditions, which in turn prevents sustainable income generation for a large number of more marginalized businesses. The perception of insecurity in certain parts of the focus area, especially at night, creates a bad reputation for the neighborhood.
Opportunities
The area has a wide range of stakeholders, which provide a strong base for the creation of cooperative networks for the promotion of local economic development. Such networks can create a process by which public, business and non-governmental sector partners work collectively to create better conditions for economic growth and employment generation (World Bank 2011). Furthermore, the massive amount of renovation work required in the area presents potential for cooperation between the municipality and private sector firms. The current offering of natural, homegrown products at the Dobrobut Market suggests the potential for the development of a specialized market for organic products. The historical structures in the focus area can be seen as a starting point in the development of a thriving tourist industry and lead to an increase of small businesses for local income generation. Also the large number of empty shops and non-developed spaces indicate the possibility of an expansion of economic activities in the area.

SWOT-Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Proximity to the City Center;</td>
<td>• Subsistence level incomes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed-use planning in the area;</td>
<td>• Poor physical conditions of buildings and shops;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diverse commercial activities and services;</td>
<td>• Poor accessibility and internal connectivity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low rent prices;</td>
<td>• Extensive informality; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wide range of products provided by Dobrobut</td>
<td>• Perceptions of insecurity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Wide range of stakeholders as a basis for cooperative networks;</td>
<td>• Lack of a local economic development strategy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public-private cooperation for renovation works;</td>
<td>• Lack of a local tourism strategy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of a specialized Organic Market;</td>
<td>• Potential closure of the market;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainable tourism development;</td>
<td>• Worsening of building conditions; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adaptive reuse of empty shops; and</td>
<td>• The City Center as a dominant investment pull.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase of new businesses for local income generation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Integrated SWOT Analysis and Visions for Development

2.6.1 Integrated SWOT Analysis

On May 21st and 23rd, 2011, the findings of the thematic SWOT analyses were combined to form an Integrated SWOT Analysis (Figure 2.58). The integrated SWOT (Table 2.6) emphasized cross-cutting elements that were consistently identified by thematic groups, and those deemed to be of particular significance to the area as a whole. These intersectoral findings are considered to be the most comprehensive analysis of the focus area undertaken as part of this study and consequently serve as a basis for the development of the general vision for development (2.6.2) as well as the pilot projects and proposals in Section 3.0 of this report.

2.6.2 Visions for Development

Both the outcomes of the thematic SWOT analysis and the May 22, 2011 public action at Sv. Theodora Square (see 2.7) allowed the development of five complementary visions that mirror the expected changes in the focus area in the next 20 years. Furthermore, the importance of the historical assets and the wide-range of opportunities found throughout the work, led to the development of a motto that served as a guiding phrase for the development of the pilot projects: ‘Built in the past, walking into the future.’ The collection of the discussed slogans and mottos can be found in the Annex 5.6 Slogans for the Focus Area. However, it is proposed that a participatory process be held in the community in order to develop a name and motto for the neighborhood involving all residents.

Figure 2.58
Development of Integrated SWOT
Students of the TU-Berlin Urban Management Program discuss the elements to be included in the integrated SWOT Analysis on May 23, 2011.
The development vision for the neighborhood can be summarized as five thematic ideals:

(i) The area is a showcase of a livable historic neighborhood, which provides a high standard of building conditions for its residents while preserving the value of historical heritage;

(ii) The area is an attractive place to visit also due to its system of high-quality open spaces offering various functions and recreational opportunities for all generations;

(iii) The area is family-friendly and widely recognized as a special place with a strong local identity, to which its residents are proud to belong and actively participate in improving their neighborhood;

(iv) The area is famous for its pedestrian and bicycle-friendly environment and is accessible for all generations of residents, disadvantaged groups and tourists; and

(v) The area is appreciated for its lively local economy providing a wide range of activities and facilities meeting demands of both residents and tourists while ensuring a strong and sustainable basis for local income generation.

---

**SWOT-Table**

**Strengths**

- Proximity to the city center and Vysoki Zamok;
- Tangible historic heritage;
- Unique and attractive urban fabric;
- Multiple historic place of interest;
- Connection to public transit lines;
- Varied structural usage;
- High rate of owner occupied residences;
- Lively local economy;
- Wide availability of public services; and
- Beneficial neighborly relationships.

**Weaknesses**

- Poor accessibility to city center and Vysoki Zamok;
- Neglect of physical fabric;
- Lack of clear development strategies
- Minimal resources for physical improvements;
- Threatened informal livelihoods;
- Perceptions of criminal activity;
- Weak organizational representation within the community; and
- Lack of cohesive neighborhood identity.

**Opportunities**

- Cultural heritage as a basis for common identity;
- Improved accessibility as a basis for increasing share of tourist visits and associated revenue;
- Improvement of existing economic activities;
- Improvement of open-spaces for multi-purpose activities; and
- Willingness of residents to become involved in physical upgrading.

**Threats**

- Loss of cultural heritage through continued neglect;
- Loss of UNESCO Heritage designation;
- Unsustainable tourism cheapening actual historical significance; and
- Continued neglect leading to the further deterioration of the regional reputation.
Що є найбільшою проблемою у вашому місті?

1. Утримання університету
2. Утримання університету
3. Утримання університету
4. Утримання університету
5. Утримання університету
6. Утримання університету
7. Утримання університету
8. Утримання університету
9. Утримання університету
10. Утримання університету

Які ваші пожадання до твоєї території?

1. Прибирати і громадяні
2. Існі для сміття на Красі
3. Допомогати відремонтовувати

Комінчий символ на вул. Прибрати вулиці

1. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
2. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
3. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
4. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
5. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
6. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
7. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом

1. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
2. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
3. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
4. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
5. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
6. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
7. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом

1. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
2. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
3. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
4. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
5. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
6. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
7. Проводи ініціативи з добробутом
2.7 Neighborhood Action on Sv. Theodora Square

The fieldwork and the analysis phase were concluded with a public event organized by the Urban Management students and the GIZ in Sv. Theodora Square on May 22, 2011. The aim was to initiate the process of appropriation of this central open space through atypical uses and to encourage communication among residents. Moreover, community-planning exercises were realized.

The invitation was made by leaving flowers and short notes with intriguing messages on residents’ doors, during the previous night. Over the course of the following afternoon, several activities took place on the square, which created a lively atmosphere and attracted numerous visitors. Residents of the focus area and other passers-by wrote down their problems with and their hopes for the neighborhood (Annex 5.3 Wishes and Problems with the Focus Area), children were able to draw their perceptions of both the square and the neighborhood, mapping exercises were done, a community model was built and seeds were planted in the empty spaces (Figure 2.59 - 2.67). Furthermore, parallel activities took place, such as a football match with children, a bicycle competition and music from a local artist. Simple events like this are fruitful starting points for community identity building.