



INVESTMENT PLAN GEEL



URBACT



Co-funded by
the European Union
Interreg

Index

1. The policy context	3
1.1 Needs analysis in the territorial context.....	3
1.2 The policy response	5
2. The investment proposal	9
2.1 Our starting point	9
2.2 The adapted version of the innovative practice	11
3. The adapted innovation project.....	13
3.1 The Value Proposition	13
3.2 The workplan	13
3.3 Partners involved in the Workplan	17
3.4 Overall project schedule	19
4. Budget	22
4.1 Project costs	22
4.2 Investment sources	24
5. Monitoring and Evaluation	26
5.1 The Monitoring and evaluation approach	26
5.2 The monitoring and evaluation framework	26

1. The policy context

1.1 Needs analysis in the territorial context

The City of Geel is confronted with an increasing challenge concerning public order and the perception of safety within several key urban areas. This challenge is primarily attributable to two interrelated factors. Firstly, incidents of public disturbance and loitering—particularly in and around the market square, the railway station, and the city's parks—have become a recurrent issue. Groups of young people and middle-aged men frequently engage in behaviours that create nuisance, most commonly during evening and night-time hours. Police statistics from 2025 reflect this operational burden, showing that Geel accounts for 68% of the 19,929 total police reports and 76% of the 8,635 police interventions within the entire police zone. Tellingly, "difficulties with a person" ranks as the second most frequent reason for both reports and interventions.

Secondly, the urban design and declining commercial vibrancy of certain zones have contributed to reduced natural social control. The diminishing diversity of retail functions, combined with a limited range of accessible leisure options after dark, has weakened the social fabric and diminished the overall attractiveness of the city centre. As a result, feelings of insecurity among residents and visitors have been reinforced, despite the absence of a significant rise in actual crime incidents. This situation is further compounded by misperceptions amplified through social media channels. Despite considerable municipal investments in the revitalisation of public spaces, improved lighting, and enhanced communication regarding safety initiatives, negative narratives concerning urban safety continue to prevail online. Moreover, reports of economic activity linked to illicit financing have contributed to public unease, notwithstanding their limited visibility in everyday urban life.

In response, the municipality and the local police have developed a set of coordinated interventions. Regular safety consultations have been institutionalised to strengthen joint decision-making and ensure a coherent approach. In addition, targeted outreach programmes have been implemented to engage young people and chronic alcohol users, emphasising early intervention and harm reduction. Multidisciplinary working groups further support the development of integrated and data-informed security policies. Despite these efforts, the overall perception of insecurity has not substantially improved. This underscores the need for a more comprehensive and strategic approach that goes beyond operational management. Future efforts should aim to address both the objective safety conditions and the subjective sense of security, thereby fostering a resilient, attractive, and socially cohesive urban environment in the city centre of Geel.

These results are enriched with a scale survey (random selection of 5.000 inhabitants, with a response of 1254) conducted in the summer of 2025 specifically regarding urban security. The results indicate a predominantly positive overall sense of safety, but at the same time reveal some clear and urgent policy challenges relating to social insecurity, the city centre environment, traffic and the reporting chain.

1. Living together with certain groups of people

The strongest factor running through the entire survey is the feeling of insecurity in relation to "(groups of) people", especially people of different origins and loitering youths. 83% say that their sense of security depends on (groups of) people, and it is precisely this group that colours responses about location, time and events. This aligns with police data, which recorded 1,901 nuisance reports in 2025, including 688 for noise, 233 for drunk persons, and 225 for fights. Additionally, the police issued 319 GAS fines¹—primarily for disturbing public peace, such as drunkenness—and made 84 administrative arrests for disturbing the public order, along with 48 arrests for public intoxication. This is accompanied by many negative and sometimes polarising terms, which points to a real social challenge and the risk of further us-versus-them divisions. This is urgent from a policy perspective because social problems are concentrated in visible places (station areas, city parks, night shops) and feed into multiple motives at the same time (location, time of day, "feeling targeted as a target group"). A significant proportion of residents say they feel targeted as native Gelenaars, women or older people, with many experiences of verbal abuse and intimidation.

¹ GAS stands for 'Gemeentelijke Administratieve Sancties' (Communal Administrative Sanctions).

2. Feelings of insecurity in the city centre and specific hotspots

Respondents systematically feel less safe in the city centre than in their own neighbourhood; the number of people who feel “always safe” roughly halves when moving from their neighbourhood to the city centre, while the number of people who feel “rarely/never safe” doubles. Specific locations are repeatedly cited as unsafe: the area around the station, the city park, the area around night shops, the market and areas around bank branches. The objective numbers show that police actively monitor these concerns: in 2025, the police conducted 1,931 checks across 10 specific nuisance locations and carried out 121 targeted actions addressing nuisance, drugs, and nightlife. This is urgent from a policy perspective because the city centre is the showcase of the city, but is deliberately avoided by some residents, with 72% indicating that they avoid certain places or situations (especially the city centre, city park, evening hours). Visitors from other municipalities also mention exactly the same places and groups (people of other origins, loitering youths around the park) as sources of feelings of insecurity.

3. Traffic (un)safety and conflict involving cyclists/scooters

68% indicate that traffic affects their sense of safety, with unsafe crossings, speeding issues, cycle lanes and electric scooters being frequently cited sources of insecurity. This subjective feeling is backed by objective police figures: in 2025, there were 185 accidents with injuries, of which 51% involved vulnerable road users. Furthermore, out of 31,890 recorded traffic violations, offences in pedestrian, cycling, and other zones ranked in the top three. During targeted police actions, e-scooters and fatbikes were also confiscated 20 times. Both cyclists and motorists experience the current layout and rules of conduct as a cause of conflict and a “false sense of security” in cycle lanes. This is urgent because traffic spontaneously comes up in many open responses, even outside the specific traffic question (e.g. in “other” motivations and negative stories). Specific black spots and patterns (fietsostrade, Dr.-Van de Perrestraat, rat-running in Poel and Stelen, heavy traffic, visibility at intersections) are mentioned, which points to targeted infrastructure and enforcement issues.

4. Willingness to report, trust and barriers

Although a large majority sometimes feel unsafe, 81.8% have never reported anything. The two main reasons are “I have never experienced anything that I wanted to report” (60.3%), but also “I don't think anything will be done about it anyway” (29.5%) and “I don't know where to report it” (9.3%). However, police data shows that citizens do reach out for specific issues; in 2025, the police logged 1,173 reports specifically regarding suspicious matters (such as suspicious situations and behaviour). Furthermore, citizens are increasingly making use of digital reporting channels, with 312 e-forms submitted specifically for non-urgent interventions. At the same time, a significant minority are dissatisfied with how reports are handled by the police and the city, and expect the city to take visible action or build a case file. 22.3% choose to share unsafe situations with others informally (verbally, via social media), partly because they have little faith in the impact of an official report.

5. Night-time, street lighting and avoidance behaviour

75% indicate that the time of day affects their sense of safety; the later and darker it is, the more unsafe they feel. Street lighting is mentioned very often in explanatory texts and ranks high among concrete suggestions for improving the sense of safety. This translates into behaviour: 35% specifically avoid going out after dark, in the evening or after 10 p.m.. This avoidance behaviour correlates with police data showing a concentration of nuisance reports linked to the night, such as 233 reports for drunk persons and 225 for fights.

6. Expectations regarding enforcement and prevention

Across all motives, “more and stricter control/enforcement” and “more visible police and community guards” are at the top of the list of suggestions. Smart cameras and better street lighting follow as frequently mentioned solutions, with specific references to hotspots. Acknowledging that these responses might not be the most appropriate or effective ones, this data is still relevant for the policy response and the reality on the ground.

When it comes to social insecurity surrounding coexistence with people of other origins and loitering youths, two trends stand out:

- a large group calls primarily for repressive measures (fines, tough action, curfews, immigration bans, identity checks), often in strong language.
- a smaller but significant group advocates integration, dialogue, community work, meaningful daytime activities and parenting support, but at the same time feels that “it may already be too late”.

This is urgent in terms of policy because:

- there is a wide gap between repressive expectations and the more complex reality of preventive security policy, and disappointment about this can further erode confidence in policy.
- the tension surrounding coexistence is already translating into polarising language, avoidance behaviour and a feeling of ‘no longer being at home in one’s own city’ among some of the native population.

1.2 The policy response

Policy response for Geel

Both the analysis of the most recent police statistics and the survey confirm that Geel’s safety challenge is not only a matter of policing, but of **public space, social cohesion, mobility, reporting behaviour, and trust in institutions**. The appropriate response is therefore a locally anchored but multi-level strategy: Geel should lead with an integrated security approach at neighbourhood and city-centre level, while aligning that approach with Flemish urban policy and federal security and prevention frameworks. Flemish urban policy explicitly recognises the neighbourhood as the scale where persistent and interconnected challenges come together and where integrated, place-based action is most effective. At federal level, Belgium’s prevention architecture already supports local, low-threshold, multidisciplinary coordination through mechanisms such as the Local Integrated Security Cell on Radicalism (LIVC-R), which is chaired locally and brings together municipal, police and social actors and nowadays goes broader than just radicalisation, but focusses also on for instance polarisation.

Local priorities in Geel

For Geel, the immediate priority is to reduce feelings and perception of insecurity in the city centre, the railway station area, city parks, the vicinity of night shops, and traffic conflict zones. This requires a combined package of social, spatial and organisational measures, directly linked to objective enforcement data. Police statistics from 2025 demonstrate the urgency of this approach, recording 1,901 nuisance reports, including 688 for noise, 233 for drunk persons, 241 for vandalism, and 225 for fights. The proposed Local Security Council will serve as the steering body for these measures, bringing together the city, police, welfare services, youth work, mobility, and communication departments around a single shared risk picture and action plan.

This approach closely aligns with the survey results and police data through three concrete pillars:

- **Targeted approach to hotspots and nuisance:** Nuisance and feelings of insecurity are heavily concentrated in highly visible areas. The police are already actively enforcing policy here: in 2025, 1,931 checks were carried out across 10 specific nuisance locations, and 121 targeted actions were organised addressing nuisance, drugs, and the nightlife scene. These actions resulted in 84 administrative arrests for disturbing public order, 48 arrests for public intoxication, and 319 GAS fines (primarily for disturbing public peace and vandalism). The Security Council will make these law enforcement efforts more sustainable by linking them to preventative spatial interventions (such as improved street lighting) and outreach youth work.

- **Traffic safety and road infrastructure:** Traffic conflicts represent one of the primary drivers of subjective insecurity in the city. This subjective fear is corroborated by 31,890 recorded traffic violations—including frequent infractions in pedestrian and cycling zones—and 185 accidents with injuries in 2025. Crucially, vulnerable road users were involved in 51% of these injury accidents. In addition, the police confiscated 20 e-scooters and fatbikes during targeted enforcement controls over the past year. The Security Council must focus on visible infrastructural adjustments at specific black spots alongside targeted enforcement against reckless behaviour.
- **Strengthening reporting willingness and trust:** While many residents demonstrate avoidance behaviour, the willingness to officially report insecurity remains low due to a lack of confidence. Nevertheless, data indicates that citizens do reach out to the police through accessible and digital channels; in 2025, 1,500 e-forms were processed (including 312 for non-urgent interventions) and the police logged 1,173 reports concerning suspicious matters (primarily suspicious situations and behaviour). By further optimising reporting channels and ensuring visible, tangible follow-up to citizen complaints, the Security Council aims to restore public trust.

The Security Council is not intended to replace existing administrative structures, but rather to connect them into a single comprehensive advisory and executive forum equipped with clear mandates, objectives, and visible accountability for the community.

Regional and federal alignment

At Flemish level, the project aligns well with the urban policy emphasis on integrated neighbourhood action in vulnerable areas, especially where safety, liveability, mobility and social cohesion interact. The project can also fit broader Flemish expectations around urban renewal and neighbourhood-oriented interventions that combine spatial quality with social support. At federal level, the project complements the logic of the Local Integrated Security Cell model, which is intended to be low-threshold, preventive and tailored to local needs, with participation from the mayor, local police information officers and social actors. In addition, the federal focus on stronger station security and a more coordinated response to hotspots shows that Geel's station-area and city-centre issues are not isolated, but part of a wider Belgian policy direction.

Strategic priorities and targets

In order to effectively address the identified challenges, the City of Geel translates its strategic vision into concrete, data-driven actions. These actions are designed with both immediate milestones and a wider five-year target timeframe (2026–2031) in mind. Each action is directly linked to a clear target to ensure that progress can be systematically monitored and sustained through the Local Security Council over this period.

Action 1: Targeted and dynamic approach to nuisance at hotspots

Description: Intensifying police and administrative visibility and enforcement at specific locations where nuisance (such as noise complaints, public intoxication, vandalism, and fights) impacts local quality of life. Priority areas include the railway station surroundings, the city park, and the vicinity of night shops. This operational initiative combines physical patrols with targeted actions and infrastructure management (such as CCTV deployment and optimized lighting).

Target: Achieve a minimum decrease of 15% in the total number of recorded nuisance reports in the city centre by the end of 2027, with a broader ambition of a 30% structural reduction over the next five years (by 2031) (baseline 2025: 1,901 nuisance reports, including 688 for noise and 241 for vandalism). Additionally, the city aims to maintain high enforcement pressure by conducting at least 1,900 targeted hotspot checks and 120 specific operations tackling drugs and nightlife-related nuisance annually throughout this five-year period.

Action 2: Providing resilience training to citizens and staff

Description: Establishing and structurally delivering accessible resilience training, with a specific focus on bystander intervention training. These sessions will be offered to vulnerable target groups (such as youths, women, and the elderly) as well as the city's own frontline staff (local desk agents, community wardens, and public space managers). The objective is to equip citizens and employees with tools to respond appropriately and de-escalate verbal aggression, intimidation, and polarising behaviour in public spaces.

Target: Starting in autumn 2026, a minimum of 6 training sessions will be organized annually, catering to at least 20 citizens per session, a program that will be structurally embedded and expanded over the next five years. Concurrently, 100% of the operational frontline staff of the City of Geel must have completed the training by mid-2027, with biennial refresher courses scheduled through 2031. Over this five-year horizon, this continuous effort aims to significantly lower the barrier for reporting incidents (baseline 2025: 81.8% of citizens currently never report incidents).

Action 3: Modernising the communication strategy in a polarised society

Description: Transforming the municipal and police communication strategy to proactively address online polarisation and negative perceptions on social media. By transparently sharing objective security data, highlighting preventative successes, and presenting unifying, neighbourhood-oriented stories, the city will actively counter 'us-versus-them' narratives and online rumour mills.

Target: Increase digital reach and citizen interaction across the official communication channels of the city and the police zone by 20% by the end of 2027, scaling up to a 50% growth over the five-year strategic horizon (baseline 2025: 15,250 followers on the primary Facebook page of PZ GLM). Furthermore, starting from late 2026, an accessible, objective security and nuisance bulletin will be published quarterly and sustained over the next five years, specifically designed to correct misperceptions online.

Action 4: Establishing a flexible and agile Local Security Council

Description: Restructuring the Citisense Local Stakeholder Group to a Local Security Council into an agile and decisive body that does not merely follow rigid, bureaucratic agendas, but is capable of shifting resources immediately via temporary, multidisciplinary 'task forces'. This council must be able to respond instantly to current, acute issues and emerging trends and at the same time must be able to be the facilitator for workshops and lectures. It should also be able to act as advisory body for the city.

Target: Over the next five years, the Local Security Council will be established and an institutional part of the local authority. The local safety council will continue to exist after the end of this term of office as an advisory body, organising lectures and workshops and monitoring broader developments in the field of safety.

How the project contributes

The proposed project contributes by creating an integrated governance and delivery model that links **people, place and response**. The local security council will strengthen joint analysis, rapid decision-making and consistent follow-up, which is essential when insecurity is driven by a mix of nuisance, traffic conflict, social tension and distrust. The social strand of the project can focus on outreach to young people, chronic alcohol users and other groups that are repeatedly visible in hotspot areas, while the spatial strand can address lighting, sightlines, park design, station-area routing and traffic black spots. Together, these actions should improve both the objective conditions in public space and the subjective feeling of security, which is precisely the gap identified in the survey.

Policy value added

The added value of the project is that it moves Geel from a set of separate interventions to a **more strategic security and cohesion framework**. That matters because the survey shows a low willingness to report, a strong tendency toward informal and polarising narratives, and a growing belief among residents

that visible action is not happening fast enough. By linking enforcement, prevention, communication and spatial interventions, the project can rebuild trust while also making urban spaces more usable and attractive. In policy terms, this makes the project relevant not only to Geel, but also to Flemish urban renewal priorities and the federal emphasis on coordinated local prevention and station/hotspot security.

2. The investment proposal

2.1 Our starting point

The City of Geel's decision to adapt and transfer the 'BeSecure-FeelSecure' (BSFS) innovative practice model of Piraeus was originally rooted in the need for an innovative response to the specific security challenges faced by a growing medium-sized city. Geel strongly believes that the BSFS initiative provides the necessary framework to tackle the increasing fear of crime through enhanced cross-sectoral and international exchange. By implementing this model, the city aims to develop and execute new initiatives designed to strengthen social cohesion and reverse urban and environmental degradation.

A central motivation for transferring the BSFS model is strategic integration. Geel intends to use the knowledge and experience gained from BSFS as the foundational basis for its new Societal Security Plan for the upcoming legislative period. This integrated plan will synthesize all actions taken by various security actors across the city, importantly including the citizens themselves, to create a unified approach to safety and security.

Furthermore, Geel's commitment to the network is driven by the principle of mutual exchange. While it is clear that the BSFS framework will help improve the city's own local actions and initiatives, Geel also believes that contributing its existing urban safety initiatives will provide added value to the wider BSFS network. Ultimately, this transfer is fuelled by the conviction that European cities sharing similar problems must work closely together. Doing so not only helps tackle immediate local challenges but also brings cities and regions closer together in the spirit of broader European cohesion and unity.

While the strategic benefits of this transfer are clear, embarking on this cross-sectoral journey naturally presented initial practical challenges. At the onset of the ITN activity, the primary barrier was securing the active commitment of various municipal departments. Because the 'BeSecure-FeelSecure' framework demands significant collaboration across different disciplines, convincing colleagues of its long-term added value proved difficult, particularly given their existing workloads and time constraints.

However, these early administrative hurdles were effectively counterbalanced by robust political will. The newly appointed mayor fully championed the project from day one, providing strong and visible executive support. This immediate political backing proved to be a tremendous asset, acting as a catalyst to overcome internal hesitations, align municipal priorities, and ensure the initiative gained the necessary traction to move forward successfully.

Policy challenges

This section provides further details on the policy challenges and their impact at the urban level, including relevant baseline data. The safety survey in Geel reveals fundamental challenges that are also reflected in the operational data from the local police.

Policy challenge 1: Social cohesion & polarisation

There is a clear tension surrounding coexistence with specific groups in public spaces. The survey reveals that 83% of respondents state that their sense of safety is negatively affected by the presence of loitering youths and people of different ethnic backgrounds. This subjective unease is supported by 1,901 recorded reports of nuisance in 2025, including 688 for noise pollution, 241 for vandalism, 233 for public drunkenness and 225 for fights. This fuels 'us-versus-them' thinking and polarising language, which requires a balanced approach between prevention and enforcement.

Policy challenge 2: Perceived insecurity and avoidance behaviour in hotspots

Residents consistently feel less safe in the city centre and avoid specific trouble spots (such as the area around the station, the city park and the neighbourhood around late-night shops), particularly in the evening and at night. Poor street lighting and a lack of visibility exacerbate this avoidance behaviour. Police figures show that these locations do indeed pose an operational challenge: in 2025, the police carried out 1,931

checks at 10 known trouble spots and organised 121 targeted operations. This led, among other things, to 84 administrative arrests for disturbing public order and 48 for public drunkenness.

Policy challenge 3: traffic safety

Road safety concerns are the most frequently cited cause of feelings of insecurity; 68% of residents feel unsafe due to inappropriate speeds, unclear cycling infrastructure and the rise of e-scooters and fat bikes. Specific locations (so-called 'black spots') and rat-running cause daily conflicts. Objective figures confirm this problem: in 2025, the police recorded 31,890 traffic offences (with offences in pedestrian and cycle zones featuring in the top three) and there were 185 accidents resulting in injuries. It is particularly worrying that vulnerable road users were involved in 51% of these accidents. In addition, 20 e-scooters and fat bikes were seized during targeted operations.

***Disclaimer regarding Traffic Safety:** The recent urban security survey clearly indicates that traffic safety and mobility conflicts are among the primary reasons why people feel unsafe in our city. While the City of Geel fully acknowledges the critical importance of this challenge, specific interventions targeting traffic safety fall outside the direct scope of this adapted innovative practice project. The 'BeSecure-FeelSecure' (BSFS) transfer model is explicitly designed to address urban crime, public nuisance, and social cohesion through its governance, social, and spatial modules. Therefore, while traffic-related insecurity remains a top municipal priority, it will not be tackled through the Citisense/BSFS investment plan, but will instead be addressed through the city's separate, dedicated mobility and infrastructure policy frameworks.*

Policy challenge 4: Low reporting rates and a lack of trust in public institutions

Despite widespread feelings of insecurity, 81.8% of residents have never made a report. This is partly due to a lack of confidence in an adequate follow-up and a perceived distance from the security services. Citizens often choose to share incidents informally via social media, which fuels rumours. At the same time, the statistics show that the reporting system does work when it is accessible: in 2025, the police processed 1,500 e-forms and 1,173 reports of suspicious incidents were recorded. The challenge lies in encouraging this formal reporting behaviour through better feedback and visible action.

2.2 The adapted version of the innovative practice

The city of Geel will adopt three modules of the innovative practice. In order of priority the transfer modules will be:

1. Governance : Local Security Council
2. Social: Training and education of staff, stakeholders and citizens
3. Spatial: Adaptation of public spaces to increase security feelings

1. The governance module – Local Security council (LSC)

Like the BeSecure FeelSecure (BSFS) project of Piraeus, Greece, Geel is keen to reinforce urban security and promote positive perception of urban safety.

In this module Geel will establish a Local Security Council with the Local Council for Crime Prevention (LCCP) of Piraeus as an example. The Geel Security Council will build further on the Local Stakeholder Group already active through the Citisense project and has a broad political platform as its establishment is part of the city's multi annual plan.

The LSC will not only act as an advisory body, its role is to identify current safety issues, keep track of them and take action. This may involve organising forums and lectures, but also promoting active public participation through workshops, test panels and living labs. The Local Security Council will also have a steering role with regards to the two other modules, safeguarding the coherence and integration of the proposed project.

2. The social module – social action on depolarisation and community building

This module links the BSFS project to the regional policy of the Flemish government regarding radicalisation and polarisation. The importance of this lies in the key insight that feelings of insecurity stem partly from polarisation in society, which may lead in turn to radicalisation. The actions in this module have the ambition not only to prevent polarisation but also to make communities in Geel more resilient and strengthen the sense of community;

The social action will be fuelled by the examples of the BSFS social activation strategies to enhance community cohesion and connectivity at neighbourhood level and translated into the specific context of Geel. To this end, the city will focus on a number of Flemish policy priorities. Possible actions include: the municipality training its own staff as polarisation strategists, offering support to local organisations during (acute) tensions, providing training to support workers in an online environment, investing in de-escalation techniques, training its communications staff to moderate appropriately and respond to intimidation, disinformation and hate speech on its social media, and acting as a point of contact for questions on the topic of socio-preventive actors; working with local influencers; and organising train-the-trainer sessions on bystander behaviour and street harassment.

3. The Spatial module – Public spaces adaptation for enhanced security

The importance of this module is shown in the territorial analysis and policy response and will introduce the concept of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design into the security and spatial planning policy of the city. This is also an adaptation of BSFS.

The spatial actions together with the social interventions will strengthen the security policy of the city of Geel and improve the feelings of security of its citizens. In this module, apart from CPTED, New Bauhaus (NEB) principles are introduced. The coupling of CPTED with NEB not only ensures safer public spaces but also gives attention to design aesthetics and guarantees citizen participation throughout the process.

The analysis and context urges a geographical focus in this module -however not exclusively- on those already identified nuisance hotspots between the train station area, city park, market place and youth centre. However the ambition of this module goes much further and aims at integrating the CPTED

principles, coupled with New Bauhaus principles, into the regular spatial planning process and ultimately as part of the policy

The three modules are coupled with three milestones and set up against a timeline spanning the next ten years:

<i>TRANSFER MODULE</i>	1 YEAR	5 YEARS	10 YEARS
Local Security Council	Established LSC. Common goals defined. Flexible working schedule	Continuity of the LSC	LSC part of the city administration framework.
Training/education	All relevant own staff trained	Training of stakeholders	Training of citizens in general
Adapt. Public spaces	Establish common goals internally with different city services	CPTED principles accepted within the organization	Combination of CPTED with New Bauhaus principles

3. The adapted innovation project

3.1 The Value Proposition

Through these transfer modules and following this investment plan, over the next decade, we will create a safer and more cohesive Geel by embedding a permanent Local Security Council in the city's governance, redesigning key public spaces, and strengthening social prevention and reporting, so that residents and visitors feel confident using the city centre, parks and streets at all hours, trust the security chain, and see visible, coordinated follow-up on problems rather than fragmented, ad-hoc reactions

3.2 The workplan

3.2.1 Work Package Local Security Council

The Local Security Council (LSC) will be established as the central governance body for urban safety in Geel. This section details the steps to move from a conceptual framework to an operational, multidisciplinary council that bridges the gap between police management and social policy

Action 1: Recruitment LSC

- **Deliverable 1.1: Recruitment method is set out.** Establish a transparent selection process to identify key representatives from the local police, municipal departments (Youth, Social Affairs), and outreach experts.
- **Deliverable 1.2: Citisense stakeholder group involvement.** Align the recruitment with the CITISENSE framework to ensure that the council reflects the multidisciplinary needs of the city's safety strategy.
- **Deliverable 1.3: Broad stakeholder group is represented.** Finalize the council membership to include a diverse range of safety actors capable of addressing both objective crime and subjective feelings of insecurity.
- **Output 1: Membership framework established.** A finalized list of LSC members and a defined organizational chart for the council.

Action 2: Legal Framework of the LSC

- **Deliverable 2.1: LSC framework approved by management.** Submit the operational mandate and strategic goals of the LSC to the municipal management team for administrative validation.
- **Deliverable 2.2: LSC framework approved by city council.** Secure formal political approval from the City Council to grant the LSC the necessary authority to coordinate urban safety policies.
- **Deliverable 2.3: Continuity to next legislation.** Ensure the LSC framework is integrated into the city's multi-year planning to maintain its mandate beyond the current political term.
- **Output 2: LSC embedded in the city governance system.** Legal recognition of the LSC as a permanent advisory and coordinating body.

Action 3: LSC bylaws / internal regulation

- **Deliverable 3.1: Workshop on LSC bylaws.** Conduct a foundational workshop to draft the core principles, decision-making procedures, and meeting frequencies for the council.
- **Deliverable 3.2: Workshop 2 on LSC internal regulations.** Finalize the protocols for data sharing and joint interventions, specifically addressing hotspots like the station area and city parks.
- **Deliverable 3.3: LSC Bylaws approved.** Achieve official sign-off on the internal regulations by all participating stakeholders.
- **Output 3: LSC bylaws & internal regulations framework set.** A comprehensive document outlining the operational rules of the LSC.

Action 4: Operationalisation

- **Deliverable 4.1: LSC coordinator appointed.** Assign a dedicated coordinator to manage the LSC's agenda, facilitate communication between departments, and monitor progress.
- **Deliverable 4.2: Organisation of first LSC.** Convene the inaugural meeting of the council to set the immediate priorities based on the 2025 security survey results.
- **Deliverable 4.3: At least three LSCs organised in one year.** Maintain a consistent meeting rhythm to review safety data and adjust coordinated interventions as needed.
- **Output 4: LSCs agenda planned one year ahead.** A finalized calendar of meetings and a structured reporting cycle for the first year of operation.

3.2.2 Work Package Social Action

This module focuses on the development and implementation of a training program designed to equip local stakeholders with the skills to address public nuisance and improve the perception of safety through social action. The goal is to move beyond purely operational management by fostering community resilience and proactive dialogue in high-priority areas like the market square, the railway station, and city parks.

Action 1: Development of Training Curriculum

- **Deliverable 1.1: Needs Assessment and Stakeholder Mapping.** Identify the specific training needs of municipal staff, local police, and community volunteers. Map out the key stakeholders who will participate in the training sessions.
- **Deliverable 1.2: Curriculum Design.** Develop a multidisciplinary training curriculum that includes modules on conflict de-escalation, community engagement, and addressing negative online narratives.
- **Deliverable 1.3: Material Production.** Create training handbooks, digital resources, and case study materials based on the "innovative practices" identified in the CITISENSE framework.
- **Output 1:** A finalized training manual and a detailed schedule for the Social Action training sessions.

Action 2: Implementation and Pilot Sessions

- **Deliverable 2.1: Pilot Training Rollout.** Conduct an initial round of pilot training sessions with a selected group of "early adopters" from the local security council and outreach programs.
- **Deliverable 2.2: Workshop Facilitation.** Organize stakeholder workshops to refine the training based on real-world scenarios encountered in Geel's city centre.
- **Deliverable 2.3: Cross-Departmental Training.** Deliver specialized sessions for various city departments to ensure an integrated approach to urban safety and social control.
- **Output 2:** Completion of the first phase of training for 20+ key local safety actors.

Action 3: Evaluation and Scaling

- **Deliverable 3.1: Impact Assessment.** Use the "Gemeentemonitor" or internal security surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of the training in improving the subjective sense of security.
- **Deliverable 3.2: Peer-to-Peer Mentoring.** Establish a mentoring system where trained staff can support new participants, ensuring the sustainability of the social action skills.
- **Deliverable 3.3: Integration into Multi-Year Plan.** Ensure the training modules are formally integrated into the City of Geel's annual review and multi-year planning process.
- **Output 3:** An evaluation report summarizing the impact of the training on local safety perceptions and recommendations for future iterations.

3.2.3 Work Package Public spaces adaptation for enhanced security

This module focuses on the physical and environmental transformation of Geel's city centre to enhance safety and the perception of security. By applying CPTED principles—such as natural surveillance, territorial reinforcement, and maintenance—the city aims to revitalize "hotspots" like the railway station and city parks. This approach moves beyond purely social interventions by creating a physical environment that discourages nuisance and encourages positive community use.

Action 1: Recruitment and CPTED Audit Team

- **Deliverable 1.1: Recruitment method for audit experts is set out.** Identify and select a multidisciplinary team of urban planners, police architectural prevention advisors, and safety experts specialized in environmental design.
- **Deliverable 1.2: Citisense stakeholder group involvement.** Engage local residents and business owners in "safety walks" to identify specific environmental factors (e.g., poor lighting, overgrown vegetation) that contribute to their feeling of insecurity.
- **Deliverable 1.3: Broad stakeholder group is represented.** Ensure the audit team includes representatives from the city's technical services, youth department, and local police to cover all aspects of the urban landscape.
- **Output 1: CPTED Audit framework established.** A finalized list of the audit team and a methodology for evaluating the city's priority zones.

Action 2: Legal and Planning Framework

- **Deliverable 2.1: CPTED guidelines approved by management.** Submit a set of standardized CPTED design guidelines to the municipal management for integration into future urban development projects.
- **Deliverable 2.2: CPTED framework approved by city council.** Secure political commitment to prioritize environmental safety interventions in the city's budget and revitalization plans.
- **Deliverable 2.3: Continuity to next legislation.** Formally embed CPTED principles into the city's building codes and public space management protocols to ensure long-term impact.
- **Output 2: CPTED principles embedded in the city governance system.** Official adoption of CPTED as a mandatory consideration for all new urban infrastructure projects in Geel.

Action 3: Design Standards and Internal Regulation

- **Deliverable 3.1: Workshop on CPTED technical standards.** Host technical sessions to define specific standards for lighting, sightlines, and "defensible space" in the market square and station area.
- **Deliverable 3.2: Workshop 2 on maintenance and management.** Develop regulations for the rapid repair of vandalism and upkeep of public greenery to prevent the "broken windows" effect.
- **Deliverable 3.3: CPTED design manual approved.** Achieve official sign-off on a practical manual for city developers and contractors.
- **Output 3: CPTED design & maintenance framework set.** A comprehensive handbook for applying environmental design to Geel's specific urban challenges.

Action 4: Operationalisation and Pilot Projects

- **Deliverable 4.1: CPTED project coordinator appointed.** Designate a project lead within the city's infrastructure department to oversee the implementation of environmental changes.
- **Deliverable 4.2: Organisation of first CPTED pilot intervention.** Launch a targeted physical improvement project—such as revitalizing a city park or a specific "night-shop" surroundings—based on the audit findings.
- **Deliverable 4.3: At least three CPTED-based interventions organised in one year.** Execute a series of "quick wins" (e.g., improved lighting, removal of physical barriers) to demonstrate immediate impact on resident safety perceptions.
- **Output 4: CPTED intervention agenda planned one year ahead.** A finalized schedule of physical urban improvements designed to increase natural social control.

The implementation of the CPTED workplan in section 3.2.3 serves as the foundational technical layer for Geel's urban security, but its final and most transformative step lies in its alignment with the New European Bauhaus (NEB). By transitioning from purely functional crime prevention to an NEB-inspired approach, the city ensures that security interventions simultaneously deliver Sustainability through nature-based solutions (like green sightlines), Aesthetics by replacing "hard" defensive architecture with high-quality design, and Inclusion through the co-creation of safe spaces for all social groups. This integration ensures that the final planning policies of Geel do not just "secure" public space, but actively enhance the quality of life, turning safety into a driver for a more beautiful, sustainable, and inclusive city.

3.2.4 Risk Analysis

Risk Category	Potential Risk / Challenge	Mitigation Strategy
Governance & Coordination (WP 3.2.1)	Siloed working: Key departments (Police vs. Social Services) may prioritize individual mandates over the LSC's integrated goals.	Formalize the LSC through a signed cooperation charter and clear internal regulations to ensure joint accountability.
Political & Legal (WP 3.2.1 & 3.2.3)	Legislative Discontinuity: A change in local government could lead to shifting priorities or budget cuts for long-term safety projects.	Formally embed the LSC and CPTED principles into the city's official multi-year plan and building codes to ensure legal continuity.
Stakeholder Engagement (WP 3.2.2 & 3.2.3)	Stakeholder Fatigue: Local residents and business owners may lose interest if they do not see immediate physical or social changes.	Implement "Quick Wins" through CPTED pilot projects and maintain transparent communication via the LSC dashboard to show tangible progress.
Social & Public Perception (WP 3.2.2)	Polarization: Social Action training could be perceived as "too soft" by residents demanding repressive measures, or as "stigmatizing" by the target groups.	Use the CITISENSE methodology to balance social control with harm reduction and communicate the objective safety data to counter negative online narratives.
Operational & Technical (WP 3.2.3)	Higher than expected Implementation Costs: Large-scale CPTED interventions (e.g., station area revitalization) may exceed the allocated budget due to unforeseen circumstances as ie. high inflation	List interventions based on the 2025 security survey data. Then prioritise interventions on the basis of quick and tangible results. If necessary, seek for external funding (Flemish or European subsidies). Make realistic estimations in the investment plan
Data Reporting & (WP 3.2.1)	Under-reporting: If residents continue using informal social media channels instead of official ones, the LSC will lack actionable data.	Standardize the reporting chain and launch a public campaign to promote official channels, demonstrating that reports lead to direct council action. This can be combined with the use (or development) of a 'social media scraping tool' to harvest complaints and for monitoring purposes.

3.2.5 Indicators: baseline & final result indicators and monitoring

To complete the workplans for sections 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3, the following baseline, output and result indicators have been developed. These are based on the **2025 Security Survey** (1,254 respondents), **Gemeentemonitor** and the **Local Police statistics of 2025** as established in the investment plan.

Local Security Council (LSC)

- **Baseline Indicator:** there is currently an operational absence of a formalized Local Security Council, with a baseline of **0** permanent multidisciplinary security task forces embedded in the city administration framework.
- **Output indicator:** structural integration of the LSC into the city's multi-year planning framework, ensuring it successfully scales across the 5-year target timeframe (2026–2031) and permanently transitions into a post-term advisory body.
- **Result Indicator:** the capacity to determine positive impact on urban security and on the efficiency and effectiveness of public responses to security issues, measured in the following surveys.

Social Action depolarisation/community building

- **Baseline Indicator:** 83% of surveyed residents report that their sense of security is negatively influenced by the presence of specific groups (e.g., loitering youth or groups of different origins) in public spaces.
- **Output indicator:** organisation of a minimum of 6 resilience and bystander intervention training sessions annually starting in autumn 2026, training at least 12 co-workers or persons from partner organisation per session.
- **Result Indicator:** A measurable reduction in the "subjective feeling of insecurity" related to these groups in the city centre, targeting a 15% improvement in the next "Gemeentemonitor" cycle.

Public Spaces Adaptation

- **Baseline Indicator:** 72% of residents currently avoid specific "hotspots" such as the station area, city parks, and night-shop surroundings during evening and night-time hours due to perceived lack of safety.
- **Output:** execution of at least three targeted CPTED-based physical interventions (such as improved lighting or removal of physical barriers) within the first two years, specifically aimed at revitalizing hotspots like the city park or night-shop surroundings.
- **Result Indicator:** A 15% decrease in the number of residents who report "avoidance behavior" in the city centre at night, alongside a documented improvement in the physical quality (lighting, sightlines) of at least three major urban hotspots.

Summary Monitoring Framework

As per the city's policy, these indicators will be tracked through:

1. The Annual Review: Integrated into the City of Geel's multi-year planning cycle.
2. Comparative Data: Results will be benchmarked against the 2025 Baseline Survey and the 2025 Police Statistics to measure the shift from objective crime stats to subjective safety perceptions.

3.3 Partners involved in the workplan

3.3.1 Mayor

Serves as the political champion, executive leader, and possible chairperson of the Local Security Council (LSC). Responsible for utilizing administrative powers to maintain public order, securing

cross-departmental alignment, and anchoring the project within the city's multi-year legislative strategy.

3.3.2 Policy Advisor Safety and Security

Acts as the primary operational coordinator for the entire investment plan and the LSC. Responsible for bridging the gap between police enforcement data and social policy, managing the council's agenda, and monitoring the delivery of the three primary transfer modules.

3.3.3 Street Corner Workers (*Straathoekwerkers*)

Drive low-threshold, field-based prevention and outreach programs directly in identified hotspots, such as the station area and city parks. They focus on establishing dialogue, early intervention, and harm reduction for loitering youths and chronic alcohol users.

3.3.4 Community Guards (*Gemeenschapswachten*)

Provide a visible, non-repressive municipal presence in the city centre and urban hotspots to increase public reassurance and natural social control. They identify environmental nuisances, encourage formal citizen reporting, and assist with public awareness campaigns.

3.3.5 Bureau of Communal Sanctions (*Bureau GAS*)

Manages the administrative follow-up, legal enforcement, and processing of municipal ordinances (GAS fines) regarding public nuisance, public intoxication, and minor vandalism. Supports the LSC by providing localized trends on public peace violations.

3.3.6 Local Police (*Politiezone Geel Laakdal Meerhout*)

Responsible for objective law enforcement, regular physical patrols, targeted hotspot checks, and specialized security operations (e.g., drug and nightlife enforcement). Functions as a core member of the LSC to establish a shared, data-driven security picture.

3.3.7 Fire Department (*Brandweer Zone Kempen*)

Serves as the primary advisory body for fire safety legislation and emergency prevention protocols. Contributes to the Spatial module by evaluating infrastructure adjustments, public space layouts, and major urban design projects to ensure structural safety.

3.3.8 Education Department & Supporting Education Policy

Coordinates preventative safety strategies across the local school ecosystem. Focuses on aligning institutional support, identifying early youth vulnerabilities, and embedding resilience and de-escalation frameworks within local youth policy.

3.3.9 Thomas More (College)

Functions as an academic and research partner, leveraging its local campus presence to support data collection, assist with local security survey evaluations, and co-create living labs or citizen test panels.

3.3.10 KOGKA

See 3.3.11

3.3.11 Go!Geel (Secondary Schools)

Act as direct partners in youth engagement and polarization prevention. They could also facilitate student participation in bystander intervention and resilience training sessions, managing student dynamics near central transit zones and school environments.

3.3.12 House of the Child (*Huis van het Kind*)

Focuses on preventative family outreach, offering parenting support and youth welfare services to address the root social causes of public distress, thereby fostering social cohesion from an early age.

3.3.13 Social Services City of Geel

Designs and implements socio-preventive programs to tackle structural vulnerabilities like homelessness and chronic addiction, ensuring that marginalized individuals are routed toward support services rather than purely repressive frameworks.

3.3.14 Hannah Arendt Institute

Acts as the primary external expert organization for the Social Action module. Responsible for designing the training curriculum, educating municipal and communication staff as "polarization strategists," and providing frameworks to counter negative online narratives.

3.3.15 Equal Chances Department (*Dienst Gelijke Kansen*)

Guarantees that all social and spatial interventions adhere to democratic inclusion principles. Focuses on protecting vulnerable target groups (such as women, the elderly, and minorities) from street harassment and intimidation in public spaces.

3.3.16 Diversity Organisations & NGOs (The Mosque, ...)

Act as vital intercultural bridges to build trust, facilitate community dialogue, and proactively counter "us-versus-them" polarization or social divisions within visible urban spaces.

3.3.17 Expert Citizens

Participate directly in localized co-creation trajectories, representing neighborhood interests during "safety walks," executing CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) audits, and providing immediate feedback via living labs.

3.4 Overall project schedule

GANTT LSC		2026				2027				2028				2029				2030			
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
A1	Recruitment Local Security Council (LSC)																				
D1.1	Recruitment method is set out			X																	
D1.2	Citisense stakeholder group involvement	X																			
D1.3	Broad stakeholder group is represented					X															
Output1	Membership framework established				X																
A2	Legal Framework LSC																				
D2.1	LSC framework approved by management								X												
D2.2	LSC framework approved by city council									X											
D2.3	Continuity to next legislation																X				
Output2	LSC embedded in governance system																	X			
A3	LSC Bylaws / Internal regulations																				
D3.1	Workshop on LSC bylaws			X																	
D3.2	Workshop 2 on LSC internal regulations				X																
D3.3	LSC bylaws approved				X																
Output3	LSC bylaws & internal regulations framework set					X															
A4	Operationalisation																				
D4.1	LSC coordinator appointed	X																			
D4.2	Organisation of first LSC					X															
D4.3	At least 3 LSCs organised in 1 year								X												
Output4	LSCs agenda planned one year ahead									X											

GANTT Social Action Training		2026				2027				2028				2029				2030			
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
A1	Development of Training Curriculum																				
D1.1	Needs Assessment and Stakeholder Mapping		X																		
D1.2	Curriculum Design			X																	
D1.3	Material Production				X																
Output1	A finalized training manual and a detailed schedule					X															
A2	Implementation and Pilot Sessions																				
D2.1	Pilot Training Rollout					X															
D2.2	Workshop Facilitation						X														
D2.3	Cross-Departmental Training							X													
Output2	Completion of the first phase of training for 20+ key local safety actors								X												
A3	Evaluation and scaling																				
D3.1	Impact Assessment									X											
D3.2	Peer-to-Peer Mentoring									X											
D3.3	Integration into Multi-Year Plan											X									
Output3	An evaluation report summarizing the impact of the training												X								

GANTT Public Spaces Adaptation		2026				2027				2028				2029				2030			
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
A1	Recruitment and CPTED Audit Team																				
D1.1	Recruitment method is set out						X														
D1.2	Citisense stakeholder group involvement							X													
D1.3	Broad stakeholder group is represented								X												
Output1	CPTED Audit framework established									X											
A2	Legal and Planning Framework																				
D2.1	CPTED guidelines approved by management									X											
D2.2	CPTED framework approved by city council									X											
D2.3	Continuity to next legislation													X							
Output2	CPTED embedded in governance system													X							
A3	Design Standards and Internal Regulation																				
D3.1	Workshop on CPTED technical standards.								X												
D3.2	Workshop 2 on maintenance and management								X												
D3.3	CPTED design manual approved									X											
Output3	CPTED design & maintenance framework set									X											
A4	Operationalisation and Pilot Projects																				
D4.1	CPTED coordinator appointed						X														
D4.2	Organisation of 1 st CPTED pilot intervention										X										
D4.3	At least three CPTED-based interventions organised in one year																X				
Output4	CPTED intervention agenda planned one year ahead																X				

4. Budget

4.1 Project costs

1. Total investment amount required

To successfully realise the total workplan across its multi-disciplinary pillars over the 5-year project duration, the total estimated investment required is **€625,000**.

2. Capital vs. revenue funding split

The project focuses heavily on organisational restructuring, social prevention, and community building, making it resource and personnel-intensive (Revenue). However, it also includes a significant technical layer dedicated to physical adaptations in hotspot urban areas (Capital).

- **Revenue funding ('exploitatie') (80%): €500,000** Covers: Project coordination, training delivery, communications campaign, workshops, stakeholder engagement, evaluations, and academic research partnerships.
- **Capital funding ('Investeringen') (20%): €125,000** Covers: Priority urban zone camera physical audits (in close cooperation with the local police), smart camera infrastructure deployment, targeted public lighting optimisations, and urban co-creation physical living labs.

3. Detailed cost breakdown by workplan components

The costs are broken down into the project's Work Packages (WP) and thematic pillars:

Component A: Local Security Council (LSC) & Governance (WP 3.2.1)

- **Estimated cost: €225,000**
- **Cost drivers:**
 - Dedicated LSC Coordinator (Partial/Full FTE allocation scaled over 5 years) to bridge police data and social policy, manage agendas, and coordinate multidisciplinary task forces.
 - Foundational governance workshops, draft bylaws/regulations framework, charter agreements, and administrative support.
 - Academic evaluations, living labs coordination, and security survey evaluations with Thomas More University College.

Component B: Social Action, Resilience, and Communication (WP 3.2.2)

- **Estimated cost: €150,000**
- **Cost drivers:**
 - Delivery of at least 6 citizen bystander intervention and de-escalation training sessions per year (including target materials for youth, women, and the elderly).
 - Mandatory frontline municipal/police staff resilience training and biennial refresher courses.
 - Modernising digital communication strategies: publishing quarterly objective safety bulletins, running countering campaigns against online 'us-versus-them' polarization.

Component C: CPTED & Spatial Adaptations (WP 3.2.3)

- **Estimated cost: €190,000**
- **Cost drivers:**
 - Formulating the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Audit framework and executing technical physical space audits across priority hotspots (Station, City Park, Night Shops).

- Procurement and installation of optimised public street lighting and flexible smart camera network deployment at hotspots.
- Transitioning CPTED into "New European Bauhaus" (NEB) principles (integrating green sightlines, co-creation panels, and high-quality inclusive public architecture).

Component D: Project Management, Monitoring & Evaluation (WP 3.2.5)

- **Estimated cost: €60,000**
- **Cost drivers:**
 - Annual internal reviews, indexing safety data against the 2025 baseline, tracking indicators (nuisance report drop targets, digital engagement growth, reporting rates).
 - Contingency budget for risk mitigation (e.g., handling technical overruns in spatial interventions or material costs).

4. Funding time schedule (2026 – 2031)

The table below outlines the financial deployment strategy. Years 1 and 2 lean heavily on setup, initial broad-scale staff training, extensive auditing, and high-impact "Quick Win" capital infrastructure interventions to combat public fatigue. Years 3–5 stabilise into operational monitoring, citizen training expansion, and policy maintenance.

Component / WP	Year 1 (2026-27)	Year 2 (2027-28)	Year 3 (2028-29)	Year 4 (2029-30)	Year 5 (2030-31)	Total Component Cost
WP 3.2.1: Governance & LSC	€55,000	€45,000	€42,000	€41,000	€42,000	€225,000
WP 3.2.2: Social & Comms	€35,000	€32,000	€28,000	€27,000	€28,000	€150,000
WP 3.2.3: Spatial & CPTED	€65,000	€45,000	€30,000	€25,000	€25,000	€190,000
WP 3.2.5: M&E / Management	€15,000	€12,000	€11,000	€11,000	€11,000	€60,000
Annual Total Requirement	€170,000	€134,00	€111,000	€104,000	€106,000	€625,000
<i>Funding Class Split</i>						
— Revenue (80%) Allocation	€120,000	€104,000	€91,000	€91,000	€94,000	€500,000
— Capital (20%) Allocation	€50,000	€30,000	€20,000	€13,000	€12,000	€125,000

Total project costs overview

Component / Work Package	Focus Area	Funding Category	Estimated Cost
WP 3.2.1: Governance & LSC	Coordination & Administration	Revenue	€225,000
WP 3.2.2: Social Action & Comms	Training & Public Engagement	Revenue	€150,000
WP 3.2.3 & 3.2.4: Spatial Adaptations	Physical Audits & Infrastructure	Capital & Revenue	€190,000
WP 3.2.5: M&E & Management	Monitoring & Contingency	Revenue	€60,000
Total Project Investment	All Pillars	80% Rev / 20% Cap	€625,000

4.2 Investment sources

4.2.1 Funding and grants

The funding for the workplan is primarily based on the city's multi annual plan (2026-2031). Relevant approved actions include:

1. Actions to work on depolarisation and prevent radicalisation in the community (trajectories for disengagement, support for co-workers, trainings, workshops,...) (revenue)

2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
€62,000	€62,000	€62,000	€62,000	€62,000	€62,000

2. Action on raising awareness about clean streets (revenue)

2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
€5,100	€5,202	€5,306	€5,412	€5,520	€5,630

3. Operational resources for the safety team (revenue)

2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
€54,000	€42,000	€42,840	€43,700	€44,575	€45,465

4. Organisation Local Security Council (revenue)

2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
€1,500	€1,500	€1,500	€1,500	€1,500	€1,500

5. Action for European cooperation – participation in European programmes (revenue)

2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
€35,000	€25,000	€25,000	€25,000	€25,000	€25,000

6. Smart camera deployment (capital)

2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
€434,084	€250,000	€200,000	€200,000	€50,000	€50,000

These budgets are partly funded by grants from higher-level authorities:

1. Flemish Government: Support Local coordinating role in policy on the prevention of violent radicalisation, extremism, terrorism and harmful polarisation

2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
€50,000	€50,000	€50,000	€50,000	€50,000	€50,000

2. European grants. Expected revenues from active projects and proposals in the context of the IP.

2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
€175,000	€25,000	€25,000	€25,000	€25,000	€25,000

4.2.2

The city's internal budget lines align well with the revenue-heavy parts of the workplan:

- **WP 3.2.2 (Social Action & Comms):** Fully covered. **Funding action 1** provides **€62,000 annually** for depolarisation and prevention trajectories, which easily absorbs the estimated €150,000 needed for citizen bystander training and communication campaigns.
- **WP 3.2.1 (Governance & LSC):** Mostly covered. While the specific LSC budget (**funding action 4**) is low at **€1,500/year**, the necessary LSC Coordinator and administrative costs can be absorbed by **finding action 3** (Operational safety team resources), which provides **€42,000 to €54,000 annually**.
- **WP 3.2.5 (Project Management & M&E):** Fully covered. **Funding action 5** (European cooperation) allocates **€25,000 to €35,000 annually**, providing sufficient budget for, among others but not exclusively, academic data indexing, survey evaluations, and risk monitoring.

2. Identified Funding Gaps

- **The Spatial Infrastructure Gap (WP 3.2.3):** **Funding action 6** provides a massive capital budget for **Smart camera deployment** (ranging from €434,084 in Year 1 to €50,000 in year 5). However, this budget is structurally restricted to cameras. There is a funding gap for the other non-camera spatial adaptations in the workplan, such as optimized street lighting, park landscaping, and New European Bauhaus architectural redesigns. However, the city aims at European programmes to cover this part, especially within Horizon Europe (NEB calls), Urbact and ISF.
- **The LSC standalone shortfall:** Relying strictly on the €1,500/year allocated for "Organisation Local Security Council" would create an immediate deficit for the LSC coordinator role. It forces the project to cannibalize the general safety team's operational resources. Ideally, this shortfall should be addressed through European programmes, which means that specific efforts must be made in this area.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation

5.1 The Monitoring and evaluation approach

The City of Geel has a multi-annual plan that spans from 2026 to 2031. And consists of Policy Goals, action plans and actions. Each action is evaluated on two moments each year. The first evaluation is every 30th of June and the second evaluation is on December 31st and marks the final evaluation of that year. This means actions are evaluated on a cumulative basis.

The evaluation of the actions of the multi annual plan is presented to the management and city council. There is no external evaluator although the city council works independently from management and administration.

The three work packages are (or will be) included in the multi annual plan as follows:

1. Work Package 1 Local Security Council

=> Policy Goal 8: Comprehensive Safety and Prevention Policy 2026–2033; Action Plan 60: Security services; **Action 238 Geel organises a periodic Local Security Council.**

2. Work Package 2 Social Action Training

=> Policy Goal 8: Comprehensive Safety and Prevention Policy 2026–2033; Action Plan 59 Sense of security; **Action 234 Geel prevents violent radicalisation by combating harmful polarisation in society.**

3. Work Package 3 Public Spaces Adaptation (CPTED)

In the GANTT chart CPTED is embedded in the governance system as the output for action 2. The time frame for this output is the first quarter of 2029, in other words, WP3 will be included as an action in the multi-annual plan in 2028 at the latest.

5.2 The monitoring and evaluation framework

To ensure the successful rollout and structural integration of the project, performance will be tracked against established baselines using clear output and result indicators. These indicators are linked to specific delivery schedules mapped across the multi-annual plan (2026–2031).

Work Package 1: Local Security Council

Indicator Type	Description & Target Value	Schedule/Timeline
Baseline	0 permanent multidisciplinary security task forces embedded in the city administration framework (operational absence of a formalized LSC).	2025 baseline
Output	Membership framework established.	Q4 2026
Output	LSC bylaws and internal regulations framework set.	Q2 2027
Output	Formal establishment of the LSC, appointment of a dedicated coordinator, and a minimum of 3 operational council meetings organized.	Within year 1 (2026-2027)
Output	LSC agenda planned one year ahead.	Q1 2028
Output	LSC legally and operationally embedded in the governance system	Q1 2030
Result	Structural integration of the LSC into the city's multi-year planning framework, permanently transitioning into a post-term advisory body.	2026-2031 timeframe

Result	Minimum decrease of 15% in recorded nuisance reports in the city centre, with a broader ambition of a 30% structural reduction (Baseline: 1,901 reports in 2025).	15% by end o 2027. 30% by 2031
--------	---	-----------------------------------

Work Package 2: Social Action Training

Indicator Type	Description & Target Value	Schedule/Timeline
Baseline	83% of surveyed residents report their sense of security is negatively influenced by the presence of specific groups in public spaces.	2025 survey
Output	Finalized training manual and a detailed schedule developed.	Q1 2027
Output	100% of the operational frontline staff of the City of Geel complete the required training.	Mid-2027
Output	Completion of the first phase of training for 20+ key local safety actors.	Q4 2027
Output	Organisation of a minimum of 6 resilience and bystander intervention training sessions annually (training at least 12 co-workers or partner organisation persons per session).	Annually, starting Q3 2026
Output	An evaluation report summarizing the impact of the training on local safety perceptions.	Q2 2029
Result	A measurable reduction in the "subjective feeling of insecurity" related to specific groups in the city centre, targeting a 15% improvement.	Next 'Gemeentemonitor' cycle – (timing not set yet)

Work Package 3: Public Spaces Adaptation (CPTED)

Indicator Type	Description & Target Value	Schedule/Timeline
Baseline	72% of residents currently avoid specific "hotspots" (station area, city parks, night-shop surroundings) at night due to a perceived lack of safety	2025 survey
Output	CPTED Audit framework established.	Q1 2028
Output	CPTED design and maintenance framework set.	Q1 2028
Output	Execution of at least three targeted CPTED-based physical interventions (such as improved lighting or removal of physical barriers) to revitalize hotspots.	Q4 2028
Output	CPTED legally and technically embedded in the governance system.	Q1 2029
Output	CPTED intervention agenda planned one year ahead.	Q4 2029
Result	A 15% decrease in the number of residents who report "avoidance behaviour" in the city centre at night.	By 2031
Result	Documented improvement in the physical quality (lighting, sightlines) of at least three major urban hotspots.	By 2031