

Fennie M. van Straalen

Conference report

Property Rights and a Changing Economy: The 7th Conference of the IAAPLPR, Portland, Oregon, 13–15 February 2013

One hundred and twenty scholars from around the globe gathered at Portland State University in Portland (OR) on 13 February 2013 for the 7th International Academic Association on Planning, Law and Property Rights' (PLPR) conference. The local hosts, Ed Sullivan (Portland State University/Lewis and Clark College), Ellen Bassett (University of Virginia), Sy Adler (Portland State University) and Al Burns (City of Portland) invited us to an inspiring event, filled with scientific presentations and discussions, social gatherings and – as PLPR President Ben Davy called it – ‘meetings with friends’. As in previous years, the venue locations were splendid. During the welcome reception we admired the interior of Portland’s City Hall and had the opportunity to get (re)acquainted. The conference dinner took place in the ballroom of the Governor Hotel. A show of hands at the dinner revealed a fifty/ fifty mix of planners and lawyers attending the conference. This balanced mix was a PLPR first; usually planners have been in the majority, since PLPR has its roots within AESOP (Association of European Schools of Planning).

Forty years’ planning for Portland

Gathering in Portland had an extra festive component as Oregon’s pioneering state-wide land-use Planning Program celebrated its fortieth anniversary in 2013 and this gave delegates the opportunity to reflect on and learn from planning in the State. The learning experience commenced during the pre-conference tour. Nancy Hales, from First Stop Portland, showed us around town using the light rail system, taking us first to Pill Hill and the new waterfront development. Pill Hill was initially designed to be part of the railway network, but as soon as the planners realised the area was such a hilly site, the plan was abandoned. After several years, a hospital acquired the land and developed new facilities and a medical university on the hill. Eventually, Pill Hill was fully developed and the hospital contacted the Portland planning department to find additional space for development. They suggested a new building site near the river waterfront, and a new 140-acre high-density, mixed use urban community is now under construction. To unite both sites a new form of infrastructure was introduced to Portland: both sites are now connected via a cable car system, which – as we experienced – provides a beautiful panoramic overview of the city. After the panoramic view of the city, Nancy Hales also showed us the Pearl district, a post-industrial neighbourhood, currently being redeveloped. This project includes historic preservation, earth-

quake prevention, urban retail and sustainable development. The Brewery Blocks development is a good example of Portland working towards a sustainable city, while preserving its heritage.

Oregon planners reflected on their planning system in two morning sessions during the conference. Ed Sullivan defined the journey of Oregon planning as ‘a story of ideas and a lot of luck’ and added that the journey was ‘a unique experience within the USA’. He argued ‘we might not be Nirvana, but we are pretty close’. Ed also addressed challenges for the future, such as climate change. During the coming decennia the climate in the USA is expected to change in a way which will affect the south of the USA in particular, causing southern citizens to move to the north: Portland is one of the areas to accommodate the climate refugees. This raises several planning questions for the State, such as ‘how to accommodate the growth’ and ‘how to sustain the liveability of the city’. Both the pre-meeting tour and the Oregon sessions showed us much of the true nature of planning in Portland and how, in a changing economy, Portland is getting ready for the future.

Fine keynotes

As part of the conference we enjoyed two keynote speeches. Both speakers focused on the impact of planning on individual property rights, with the role of lawyers and planners being central to both. Each speaker had interesting thoughts on this role. Dwight Merriam proposed to be ‘a planner for the salary of a lawyer’, while Lee Fennell opted for a view of the ‘planner as leader of the beehive’.

Dwight Merriam (Robinson & Cole, Hartford, Connecticut) spoke about decision-making and just compensation in his keynote ‘Getting past “Yes or No”: Linking police power decision-making with just compensation’. He argued that all takings should be compensated, even if law does not take account for the taking: ‘what you and I might think is a property right, the law may not respect as a property right’. Dwight added that most planning projects are public focused, not person-oriented. Therefore, it is complex for individual land owners to access the decision-making process and bring forth the perceived impact on their property. This is especially the case when the perceived impact has no clear economic value. Dwight proposed to separate decision-making and compensation and spread the burden of planning decisions among all who benefit from the planning decision; for example via trust funds to provide for just compensation in relation to takings for the public good.

The address by Lee Fennell (University of Chicago) focused on ‘Optional Planning’. At the beginning of her speech, Lee reassured us that she did not think planning was inessential, stating ‘planning is not only necessary, it is even inevitable’. Fennell defined ‘optional’ as an opportunity to involve the public further in planning; to let the public gather information about land use impacts, land use intentions and preferences for land use patterns; for instance, to allow the public to gather information on

nuisance via apps, thereby providing a basis for performance zoning. In this planning system, the role of the planner would be to optimise participation, use gathered information and behavioural insights to frame choices or options and pursue normative commitments to benefit the public good. The planner, she proposed, should be a swarm leader, a hive planner.

Themes of papers and sessions

Some eighty nine of the delegates attending the 7th PLPR conference presented a paper in one of the twenty four sessions. As a result of the excellent work of the hosts, the presentations in different sessions fitted together wonderfully. This structure stimulated lively discussions at the end of every session. Although the themes of the papers were diverse, many of them related to the central theme of the conference, 'Property rights and a changing economy'. The papers can be roughly divided into three categories. To begin, several sessions focused on societal problems, such as sprawl, (sustainable) energy, water risk management, climate change, agriculture and decline. Next, a number of sessions concentrated on the human aspect in relations of planning and law, for instance human rights, personal freedom, inclusion and exclusion, power and equity. A final category of papers provided insight into planning practices in relation to law and property rights, covering topics such as public engagement, changing regulations, public / private development, institutions, expropriation / takings, value capture and land readjustment.

The presentations and discussions during the conference proved (again) that planning for societal changes via regulation or property rights asks for continuous effort from planners and scientists. The presentation of Charles Wiggins (DS Consulting) and Leonie Janssen-Jansen (University of Amsterdam) on planning for Portland, for instance, emphasised 'the need for a mechanism of feedback and sensitivity for a changing context over time'. Judd Schechtman (Rutgers University) spoke about restoration and adaptation after natural disasters and asked 'when not to rebuild' and 'how to compensate for such a taking?'

Erwin van de Krabben (Radboud University Nijmegen) stressed the role of economics in planning, proposing to change the name of our association to 'the International Academic Association on Planning, Law, and *Economics*'. He stated that all planning systems and tools are based on economic growth and that it is not possible to have pro-active planning or use value-capturing in times of economic non-growth. Harvey M. Jacobs (University of Wisconsin-Madison) also commented on PLPR, speaking about the role of private land ownership in an increasing urbanised world and asked, 'is private property a human right, or, do you have rights when owning property?'. Jacobs expressed the need for anthropologists to attend the PLPR conference so as to accommodate a more philosophical debate on personal freedom and human rights in relation to property.

The questions whether or not the current planning systems could cope with economic setback and whether planning systems are failing in general arose during several sessions. When asked if Dutch spatial planning was limping, David Evers (Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency), for example, answered ‘we are slowly strolling forth’. Tzuyuan Choa (National Cheng Kung University) talked about missed policy opportunities in relation to low birth rates in Taiwan. Instead of dealing with population decline, the Taiwanese system focuses on stimulating birth rates by offering bonuses for babies.

In her presentation on tensions between levels of government in Spain, Marta Lora-Tamayo Vallvé (Universidad Nacional de Educacion Distancia, Madrid) underlined the permanent conflict within the system. As a consequence, both organisations and laws are pressured. In a later discussion, participants nominated dependency relationships as *the* fail point for development. Andreas Hengstermann (University of Bern) spoke about the Swiss planning system, second homes and new strict property-related regulation. Hengstermann added that Switzerland is currently working towards a new spatial planning act, not exclusively based on zoning, but also on property regulation and value-capturing mechanisms. This new act could, he thought, prove more adaptive in comparison to traditional systems when planning in a changing context.

In conclusion and as a synopsis of the 7th IAAPLPR conference in Portland, I should like to quote John Gustafson, who during the Oregon sessions, reflected on the successes of the Oregon planning system and added that ‘it is all about leadership, technique, and love of the land’.

Trends across PLPR conferences

The number of papers (90–100) presented at the annual PLPR conferences and the number of participants (120) attending have both been stable for several years. This has resulted in conferences where participants have the opportunity to get acquainted and engage in conversation with most of the others. In the same way, 90–100 presentations, divided into several sessions over the course of three days, have allowed for plenty of time for additional questions and discussion. The time for additional discussion and the opportunity to engage with other participants, both during sessions and breaks, have improved the quality of the conferences. My advice to future PLPR hosts would be to maintain this size and time schedule so as to keep the quality of the conferences high.

Secondly, various issues and topics have been addressed during the past seven PLPR conferences, all with a clear focus on the intersecting field between planning, law and property rights. However, several more specific themes keep reappearing, for instance ‘inclusion’, ‘engagement’, ‘institutional power’, ‘changing regulation’, ‘compensation’ and ‘cross national comparisons’. These themes are at the core of our scientific field and keep the debates within the association alive. Although they have

reappeared at a number of conferences, so far there has been little opportunity to monitor and evaluate progression in a specific thematic subfield. To help understand the progressive development of the subfield themes, it could be useful to keep an online accessible database of presented papers. However, some might point to difficulties with making relatively informal conference papers available digitally in an era of steep tenure track requirements and high publishing standards. Another option might be to publish the conference's top ten papers in a special issue print format. Furthermore, the opportunity to publish a (modified) conference paper in a refereed journal might persuade delegates to keep investing time and effort in the papers they write for conferences and, as a consequence, help in keeping up the outstanding scientific quality of PLPR meetings.

A third trend to be addressed is the number of Ph.D. candidates and the quality of their work. To start with the latter point, the doctoral candidates, as with all other participants, presented high quality papers and research ideas. Consequently, they have been easily adopted into the academic life of the PLPR association. This acceptance has given them the opportunity to participate in discussions and be inspired by comments and suggestions on their research. As to the former point, the number of Ph.D. candidates attending the conference has been growing since the first conference. In 2013, there were approximately twenty five Ph.D. candidates participating, representing both new and familiar faces as several candidates have returned to the subsequent PLPR meetings. This has enabled PLPR to provide a platform for young scientists in the fields of planning and law and to mix experienced researchers and novices at every conference. At the same time, frequent attendees encourage the development of a strong community of dedicated researchers, helping to progress the scientific and academic study of PLPR. As participants keep returning and new institutions keep offering to host the annual conference, the future of PLPR seems bright.

The 8th PLPR conference in Haifa, 2014

After a conference with outstanding presentations and many good discussions, delegates can look forward to the next PLPR conference when they will have the opportunity to meet again and welcome new delegates. During the General Assembly, Rachele Alterman presented her plans for the 8th Conference to be held in Haifa, Israel from 12 to 14 February 2014, launching an attractive combination of the annual PLPR conference and several special workshops (10–11 February) on planning issues in Israel. The next PLPR conference thus promises to be an opportunity to have more engaging presentations and discussions, to meet with friends and to experience planning in the host state – an exciting prospect.

David W. Edgington and Carola Hein

Conference report

Japanese cities in their global context

Special Paper Sessions at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers, Los Angeles, 13 April 2013

After an interval of some years in which interest by scholars appeared to have waned, Japanese cities are back in vogue. With an eye to exploring the position of Japanese cities in a broader global context, the 2013 Association of American Geographers' meeting in Los Angeles hosted two consecutive panels bringing together research into aspects of Japanese urban history and contemporary urban development, as well as political, social and cultural issues. Participants and their audience came from a wide diversity of sub-disciplines, including geographers, planning historians and architects from universities in North America, Japan, Singapore and Australia. Working at the frontier of their fields, they all were interested in a multi-disciplinary approach to discussing the complex nature of urban life and the forces shaping metropolitan development in the Japanese context.

Global influences on Japanese approaches to town planning

To what degree are overseas approaches to urban development, policy and governance found in Japanese practice? Tristan Grunow, an urban historian from University of Oregon, developed this theme by examining the American and European influences brought to bear upon planning Tokyo as it transformed from a feudal castle city with narrow streets unfit for vehicular traffic into the Meiji capital of Tokyo during the late nineteenth century. Grunow's close reading of urban plans and improvement projects – the 1872 Ginza Bricktown project, the 1880 Matsuda plan, the competing Home Ministry and Foreign Ministry plans of the mid-1880s and the Tokyo Urban Improvement projects of the 1890s and 1900s – revealed a constant emphasis on transportation, street widening and the persistent recognition of the role of Tokyo as the seat of the national government and the residence of the Japanese emperor as the primary reason for undertaking such improvements. At the same time that western practice in New York and London emphasised sewerage and street lighting, the first recorded urban planning legislation in Japan, the Tokyo Municipal Improvement (*Tokyo Shiku-Kaisei*) Act of 1888, was instigated directly by the central government and was much more concerned over the capital's economic and political functions rather than its appearance or the social and housing conditions of its citizens. Notably, this emphasis on public works totally ignored housing and local residential environments. The history of early planning in Japan reflects a lack of interest in people

David W. Edgington is a Professor in the Department of Geography, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T1Z2, Canada; email: David.Edgington@ubc.ca. Carola Hein is Professor of Growth and Structure of Cities at Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA 19010, USA; email: chein@brynmawr.edu.

and their needs, underlined by a long-standing lack of civil society in the country. To sum up, Japanese planning, at least until 1945, took a significantly different form from that practised in Europe and North America. While British planners emphasised public housing and redevelopment and American planners focused on strict land use controls in suburban areas, Japan followed a system of weak regulations and strong public works programmes heavily geared towards economic infrastructure.

The stark difference between Japanese and Western urban planning traditions was also considered by urban planning historian Fukuo Akimoto (Kyushu University). He contended that while western urban planning was wide-ranging, visionary and drew from Greek philosophy of the ‘philosopher king’, Japanese approaches to planning legislation established a pattern under which the national government held responsibility for planning, while municipal governments (with some national subsidies) were in charge of expenses and implementation of various projects. This planning system was appropriate to the highly centralised power which produced it, and it had an immense impact on all subsequent planning concepts. For instance, up until 1945 Japanese administrative style of planning had no public review or input into the new planning system due to the lack of civil society in Japan. Akimoto concluded that this system of city planning (*toshi keikaku*) persisted into the post-1945 period despite some decentralisation of decision-making given to local government in the 1968 Urban Planning Act.

Much later, the manifesto of politician Ichiro Ozawa – ‘Blueprint for Japan: The Rethinking of a Nation (*Nihon Kaizō Keikaku*)’ – envisaged a much more decentralised mode of urban governance. Indeed, this thinking was incorporated into the mandate of the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) (partly established by Ozawa), which won the 2009 lower house election, ousting the traditional Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) administration for only the second time since the 1950s. However, this decentralisation policy was never implemented. The DPJ also promised a broad-ranging National Strategy Bureau to provide a link between politicians and policy making, which in the Japanese government system were usually the purview of senior bureaucrats. The lack of any coherent set of institutions and the dislike of the traditional bureaucracy by the DPJ Prime Minister, Naoto Kan, were shown in the confusion of authority following the 2011 earthquake, tsunami and nuclear power plant accident – Japan has no equivalent to America’s FEMA (the Federal Emergency Management Agency). Since this crisis there has been little sense of the central government taking the initiative in the reconstruction of the stricken Tohoku region affected by the tsunami in the north-east of Japan. Akimoto contended that the opportunity to rebuild Tohoku with a strong vision has been lost. Urban visions are traditionally sparse in Japan, and they rarely influence reality.

Japanese ports and place-making

If a characteristic of Japan as a whole has been its relative isolation from Western ideas, then a significant variant has been its port cities. Nagasaki, Kobe and Yokohama have all been places very familiar with overseas people, technology and cultures. This theme was taken up by historian David Palmer (Flinders University) through analysing a number of Nagasaki districts as focal points for Japan's contact with the West: the Urakami District; Dejima; the Oura River bridge area; and, the Mitsubishi Shipyard. Each has had an important role in Japan's 400 years of interaction with the West, and in various ways represents how this city has been shaped by religion, commerce, industrial modernisation, scientific knowledge and war. The Urakami district had the largest concentration of Christians in Japan as well as being the atomic bomb's hypocenter in August 1945. Jesuit missionaries converted Nagasaki townspeople in the late sixteenth century, but the outlawing of Christianity from the seventeenth to mid-nineteenth centuries coincided with the period of national isolation from the West. However, the feudal Tokugawa Shogunate gave Japan's sole Western trading concession to the Dutch on Dejima, a tiny island located just a short distance from the town. Through this extremely constrained space 'Dutch learning' entered Japan from the seventeenth century, including scientific and technical knowledge contributing to Japan's later modernisations.

In the Oura River area, the renowned Japanese political theorist, Fukuzawa Yukichi, began his studies of European knowledge, first with 'Dutch learning' in the 1850s. Later, touring the West, he returned to play a pivotal role in the Meiji Restoration and Japan's modernisation. Across the harbour from the main commercial districts, the Meiji government established Japan's first industrial shipbuilding complex in 1861 using foreign technology. Under Mitsubishi, the shipyard formed the core of Nagasaki's extensive World War II military-industrial complex. In sum, Nagasaki is a micro-version of Japan's contact with the West. Despite its destruction in 1945 and subsequent rebuilding, Palmer shows that this city's history is grounded in urban places that still exist today.

Focusing on the former Japanese 'treaty port' of Yokohama, architect Sujn Eom (UC Berkeley) presented her study of the city's Chinatown and the nearby district of Kotobuki-cho, an area of 'day-labourers' working on construction sites and their inexpensive hostels (called *doya*). Kotobuki was also inhabited by Korean migrant workers at the time of the former Japanese empire, and is now informally referred to as a ghetto and one of the poorest locales in Japan. Placing her analysis in a post-colonial framework, she showed that while Yokohama today is a self-proclaimed 'cosmopolitan city', these two settlements of former colonial subjects (Chinese and Korean) have been troublesome in official place-making. For instance, Yokohama's Chinatown in the 1960s was still perceived as a dangerous place and very un-Japanese, but this impression changed in the 1970s to a place of 'good food' and a marker

of Yokohama's (and Japan's) growing internationalisation. Kotobuki, by comparison often remains left out from tourist maps and, until recently, Yokohama's official attitude was that this was an ageing and homeless people district. Nonetheless, in the last decade or so the area became popular for 'backpackers' taking advantage of cheap hostels. Now the Yokohama city administration wants to build on this trend to bring young people in and make the neighbourhood healthy and vital. Sujn Eom's conclusion is that the norms of Yokohama are still being negotiated and she asks 'is globalisation an erasure of differences, or, what remains?'

Tokyo as a global city

Finally, a number of papers dealt with the familiar discussion around Tokyo's role as a global city. While this characteristic has been most often associated with the city's post-1980 rise in international finance and commerce, it has arguably served to obfuscate rather than clarify the nature of urban life in Japan's capital and its role in a regional and international context. The presentation by architectural scholar Naomi Clara Hanakata (ETH Zurich) focused on the paradox that is metropolitan Tokyo, home to twelve million people. It is the largest urban complex in the world, but one that can only be understood through its 'finely ground pattern'. Using frameworks from Henri Lefèbvre and his theorisation of space, she drew attention to the build form characteristics of the city – its back alleys and freeways and the mixing of spaces, commerce and residential side by side. Despite Tokyo's image as a global megacity – a harsh dehumanised capital, full of high-rise buildings, neon lights and huge transportation infrastructures – hidden behind this façade we can find a more human-friendly city than people usually imagine. It has a physical fabric, which reminds people of that of villages, with low-rise wooden houses, creating an intense sense of community.

The newest addition to the Tokyo skyline is the Tokyo Sky Tree, a broadcasting and observation tower in Sumida ward, open to the public in May 2012. It is the tallest structure in Japan, as well as being one of the tallest towers in the world. Cultural geographer Roman Cybriwsky (Temple University) 'deconstructed' the meaning of this 634-metre high urban icon, noting that the construction of Skytree was a public event, with Tokyoites invited to vote on its name. Apart from its transmission functions and its replacement of the existing Tokyo Tower put up in the 1950s, Cybriwsky posited a wide range of reasons why it was built, including: the Japanese tradition of urban towers; Japan's 'construction state' political economy; the boost it gave to the Sumida district; its symbolism of Japan's recovery after two decades of economic recession.

Another facet of global Tokyo is the increasing number of foreigners living, working and studying there, now around 3 per cent of the population. Urban geographer David Edgington (University of British Columbia) reported on his research covering the twenty three city ward offices in metropolitan Tokyo (*kyyakusho*) and a survey of

various services provided to non-Japanese, including consultation advice, education, health and welfare assistance. His study also included other ways in which some local governments had responded to the growth in foreigners by promoting multicultural values in the local community and including non-Japanese in their urban and social planning. For example, Shinjuku ward has around ten per cent international population comprising Chinese and Korean residents and has set aside a large budget to establish a 'Multicultural Plaza'. Essentially, this office space opened in 2005, provides 'one-stop shopping' services for foreign residents, such as Japanese language study classes, books and newspapers in several languages, consultation for a host of daily problems faced by non-Japanese (trouble at work, housing and children's school problems) as well as spaces for networking with other foreigners. He concluded that slowly, there was an appreciation by local governments that '*gaijin*' (foreigners) were residents too, although access to voting and jobs in the city administration were still largely constrained.

Japanese city research and other countries

Japan today faces the tremendous challenge of reforming its economy as well as the effect of a rapidly aging population. In large part these issues will be faced in urban settings as more than 60 per cent of the population live in cities with a population of over one million. All told, Japanese cities have much to offer in helping us make sense of the urban condition and how life in one part of the world is related to life elsewhere. These sessions at the 2013 AAG annual meeting underscored that in the field of understanding urban history as well as modern approaches to planning and urban governance the study of Japanese cities should contribute to a contextually richer approach to comparative urban studies.

Dwi Ratih S. Esti, Johan Woltjer and Mustafa Hasanov

Workshop report

Evaluation in Integrated Land-Use

Management:

Towards an Area-Oriented and Place-Based Evaluation for Infrastructure and Spatial Projects, University of Groningen, 13–15 March 2013

The eighth International Workshop Planning and Evaluation was held at ‘Het Kasteel Congres en Vergadercentrum’ during the period between 13 and 15 March 2013 in Groningen, the Netherlands. The workshop was organised by the Faculty of Spatial Sciences at the University of Groningen and funded by the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment.

The event gathered more than thirty five experts and practitioners working in the field of planning, infrastructure and regional development. The practice experts were from the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment, while academic experts and researchers came from a variety of disciplines and institutions within Europe and America (mostly universities in Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom, Germany and the United States).

Background of the workshop

In recent years, there have been some major changes in the approach to managing planning projects and infrastructure development such as roads, rail and waterways in particular. The emphasis is increasingly on local and regional integration of these projects. Besides the linkages between projects, their value and interactions with other related planning matters including housing, industry, green infrastructure and water should be considered. In other words, land-use planning and infrastructure management have become more spatially-integrated.

This workshop aimed at creating a meeting place and a networking opportunity for experts in the fields of spatial planning, land-use and infrastructure management to tackle an emerging agenda of spatially-oriented integrated evaluation. The presentations from the workshop participants tried to clarify the nature and roles of evaluation against the wider context of current planning and policy practices.

The structure of the workshop

The workshop followed a three day format, featuring a walking tour of Groningen by Professor Gregory Ashworth, plenary sessions, discussion sessions, group activities

and a closing session led by Professor Johan Woltjer. The workshop was a successful event, with an interactive and supportive atmosphere throughout among the participants, and accommodating dynamic interdisciplinary and intercultural professional exchange and discussion. The programme was divided into seven sessions, each of them chaired by a leading academic. Discussion on academic and policy implications was held after each session, followed by informal exchange during dinner. The session themes and presentations were:

- ***Evaluating value and benefit in land-use and infrastructure development.*** Session chair: Professor Johan Woltjer from the University of Groningen, the Netherlands. This session featured four presentations: ‘Evaluation in Institutional Design for Infrastructure Planning and Delivery’ by Ernest Alexander from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee/APD, ‘Creating and Evaluating Co-Benefits and Co-Costs of Environmental Planning, Policies, and Investments’ by Matthias Ruth from the Northeastern University, ‘Social, Economic and Ecological Benefits of Landscape Park Projects: Using Benefit Transfer to Assess Green Infrastructure Projects’ by Karsten Rusche and Jost Wilker from ILS (Research Institute for Regional and Urban Management, Dortmund) and ‘A Multi-Attribute Comparative Evaluation of Value Capture Financing Mechanisms: a Case Study’ by Anastasia Roukouni from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Presentations in this session noted that planning projects were often associated with their direct economic value and costs, and that they should also pay attention to the longer term and more indirect benefits that users could receive from public values embedded in projects such as roads and waterways. Evaluation practices, therefore, should focus on improving our understanding of the relationship between assets and users to perform user-oriented measurement. Measurement of such values should be dynamic and on-going, and include implicit and more indirect benefits and place-specific characteristics of a plan or a project. New institutional arrangements will be required to make these benefits more explicit.
- ***Understanding impact assessment and plan effectiveness.*** Session chair: Professor Jos Arts from the University of Groningen and the Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment, the Netherlands. There were three presentations in this session: ‘Current Trends in Social Impact Assessment: Implications for Infrastructure Developments’ by Frank Vanclay from the University of Groningen, ‘The Use of Citizen Input in the Evaluation of Planning and Policy Practice via HIAs’ by John Gaber from the University of Arkansas and ‘The Plan-Process-Results (PPR): a Methodology for Integrated Land-Use Planning and Evaluation’ by Vitor Oliveira from the University of Porto. Presentations and discussion in this session raised particular awareness on the importance of Social Impact Assessment (SIA) and how SIA could be institutionalised and made part

of management processes (e.g. to adapt original proposals). The discussion also focused on how institutional design could help improve institutional learning, for example, with different types of impact assessment conducted simultaneously rather than following each other, and to employ new evaluation instruments like assessment workshops. This would improve plan or project effectiveness and assist practitioners and decision makers in implementation processes.

- ***Place-based evaluation.*** Session chair: Professor Dino Borri from the Polytechnic University of Bari, Italy. There were three presentations in this session: ‘Assessing Present Space with the Help of Future Scenarios’ by Abdul Khakee from the Royal Institute of Technology, ‘Spatial Synergies and Conflicts: Monitoring Government Policies and Programmes in England’ by Cecilia Wong from the University of Manchester and ‘Spatial Patterns Induced by ‘Mestre Through Highway’ Within the Venetian Metropolitan Area (Italy)’ by Domenico Patassini and Matteo Basso from the University Institute of Architecture of Venice. The understanding from this session was that evaluation activities should articulate more clearly local spatial characteristics. These characteristics include, in particular, institutional capacities, local economic potential and benefits. Therefore, evaluation work should be more place-based to raise spatial awareness among a variety of public and private stakeholders. Another useful point from this session was how evaluation tools and results should be more accessible for the public and make a broader and more community-based ‘evaluation vocabulary’ possible.
- ***The use of evaluation in Dutch infrastructure and spatial development.*** Session chair: Dr Frans Sijtsma from the University of Groningen, the Netherlands. As the title of the session suggests, it focused on the Dutch experience in implementing evaluation methods and tools. There were three presentations in this session: ‘CBA and integrated area development assessments. Is the Dutch guidance document on infrastructure effects (OEI) also suitable?’ by Peter Bakker from the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment, ‘Evaluation of national spatial projects’ by Niek van der Heiden from the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment, ‘Streamlining the instruments for value creation and assessment early in the planning process’ by Niels Heeres from the University of Groningen. This session showed how cost-benefit analysis (CBA) was still a dominant practice in Dutch planning. The presentations demonstrated how CBA was made more ‘spatial’ and how efforts have been made to express CBA in terms of synergies and benefits from projects, in a more distinct way. Further challenges were how to adapt CBA as a learning tool, and how the results of CBA could be merged with other evaluation tools in order to improve decision making support.
- ***Cost-benefit analysis for integrated projects.*** Session chair: Professor Angela Hull from the Heriot-Watt University, United Kingdom. There were

four presentations in this session: 'Use and understanding of CBA in the evaluation of infrastructure and spatial projects' by Emile Dopheide from the University of Twente; 'Solid measurement of soft values: how evaluation of integrated projects can incorporate nature and landscape impacts' by Frans Sijtsma from the University of Groningen; 'The plan review: A new approach to discussing, assessing, and improving urban projects' by David Hamers, Like Bijlsma and Anton van Hoorn from Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL); and 'Assessing integrated plans in the cost benefit analysis through a pre-CBA dialogue' by Els Beukers from the University of Amsterdam. This session pointed out the fact that CBA had a lot of benefits, but also needed to assume a stronger focus on its users and the ways CBA could help to raise strategic awareness among a broader range of users (beyond professionals).

- ***Institution, knowledge and planning evaluation.*** Session chair: Professor Ernest Alexander from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. There were three presentations in this session: 'Marketing behaviour change in institutions: measuring the change' by Angela Hull from the Heriot-Watt University; 'Towards Credible, Salient, and Legitimate Knowledge for Integrated and Area-Oriented Planning: the Role of Boundary Organisations' by Hens Runhaar, Wanda van Ernst and Peter Driessen from Utrecht University; and 'Discursive Evaluation of Environmental Policy Integration in Swedish Structure Plans' by Ann Åkerskog and Sylvia Dowlén from the Swedish University of Agricultural Science. One of the foremost conclusions from this session was that more attention should be paid to institutional design for evaluation activities. A series of institutional arrangements were discussed, including science-policy interfaces and organisational use of tools to improve contextual awareness of urban projects.
- ***Evaluating planning intervention and spatial change.*** Session chair: Professor Abdul Khakee from the Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden. There were three presentations in this session: 'Metro expansion and spatial development in the Iberian Peninsula cities: a qualitative historical assessment' by Júlia Lourenço from the University of Minho, 'An evaluation of the management of Budapest district VIII and IX urban regeneration area based on property prices, inspection and narratives' by Tom Kauko from the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) and 'Valuing the Occurrence of Natural Extreme Events (Landslides and Floods) on Infrastructure in Italy and Canada' by Caterina De Lucia from the Polytechnic University of Bari. This session pointed to the importance of the temporal aspect of evaluation. A specific issue widely discussed in this session was that evaluation instruments should be dynamic and that they should provide evaluative information continuously. In addition, this session reaffirmed the importance of spatial awareness: evaluation

in (and of) planning should include a distinctive understanding of the linkages between various spatial activities and land uses.

The workshop included debates and exchanges on the latest academic ideas and thinking, case studies, methods and policy and practice review to examine and assess the values, impacts, benefits and the overall success in integrated land-use management. The assessment of values, impacts and benefits were key threads running through all discussion sessions, in particular the session in which senior practitioners from various national agencies in the Netherlands presented the latest methods and practice of cost-benefit analysis in evaluating infrastructure projects in order to facilitate dialogue between Dutch policy practice and international academic research.



Figure 1 An impression from the 8th IWPE

Key findings from the workshop

The workshop sessions produced a number of key conclusions, which are summarised below:

- Evaluation activities should express local spatial characteristics more clearly. These characteristics should include, in particular, institutional capacities, local economic potential and benefits. The understanding is that evaluation work

should be more area-based and contribute to raising spatial awareness among a variety of public and private parties involved in land-use and infrastructure development.

- Evaluation tools should be developed and used to inform strategic planning. For evaluation tools to be useful, they should be user friendly and function as an intermediary between public and private users. The discussion also pointed to the fact that evaluation instruments should be dynamic and provide robust information in a consistent and frequent manner.
- Evaluation in (and of) planning should include a distinct understanding of the linkages between different spatial activities and/or land uses. This understanding will include the expression of more indirect and longer-term impacts of planned interventions (like infrastructure projects) and the inclusion of co-costs and co-benefits, unobserved values and transaction costs. The call here is for evaluators to think in terms of synergies, for example, between a road project and surrounding real estate.
- Attention to institutional design in evaluation activities is required. Current problems in the field of land-use and infrastructure development, such as the need to lever private funding and the need to better understand social impacts, make it necessary to articulate and evaluate the value of public spatial investment more explicitly. These evaluation demands imply the need to have new organisational arrangements and rules.

The International Planning and Evaluation Group

This workshop was the 8th meeting for the International Planning and Evaluation Group, a research group which has been in existence since 1992. It held its first workshop in 1992 in Umea, Sweden, hosted by Professor Abdul Khakee and has held seven more workshops or conferences since. The aim of the group is to share research, exchange views and argue about the current state and future of evaluation in spatial planning. Attendance at these workshops has varied from twenty to sixty participants.

The main outcome for each workshop has been a jointly edited book. So far, seven edited books of workshop papers have been published. The latest book is the 2011 book, *Evaluation for Participation and Sustainability in Planning*, edited by Angela Hull, Ernest Alexander, Abdul Khakee and Johan Woltjer.

Management of the research group, and the organisational responsibility of the workshops, has been shared between the co-ordinators of four countries (Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK). The current organising committee members of this group are Professor Dino Borri, Professor Ernest Alexander, Professor Abdul Khakee, Professor Angela Hull and Professor Johan Woltjer.

Future activities

Preparation of a book for publication, led by Professor Johan Woltjer, has already begun. The next workshop is scheduled to be hosted by the Polytechnic University of Bari (Professor Dino Borri) in 2014 or 2015.