5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we identified the lifecycle of a pilot project to correspond to the waterfall lifecycle model of development projects. This categorisation of the proceedings of pilot projects allows for reuse of known properties of a waterfall lifecycle. Most notable is the non-iterative nature of these projects that manifests in non-overlapping subsequent stages that do not incorporate feedback. As we aim for the efficient and effective sharing of knowledge and experiences, the latter property is very important. It contrasts to the fundamental feedback step of the knowledge management process we propose to integrate into pilot project stages. To that end, we present the concepts to overcome this mismatch and to integrate knowledge management into the lifecycle of pilot projects. As mentioned, this integration repeats for every stage in order to reduce the unit of sharing from a comprehensive final project evaluation report to smaller pieces of information. This should reduce the effort of knowledge identification, acquisition and utilisation. I.e. it improves the cost-benefit ratio of these steps of knowledge management and makes them attractive for pilot projects. In this paper, we presented the required background and contributed a theoretical solution for this integration of knowledge management into pilot project stages. Moreover, we exemplified the knowledge preservation and sharing via a novel, external sharing infrastructure on the example of two consecutive pilot projects. In the future, we aim for investigation of benefits of digitalisation and automatization to further simplify the tasks knowledge identification and acquisition. We plan to implement our concepts in a small scale and test it on data from pilot projects we monitored in the past.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

[Gatzweiler and Runkel, 1997] Gatzweiler, H.-P. and Runkel, P. (1997): Modellvorhaben der Raumordnung – ein raumordnungspolitisches Aktionsprogramm, in: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung (IzR) 3.1997, 145–154.

[Gilcher and Steinebach, 2016a] Gilcher, E. and Steinebach, G. (2016a): Pilot Projects and their Significance in Approaching Challenges – Exemplified by Refugee Aid. In Proceedings of the 12th Urban Planning and Environment Association Symposium (UPE12).

[Gilcher and Steinebach, 2016b] Gilcher, E. and Steinebach, G. (2016b): Scientific monitoring of “Starke Kommunen – Starkes Land” (SKSL, “Strong Communities, Strong Rural Areas”) – a pilot project involving 13 municipalities from 2013 to 2016.

[Probst et al., 1999] Probst, G. J. B., Raub, S., and Romhardt, K. (1999): Managing Knowledge: Building Blocks for Success, Frankfurt am Main.

[Royce, 1970] Royce, G. (1970): Managing the Development of Large Software Systems, In Proceedings of IEEE WESCON, 1–9.

[Steinebach, 1992] Steinebach, G. (1992): Städtebauliche Möglichkeiten durch »Umwidmung militärischer Einrichtungen«, in: EXWOST-Informationen – Forschungsfeld: Konversion, Nr.1, Bonn, 7–13.

[Wiechmann et al., 2012] Wiechmann, T., Mörl, K., and Vock, A. (2012): Evaluation von Modellvorhaben in der Raumordnung. Informationen zur Raumentwicklung (IzR). Issues 1 and 2, 79–90.

ID 1598 | PLANNING ETHICS IN MAJOR TRANSPORT SCHEMES: REFRAMING THE CHALLENGE

Ángel Aparicio[1]
[1]Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
angel.aparicio@upm.es

1 INTRODUCTION

This paper revisits the various visions of justice in transport planning, with a focus on major schemes, and the role played by transport planners. Whereas extensive discussion has taken place in the case of urban schemes affecting particular communities, less attention has been paid to major planning concepts at the

metropolitan, regional, national or international level, beyond the well-known discussion on ´´megaprojects´´.

The paper elaborates on the merits and limitations for transport of the distributional, participatory and social/recognition dimensions of justice, and their disappointing limited influence in decision making at these planning levels.

The paper opens in section 2 with a description of the various perspectives of justice in contemporary political philosophy, and how they have been received by the planning community within the general discussion on planning ethics. Section 3 reviews the differences of transport with other dimensions of spatial planning, and suggests that its comparatively high degree of autonomy facilitates the analysis of the planning cycle in this sector. Section 4 analyses different approaches to justice from transport planning, highlighting their similitudes and differences compared to other planning sectors, and advances a conceptual framework for the analysis of justice in transport planning. Section 5 applies this framework to three case studies: the Trans-European Transport Network, the Spanish National Transport Plan 2005-2020 and Madrid Chamartín redevelopment project2, defining their respective decision-making environment, the prevailing justice concept, and the legitimation process for the planning concept. Section 6 concludes suggesting that, although far from being mainstreamed, transport planning is making efforts to assume its complexity, and to adapt its practice to the interrelated justice requirements at the normative (procedural), descriptive (distributional) and cultural (recognition and participation) levels. A pragmatic practice is emerging, probably as a reaction to increasing criticism from the economic community (which attempts to address transport from the classical utilitarian approach) on the one side, and to unsatisfactory results of the autonomous practice, on the other side.

2 PLANNING ETHICS AND JUSTICE

In her extensive review of how ethics are being integrated within planning practice, Hendler (1995) suggests that planning ethics “is based on notions of inclusiveness, communication and equity”. These notions can be seen as a reflection of the evolution of contemporary discussion on justice within political philosophy: the “political turn” from Rawlsian’s distributive justice to Young’s or Fraser’s widening of justice to political participation and communicative action, and the “cultural turn”, to take into account the challenges of an increasingly multicultural and global context. (Benhabib, 1992, Agra, 2008).

From this perspective, equity has been mainly associated to distributional justice, along the traditions of the liberal and the communitarian approaches to the distribution of goods. For the liberal approach, equity is mainly dealing with equal opportunities, so that everybody can have the opportunity to gain access to competences and means acquired through education and other public goods; inequalities as justified as long as they result in a social benefit, with a priority for those that are worse off. As we will see, distributional justice understood as “accessibility to” provides an appealing justification for transport planning to understand itself as a facilitator of distribution, by taking “accessibility” from a purely physical basis. The communitarian criticism to the liberal concept of justice in Rawls and Dworkin as a good with a priority to other goods, and the need to adopt a broader perspective based on the social background of the self (Taylor, 1991).

The position of the critical theory towards distributive justice is partly anticipated by the communitarian perspective. As Walzer (1983) puts it, the objective of justice is more related to domination than to inequality. Incidentally, Walzer’s view of distribution of different goods in their own “spheres” has been appealing to transport planners, eager to keep the autonomy of their discipline (Martens et al, 2012). However, the enlargement of the concept of justice is more ambitious in I.M Young (1990), as she points out three dimensions not considered by the distributional paradigm: structures and procedures for decision making, division of labour, and culture; the ideal of justice would therefore be liberation, rather than equity. Young’s criticism towards the distributional paradigm is shared with N. Fraser (1997): the challenge is to address the ideals of redistribution with those of social recognition, and this can be made through parity of participation.

The challenges of social recognition can be difficult to accommodate with those of economic distribution. The focus on minority groups can be seen as independent and not conflicting the distributional paradigm

(e.g. Kymlicka, 1995). Groups' specific rights have also been inspiring transport planners' criticism of the "average user" paradigm and the customization of the transport system to different social groups.

This quick review has put in evidence three major components within justice: the distributional, the procedural, and the social-cultural. All of them have informed planners' approaches to justice. Uitemark and Nichols (2017, p.38-39) provide a simplified overview of these approaches, along two variables: on the one side substantive conception of justice and on the other side, engagement with communities. The first variable would differentiate among planners focusing on procedure (e.g. the traditional rationalist approach to planning or alternative approaches such as collaborative planning), and those with a strong substantive conception of justice (e.g. the Fainstein's (2010) views on "the just city" or Soja's approach to advocacy planning). Likewise, the second variable would relate to the relationship between planners and marginalized communities, particularly on the leading or supporting role of the former vis-a-vis the latter.

The nature of planners' engagement with communities raises the debate on the actual relevance to be given to the views of the marginalized, at the core of the well-known controversy between Habermas and Foucault. From Habermas's perspective, the merits of the "archeology of knowledge" practiced by Foucault to understand the Lifeworld would be dubious: the position of the marginalised, of those without power or conventional knowledge- so important for Foucault- does not provide particularly valuable components for sound social criticism, as Habermas sees it (Cusset, 2007). The justifications of planners have been twofold: on the one hand, on the basis of the virtues of "local knowledge": in spatial planning, the locals have a particular insight of the social-place relationships that cannot be replaced by technical knowledge, no matter how specialized (Innes, 2004); on the other hand, on the basis of providing a fair balance to a communicative process in which marginalized groups would not be recognised, and would have difficulties to properly participate in the conversation (Healey, 2006).

Notwithstanding these controversies, the case emerges for convergence in practice among planners initially inspired by different views of justice: those with a focus on distributive issues, which could be translated into regular technical tools, for example through a revised concept of the public interest beyond utilitarianism (in the footsteps of Amartya Sen); those with a normative focus on the reform of decision-making institutions and procedures, and those primarily interested in their involvement with marginalized groups through a variety of tools and mechanisms. The prospects for this pragmatic convergence can be better explored within the particular (and maybe parochial) realm of transport planning, as a relative isolated field where these approaches can be better described and analysed.

3 WHAT MAKES TRANSPORT DIFFERENT IN SPATIAL PLANNING

The transport has traditionally enjoyed wide autonomy within the realm of public policies, and has consolidated a particular approach to the planning cycle, compared to spatial planning at large and also with other sectors of public policy strongly linked to physical space, such as water management or energy.

A variety of factors can be mentioned for this autonomy. In first place, the technical/engineering intricacies of the transport system, which makes it easy to engineers to monopolise any discussion by putting forward technical feasibility issues. Technical specialization facilitates the justification for a separate, specialized governance and institutional framework. In some cases, dedicated tax funds or regulations provide the bulk of the funding necessary for system operation, consolidating this autonomy.

This is not to say that the autonomy of transport planning has not often been challenged from different fields. In Western Europe, spatial planning made repeated attempts in the post-war period (1940s-1970s) to integrate transport within a comprehensive planning approach on the basis of optimizing public policies for regional development. In the 1980s, environmental critics suggested to subsume transport within broader public policies favouring sustainable development. More pervasively, critics from the economics field have stressed the virtues of applying the concepts of micro and macro-economics to transport, and to base transport decisions on the same grounds than for any other public policy related to the economy. These critics have stressed the (economic) inefficiencies of decision-making in transport and the virtues of addressing an increasing number of topics in the sector through standard market solutions (e.g. Button, 2010).

Transport has accommodated to critics by developing new micro-disciplines within the sector, sometimes with remarkable success: transport geography emerged in the 1950s with a focus on spatial accessibility; environmental transport studies have flourished with specialized tools for environmental analysis and assessment; transport economics have developed as a specialization in the study of the specificities of transport markets; even social studies have resulted in increasing specialization on the mobility behaviour of particular social groups.

As transport expanded as a discipline, so did the institutional and governance framework, with a variety of governmental agencies, special interest groups, cooperation platforms, and participatory forums. It cannot come as a surprise that this complex network of stakeholders have often been keen in presenting justice as one of the relevant outcomes of transport policies, together with efficiency and development: as a community of interest (and of knowledge) consolidates and gains autonomy, it turns to recognize itself as one of the "spheres of justice" in Walzerian sense.

In fact, justice has gained relevance as the autonomy of transport was challenged on efficiency grounds. Not surprisingly, the ambition for further expansion and sophistication of the transport system was confronted in developed countries since the 1970s with growing evidence (pointed out by economists and also environmentalists) of poor economic returns compared to the investment required. In many cases, schemes moved forward on the basis of justice-related justifications. In most cases, justice is mostly understood as a distributional concept, and "accessibility" is taken as the key public good to be distributed. A participatory concept of justice has also been push forward to justify the involvement of additional social agents in the decision-making process, usually interested in the implementation of apparently inefficient schemes.

Astonishingly, the transport system is sometimes understood by its most enthusiastic supporters as a marginalized subject deserving fair treatment. This position has been explicit in discussions on "value creation" and "value capture", basically supporting the idea that any value created by the transport system (e.g. by the construction of a new infrastructure) should be dedicated to further improve the transport system.

As a result, it can be said that transport has navigated relatively safe the troubled waters of sharp criticism to the role of public policies that have dominated the last decades. In principle, transport policy seemed quite defenceless to the point made by the public choice theory (Niskanen, 1994) about the inevitable trend of most public policies to ever-increasing costs as a result of the ambition of bureaucrats to expand their power, and the willingness of the public to support further public investments to rip their localised benefits while spreading the costs among all taxpayers. Elaborating on a narrow, purely sectoral concept of justice, transport policies received support from many stakeholders. Obviously, the internalisation of justice in transport pays the price of forgetting the comparative virtues of other (or a combination of) public policies to better serve justice. What is interesting for the scope of this paper is to analyse the various ways followed in this internalisation process, and to see how it works in practice. This should facilitate any broader discussion on justice in planning.

4 COMPETING APPROACHES TO JUSTICE IN TRANSPORT PLANNING: AN ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

A distributional approach to justice in transport has to answer first to the question of which is the public good(s) to be fairly distributed. In this regard, one well-known discussion among transport planners refers to the differentiation among mobility and accessibility and their respective merits to be considered as public goods. Mobility would be a people-centred concept, referring to the ability of people to change to other places: safety, quality (speed, comfort) and affordability would be key mobility traits from an equity perspective. Accessibility would be a place-centred concept, referring to the facility for one particular place to be reached from other places.

Both concepts are strongly interrelated, and connected to the concept of the transport system as a network (Dupuy, 1991); the personal traits usually associated to mobility would be mainly associated to the requirements for the use of the network (fares and other conditions for use-e.g. owning a driving license-, schedules…); the place-related traits associated to accessibility would refer to the topological and

technical characteristics of the network. Obviously, mobility and accessibility interact as people and places do: whenever people are distributed in particular places and have interests in conducting activities in other places, they may find that their needs are well or poorly served by the transport system).

Di Ciommo and Lucas (2014) provide an inspiring assessment of equity in transport policies. The case study refers to a road-pricing concept to be implemented in the main orbital motorway in Madrid and the resulting gains and losses in accessibility, due to the different disposable income of residents in different parts of the metropolitan area. Lucas et al. (2016) further elaborate on the use of accessibility indexes in the way economic assessment is currently done, providing an "equity assessment" that could be compared to current utilitarian cost-benefit analysis.

The procedural approach to equity in transport would focus on current governance in transport. The analysis of governance in transport has been particularly active from an environmental perspective. In the last decade, the introduction of compulsory Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) for certain plans and programmes in the European Union raised significant discussion on the needs for normative reforms in transport planning. A similar interest has arisen in the last years based on the challenges of sustainability and the achievement of the climate change mitigation targets set up at the Paris Summit (COP22). An early and optimistic reflection is provided by Lawrence (2000), showing the potential of environmental assessment procedures to integrate a disparity of concepts and theories in a flexible way; justice-related concerns could therefore find a favourable framework for formalization through environmental assessment procedures. Sager (2009) draws a dimmer picture, stating how the dominance of the neo-liberal paradigm is driving public policy processes throughout Europe back towards a purely utilitarian, efficiency-focused approach, and is transforming the citizen back into a mere customer, a consumer of transport services. A more recent review of procedures in transport planning is provided by Gudmundsson et al (2016), and is related to the need to reform transport planning procedures in order to cope with sustainability challenges and, particularly, with climate change mitigation. The review of the governance system in transport concludes on the need to reform the current dominance of powerful actors, and the need to open up procedures to other policies, overcoming the current isolation and lack of accountability.

The social/cultural perspective of justice can be approached from the perspective of the involvement of marginalised groups, and the relationship established between planners and these groups. The evidence shows a growing presence of reference to "at risk" groups in policy rhetoric. The identification of marginalised groups seems to be unequal, with generalised presence of references to gender issues, and some focus on people with reduced mobility, children or the elderly, whereas considerations to more specific groups, such as those based on low-income, cultural background or lone parents, are less frequent. Elvy (2014) provides a review of 32 Local Transport Plans in Britain, concluding that current efforts to get marginalised groups involved in transport policy are far from satisfactory. Not surprisingly, the consideration of marginalised groups at the regional or national planning level is still scarcer, for the time being.

A framework for the assessment of the consideration of justice within existing transport policies can be established based on the three perspectives of justice presented above, so that they can be explored in each case study. The distributional perspective would focus on the identification of the "public good" provided by the transport policy and deserving distribution, and the place- or people-focus in the consideration of that public good. The procedural perspective reviews whether potential equity-sensitive procedures (mainly SEA) have been followed, and whether other already existing or ad hoc procedures have also been used, as well as whether the transport policy has resulted in a revision and formalisation of procedures. The socio-cultural perspective takes into consideration the identification of marginalised groups, the level of detail in their definition and the approach to integrate the interests of these groups: from top-down approaches without participation to empowering strategies, advocacy approaches or insurgent actions. Finally, an additional analysis category is set up to assess the degree of openness of the transport sector to other public policies as a result of the planning exercise.

5 JUSTICE IN TRANSPORT PLANNING PRACTICE: THREE CASE STUDIES

The case studies selected for this review refer to transport planning at three different scales: European, national and metropolitan. Although not necessarily representative of currently prevailing planning

practices in Europe, they provide useful evidence of the challenges and difficult options planners have to make in the transport sector.

The first case study refers to the approval process that led to the adoption of the revised guidelines of the Trans-European Network for transport (TEN-T) in 2013 (EU, 2013). The revision started with three technical working groups, put in place to provide a sound methodology for the exercise. The revised TEN-T guidelines, approved in 2013, managed to reduce the ambition of the original TEN-T by selecting a reduced or core network, with 2030 as horizon for completion. This reduction served to liberate the EU from getting involved in projects of a purely regional interest, as had been the case in the past, and received sharp criticism from those considering TEN-T as a key policy for regional development. The new TEN-T guidelines provided some additional requests to member states, for critical aspects that- surprisingly- had not been addressed at the European level, including the need for strategic environmental assessment, network vulnerability and adaptation to climate change and contribution to mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. The new planning narrative strengthened the "transport efficiency" rationale whereas the previous focus on accessibility and territorial cohesion seemed to be relegated. Otherwise, the new planning narrative remained lacking any ambition on the improvement of the planning process itself. The obvious limitations in terms of access of stakeholders to the deliberative process, lack of formalization of consultation and isolation with respect to other policy fields were not even mentioned (Aparicio, 2017).

The Spanish national transport plan 2005-2020 (Plan Estratégico de Infraestructuras y Transporte, PEIT) was presented as an opportunity to replace the short-term programming without formal participatory and approval procedures with long-term strategic planning based on a collaborative, formalized approach. The plan was successful in establishing a consistent methodology, which was subsequently followed by the plan approved by the new government in 2015, and served to introduce SEA in national transport planning, but failed in consolidating a formalized planning procedure (Aparicio, 2007).

Madrid Puerta Norte (MPN) is an ambitious redevelopment project in the north of Madrid, first proposed in 1994. The redevelopment area includes one of the main railway stations in the city (Chamartín) and other public land (such as the depots of the municipally owned urban bus company, EMT), and the northern section of the urban motorway M-30. The total surface involves more than 3 million m2, mostly dedicated to office space. Some densely populated (and mostly low-to-medium income) neighbourhoods within the area or in its vicinity will be deeply impacted by the scheme. The planning concept has been changed at several stages and not agreement has been reached yet among the main stakeholders: the railway company, the real estate developer in charge of the scheme, and the municipality[1]. Transport plays a major role in the project, as the functionality of the railway station for commuter and long-distance trains imposes major limitations on land requirements and what can be done in the vicinity of the terminal, and the impressive addition of office space creates new accessibility pressures on the area. Furthermore, the developer's vision of the area as prime office space raises concerns on social segregation and future displacement of residents and activities. The character of the M-30 section in the area (to be maintained as a motorway, with increased capacity to accommodate additional traffic demand or to be transformed into an urban arterial, giving priority to public transport as main access to the new office space) is another point of controversy. After significant reduction in the amount of office space and high-level housing, and prioritization to certain facilities for current residents, an agreement among stakeholders is expected by the end of 2017.

The table below summarizes the main justice-related components in the three planning processes.

[1] http://distritocastellananorte.com/en/

	TEN-T	PEIT	Madrid P.N.
Distributional perspective	Focus on efficiency and transport operations. Mobility (people and goods) as a public good. Justice-related challenges such as distribution of EU funds, improvement in access to markets for peripheral regions, reduction of accessibility gaps among regions with a trans-border focus.	Focus on accessibility (place-based). Attempt to define a people-based accessibility concept based on sufficiency, not accomplished. Fair distribution of national transport funds among regions. Avoiding transport subsidies to those better off.	Focus on economic development, and railway expansion. Trickle- down economics. Mixed land uses expected to avoid displacement. Quality of life expected to increase for all (newcomers and residents). Distribution of benefits partly dedicated to public space and transport facilities.
Procedural perspective	Formalised EU "co-decision" procedure, complemented by participatory channels (workshops, working groups…) for selected stakeholders. SEA not undertaken. Basic objectives and scope of the revision process decided at the highest political level. Key stakeholders: national governments, European Parliament and European Commission. Interested regions and socio-economic agents through Committee of the Regions and European Economic and Social Committee.	Ad hoc procedure defined by the government, including SEA. Follow up procedure for plan implementation defined. However, these procedures are not formalised. Key stakeholders: national and regional governments; key transport and construction agents.	Formal procedure established in land-use legislation. Participation: increased public participation lately encouraged by mayor. Key stakeholders: private developer, railway company, municipality. Other agents include other land owners, local economic associations, professional councils and residents' associations.
Socio-Cultural perspective	No identification of potentially marginalised groups.	Marginalised agents poorly identified (e.g. environmental NGOs); no particular action with marginalised social groups.	Residents generally lacking public support and self-organizing on a voluntary basis. Particular marginalised groups poorly identified, if at all.
Transport Autonomy	Limited interaction with other EU or national policies. Autonomy is reinforced.	Transport autonomy reduced due to (1) plan formally approved and (2) SEA requirements	Transport autonomy limited by the global concept, although major options proposed by transport planners are seldom challenged.

Table 1 – Assessment of the case studies

As a summary, it can be concluded that the three processes show pervasive difficulties to contain the tendency of transport to high autonomy with respect to other public policies and needs. The three case studies provide different approaches to justice (on distribution in the first case, on procedure in the second case and on participation (in the sense of increasing the consensual basis) in the third case, but it can be said that an effort to better identified the justice challenges at stake can be perceived, and is facilitated by the requirements imposed by the formalised procedures set in place, and the planning effort gains in legitimacy compared to the previous situation. However, the planning process seems still far away from the identification and involvement of marginalised groups.

6 CONCLUSIONS

It is fair saying that none of the case studies reviewed show evidence of taking justice at the core of the planning process, but rather as an additional consideration to be addressed in general, rather than specific terms. Under this framework it is not surprising that technical experts and planners are being asked to "integrate" justice considerations within their approach, rather than undertaking a serious procedure to engage marginalised agents or to reform existing procedures: the vision of planners as facilitators of dialog seem to be absent in these case studies.

The distributive value of the transport scheme is highlighted in all case studies. In all cases, the key stakeholders remain fully confident of the virtues of markets to fairly distribute the benefits, and the capacity of transport to provide those benefits. Past imbalances are expected to be corrected by providing more equal access to the transport system to all relevant actors, thus fostering the expansion of the system. It can be argued the limited capacity of transport to provide significant accessibility gains, and to effectively reduce remaining accessibility gaps once the system has reached a significant level of development, as is the case in Europe: under these conditions, the confidence on the distributional capacities of transport systems seems poorly founded; on the contrary it could be claimed that such focus on “distributing accessibility” is probably a bad (and expensive for the public sector) idea. Following the Rawlsian approach to inequalities, unequal accessibility could be justified by the contribution it provides to society at large, if these benefits are properly redistributed, at their turn: this would require a different approach to transport policy assessment.

Procedures do matter, but they cannot provide for justice on their own, and they can be effective only in the medium and long term. New procedures are difficult to implement and even more difficult to get formalized and enforced by legislation. In the meantime, planning professionals can see an opportunity in exploring and strengthening existing procedures, and making better use of them. SEA offers a good example of the potential and limits of formalised procedures: it was influential in getting the planning process better formalised in Spain (PEIT), but it has been repeatedly avoided by European authorities (TEN-T). All in all, a procedural approach to justice looks like a long-term battle, with limited concrete results in the short and medium term.

Notwithstanding the existence of formalised procedures (as in MPN), public authorities do retain a strong control of the planning process, and can effectively make use of it. Timing is particularly relevant: as long as public authorities do not feel the pressure of self-imposed deadlines, they can try to improve results through extended negotiations: most stakeholders are open to accommodate their goals and strategies to perceived changes in the political environment and priorities. This can be discouraging for the weakest stakeholders, who need quick responses, but there is evidence that quickly agreed deals do not usually take much care of those interests.

The marginalization of social groups remains a major challenge in most transport schemes and policies, and attempts to address them are too weak to be effective. Ironically, the opposite is obvious in some cases: the beneficiaries of transport projects happen to be a minority of privileged social groups, without raising much concern among planners, on the basis of the expected trickle-down effects...

Under the current approach, transport planning processes tend to result in an ever-growing request for scarce resources, with no comparatively reasonable results in terms of justice. There could be a case for further reducing the well-established autonomy of transport policies, encouraging more acute competition among bureaucracies for public resources, as this could provide comparisons among the justice dimension in alternative policies. At any rate, it is fair to say that the concept of justice remains problematic in transport planning, but this should not be surprising for this and for any other discussion dealing with values. Even under this uncertainty, we can agree with Berlin that transport planners and professionals at large, even if they may not fully agree on their visions, they will certainly be able to describe what most of them, in most cases, would easily perceive as outrageous injustice[1].

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

Aparicio, A. (2007). Assessing public involvement effectiveness in long-term planning. Transportation Research Board. 86th Annual Meeting. Paper 2007-728. Washington, D.C., January 2007

Aparicio, A. (2017). The changing decision-making narratives in 25 years of TEN-T policies. Transportation Research Procedia. World Conference on Transport Research - WCTR 2016 Shanghai. 10-15 July 2016.

Button, K. (2010). Transport Economics. 3rd edition. Edward Elgar Publishing

[1] “What I mean by "the human horizon" is a horizon which for the most part, at a great many times in a great many places, has been what human beings have consciously or unconsciously lived under, against which values, conduct, life in all its aspects, have appeared to them”. Berlin, Isaiah (1992). Reply to Ronald H. McKinney, "Towards a postmodern ethics: Sir Isaiah Berlin and John Caputo". The Journal of Value Inquiry, 26(4), p. 557-560.

Cusset, Y., & Haber, S. (2007). "Introducción: las coordenadas del debate entre Foucault y Habermas" (H. Cardoso, Trad.) en Y. Cusset & S. Haber (Eds.), Habermas y Foucault: Trayectorias cruzadas, confrontaciones críticas. Buenos Aires: Nueva visión.

Dupuy, G. (1991). L'urbanisme des réseaux: Théories et méthodes. Paris: Armand Colin.

Elvy, J. (2014). Public participation in transport planning amongst the socially excluded: An analysis of 3rd generation local transport plans. Case Studies on Transport Policy, 2(2), 41-49.

EU, 2013. Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network and repealing Decision No 661/2010/EU.

Fainstein, S. (2010). The Just City. Cornell University Press

Fraser, N. (1997), Justice Interruptus. Psychology Press

Gudmundsson, H, R.P. Hall, G. Marsden, J. Zietsman (2016). Sustainable Transportation: Indicators, Frameworks and Performance Management. Springer.

Healey, P. (2006). Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies (2 ed.). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Innes, J. E. (2004). Consensus Building: Clarifications for the Critics. Planning Theory, 3(1), 5-20.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights. Oxford University Press.

Lawrence, D. P. (2000). "Planning theories and environmental impact assessment". Environmental Impact Assessment Review 20(6): 607-625.

Lucas, K., van Wee, B., & Maat, K. (2016). A method to evaluate equitable accessibility: combining ethical theories and accessibility-based approaches. Transportation, 43(3), 473-490.

Martens, K., Golub, A., & Robinson, G. (2012). A justice-theoretic approach to the distribution of transportation benefits: Implications for transportation planning practice in the United States. Transportation Research Part A, 46(4), 684-695.

Niskanen, W. (1994). Bureaucracy and Public Economics. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Sager, T. (2009). Responsibilities of theorists: The case of communicative planning theory. Progress in Planning (72): 1-51.

Soja, E. (2010). Seeking Spatial Justice. University of Minnesota Press

Taylor, C. (1991) The Malaise of Modernity. Anansi.

Walzer, M. (1983). Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality. Basic Books

Young, I. M. (1990), Justice and Politics of Difference. Princeton University Press

ID 1600 | IF NEOLIBERALISM IS EVERYTHING, MAYBE IS IT NOTHING? QUESTIONING NEOLIBERAL IDEOLOGY IN SPATIAL POLICIES AND PROJECTS

Simonetta Armondi[1]
[1]Politecnico di Milano
simonetta.armondi@polimi.it

1 INTRODUCTION

Neoliberalism is held to be the dominant and pervasive economic policy agenda of our times, apowerful and expansive political rationality of class domination and exploitation, the manifestation of ‘capitalresurgent’. Anderson describes it as ‘the most successful ideology in world history’ (Anderson 2000, 17).This paper tries to demonstrate how the new development project MilanoSesto in the metropolitancity of Milan, Italy – an ongoing large-scale development project of housing, retail, offices, and publicservices, symbolically built on former Falck steelwork industrial areas – can’t be understood as one of theembodiment of current pervasive neoliberal planning practice of the Western societies.