ID 1398 | SPATIAL PLANNING ACROSS EUROPEAN PLANNING SYSTEMS AND SOCIAL MODELS: A LOOK THROUGH THE LENS OF PLANNING CULTURES OF SWITZERLAND, GREECE AND SERBIA

Ana Peric[1], Charles Hoch[2]
[1] ETH Zurich (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology), Institute of Spatial and Landscape Development University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture; [2] University of Illinois at Chicago, Department of Urban Planning and Policy
aperic@ethz.ch ; chashoch@uic.edu

1 INTRODUCTION

Europe today faces many challenges to the principle of integration. Migration crises fuel support for withdrawal from the European Union (EU), which motto 'united in diversity' has proven more deeply contested among a large portion of citizens across the member states. Yet the regional systems that each state relies upon require purposeful coordination and planning. However, these efforts portrayed comically as bureaucratic control build upon established networks that demonstrate how cohesion works to turn spatial interdependence into useful practical collaboration serving places. Further, these collaborations prove invisible because they result from complex spatial interactions that do not fit conventional territorial and jurisdictional sectors. Nevertheless, the multitude of agents making plans has never been greater. These networks focus on shared spatial projects and local purposes that search for deliberate practical compromises resolving differences that in principle remain unresolved. Identifying and fostering these networks for spatial planning may offer pathways to regional cohesion currently overlooked (Zielonka in Faludi, 2016: 76).

Collaborative spatial planning in Europe did not follow the European Spatial Development Perspective (CEC, 1999) or the principles laid out in the Territorial Agendas (EU, 2007, 2011). The Europeanization of planning (Dühr et al., 2007, 2016; Faludi, 2014, 2016) embraced a variety of approaches each linked to distinct combinations of political, social, administrative and legal systems (Newman and Thornley, 1996; CEC, 1997; Farinós Dasi, 2006; Reimer et al., 2014). We believe that what binds these approaches together is not a singular authority or purpose, but an evolving culture for spatial planning (Knieling and Othengrafen, 2009; During and van Dam, 2007; COMMIN, 2009). Planning practice is 'strongly rooted in and restricted to the specific cultural context of a society' (Othengrafen, 2010: 83). Understanding the how people use institutions to plan for places provides hopeful insight about system interactions that might govern uncertainty with shared rather than singular responsibility (Reimer, 2013).

Studying specific planning approaches within the context of time and place (Healey, 2011) focusing on 'how things are done' (Faludi, 2005) is crucial. We believe that examples of successful spatial planning will exhibit qualities of democratic involvement necessary for taking practical collaborative actions able to grasp spatial complexity, even as plenty or perhaps even most forms of spatial planning pay little head to the efficacy of such collaboration. The literature on planning culture tends to conflate many post plan making activities as 'planning' included as elements of a 'process'. The range and complexity of the relationships becomes too vast to comprehend. Analysts create imaginative scaffoldings to encompass and classify these relations, but in so doing become social scientists seeking out patterns of order for a place that lose touch with the contributions a plan may have offered the actors involved. In this paper, a functional pragmatist conception of planning is adopted, focusing on the human cognitive capacity for imagining and assessing the effects of future actions before taking one (Hoch, 2011, 2012, 2016). How do we identify and analyse instances of systemic spatial planning? What should we look for as we investigate functional plan making undertaken within a specific cultural context? The advantage of our constrained approach is that we focus attention on how differences in culture shape spatial plan making. Following this argument, the paper tries to elucidate: 1) a methodological tool for the analysis and comparison of planning practices, and 2) the ways on how culture influences planning practice in various contexts (observed through three case examples).

The paper is structured as follows. After a succinct overview, three planning models across Europe are illustrated: the comprehensive integrated approach of Central/Northern European nations, the urbanism of Southern Europe and a hybrid style among Eastern European countries. Nevertheless, as the planning context assumes not only the planning system, but also the planning culture, a methodological tool

(comprising the parameters of social setting, planning process, and planning environment) is breifly desribed in a second step. Then, we focus on elucidating the planning culture in Switzerland, Greece, and Serbia, through illustrating the planning practice in Solothurn, Patras, and Belgrade, respectively. Such an analysis clearly shows the 'cultural embeddedness' of planning and development. The paper concludes with the identification of similarities and differences in the planning approaches from different settings.

2 PLANNING TRADITIONS IN EUROPE

Before we proceed to elucidate the notion of planning culture and its manifestations in different case examples (as the central part of the paper), it is important to have a brief overview of the main comparative studies of planning systems and processes. One reason for doing so is to show the current collections of planning characteristics of European states as the background information which will make the central analysis more profound and local planning procedures more understandable, as well. On the other hand, it is important to actually highlight major drawbacks of the comparative studies, thus, making room for introducing the concept of planning culture.

The comparative study of spatial planning in Europe (Newman and Thornley, 1996) presented the comparison of sectoral state characteristics (political and administrative structure) emphasizing distinct national planning systems. The approach focuses on differences in formal legal authorization and administrative segmentation of that authority between central and local government. Spatial planning was sorted into five types: British, Napoleonic, Germanic, Scandinavian and Eastern European. Later analysis sponsored by the European Commission (CEC, 1997) added more dimensions, but exhibited a similar dualistic approach (public vs. private, central vs. local, goal vs. implementation). The typology in this case exhibited a functional organisation: land use management, regional economic planning, comprehensive integrated approach, and urbanism tradition. Since the analysis encompassed only 15 EU member states at that time, there has been a need for an update of this typology, provided by Knieling and Othengrafen (2009: 46) who introduced the Eastern European transformation processes as the fifth group of planning styles in Europe. National spatial planning system is usually a combination of several models, however this overview successfully serves for a better understanding on comparative issues among various planning traditions.

Although the studies provided useful comparisons of planning systems, their main drawback refers to their emphasis placed only on formal structures of planning. More precisely, by highlighting the legal and administrative features, it was practically impossible to take into account 'the role of cultural traditions, values, habits, and semantics' (Othengrafen, 2010: 88) and therefore try to explain various spatial developments in Europe. Nevertheless, it is important to gain an overview of the main planning typologies in regard with the case studies analysed in the third section. A brief review of the comprehensive integrated approach, urbanism tradition, and the hybrid planning style of Eastern European countries is provided in the following lines.

2.1 COMPREHENSIVE INTEGRATED APPROACH

Comprehensive integrated planning approach is experienced in the Scandinavian countries and Belgium, as well as in the most of Central Europe: Germany, Switzerland, and Austria. According to this planning style, spatial planning is conducted through a very systematic and formal hierarchy of plans, be these on the national, regional or local level. In most of the states belonging to this planning model, the regional level of planning authorities plays a key role in directing the spatial development. It actually represents a strong link between the local initiatives, on the one hand, and the national guidelines on the other. Therefore, spatial planning is understood as spatial coordination, i.e. systemic preparation and coordination of spatial policies of relevant bodies and authorities at various levels, rather than a tool for balanced economic development, i.e. spatial equity, as highlighted in other planning models. In terms of the planning scope, it is very wide, providing horizontal, vertical and geographical integration of spatial policies. The role of government is decisive in most of the spatial development issues. In other words, planning is mainly understood as the public sector activity, with major investment in planning stemming from various governmental structures, depending on the scope and complexity of the planning task. The planning system itself is considered mature – planning institutions are responsive, planning mechanisms

are developed and transparent, there is political commitment to the planning activities, and, finally, public trust in planning is a norm (CEC, 1997: 36-37).

2.2 URBANISM TRADITION

Southern European countries of Spain, Italy and Greece belong to the states with dominant urbanism tradition. This planning model is centred on structural planning and urban design through rigid building regulations, zoning and codes. Such a focus on building control and townscape shows a clear affiliation to the domain of architecture, i.e. planning as an independent discipline is still not properly established. Briefly put, it is mainly about design and creation of places, without taking into account the strategic dimension of planning. Therefore, it is logical that the spatial level mainly responsible for the planning issue is the local one, whereas the main instrument is building regulations. Despite the fact that within the mentioned states there is a plenty of planning laws and regulations, they are not well coordinated and therefore they miss a clear strategic vision for further development. As a result, the mentioned states usually suffer from an uncontrolled development and ad-hoc planning solutions. Additionally, planning activity is not recognised as a political priority, nor it has general public support. Finally, there are only limited mechanisms for citizens' involvement in the plan-making procedure. Therefore, it is very difficult to manage the ever-growing conflicts among different sectors, usually at the expense of the public interest. Nevertheless, there is on-going intention to improve building control, on the one hand, and to broaden the spectre of spatial planning and its influence on the other (CEC, 1997: 37).

2.3 HYBRID PLANNING STYLE

Transformative planning is today experienced within a great area of the post-socialist states in Europe. In the past, these countries were faced with the centralised hierarchical social model, while nowadays they are muddling through the transition period in order to achieve stable future based on completely different social norms than those previously implemented. Due to such a tremendous change in political and social context, the planning is also still considered to be in the process of transition from the top-down state planning towards the market-driven development, posed by neoliberal paradigm premises, introduced overnight. In terms of its spatial focus (national planning vs. local regulations) and the competences of government, in the past this planning style could be compared with the comprehensive integrated model – a strong role of the public sector, however with the advantage of the national government contrary to the decentralised planning system. In terms of planning laws and spatial division of the state, the cases of ex-Czechoslovakia and ex-Yugoslavia could be easily compared to Austria (Newman and Thornley, 1996). However, the fall of the Berlin Wall designated great changes in the broader social and thus in the planning context, too. The scope of the planning became narrowed and limited only to the activities related to the economic sector, while the main investments came from the private sector – in the beginning, from domestic investors, and recently, more foreign. Planning institutions are clearly immature, with planning experts still seeking to find their position in between strong governmental demands and the private sector initiatives. Therefore, spatial decisions are made without previous prioritisation and taking into account the citizens' voices, thus leaving no room for public trust in planning (Tsenkova and Nedovic-Budic, 2006). Due to the various pace that different post-socialist countries followed in recent three decades, there can be certain variations in the extent of the planning transformation. However, one is true: the post-socialist nation states still strongly attempt to catch up with European standards – the spatial planning field cannot be neglected in such a transition.

3 PLANNING CULTURE: A METHODOLOGICAL TOOL

To better understand specific spatial development across Europe, it is not enough to consider only the planning system characteristics – institutional, legal and regulative framework of planning policies. On the contrary, 'everyday planning practice', deeply rooted in the values, norms, belief systems, visions and behaviour of the actors involved in the planning process – planning culture – must be taken into account (Fürst, 2009; Getimis, 2012). Moreover, different socio-economic patterns as well as various perceptions of planning tasks and responsibilities strongly influence spatial planning (Sanyal, 2005). Furthermore, Friedmann (2005) places an emphasis on both the formal and informal ways of understanding, formalizing

and implementing the spatial planning tasks. Finally, Faludi (2005: 285-6) stresses the roles and attitudes of planners regarding the appropriate role of the state, market forces, and civil society in influencing social outcome. Therefore, we agree that the planning culture concept is a complex one, comprising several 'culture segments' or 'culture layers'. Two dimensions of planning culture are certain: 1) horizontal (e.g. planning process, decision-making arrangements), which is directly 'perceivable', but still fuzzy, easily affected and in a constant change, and 2) vertical (e.g. social structures/governance model, planning system), which is underlying and difficult to perceive, but pretty stable and deep-rooted (Gullestrup in Dühr et al., 2010).

Although the notion of planning culture entered both the planning theory and research field ambitiously trying to go beyond the classical 'planning system' concept, many of these studies are still at the level of general statements on institutional structures and far from an operational framework for analysis of the concrete planning cultures in different localities (Fürst, 2009). However, some research findings try to complement it with a certain 'planning culture' approach (Knieling and Othengrafen, 2009; Getimis, 2012). In fact, they provide an idea how to understand the notion of culture and its effect on spatial planning. More precisely, Knieling and Othengrafen (2009) provide the 'culturised planning model', while Getimis (2012) points out the aspects of the 'planning culture framework'. The main characteristics of both models are briefly described in Table 1.

Source	Aspects		
Culturised planning model (Knieling and Othengrafen, 2009)	**Societal environment** Underlying and unconscious; taken-for-granted beliefs; thoughts and feelings which are affecting planning	**Planning artefacts** Visible planning products; structures and processes	**Planning environment** Shared assumptions; values and cognitive frames that are taken for granted by members of the planning profession
Planning culture framework (Getimis, 2012)	**Policy styles** Values, perceptions and mentalities of the representatives of collective actions	**Actor constellation and power** Agenda setting; the problems/challenges to be addressed; the scale of planning practices that are initiated to resolve the problems	**Knowledge forms** Scientific (planning expertise); institutional (logic of institutions, managerial capacities); everyday (individual act in common-sense situations)
PLANNING CULTURE: A PRAGMATIST APPROACH	**SOCIAL SETTING** System conditions; institutional and organisational action; agents' beliefs; social learning	**PLANNING PROCESS** Deliberative plan making	**PLANNING ENVIRONMENT** Cultural awareness of planners

Table 1 – Interrelated aspects of the planning culture approach

In Europe, the reality of the many successful spatial planning efforts coping with different problems testifies to the usefulness of plan making. Therefore, we consider how certain spatial problems flow from the interactions of purposeful systems whose agents are unable to anticipate and comprehend how their own efforts contribute to the spatial problem at hand. The institutional context varies along with the vocabularies of complaint; but the familiar elements of spatial interaction and competing belief offer an opportunity for deliberate plan making efforts among the relevant parties. People responsible for the collective welfare or public good of each place face a problem generated by unexpected changes in economic and political relationships that extend beyond the local place. Following a pragmatist approach, we ask three questions: What conditions and beliefs shaped the problem situation generating plan making? How did the relevant actors or agents (people) make spatial plans for the place? How well did the plans inform the intentions of the actors whose choices and actions could influence future outcomes? More specifically, our approach includes the parameters of social setting, planning process and planning environment, which are at the core of the methodological tool for empirical analysis.

Social setting depends on the systemic factors, whereas these differ from the political forces to the economic incentives, both affecting the planning practice in a particular spatial context. The systemic interdependence of the varieties of interacting systems cannot be comprehended by any one person, but

requires forms of social learning across diverse webs of institutional and organisational action. Therefore, it is not only the expertise, but also 'experiential' knowledge and skills what counts. Involving people in making plans for places while introducing relevant impacts informed by scientific and moral assessment requires deliberation. The varieties of such deliberate learning provide examples of innovative planning practice that contribute to the judgments people take making and altering the places they inhabit and use. Finally, the profession of spatial planning for places proves culturally useful by helping those who make plans for a place better anticipate and prepare for current and plausible problems. Cultural awareness makes the planners: acquainted with the context where they operate, capable of constant capacity-building, able of conducting socially justified activities and, thus, producing sustainable spatial solutions.

Briefly put, the 'cultural embeddedness' (Alexander in Reimer and Blotevogel, 2012) or as Healey (2006) puts it 'spatial consciousness' – the extent to which concepts of place, spatial organisation and territorial identity are built in policy cultures, deeply affects the spatial development patterns within certain territories. Do these cultural differences in the plan making craft fail to address the basic functional questions? We study the plan making in Solothurn (Switzerland), Patras (Greece), and Belgrade (Serbia) to find out how the projects responded to system demands, changes to planning approach and the planning professionals' expectations.

3.1 PLANNING CULTURE IN SOLOTHURN, SWITZERLAND

The Borregaard AG (Norwegian lumber company) shut down a 107 ha wood industry plant in 2008 located in Solothurn. The site went from a revenue producing employer to an environmental brownfield posing a risk to public health. The canton elected officials did not ignore the problem, blame it on industry or turn for assistance to the national government. They coordinated purchase of the site together with three private employers. This extraordinary act reflected recognition of the scarcity of flat land in Switzerland and the promise of continued economic prosperity. The structural plan for the canton had anticipated this departure as early as 2005 setting in motion the idea that this site deserved attention as a resource for future redevelopment (Scholl et al., 2013). The plan was created as part of an already well established tradition of plan making that the people involved all understood and accepted.

3.1.1 SOCIAL SETTING

Switzerland is famous for its decentralized way of decision-making and informal planning procedures when tackling complex spatial problems. The concept of pluralism is anchored in the Swiss conception of the political state, with its direct-democratic institutions, while citizen participation is natural planning practice (Keller et al., 1996). Thus, the main goal of Swiss comprehensive spatial planning is to achieve consensus among the interests of spatially relevant stakeholders. Moreover, public voting on planning issues is deeply rooted in Switzerland due to its territorial limitation of available land reserves (Swiss Federal Council, 2012). Collaboration between various institutional levels during the policy-making process (in a 'bottom-up' manner), as well as the cooperation between different sectors (public, private and civil) is the major feature of Swiss spatial planning culture. Collaborative planning procedure in the brownfield redevelopment process in Solothurn caused the changes in the cantonal structural plan (as the official spatial development instrument), proving that cooperation finds a fertile ground within a consensus-based direct democracy (Staub, 2011).

Moreover, stable economic situation of the cantonal government makes the planning procedures easier. Since in case of Solothurn there was no interest from private sector to invest in land development, the cantonal representatives, having in mind that the site is of great cantonal importance, bought the land and thus saved it from further degradation (Staub, 2011). Such an action clearly demonstrates the power relations among various sectors in Switzerland, with a central role of cantons – both in terms of economic independence, and hence no need to sacrifice the land reserves through the compromising planning solutions, as well as in institutional capacity to coordinate the future actions horizontally (various sectors of cantonal representatives participated in creating new spatial solution), and vertically, with continuous interaction with both the municipalities and federal spatial planning office. Clearly, democratic cooperative 'steering style' – the power decentralization combined with the network-building among the participants with different roles – makes an optimal setting for collaborative planning procedures (Scholl et al., 2013).

3.1.2 PLANNING PROCESS

Swiss planning practice is not grounded on standardized procedures; the focus is on the 'tailor-made' solutions, pragmatism and action-orientation (Keller et al., 1996; Scholl et al., 2013). In case of Solothurn, the stakeholders' participation was organised in a transparent manner with considering different interests of various parties – citizens, private companies, authorities at various levels, and independent experts. Although differing in power, there was no restriction to the needs and demands of the less powerful stakeholders. Imposing the decision by the canton was not chosen as a proper solution. More precisely, cantonal representatives influenced the planning procedure in two ways: indirectly – by defining the guidelines in the structural cantonal plan, and directly – through initiation of and participation in the planning process and the selection of expert committee members (a body responsible for structuring the action plan, i.e. major milestones and deliverables throughout entire planning process). The possible misuse of such a superior position was prevented by a highly transparent planning process management, containing the following parameters: 1) role differentiation, 2) several consultation meetings, 3) at least three competing project teams, and, 4) joint development of the final strategy (based on the combination of different proposals, i.e. there are no winners). Those rules are part of 'test-planning' – informal planning procedure not regulated by the law, but surely contributing to an efficient and meaningful planning process (Scholl et al., 2013). The described procedure provides the opportunity for the stakeholders to "be smarter when working together" (Staub, 2011). Also, only "jointly recognized problems are the motives for cooperation" (Grams, 2011). Planner, as an expert, does not insist on his own opinion. On the contrary, the consensus building is the main prerequisite for the success of the 'test-planning' procedure.

3.1.3 PLANNING ENVIRONMENT

With a combination of direct democracy and the need for sustainable spatial development, Swiss planners have a high level of autonomy – they are pursued to create original planning concepts and individual approaches (Scholl, 2008). Finding a creative solution for the brownfield site in Solothurn was made possible due to involvement of specific expert group and a specific organisation of the planning process. Namely, in addition to the main sectors involved (cantonal officials, private investors, local community), the particular significance was assigned to the independent experts, i.e. the experts outside the cantonal office. Also, despite a large number of stakeholders, the whole process ran smoothly due to its efficient organisational structure divided into two levels – strategic and operational. At the strategic level, the main role of decision-making was assigned to the executive board (consisted of cantonal representatives). At the operational level, the most important body was the expert committee (composed of both cantonal and external representatives), whose role was: 1) the definition of goals, vision and strategy, and, 2) the evaluation of the proposals made by different project teams (based on previously defined criteria) (Scholl et al., 2013). The key negotiator in the entire process was the expert committee – a multidisciplinary team of experts with both technical knowledge and mediation and facilitation skills, with two main tasks: advising the executive committee and selecting the best planning solutions (Grams, 2011; Staub, 2011). Such a position of planning expertise that goes beyond its expected performance was the core of the successful planning approach.

3.2 PLANNING CULTURE IN PATRAS, GREECE

A reliable and direct railway connection between Athens and Patras, the largest city in Pelopponese, is a strategic project of high priority aimed at bridging the East-West division of high-performance transport infrastructure that exists in Greece for a long time. However, in recent two decades, an endless discussion and unsustainable studies about the integration of the rail tracks into the urban pattern have been developed without concrete results. This stems mainly from an administrative fragmentation of the waterfront areas along the existing railway line leading to inconsistent decision-making, which makes the local government, the OSE (Hellenic Railways Organisation) and the ERGOSE (the OSE subsidiary company in charge of real estate) reluctant to collaborate (Papamichail and Peric, 2017).

3.2.1 SOCIAL SETTING

Greek administrative planning framework was modelled after the Napoleonic structure, characterized by the 'fused system' – a system with a dominant national planning level, while there also laws for municipal plans (Newman and Thornley, 1996). Due to the institutional transformation during the 1990s, the decentralization of the planning responsibilities toward the regional administrations and local authorities was enforced. However, nowadays all the planning decisions still have to be in line with the national spatial planning guidelines. More precisely, national ministry has formal competences and responsibility for preparation of urban (municipal) plans, while cities mainly decide on building permits, in line with the planning tradition of urbanism. Briefly put, planning is translated into the design and creation of places and is mainly carried out at the local level, while there is evident lack of a strategic approach of the national government (Papaioannou and Nikolakopoulou, 2016). Together, this makes the spatial planning in Greece highly ineffective.

Moreover, due the current economic crisis, the financial framework is unstable and limited, which unconditionally leads to the fragmented decision-making processes taking place between different planning levels and actors, and thus ad-hoc developments (Pappas et al., 2013). Firstly, spatial planning lacks a vision because of the recent privatization of planning powers and services, outsourcing, and the pro-growth planning (Reimer et al., 2014). The HRADF (Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund) illustrates the privatization phenomenon that transfers the responsibility of many services and public agencies into private entities. This affects directly the development and planning in Greece with the constant legalization of illegal constructions and/or stretching the scope of territories covered by the city master plans. Secondly, there is no a cooperation model among state, different administrative bodies and public organisations towards a common strategic spatial planning, thus causing the conflicts and delays for the vital strategic projects (Papamichail, 2015). Such an example is the attempt of introducing the railway line into the central city core of Patras.

3.2.2 PLANNING PROCESS

As assumed from above, the final decisions and approval of various plans and programmes are based on a top-down approach, thus creating a non-flexible environment for participation and collaboration. Although since the 1990s, there has been an effort for the new mechanisms of actor involvement toward the Europeanization of the Greek planning (Giannakourou, 2011), the development of planning policies and instruments has been proved as non-intersectoral and non-interdisciplinary, while overlapping responsibilities and interests at all administrative levels prevent any collaborative approach. The limited mechanisms for citizens' involvement as well as poor managing the conflict among different planning levels and actors are also the norm in the Greek spatial planning (Knieling and Othengrafen, 2016).

In the case of Patras, the prolonged conflicts are persistent mainly due to the administrative fragmentation of the waterfront area and consequently due to a lack of cooperation between the responsible authorities (Papamichail and Peric, 2017). Moreover, the local level does not have any competence in making plans on future railway development. Namely, the Greek Ministry of Transportation started a discussion about three scenarios of railway development in Patras, in an effort to meet the political interests of the municipality. The proposal included the by-pass, the underground and the ground-level solution. The discussion about the best scenario has recently continued with the presence of different actors, including the port authorities, ecologists, other political parties, the University of Patras and local organisations of neighbourhoods excluding the OSE, the ERGOSE, and planning experts, as well. Hence, the debate turned out to be pure political verbalism that insisted on the pharaonic plans, e.g. the by-pass solution, an unsustainable project of € 700 million with no proposals for the integrated model of city development. Once again, the fragmented decision-making and a top-down approach were implemented, excluding any collaborative attitude. Therefore, spatial planning is generally understood to be product-oriented, e.g. it is concentrated on the production of individual plans rather than on pursuing a continuous planning process, with a lack of coordination among the actors about institutional boundaries and a lack of effective monitoring mechanisms (Pappas et al., 2013).

3.2.3 PLANNING ENVIRONMENT

In Patras, planning experts were not involved in the discussion about the railway solution that greatly affect future urban development (Papamichail and Peric, 2017). This is a clear sign of an underestimated professional planning position. There are two main reasons behind such a situation. Firstly, local spatial planners are not formally competent to provide proposals that include even a pinpoint of strategic vision, i.e. strategic reasoning is reserved for the national planning offices within the relevant ministry, although it is highly ineffective. Local planners are in charge of providing building permits, thus supporting various decision-makers, mainly national government or private sector representatives (Othengrafen, 2010). Moreover, since each urban plan has to be in line with the national guidelines (and practically the plan is prepared by ministry), there is no room for local planners to show their possibly innovative approaches and a certain degree of independence. Briefly put, it is very hard to find a way for introducing integrated spatial and transport models (as truly strategic approach) within the highly centralised structure (Papamichail, 2015).

Another reason for a weak position of spatial planners lies in the specificity of their education. Only in the last 15 years, it has been possible for students to attend specific degrees in spatial planning (Othengrafen, 2010). Majority of spatial planning tasks today are undertaken by architects, whose focus is a bit different than this of strategic planning and creation of spatial visions for future. On the contrary, they deal mainly with urban design aspect of the built environment, without an idea on comprehensive planning approach. Finally, the skills immanent to planners in the Western world (negotiation, mediation, facilitation) are not experienced in the Greek context (Papaioannou and Nikolakopoulou, 2016). On the one hand, citizens' voices are not heard, except in case of threat to the self-interest, while, on the other, planners are mostly excluded from debate where other, powerful actors, have the leading role.

3.3 PLANNING CULTURE IN BELGRADE, SERBIA

Three years after initiating the idea on the Belgrade Waterfront project (during the political campaign of then-largest opposition party), the cornerstone for a 90 ha land on the river bank was set in October 2015, thus marking the beginning of the 30-year long development period. Moreover, due to its position (close to the confluence of two rivers and the historical city core), this brownfield site redevelopment is not only of city, but also of regional and even national importance, thus attracting mainly foreign investors (Maruna, 2015). The current construction work is financed by the investor from the United Arab Emirates (UAE).

3.3.1 SOCIAL SETTING

As other post-socialist countries, Serbia is faced with the decentralisation of power, reflected also in the decentralisation of responsibilities in the spatial planning domain, on one hand, and the adaptation to the neo-liberal paradigm on the other (Vujosevic, 2010; Vujosevic et al., 2012). However, the Belgrade Waterfront project clearly shows that spatial planning power decentralisation in Serbia is not real: although the city authorities should have the major role in defining the priorities for further development of the riverfront area, their role is marginalised; in fact, when it comes to the mega-projects, the tight cooperation between the city and national governance – in the way that all decisions made at the national level are simply imposed on the local/city level – appears as a necessary condition for any further spatially relevant action; finally, the illusion that the city mayor's voice is heard when debating about the future project lies in the fact that both the city mayor and the prime minister belong to the same political party (Maruna, 2015).

Although the success of the economic system's transition within the ex-central economy-driven post-communist states can be debated (Vujosevic et al., 2012), the Belgrade Waterfront is an example of a strong glorification of the neo-liberal principles without taking into account the public interest demand. More precisely, all negotiations during the preparation of the agreement with the foreign investor were subordinate to the developer's requests, while the national interests were masked under the veil of new workplaces and the assignment of the construction work to Serbian subcontractors. Concretely, according to the agreement between Eagle Hills, a company from the UAE, and the national government of Serbia, the state is obliged to remove the old railway tracks (currently at the site since this is the broader area of railway station still in use), invest in constructing the new railway station, provide all the infrastructural equipment to and on the site and even lease the land to the UAE investor for 99 years. Unfortunately, this

is a paradigm of the current spatial planning approach in Serbia: ad hoc solutions are today the only way of attracting investments for large redevelopment projects (Zekovic et al., 2015).

3.3.2 PLANNING PROCESS

In contrast to the former Yugoslav planning professionals who were acting in concert with the authorities, highly appreciating multidisciplinarity in the planning process and being recognised as the bearers of public interest, Serbian planners are today completely side-lined for public interest lost its privileged position as the 'higher' reason that cannot be brought into the question (Vujosevic and Nedovic-Budic, 2006). Planners cannot cope effectively with the private interest requests expressed in the Belgrade Waterfront project for their expertise did not evolve through time: they do not know how to swim in the whirlpool of multiple interests, i.e. they did not adapt to the pluralistic society and still try to keep their exclusive position.

The global shift of the planning paradigm addressed the raising awareness of the stakeholders' collaboration in creating the spatial development policies (Vujosevic et al., 2012). Nevertheless, in the case of the Belgrade Waterfront project, strategic decisions were made at the political level (with the key role of prime minister!), hence, avoiding any kind of a public debate with a range of interested parties. The professional planners' society was completely ignored by the political power structures: on the one hand, they were the advocates of public interest, but what is worse, they never showed any understanding of a contemporary society's demands and the need of adjusting their own profile to it. Persistent adherence to the outdated position made them players without power in a stakeholder arena, thus easily disregarded by the powerful political structures. The civil sector, i.e. several non-governmental organisations, also raised its voice pointing to the irregularity of the legal basis of the Belgrade Waterfront project, thus trying to address the broader public audience. They were underlining the importance of safeguarding public interest and compliance with planning and construction legislation (Maruna, 2015). However, the exclusion of both the planning profession and the public in such an important project is a clear sign of an elementary ignorance of democratic decision-making.

3.3.3 PLANNING ENVIRONMENT

The previous paragraphs tackled the issues of planners' relationship to other stakeholders. However, here we want to draw attention to the professional expertise – their skills and knowledge needed when dealing with complex spatial problems. Briefly put, Serbian planning professionals place their expertise only on their technical knowledge (of producing the plans), without taking into account 1) the planning process itself (and hence the need to use the skills of facilitation, mediation, and negotiation while communicating with other interested parties), on the one hand, and 2) a broader social context in which the stakeholders' collaboration should take place on the other (Vujosevic et al., 2012). The clear example of the Serbian expertise position was the complaint of the National Association of Architects (NAA) to the spatial concept proposed by foreign architects and designers. To avoid possible confusion, most of the urban planning professionals come from the Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade or similar technical faculties of the other Serbian universities. The NAA president stressed the unfair domestic exclusion of experts in the project: the comment was mainly on the quality and design of the project, and not on the strategic decision-making procedure that caused such a design. In this way, the experts confirmed that they only reckon on their own technical experience with no understanding that a strategic decision-making process in spatial planning should include knowledge and skills from other disciplines, as well (Maruna, 2015).

4 CONCLUSIONS

As the empirical analysis shows, diversity in planning is constant in Europe and this can be hardly changed. The quality of the planning approach and further success in its implementation strongly depends on broader social context; the setting which do not pay enough attention on the planning as a powerful tool for directing future spatial development seems to be confused in providing proper answers to the challenging situations.

Looking through the lens of the social environment, Switzerland, famous for its decentralized way of decision-making, is also a clear example of reflecting its collaborative approach during the policy-making process (experienced at federal level) into the deliberative plan making. Moreover, within the Swiss Spatial Planning Law (revised in 2013), there is a clear demand for informal planning procedures when tackling complex spatial problems. On the contrary, Greece is highly influenced by a fragmented decision-making and a clientelism approach, thus remaining attached to rules and adopting a politics of resentment. Under the umbrella of the market-oriented pluralist society, the Serbian national governance is highly confused in a controversial attempt to re-decentralize the state administrative structure, and thus make some other levels more powerful in the spatial planning decision-making process, on the one hand, and to strive to achieve as tight as possible feedback with foreign private investors on the other.

Deliberative planning through the democratic actor constellations is a norm in the Swiss plan making. Mutual trust, joint actions and transparent decision-making procedures among the representatives of public, private and civil sector makes the culture of Swiss plan making highly collaborative. In Greece, plans cannot work because the problem is not recognized as a kind of uncertainty susceptible to resolution, but a conflict of injustice or identity. This hence results in unconventional and ad-hoc developments. In Serbia, there is a high disproportion in power between the national government, thus reaching a dominant position in negotiation with private sector about future spatial development, and other parties, be these the authorities at lower levels, citizens or experts, which are totally marginalised.

Swiss planners, as public administration representatives, have a high level of autonomy, which offers them an opportunity for creating the original planning concepts and individual approaches. In Greece, planning/planners are considered a 'supportive actor' (Othengrafen, 2010), sometimes only providing technical instrument for the decision-making to be done by politicians or private investors. Similarly to this, professional expertise in Serbia is highly behind the contemporary demands of the planning vocation; planning is deeply subject to politics.

To conclude, the illustrated differences flow from the variations shaping the cultural conceptions of the problems and the relevance of spatial plan making as a source of practical judgment for meaningful joint action. The Swiss plan offers such a good example of effective collaborative planning not because the plan making was significantly better than the plan making for the transport corridor in Greece or the brownfield in Serbia; but because the attachment to institutional patronage in Greece and political favouritism in Serbia undermined the relevance for spatial planning. However, analysts go astray as they imagine planners or plans responsible for relations of social mistrust and cynical detachment. The plans can provide important testimony to the kind of purposeful deliberation that may anticipate and avoid the social and economic damage of urban developments that wilfully ignore future consequences for others. Nevertheless, bureaucratic indifference and patronage along with political favouritism and corruption cannot be remedied by planning. Changing these conditions requires a host of social, political and economic changes that extend well beyond what plans can do.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

CEC (Commission of the European Communities). (1997). The EU Compendium of Spatial Planning Systems and Policies. Luxembourg: Regional Development Studies, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

CEC (Commission of the European Communities). (1999). The European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

COMMIN. (2009). Comparison of Planning Systems. Available online at www.commin.org (accessed 1 May 2017).

Dühr, S., Stead, D. and Zonneveld, W. (2007). The Europeanization of spatial planning through territorial cooperation. Planning Practice & Research, 22(3), 291-307.

Dühr, S., Nadin, V. and Colomb, C. (2010). European spatial planning and territorial cooperation. New York: Routledge.

Dühr, S., Cowell, R. and Markus, E. (2016). Europeanizing planning education and the enduring power of national institutions. International Planning Studies, 21(1), 16-33.

During, R. and van Dam, R. (2007). Cultural Differences in European Cooperation: Learning from INTERREG Practice. Final report of the INTERACT project CULTPLAN. Wageningen: Alterra, Wageningen University and Research Centre.

EU (Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Development and Territorial cohesion). (2007). Territorial Agenda of the European Union: Towards a More Competitive and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions. Leipzig, 24-25 May 2007.

EU (Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Development and Territorial cohesion). (2007). Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020: Towards an Inclusive, Smart and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions. Gödöllő, 19 May 2011.

Faludi, A. (2005). The Netherlands: a culture with a soft spot for planning. In B. Sanyal (Ed.), Comparative Planning Cultures (pp. 285-308). New York: Routledge.

Faludi, A. (2014). EUropeanisation or Europeanisation of spatial planning? Planning Theory & Practice, 15(2), 155-169.

Faludi, A. (2016) The Poverty of Territorialism: Revisiting European Spatial Planning. disP - The Planning Review, 52(3), 73-81.

Farinós Dasi, J. (Ed.) (2006). Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level. Final Report of ESPON Project 2.3.2. Esch-surAlzette: ESPON Coordination Unit.

Friedmann, J. (2005). Planning cultures in transition. In B. Sanyal (Ed.), Comparative Planning Cultures (pp. 29-44). New York: Routledge.

Fürst, D. (2009). Planning cultures en route to a better comprehension of “planning processes”? In J. Knieling and F. Othengrafen (Eds.), Planning Cultures in Europe: Decoding Cultural Phenomena in Urban and Regional Planning (pp. 23-38). Farnham: Ashgate.

Giannakourou, G. (2011). Europeanization, Actor constellations and Spatial Policy in Greece. disP – The Planning Review, 47, 32-41.

Getimis, P. (2012). Comparing Spatial Planning Systems and Planning Cultures in Europe. Planning Practice and Research, 27(1), 25-40.

Grams, A. (2011). [Personal communication]. 4 September.

Healey, P. (2006). Relational Complexity and the Imaginative Power of Strategic Spatial Planning. European Planning Studies, 14(4), 525-546.

Healey, P. (2011). The universal and the contingent: Some reflections on the transnational flow of planning ideas and practices. Planning Theory, 11, 188-207.

Hoch, C. (2011). The planning research agenda: planning theory for practice. Town Planning Review, 82(2), vii-xv.

Hoch, C. (2012). Making Plans. In R. Weber and R. Crane (Eds.), Urban Planning Handbook (pp. 241-258). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hoch, C. (2016). Utopia, scenario, plan: a pragmatic integration. Planning Theory, 15(1): 6-22.

Keller, D. A., Koch, M. and Selle, K. (1996). ‘Either/or’ and ‘and’: first impressions of a journey into the planning cultures of four countries. Planning Perspectives, 11(1), 41-54.

Knieling, J. and Othengrafen, F. (Eds). (2009). Planning Cultures in Europe: Decoding Cultural Phenomena in Urban and Regional Planning. Farnham: Ashgate.

Knieling, J. and Othengrafen, F. (Eds.). (2016). Cities in Crisis: Socio-spatial impacts of the economic crisis in Southern European cities. New York: Routledge.

Maruna, M. (2015). Can Planning Solutions Be Evaluated without Insight into the Process of their Creation? In M. Schrenk, V. Popovich, P. Zeile, P. Elisei and C. Beyer (Eds.), Proceedings of the REAL CORP 2015 Conference “Plan Together–Right Now–Overall” (pp. 121-132). Vienna: REAL CORP.

Newman, P. and Thornley, A. (1996). Urban Planning in Europe: International Competition, National Systems, and Planning Projects. London: Routledge.

Othengrafen, F. (2010). Spatial planning as expression of culturised planning practices: the examples of Helsinki, Finland and Athens, Greece. Town Planning Review, 81(1), 83-110.

Papaioannou, A. and Nikolakopoulou, Ch. (2016). Greek cities in crisis: Context, evidence, response. In J. Knieling and F. Othengrafen (Eds.), Cities in Crisis: Socio-spatial impacts of the economic crisis in Southern European cities (pp. 172-189). New York: Routledge.

Papamichail, T. (2015). Railway and urban development in Patras: Towards the improved participation of local governance in complex planning problems. Serbian Architectural Journal, 7(3), 365-380.

Papamichail, T. and Peric, A. (2017). Informal Planning: Towards Promoting Resilient Governance in Greece. In A. Bisello (Ed.), Proceedings of the EURAC 2017 Conference "Smart and Sustainable Planning for Cities and Regions". Berlin: Springer (forthcoming).

Pappas, V., Kalamiotis, I. and Karidi, A. (Eds.) (2013). CODE PATRAS Joint Seminar Week, Urban and Railway Development in Patras: Report. Patras: University of Patras.

Reimer, M. (2013). Planning Cultures in Transition: Sustainability Management and Institutional Change in Spatial Planning, Sustainability, 5, 4653-4673.

Reimer, M. and Blotevogel, H. H. (2012). Comparing Spatial Planning Practice in Europe: A Plea for Cultural Sensitization. Planning Practice and Research, 27(1), 7-24.

Reimer, M., Getimis, P. and Blotevogel, H.H. (Eds.) (2014). Spatial planning systems and practices in Europe: a comparative perspective on continuity and changes. New York: Routledge.

Sanyal, B. (Ed.). Comparative Planning Cultures. New York: Routledge.

Scholl, B. (Ed.) (2008). Spatial planning and development in Switzerland - observations and suggestions from the international group of experts. Zurich: ETH Zurich, Institute for Spatial and Landscape Development.

Scholl, B., Staub, B. and Vinzens, M. (Eds.) (2013). Test Planning – A Method with a Future. Main features and information on the practical application of the test planning process using Riedholz/Luterbach as an example. Solothurn: Kanton Solothurn.

Staub, B. (2011). [Personal communication]. 3 December.

Swiss Federal Council. (2012). Sustainable Development Strategy 2012-2015. Berne: Swiss Federal Council.

Tsenkova, S. and Nedovic-Budic, Z. (Eds.) (2006). The urban mosaic of post-socialist Europe: space, institutions and policy. Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.

Vujosevic, M. (2010). Collapse of strategic thinking, research and governance in Serbia and possible role of the spatial plan of the Republic of Serbia (2010) and its renewal. SPATIUM International Review 23, 22-29.

Vujosevic, M. and Nedovic-Budic, Z. (2006). Planning and societal context – The case of Belgrade, Serbia. In S. Tsenkova, and Z. Nedovic-Budic (Eds.), The urban mosaic of post-socialist Europe: space, institutions and policy (pp. 275-284). Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.

Vujosevic, M., Zekovic, S. and Maricic, T. (2012). Post-socialist transition in Serbia and its unsustainable path. European Planning Studies 20, 1707-1727.

Zekovic, S., Vujosevic, M. and Maricic, T. (2015). Spatial regularization, planning instruments and urban land market in a post-socialist society: The case of Belgrade. Habitat International 48, 65-78.

ID 1453 | INTRODUCING BUSINESS REGIONS IN DENMARK: TOWARDS A NEW PLANNING CULTURE?

Olesen Kristian[1]; Jahn Hansen Carsten[1]
[1] Department of Planning, Aalborg University
kristian@plan.aau.dk ; jahn@plan.aau.dk

1 INRODUCTION

Significant attention has recently been paid to the new forms of territorial governance emerging at the scale of urban regions in Western Europe (Allmendinger et al., 2015; Janssen-Jansen and Hutton, 2011). In the planning literature, these new spaces of governance have been conceptualised as 'soft spaces' with 'fuzzy boundaries', as they are often located in between formal levels of governance, and are not necessarily univocally bounded (Haughton et al., 2010). It is claimed, that the new spaces of territorial governance do not as much replace formal levels of governance, as they seek to supplement existing