Initiated in 1995, with the first award made in 1996, the purpose of the prize is to celebrate the work of the scholars in the planning field publishing in European planning journals. It also serves to bring to the attention of planning academics and other interested parties across Europe the range of academic work being undertaken in the spatial planning field and to exchange literature between our different national academic cultures. The reviewing and the selection of the winning articles is done by a committee which is nominated by AESOP Council of National Representatives.

The AESOP Paper Prize Paper Committee consisted of the next five members:

- Prof. Dr. Willem Salet (chair) (The Netherlands)
- Dr. Hermann Boemer replaced by Dr. Deike Peters (Germany)
- Dr. Anne Geppert (France)
- Prof. Dr. Petter Naess (Denmark)
- Prof. Dr. Vesselina Troeva (Bulgaria).

The editors of more than 50 European planning journals were invited to submit the two best papers of their journal over 2005. The prize paper committee accepts papers in English, French and German languages. Planning journals in other languages are encouraged to enable translation of their selected papers in one of these languages. In 2005, the editors nominated 26 papers on behalf of AESOP’s prize paper committee. The full list of nominated papers is attached in the Appendix.

REVIEW OF THE 2005 NOMINATIONS

The committee operated in two rounds. Firstly, four papers were selected as ‘highly qualified’, and in the second round the winning paper is selected from this category of excellent papers. The committee selected the next four papers over 2005 as “highly qualified”:

Kate Shaw

John Friedmann

Heather Campbell & John Henneberry

Francesca S. Sartorio
Strategic Spatial Planning: A historical review of approaches, its recent revival, and an overview of the state of the art. disP [162-3 (2005), 26-40].

Making a further selection in this category of ‘highly qualified’ papers, the AESOP Prize Paper Committee awarded the prize for the best scientific article over 2005 to

Kate Shaw
The Place of Alternative Culture and the Politics of its Protection in Berlin, Amsterdam and Melbourne’. In the journal Planning Theory and Practice

The AESOP Prize Paper Committee also awarded a distinction of honor to the scientific essay of

John Friedmann
Globalization and the emerging culture of planning In the journal Progress in Planning

All selected papers for the final round are well written, with a high intellectual quality and cover highly important issues within current planning theory and practice – the need for innovative restructuring of the strategic and operational planning institution and for a new planning culture.

Kate Shaw, ‘The Place of Alternative Culture and the Politics of its Protection in Berlin, Amsterdam and Melbourne’, Planning Theory and Practice

Shaw’s paper is an original interpretation of the role of the alternative city cultures as a heritage, as an important human, social, cultural, intellectual and financial asset of the urban environment, preserving the identity of place in a global world. It
is well-written and deals with some important paradoxes for planners in multicultural cities. Drawing on examples from three case cities, Shaw discusses the tensions between facilitating the creativity of recalcitrant subcultures and the risk of killing this very creativity through reformist policies by which these activities are co-opted into the established tourism industry, and between protecting places for alternative cultures and the tendency of such cultural activities to be spatially ‘non-rooted’. These issues will be in the heart of professional planning practices in the forthcoming era of higher mobility and increasing plurality of urban societies.


Friedmann’s paper gives a high standing and intellectual contribution to the planning history and theory, valuable for professional practice and education. It is well written and embedded in the existing literature. Friedmann identifies a number of different planning ‘cultures’ prevalent in different corners of the world, and discusses similarities and differences among these streams of planning in the light of their social and cultural contexts. It is a provocative overview of the principle of strategic planning under global conditions and stimulates important local debates on the global culture of planning. He concludes by offering some recommendations for future context-based ‘planning habitus’. These recommendations are thought-provoking and likely to arouse debate, e.g. regarding tensions between the recommended strengthening of entrepreneurial and ‘action-oriented’ elements in planning, and the imperatives of long-term environmental sustainability and socially equitable distribution.


Campbell & Henneberry’s paper investigates the British practice of imposing certain social obligations on developers as a part of the conditions for being given building permits. The paper demonstrates how British planners deal with value-based judgments under current, more market-influenced and negotiation-based planning conditions where ‘planning obligations’ have become an economic resource of increasing importance for local authorities. The analysis of this policy game is very relevant and as such may give a lot of inspiration to other countries as well, even though there is no explicit comparative approach. The paper reflects a classical example of a planning research with well applied research methodology and a contribution to the important planning issues such as institutional, organisational and professional culture.

Francesca S. Sartorio, ‘Strategic Spatial Planning: A Historical Review of Approaches, its Recent Revival, and an Overview of the State of the Art’, disP.

Francesca Sartorio’s paper discusses the concept of strategic planning and shows how this mode of planning has been practised in Italy during recent decades. More than just a “historical review”, it is a real attempt to understand not only how, but also why strategic planning has changed. This evolution towards strategic planning is shared by most European countries - it would have been even interesting to have some other examples – although the approach of Italian reality seems to be very relevant. The strength of the paper lies in its conceptual clarification. An interesting contribution of the paper is the attempt to go beyond the professional boundaries and to find its creative and innovative potential in the wider context of strategic spatial planning.

NOMINATED PAPERS OVER 2005 (ALPHABETICALLY)

2. Bertolini,L. Sustainable Urban Mobility, an Evolutionary Approach. European Spatial Research and Policy (ESRP)
Joining up Policy in Practice. Regional Studies.


7. Fothergill, S. A New Regional Policy for Britain. Regional Studies.


9. Fürst, D. Entwicklung und Stand des Steuerungsverständnisses in der Raumplanung. DISP.


20. Sartorio, F.S. Strategic Spatial Planning: A Historical Review of Approaches, its Revival and an Overview of the State of the Art in Italy. DISP.


SELECTION CRITERIA

Both the nomination of the papers by the editorial boards and the further selection by AESOP prize paper committee is based on the next selection criteria.

Criterion 1 : Related to Planning Theories

Planning is understood as a set of coordinated public policies aiming to improve the use of space by a human community (/society). It may:

• be applied to any spatial scale (from neighbourhood to global)
• concern different sectors of human activity (housing, transportation, environment, economics...)
• use different tools of intervention (construction, legislation, project-making...)

Therefore this relevance may be understood as:
• theory on planning: considering planning as a societal process, addressing planning procedures, outcomes and the social function of planning;
• theory in planning: substantive issues about which planners need to have knowledge when making spatial plans;
• theory for planning: planners toolbox of methods.

Criterium 2 : Conceptual Quality
The selected papers shall prove conceptual quality through rising a question and leading a demonstration in its field. The jury will pay special attention to the width and depth of the subject (for instance, study cases are not likely to be prized, unless they are used as an illustration to a wider matter).

Criterium 3 : Methods
The jury expects papers of high quality in the methodological approaches in both planning practice and planning research. Though not strongly required, the use of interdisciplinary and/or comparative approaches, especially at the European level, is considered as a positive quality.

Criterium 4 : References
The authors are expected to be updated on the state of knowledge and on current debates within the topic of the paper.

Criterium 5 : Findings
To be rewarded, a paper shall bring an improvement into the comprehension/practice in the field of planning. Nevertheless, it is obvious that all submitted papers cannot be expected to give revolutionary innovations in their outcomes. The findings may be understood as:
• making a new step, giving a new light in, on or for planning theory ;
• and / or bringing proposals for public action.

Criterium 6 : Overall Quality
In addition to the five listed criteria, the jury will use a holistic evaluation where each juror shall express his overall appreciation of the paper and its qualities.