

AESOP PRIZE AWARD for best Published Paper over 2005
Rewarded at the Global Planning Conference, Mexico City, 2006, July 13
REPORT OF AESOP PRIZE PAPER COMMITTEE

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 AESOPs 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
 The Place of Alternative Culture and the Politics of its Protection in Berlin, Amsterdam and Melbourne. *Planning*

Theory and Practice [Vol. 6, June 2005, No.2, 149-169]

John Friedmann
 Globalization and the Emerging Culture of Planning. *Progress in Planning* [64 (2005)183 – 234].

Heather Campbell & John Henneberry
 Planning Obligations, the Market Orientation of Planning and Planning Professionalism. *Journal of Property Research* [March 2005, 22 (1) 37 -59].

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.

John Friedmann, 'Globalization and the Emerging Culture of Planning', *Progress in Planning*

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.

Heather Campbell and John Henneberry, 'Planning Obligations, the Market Orientation of Planning and Planning Professionalism', *Journal of Property Research*.

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)

1. Berding, U., K Selle, Öffentlich ist öffentlich ist ...? *Gärten und Landschaft*.
2. Bertolini, L. Sustainable Urban Mobility, an Evolutionary Approach. *European Spatial Research and Policy (ESRP)*
3. Bieker, S. / F. Othengrafen, Organising Capacity - Regionale Handlungsfähigkeit von Regionen im demographischen Wandel. *Raumforschung und Raumordnung*.
4. Caffyn, A. and M. Dahlström, Urban-Rural Interdependencies:

- Joining up Policy in Practice. *Regional Studies*.
5. Campbell, H. and J. Henneberry, Planning obligations, the market orientation of planning and planning professionalism. *Journal of Property Research*.
 6. Cheshire, P. Unprized regulatory risk and the competition of rules: unconsidered implications of land use planning. *Journal of Property Research*.
 7. Fothergill, S. A New Regional Policy for Britain. *Regional Studies*.
 8. Friedmann, J. Globalization and the Emerging Culture of Planning. *Progress in Planning*.
 9. Fürst, D. Entwicklung und Stand des Steuerungsverständnisses in der Raumplanung. *DISP*.
 10. Grosse-Bächle, L. Die Kunst des Wartens. *Gärten und Landschaft*.
 11. Hajer, M.A. Rebuilding Ground Zero. The Politics of Performance. *Planning Theory and Perspective*
 12. Halpern, Ch. Institutional change through innovation: the URBAN Community Initiative in Berlin, 1994-99. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*
 13. Kenworth, JR and F.B. Laube, An International Comparative Perspective on Sustainable Transport in European Cities. *European Spatial Research and Policy (ESRP)*
 14. Latz, P. Landscape architecture as an intercultural principle. *Topos*.
 15. Mossop, E. Affordable landscapes. *Topos*.
 16. Müge Akkar, Z. Questioning 'inclusivity' of public spaces in post-industrial cities: the case of Haymarket bus station, Newcastle upon Tyne. *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*.
 17. Neuman, M. and J Gavinha, The planning dialectic of continuity and change: the evolution of metropolitan planning in Madrid. *European Planning studies*.
 18. Peel, D. Planning for safe and secure communities: the social reconstruction of antisocial behaviour. *Town Planning Review*.
 19. Punter, J. Urban Design in Central Sydney 1945-2002. *Progress in Planning*.
 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*.
 21. Shaw, K. The Place of Alternative Culture and the Politics of its Protection in Berlin, Amsterdam and Melbourne. *Planning Theory and Perspective*.
 22. Ward, S.V. A pioneer 'global intelligence corps'? The internationalism of planning practice, 1890-1939. *Town Planning Review*.
 23. Snyder, A.B. Traversing an Anatolian village: views from the inside. *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*.
 24. Steurer, R. / Martinuzzi, A. Towards a new pattern of strategy formation in the public sector: first experiences with national strategies for sustainable development in Europe. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*.
 25. Williams, J. Designing Neighbourhoods for Social Interaction: The Case of Cohousing. *Journal of Urban Design*.
 26. Yang, W. and J. Kang, Soundscape and Sound Preferences in Urban Squares: A Case Study in Sheffield. *Journal of Urban Design*.
- 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.

Criterion 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).

Criterion 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.

Criterion 4 : References

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

Criterion 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.

Criterion 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.