Paper

From urban planning towards strategic integral area development

Inge de Kort, Mirjam Bult-Spiering and Geert Dewulf

Session C2: Integrated assessment and planning for sustainable development
Tuesday 27 September 2005, 15.00 – 16.30
Session leader: Hussein Abaza; Hussein.ABAZA@unep.ch

University of Twente,
Department of Construction Management and Engineering
ir. I.A.T. de Kort
P.O. box 217
7500 AE, Enschede
The Netherlands
P: +31 53 489 4254
F: +31 53 489 2511
E: i.a.t.dekort@utwente.nl

Conference of IAIA
SEA Prague: International experience and perspectives in SEA
26-30 September 2005
Prague, Czech Republic

From urban planning towards strategic integral area development

Inge de Kort, Mirjam Bult-Spiering and Geert Dewulf

Abstract
Since space is scarce and most types of land uses are competitive for space, spatial functions have to be coordinated efficiently to make optimal use of the available space. An integrated approach is needed to be able to develop sustainable areas. Integral area development is the alignment of different spatial functions leading to an overall solution for a specific area. It aims at making efficient use of the coherence between the various functions. Practice shows this coordination is inadequate. Bottlenecks are described in the current approach of coordinating the multitude of spatial functions and in coordinating the multitude of stakeholders. Improvement of the present coordination approach in integral area development is needed.

Besides, three trends are signalized in urban planning: 1) a shift from the focus on the planning product towards a focus on the planning process, 2) a shift from government towards governance and 3) a shift from sector specific urban planning towards integrated coordination of spatial planning. The signalized bottlenecks and trends indicate the need for a more integrated and better coordinated approach of spatial planning, comprehending both the physical coordination of the land uses and the interaction process of the stakeholders. The current planning literature focuses on either project management or process management. This paper claims a perspective is needed that combines project and process management. Both multiple spatial functions (product) and multiple stakeholders (process) have to be strategically aligned for successful integral area developments. Aspects of strategic planning, comprehensiveness and the network approach have to be combined to develop such perspective. In this paper a draft of such a perspective is outlined.

Key words
Integral area development; multiple land use; strategic planning; urban planning

Inge de Kort (corresponding author) is a Ph.D. student at the Department of Construction Management and Engineering, University of Twente, P.O. box 217, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands; E-mail: i.a.t.dekort@utwente.nl; Tel: +31 53 489 4254; Fax: +31 53 489 2511

1 Introduction

Since space is scarce, especially in the densely populated Netherlands, space has to be used efficiently. Most spatial functions are competitive for space, but are also interrelated. Therefore the various functions have to be aligned and coordinated to make optimal use of the available space. An integrated approach is needed to be able to develop a sustainable spatial area and to create coherence between the different spatial functions (Bult-Spiering et al., 2005). Integral area development is the alignment of different spatial functions leading to a coherent overall solution for a specific area. It attempts to make efficient use of the interrelationships between the spatial functions. Other terms used for integral area development are multiple land use, mixed use developments and integrating multiple purposes.

Many different spatial functions can be distinguished in spatial planning. The four key spatial functions are real estate, infrastructure, environment and water. These spatial functions can be further subdivided in many different objects, for example the function real estate includes houses, public space, offices, shops, factories. Integral area development projects experience many problems in aligning and coordinating the various spatial functions and in creating coherence between them. Practice shows (CPB, 2001; Spiering and Dewulf, 2001; Edelenbos and Teisman, 2005) the coordination of the spatial functions is inadequate, for example in terms of finding coherence between the spatial functions, non-harmonized policies and differences in formal procedures, etc. This paper describes bottlenecks in the coordination of spatial functions and in finding coherence between them. It also describes bottlenecks in the

collaboration of the stakeholders. Many stakeholders, both public and private, are involved in integral area development projects. Each stakeholder has its own specific goals and interests in the project, which need to be coordinated. Practice shows bottlenecks in public-private partnerships, the coordination of (conflicting) goals and interests, etc.

First an overview is given of trends signalized in urban planning. These trends give an indication of the way urban planning has developed during the time and the line of reasoning to the position were it stands now. The trends are followed by a section discussing bottlenecks in the current spatial planning. This section gives an overview of bottlenecks in the coordination of the multiple spatial functions and bottlenecks in the coordination of the multiple stakeholders and their interests. The described bottlenecks and trends indicate a need for a more integrated and better coordinated approach of spatial planning, comprehending both the physical coordination of the land uses and the interaction process of the stakeholders. Finally, a draft of such a perspective to overcome the bottlenecks is outlined and suggestions for further research are made.

2 Trends in urban planning

Three trends are signalized in the urban planning. The first trend is a shift of reasoning in the urban planning literature. In literature a shift could be depicted from the planning product, towards the planning process. The second signalized trend is the shift from government towards governance. This trend indicates the involvement of a growing number of stakeholders in integral area development which have to collaborate to find a solution for the concerning planning task. The third trend is a shift from sector specific planning towards a more integrated approach of spatial planning, which is noticed in the planning practice. This integrated approach of planning aims to find coherence between the various spatial functions in order to improve spatial quality and make efficient use of the available space. The three trends are further elaborated in the following sections.

2.1 Two lines of reasoning in the urban planning literature

The urban planning literature can be divided in two separated lines of reasoning: one is concentrating on the planning product, the other is concentrating on the planning process. Below both lines of reasoning are described.

2.1.1 Rational comprehensive planning

Traditionally, urban planning had a strong focus on the physical planning result. The emphasis of rational comprehensive planning is on the development of an extensive plan that describes the physical use of land in the desired end-situation. Rational comprehensiveness means all-embracing plans are made of towns as a whole. The outcome of this allocative way of planning is a comprehensive master plan or a blueprint that divides the concerning area into various zones of different land uses and represents the future land use of the area. These comprehensive plans function as guide in the search for a location of new buildings and constructions and other planning actions.

Rational comprehensive planning supposes a high level of feasibility. The basic idea is that the future shape of the city can be ‘designed’ by planners on basis of rational, scientific considerations and knowledge. Once adopted, the plan is supposed to be an unambiguous guide to action. A project plan is expected to have a determinate effect. In other words, within predefined margins of error, outcomes must conform to the specifications in the project plan (Faludi, 2000).

The key criticism on rational comprehensive planning is its over-reliance on the ‘objective possibility’ to prescribe the future of an area. It concentrates on the creation of a master plan. Consensus is (pre)assumed about the normative ideals and values of planning (De Graaf, forthcoming). Rational comprehensive planning supposes the implementation of the master plan does not cause problems if the developed master plan clearly describes the desired land use. As Motte (1997) describes it “… a ‘good’ plan will necessarily be followed by action in line with the plan”. The underlying belief was that social problems would be resolved by

technical progress. The plan's role was a set of possible decisions, to guide the institutional processes of public policy actions. However, many rational comprehensive plans were difficult or even impossible to apply (Motte, 1997). Due to the new challenges, the ever more complex problems, the emerging environmental and social considerations and the increasingly active population groups defending these values and/or their own local interests, the simple implementation of the master plans became increasingly problematic (Tosics, 2003) and the criticism on rational comprehensive planning increased. Since planning was seen as a technically led process that concentrated on the area's design, there was a lack of attention for social, political and economic aspects in planning. Planning was seen as a value-neutral process that could be developed from a central position on basis of rational thoughts. Important points of criticism are the ignorance of the desires of society, the pluralistic social perspectives and values and the political and economic consequences of planning decisions. A second criticism on rational comprehensive planning was the inflexibility of the master plans. It took years to develop a master plan, while in the meantime the context changed. The master plans were not flexible enough to take the new constructions and other developments into account, which implied that the new developed master plan already was outdated before it even was implemented (De Graaf, forthcoming).

2.1.2 Planning with a process focus

Gradually the criticism on rational comprehensive planning increased. As reaction on these points of criticism the attention for the planning process grew. A different line of reasoning in the urban planning literature was developed that concentrates on the planning process (e.g. Innes, 1996; Fainstein, 2000). Examples of theories concentrating on the urban planning process are communicative planning and interactive planning. These planning approaches stress the attention for the various stakeholders that are involved in the planning process. Both approaches focus on the goals, aims and interests of the stakeholders and the relations between these stakeholders. Communication and participation are the key elements in theories concentrating on the planning process.

Communicative planning, or also called collaborative planning (Healey, 1997), emphasizes the planner's role in mediating among stakeholders within the planning situation (Fainstein, 2000). The collaborative approach focuses on the interaction at the level of developing strategies and frameworks, and not merely at the level of projects (Healey, 1997). Planners are no longer 'designers', but have a role as communicator, networker and negotiator. The objective is to bring all stakeholders together in the planning process and give each of them an equal opportunity to present their own ideas and arguments. This debate is supposed to led to mutual understanding and empathy for each other's situation and interests and finally to a collective meaning and consensus over the chosen solution. The main question that communicative planning addresses is how plans can be developed based on all the different interests of stakeholders (De Graaf, forthcoming).

Interactive planning (Salet and Faludi, 2000) also supposes communication as one of the key aspects in planning, but includes aspects of negotiation and bargaining between the different stakeholders. The three essential aspects of interactive planning are the involvement of a broad range of stakeholders, the involvement of the stakeholders in an early stage in the planning process and a sufficient degree of openness in the process (De Graaf, forthcoming). The objective of interactive planning is to reach consensus on a suitable solution between all stakeholders. Due to the negotiation process this consensus may have the form of a 'package deal'.

The theories concentrating on the planning process are criticized for considering cooperation between the stakeholders as a target in itself. Cooperation is seen as essential condition to find a solution. The objective of the theories concentrating on the planning process is reaching consensus between the stakeholders. The further completion of the planning, the content of the planning and the implementation in the area is, more or less, taken for granted. As a result these theories lack attention for the final result and its implementation: the future area development.

2.2 Shift from government towards governance

Traditionally, a strong hierarchical approach was assumed in spatial planning, in which the central government was responsible for long-term and strategic decisions (Kreukels, 1999). Nowadays, self-organising, complex, and dynamic inter-organizational networks are characteristics of the social political world (Stoker, 1997; Laws et al., 2001). Today it is argued that spatial developments are shaped through the interaction of many different stakeholders. Furthermore, there is a growing recognition of interdependence between stakeholders as a basic governing principle in a continuous process of negotiating (De Bruijn and Ten Heuvelhof, 1999; Stoker, 1997). Public stakeholders are increasingly dependent on private actors due to financial reasons, private land ownership and lack of technical, financial and market knowledge. On the other hand private stakeholders are dependent on public stakeholders because of their authority and their knowledge of production schemes and procurement. In the context of spatial planning interdependence means a stakeholder does not have all the resources needed to develop an area, and therefore depends on other stakeholders who do have those resources. The stakeholder is not able to achieve his goals without interaction with other stakeholders. The current idea is that a form of planning that involves the various stakeholders in following strategic ideas through into action, may be more effective in linking policy to implementation than the technical plans produced in the past (Healey et al., 1997).

The shift from government to governance emphasizes social interaction in which the collaboration with a range of stakeholders is the central concern. The concept of governance is related to the ideas of interactive planning. The shift implies a development of governing styles that entails a broad network of public, semi-public and private stakeholders (Stoker, 1998). Governance seeks to enhance collective goals and is primarily concerned with the coordination and fusion of public and private resources (Pierre, 1999). Besides focusing on the governance of public and private stakeholders, governance also comprehends the relations between these stakeholders and the functioning of networks and coordination mechanisms (Bult-Spiering and Dewulf, forthcoming).

2.3 Shift from sector specific urban planning towards integrated spatial planning

Besides, a trend from sector planning towards integrated planning could be signalized in the planning practice. For centuries the various spatial functions have been divided over several planning sectors, each focusing on their own specific part of planning. Urban planning, rural planning and water management have remained largely separated sectors, at least in The Netherlands. Traditionally, urban planning aimed at the coordination of real estate functions. In a later stadium also the infrastructure functions were included in this coordination. Until recently, water and environmental functions were barely considered. The problem with this kind of sector divisions is that interrelationships between the various spatial functions may not be addressed (Carter et al., 2005). Due to the fragmentation in the planning sectors, the interactions between the various spatial functions and the consequences of these interdependencies are hardly taken into account in spatial planning projects. For instance, spatial planning in the low-lying Netherlands has for centuries been a matter of separating land and water. Maintaining this separation was seen as the main target. Nowadays water management is no longer seen unrelated to urban planning and nature conservation policies (Stokkum et al., 2005). It is recognized that decisions about the land use influence hydrological systems, and the other way around, and that these influences have to be taken into account. A simple example of such interaction is the decrease of water infiltration due to urban developments and thus the increase of the water runoff and consequently an increase of the flood change.

The current trend of coordinating and integrating multiple land uses is directed to make efficient use of the coherence and interrelationships between the various spatial functions and to increase the spatial quality. Coherence is related to the spatial and functional integration of spatial functions in urban projects, but also to the interaction of an urban project as a whole with the spatial functions and facilities of its surrounding (Bult-Spiering et al., 2005). Spatial quality is often defined as diversity. A mixture of spatial functions is seen as important determinant of this diversity (SCP, 1999; Bult-Spiering et al., 2005). High quality is created when this mixture of spatial functions has a strong coherence. Therefore, it is important to

coordinate the multitude of spatial functions and land uses in a project area carefully. This confirms the trend to a more comprehensive alignment of spatial functions and land uses.

In the following section an overview of bottlenecks in the spatial planning practice is given. As indicated by the trends these bottlenecks are in the field of the alignment and coordination of the spatial functions and in the field of the collaboration between the increased number of stakeholders.

3 Bottlenecks in spatial planning

3.1 Bottlenecks in the alignment and coordination of multiple spatial functions

As described earlier, space is scarce and most spatial functions are competitive for space, but are also interrelated. To make optimal use of the available space and to be able to find coherence between the various types of land use, the alignment and coordination of the multitude of spatial functions is needed. Since high quality could be created when the mixture of spatial functions has a strong coherence, it is important to coordinate the multitude of spatial functions carefully. However, coordinating the various spatial functions and creating coherence between them is a complicated task. Each spatial function has its own specific characteristics that must be taken into account. These characteristics differ for each spatial object or construction, for example the dimension and the shape of the spatial object, the type of construction material used, the required level of accessibility of the construction, the possibility to construct the object (partly) underground, the permeability of the object, whether the land use needs to be concentrated or has a line function, etc.

Besides this variety of characteristics, a further complicating factor is the unit or term in which to express the goals of the coordination of the spatial functions. Usually, most goals are expressed in terms of the costs of the spatial object. However, for an optimized alignment the costs have to be considered against the (added) value(s) of the concerning object, the lifespan, the sustainability, etc.

The many interrelations and interdependencies between the spatial functions further increase the complexity of the coordination. A small adaptation in the planning of one specific object, most likely will influence various other planning objects. For example a small change in the planning of the position of an office, can imply necessary adaptations in the planning of the location of the connecting road, the location of the car park, the location of the green area, etc. Due to the fragmentation of spatial planning in various sectors it is hard to take the consequences of all these adaptations into account.

The fragmentation in spatial planning also causes various other bottlenecks in the coordination of the spatial functions, such as non-harmonised policies, differences in culture of the various planning sectors and differences in formal procedures. Most spatial functions and land uses have their own specific policies. These policies are often non-harmonised or only harmonized in their main aspects and therefore regularly cause conflicts in the planning process. Also the formal procedures are different for each sector. Since integral area development projects overlap several planning sectors, a range of formal procedures have to be followed, each focussing on a specific topic. This number of mainly non-harmonised formal procedures causes an unnecessary amount of work, time delays, conflicting situations and confusion in the spatial planning practice.

Besides the fragmentation in the planning sectors, also the diversity in geographical and institutional boundaries and the diversity in time horizons are important bottlenecks in the alignment of spatial functions. Each spatial function has its own geographical boundaries (local, regional, etc.), its own institutional boundaries (level of municipality, province, etc) and its own time horizon where it focuses on (long term versus short term). These many varieties cause differences in focus (geographical, time, etc.), in involvement and commitment of stakeholders and other conflicts. Altogether these differences create many bottlenecks in the planning of a spatial area and make it complex to coordinate the various spatial functions.

3.2 Bottlenecks in the collaboration of multiple stakeholders

The coordination and integration of multiple spatial functions implies collaboration of many stakeholders that represent these functions. Examples of stakeholders are provinces, municipalities, real estate developers, water managers, environmental organization, etc. Besides bottlenecks in the physical coordination in integral area development, practice also shows bottlenecks in the collaboration between the stakeholders.

In each spatial project, the discussion raises which stakeholders to involve, and which to exclude. Freeman (1984) defines stakeholders as “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives”, or in this case the project’s objectives. Freeman is widely cited, but his definition is still very broad. A theory of stakeholder identification is needed that can reliably separate stakeholders from non stakeholders (Mitchell et al., 1997). In their paper Mitchell et al. (1997) classified stakeholders based upon three attributes, namely power, legitimacy and urgency. This typology divides stakeholders in eight classes on basis of which can be decided which (classes of) stakeholders to include in the planning process. However, this is a static typology, while integral area development projects have a dynamic character. As Mitchell et al. (1997) already mention in their paper, the importance of stakeholders is relative, can change over time and is based on the specific issue addressed.

Furthermore, stakeholders in the sense of institutions and organizations are often non-transparent, in which various involved departments of the same organization can have their own specific purposes or goals. For example, municipalities often fulfill various roles in spatial planning. For each of these roles a different person or part of the organization is responsible. Therefore it is important to clearly define the precise stakeholders to involve in the project.

In integral area development projects public and private stakeholders can be distinguished. Since the focus is on formal arrangements and partnerships, citizens are not considered in this context. The various involved stakeholders each have their own specific goals, interests and reasons to be involved in the integral area development project. Public stakeholders mainly have social targets and responsibilities, while private stakeholders mainly have commercial targets. Cooperation is needed to coordinate all the various interests, aims and goals of the stakeholders. However, as a rule integral area development projects comprehend conflicting aims and interest of several stakeholders. Besides, usually it is nearly impossible to express the added value of each aim or interest in clear and unambiguous units, for example in financial value, social terms or environmental value. Both the conflicting aims and interests and the difficulty to express the added value in unambiguous units creates bottlenecks in the coordination process.

Since each stakeholder acts and reacts from his own specific background, goals and interests, the various stakeholders have different views on the nature of problems and the desirability of solutions, or the role that different stakeholders play. This causes difference in the performance criteria and values used by the stakeholders to judge possible solutions. Even with the same knowledge and information the various stakeholders will have different interpretations and thus different conclusions. These differences in goals, interests, backgrounds, performance criteria and roles of stakeholders make it hard to reach consensus and increase miscommunication and a lack of understanding.

Equal to the interdependence of spatial functions, many interdependencies exist between the involved stakeholders. As described, public stakeholders are increasingly dependent on private actors due to financial reasons, private land ownership and lack of technical, financial and market knowledge. On the other hand private stakeholders are dependent on public stakeholders because of their authority and their knowledge of production schemes and procurement. Interdependency is based on the distribution of resources over various stakeholders, the goals they pursue and their perceptions of their resource dependencies (Kickert et al., 1999). The interdependency of stakeholders in the field of spatial investments can be characterized by six crucial resources: authority, finances, data and information, land ownership, legitimacy and political support and commitment (De Bruijn and Ten Heuvelhof, 1999; Teisman, 1998). These interdependencies cause power relations between the

stakeholders, which have large impact on the project outcome and on the course of the spatial project.

The interdependencies of the stakeholders are not confined to a single planning series or cycle, but are part of a large number of societal processes in which the stakeholders more or less frequently participate (Bressers and Kuks, 2003). These networks and their environment are subject to strong dynamics. The power and the position of stakeholders can change during the project. Stakeholders can enter and leave the network in which they are operating. Moreover, developments in the context or environment of the project can change the interdependencies between the stakeholders, even as the commitment of stakeholders can change over time (De Bruijn and Ten Heuvelhof, 1999).These dynamics in the network can have large influence on the course of the spatial project.

Two other dynamics with large impact on the course of the spatial project are the redefinition of signalized problems and the political and strategic behavior of stakeholders. The content of a problem could change during the time. Stakeholders often redefine their problems after a while. One of the most important reasons to redefine problems is the lack of enough support in the participation network. A new formulation of the signalized problem can provide options to form coalitions with other stakeholders (De Bruijn and Ten Heuvelhof, 1999) and thus strengthen the stakeholder's position. Another possible reason is that new obtained information has provided new insights.

Furthermore, reformulation of the problem takes place after the broadening of a single spatial function project into an integral area development project. In most integral area development projects the initiative for the project is taken with the intention to solve a specific problem within one single spatial function, for example traffic jam. For reasons of interdependency, financial reasons, raise of attractiveness of the project etc., the original initiative later is broadened with problems within other land uses or spatial functions. This extension causes a need for reformulation of the signalized problem(s) and thus a focus shifts in the project.

The political interests and strategic behavior of stakeholders also has large impact on the course of the project. Even if a "perfect" solution for the spatial problem is developed with added value for all involved stakeholders (at that moment), still the implementation of the defined solution can be blocked due to for example a lack of trust between the stakeholders, political games, lack of political support, problems with non stakeholders etc. On the contrary, it is just as possible that "far from perfect" project solutions relatively easy can be implemented due to strategic behavior and/ or political support.

As described, practice shows the coordination of the spatial functions and the interests of stakeholders are inadequate. Bottlenecks are signalized both in project management and in process management. In the following section a perspective is described that, in line with the trends, integrates the focus on project and on process management in order to be able to make efficient use of the scarce space and develop sustainable areas with coherence between the different spatial functions, but also includes the planning process to assure the feasibility of the final implementation of the planning project.

4 Strategic planning

The described bottlenecks in integral area development projects indicate that further improvement of the current insights in planning is needed. Although many mutual dependencies exist between the spatial functions, between the involved stakeholders and between the functions and stakeholders, these interdependencies are hardly taken into account in the planning literature. The current research focuses either on the way integrated products could be planned and developed or on the process of interaction and participation; not on a combination of a focus on both product and process. After leaving behind the more hierarchical structure of spatial planning, also the new structures of collaboration and the social interaction processes between the stakeholders need to be investigated. Besides, it is generally agreed that each integral area development project has its own specific characteristics, situation and context in which it has to operate, but this unique situation of each spatial project is hardly taken into account. Also the power relations between

stakeholders are hardly considered in the planning literature, while the described bottlenecks indicate large impact of these power relations on the final solution and on the course of the spatial project.

The Dutch planning practice, as in many other western countries, could be characterized as a prescriptive approach: it operates according to procedures. Barely any attention is paid to a strategic approach of the spatial project, in compliance with its unique context and situational characteristics. Each spatial project follows a certain procedure, instead of determining the "best approach" to deal with the concerning spatial project. Based on the described bottlenecks in the spatial planning practice, and especially the interdependencies between the spatial functions and the stakeholders, it seems important to develop a perspective that combines aspects of project and process management and considers the context of the spatial project. Statements found in literature underlining the idea to interweave aspects of project management and process management are:

- Healey et al. (1997) think: "it is desirable for actors in urban regions to attend carefully to the interrelationships between economic, social and environmental pressures as these affect the qualities of particular places. We also think that a strategic view of these relations as they may evolve over time is helpful to many stakeholders in present conditions. In our judgement, consideration of process and product needs to be closely interrelated in spatial planning."

- Mintzberg et al. (1998) and Albrechts (2004) state: "Strategy making should be concerned with process *and* product, statics *and* dynamics, the planned *and* the learned *and* the economic and the political. A combined or interwoven perspective on both the multiple spatial functions *and* on the stakeholders seems to be essential to solve the current spatial planning problems."

Strategic planning is seen as a perspective that is able to integrate project and process management in the spatial planning. This theory is derived from the private sector, but is originally developed in the military. In the United States strategic planning in the public sector gained attention in the eighties. Only recently it also started to gain attention in Europe. Several authors recognize that strategic planning provides methods and concepts that are more market oriented, more pragmatic, more realistic and that are able to cope with a turbulent and complex environment and its rapid developments (De Graaf, forthcoming).

Strategic planning is a planning concept based on the learning process needed to develop mutual understanding between the stakeholders. The strategic planning approach is based on the philosophy that interaction programmes need to be based on an analysis of the environment or context. The objective of strategic planning is searching for an 'ideal fit' between the organization (with its strengths and weaknesses) and the environment (with its strengths and opportunities) of the concerning problem (De Graaf, forthcoming). The goal is not only to find the optimal solution in terms of issue solving, but also to create commitment among the stakeholders. In doing so, strategic planning considers both the planning product and the planning process and attempts to strategically coordinate integral area development projects in compliance with its unique situation.

No univocal or universally accepted definition of strategic planning exists. Most authors define strategic planning through its characteristics. Based on an analysis of ten cases of strategic planning practice, Healey et al. (1997) describe strategic planning as "an interactive social process through which local communities respond to internal and external challenges with respect to the management of local environments. Local communities build new strategic ideas and policy discourses (intellectual capital), build institutional relations (social capital), and mobilize political support (political capital). Through these processes, active stakeholders in urban regions combine in an attempt to exercise power over the forces and pressures in which they are embedded, in an attempt to confront and shift structural power arising from economic and political forces."

Strategic planning typically relies more on the identification and resolution of issues than on the specification of goals and objectives. Therefore strategic planning is more suitable for

interaction processes between many actors with competitive interests since identifying and resolving issues does not presume an all-encompassed consensus on organizational purposes and actions (Bryson and Einsweiler, 1988). Strategic planning considers goal definition and implementation together at the same time. Goals are not seen as a point of departure, but are developed during the process that is characterized by multiple stakeholders, each having their own goals and interests (Ackoff, 1970; Ansoff et al., 1976). Some of the aspects which distinguish strategic planning from more traditional planning are its emphasis on action, the consideration of a broad and diverse set of stakeholders, and the attention to external opportunities and threats and internal strength and weaknesses (Bryson and Einsweiler, 1988).

The strategic planning concept involves general policy and direction setting, situation assessments, strategic issue identification, strategy development, decision making, action and evaluation (Bryson and Einsweiler, 1988). Furthermore it emphasizes the role of stakeholders, their interests and their actions. The novelty of strategic planning is not only in the content (how to deal with economic, environmental and social aspects in a comprehensive and long-term manner), but also in the method (how the whole process is prepared and discussed with the different stakeholders in the area) (Tosics, 2003). Strategic spatial planning is used for complex problems where authorities at different levels and different sectors and private actors are mutually dependent (Albrechts, 2001). A basic question remains as to what kind of strategic issues could attract interest, sympathy and support of citizens, interest groups, communities and governments without being too antagonistic right from the planning formulation (Albrechts, 2001).

As described strategic planning concentrates both on the product and on the process of spatial planning. However, the concept of strategic planning is, as far as we know, not applied to multi function planning. Most research still focuses on the management of one single spatial function or sector (Tosics, 2003). As indicated by the bottlenecks concerning the spatial functions and the trend towards an integrated spatial planning approach, the strategic alignment of the various spatial functions in an area is needed to be able to take the interdependencies and possible coherence of the spatial functions into account and thus to be able to create high quality. Since practice shows a diversity of problems in aligning the spatial functions and creating coherence between them and though increasing the spatial quality, the coordination of multiple spatial functions needs to be analyzed. The comprehensive part of rational comprehensive planning concentrates on the physical planning product and focuses on the integrated alignment of spatial functions. With a more integrated approach of planning the interdependencies of the spatial functions are taken into account to be able to create more coherence between the spatial functions.

Besides, the concept of strategic planning is, as far as we know, not applied to the power relations between the stakeholders. Strategic plans concern the coordination of spatial goals and interests and other measures taken by a multitude of stakeholders, but it does not take the relationships between these stakeholders into consideration. The set of decisions taken by the stakeholders forms the object of planning and is seen as a frame of reference for negotiations (Faludi, 2000). However, as indicated in the bottlenecks concerning the stakeholders and by the trend towards governance, the social interaction in relation to the power relations between the stakeholders is a frequently occurring bottleneck in the collaboration process. The stakeholders operate in networks and the relationships and interdependencies in these networks can have large influence on the outcome and course of integral area development projects. Due to goals which stakeholders pursue and the distribution of resources over the stakeholders, influential power relations exist between these stakeholders. The network approach pays attention to the relations between the stakeholders, the role and power of a stakeholder in a network and the context of their interaction and can be used to further develop strategic planning in the context of integral area development projects.

5 Conclusions and further research

Due to scarcity of space and the competitiveness, but also the interrelatedness of most spatial functions, strategic integral area development is needed to be able to develop

sustainable spatial areas. Integral area development aims at making efficient use of the coherence between the various functions. Bottlenecks in practice show the current planning approach is inadequate. These bottlenecks comprehend both the alignment of the multitude of spatial functions and the collaboration of the multitude of stakeholders and their interests.

The described bottlenecks and the three trends signalized in urban planning indicate a need for a more integrated approach of spatial planning, comprehending both the physical coordination of the land uses and the interaction process of the stakeholders. The current researches in urban planning focus either on the way integrated products could be planned and developed (project management) or on the process of interaction and participation (process management). This paper claims a perspective is needed that combines project and process management. Both multiple functions (product) *and* multiple stakeholders (process) have to be strategically coordinated for successful integral area developments.

Strategic planning is seen as a perspective that is able to integrate project and process management in the spatial planning. The objective of strategic planning is searching for an 'ideal fit' between the organization and the context of the concerning problem. The goal is not only to find the optimal solution in terms of issue solving, but also to create commitment among the stakeholders. With this combined attention for both the spatial functions and the stakeholders and their interests, strategic planning is able to take the unique situation of each integral area development project into consideration.

According to the described bottlenecks in spatial planning and in line with the trends, the power relations between stakeholders and the coordination of a multitude of spatial functions instead of the focus on one single function needs to be considered in integral area development projects. However, strategic planning does not go into these bottlenecks. Therefore, it is suggested to include aspects of the network approach and of comprehensive planning in the outlined draft of a strategic planning perspective for successful integral area development projects.

Further research and empirical evidence on a combined perspective on multiple spatial functions and on the coordination of the interests of stakeholders is needed. Currently little is known about the way stakeholders are interacting and the way they deal with interdependencies in integral area development projects. Despite the growth in attention, little is known how to deal with the combination of multi function and multi stakeholder governance or, in other words, how to design the process of integral area development projects. Therefore the perspective of strategic planning in the context of integral area development has to be further investigated. The first question that rises is: how to investigate strategic process designs for integral area development projects?

Important questions in this context that have to be answered are: Which spatial functions have to be coordinated in integral area development projects? What are the interdependencies between these spatial functions? What are the performance criteria used for the alignment of these spatial functions? And how is dealt with these interdependencies and performance criteria of the spatial functions in the current situation of aligning spatial functions? Comparable questions can be asked for the stakeholders. Which stakeholders have to be involved in integral area development projects? What are the interdependencies between these stakeholders? What are the performance criteria of these stakeholders? And how is dealt with these interdependencies and performance criteria of the stakeholders in the current situation of coordination the goals and interest criteria of the stakeholders?

References

- Ackoff, R (1970), *A Concept of Corporate Planning* (John Wiley & Sons, New York).
- Albrechts, L (2001), "In Pursuit of New Approaches to Strategic Spatial Planning. A European Perspective" *International Planning Studies* 6(3), pages 293- 310.
- Ansoff, H I, R P Declerck and R L Hayes (1976), *From Strategic Planning to Strategic Management* (London ua).

- Bressers, H T A and S M M Kuks (2003), “What does "governance" mean? From conception to elaboration” in H T A Bressers and W A Rosenbaum (editors) *Achieving sustainable development* (Praeger, Westport).
- Bruijn, J A de and E F ten Heuvelhof (1999), *Management in netwerken* (Lemma, Utrecht).
- Bryson, J M and R C Einsweiler (editors) (1988), *Strategic planning; Threats and opportunities for planners*, American Planning Association (Planners Press, Chicago, Illinois, Washington).
- Bult-Spiering, M, A Blanken, and G Dewulf (2005), *Handboek Publiek-Private Samenwerking* (Lemma BV, Utrecht).
- Bult-Spiering, M and G Dewulf (forthcoming 2006), *Strategic issues in Public- Private Partnerships* (Blackwell Science, Oxford).
- Carter, N, R D Kreutzwiser, R C de Loë (2005), “Closing the circle: linking land use planning and water management at the local level”, *Land Use Policy* 22, pages 115-127.
- CPB – Centraal Planbureau (2001), *PPS: een uitdagend huwelijk: Publiek-Private Samenwerking bij combinatieprojecten* (The Hague).
- Edelenbos, J and G R Teisman (2005), *Co-production on the edge of process and project management*, 45th Congress of the European Regional Science Association, Land use and water management in a sustainable network society, 23-27 August 2005, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Fainstein, S S (2000), "New Directions in Planning Theory", *Urban Affairs Review* 35, pages 451-478.
- Faludi A (2000),”The Performance of Spatial Planning”, *Planning Practice & Research* 15(4), pages 299–318.
- Freeman, R E (1984), *Strategic Management, A stakeholder approach* (Pitman, Boston).
- Graaf, R S de (forthcoming 2005), *Strategic Urban Planning; Developing industrial areas in The Netherlands, to direct or to interact?* Ph.D. thesis, University of Twente, Enschede.
- Healy P (1997) “An institutionalist approach to spatial planning”, in P Healey, A Khakee, A Motte and B Needham (editors), *Making strategic spatial plans: innovation in Europe* (UCL Press, London).
- Healy P, A Khakee, A Motte and B Needham (1997) “Strategic plan-making and building institutional capacity”, in P Healey, A Khakee, A Motte and B Needham (editors), *Making strategic spatial plans: innovation in Europe* (UCL Press, London).
- Innes, J (1996), “Planning through consensus building: A new view on the comprehensive ideal”, *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62, pages 460-472
- Kickert, W J M, E H Klijn, J F M Koppenjan (editors) (1999), *Managing complex networks; strategies for the public sector* (Sage, London).
- Kreukels, A (1999), *Marktwerking in het ruimtelijk beleid*, Essay for the workshop Marktwerking in het ruimtelijk beleid, Themagroep Sturing, Afdeling Milieu en Ruimtelijke Ordening, 29 januari 1999.
- Laws, D, L Susskind, J Abrams, J Anderson, G Chapman, E Rubenstein and J Vadgama (2001) *Public entrepreneurship networks*, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.
- Mitchell, R K, B R Agle, D J Wood (1997), "Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts" *Academy of Management Review* 22(4), pages 853-886.
- Mintzberg, H, B Ahlstrand and J Lampel (1998), *Strategy safari, A guided tour through the wilds of strategic management* (The Free Press, New York).
- Motte A (1997) “The institutionalist relations of plan-making”, in P Healey, A Khakee, A Motte and B Needham (editors), *Making strategic spatial plans: innovation in Europe* (UCL Press, London).
- Pierre, J (1999). "Models of urban governance: The institutional dimension of urban politics" *Urban affairs review* 34(3), pages 372-396.
- Salet, W and A Faludi (editors) (2000), *The revival of strategic planning* (Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Amsterdam).
- SCP- Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau (1999), *De stad op straat*. Sociale en Culturele Studies 27.
- Spiering M and G Dewulf (2001), *Publiek-Private Samenwerking bij infrastructurele en stedelijke projecten*, Rapportage resultaten enquête (P3BI, Enschede).

- Stoker, G (1997) “Public-private partnerships and urban governance”, in J Pierre (editor), *Partnerships in urban governance: European and American experiences* (MacMillan Press Ltd, London) pages 34-51.
- Stoker, G (1998), “Governance as theory, Five propositions”*, International Social Science Journal* 50(1), pages 17-28.
- Stokkum, H T C, A J M Smits and R S E W Leuven (2005), “Flood defence in The Netherlands; a new era, a new approach”, International water resources association, *Water International* 30(1), pages 76-87.
- Teisman, G R (1998), *Complexe besluitvorming, Een pluricentrisch perspectief op besluitvorming over ruimtelijke investeringen* (Elsevier, ’s-Gravenhage).
- Tosics, I (2003), *A new tool for consultants to influence policy-making? Strategic planning in European cities*, Eura – Eurocities – MRI Conference, European urban development, research and policy, The future of European cohesion policy, Budapest, 28-30 August 2003.