

Spatial Planning is Beyond Traditional Land-Use Planning? A Critical Review

Anil Kumar Palakodeti (Ph.D)

Erasmus University Rotterdam, Burgemeester Oudlaan 50, 3062 PA Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract: *Traditional land-use planning, or town planning encountered a paradigm shift in terminology over many years, currently known as Spatial Planning (Taylor, 2010). There is no single definition to Spatial Planning, but can broadly identify certain principles in common, which are unique from traditional land-use planning (ODPM, 2004c; Taylor, 2010), which was later disproved. This paper initially describes the ideas of spatial planning and then focuses on Taylor's evaluation made for spatial planning and claims "this talk of going beyond the narrow focus of traditional land use planning is pejorative rhetoric... when it comes to actual spatial plans, it would appear spatial plans are, after all, still land use plans" (Taylor, 2010, pp.203- 205). However, the paper further focuses on critically reviewing the basis for arguments that spatial planning is a new practice that goes beyond traditional land use planning.*

1. Introduction

Spatial Planning, in principle, is having visionary in terms of development, wide-range of objectives addressing social, economic, environmental issues, delivering sustainable developments, participative approach in terms of strengthening community participation and stakeholders at different levels, integration of different policies and strategies, flexible approach in terms of changes and implementation of plans and deliverability (ODPM, 2004c; Taylor, 2010). But all these principles are nothing new in spatial planning, rather were into traditional land-use planning. Further, all these spatial planning strategies and policies are just land-use planning (Taylor, 2010).

1.1 Spatial Planning is Traditional Land-use Planning

The notion of traditional land-use planning, if considered, can show that spatial planning is not different from land-use planning. The conception of traditional land-use planning is related to physical elements of the city i.e. to do with buildings, land and its type of usage i.e. the physical design of urban spaces; in the wider context, it is the physical urban design of towns, cities or regions (Taylor, 2010). The urban planners of the post-second world war were mainly of architect-planners, who reflect upon plan-making by utopian architectural visions of towns and cities. The cities and towns that were planned were mainly guided by architectural visions rather than understanding the socio-economic conditions, political and cultural backgrounds of the cities (Jacobs, 1964). But, later in the 1960's there was a better understanding of functions of urban settlement systems with the introduction of systems theorists to urban planning which include social and economic elements into planning. Therefore, according to Taylor (2010) along with social and economic aspects, environmental concerns and hence the sustainable development principles were also nothing new to spatial planning, but the principles of sustainable development were not into land-use planning until the 1980s.

According to Taylor (2010), traditional land-use planning was not a narrow-focused planning and spatial planning is not new to its wide-ranging nature. The physical design views of traditional land-use planning had an only limited

scope of planning, but later many matured views of land-use planning included the proper understanding and planning of all potential land-use activities both in urban and rural areas and the surrounding regions. Later, in 1963 the then British Government enhanced the views of traditional land-use planning with the introduction of transportation into land-use planning (Buchanan, 1964); this was also known as land-use transportation planning. Further, the Structure plans of British planning practice were viewed as wide-ranging documents which also included social and economic aspects of the settlements. These structure plans were also flexible enough to the changes, similar to that of spatial planning strategies or principles (Taylor, 2010).

According to Taylor (2010), spatial plans are still land use plans. Supporting this statement, government and legislative policies which come out with spatial plans will only be for land use and land developments. Thus, we can see that all the spatial plans that are framed were only to do with its geographical land area. All the regional planning strategies that are described in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act are also related to the development and use of land within the region. Similar is the case with local development plans. They primarily focus on the development and usage of the land within the region.

All the principles of spatial planning which seek the development have clear, distinctive, and realistic visions. And these visions are only being achieved with the active participation of community and stakeholders at different levels within an area. Thus, spatial planning includes strengthening mechanisms for community involvement. And these spatial plans also focus on delivery mechanisms that strive to identify schemes or strategies for implementation of prepared plans with proper resource allocations and usage of powers. According to Taylor (2010), these qualities of visionary, participation, and deliverable of spatial plans are not new, rather very much the qualities of traditional land-use planning. All the traditional land-use plans were guided by visionary statements of Ebenezer Howards's garden city; Le Corbusier's radiant city and Frank Lloyd Wright's Broadacre city focusing on the future (Jacobs, 1964). In the case of public participation, traditional land-use planning was one of the areas where there was a high level of public participation in British government policy and plan-making

Volume 9 Issue 8, August 2020

www.ijsr.net

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

for the first time (DOE et al., 1969). So, this shows that participative planning is not new to spatial planning. And, the implementation of the plans always remained as the problematic issue even with the traditional land-use plans (Barrett & Fudge, 1981). Thus, Taylor (2010) claims that the effective implementation or deliverability of urban plans was not new to spatial planning.

The most distinctive feature of spatial planning is to plan and integrate policies across different sectors of government and properly coordinate spatially, so as to have an overall development of the society in the different sectors rather than focusing on only one sector for development. This kind of cross-sector planning is also neither new in spatial planning. According to Taylor (2010), rational comprehensive planning and corporate planning in the 1960s and 1970s respectively were primarily designed and framed that include different sectoral boundaries. The local government departments which were responsible for the land-use planning included authorities of housing, social services, parks, and recreation, etc. Thus, we can see that the idea of cross-sector planning is a part of traditional land-use planning.

According to Taylor (2010), the idea of spatial integration of different cross sectors can also be seen in traditional land-use planning. This is mostly because of the land-use planners who were responsible for the planning making in local authorities who think of policy and planning that require wider corporate planning i.e. high level of integrative cross-sector planning. However, this kind of integrative cross-sector planning requires a high level of power at each and every sectoral department for a successful implementation. Even in this regard, the spatial planning is not new to that of traditional land-use planning. The spatial planning doesn't show any evidence of having complete powers in implementing the spatial planning strategies through cross-sectoral elements (Nadin, 2007). Further, the conceptions of spatial planning do require powers at different departments or proper coordination between different sectors, which in reality doesn't take place; thus, this ending up achieving nothing. So, is the case with traditional land-use planning which has a wider range of planning remained only on paper and they were hardly successful in implementation processes due to less political power (Reade, 1987). But the following section shows that the conception of spatial planning is not just the traditional land-use planning – it is much newer and more diverse.

1.2 A critical analysis of difference: Spatial planning is new and beyond traditional land-use planning

1.2.1 Institutional arrangement

The British Planning system's Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 was responsible for the development of a new hierarchy of statutory spatial planning at national, regional, and local levels. The National spatial planning (top in the hierarchy of planning levels) is to develop and administer the statutory spatial planning frameworks and planning policies. At the second level, the Regional Spatial Planning is to develop Regional Spatial strategies in relation to the development and usage of land. These Regional Spatial Strategies were further merged with Regional

Economic Strategies by Regional Development Authorities, which turned out to be the very new element of spatial planning. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act is also responsible for planning at local levels preparing development plans known as local development frameworks (Taylor, 2010). However, the institutional set-up at National and Local level were not new to spatial planning, but the prime institutional innovation was with the introduction of planning at the regional level in the form of regional planning bodies who prepares strategic development plan.

1.2.2 Spatial Planning at Non-statutory scales (Sub-Regional Planning)

The spatial planning is not strictly restricted to development and usage of land or statutory basis of planning is at national, regional, and local scales. But the new spatial planning rather also focuses on non-statutory scales. There are otherwise known as soft spaces and fuzzy boundaries of planning. This goes beyond the traditional land-use planning. The increasing complexity of planning at different scales and growing emphasis on partnership and networked governance led to the emergence of planning at distinctly new spaces which primarily focus on sub-regional, city-region, or local delivery scales. The planning policies at non-statutory scale encourage creative thinking and at the same time generate opportunities to non-planning actors to engage in planning processes, thus influencing the planning policies at statutory scales (Haughton et al., 2010).

1.2.3 Spatial Development Frameworks – Spatial Planning Instruments

Spatial Planning Frameworks play a vital role in attaining the objectives of sustainable development without missing the elements of socio-economic, environment, and culture of the areas (Tewdwr-Jones, 2004). The innovation to traditional land-use planning was with the introduction of Spatial Planning Instruments such as Regional Spatial Strategies at Regional Level and Local Development Frameworks at Local level. These are the spatial plans with varying specificity replacing the former local plans (Taylor, 2010). For instance, the spatial planning instruments that were developed for Northern Ireland's regional spatial strategy (Harris et al., 2004). The primary objective of the development of these new plans was to develop more flexibility in development plans both at local and strategic levels. They also focus on resource allocation and generating finance for development in a regularized manner. These planning frameworks are easily understood by all the participants of policymaking and directly address the needs and desires of the communities (Tewdwr-Jones, 2004).

1.2.4 Devolution and Re-scaling of Planning

The innovation was the devolution of powers to different stakeholders at different levels improved the efficiency and effective implementation of spatial planning. This, thus, resulted in the strong participation of government officers in the territories. Devolution of powers had very strong on the preparation of national plans with the active participation of planners in devolved administrations or powers. There was also the active participation of transnational policy communities along with planning stakeholders at national levels within Ireland and Wales (Haughton et al., 2010). In addition to the fragmentation of powers into different levels

of government bodies, the national state still remained as the supreme power in the UK and Ireland. In relation to planning in these government bodies, the new trends developed in-terms of rescaling of powers among the territorial bodies at sub-national levels. There was the strategic and selective transfer of planning powers to newly devolve territorial bodies and lesser powers to other regions. On the other hand, the territorial bodies with lesser powers were further strengthened with planning instruments and tools or ad-hoc/ temporary institutional setup. The post-devolutionary process led to a growing emphasis on the development of new approaches of planning at sub-regional and metropolitan scales (Haughton et.al., 2010).

1.2.5 Coordination

The success of Spatial Planning is highly dependent upon the coordination of different sectors at different levels and various actors. The horizontal coordination of policies between different sectors such as housing, recreation, infrastructure, transportation, and economic activities is nothing new to spatial planning. The vertical coordination includes the participation of agencies at national, regional, and local levels. The new element of spatial planning is coordination at the international level (Haughton et.al., 2010). The other dimension of coordination with the relation between policy frameworks and policy implementation developed active participation and coordination of public authorities and private agencies (Priemus, 1999). The decreasing level of public investments in implementing the prepared policy led to significant importance to public-private partnerships to raise capital resources with active involvement. The collaboration between public and private is not new to many European countries, but the style of operating in a pro-active and entrepreneurial approach is very new (Batley & Stoker, 1991). Further, to achieve more negotiation and communication between the public and private sectors, many policies were developed. Neo-liberal policy increased the role of private sectors into public policy-making and widespread roles and responsibilities to new agencies. This thus increases new managerialism with the increasing superiority of the private sector's approach to planning and management (Healey et al., 1999; Shaw et.al., 2007).

1.2.6 Sectoral Spatial Polices

Sectoral policies are nothing new to spatial planning; they are very much part of traditional land-use planning. Different sector policies coordinate with each other to increase the flexibility of the implementation process. Only a few sector policies are spatially coordinated with spatial plans but certain spatial plans along with spatial policies are prepared by the sectors themselves and trying to intervene them into the spatial planning strategies for implementation. For instance, in the Netherlands, many alternatives to spatial development plans were developed to enhance the public decision-making processes. Nowadays, the sectoral departments are not restricting themselves to the development of sectoral policies rather produce the spatial impacts of their policies. Traditionally, departments of spatial planning were responsible for any decision-making whether which sector's policies are suitable to support through spatial coordination (Priemus, 1999). But the current scenario is that sectoral departments, by themselves,

make their sectoral spatial polices and trying to intervene them into the spatial plans. The devolution of powers in terms of governance led to fragmentation and development of separate new territorial administrations. This innovative approach of devolution of powers led to the development of new policy communities, producing their own spatial perspectives (Haughton et.al., 2010). For instance, the four sectoral spatial perspectives that are prepared by sectoral departments in the Netherlands (Taylor, 2010; Priemus, 1999).

1.2.7 Spatial Planning – not just land, oceans too

With the increasing concerns of climate change issues and focus on the usage of non-renewable resources a new arena of planning and management of sea and seacoasts increased. Marine Spatial Planning is an eco-based approach, primarily aims at ecosystem management which basically supports the well-being of livelihoods. It is a public procedure of analyzing and allocating the spatial and temporal distribution of human activities achieving ecological, economic, and social objectives (Ehler & Douvere, 2007). According to DEFRA (2007), Marine Spatial Planning is commonly defined as a strategic, forward-looking for regulating, managing, and protecting the marine environment, including through allocation of space that addresses the conflicting uses of the sea. The Marine Spatial Planning tries to create harmony between ecological, socio-economical, and governmental objectives, thus, spatially focused and integrated. For instance, the UK government's 'Safeguarding our Seas', a vision for the management and protection of our seas. This focuses on management, spatial analysis of different uses, and data requirements for decision-making. Initially, the management of marine resources was restricted to selective departments but increasing the need for the development of policies and frameworks in the management of marine resources in the regulatory process, led conception of spatial planning into the marine world (Smith et.al., 2005).

2. Conclusions

The central theme explored in this paper focuses on Taylor's viewpoints in evaluating the principles of spatial planning and claiming that these principles were not new to spatial planning. He rightly explained that traditional land-use planning is visionary, wide-ranging, participative, integrative, and flexible in their approach; proving that spatial planning is the same as traditional land-use planning. But there are many other dimensions that show that spatial planning is new. The innovation of planning at the regional level in developing regional planning strategies, Local Development bodies developing Local Development Frameworks - increase flexibility in implementation processes. Further, the wide-spread of spatial planning into sub-national and trans-national shows that it is not still traditional land-use planning. The spatial planning is not restricted to the statutory basis of planning, rather it was into non-statutory scales known as soft and fuzzy boundaries of planning. In addition to that, a high level of participation of the private sector and other agencies in the public plan-making process and different individual public and private sectors themselves preparing sectoral spatial plans are very new and show that it is not the same traditional land-use

planning. Further, conceptions of spatial planning moving beyond the land-use, with the increasing concerns of ecology and environment, the focus was on planning and management marine which proves that spatial planning is much beyond the traditional land-use planning.

On the other hand, many new trends of working, increasing co-ordination, mediation between different participants responsible for planning policy and development decisions are evolved to achieve the principles of spatial planning. The role of professional planners increased to manifolds - as a policymaker, facilitator of participation, mediator between interest groups, and as a managerial role to achieve sustainable development. The education of planning students comprised of aspects such as community development, management studies, and property investments, besides land-use and development studies. The focus also turned onto the critical thinking, communication, management, legal and political aspects. These professional planners on the other hand at the local level are promoting the planning and its importance; bring awareness among the public and making them actively participate in planning processes. Other professional practitioners and bodies related to built and natural environments are also actively engaging themselves in policy development along with professional planners at public authorities.

References

- [1] Barrett, S. and Fudge, C. (eds). (1981). *Policy and Action: Essays on the Implementation of Public Policy*. London: Methuen.
- [2] Batley, R and Stoker. G. (eds). (1991). *Local Government in Europe: Trends and Development*. London: Macmillan.
- [3] Buchanan, C.D. (1964). *Traffic in Towns: A Study of the Long-Term Problems of Traffic in Urban Areas*. Minister of Transport. London: HMSO.
- [4] Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). (2007). *A Sea Change: A Marine Bill White Paper*. March. Marine Legislation Division. DEFRA: London. P-176.
- [5] DOE (Department of the Environment). Scottish Development Department and the Welsh Office. (1969). *People and Planning: Report of the Committee on Public Participation in Planning*. London: HMSO.
- [6] Ehler, C. and Douvère, F. (2007). *Visions for a change: Report of first international workshop on Marine Spatial Planning*. Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission and Man and the Biosphere programme. IOC. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.unesco-ioc-marinesp.be/uploads/documentenbank/322a25f624fcb940dc70d0b3b510de24.pdf>. [Accessed on: 03 August 2011]. Paris: UNESCO.
- [7] Harris, N. and Hooper, A. (2004). Rediscovering the 'spatial' in Public Policy and Planning. *Planning Theory and Practice*. 5(2). pp. 147 – 169.
- [8] Houghton, G. Allmendinger, P. Counsell, D. and Vigar, G. (2010). *The New Spatial Planning. Territorial Management with Soft Spaces and Fuzzy Boundaries*. London: Routledge.
- [9] Healey, P. Khakee, A. Motte, A. and Needham, B. (1999). *European Developments in Strategic Spatial Planning*. *European Planning Studies*. 7(3). pp. 339-355.
- [10] Jacobs, J. 1964. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities: The Failure of Town Planning*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- [11] Nadin, V. (2007). The Emergence of the Spatial Planning Approach in England. *Planning Practice and Research*. 22(1). pp. 43-62.
- [12] ODPM (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister). (2004c). *Creating Local Development Frameworks: A Companion Guide to PPS 12*. Norwich: TSO/ HMSO.
- [13] Priemus, H. (1999). The Emergence of the Spatial Planning Approach in England. *Planning Practice and Research*. 22(1). pp. 43-62.
- [14] Reade, E. (1987). *British Town and Country Planning*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- [15] Shaw, D. and Lord, A. (2007). The Cultural turn? Culture change and What it means for Spatial Planning in England. *Planning Practice and Research*. 22. pp. 63-78.
- [16] Smith, D., H. and Potts, S., J. (2005). *Managing Britain's Marine and Coastal Environment. Towards a Sustainable Future*. New York: Routledge.
- [17] Taylor, N. (2010). What is this thing called spatial planning? An Analysis of the British Government's View. *Town Planning Review*. 81(2). Pp. 193-208.
- [18] Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2004). Spatial Planning: Principles, Practices and Cultures. *Journal of Planning and Environment Law*. May. pp. 560-569.