ECTP-CEU YOUNG PLANNERS WORKSHOP 2015

Introduction

There are twelve papers to be presented as part of the ECTP-CEU Young Planners Workshop 2015. The submitted papers provide a range of different topics and approaches to the matter of technology and planning. To this extent, each paper represents a distinct way to address the brief.

Themes & Structure

In order to ensure that the papers can be read collectively the workshop and subsequent publication is to be structured around three broad themes. These themes are intended to provide additional focus and clarity for discussions, written work and presentations. The three broad themes and specific questions associated with each are:

- **Technology for Design**: How can we apply technology to make places more sustainable?
- **Technology for People**: How can we use technology to engage more people in the planning process?
- **Technology for Planners**: How can we incorporate technology into policy-formulation?

On this basis paper we propose dividing the submissions accordingly:

- **Technology for Design**: Italian Group, Irish Group and Cathal Brennan.
- **Technology for People**: French Group, Egyptian Group, Turkish Group, Rafael Grosso Machpherson and Maltese Group.
- **Technology for Planners**: Norwegian Group, Slovenian Group, Nuha Eltinay and Spanish Group.
Should any group consider that their brief would be better placed within another theme, this should be flagged to the Workshop Coordinator. It is however assumed that the above division will be acceptable in the majority of cases.

Each group should tailor the briefs and future papers to fit these themes as closely as possible. In doing so, each group should directly address the specific question within each theme. To assist with this process a number of detailed questions for the consideration of each group are set out in the following sections.

**Specific Considerations**

1. **French Group**

   - This relates to the data that’s available to planners in terms of evidence gathering and policy formulation. What is not clear is how this aligns with advocacy and public engagement. Could you please clarify this?

   - The brief also lacks an index (or table of contents) which might help clarify the objective.

2. **Egyptian Group**

   - Could you explain what the structure of a “people-oriented” governance system is and how this relates to the potential application of new technology?

   - Informal urbanism is not common in European cities. It would be helpful to understand whether e-governance in informal cities may be more useful than in formal city and, if so, why?
3. Norwegian Group

- Could you provide some more information about Barnetrakk. Is it aimed at the city-level or could it be applied more widely at the regional/neighbourhood scale? To what extent could it be used to secure a “vision” as well as “design”?

- It would also be interesting to understand the extent to which children find participating in city issues interesting. Who provides most support for this approach (Administration, Parents or Children)?

4. Slovenian Group

- The link between centralisation and optimisation suggests a more top-down approach, or at least a more formal model of engagement. What opportunities do you propose to allow “informal” engagement between stakeholders, and what role would technology play in this?

- It would be helpful to understand the extent to which participation uses new technologies and how this form of participation has influenced public decisions.

5. Italian Group

- Could you clarify what specific issues / technologies you propose to review and how this relates to young people? With technology advancing rapidly, how you “future proof” SMART infrastructure to avoid it becoming obsolete?

- Could you clarify the relationship between improving energy efficiency in individual buildings and actively planning for energy integration?
6. Nuha Eltinay

- Could you provide more information on the legislative requirements for VGI and how these c/would be implemented?

- The brief also lacks an index (or table of contents) which might help clarify the objective. Further detail would be helpful.

7. Irish Group

- How c/would the findings of this research feed into the advocacy process, particularly for young people, in the future?

- Perhaps you could provide more information on how citizens have managed to change the design and/or new technologies have helped to influence that change?

8. Turkish Group

- The premise appears to be that e-planning is non-democratic. Could you please clarify whether this is the case and exactly what this paper will look at?

- Does the commitment to participation include a guarantee that the Administration will take this into account when assessing specific proposals?

9. Spanish Group

- Please provide more information on the Citizens Table. Which stakeholders take part and how are they selected? How does this relate e-governance with stakeholder engagement?
10. Cathal Brennan

- To what extent is the participation of young people in spatial planning linked to their participation in mainstream politics? What evidence exists regarding this correlation?

- Could you confirm whether the case study relates only to California or has been applied more widely?

11. Rafael Grosso Machpherson

- Please provide further detail as to what this paper will look at. Are there any specific case studies or approaches you’re particularly interested in?

- The suggestion appears to relate to a theoretical technology which would automatically update planning policy depending on feedback. It would be interesting to know the extent to which this relates for practical considerations such as land ownership, finance and democracy, etc.

12. Maltese Group

- The submission is relatively short, lacking information and detail. It would be helpful to have some additional content to provide further clarity.

General Considerations

A key objective from the Workshop will be to agree some broad conclusions. These conclusions will relate both to the specific question for each theme and more broadly across all three.

In the first instance, the intention is that each group will seek to agree, with other groups addressing the same theme, the conclusions that can be taken from their key question. For example: The Italian Group, Irish Group and Cathal Brennan should look to agree answers to the question “How can we apply technology to make places more sustainable?”
The key questions for conclusions across all three themes remain to be agreed. To some extent, it is hoped that these will become clearer as the Workshop progresses. At this stage, however, there are a number of initial questions which emerge. These are:

- There is recognition that participation should be guaranteed. To what extent can and should this influence policy-makers and decision-takers in their approach?

- Cities are complex and technology provides one way in which to mediate different perspectives. That said, to what extent is technology necessary to ensure participation and engagement?

- Technological responses are not always the most sustainable ones. They can also be expensive. It is necessary for us to give more thought to technology as planners or are we simply following fashion?

The suggestion of additional questions is encouraged. Potential additional questions should be submitted to the Workshop Coordinator.

**Further Thoughts?**

Any comments or questions should be directed to the Workshop Coordinator and Facilitators:

Ignacio Pemán Gavín: ignaciopeman@futurnet.es

Beatriz Santos Sánchez: bss2430@hotmail.com

Jonathan Manns: jonathan.manns@colliers.com