



**AESOP PRIZE AWARD for best Published Paper over 2006
Rewarded at the annual AESOP Planning Conference,
Naples 2007 July 12th**

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.

In 2007 The AESOP Paper Prize Paper Committee consists of the next five members:

- Prof. Dr. Willem Salet (chair) (The Netherlands)
- Prof. Dr. Vesselina Troeva (Bulgaria).
- Prof. Dr. Petter Naess (Denmark)
- Dr. Deike Peters (Germany)
- Dr. Elisabete Silva (Portugal)

The committee invited the editorial boards of more than 50 European planning journals to nominate the two best papers in their journal over 2006, accepting papers in the English, the French and the German language. Planning journals in other languages are encouraged to enable translation of their selected papers in one of these languages. In total, 28 papers were nominated for the awarding of the Prize at the General Assemblée of AESOPs annual Conference in Naples, July 2007.

The complete list of nominated papers is attached in the Appendix A. The criteria for the selection of the papers are brought to Appendix B.

Review of the 2006 nominations

The committee operated in two rounds. Firstly, four papers were selected as 'highly qualified', and next the winning paper is selected from this category of excellent papers. The committee selected the next four papers over 2006 as "highly qualified":

* Sager, T.

Planning Theory, Vol. 5(3): 223-254, 2006

The Logic of Critical Communicative Planning: Transaction Cost Alteration

* Gospodini, A.

Cities, Vol.23, No.5, p.311-330, 2006

Portraying, classifying and understanding the emerging landscapes in the post-industrial city

- * Hebbert, M.
Planning Perspectives, 21 (July 2006) 233–251
Town Planning versus Urbanismo
- * Carmona, M., S. Marshall and Q. Stevens
Progress in Planning, 65 (2006) 209–289
Design codes: their use and potential

The selected papers

All selected papers for the final round are well written with a high intellectual quality and cover relevant issues within current planning theory and practice. The variegation of papers perfectly demonstrates the range of academic work in the schools of planning. Tore Sagers paper attempts to breath new conceptual life in basic assumptions of communicative planning theory. Aspa Gospodini successfully classifies the new landscapes of the emerging cities in the twenty first century in terms of land use patterns, urban morphology and density. Michael Hebbert explores the historical genesis of urban planning by contrasting the ‘Anglo Saxon’ concept of town planning (based on rational methods and strategies of intervention) with the ‘Latin’ concept of Urbanismo which is more based on architecture and urban morphology. Finally, the Carmona, Marshall and Stevens paper highlights the operational part of planning thought and methodology by investigating the use and potential of design codes in British planning.

AESOP Award of best published paper in 2006

AESOP Prize Paper Committee decided to award the prize of best published planning paper in 2006 to the next paper:

TORE SAGER

**The Logic of Critical Communicative Planning: Transaction Cost
Alteration**

Planning Theory

Sagers paper is a fascinating endeavour to deal with the biased power relations in approaches of communicative planning. Taking a critical approach of communicative planning, Sager is fully aware of the vulnerability of such assumptions as ‘free dialogue’ and ‘rational arguing’ which easily might get overshadowed by more manipulative uses of power. For this reason he is in search of a sort of counteracting strategy on behalf of deprived groups. Sager proposes to introduce a new strategy of power management by deliberate alteration of political transaction costs. The jury considered the paper as an important contribution to the conceptual perspectives of critical communicative planning and as an interesting attempt to link planning concepts with recent approaches in institutional economics.

APPENDIX A: Oversight of nominated papers over 2006 on behalf of AESOP Prize Paper Award (Alfabetical sequence)

1. Allmendinger, P.
International Planning Studies, Vol. 11, no. 2 (2006)
Zoning by Stealth? The Diminution of Discretionary Planning
2. Bertolini, L.
Journal of Urban Design, Vol.11, No. 3, 319–334, October 2006
Fostering Urbanity in a Mobile Society: Linking Concepts and Practices
3. Boelens, L.
disP, 167 – 4 / 2006 p. 25- 40
Beyond the Plan; Towards a New Kind of Planning
4. Bollens, S. A.
Progress in Planning, 66 (2006) 67–139
Urban planning and peace building
5. Campbell, H. and R. Marshall
European Planning Studies, Vol.14, No.2, February 2006
Towards Justice in Planning: A Reappraisal
6. Carmona, M., S. Marshall and Q. Stevens
Progress in Planning, 65 (2006) 209–289
Design codes: their use and potential
7. Cochrane, A.
European Urban and Regional Studies, 13(1): 5–24, 2006
Making Up Meanings in a Capital City: Power, Memory and Monuments in Berlin
8. Counsell, D. and G. Haughton
Geoforum, 37 (2006) pp. 921-931
Sustainable development in regional planning: The search for new tools and renewed legitimacy
9. Davoudi, S.
disP, 165 – 2 / 2006 p.14-24
Evidence-Based Planning: Rhetoric and Reality
10. Dövényi, Z. and Z. Kovács
European Spatial Research and Policy, Vol. 13, No. 2 / 2006
The Post-socialist Metropolitan Periphery between ‘Catching up’ and Individual Development Path
11. Forester, J.
Critica della Razionalità Urbanistica, 19, pp.55-6, Alinea Editrice, Firenze, 1° semestre 2006
Exploring Values-based Disputes
(Translation of Italian article: Esplorando le dispute basate sui)

12. Gospodini, A.
Cities, Vol.23, No.5, p.311-330, 2006
Portraying, classifying and understanding the emerging landscapes in the post-industrial city
13. Harwood, S.A., M. Zapata
International Planning Studies, Vol. 11, No 3-4 (2006)
Preparing to Plan: Collaborative Planning in Monteverde, Costa Rica
14. Hebbert, M.
Planning Perspectives, 21 (July 2006) 233–251
Town Planning versus Urbanismo
15. Herfert, G.
European Spatial Research and Policy, Vol. 13 no.2 / 2006
The Metropolitan Periphery between Boom and Shrinkage
16. Hoch, Ch.
Planning Theory and Practice, Vol. 7, No. 4, 367 - 382, December 2006
Emotions and Planning
17. Jabareen, Y.
Planning Theory and Practice, Vol.7, No. 3, 305-323, September 2006
Space of Risk: The Contribution of Planning Policies to Conflicts in Cities, Lessons from Nazareth
18. Kotus, J.
Cities, Vol. 23, No 5, p. 364-381, 2006
Changes in the Spatial Structure of a large Polish City: The Case of Poznań
19. Larsson, A.
Town Planning Review, Vol. 77/5, 2006, pp. 507-530
From equal opportunities to gender awareness in strategic spatial planning: reflections based on Swedish experiences
20. Loeb, C.
Planning Perspectives, 21 (January 2006) 67–87
Planning reunification: the planning history of the fall of the Berlin Wall
21. Pincetl, S.
Geoforum, 37 (2006) pp. 246-255
Conservation planning in the west, problems, new strategies and entrenched obstacles
22. Ratti, C., D. Frenchman, R.M. Pulselli, and S. Williams
Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, Vol.33 (5) p.727-748, 2006
Mobile Landscapes: using location data from cell phones for urban analysis
23. Sager, T.
Planning Theory, Vol. 5(3): 223-254, 2006

The Logic of Critical Communicative Planning: Transaction Cost Alteration

24. Schmid, H.
European Planning Studies, Vol.14, No.3, April 2006
Privatized Urbanity or a Politicized Society ? Reconstruction in Beirut after the Civil War
25. Spaans, M.
Town Planning Review, Vol. 77/2, 2006, pp.127-146
Recent changes in the Dutch planning system: towards a new governance model?
26. Ulfarsson, G.F. and Carruthers, J. I.
Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, Vol. 33(5) p. 767-788, 2006
The cycle of fragmentation and sprawl: a conceptual framework and empirical model
27. Watson, V.
Planning Theory, Vol. 5 (1): 31-50, 2006
Deep Difference: Diversity, Planning and Ethics
28. Zuindeau, B.
Regional Studies, Vol. 40.5, pp. 459–470, July 2006
Spatial Approach to Sustainable Development: Challenges of Equity and Efficacy

APPENDIX B: 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 :

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

Therefore this relevance may be understood as :

- œ theory on planning : considering planning as a societal process, addressing planning procedures, outcomes and the social function of planning;
- œ theory in planning : substantive issues about which planners need to have knowledge when making spatial plans;
- œ 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 :

- œ making a new step, giving a new light in, on or for planning theory ;
- œ and / or bringing proposals for public action.

Criterion 6 : Overall quality

In addition to the five listed criterias, the jury will use a holistic evaluation where each juror shall express his overall appreciation of the paper and its qualities.