**Keynote speaker:** Nicole Gurran is Professor of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Sydney, where she leads Urban Housing Lab@Sydney and directs the University's Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute research centre. Nicole's research focuses on intersections between urban planning and the housing system and she has led and collaborated on a series of studies on aspects of urban policy, housing, sustainability and planning, funded by AHURI, ARC, as well as state and local government. Her current research is examining affordable rental supply, informal housing provision, and the impacts of online holiday rental platforms for local communities. Nicole has authored and co-authored publications including *Politics, Planning and Housing Supply in Australia, England and Hong Kong,* with Nick Gallent and Rebecca Chiu (Routledge, July 2016), *Australian Urban Land Use Planning: Principles, Policy, and Practice (2011)*, and *Urban Planning and the housing market* (2017, Palgrave, with Glen Bramley).

•

**Keynote speaker:** Jago Dodson is Professor of Urban Policy and Director of the Centre for Urban Research at RMIT University. His work has investigated a wide array of housing, transport and urban planning questions including foci on infrastructure, governance and energy. Jago has also led notable research formations in Australian urban studies, including the Urban Research Program at Griffith University and the Centre for Urban Research at RMIT University. Jago has worked with local, state and national governments on research and policy questions and at the global scale has assisted the UN Habitat Program to evaluate the state of national-level urban policy making internationally.

# ANZAPS 2018

*Welcome to ANZAPS 2018 conference, proudly hosted by the University of Waikato.*

# Thursday 1 November

8.30am Conference opens

9.00am Welcome. Conference chair Professor White

9.15am Powhiri and welcome

9.30am **Opening address**: Andrew Crisp

9.45am **Keynote speaker**: Professor Gurran

10.45am Morning tea

11.00am **Session 1** Planning & decision making

12.30pm Lunch

1.30pm **Session 2** Planning and equality

3.00pm Afternoon tea

3.30pm **Panel Discussion: Planning & Housing.** Dr Kay Saville-Smith, Professor Nicole Gurran, Tricia Austin, Emma Fergusson

4.15pm ANZAPS meeting

4.45pm Close

7.00pm Conference dinner

*Opening address. Prioritising affordable housing and liveable cities: understanding the mandate for HUD*

The Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) was established on October 1 and is the government's lead advisor for housing and urban development. Acting Chief Executive Andrew Crisp will discuss the role of the new Ministry, and explain how it will drive the restoration of the basic right to healthy, affordable housing for all New Zealanders and make cities more liveable.

*Professor Nicole Gurran. Anti-planning rhetoric and the housing problem: challenges for pedagogy and practice*

In recent years urban planning has sustained relentless public critique in Australia – derided by development industry bodies, denuded by politicians, and distrusted by local communities. In many instances, housing is a focus for 'anti-planning' rhetoric which calls into question the legitimacy and relevance of spatial policy and urban control in the 21st century. This presentation examines three such challenges which have emerged in the context of Australia's deep housing affordability problems. The first reduces planning to a regulatory constraint, responsible for constraining housing supply. The second

codifies and privatises development control to diversify and increase housing production. The third threatens to render planning policy obsolete in the platform era of Airbnb and digital disruption. Drawing on a series of recent studies on the impacts of planning reform for housing affordability; the rise of Airbnb, and the emergence of an informal housing sector serving lower income earners who are shut out of the formal housing market; the presentation asks whether and how planning educators and researchers should reframe the 20th Century urban planning project in the new millennium.

**Session 1 Planning and decision making**

*1. Professor Iain White & Dr Pip Wallace. Why don't we get the things we say we want? Uncovering the hidden logics of public reason, calculative rationality, and decision support tools*

A defining feature of public reasoning within planning is that it is informed by rigorous and sound evidence. To help achieve this goal there is an ever more diverse range of Decision Support Tools (DSTs); a trend that is set to accelerate along with the rise of Big Data and Smart Cities. However, while decision makers have never had so much scientific and technical knowledge at their disposal, we have simultaneous urban and

environmental crises. Political and public dissatisfaction with planning outcomes is rife. In response, planning systems around the world are under pressure to deliver better outcomes, typically by new policy fixes, tools, or legislation. This research draws upon concepts from the field of Science and Technology studies and extensive interviews with key actors across the science-policy-practice interface to shift the focus to the ways that DSTs shape planning decisions and outcomes. In the wake of the Global Financial Crisis DSTs have been hugely critiqued within the field of economics, and within planning individual tools or models have received attention, but research has yet to look across the breadth of DSTs to ascertain the various ways they influence public reasoning concerning the use of land and resources. We find that DSTs have hidden logics and perform multiple political roles that stretch far beyond their positioning as objective, neutral devices. We also reveal the various ways that their calculative rationalities exert significant power in shaping current land and housing markets, citizen behaviour, and our urban environments more generally. In doing so we reposition power and agency away from the usual research objects of policy, planners, or even politicians, to being epistemological. To achieve better

homes, towns and cities, there is a need to focus on developing a different rationality that re-balances technical, political, and professional judgement.

*2. Dr Simon Opit & Professor Karen Witten. Creating space for innovation: Understanding the inertia within transport planning decision-making as a sociotechnical assemblage*

It is becoming apparent that translating macro-level policy directions into innovative practices and solutions at the micro-political level of everyday transport planning decision-making presents a significant challenge. The desire to provide safe, accessible and attractive urban environments is uncontroversial – yet consistently delivering on these goals remains a challenge. Moving beyond the blaming of individuals and departments for failure to deliver, taking a sociotechnical perspective presents the outcomes of transport planning decision-making as produced through a complex network of logics, processes and practices. The aim of this research is to understand the complex architecture of decision-making that transforms regulatory and decision-making logics, processes and practices into the street design solutions that become part of our urban environment

and transport infrastructure. The case study for this research is the proposal for, and eventual rejection of, an innovative type of pedestrian crossing as part of Te Ara Mua: Future Streets, a neighbourhood-scale transport planning intervention in Māngere, Auckland. Through interviews with key decision-makers involved in proposing and assessing the crossings, conclusions are drawn about how particular logics can drive inertia within decision-making – thereby maintaining 'business-as-usual' practices and the obduracy of particular traffic control solutions. Several influential logics within transport planning decision-making are identified and their connections to planning outcomes discussed. Conclusions are drawn about the obduracy of existing solutions to transport planning problems, the challenge of creating space for innovation and potential pathways to change.

*3. Dr Michael Grosvenor. It's the planners fault! How influential is the urban planning profession in urban development decision making today?*

The onset of postmodernity in the 1970s changed the urban planning profession forever. This "second wave" of urban planning saw the practice of planning move from being an autonomous design oriented

profession populated by architects, urban designers, engineers and surveyors to a stand-alone accredited profession that became increasingly interested in better understanding the social, political and economic influences of our cities and regions (Taylor, 2014). Although the global sustainability agenda has seen an adoption by the urban planning profession of design led approaches to solve the environmental problems urban development has contributed to, the difficulty of implementing long term plans to address these problems cannot be separated from the political economic context in operation today, with planners increasingly being asked to understand and be prepared to work with the initiators of land use development, especially private sector developers (Taylor, 2014). Although most planners today would agree with this statement, there is a belief in the community that planners are wholly responsible for the urban "mess" we see ourselves in today. This presentation will retrace the evolution of the urban planning profession during the postmodern period and illustrate, with reference to examples in metropolitan-wide strategic planning in Sydney, that the urban planning profession is much less autonomous and influential in urban development decision making than the

community think they are. The presentation will then highlight the pros and cons of the urban planning profession becoming less autonomous, more consultative and more rational in its approach to managing urban and regional areas.

*4. Dr Gauri Nandedkar & Professor Iain White. The politics of framing: Understanding how discourse shapes perspectives and policies on the housing crisis in New Zealand*

Issues of housing supply and affordability are key concerns facing many countries around the world. These issues are embedded in the wider context of neoliberalism, globalisation, colonisation and an ever-increasing rate of social and economic inequalities reaching back several decades. The way that housing supply and affordability is framed within politics plays a critical role in the strategies that are employed to address it and their effectiveness in practice. For example, if it is defined as an issue of too much regulation or immigration, then these would require very different policy interventions than if the problem were associated with the financialisation of housing. This paper provides a critical evaluation of how political discourse around housing in

New Zealand under three National Party-led governments has evolved over the past decade, with a view to better understanding the ways in which the issue has been problematised and operationalised in policy. Specifically, we identify and interrogate how particular frames are created that have shaped housing discourse and intervention through an analysis of Hansard speeches from 2008-2017. Key questions we ask are: How is housing framed? What are the policy effects of this? And what frames are absent or hidden, and with what consequences? The paper highlights how the ways politicians frame housing has significant consequences for the effectiveness of public policy and the ability to transform a housing crisis that has become an uneven experiential condition.

**Session 2 Planning and equality**

*1. Emma Fergusson. Diversity, pathology and responsibility: framing policy for areas of concentrated deprivation*

This paper presents findings of research into the discursive frames evident in policy documents which seek to address the challenges facing deprived communities. The research employs two detailed case studies, both of which fall in the most deprived decile nationally: Flaxmere, in Hawke's Bay, and Tāmaki, in Auckland. In addition to providing some obvious

contrasts (one provincial, one urban, one inland, one coastal), these two cases exemplify the predominant policy approaches applied to deprived areas: community development and housing-led regeneration. Despite the different approaches employed in each case, the discursive constructions of both the current circumstances of each place and the proposed future 'solutions' exhibit some similarities. The three concepts discussed in this paper—diversity, pathology, and responsibility—are not the only tropes evident in the policy documents considered but have been selected for examination because of the way these three themes interact with and reinforce each other. This paper briefly introduces and contextualises each theme. Examples from both Tāmaki and Flaxmere are then employed to demonstrate how these frames are used. Finally, the implications of these tropes in planning for deprived communities are explored.

## 2. Dr Mirjam Schindler, Dr Rita Dionisio-McHugh & Professor Simon Kingham. The role of spatial planning tools in New Zealand's urban decision-making

New Zealand's cities face challenges coping with the emerging complexity of modern urban systems. Decision problems in urban planning involve multiple actors, views, values and possible outcomes, and are characterized by high degrees of uncertainty. This has resulted in an increased use of spatial planning and decision-support tools to address such complexities, increasing using a systems thinking approach. Examples of tools are MBIE's Development Feasibility Tool or the Envision Scenario Planner (ESP) developed within the Building Better Homes, Towns and Cities National Science Challenge. The choice of decision-support tools used to inform urban decisions should have essential intended urban outcomes, but may also have unintended consequences. This paper researches the role of spatial planning tools on urban decision-making on New Zealand's cities. Based on an online survey of urban planning stakeholders (e.g. local councils, urban planners, decision-makers), we contribute a review of which (spatial) decision-support tools the urban planning community has at hand and uses, how such tools might affect stakeholders' decision-making, and critically reflect on what the choice of the particular tools might have on urban decisions.

## 3. Khandakar Uddin & Dr Awais Piracha, Cities within a city: The NSW planning policy divergence

The NSW urban planning policies and systems are in a constant state of flux. The continuing planning reforms have been significantly influencing the politics, public policies, and communities. Economic efficiency is the consistent motivator of the reforms. The objectives of the state government planning reforms are aligned with the neoliberal agenda. The NSW state government is also applying post-political strategies to attain their policy goals. However, the government is successful in some regions and failed in other regions in implementing their planning policies. The policy implementation and outcomes are different in the affluent and poor halves of the Metropolitan Sydney. That variation has been reinforcing social, economic, cultural and ecological divide in the metro. The affluent neighbours are actively dominating the urban policies. The affluent communities are more active in resisting planning policy practice and outcomes. They are successful in pursuing suspension of planning policy and keep themselves excluded from the planning reforms. Thus, there is the manifestation of gentrification in the city. Communities abilities to engage in planning is diametrically different in the rich and poor parts of Metropolitan Sydney.

Also, planning outcomes play out dramatically differently in the two regions of Metro Sydney. In recent times, the forced amalgamation of Canterbury and Bankstown councils created a mega-council of 360,000 people in the poor part of Greater Sydney and by the abandonment of amalgamation policy the affluent area of Hunters Hill Council could avoid merger and persist with mere 14,000 people. More recently, the NSW government's medium density code, soon after its promulgation, was suspended for some councils because of strong local opposition. Other councils had adopted the rules without any resistance. That is another example where planning reforms has created division in the Metro Sydney.

*4. Jason Harrison & Professor Susan Thompson. Making the healthy city equitable: a case study of walkability and wayfinding for the visually impaired*

There is no doubt that the built environment plays a significant role in supporting healthy behaviours which are critical to stem rising rates of chronic disease. Planners and allied professionals faced with making decisions about how cities are best developed and maintained to support health increasingly draw from this evidence base. A key element of a healthy city is walkability – in part because walking is undertaken by most people of all ages in their every-day activities. Nevertheless, a walkable city is not necessarily accessible for all, particularly as research and practice primarily focuses on people without disabilities. The barriers which do exist and turn otherwise walkable streets into unwalkable ones are not sufficiently considered in key healthy city decision making. With an estimated 15% of the world's population living with a disability, there is the risk that many who use cities feel excluded and are not able to access essential services and facilities to live healthy and happy lives. This paper presents a case study examining walkability barriers within the urban environment of the City of Sydney for people with a visual impairment. The research quantifies, through a detailed access audit, the barriers within a 400m catchment area of a major CBD railway station. The audit highlights design features which have been implemented to aid people with a visual impairment in walking around the city. The study outcomes, as well as the research methods used, offer understandings for urban planners seeking to create an equitable healthy city.

# Friday 2 November

8.00am Heads of planning breakfast – on campus. Meet at Kahurangi café in the Oranga building by the lake (AKA Stacey's)

8.30am Conference opens

9.00am **Keynote speaker**: Professor Jago Dodson

10.00am Morning tea

10.30am **Session 3** Planning for the Environment and Climate Change

12.00pm Lunch

Parallel Early Career Researcher Networking meeting

1.00pm **Session 4** Planning, people and heritage

2.30pm Afternoon tea

2.45pm **Session 5** The Pedagogy of Planning

4.15pm **Panel Discussion:** The Future of Planning Curriculums

5.15pm Conference close

*Professor Jago Dodson. Urban governance at the global scale: the evolving SDG-New Urban Agenda regime and its implications for planning*

Since 2015 a new global scale framework for the management of urbanisation has emerged via international institutions. This includes the New Urban Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goal as well as the Paris Climate Agreement and the Sendai Disaster Risk Agreement. These frameworks are agreements of UN member states yet will be applied at the urban scale which is typically the domain of sub-national and local governments. Meanwhile cities across the world are seizing the imperatives of improving urban conditions while transforming urban development to a sustainable trajectory. There is thus a scalar mismatch between the global level agreements and necessary local action. The nation state it seems, faces a new role in managing urbanisation. This paper explores these emerging dynamics by asking: 1) Are we seeing the emergence of a global tier of urban planning? 2) What role in managing urbanisation does this new global urban governance imply for the nation state? 3) How are the Australian and NZ governments responding to these global agendas? 4) What are the prospects for

systematic application of the new global urban governance for cities?

## Session 3 Planning for the Environment and Climate Change

*1. Dr Rebecca Retzlaff & Charlene LeBleu. Marine spatial planning: exploring the role of planning practice and research*

Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) is a tool for managing and improving marine environments. MSPs have been prepared and implemented throughout the world. The earliest example was the 1981 plan for the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park in Australia. In many countries, the field is dominated by natural scientists and has not been commonly associated with planning. The goals of this paper are to analyze the MSP literature to identify key themes related to both MSP and planning, and to use those themes to explore how planners can contribute to MSP research and practice. We conducted a literature review to find relevant literature on MSP. We reviewed a total of 191 different articles and books. After an initial reading and categorizing of the literature, we organized it into eight major themes; with 2-6 sub-themes organized under each major theme. The themes are: ocean zoning, defining boundaries, planning in dynamic environments, stakeholder involvement, information

needs, integrating ocean and land use management, managing multiple and conflicting uses, and transboundary institutional structures. After organizing the literature into themes and sub-themes, we analyzed it for its main findings and conclusions. We conclude that planners have a lot to contribute to MSP. For example, the MSP literature has centered mostly on individual case studies of one or a few MSPs, with very little research that comprehensively analyzes many MSPs collectively and comparatively. Planners could contribute their experience with regional planning, planning for issues that transcend political boundaries such as traffic, commuting, and watersheds, and regional land uses.

*2. Christina Hanna, Professor Iain White & Professor Bruce Glavovic. National guidance, RMA tools and voluntary retreat: lessons from Matata, New Zealand*

Managed retreat is being applied in a variety of ways across New Zealand due to an absence of formalised national direction. In this research, a case study is examined, where managed retreat is being attempted in Matatā via a voluntary land acquisition package, supported by unprecedented changes to the regional plan to extinguish existing use rights. Document analysis, and semi-structured interviews of local

government actors have uncovered administrative and social barriers to managed retreat in New Zealand. Principal administrative barriers include a lack of tools, national guidance, funding and implementation support to achieve managed retreat of existing land-uses under the current planning system. Under this system, integrated management is vital in order to overcome the mismatch between the functions and powers of territorial and regional authorities with regard to managed retreat of existing uses. Furthermore, whilst 'voluntary retreat' is the only tool currently available to local authorities to achieve (compensated) managed retreat of existing uses, (where the Public Works Act 1981 cannot be applied) it is not often perceived as being 'voluntary', which undermines the retreat process. In contrast to these barriers are also enablers, which in the absence of a national framework, include the potential for direction from Regional Policy Statements where they deliver a strong policy framework and direction to reduce risk to tolerable levels based on clear thresholds. Policy learning is occurring across New Zealand, driven by local leadership. In order to improve policy and its outcomes, we must learn from current practice.

*3. Dr Michael Howes. Preparing planners for climate change adaptation decision-making: observations from the policy research-teaching nexus*

The impacts of climate change pose profound challenges for urban and environmental planning. Overall the objective is to build resilience through effective, efficient and appropriate adaptation planning and this in turn requires good decision-making. This must often be accomplished with scarce public resources, in a hostile political environment, and while dealing with all the pitfalls inherent in a 'wicked' policy problem. Educating planners in policymaking and climate change can help prepare them to meet these challenges and make good decisions, but it needs to be based on sound research into what is actually happening on the ground. This paper explores this topic and seeks to make some practical suggestions. It is based on many years of research, teaching and experience by the author across several countries. While the challenges are great, there is still room for some optimism.

*4. Dr Hamish Rennie. Micro-planning for resilience – a resilience module for Farm Environment Plans*

Planning to manage the effects of farming activities on the environment, especially water quality, has become a significant component of regional planning in New Zealand. In some regions, farmers are required to obtain resource consents to continue to farm. To obtain consent they are required to prepare farm environment plans (FEPs) that describe how they will meet targets for preventing nutrient and sediment loss to waterways. As part of the New Zealand Government –funded National Science Challenge – Resilience to Nature's Challenges a new voluntary resilience module has been developed that focusses landowner attention on the effects of the environment on the landowner. This micro-planning approach is a shift from treating landowners as all powerful impactors on static environments to entities striving to thrive within impermanent, chaotically dynamic systems. In so doing it manifests a challenge to the present anthropocentric doctrine of the Anthropocene and re-embeds landowners, especially farmers, within their environment.

## Session 4 Planning, people and heritage

*1. Professor Mark Dyer, Rachel Dyer, Dr Annika Hinze, Tomas Ferrari, Kate Mackness & Dr Shaoqun Wu. Urban Narrative*

Urban Narrative is a proof of concept research project to develop new digital tools and techniques to enable communities to express their values and priorities to co design future urban plans and design briefs. The project is collaborating with two neighbourhoods at the New Zealand Cities of Napier and Christchurch. In the case of Napier, the neighbourhood is a Maori and Pacifika community with the highest deprivation score in the city based on a variety of indices including income, home ownership, qualifications and access to private transport. In contrast, the case study for Christchurch focusses on the neighbourhood of Addington, which has undergone several significant changes during the last fifty years from a neighbourhood with major heavy industry centred largely on the pre-1960s railways sector to more recently a safe post-earthquake haven for residents and business after the 2011 Christchurch earthquake. The project explores co-design and adaption of digital ethnographic tools with communities using a variety of mixed social media including bespoke APPS. The results coupled with text mining of big data sets using collocation tools, facilitates data storytelling that led to a community based urban narratives that can guide future decision-making and transformation. In the case of Addington, the focus is on tangible and intangible culture and heritage as a means of increasing a sense of belonging. Whereas for Maraenui, the attention is given to empowering local residents to visibly influence future planning decisions around a new health care facility, new social homes and changes to the highways system.

*2. George Greiss & Dr Awais Piracha. Rewriting political influence: The NSW "Rock Star" planning reforms*

The Environmental Planning and Assessment Act (EPAA) was promulgated in 1979 to simplify the planning process, to pay particular attention to ecological sustainability and to improve community consultation in planning matters. In the four decades since its inception, the EPAA has been amended more the 150 times. The changes to the planning system created by the constant amendment of the planning Act have evolved around the decision-making process, the unmistakeable struggle for control between the State and Local Government and the attempts to shift to a post-political/managerial planning system. In this paper, we will explore the inherent conflict between collaborative planning practices and the traditional political hierarchies in planning decisions. A 'Joint decision-making system' or a 'shadow hierarchy joint decision-making system' has traditionally been used to reconcile the struggle and create acceptable outcomes for all stakeholders. However, in NSW, there has been a shift to a post-political decision-making that is being used to overcome the power and legitimacy of collaborative planning and re-concentrate the decision-making powers in the political hierarchies. The delegation of substantial decision-making powers to Local Governments by the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EPAA), forced the State Government to work collaboratively with the Local Governments. In practice, this proved difficult for the New South Wales State Government, of both political persuasions. We draw attention to the decision-making reforms that have dominated the planning system debate in New South Wales and how their achieving "rock star" status with constant controversial media coverage, has created a legitimacy question and stronger opposition to planning decisions. We

conclude that the change to a post-political/ managerial planning system of past decade is a move in the wrong direction. The most recent amendment to the New South Wales Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EPAA) regarding the compulsory use of Independent Hearing and Assessment Panels (IHAP) in all Sydney metropolitan councils, hides political influences on the decision-making process, and is another means of eliminating or undermining the democratic scrutiny that comes with the exercise of political power. The changes will have more of a negative impact in the less affluent areas of the city, which lack the means or political ability to challenge decisions.

*3. Tung, Chih-Hsuan & Cheng, HsienHsin. A study on the urban morphology evolution of ancient city wall along the urban fringe belt – A case study of Tainan castle town*

The Tainan castle town is the earliest city in Taiwan to develop a large-scale city. From the perspective of urban development, it is a major matter for a city to have almost enclosed gates and walls. The spatial attributes outside the city are completely different and it is of significance to urban space. It is also totally different, and it even shapes the urban fringe belt. The evolution of the

urban fringe belt is closely related to the local historical environment. The purpose of this study is to explore the evolution of the urban form of the ancient city wall along the edge of the city. We selected the surrounding area of Tainan castle town as the main research object. We use the morphological microscopic scale to analyze the land use and analyze the land pilings to understand the demolition of the ancient city wall. After the demolition changes, whether the ancient city wall is still the urban fringe zone, and then use the type of building analysis to verify the evolution of the ancient city wall, reflecting the cultural and political conditions in different eras. Due to the existence of new and old, urban textures around Tainan city wall, the difference in stitching is a topic that the Tainan city government is trying to solve. It also raises awareness of the urban fringe belt and helps to sewn the old and new textures of the city.

*4. Lo, Wei-Hsuan & Cheng, Hsien-Hsin. The Study of heritage for conservation strategy – historic urban landscape approach for Tainan Fu-cheng Historic Districts.*

In order to solve the problems of large population migration, tourism prevalence, commercial development and globalization during the development of modern cities, the

cultural and regional characteristics of historical cities are dispersed. The issues between urban development and preservation continue to occur, leading to the challenge of the development in historic districts. UNESCO passed Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) in November 2011. This approach protects and manages the urban heritage in historical towns from the viewpoint of "landscape". It contains both natural and cultural environments, in order to balance the development of the city and the preservation of the landscape. This research discusses the use of HUL methods to preserve the features of historic urban landscapes, enhancing local cultural values and genius loci. Taking Tainan Fu-cheng Historic District as an example. It used to be the main city in Taiwan, and is rich in distribution of natural and cultural resources. First, this research uses field research to draw the preservation and development. Then, this research analyzes the resource maps by map overlay analysis to understand the landscape content of historical cities. Next, to evaluate historical urban landscape features and cultural values, in order to delimit historically preserved sensitive areas, and arrange the order of historical resources. Finally, this study proposes a management strategy for the preservation of historical urban landscape features in Tainan Fu-cheng Historic Districts.

**Session 5 The Pedagogy of Planning**

*1. Dr Aysin Dedekorkut-Howes, Professor Jason Byrne, Dr Deanna Tomerini & Dr Alison Sammel. Taking students on a field trip towards employment*

The value of fieldtrips and study tours in promoting skills development is widely recognised among academics especially in the natural and built environment disciplines. Field trips have various other benefits including cohort bonding and enhancing student experience. However, they are expensive and time consuming to organise and administer. This project is aiming to develop Best Practice Guidelines for embedding field trips into the curriculum to maximise their benefits and particularly employability skills. To achieve this aim we use data from 16 semi structured interviews and a panel we conducted during ANZAPS 2017 conference in Hobart. The participants represent 12 universities from New Zealand and Australia and are in the natural and built environment disciplines. Over half of them teach in planning, the rest represent architecture, engineering, environmental science and science education disciplines. In our analysis, we first overview how field trips are used in planning education, what benefits the

convenors observe and what obstacles and challenges they face. Are these any different than the challenges faced by other disciplines? What unique skills are we teaching through field trips? What are the important aspects of a field trip that maximize these skills and benefits? We examine the role of the duration, timing and destination of field trips as well as assessment. We conclude with some best practice tips.

*2. Dr Adrienne Keane & Professor Peter Phibbs. Developing student engagement with Indigenous Australians through urban planning curricula*

In 2017 the NSW Government initiated a pilot project of negotiation between Local Aboriginal Land Councils (LALC), NSW Crown Lands and local government seeking to resolve over 30,000 land claims under the NSW Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983. Separately, there were training sessions with LALCs, delivered by a Sydney University academic, about the NSW planning framework. At these training sessions it became clear that LALCs generally did not have the resources or expertise to understand the development potential of their lands or claimed lands. Understanding development potential is key in the negotiation project but there were no or

limited resources to access expertise. Utilizing an existing shell unit, six Sydney planning students and a volunteer mentoring planner, undertook land use investigations on behalf of the Metropolitan LALC. The studies will be used as part of the negotiation project as they contributed to the MLALC's understanding of the potential of lands. This presentation will demonstrate how planning curricula responded to circumstance bringing about a unique but potentially adaptable program which enabled student engagement with Indigenous Australians; cultural competence building; development of work readiness skills; relationship building between the University and the planning profession; and a proactive and useful project for LALCs.

*3. Dr Dorina Pojani. Role Playing vs serious gaming in planning education: Which activity leads to more learning?*

This study assesses the utility, in terms of learning, of two class activities which I have employed in 2015-2016 in a planning theory course at the University of Queensland, Australia. One is a role playing exercise, called the Great Planning Game (GPG), which was developed by Dr Roberto Rocco at Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands. The other is a serious game,

called Polis Power Plays (PPP), which I am developing with a group of colleagues in Australia. Both role playing and serious gaming are commonly used as an education tool. The purpose of this study is to determine whether in planning courses gaming is more effective than role playing or whether the two yield more or less the same results in terms of educational outcomes. This is important because developing serious games is much more costly in terms of time and resources, while role playing is an inexpensive activity that requires minimal investment outside the classroom.

*4. Professor Claire Freeman, Learning how to make decisions in the education context*

Dunedin's biggest challenge in decision making in many years has been whether to endorse the highly controversial but inspirational redevelopment of the waterfront proposed by van Brandenburg architects. With its bold, gleaming white modernist, curvilinear buildings the development would totally transform the waterfront and place Dunedin on the world's architectural stage. The city council has endorsed the bridge element of this project that would act as the vital link between the CBD and Harbourside.

This development has been used as the catalyst for teaching a studio based paper "Spatial planning and development" where students act as the planner for a client engaged in waterfront development. Students identify a development site, undertake a site analysis, design their development, undertake a hypothetical consultation process and evaluate their proposed development using selected development tools. Finally they have to make a decision- this takes the form of a recommendation on whether they should advise their client to go ahead with the development. This paper differs from more standard papers in that students engage with all aspects of the development process and the decisions that have to be made all through the process while simultaneously considering all the permutations and challenges this entails. The van Brandenburg development is the inspiration for student's own Waterfront development aspirations. The question is will students rise to the challenge and make decisions that forge a bright "white" inspiring future or stick to the more mundane and realistic?

**Panel Discussion: The Future of Planning Curriculums**

Professor Carl Grodach
Professor Claire Freeman
Dr Aysin Dedekorkut
Professor Peter Phibbs

## Delegate list

Dr Adrienne Keane, The University of Sydney

Dr Aysin Dedekorkut, Griffith University

Andrew Crisp, Ministry of Housing and Urban Development

Professor Carl Grodach, Monash University

Dr Caryl Bosman, Griffith University

Christina Hanna, University of Waikato

Professor Claire Freeman, University of Otago

Dr Dorina Pojani, The University of Queensland

Dr Elizabeth Aitken Rose, University of Auckland

Emma Fergusson, Massey University

Francesca Dodd-Parr, University of Waikato

Dr Gauri Nandedkar, University of Waikato

George Greiss, Western Sydney University

Dr Hamish Rennie, Lincoln University

Dr Hitomi Nakanishi, University of Canberra

Professor Iain White, University of Waikato

Professor Jago Dodson, Centre for Urban Research, RMIT University

Jason Harrison, UNSW

Jo Ross, Massey University

Kate Mackness, University of Waikato

Dr Kay Saville-Smith, CRESA

Khandakar Al Farid Uddin, Western Sydney University

Laurel Johnson, University of Queensland

Dr Maria Kornakova, Massey University

Dr Michael Howes, Griffith University

Dr Mirjam Schindler, University of Canterbury

Professor Nicole Gurran, University of Sydney

Patricia Austin, University of Auckland

Professor Peter Phibbs, University of Sydney

Dr Pip Wallace, University of Waikato

Rachel Dyer, University of Waikato

Dr Raven Cretney, University of Waikato

Rebecca Retzlaff, Auburn University

Professor Richard Bedford, Chair of the Governance Group for the Building Better Homes, Towns and Cities National Science Challenge

Ruth Berry, Director, National Science Challenge 11, Building Better Homes Towns and Cities National Science Challenge

Dr Silvia Serrao-Neuma, University of Waikato

Dr Simon Opit, Massey University

Professor Susan Thompson, UNSW

Wei-Hsuan Lo, National Cheng Kung University

Dr Wendy Steele, RMIT University

Wen Liu, University of Auckland