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Planning, global challenges and the future.
Transition Theory and Transition Management
The Low Carbon transition
Planning, Transition and a low carbon economy
Planning can be described as....

‘the exercise of deliberate forethought by people’
Alexander, 1992

‘ability to prescribe the future urban life’
Davidoff, 2003

‘the guidance of future action’
Forester, 1989

‘persuasive storytelling about the future’
Frogmorton, 1992

‘an explicit exercise in imagining the future’
Healey, 1996

‘it identifies a (future) order together with the steps that must be taken to bring it about, based on knowledge concerning the present order of things’

Faludi, 1973

‘all conscious attempts to organise action in order to affect future outcomes’
Paris, 1982

From: Connell, 2009
Planning and the future

- The demands of grand challenges
- Is planning well-equipped for thinking about the future?
- Utopianism and Pragmatism;
- Time, Timescales and uncertainty in planning
- Tools for thinking about the future: forecasting, visioning, scanning
- Neoliberalism, laissez-faire & a declining capacity for intervention.
Transition perspectives

- Transition as a discourse and as a theory
- ‘Transition theory’ focuses on:
  “a fundamental transformation towards more sustainable modes of production and consumption” incorporating “institutional, organizational, technical, social, and political aspects of far-reaching changes in existing socio-technical systems” (Markhard et al 2012)
- Emphasis on the process rather than end point; redirecting and steering not a blueprint;
- Socio-political and socio-technical change;
- Multi-actor, multi-causal, multi-level, multi-domain, multi-phases
- Anticipates surprises, political myopia, cultural inertia, lock in.....
Increasing structuration of activities in local practices

Socio-economical Landscape

Pressure creates 'Windows of opportunities'

Landscape developments put pressure on existing regime
- Aging Population
- Lower budgets

The new regime is able to deal with the landscape pressure

New regime influences landscape

Socio-economical Regime

Existing socio-economical regime is 'dynamically stable'. On different dimensions there are ongoing processes

Markets
Science
Culture
Technology

Industry
Policy

Niche innovations

External influences on niches (via expectations and networks)

Niche stabilization

New configuration breaks through, taking advantage of 'windows of opportunity'. Adjustments occur in socio-economical regime

Elements become aligned and stabilize in a dominant design. Internal momentum increases.

Experiments: Learning processes take place on multiple dimensions (co-construction).

Small networks of actors support novelties on the basis of expectations and visions.

(Based on: Geels & Schot, 2007)

Transition studies explore ways of ‘unlocking’ sub-optimal, inefficient or undesired socio-technical configurations to open up new opportunities.

- An emphasis on innovation (technological, social, policy)
- The interplay of society, technology and governance, across different geographic and temporal scales.
- Ongoing theoretical debars on the role of spatial context, power, social learning etc.
- Transition management combines reflexive governance and complex adaptive systems theory – used by the Dutch government for a decade.
Transition Theory and the Energy system

- Recognition of energy as a socio technical system, embedded in a complex multi dimensional multi actor and multi-level arena, with dynamic properties.
- Highlights the strong impact of lock-in of past decisions re. fossil fuel energy sources.
- Confirms the crucial role of government policy and dispels the notion that major long terms transitions are technology or market.
- Highlights the importance of the dynamic between multi-levels of governance and contexts (EU-National-local)
The ‘steering’ effect of regulatory regimes: spatial planning is often the most effective vehicle for key transition activity.

The growing emphasis on the urban arena in tackling climate change.

The spatial dimensions of energy policy/governance are largely undeveloped.

Spatiality and the framing energy discourse and policy: e.g. local site battles can reframe the level and scale of concerns.

Inertia and policy capture in planning can suppress innovation and reproduce structures of lock in..
Planning as a *tool* of transition

- How can planning impede or facilitate key transition activity:
  - Innovation; envisioning, alternative scenarios, pathway identification.
- How can planning goals and transition visions be aligned?
- Does planning adequately recognise the social sphere - or the role of technology - in securing long term plan objectives?
- The need for a better understanding of the dynamic interactions within an urban area.
- Is planning governance adequately reflexive?
- How can local level plans link with broader transition goals and long term visons and cope with uncertainty.
- Can planning be both regulatory and enabling?
We are currently ‘locked in’ a market supportive, pragmatic planning system whose rationality represses issues of social justice or sustainability.

How can we use the insights from transition to think about changing the way we plan?

Where and how does innovation occur in planning systems?

Where are the ‘radical novelties’ and how do we facilitate these?

What are the alternative pathways?

How do different governance levels capture or repress progressive innovation?

How can we embed longer term conceptual thinking and analysis of complex situations?
Conclusions

- Further work needed to elaborate transition theory and its orientation to specific policy domains...
- .... but it is starting to deliver useful insights into the forces and drivers of future change, at different scales
- Planning suffers from inadequate tools and poor concepts for its future orientation.
- There is therefore potential to develop:
  - Theory of *planning for transition* (planning as a transition tool)
  - Theory of *transition for planning* (evolving better forms of planning)