

Spatial justice and the NIMBY effect

An analysis of urban densification debate in Switzerland and the Netherlands

Herdt, T.; Jonkman, Arend

Publication date

2021

Document Version

Final published version

Citation (APA)

Herdt, T., & Jonkman, A. (2021). *Spatial justice and the NIMBY effect: An analysis of urban densification debate in Switzerland and the Netherlands*. 85-87. Abstract from AESOP 2021 online conference, Gdansk, Poland.

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Title: Spatial justice and the NIMBY effect: An analysis of urban densification debate in Switzerland and the Netherlands

Author(s): Tanja Herdt Dr.Arend Jonkman MSc

Affiliation: Assoc. Prof. Dr. sc., Theory and Methods of Urban Design, Dept Urbanism, TU Delft T.Herd@tudelft.nl 1 M Homes, Management in the Built Environment, TU Delft

What is seen as just in a society largely depends on public reasoning, which occurs in public debates. This paper analyses public debates around land use and densification in Switzerland and The Netherlands to understand how private and public interests interrelate in the tensions of urban growth. The paper is based on the hypothesis that while a consensus on the desirability of densification may exist in public, its implementation may cause direct tensions on a local level where it affects the quality of the immediate living environment. Therefore, insights into the acceptance of densification at a local level are considered important factors for successfully implementing densification projects.

The research is based on quantitative and qualitative discourse analysis covering public media outlets of different reach between

2010 – 2019. During that time, both countries implemented policies to limit land take and promote densification to answer the demand for housing in metropolitan areas. With their relatively high population densities and historical awareness of the scarcity of land and environmental concerns, both countries are at the forefront of sustainable planning. At the same time, both countries strongly differ in their specific planning approaches and historical perception of private property.

Focusing on environmental qualities and sustainability goals as indicators of spatial justice, the paper explores conflicts and looks into how private and public interests were addressed in public debate. Findings show a strong focus on private interests that dominate the debate and general disconnection of public and private interest in both countries, despite differences in policies and discourse. Here the highrise as urban densification typology is strongly influencing public debate. To counteract the found NIMBY effects, it is suggested to implement formal deliberative planning processes and instruments of governance which balance interests and maintain support for densification policy to gain a greater acceptance.

References:

- Campbell, S. D. (2013). Sustainable Development and Social Justice: Conflicting Urgencies and the Search for Common Ground in Urban and Regional Planning. *Michigan Journal of Sustainability*, 1(20181221), 75-91. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mjs.12333712.0001.007>
- Haaland, C., & Konijnendijk van den Bosch, C. (2015). Challenges and strategies for urban green-space planning in cities undergoing densification: A review. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 14(4), 760-771. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2015.07.009>
- Horwitz, M. J. (1982). The history of the public/private distinction. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 130, 1423-1428.
- Pendall, R. (1999). Opposition to housing: NIMBY and beyond. *Urban Affairs Review*, 35(1), 112-136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10780879922184310>
- Roodbol-Mekkes, P. H., van der Valk, A. J. J., & Korthals Altes, W. K. (2012). The Netherlands spatial planning doctrine in disarray in the 21st century. *Environment and Planning A*, 44(2), 377-395. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a44162>
- Zimmerli, Joelle (2018) Akzeptanz städtischer DichteErwartungen und Prioritäten zum Wohnen in der Stadt Zürich: Vorstellungen von öffentlichem Raum und grossen Überbauungen,
- Survey and Evaluation Report, Zurich, <http://www.zimraum.ch/studien/akzeptanz-staedtischer-dichte-2018>