Balancing Interests

Development of a Mediation Strategy for the Spatial Planner and Designer operating as a mediator in collaborative interest based urban development processes

Master Thesis Urbanism
Wouter Freek Spijkerman
wouterspijkerman@hotmail.com
Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Architecture
Colophon

Document: Master Thesis
Date: 25-06-2010
Student: Wouter Freek Spijkerman
Studentnumber: 1090585
E-mail: wouterspijkerman@hotmail.com
University: Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Architecture
Program: Master Urbanism
Mentors:
Eric Luiten
Agnes Franzen
Ana Maria Fernandez Maldonado
Preface
This document is the final report of my master Urbanism at the Faculty of Architecture of Delft University of Technology. Although urbanism is a design study the graduation project was on purpose an exploration of the responsibilities of the Spatial Planner and Designer and the way he or she faces the current practice in the urban development process. This resulted in the following research which is not a typical design project but a process design of the way the Spatial Planner and Designer could operate as a mediator in the current and future practice of urban development. The project showed me the way I would like to work as an urban planner and designer and prepared me for a complex environment where the ideas of the urban planner and designer are not taken for granted.

Thanks to all those who have provided me with inspiration and comments about this topic. Thanks also to those who had the patience of keeping up with my comments about the build environment and the way it takes shape. Special thanks to my mentors for pushing me in the right direction and providing me with food for thought!

Wouter Spijkerman

The Hague 25-06-2010
# Table of Contents

Colophon .................................................................................................................................................. 1  
Preface ..................................................................................................................................................... 3  
Abstract .................................................................................................................................................. 7  
Introduction ........................................................................................................................................... 8  
Chapter 1; Research setting .................................................................................................................. 10  
  Problem Field ........................................................................................................................................ 10  
  Research questions ............................................................................................................................... 11  
  Relevance .............................................................................................................................................. 13  
  Methodology .......................................................................................................................................... 14  
Chapter 2; Research ............................................................................................................................. 16  
  Background analysis ............................................................................................................................. 16  
  Mediation Strategy ............................................................................................................................... 19  
    Part 1; Theoretical framework for the Mediation Strategy ................................................................. 19  
    Part 2; Process model of the Mediation Strategy .............................................................................. 31  
    Part 3; Project model of the Mediation Strategy ............................................................................. 36  
Chapter 3; Case example of A13/A16 ................................................................................................. 44  
  Introduction A13/A16 .......................................................................................................................... 44  
  Part A: Analysis .................................................................................................................................. 45  
  Part B: Framing the problem ................................................................................................................ 57  
  Part C: Mutual Gains Approach ......................................................................................................... 66  
  Part D: Consensus ............................................................................................................................... 69  
Chapter 4; Discussion ........................................................................................................................... 74  
Chapter 5; Conclusions and recommendations ............................................................................... 77  
  Conclusions .......................................................................................................................................... 77  
  Recommendations; .............................................................................................................................. 79  
References ............................................................................................................................................... 80  
Appendices ............................................................................................................................................... 82  
Interview A13/A16 .................................................................................................................................. 83  
Mediation Strategy ............................................................................................................................... 85
BALANCING INTERESTS

Keywords: spatial planner and designer, future roles of planners and designers, mediation, communicative action, collaborative interests based design

Abstract
The role of the Spatial Planner and Designer (SPD) is changing due to changes in the communication among stakeholders of urban development. Increasingly the design is used to communicate conflicting interests among stakeholders which means that the traditional role of the SPD as a translator of a program of requirements is shifting towards the role of a facilitator of communication. This means that the design is becoming interest based, with a direct participation of stakeholders. In order to achieve a balanced design where no interest has become too dominant the SPD has to evaluate the interests and weigh them. This leads to the SPD becoming a mediator among the stakeholders in the process of urban development.

The problem with this development is that the SPD is not trained to operate as a mediator which is why this research focuses on the development of a Mediation Strategy which provides the SPD with a theoretical background as well as a practice based methodology to function as a mediator.

This strategy has been developed with the use of literature about the functioning of communication in urban development and the negotiations which take place in urban development. Based on the literature studies, process and project models have been developed for the Mediation Strategy. A single case study is then used to evaluate the mediation strategy. This showed that the Mediation Strategy provides useful insight in the complex interactions between stakeholders and that the SPD as a mediator could help a locked in negotiation beyond its stalemate. However the case study is of such nature that the time scale on which it takes place is much longer than the time scale of this research, therefore the results from the case study are only a snapshot of reality. A positive spin off effect is that the SPD while using the Mediation Strategy gains more information about the users of the space which in turn leads to a more comprehensive design.
Introduction
This research started with discussions about how the current process of urban development takes place and what the role of the community is in that process. A few years ago at a neighbourhood meeting, the results of a spatial analysis, performed by several DUT-students met the mistrust and frustration of the attaining community. What was striking was the difference in perspective. The way the students perceived the neighbourhood and the way the community perceived their daily living environment naturally had a big difference but in the feedback of the community this difference was perceived as negative and gave reason for mistrust and frustration towards the ‘experts’. In the discussions that followed, the members of the community opted that a solution for less mistrust and frustration could be a dialogue between experts, decision makers, and the community. Participation and direct user input were keywords for this dialogue.

Thoughts about participation and direct user input lay dormant for a while although with discussions about the way the build environment should take shape the frustration of that particular neighbourhood meeting had changed my personal perception about the way the urban development process could take place. What followed is a critique towards the study of spatial planning and strategy since it currently does not provide basis for studying how the urban development process takes place or should take place. From a personal fascination, discussions about the way the urban development process should take place were followed and when the question came to develop a subject for the graduation projects the fascination turned into an actual study.

The first ideas started with studying the bottom-up approach and how to help the community as the SPD to participate in the urban development process. Soon it was found that this topic has long been studied and that advocacy planning did not prove to be as successful as it seems. What did follow from these studies is the point of friction between the bottom-up and the top-down approach where the SPD could help the discussions forward by facilitating the communication with the translation of arguments. After studying this matter the trend of planning and design as a communicative action crystallised into the current research.

What was discovered is that planning and design as a communicative action and the role of the SPD that goes with that was a subject which the current curriculum did not treat. The idea to construct a Mediation Strategy which would provide an answer to the SPD as to how to operate as a mediator in the urban development process seemed the next logical step. This report shows how the final idea has been worked out and how the end results provide an argument to the discussions about the way the urban development process takes place.

The report is structured in five chapters. Chapter 1 goes into the research setting, elaborates on the problem field and concludes with an argumental line which has been the backbone of this research. Chapter 2 is the actual research and starts off with a background analysis of the current trends in urbanism. The background analysis puts this research in perspective and provides the argument for why the Mediation Strategy could prove necessary in the coming future. After the background analysis the Mediation Strategy is elaborated. This elaboration is split up in three parts which together provide the SPD with the theoretical background, an overview of the process and a way how to handle a Mediation Strategy on a certain project. Chapter 3 is the evaluation of the Mediation Strategy and starts with an example of how the Mediation Strategy would work in practice.
at project level. This example is a single case study of the bypass of the A13/A16 in the north of Rotterdam.

Figure 1, Location case example A13/A16

After the case study the evaluation answers questions about the legitimacy of the SPD as a mediator by showing what value the SPD as a mediator can generate for stakeholders. Finally the applicability of the Mediation Strategy is answered by showing what types of cases could be tackled by the Mediation Strategy. Chapter 4 then provides arguments for the discussion about the role of the SPD as a mediator. Finally in chapter 5, conclusions and recommendations are provided.
Chapter 1; Research setting
This chapter starts with explaining the context in which this research is set. Following from this context the problem statement is formulated as well as the research questions. Once the direction of the research is set the scientific and societal relevance of this research is explained. At the end of this chapter the way this research has taken place is explained in the methodology section.

Problem Field
The traditional role in which the SPD translates a program of requirements into a spatial design or plan is not sufficient anymore for the current and emerging urban development process. (ECTP, 2003, OECD, 2001, Carmona, 2005) The purpose of design is changing from a translation of requirements into a medium for discussion about the interests of various stakeholders in the urban development process. (Blank, 2009)

Figure 2, Design to overcome differences
The cause of this shift is the change in the hierarchy in the urban development process. Where the public sector used to be the initial key player in a vertical process this has shifted to a process in which the public sector, the private sector and the civil society interact in a horizontal and less hierarchical manner. (Hulsbergen, 2005)

Figure 3, Shift from vertical to horizontal interaction
This horizontal way of interaction means more stakeholders join the discussion about the future shape of the build environment. More stakeholders results in more discussions about the shape and function of the build environment due to the increased variety of (conflicting) interests. In order to overcome the differences between the interests of stakeholders, the design is used as a means of conflict resolution. (Edelman, 2007)

The increase in communication and its resulting shift in the purpose of the design ask for a change in the role of the planner and designer. Translating interests is increasingly becoming more important; this points to the direction of the SPD as a mediator of interests in the process of urban development. (ECTP, 2003) In order to achieve a balanced program of requirements it becomes
necessary to take into account all the stakeholders and their various interests and formulate a plan or design which meets the demand of current and future societies. (Innes and Booher, 1999) To achieve such a balanced program of requirements, the SPD should consult and weigh all the interests of the various stakeholders against each other. Here the SPD operates as a mediator between the design of “good public space” and the interests of all relevant stakeholders. (Carmona, 2005)

That the SPD is suited to be a mediator lies in the fact that he or she is capable of breaking down the communicative barrier between stakeholders. (Innes and Booher, 1999) This is done making use of the qualities of the SPD namely the means to translate arguments into design or plans. Communicating through the means of imagery provides a better understanding between stakeholders at variance and increases the chance that the discussion will focus on the build environment instead of emotions. (Carmona, 2005) That the SPD should not only translate between stakeholders but also should weigh their arguments and mediate among them is because of the expertise the SPD brings to the discussion. The SPD is educated to work with desirable, probable, and possible futures (Jong and Voordt, 2002) in which the desirable future can be seen as the interests the stakeholders have. The SPD is also able to show whether interests provided here have a probable or possible future and what the effects will be on the build environment on larger (time) scale. (Carmona, 2005) This expertise makes that the SPD could balance the interests in order to come to a consensus in which the interests are valued in a professional way. (Edelman, 2007)

However, in current practice the SPD is not trained or educated to be a mediator. The conflicts and discussions that may rise between stakeholders can become very complex and a way in which the SPD could translate and communicate the various interests in a transparent way is not provided by the current training. The lack of this training and the challenge given by the practice provide the starting point of this research which results in the following problem statement.

**Problem statement;**

The SPD could play a central communicative role in the process of urban development and at the same time use his expert knowledge and creative skills to mediate between parties at variance. However, in current practice the SPD is not trained to operate as a mediator.

This research aims at constructing a theoretical and operational framework (a mediation strategy) for the SPD to operate as a mediator in the changing context of urban development. In order to develop such a mediation strategy several research questions are formulated.

**Research questions**

The main research question spins off from the problem statement and aims at solving the implicit question posed here. The question related to the problem statement is that the SPD is not trained as a mediator and in his current training not ready to start problem solving in the complex interactions between stakeholders. The main research question should answer this statement.

**Main Research Question;**

How can the SPD meet the emerging mediator role given by the changing urban development process?
Answering the main research question can be done by developing a mediation strategy and evaluating whether this provides grip on the complex interactions between stakeholders. To develop a mediation strategy, information is needed about the way the SPD could operate as a mediator. The first step is to develop a theoretical framework on which the actual mediation strategy can be based. Sub research question 1 thus becomes:

**Sub research question 1.1; Mediation theory**

*What theories provide a theoretical framework which could formulate a mediation strategy for the SPD?*

With just a theoretical framework the main research question cannot be answered. Translating the theory to a process model which provides an overview of the practice is therefore needed. The question which should be answered based on the theoretical framework then becomes:

**Sub research question 1.2; Mediation process**

*Based on the theoretical framework how does the process model of a mediation strategy in the practice of urban development look like?*

Once the process of the Mediation Strategy has taken shape it is still not functional for practice. Developing the process model into a project model where the steps and the methods are explained on project level will make the Mediation Strategy ready for practice. The question to be answered for this project model then will be:

**Sub research question 1.3; Mediation project**

*How will the process model of the Mediation Strategy operate at project level?*

The role of the SPD is changing however this does not mean that a new role in the process of urban development will be accepted automatically by other actors in the process. Therefore there is the question about the legitimacy of the SPD in a more political role in the urban development process. In order to answer this question of legitimacy we will look into the added value of the SPD as a mediator in the communicative interactions between stakeholders. Sub research question 2 then becomes:

**Sub research question 2; Legitimacy**

*In what ways does the SPD as a mediator in the process of urban development provide value for the other actors?*

Value here is to be taken broader than just the monetary term, all aspects which increase the value of the process or the outcome are regarded as added value; this includes for example aspects as aesthetics and sustainability. (Rowley, 1998)
The problem statement in combination with the research questions provides the argumental line for this research. This line operates as a backbone throughout the research and while it may seem like a straightforward process actually much iteration has taken place. Answering the questions occurred sometimes in a random order or even simultaneously. This line is used to keep grip on the direction and focus of the research. For now it can be used for the reader to keep an overview of the research and follow the flow of arguments of this research.

![Argumental line of the research](image)

### Relevance

The role of planning and design in the debate about the build environment is as old as the profession itself and ongoing. However with the notion of Innes and Booher (1999) that planning and design has become part of communicative action the academic discussion takes a clear direction. As Innes and Booher (1999) describe planning and design functions as an articulation of interests and is used to overcome differences between stakeholders in the urban development process. Besides the different view on the function of planning and design the involvement of all stakeholders in a true participation is also part of the paradigm shift described (Ibid). The paradigm shift towards planning and design as communicative action is underpinned with the publication of the New Charter of Athens (ECTP, 2003). The New Charter clearly defines the various aspects of planning and design and goes into detail about the various roles of the SPD. Besides the traditional role of designer the role of the SPD as a mediator and advisor of the political processes that steer urban development processes is made explicit. The SPD among other things should facilitate true participation, collaborate with and coordinate all involved parties in order to find consensus, and strive for a high level of communication (Ibid). Carmona (2005) translates the communicative action as overcoming the professional- layperson, powerful- powerless, and designer- user gaps and further stresses the need for the SPD to facilitate participation and communication.

Besides these three publications there is an abundance of publications that goes into the need for the SPD to operate as a mediator or to facilitate true participation and communication however what is lacking in the current debate is the way in which the SPD could actually perform these advices. What most of the literature have in common is the development of guidelines or competences but a translation of these discussions to practice remains to be done. (Carmona, 2005, Edelman, 2007, Blank, 2009)

The development of a Mediation Strategy could provide new insights in the academic discussion about the role of the SPD and provide future planners and designers with insight in how their
practice relates to the complex interactions between stakeholders. Furthermore overcoming the gap between the academic debate and the societal debate with the use of communication and participation could deliver better design and more understanding between the motives that steer designers and users (Carmona 2005).

In the societal debate it shows that the government although they do have the ambition to let the civil society participate in the decision processes seems afraid to do so. Besides the anxiety of the government they seemingly have a lack of means to let people truly participate. (Heijden, 2007) The private sector is beyond that and wants to cooperate with current and future users in order to meet specific demands and to speed up the process where the civil society has the legal rights to complain or have a say in the project. (Rooy, 2007) The civil society does want to participate and argues why their interests should be taken into account in the earlier phases of urban development. Some even develop their own means to participate or become developers themselves. (Cornelissen et al., 2007)

Although it seems that the will is there to have collaborative interest based urban development processes they do not occur frequently. What the Mediation Strategy could provide for all stakeholders is a transparent process where the argumentation about the development is clear and understandable for everyone. Furthermore it provides a way to participate on an equal basis.

**Methodology**

The methodology to get to the Mediation Strategy is mainly a theoretical one with sometimes an addition from the practice. The project starts with the problem statement of the SPD who is not trained to be a mediator. Because the problem statement is based on trends the first step in the methodology is to do a background analysis. Information about the impact and duration of the current trends should become visible from an analysis about the factors that pushed previous discourses in urban development. The analysis is done as a literature research over four time frames making use of discourses and tipping points.

![Figure 5, background analysis](image)

After the background analysis the construction of the Mediation Strategy can begin, from here on the process becomes an iterative process where going back and forth between research questions provided the answers needed. The method of constructing the theoretical framework for the Mediation Strategy is a literature research about the role of the SPD as a mediator, starting in the literature field of urban planning and design. After the first literature has been studied the question was which fields of theory missed in the planning
and design literature. Negotiation theory and the theory of communicative action provided the answer. Combining these fields is explained in chapter 2, section theoretical framework for the Mediation Strategy. The construction of the process model is based on iterations between the theoretical framework, the case study and the project model. The same counts for the project model of the Mediation Strategy. How these have been formulated can be found in chapter 2, section Mediation Strategy.

Figure 7, finding the right theories
Chapter 2; Research
This chapter goes into the background analysis of the trends described in the problem field. A broader definition of what is happening in the previous and current discourse of urbanism will be given. The second part of this chapter aims at answering how a Mediation Strategy could look like.

Background analysis
Because this research spins off from the current and future trend of the design as a means of communication the background of this trend should be explained first in order to gain insight in, and to verify, the current trend. In order to analyse the background of the current trends, the way the various discourses in urbanism have shifted from one to another will be looked into. The use of discourse is taken because this reflects the discussion about the way urbanism takes shape in the societal and academic debate. (Mumford, 2000)

The aim is to find relations between changing context and changes in the discourse of urbanism. By mapping these relations and the influence from the context on the discourse of urbanism we gain a better understanding of the processes which are going on today and in the near future of urbanism.

The analysis is done using four time spans in which the discourse shifted from one to another, these are; the industrial age, the modern age, the post modern age, and the global age (Hall, 2002). By reasoning back from the tipping points in these time spans and examine how the context has changed and influenced the formation of urban theory and practise we can see the processes that steer the discourse of urbanism. Described here are only the results from the analysis, for more information see appendix ... Context of Change.

Factors for change
The start of urban planning and design as we know it today has strong roots in the industrial age. The reasons for a profession of town planning lie in the following aspects;

- The spatial fabric of cities under stress
- Vast amounts of work in industrial cities
- Increased population due to better health care
- Need for political control
- Rise of the middle class

The breakthrough of modernism as the international style is marked as the modern age. The actual tipping point from which modernism took flight is the reconstruction period after WWII. The factors which have influenced the discourse of modernism are mainly between WWI and II and are the following:

- Strong political control in after war periods
- Mechanisation of the building process
- Emancipation of the working class
- Emerge of abstract art
- Shock due to war
- Damaged spatial fabric
The shift from modernism to the postmodern age is marked by the chaotic and rebellious decades of the 1960s and 1970s. The publication of Learning from las Vegas (Venturi 1972) marked the tipping point of post-modernism however the factors which caused the shift have their origin at the end of the 1950s. The factors which caused the change are:

- Change in cultural discourse,
- Distrust from society and academics
- Pragmatism
- Chaos theory
- Paradigm shift
- The re-emerge of ethics in politics
- Regeneration of the spatial fabric

At the end of the 1980s the discourse of urbanism shifted into another direction, the global age. Although this age is not marked by a specific architecture the way we look at cities and the way we develop cities did change. Reasons for this shift in discourse go back to the oil crises of the 1970s and are the following:

- Shocks due to economic recessions
- Unemployment
- De-industrialisation
- Derelict spatial fabric
- Formation of robust global systems

The global age is still ongoing and provides the background of the current trend in which the role of the SPD in the process of urban development is changing. In order to say something about how the SPD relates to the shifting discourses we can draw the conclusion that the previous shifts happened outside the scope of the SPD. The factors that causes the societal and academic discourse to change stems from a variety of fields like:

- Politics
- Economy
- Society
- Technological developments
- Academic debate
- The state of the spatial fabric
- Shocks like war and recession

These factors, which influence and accelerate each other as well, seem to boil up to a certain point on which one or more factors cause political, social and economic will to change the discourse of urbanism. Shocks to these factors like war and economic recession seem to fuel changes. And finally the society in each of the shifting discourses was at the centre of attention. Liberating the people from the conditions they were left in due to former conditions created societal will to accept a new discourse.

Back to the current state we are in. The paradigm of planning and design as a communicative action originates from the increase of stakeholders which is fuelled by decentralisation policy (OECD, 2001,
ECTP, 2003, Sassen, 2006) and increased reliance on private parties (OECD, 2001, Sassen, 2006). This is strengthened with the ongoing formation of robust global systems (Sassen, 2006). Following from the factors that push the current trends it seems likely that they will continue to go on and maybe even cause a shift in the current discourse of urbanism. It may be too early to come to the conclusion that a shift will occur but the following factors could push the course of urbanism in a new direction in which the SPD operates in a different role;

- Stress on the spatial fabric (OECD, 2001)
- Increased unemployment rates
- Recession
- War on terrorism
- Academic debate about the effects of neo-liberal policy (Carmona, 2005)
- Socio-spatial ruptures (OECD, 2001), pressure on the public sphere (Madanipour, 2003),
- Socio-political unrest (Frieling, 2006)

The analysis has shown that the discourse of urbanism is affected greatly outside the scope of the SPD. Furthermore it makes clear that the trends from which the changing role of the SPD originates are happening in a broader context and are likely to continue. This underpins the need for the SPD to develop new strategies for the future roles of planning and design. Developing a Mediation Strategy could help open new insights and work fields for the SPD in a future context.
Mediation Strategy
This section is build up in three parts; the first describes the theoretical framework about communication and the role of the SPD in a collaborative process. The second part describes the process of a mediation strategy which is based on the theoretical framework of part 1. The last part describes the methods and actions on the project level of the Mediation Strategy; this is based on the process model given by part 2.

Part 1; Theoretical framework for the Mediation Strategy
This part goes into sub research question 3.1 and aims at finding a suitable theoretical framework for the SPD to operate as a mediator in the urban development process. The question to be answered here is;

What theories provide a theoretical framework which could formulate a mediation strategy for the SPD?

The theoretical framework following from this question provides the input for a process model of the Mediation Strategy. The fields which are studied in order to develop the theoretical framework of the Mediation Strategy are;

- Communication theory
- Negotiation theory
- In combination with methodology of Spatial Planning and Design

Communication as a function of urban development
The main function of communication is being the carrier of information which in turn influences decisions, opinions and perspectives. (Innes and Booher, 1999) The degree to which the communication is successful thus influences the outcome of decisions and the understanding of each other’s perspectives.

For the practice of planning and design a successful communication would mean a communication which results in consensus over a planning or design decision. This is where the role of the SPD is redefined. When the SPD would facilitate the communication by translating the various means of information in visual representations the understanding of each other’s meaning and interpretation of information would increase. (Carmona, 2005) This is underpinned by the OECD (2001) and the ECTP (2003) who argue that the role of the SPD as a facilitator and political advisor will increase as the process of communication in urban development becomes more complex.
That this process reflects a paradigm shift in the perspective of the role of communication in the urban development process. (Innes and Booher, 1999) Planning and design in the emerging paradigm is understood as a communicative action. Communicative action is based on the theory of communicative rationality by Habermass (1984) who defines communicative action as follows:

"The concept of communicative action presupposes the use of language as a medium for a kind of reaching understanding, in the course of which participants, through relating to a world, reciprocally raise validity claims that can be accepted or contested."

This means that communicative action aims at reaching for understanding each other in order to search for consensus, see image below. Language as defined here is not just in spoken words but a broader definition which also includes the use of images. (Habermas, 1984)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Action orientation} & \text{Oriented to success} & \text{Oriented to reaching understanding} \\
\text{Action Situation} & \text{Non-social} & \text{Instrumental action} & \text{Social} & \text{Strategic action} & \text{Communicative action} \\
\end{array}
\]

*Figure 12, placing communicative action in its context (Heath, 2001)*

If we use this definition by Habermass and translate it for the purpose of spatial planning and design the definition would be as follows;

*Communicative action in planning and design takes into account the use of drawings as a medium by which actors in society seek to reach common understanding and coordinate actions by reasoned argument, consensus, and cooperation.*

If deliberations and learning in the urban development process takes place in a collaborative and communicative way the SPD needs to establish a new role for information. To help to ensure that decisions take into account important knowledge and perspectives and that it is in some sense socially just, and not just co-opt those in weaker positions, the role of information which is to be carried out by the SPD should answer to the following principles of communicative rationality (Innes and Booher, 1999):

- Individuals representing all the important interests in the issue must be at the table
- All must be equally empowered in the discussion
- The discussion must be carried on in terms of good reasons, so that the power of a good argument is the important dynamic
- The discussion must allow all claims and assumptions to be questioned/ all constraints to be tested, these can be assessed by four tests
  1. Speakers must speak sincerely and honestly
  2. They must be in a legitimate position to say what they do, with credentials or experience to back them up
3. They must speak comprehensibly, jargon and technical language communicates poorly
4. They must speak factually accurate in terms of scientific or other methods of verification
   - The group should seek consensus

This provides the first building block of the theoretical framework;

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 13, Theoretical basis based on communicative rationality**

In this diagram the SPD could be the carrier of information and provide the means, translating the language into uniform drawings, to communicate between the various stakeholders. The next section goes into the way the SPD should act between stakeholders when in this position.

**Negotiating the outcome of collaborative processes**

As the SPD moves into the collaborative processes he or she will inevitably become part of the negotiations which are part of reaching a consensus in the urban development process. The starting point therefore for a theoretical basis about the way the SPD should operate lies in negotiation theory.

Roger Fisher (1981) defines “negotiation” to include “all cases in which two or more parties are communicating, each for the purpose of influencing the other’s decision.” Negotiation starts with the stakeholders involved in the process who have a different interest in the outcome of the process. All real estate developments and city planning activities are linked to specific needs or interests. The interaction of these interests is what produces urban development. (Edelman, 2007) The negotiation situation is characterized by two or more stakeholders who have contending interests, and choose to address their differences by striving to reach for an agreement through a process of mutual adjustments of demands. (Lewicki et al., 2006) Communication therefore is at the core of the negotiation process, the success of a negotiated outcome depends largely on the successful communication between stakeholders (Edelman, 2007).

This places the position of the SPD in between stakeholders who have contending interests. In this position the SPD operates as a facilitator of communication. (Innes and Booher, 1999) The role of
information is to establish common understanding and coordination of actions. It is in this position that the SPD could also act as a mediator thus create added value to the flow of information. As a mediator the SPD could provide more possible and desirable solutions to a conflict which concerns the build environment thus providing alternatives to a locked negotiation. Furthermore the SPD could balance the relations by providing expert knowledge and understanding about the functioning of the build environment.

The concept of the SPD as a mediator is not new; already in the 1980s the concept of a planner as a mediator has been developed. (Susskind et al., 1999) This is further explained in the New Charter of Athens (ECTP, 2003) where the SPD as a mediator should, among other things, be committed to;

- Provide civic authorities with plans and solutions aiming at enhancing public welfare.
- Suggest and elaborate operational legislative tools to ensure efficiency and social justice in spatial policies.
- Facilitate true public participation and involvement between local authorities, decision-makers, economic stakeholders and individual citizens in order to co-ordinate developments and ensure spatial continuity and cohesion.
- Collaborate with and co-ordinate all involved parties in order to find consensus or solve conflicts by clear decisions prepared for the appropriate authorities.
- Strive for a high level of communication to ensure knowledge and understanding among the future users

The recommendations above provide us with a starting point which is closely related to the outcome of the communicative rationality but it does not provide the practice of planning and design with an adequate framework which shows how the SPD could bring forward his expert knowledge and communicative skills in a collaborative process. The search for a theory which does support a theoretical framework followed from the principles of rational communication. This focused the search for a negotiation method on an integrative model which did not only co-opt those in the weaker positions but involved all stakeholders in reaching an integrative solution.

**Consensus building**

An integrative process model which is tested and has already demonstrated its applicability in spatial planning and design is the Consensus building approach (Susskind et al., 1999). What separates this approach from other integrative processes is that the “parties strive for unanimity and overwhelming agreement based on informed decision-making” (Edelman, 2007). “In practice this definition of consensus does not means that everyone necessarily agrees with the decision, but does mean that those who don’t agree are aware of the content and context of the decision and can cope with the results” (Ibid). The Consensus Building process leads from the problems and issues to a shared vision of the future in the following way;

![Figure 14, phases of Consensus Building (Strauss, 1999 in Edelman 2007)](image)
This provides the SPD with a process overview of the negotiation. Working from a problem definition or an analysis to a vision of the future is what planners and designers are trained for (Jong and Voordt, 2002) which is why this model of consensus building provides the lay-out of the theoretical framework.

**Capacity and mediation**

With the lay-out of the theoretical framework defined, the next step in developing the framework is to get all the stakeholders to cooperate in integrative development. Edelman (2007) proposes two main functions for integrative development; capacity building, and mediation. Capacity building here is defined as teaching the principles of integrative development to the involved stakeholders thus creating knowledge and will to cooperate in integrative development. (Ibid) Mediation is defined as an “intervention in a negotiation or conflict of an acceptable third party who has limited decision-making power but who assists the involved parties in voluntarily reaching a mutually acceptable settlement of issues in dispute” (Moore, 2003)

![Figure 15, Basic frame of the Mediation Strategy](image)

This gives two clear objectives in negotiation;

- In the start-up phase the creation of knowledge and will to cooperate in integrative development
- In the actual negotiation, the assisting of reaching a mutually acceptable settlement

In order to get more grips on these two objectives the capacity and mediation will be explained in more detail.

**The start-up phase**

First some more background information about negotiation; in negotiation there are two main options, distributive and integrative bargaining. Distributive bargaining focuses on win-lose, competitive bargaining, while integrative bargaining focuses on win-win, collective bargaining. (Lewicki et al., 2006) These two bargaining methods are not mutually exclusive (Edelman, 2007) however the latter is preferred due to the integrative character and the focus on win win situations which is in line with the social aspects of communicative action. (Innes and Booher, 1999)

A mental model for the bargaining process is the dual concern model (Edelman, 2007). It represents the strategic interests used by the various stakeholders in the process of negotiation.
Figure 16, the dual concern model (Edelman, 2007)

This mental model gives a quick insight in how stakeholders could react in the process or how they currently are reacting. Furthermore it shows that stakeholders who have a high degree of self-interest and a high degree of concern for others interest would be more willing to agree on collaborative problem solving (upper right corner).

The focus on interests in negotiations is based on the book ‘Getting to yes’ (Fisher and Ury, 1981) which defines the following characteristics of interest based negotiations;

- Bargaining over positions is avoided
- People are separated from the problem
- Focus is placed on interests, not positions
- Options for mutual gain are invented
- Objective criteria are used to select the appropriate resolution to an issue

Using these characteristics increases the range of alternative solutions for a problem so that the chance of finding a solution which meets more interests or provides a win win solution increases. The way in which the SPD could facilitate this process is by formulating more alternatives in the form of possible and desirable futures and by translating interests into uniform drawings which then could be communicated among stakeholders.

The spatial representation of interests can be measured by the way people perceive space. This perception is formed by the way places affect people and how people formulate the spirit of a place. (Day and Parnell, 2003)
The spirit Day and Parnell (2003) describe is for this research to be seen as the perspective one has on the environment. The way people build this perspective is how they are affected by the environment but also by their interests in space. The perception of space is thus built up in two ways. The first is the material sense of place, for example the way a park makes people feel. The second is the way people build up a mental image of space based on their background and interests. If this image is fixed then people will hold on to positional bargaining, while if this image is open to suggestions people will be able to perceive more visions of possible and desirable futures. Here the SPD could operate in the following ways;

- Analyse and map the current perception of space (Lynch, 1960), and thus interest.
- Provide possible and desirable futures of places (Jong and Voordt, 2002), and thus separate people from their positional bargaining

The perceptions then could be used to strengthen integrative bargaining by:

- Showing to which degree emotional screens of individual perceptions exist and to which degree they match reality (Filley, 1975)
- Motivating stakeholders to acknowledge and validate each other’s perspective with their own perspective (Lewicki et al., 2006)
- Increase cooperation by emphasizing commonalities and shared preferences (Filley, 1975)

The reasoning above provides the theoretical background for the capacity building. The capacity building is set in the conceptual framework of the dual concern model and the relation between the interest based collaborative negotiation and the theory of planning and design is made through the translation of interests into perspectives and with the capacity of the SPD to formulate possible and desirable futures.
Negotiation

The objective of the negotiation process is to find win win solutions on the basis of interests rather than positions. A win win solution is defined as; In a win win solution different stakeholders interact as vital parts of the same process, the production of the built environment, rather than opponents seeking value at the expense of the others. (Lewicki et al., 2006) This can further be explained by the example of the orange; here two girls were fighting over an orange and the solution given by their mother was to split the orange in halves. However one girl needed the peel to bake a pie while the other wanted to eat the fruit. If they had communicated about their interests they could have find a win win solution of separating the peel from the fruit. (Edelman, 2007) In an attempt to frame this in a larger and more complex setting Edelman (2007) proposes the use of the Mutual Gains approach (Susskind and Field, 1996) as a mental model for consensus building.

The Mutual Gains approach has six basic principles which were originally developed to deal with an angry public. It focuses on the accumulation of trust among the stakeholders through joint fact-finding and problem-solving. (Edelman, 2007) The six basic principles are (Susskind and Field, 1996);

- Acknowledge the concern of the other side.
- Encourage joint fact finding.
- Offer contingent commitments to minimize impacts if they do occur; promise to compensate knowable but unintended impacts.
- Accept responsibility, admit mistakes, and share power.
- Act in a trustworthy fashion at all times.
- Focus on building long-term relationships.

The intended outcome proposed by the consensus building is a shared vision of the future. The definition of a vision is that of a personal or a group desired future. This could pose a problem to the integrative bargaining process because the desire for a certain future could fix stakeholders in a position. In order to overcome this, the use of scenarios is proposed. Scenarios are representations of a possible future which can be used as a tool to explore spatial implications over time (ways to study). Following this reasoning the scenarios on which consensus is reached are Mutual Gains scenarios. The use of scenarios instead of visions provides another useful method for the SPD which is the use of mixed scanning. Once a mutual gains scenario is agreed upon it can be developed into a strategic design making use of mixed scanning. Mixed scanning provides the tools for the SPD to evaluate the mutual gains scenarios (Drewe, 2008) and it generates an output on which stakeholders can deliberate. Once agreed upon, the outputs generated by mixed scanning can be used as a program of requirements for the realisation phase of urban development.

![Figure 19, mixed scanning, adapted from (Drewe, 2008)](image-url)
The Mutual Gains approach will be used as the conceptual framework for the mediation. On the basis of interests the aim is to develop win win solutions for a mediated outcome. The principles given by Susskind (1996) provide a guideline for this process. The relation with planning and design is made with the use of scenarios, which function as possible futures in which the win win solutions given by the mutual gains approach can be tested.

With the development of the theoretical background of the capacity building and the mediation the theoretical framework now looks as follows;

For the practice of planning and design this framework is still not complete. What it lacks is the analysis and the output which can be used in the further stages of the process of urban development. The output has already been discussed and could follow from processing the Mutual Gains scenarios with the mixed scanning method. The analysis however still needs to be addressed.

**Analysis**

Prior to the negotiation the SPD should analyse the potentials of the location and gain insight in where the interests of stakeholders are generated (Edelman, 2007) as well as formulate his or her own interest. In identifying possible solutions for the negotiation process Edelman (2007) proposes to use the ‘Sneaking ghost method’. This is based on identifying urban potentials, and links the potentials of urban places with the interests of the stakeholders to generate a joint solution. The interests of the stakeholders follow from the start up of the negotiation process where the mental images of the stakeholders will be translated to perspectives which reflects the interests (Day and Parnell, 2003), the urban potentials have to be identified before that making use of a spatial analysis.
The classical approach of a spatial analysis is the figure ground analysis however this does not provide insight in the interests of stakeholders. An approach is needed which goes into the interaction of urban functions and users. A type of analysis which is closely related to these topics is the 'Success and failure of city parks' (Jong et al., 2008). The method of is based on the practical theories of Jane Jacobs (Jacobs, 1961) and Lynch (1960) about the functioning of space in relation to its users. The City Park analysis places the research area in its context and shows how it functions internally, in relation to similar areas, and to its users. (Jong et al., 2008) Functions of the analysis are:

- Reach
- Density
- Uniqueness
- Mixed functions
- Connectivity
- Accessibility
- Routing
- Identity

A more detailed description about the use of these functions in found in the project model of the Mediation Strategy on page 34.

Arguments in favour of this type of analysis are;

- The SPD gains fast insight in how and why the space is currently functioning as it is,
- The SPD can relate to arguments/interests of stakeholders why the space is functioning as it is
- The analysis provides an instrument about the possible effects of an intervention

A spatial analysis alone does not suffice because this does not give all the information about who has an interest in the location and who has what kind of power. A stakeholder’s analysis should also be done prior to the negotiations. The goal of this analysis is to gain insight in who has an interest and who has what power in the urban development process. Early identification of stakeholders is crucial to the negotiation process because when stakeholders are left out of the process or are uninformed
while they do have an interest in the project then their position towards collaboration is damaged (TNO, 2006). Identifying the stakeholders starts with the question of whom tangible and intangible has an interest in the space under research. Intangible here stands for the stakeholders who do not have a direct say in the process, like tourists or the passer by. After the stakeholders have been identified then the power they have in the process should be judged. The relation between the amount of interest and power can then be displayed in a power – interest diagram. This is to get acquainted with possible power struggles in the negotiation process and frustrations of those who do not have any power. This diagram should be used as an indication, while relations between stakeholders may change and power and interest may decrease or increase (TNO, 2006).

Combining the analysis and the output to the conceptual frameworks of capacity building and mediation gives the following theoretical framework.

Making use of the theoretical knowledge the SPD should have more grips on how the communication and negotiation in an interest based collaborative process works. This does not say anything about the functioning of the SPD as a mediator. The SPD should still develop a knowledge base about the way a mediator should operate as a person. Following from the theory above there are some pointers which the SPD should take into account when operating as a mediator.
The SPD as a mediator

In operating as a mediator the SPD should consider that he or she is not impartial to the outcome of the process. The SPD as a professional of the built environment has a specific own opinion about the definition of good place making. (Carmona, 2005) However this is not a handicap if used proper then the expert knowledge of the SPD in combination with the user knowledge of the stakeholders could enhance the outcome of the process in terms of a balanced design in a matter of scale and time. (Day and Parnell, 2003)

In order to have a transparent negotiation process the SPD should communicate clearly what his or her input is in the process and why some decisions should be taken on the basis of expert knowledge. (Innes and Booher, 1999) This is to avoid technocratic behaviour and to keep all the stakeholders informed about the way the planning and design processes take shape. (Carmona and Tiesdell, 2007) In order to communicate this as transparent as possible the SPD should separately, based on the analysis and his or her expert opinion create a conceptual design and take this to the negotiation as the interest of the expert.

As a person the SPD should possess some qualities when operating as a mediator. Edelman (2007) names the following key qualities. The SPD as a mediator should display;

- Demonstrated integrity and impartiality to the process
- A basic knowledge of and belief in the integrative bargaining process
- Firm faith in voluntarism, in contrast to dictation
- A fundamental belief in human values and potentials, tempered by the ability to assess personal weaknesses as well as strengths
- The ability to analyze what is available, in contrast to what may be desirable

Furthermore Edelman (2007) gives some pointers on how the SPD could shape the information in the process;

- Redrawing and posing solutions that increase value of or around a location, the notion of value is better understood by people
- Stakeholders configure and reconfigure the solutions to include elements fulfilling their interests during the process
- Uncertainty exists; as a conflict escalates, early proposals and solutions may come to be seen as unfeasible.

The theoretical framework in combination with the mediation role of the SPD should give a background on which the SPD is able to guide the process of negotiation in urban development. The negotiation process of the Mediation Strategy, which is based on the theoretical framework, will be discussed in the next section.
Part 2; Process model of the Mediation Strategy

The aim of the mediation strategy is to formulate a consensus between stakeholders which have contending interests over a spatial transformation. The result should be an integrative spatial strategy in which the majority of the stakeholders can find their way. In order to get to this consensus the mediation strategy is split up in two phases in which the first phase is the phase where the capacity to work together among stakeholders is being build up. This is called the capacity building. Capacity here stands for the capacity of a representative structure, the willingness to bargain and the willingness to cooperate in joint fact finding. (Edelman, 2007) The second phase focuses on reaching a consensus among the stakeholders; this phase is called the consensus building.

![Diagram of the two phases of the Mediation Strategy](image)

Figure 26, the two phases of the Mediation Strategy

The two phases are separated by a go/no go moment where the go stands for the degree of willingness among stakeholders and degree of organisation to participate in working together to reach for a consensus i.e. whether there is enough capacity to do so.

The two phases are subdivided in each two parts, making a total of four parts. These parts are;

- A: Analysis
- B: Framing the problem
- C: Mutual gains approach
- D: Consensus

![Diagram of the four steps of the Mediation Strategy](image)

Figure 27, the four steps of the Mediation Strategy
Four steps to reach consensus

The four steps described above will be explained in detail in the following section. At the end of this section the four parts are brought together which gives the process model of the Mediation Strategy. The project model on page 34 goes further into detail about the steps described here.

Part A: Analysis

Here the location, the impact of the spatial transformation, the alternatives for the spatial transformation and the stakeholders will be analysed. This is to get acquainted with the possible contending interests of the stakeholders and to formulate a professional opinion about the location and the proposed intervention. In detail this works as follows.

The analysis is done in threefold;

- Analysing the space, its function and its identity
- Mapping the proposed spatial intervention and the alternatives
- Mapping the stakeholders by making a stakeholders analysis

The outputs generated by these analyses are;

- A swot based on the analysis
- Alternatives to the intervention
- A stakeholders analysis

Part B: Framing the problem

The second part, the framing of the problem, is to get to know in detail how the stakeholders perceive the current space and the proposed spatial transformation as well as the interests of the stakeholders. This is done by means of interviews. During these interviews the aim is to avoid positional thinking. In detail this works as follows.

Based on the spatial analysis and the scenarios the SPD formulates;

- His or her own professional vision
- A conceptual design or spatial strategy

Based on the stakeholders analysis the stakeholders will be structured into homogeneous groups of interest. These groups will be interviewed about;

- Their position and power in the process
- Their perception of the space
- Their perception of the proposed spatial intervention and its alternatives
- Possible bargain areas in or around the location
- Their capacity to join in an integrative approach
If all stakeholders have enough capacity, i.e. a representative structure, the willingness to bargain and the willingness to cooperate in joint fact finding. Than the process moves on to the mutual gains approach.

The outputs generated from part B are;

- The capacity from the stakeholders to participate in the consensus building phase
- In depth interviews with maps of;
  - The perception of space
  - The perception of the intervention
  - Possible bargain areas in or around the location

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 29, steps taken in part B**

**Part C: Mutual Gains approach**

The mutual gains approach is split up in two parts, the first will address the maps provided by the interviews. By comparing these maps common and conflicting goals are defined. In the second a Mutual Gains workshop is organised. Here, based on the common and conflicting goals, mutual gains scenarios are developed and evaluated.

The output generated by part C is;

- Mutual gains scenario(s) which are agreed upon.
Part D: Consensus

The last part, the consensus, starts with a mixed scanning of the scenario(s) developed in part C. Using mixed scanning the SPD works towards a single integrative vision which is the consensus among the stakeholders. This can be done in a workshop with all the stakeholders or by the SPD him or herself. Once there is agreement of the outcome of the mixed scanning the SPD can finish the results in; an integral vision, common goals, a strategic design, and key strategic projects.

The strategic design and the strategic projects form the basis for the next phase in the urban development process. The level of detail in which these strategic projects are worked out depends on the project but it has to be high enough so that major disagreements between stakeholders will not occur in the continuation of the planning process.

The output generated by part D is:

- An integral vision, common goals, a strategic design, and key strategic projects.

Each phase as well as the separate parts in the mediation strategy forms its own closed chapter and once completed the terms on which there is agreement should not be discussed anymore. This is to
prevent lagging and to keep the discussion focused on the end result which is reaching a consensus. However additional analysis to underpin arguments is of course permitted.

In conclusion the mediation strategy has the following diagram (appendix)
Part 3: Project model of the Mediation Strategy
The following section goes into the methods and actions used/ performed by the SPD. It will show how the analysis works, how to come with a conceptual design, what type of interview, how to compare the maps of the stakeholders, how to organise the workshop, and how to use the mixed scanning and generate the intended outcome. The project model is based on the process model and translated to practice making use of the case example of the A13/A16. The structure follows that of the process model, so each part, A, B, C, and D is discussed separate.

Part A; Analysis
Spatial analysis
The methodology of the spatial analysis is based on the City Parks research by de Jong (2008). The functions of space are analysed as follows;

Reach;
The reach of a location is measured by taking the maximum radius of which users would still travel in day to day activities. This radius around the location shows the potential reach. In order to calculate the realistic reach the surface areas which are blocked, by for example rivers or infrastructure, have to be subtracted. The result is a surface area in ha. (Jong et al., 2008)

Density;
Here the amount inhabitants within the realistic reach is calculated and divided by the surface area (ha) resulting in the user pressure per ha. (Ibid)

Uniqueness;
Uniqueness goes into the competition of the place in relation to similar places. The same method as reach is done however this also applies to the competing places. When 2 places overlap, the amount of users is divided by two from the surface of the overlapping. When 3 places overlap the amount is divided by three etc. The amount of decreased users due to competition is then subtracted from the density. The decreased number of users provides insight in the competition of the place. (Ibid)

Mixed functions;
Mixed functions involve mapping and counting the number of functions within the realistic reach. The results can be categorized after which conclusions can be drawn about the users of the space and the attraction the space has. (Ibid)

Connectivity;
Connectivity is analysed making use of space syntax. Space syntax involves a method of drawing 3 grades of lines. The first are the roads directly crossing the area to the point at where they make a turn. The second grade involves all the roads crossed by the first grade to the point at which they make a turn. The third grade

Figure 33, realistic reach
Figure 34, Density plotted over the realistic reach
Figure 35, Uniqueness
Figure 36, Mixed functions
Figure 37, Connectivity
Balancing interests

involves all the roads crossed by the second grade. The network of roads show which parts are well connected to the location and when compared to the realistic reach on can draw conclusions about regions which are better/lesser connected. (Ibid)

Accessibility;
All entrances to the area are mapped according to their type, i.e. car, bus, bike etc after which the contour in meters is divided by the amount of entrances. This gives an indication on how well the area is accessible. (Ibid)

Routing;
Routing involves the routes through the location or function. The routing is divided in external routes, and internal routes. The percentages of these in relation to each other provide insight in how the user moves through the area. (Ibid)

Identity;
The identity of a location is measured on the way the location interacts with its environment, interacts with its users, and its features and characteristics. The interaction with its environment is the way the location relates to its context. The interaction with users is the way users make use of the park and how they perceive is, i.e. safe, dirty etc. The characteristics are made up by the physical environment as well as urban furniture etc. A representation in a matrix with positive and negative aspects provides an overview and a possibility to communicate the idea of identity to others. (Ibid)

SWOT;
Based on the results above the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats are placed in a SWOT diagram. (Jong and Voordt, 2002) This is the conclusion of the analysis.
**Analysing the proposed intervention**

A set of simple questions applies here, what, why, and how? An extra question is added which is, what are the alternatives?

**Stakeholder’s analysis**

The stakeholders are mapped as with the intervention with the question of what, why and how? The results of this are placed in a power–interest diagram which shows what stakeholder is where in the process and what the relations are between stakeholders. (Carmona, 2005, TNO, 2010)
**Part B: Framing the problem**  

**Perception of the spatial planner and designer**

Based on the Swot and the preferred alternative the SPD should be able to formulate a desirable future (vision) about the location. (Jong and Voordt, 2002) This vision can be via the method of back casting (TNO, 2010) questioned of which goals it should meet in order to become reality. Based on these goals a conceptual design can take shape. Visual references and detailed (sketch) solutions should be added in order to make it as complete as possible. The goal is to communicate transparently the perception of the SPD.

**Perception and capacity of the stakeholders**

This phase starts with the identification of homogeneous interests (Edelman, 2007) and planning interviews with the stakeholders. If certain groups of stakeholders do not have a structured organisation yet then the SPD should establish these organisations. (Innes and Booher, 1999)

The interviews are structured in the following way (for the list of questions see appendix, interview A13/A16);

The interviews are informal; therefore they do not have to be strictly structured. This is to gain as much unforeseen information as possible. Start with an introduction of yourself and how the mediation strategy works. Then gain at least the following information;

1. The perception of the stakeholder of his or her own position in the process and the perception on the process itself, this is to gain more information about the stakeholders, their interrelations, their power, and expectations of the process.
2. A mental map (Lynch, 1960) of the stakeholder(s) of the location or if already present an explanation of the vision the stakeholders have prepared. Ask for definitions of the space, those that make up the identity of the space. (Jong et al., 2008) For more possible definitions about the space see Appendix defining Identity. Ask for references of the location in its current state and references in a desirable state to create an image of the definitions given.

3. The user type the stakeholder is of the proposed intervention, this gives information about the expectations the stakeholder has. Further ask for references of the ideal type of intervention and draw in an overlay on the mental map the preferred intervention. If already present a worked out alternative discuss the reasons for this alternative.

4. The interview ends with the available capacity of the stakeholder(s). First is the organisation of the stakeholders this is to avoid being present in future deliberation with too many stakeholders or unorganised stakeholders. Further ask if the stakeholder is willing to bargain about certain aspects of the location or in the neighbourhood of the location. If so draw these on an overlay on the (mental) map. Also present the stakeholder with the prospect of the interview information about other stakeholders and ask whether the stakeholder is willing to cooperate in an integrative negotiation process.

If all stakeholders have enough capacity to continue to the consensus phase then the capacity building phase is concluded. With not enough capacity the reasons for this should be examined and communicated to the other stakeholders, together with the stakeholders who are already willing to cooperate ways in which all stakeholders have enough capacity should be examined. Results from the interviews provide input of creating solutions for improvement of the capacity.
Part C: Mutual Gains Approach

Preparation
Part C starts with the preparation of the workshop and getting a date and location at which all stakeholders can be present. The preparation involves the developing of conceptual designs of the stakeholders into a way in which they can be compared to each other. The maps and information gained from the stakeholders should be the perception of space, the perception of the intervention, and the bargaining areas. Combining these maps results in a conceptual design. Once this is done for every stakeholder the comparison of these conceptual designs results in the shared and the conflicting interests.

Workshop
Before the workshop starts introduce everybody and yourself as well as the purpose of workshop. Then set up the ground rules for the workshop. These rules are to ensure that no disputes rise between stakeholders. The workshop is informal; however results aim at having their effect outside the workshop. Also wild and creative ideas are welcomed and taken serious in brainstorming sessions. After this introduction the first exercise is to find criteria for consensus which are agreed upon by all stakeholders. Once these are found the workshop can really begin.

The second exercise is to agree upon the shared interests which are the results from the interviews. The maps from the preparation should give a basis for this.

With the resulting conflicting interests the aim is to find win win solutions. Here brainstorming sessions and drawing and modelling should provide several win win solutions. The map of the
bargaining areas plays a serious role in the brainstorm sessions. The SPD should be alert of stakeholders adopting a position over certain solutions, try to keep everybody open for new ideas.

Once the brainstorm exercises have been completed the evaluation of the results can start. Solutions which are technically, financially and legally within reach should be addressed and discussed. The results on which consensus is reached can be taken to the next round.

The final exercise of the workshop is to integrate the shared view with the win win solutions from the evaluation into mutual gains scenarios. Here is the possibility that there are multiple scenarios, try to limit the amount because the less scenarios the less discussion in the final round.

The conclusion of the workshop is/ are mutual gain scenario(s), if there is only one scenario than there is no more discussion about the possible solution however the scenario should comply with legal, financial, and technically feasibility. If there are more scenarios then another workshop should be planned in which the mixed scanning process of part D should convince stakeholders of the qualities of certain solutions.

There is the possibility that a workshop is not an option, in that case the SPD should facilitate the communication between stakeholders with for example a Delphi method. However this is not worked out within the limited timeframe of this research.
Part D: Consensus

Preferably the mixed scanning process is held as a workshop. If this is not an option the SPD should work out the results and feed these back to the stakeholders. If this is an option then the same rules apply to the mixed scanning workshop. The mixed scanning method is a cyclical process which has as many iterations as necessary to come up with a strategic design which is agreed upon and technically, financially and legally feasible. For the evaluation the effects of the strategic design can be compared to the results of the spatial analysis.

The mixed scanning process is completed once there is consensus about the direction of the intervention and what goals should be reached for. From here on the discussion is about the details of the strategic design. This does not mean that there cannot be any contending interests anymore. The SPD should be aware that creating the integral vision, detailing the common goals and drawing the definitive strategic design with key strategic projects is still a process of deliberation with all stakeholders. Input and feedback is essential to this.

For a complete overview see appendix; Methodology of the mediation strategy.
Chapter 3; Case example of A13/A16

Following the project model of the Mediation Strategy the case of A13/A16 is explained. This shows how the Mediation Strategy works in practice and gives a reference of its applicability. The Mediation Strategy proved to work quite well with the practice, it showed how the interaction between the stakeholders takes place and how the SPD could help the current negotiations forward. The scale and time frame of this case did not comply with the timeframe of this research which is why not all the elements from the Mediation Strategy have been evaluated with the stakeholders. A smaller case example could have provided a completer evaluation, however the A13/A16 was up until the capacity building successful.

The following sections will show how the Mediation Strategy operates in practice and how the output really looks like. As said the input from the stakeholders is limited to the capacity building phase, however in order to provide a complete insight the case is finished on assumptions and account of the author. The structure will follow the structure of the Mediation Strategy which is; Part A: Analysis, Part B: Framing the problem, Part C: Mutual Gains approach, and Part D: Consensus.

Introduction A13/A16

The idea of creating a bypass for the north edge of Rotterdam is one that goes back a long time. Already in 1979 the Dutch government produced a plan in which the bypass was drawn; however this plan lay dormant until the end of the 20th century. (Rijkswaterstaat, 2010)

Since the 1990’s the bypass has been discussed as a serious option to relieve the traffic pressure of the A20 and to improve living conditions in the north of Rotterdam. In 2005 the A13/A16 became the serious solution for solving the congested road network of north Rotterdam and improving the living conditions surrounding the existing highways. At the end of 2005 there was the first participation of the stakeholders in which possible solutions for fitting the bypass in the existing structure were discussed. Following from several participation moments, research and decision making processes the environmental effects report was finished in august 2009 and the discussion about the necessity and the ways the bypass should be fitted in heated up. (Ibid) From this moment this research picked up the discussion which was going on between the stakeholders involved at the section of the Lage Bergse Bos (LBB) of the bypass.

The discussion surrounding the LBB is one of a typical top-down bottom-up stalemate among the stakeholders. Mistrust and positional bargaining dominate the discussion about the current and future situation. Especially the role of the government, specifically Rijkswaterstaat, is debated as they initiated the project and make the main decisions. The participation in the process started with high
aspirations but was limited to tokenism. (Ham, 2010) True participation where all stakeholders are involved in the decision making process and have actual power was never reached. The fact that the other stakeholders felt left out of the decision making process was because the decision making of the minister stood far away from the involved stakeholders. This caused mistrust and intensified the positional bargaining of stakeholders.

This case proved that the Mediation Strategy provides a way to understand the reasons why the discussion is heated as it is and what possible ways to cope with such a heated discussion. Besides giving insight in how the negotiation process has evolved and how stakeholders got into their positional bargaining the case also gave insight in where the Mediation Strategy needed to be adjusted. First of all the process was already ongoing for several years and the Mediation Strategy was based on a negotiation which still had to start. Adjusting the interviews to gain insight in how the process had gone so far proved necessary since the stakeholders took the initiative during the interview to explain the ongoing process. Also the idea of mental mapping during the interviews proves unnecessary since all the stakeholders had already completed visions and goals which could be discussed during the interviews. These finished documents in combination with the interview gave enough insight in what the interests for each stakeholder were. Mental mapping (Lynch, 1960) stayed in the Mediation Strategy however when projects are already underway they may be crucial.

There were also some elements of the Mediation Strategy which were evaluated positive. It seemed that the perception the stakeholders have on the build environment was flexible when during the interviews references of ideal types of highways and parks were discussed. The LBB suddenly did not seem to be holy ground anymore and improvements for the park were on the discussion table. This is positive because at the end of the interviews, when discussing bargain areas, improving the current situation was one of the possible ways in which a bypass could help the LBB forward. Another interesting fact is that the discussion so far had limited itself to the bypass and not how the future LBB could look like. There had been a limited time scale and narrow vision on the future physical state of the park. The Mediation Strategy provides a way in which the various stakeholders could discuss an integral approach in which the boundaries of the area would be explored. In this case the boundaries of the LBB. Because of the integral approach and the longer time scale of the Mediation Strategy the consensus reaches beyond the direct spatial implications of the bypass. Finally in simulating the Mutual Gains scenario the bargain areas played a crucial role because these provided common ground between stakeholders and a way to finance a better integration of the bypass. The end result, the consensus, is to be taken lightly as it did not have feedback from the stakeholders but it should at least be able to open up new discussions about the future state of the region. In that case the Mediation Strategy already has proved its use to the SPD as well as the stakeholders. Currently the process is still ongoing therefore delicate information from the interviews is left out of the report, the complete interviews can be obtained from the author.

**Part A: Analysis**

For the analysis the focus is on the section of the LBB, sometimes in relation to the bigger recreational landscape or to the economic program of the north wing of Rotterdam.

**Spatial analysis**

The spatial analysis did not take into account the effect of the Rottemeren as a whole because the parks within the Rottemeren function as separate entities. Furthermore the analysis is performed on
the current situation of the park. The spatial analysis proved useful in detecting the potential of the location in its broader context. This is necessary in order to get the stakeholders from their positional bargaining, furthermore the results from the analysis provide a null option for the ex ante evaluation.

**Reach**
The reach of the LBB was set at 2600 meters because it qualifies as a middle sized city park. This means that people within this reach are likely to visit the park. (Jong et al., 2008) The potential reach is limited due to the infrastructure of the A20 which cuts of about 10 percent of the area covered; this is shown in the figure realistic reach.

![Figure 49, Realistic reach and density (Jong et al., 2008)](image)

**Density**
Because the LBB is located at the edge of the city there is a low density surrounding the park. Only Ommoord provides somewhat user pressure but it should be taken into account that the river Rotte is also between this suburb and the LBB. The user pressure per ha can be calculated as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Inhabitants*</th>
<th>% within reach</th>
<th>Realistic reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molenlaankwartier</td>
<td>7549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillegersberg-Noord</td>
<td>7035</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terbregge</td>
<td>3474</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiebroek</td>
<td>15161</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ommoord</td>
<td>24262</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergshehoek</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total users 65265
LBB is 140.2 ha 466 users per ha

*source; Gemeentelijke Basis Administratie

![Figure 51, Calculation of the users per Ha](image)

In combination with the uniqueness of the LBB we can draw conclusions about the maximum user pressure on the LBB.


Uniqueness

The LBB is certainly not the only park in the region. When drawing the realistic reach of the parks in the neighbourhood which have similar functions, and divide the amount of users between parks when they overlap, the amount of users calculated with the realistic reach will decrease. This decrease is caused by the large amounts of competing green in the north of Rotterdam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>realistic reach</th>
<th>% going to LBB</th>
<th>Users of LBB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molenlaankwartier</td>
<td>7549</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillegersberg-Noord</td>
<td>7035</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terbregge</td>
<td>3474</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiebroek</td>
<td>11371</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ommoord</td>
<td>21836</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergschehoek</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total users 22000

LBB is 140.2 ha 157 users per ha

Figure 52, Users per Ha after uniqueness (Jong et al., 2008)

157 users per ha is a low figure when also taken into account that not all these people will actually use the park every day or at all, the number is just an indication of who could use the park. In order to increase this number the size of the park could be decreased, the competition between the LBB and the other parks could be decreased or more regional functions could be brought to the park which causes the reach to be increased.

Mixed functions

Mixed functions surrounding the LBB tell us about the functioning of the surrounding neighbourhood, and the attractiveness of the neighbourhood in relation to the park. The functions concentrate around the small shopping centre of Hillegersberg. The main activities here are daily shopping. The relation with LBB seems small since most functions are oriented at the neighbourhood and offices are mostly businesses at home. There is also some small scale industry in the area which is located along the Grindweg. These also have no relation to the park. Within the LBB there is a horse riding centre and two small restaurants.

Taken into account the size of the park and the amount of functions it seems that the functions surrounding the LBB do not have much input on the way the park functions. At most some people could combine a trip to the supermarket with a stroll in the park. The functions within the park are not of such scale that they provide a pull factor for the park.

Figure 53, Mixed functions (Jong et al., 2008)
Connectivity
From the space syntax analysis it seems that the LBB is not that well connected to the surrounding spatial tissue. The neighbourhood Hillegersberg is the only region which is well connected to the park. Bergschenhoek (northwest) and Ommoord (southeast) hardly connect to the park.

Although the third grade does reach the boundaries of the realistic reach a few more direct connections to the north and the southeast could seriously improve the connectivity of the park to the surrounding neighbourhoods to the north and the southeast.

Accessibility
The park is mostly accessed by car and bike. Two main entries, one at the northwest and one in the south provide the main entrances after which smaller roads lead to the parking lots. Public transport does not connect to the park which causes a low amount of users coming by foot. An exception to these low amounts of users by foot is Hillegersberg which due to its location provides entry for the inhabitants. In its current situation the car plays a big role in the park as the parking lots provide the actual entrances of the park, however these entrances must be known to the public as the main entries are somewhat hidden. With an outline of 5232 meter and 16 actual entrances LBB scores about 3 entrances per kilometre which is low. (Jong et al., 2008) Well defined entrances and a connection to the public transport system could improve the functioning and visibility of the park.

Routing
The park has a total of approximately 23 kilometres of routes. (Jong et al., 2008) The external routes are mostly made up of bike routes. These are used by the passerby as well as users of the park. The functional routes provide entry to the park as well as functions in the park; these are mainly car oriented routes. Park routes make up the most of the routing; these are used by cyclists as well as pedestrians as the paths are wide. For a park such as this the passerby plays a big role. Cyclists as well as cars could enhance the vitality of the park by being a visitor for a short while as the passerby. A good example of such an effect is the
cycling lane in the Vondelpark in Amsterdam; here the passerby is almost a dominant user and provider of the vitality of the park. Such a mechanism could boost the LBB and at the same time connect the LBB to the surrounding structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Percentage of total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External route</td>
<td>7436</td>
<td>32.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional route</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park route</td>
<td>14200</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 57, Percentages of routing (Jong et al., 2008)*

Identity
The identity of the park is at first a lush green environment which is quite unknown for the user outside the neighbourhood. In its environment LBB scores good on the features of a recreational landscape; there is a lot of woodland and the cultural landscape of the polder at times offers nice views along the old ditches, the water rich environment and the open parches provide the feeling of a big space. Furthermore the placement of the park at the edge of the city provides a sharp edge between suburb and landscape; the edge at the north side of the park however is undefined as it transforms slowly into an agricultural landscape after which it just stops at the industrial area of Bergschenhoek. The main users of the park are provided by the surrounding neighbourhoods in the types of; joggers, walking the dog, and family strolling. The park is relatively unknown for its size which can be explained by its placement, its accessibility, and the park functions. The main features of the park are its landscape qualities and the abundance of woodland. Orientation within the park could be improved as in its current state the park misses a “climax point” where one feels that this point is the centre of the park. Here in an opportunity to provide the park with some more robustness in its identity.
SWOT
The park in its current state is like a lump of clay. It is big and in need of restoration and full of opportunities to become something beyond the current use but it needs to be shaped either according to its size or to its use. Now LBB acts neither as a regional park or as a neighbourhood park, it is too big for its use or its use is too small for its size. A clear direction is needed for the park in which the relation of the park to the Rottemeren as well as its surrounding neighbourhoods is defined. A question to be answered is whether the park is a neighbourhood park or part of a recreational landscape or both. In short LBB has a lot of potential but currently the weaknesses overshadow its potentials.

**Intervention analysis**
The type of intervention is a highway of 2 times 3 lanes bypassing the currently congested A20 in the north of Rotterdam. The intervention was originally proposed to relieve the pressure on the existing road network and improve living conditions in the north of Rotterdam (Rijkswaterstaat, 2010) but in time the economic opportunities surrounding Rotterdam The Hague Airport have become just as big as the original argument. (RR2020, 2005) The congestion and air pollution surrounding the Kleinpolderplein en Terbregseplein should decrease with the construction of the A13/A16. (Rijkswaterstaat, 2009) A major problem however rises where the A13/A16 passes through the LBB and past Hillegersberg. Besides the discussed necessity and effects of the bypass as a whole the integration of the bypass in the existing structure is heavily debated on this section.

The analysis on behalf of the intervention is limited to the section of the LBB. The alternatives for the bypass through the park have been studied by Rijkswaterstaat and published in the MER (Environmental Impact Study). (Rijkswaterstaat, 2009) First the variants proposed by Rijkswaterstaat will be discussed after which an extra variant, the parkway, proposed by the SPD will be introduced.
The variants
As proposed by the Rijkswaterstaat there are two main variants of integrating the highway in the park. One that goes in an outside curve around the LBB and one that goes in an inside curve through the park. The inside curve has several solutions of integrating the bypass in the landscape. (Ibid)

On the section of the LBB the MER has studied the following variants for the inside curve;

An excavated highway which is surrounded by sloped green angles. This is the cheapest variant and damages the environment the most. Sound pollution, historical damage, ecological damage, and a recreational barrier make that this variant score particularly negative. (Ibid) The landscape experience of the car user is positive with this variant.

A tunnel on ground level. This variant is positive in the sense that the noise is cancelled however the historical damage and recreational barrier are still negative aspects. The ecology does suffer from the build of this variant but once completed flora and fauna should not be hindered. The cost is quite high however not as much as an underground tunnel. (Ibid)

An open tunnel. This variant scores better than the excavated highway because the slimmer profile however it still scores negative on sound pollution, and ecological values. Positive is that this profile can easily be bridged so that the recreational barrier could in part be overcome. (Ibid)

A tunnel. This variant scores positive on almost all aspects because the highway is shielded completely. However the damage done with the construction is still negative. Furthermore the cost of this variant is highest among the inside curve variants. (Ibid)

The MER proposes one variant which takes the outside curve. This variant is an open tunnel which scores positive in the sense that it is as far away from the neighbourhoods as possible and so creates less pollution. In an ecological sense this variant scores negative because the highway is longer and damages the existing
ecological structure the most. The costs because of the length are also very high. (Ibid)

An alternative which has not been discussed in the MER is the option of an outside curve on ground level, a parkway variant. This option, proposed by the SPD, is aiming at the merge of highway and landscape. The task within this variant is to design the profile and its surroundings in such a way that the experiencing the landscape from the perspective of the car user is optimal as well as the experience of the highway from the park user.

When compared, the variants become more expensive when they have less negative impact on the environment. It is most cheap to take the inside curve where the excavated highway is the cheapest and the dug in tunnel is the most expensive. The outside curve is relative expensive because of the added length. (Rijkswaterstaat, 2009) In finding a definite solution the question is how to balance the impacts of the highway in relation to the interests of the environment and the users. In the current process the costs and the environmental impact are central in the discussions about the way the bypass should take shape. The costs of the variants are not specified in the MER so for this analysis the costs of the variants are based on the relative costs to each other. This results in the following order, from cheapest to most expensive (Ibid);

- Highway sloped edges, inside curve
- Open tunnel, inside curve
- Tunnel on ground level, inside curve
- Parkway, outside curve (estimated)
- Tunnel, inside curve
- Open tunnel, outside curve

**Stakeholder’s analysis**

Based on the participation discussions which Rijkswaterstaat organised the main stakeholders are defined as follows (Rijkswaterstaat, 2010);

- National government, Rijkswaterstaat
- Province of South Holland
- Municipality of Lansingerland
- Municipality of Rotterdam
- Recreational Board of the Rottemeren composed from
- The province of South Holland
- Surrounding municipalities; Lansingerland, Zevenhuizen -Moerkapelle, Rotterdam
- Inhabitants surrounding the LBB organised in the interest group, “Belangenvereniging Hillegersberg Bergse Bos (BVHBB)”
Besides these there are also environmental protest groups active however these are also active in the recreational board and the interest group BVHBB therefore for this analysis they will not be seen as an independent stakeholder.

What is missing in the list above is the SPD. The expert opinion and interest could differ a lot from the stakeholders mentioned especially when it comes to design and a future vision of the built environment. In this case the interest from the SPD is based on the viewpoint of the author; this will be explained in detail in section B, Perception of the Spatial Planner and Designer.

Scales of the interests
The scale at which the various stakeholders have their interest is as follows;

**Rijkswaterstaat**
Rijkswaterstaat operates at the national and international scale. The general aim of Rijkswaterstaat is to optimize the national infrastructure in order to have a fast and safe network which is user friendly. (Rijkswaterstaat, 2010)

For the A13/A16 Rijkswaterstaat aims that the bypass should have a positive effect on the traffic flow of A13 and the A20 as well as providing a better access to Rotterdam and the region in the north of Rotterdam. A positive side effect should be a better living environment surrounding the Kleinpolderplein. (Rijkswaterstaat, 2009)

**Province of South Holland**

The province operates between the state and the municipalities at the international, national, regional and city scale. In contrast to Rijkswaterstaat the province does not have a single aim but has a broad spectrum of interests ranging from ecology to economy and from culture to sustainable development. The focus of the province however is improving the matters of interest at the regional scale.

For the A13/A16 the province has worked together with the city region Rotterdam to match their interests. This has resulted in the “Ruimtelijk Plan Regio Rotterdam” (RR2020, 2005). For the bypass RR2020 focuses on the economical, ecological, and recreational development of the northern region of Rotterdam as well as improving the local communities.
Municipality of Rotterdam
Just like the province, Rotterdam has a bigger interest than the municipal borders but where the province of South Holland focuses on the regional scale the municipality has the main interest at the city scale. (RR2020, 2005)

Municipality of Lansingerland
Lansingerland operates at the same scales as the municipality of Rotterdam but because of the smaller size of Lansingerland the regional and upper regional interests are a lot smaller. For the bypass Lansingerland aims at opening up connections of the local network to the national network in order to provide access and to decrease the traffic pressure. (Lansingerland, 2009)

Recreational Board of the Rottemeren
The recreational board has a clear aim about the Rottemeren which is to stimulate and maintain the ecological and recreational values of the Rottemeren. The scale at which the board operates ranges from the regional to the local scale. (GZH, 2007) For the bypass the board opposes infrastructural developments and focuses on the green structure. (GZH, 2009)

Interest group BVHBB
The interest group focuses on the neighbourhood scale. The bypass has a big impact on the current situation and the local community acts with the statement “not in my backyard” because the daily routine and environment of the inhabitants is damaged. (BVHBB, 2009)

The Spatial Planner and Designer
The SPD operates throughout all the scales and focuses at the balance between the local interest and the large scale interests as well as the timescale. Planning and designing with a future use and community in mind is essential for the build environment. (Carmona, 2005) For the bypass this means that the scale ranges from the street level to the regional scale.

The scales at which the interests are located differ quite a lot. This is a root problem for the current stalemate in the process of the bypass. Because the scale at which Rijkswaterstaat operates is far away from the scale at which the local community operates the process has become a top-down bottom-up conflict. Finding a balance between national, regional and local interests as well as the personal interests between these scales is the task ahead.
The powers the various stakeholders have in the process of the bypass are of an administrative complexity due to the size of the various administrations. Rijkswaterstaat has a clear role in the process it is the main decision maker as well as the developer. The power of Rijkswaterstaat is limited to the infrastructure and the minister is the main decision maker. (Rijkswaterstaat, 2010)

The province has an important role in the aspects which exceed the regional borders such as ecology, economy, and recreation. The power of the province lies mainly in developing spatial plans for the region and control whether local plans are in line with the regional plans. (Festen-Hoff and Hobma, 2009) The municipalities have their power at the local level in the sense that they are the ones to develop land use plans and test whether initiatives from the private sector and the community are in line with the land use plans. (Ibid) The recreational board of the Rottemeren has actually very limited power since the board is composed from the province and the surrounding municipalities. The board is mandated to make their own decisions but the members operate within the board as well as for the province/municipalities. (PZH, 2009) This makes that decision making is complex and the power the board has, has become eroded. The interest group BVHBB has a major interest however does not have actual decision power. What does give the BVHBB a lot of power is the fact that they are well organised and currently have over 24,000 households organised within the interest group. (BHVBB, 2010) The power of the SPD in this case is exceptional compared to practice since the SPD is completely independent. For this case the SPD is simulated as a mediator who is contracted by all the stakeholders in order to come to a consensus in which all stakeholders can find themselves. The SPD as a mediator in such a way becomes responsible for the balance of the interests of all stakeholders. The relation between the powers the various stakeholders have in the case of the A13/A16 can be summarised as follows.
Based on the stakeholders analysis it seems that the discussion is mainly between Rijkswaterstaat and BVHBB. The province and the municipalities also have an interest in the realisation of a bypass therefore they do not oppose to the A13/A16. Although the recreational board opposes the bypass its power is limited due to the composition of the board. The strong opposition of the BVHBB has gained power by the large amount of households they represent. The strong opposition and power makes that the BVHBB and the Rijkswaterstaat have a typical top-down bottom-up conflict.

A power interest diagram for these stakeholders would have Rijkswaterstaat and BVHBB as the most important stakeholders. These two stakeholders are the main disputants. The midrange is made up of the SPD, the province, Rotterdam, and Lansingerland. The SPD is ranked high in the power because he or she is the authority to balance the interests and has the expert opinion. The province, Rotterdam and Lansingerland are in the midrange because they do not have the power to convince the minister and they do have the power to influence the recreational board. The recreational board scores lowest in the diagram due to its administrative composition. The diagram helps to visualise the way the stakeholders interact and where possible frictions occur, in this case the friction between Rijkswaterstaat and BVHBB.
Part B: Framing the problem
Framing of the problem is about the way the stakeholders perceive the LBB and the intervention. First the perception of the SPD is explained after which the perceptions of the other stakeholders will be discussed. The perceptions provide the basis for the mutual gains workshop.

Perception of the Spatial Planner and Designer
The perception of the SPD on the integration of the A13/A16 in the Lage Bergse Bos can be constructed making use of the SWOT and the preferred variant for the intervention. Besides these tangible arguments there will also be the personal view of the SPD about the build environment. It should be taken into account that design has a personal touch to it; this should be communicated to the other stakeholders.

Vision
Based on the swot and the variants of the bypass the vision of the SPD looks into the LBB as part of a larger recreational landscape which should function as such. The A13/A16 could strengthen the position of the park and its environment and push future developments. The LBB could become the green variant of the ‘Maasboulevard’ for Rotterdam. Where the Maasboulevard has the water which provides the main entry to the city with the city skyline in its backdrop, the LBB could have the historical cultural landscape and its green character as the same type of entry to the city. Furthermore the A13/A16 could be the impulse the LBB needs to become an actual regional park which is well connected to the Rottemeren. The variant which is in line with these considerations is the outside curve with the bypass on ground level, the parkway variant. The parkway variant provides the possibility to create a symbiosis between highway and landscape. The vision of the SPD aims at creating a showcase of city and landscape and creating an entry and city edge which Rotterdam currently does not have while at the same time upgrading the Rottemeren to an integral recreational landscape.

Figure 76, Vision of the SPD, LBB as a showcase city and landscape
Back casting
Back casting questions the vision above which goals need to be achieved in order to reach for such a vision. From the spatial analysis the following goals are in line with the vision of the SPD;

- Connect LBB to the surrounding structures
- Strengthen position LBB in the region
- Define borders LBB
- Define entrances LBB
- Define neighbourhood and/or regional park

In relation to the parkway these aspects result in the following goals;
Connecting the LBB to the surrounding structures will be done by completing the local network and a stronger physical connection to the rest of the Rottemeren. The Rottemeren could also strengthen its position by adding robust functions which provide a strong identity. A water node at the nexus of the Rotte and the Zevenhuizerplas which is accessible by car, boat, bike, and public transport is one of the nodes which provide the water rich environment of the Rottemeren a stronger identity. Functions such as a harbour, bike rental, and a hotel could be located here. The Second node is a green one; this is located in the LBB. The green node provides a starting point for cyclists and walking, it should be accessible by car, bike, and public transport. Functions such as a conference centre and small scale green offices could be located here as well as a bike rental and an ecological information centre.

The northern border will be defined as part of the LBB; it should be accessible by bike and foot and will function as an ecological corridor of the Rottemeren towards Westland. The main entrances should be visible to the public and provide access to the LBB as well as the Rottemeren. Hillegersberg which in the current state of the LBB profits from a very large neighbourhood park should in the future situation still profit from the park however LBB will have to operate as a regional park. Both functions are not mutually exclusive so the northern part of which part is the Hoekse Park will provide the regional park functions and the larger part of the current LBB will function as a neighbourhood park.
The trajectory of the bypass is the outside curve which will for the larger part not damage the functioning of the LBB. The highway will be located on ground level where the experience of the landscape is optimal.

The conceptual design aims at answering the goals as described above. The bypass acts as a transition zone between the Regional Park and Hillegersberg. It provides a hard edge for the larger parts of the park but is crossed by a wide ecoduct. This ecoduct does not only function for wildlife but also for recreation, the construction is more like a lifted landscape. The green functions will also be located at this ecoduct; they will act as a beacon in the surrounding landscape.

The perception of the SPD is taken as a basis for the next steps in the Mediation Strategy. What will show is that this perception is subject to change when the argumentations of the other stakeholders join the discussion.
Perception and capacity Stakeholders

Since the process of this case was already going on for a while the stakeholders have already been organised in homogeneous groups of interest. For the interviews the following stakeholders have been targeted:

- Rijkswaterstaat
- Province of South Holland
- ‘Stadsregio Rotterdam’ on behalf of the municipality of Rotterdam
- Municipality of Lansingerland
- Recreational board of Rottemeren
- Interest group BVHBB

Of these stakeholders the province and Lansingerland did not respond within the timeframe of the interviews. Therefore their published work about the A13/A16 will be used to compose the interest maps. The other stakeholders were very willing to cooperate. The interviews with the stakeholders will not be completely published here because the content could inflict the currently heated discussion among stakeholders, for more information about the interviews please contact the author. For this research only the interest maps and the capacity are interesting and these will be explained for each stakeholder in the following section. The maps below proved very useful in exploring the various positions of the stakeholders and besides giving more detail to the stakeholder’s analysis gave direction to the end result.

The interviews were of an explorative character therefore they did not follow a strict list of questions however because certain information was needed to compose the interest maps there was a list of questions which should be answered at the end of the interview. This list of interview questions can be found in the appendix. At first the interview was build up to let the stakeholder draw a mental map of the existing situation of the LBB however because the process has been gone on for quite a while all of the stakeholders had complete maps and visions ready therefore the mental mapping seemed unnecessary and the discussion focused on the way the process had gone so far and which way it should go. This resulted in a change of the structure of the interviews, from the first interview on the interviewed was allowed to explain how the process went so far and what the position and power was of the interviewed.

Rijkswaterstaat;

Rijkswaterstaat confirmed the position they have following from the stakeholders analysis. It seems that Rijkswaterstaat is in an intermediate position between the decision makers and the construction of the bypass; this complicates decision making and power. Rijkswaterstaat did aim at a participatory process however due to the distance between the minister and the interest groups, communication proved difficult. Participation eventually turned into tokenism. Rijkswaterstaat is very aware of this situation and proved willing to turn this around. (Ham, 2010)
The perception of the LBB is that of an important green hub at the edge of the city. It functions as a city park apart from the other parks in the Rottemeren. The main users are people walking (the dog), cyclists, leisure and sports. An ideal reference is the Kralingse bos which is of almost similar size but way better defined and used. The perception of a highway is at first a means of getting from a to b but at the same time it could function as an experience of the landscape. An example of a well defined highway is the A1 through the Veluwe; here the function and its experience are in balance. Rijkswaterstaat chooses the short trajectory of a dug in concrete trench with “recreaducts” to maintain the existing connections within the park. The “recreaducts” are in fact ecoducts with recreational use. The choice of this variant is due to the budget the minister has for this project. Possible areas for bargaining are the Hoekse Park and a stretch of unused land at Terbregge. These could be used generate income for compensating the effects of the bypass. Capacity to cooperate towards a consensus is present. Rijkswaterstaat is very willing to cooperate but fears that this would be misinterpreted as creating goodwill for their own interest. A Mediation Strategy could help to overcome this problem. (Ibid)

Province of South Holland
The province of South Holland plays a big role in the economic, ecologic, and social development surrounding the A13/A16. In close collaboration with Stadsregio Rotterdam the province developed RR2020 a regional plan in which the targets for the northern region are described. Especially the economic program in the northern region is dependent on the bypass. (RR2020, 2005) The power of the province is fragmented throughout the administration and depends on collaboration with municipalities and the national government (Festen-Hoff and Hobma, 2009).
LBB is seen as an important piece of a large green puzzle which connects Midden Delfland with the Rottemeren. The ecological and recreational networks are valued and strengthened. The trajectory of the bypass is the inner curve where it should be well considered that this is the city's edge and connections between the city and the regional parks should be maintained. (RR2020, 2005) It is assumed that the province agrees with the bargain areas of Hoekse Park and Terbregge and that the province is willing to cooperate.

**Stadsregio Rotterdam**

The Stadsregio is the mandated department of the City of Rotterdam who is responsible for the spatial developments in and surrounding the city. The Stadsregio's main interest is the functioning of the city of Rotterdam. Because the Stadsregio has made the RR2020 in collaboration with the province their interest at the regional scale is the same. For the LBB the Stadsregio wants to maintain the open city edge. Also the LBB should become part of a coherent urban park system with a direct meaning to the surrounding neighbourhoods. (Schipperheijn, 2010)
The perception of the LBB is that of a green link between regional parks. Its main use is walking (the dog) which is done by the inhabitants from the neighbourhood. The park functions as a neighbourhood park as well as a regional park although connections with the rest of the Rottemeren seem weak. An ideal reference is the Wilhelmina park which a bit more formal than the LBB but well defined. The perception on a highway is that it should function primarily as a means from a to b but the experience of the landscape is valued. An ideal reference of a highway is the highway along the coast of Barcelona where the highway has a limited impact on the city and at the same time is a pleasure to drive. The A13/A16 should have a minimal impact on the cities edge and the park should be reorganised while construction will takes. Bargain areas are found outside the LBB at the Hoekse park and Terbregge. Capacity to cooperate is certainly present. (Ibid)

Municipality of Lansingerland
The municipality of Lansingerland has about the same power as the city of Rotterdam. That although its small size has about the same power is because Lansingerland owns most of the land. Lansingerland cooperates with the Stadsregio and the Province in the development of the northern region of Rotterdam. Therefore Lansingerland shares the ecological, recreational and economical goals. What further is important for Lansingerland is to unlock the existing local road network in order to relieve the traffic pressure. (Lansingerland, 2009)

The perception of space cannot be completely obtained however the municipality is in strong favour of developing the Hoekse park in order to create a coherent park system and a green border for the municipality. (Ibid) The perception on the highway is that it must have zero impact. (Kool, 2010) It is assumed that the municipality cooperates and wishes to develop in the same bargain areas as the other stakeholders.

Recreational board of the Rottermeren
The recreational board has very limited power because of the double positions of the members of the board. The members are unable to take a position just in favour of the park because their interest is at the province/municipalities as well as at the recreational board. This double position causes the board to be a weak stakeholder. The board acts as a one issue party where the main issue is the wellbeing of the park. (Elburg and Sytsema, 2010)
Perception of space

The LBB is seen as an independent park within the Rottemeren where the functional connection is not important. What is important are the spatial connections, here the ecological route is followed by the recreational route. The LBB is valued for its natural state and as a green entrance for Rotterdam. Furthermore, the cultural historical landscape should be maintained. An ideal reference is the Kralingse Bos which operates a lot better and is well defined. The main users of the LBB are people walking the dog. The perception of the highway is negative. A highway should function only from a to b and preferably always be located in a tunnel. For the LBB the highway should also be located in a tunnel. Bargain areas area can be found at the Hoekse park and Terbregge. Capacity to cooperate is present. (Ibid)

Interest group BVHBB

BVHBB has no decision making power however through combined households the interest group is a very strong player, possibly up to 40,000 households. The statement about the LBB is that the bypass should have zero annoyance for the living environment, sound, smell and visual. (Vogel, 2010)
The perception of the LBB is a green garden and although its main users are from the neighbourhood the importance of the LBB is at a larger scale. An ideal reference is the Kralingse Bos. The perception of a highway is that it should function as a mean to get from a to b but at the same time the experience of the landscape is valued. A well defined highway is the A1 at the Veluwe. For the LBB the bypass is not welcome unless it is put in a tunnel. The BVHBB is very active in making their own plans to solve the congestion at the A20. The alternatives proposed by the interest group are taken serious however they did not reach the decision making process of the A13/A16. Bargain areas for the BVHBB are located in the Hoekse Park and Terbregge. Cooperation with the other stakeholders is welcomed. (Ibid)

**Capacity**

All the stakeholders are willing to cooperate on the basis of good arguments towards a consensus. The general opinion is that not cooperating leads to the worse alternative and that cooperation could provide the most value for the environment.
Part C: Mutual Gains Approach

The Interpretation of the stakeholder’s perceptions results in the following images.

There is a general agreement that the congestion in the north of Rotterdam is a serious issue and that the A13/A16 could solve some of the problems. The trajectory of the bypass and its profile remain the conflict of interest. What does show is that the local interests are of the same opinion, that the bypass should inflict zero to minimal damage to the LBB. Interesting is that everybody agrees on the bargain areas and although these are located outside the LBB they could provide some input in getting to a consensus. Also all the stakeholders agreed on the current use of the park which is mainly local and for walking the dog.

**Mutual Gains workshop**

The following workshop did not fit in the timeframe of this research and is therefore simulated. Assumptions on behalf of the stakeholders are accounted to the author.

The objective criteria for consensus;
- Minimal impact bypass
• Connections between the neighbourhoods and the park are maintained
• Integral development of Hoekse Park
• Robust ecological network
• Reorganisation of the LBB
• Put the money where the value is

The shared interests are agreed upon;
• The necessity of a bypass is acknowledged
• New development is agreed upon
• Defining the use of the LBB is agreed
• An ecological and recreational connection is agreed
• Reorganising the LBB

Win win solutions for conflicting interests
The main problem is the trajectory of the bypass. A lot of solutions have already been discussed and researched by Rijkswaterstaat in the environmental impact report. What is new to the discussion is the hybrid solution of an integrated highway where at crucial points the bypass is covered as with an ecoduct. And the parkway variant, here the bypass should cross the LBB at ground level and the user experience will be that of a green entrance to the city.

Evaluation of the results
At this point the vision of the SPD to opt for the parkway was abandoned. It seemed that the damage done to the park with a parkway variant would not weigh up to the short experience of the highway user. Besides that the costs of such an intervention could better be spent at renovating the existing park. The SPD was convinced by the open tunnel variant but with ‘ecoducts’ at the crucial points. The places left open can be constructed in such a way that closing the tunnel in the future would remain a possibility. Furthermore the compensation could be spent on the LBB to lift the park into the region. The tunnel variant was found to be too expensive; the costs here are no longer in relation to the current situation of the park. Although the assumption is too bold it is assumed that the rest of the stakeholders agree with the reasoning above. Simulating the actual bargaining here has no added value and should be done in future projects.
Mutual gains scenario
Based on the goals resulting from the workshop the following mutual gains scenario is constructed.
Part D: Consensus

Mixed Scanning

Due to smaller time scale of this research than the case example, the workshop Mixed Scanning is simulated and since there is only one mutual gains scenario the mixed scanning workshop can be limited to the ex ante evaluation. The evaluation is done by comparing the strategic design (figure 86) to the spatial analysis. By comparing the current situation of the LBB to the proposed development with the 8 themes of the analysis we can get the following result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing situation (null option)</th>
<th>Mutual Gains Scenario</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Larger range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>More housing, larger range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>Integrated with Rottemeren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed functions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Park reaches the centre of Lansingerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Slightly more local roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>More entrances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Increased walkways and external routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>Aims at regional scale, more users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 86, results from the mixed scanning

This shows compared to the null option that the LBB in the future situation scores overall better in these fields of analysis. The most important for a successful regional park is the identity (Jong et al., 2008) which in the current situation on the regional scale is quite low. In the new situation the park could set itself apart from other regional parks in the neighbourhood with good accessibility and with clear functions, furthermore the new developments surrounding the park could provide more visitors. More visitors will increase the reputation of the Park which in turn will add to identity of the LBB. The local parkway system provides more access to car users who will add to the livelihood of the park as the passerby.
Integral vision and common goals
The integral vision is in twofold. The first is the vision about the environment. The LBB should act as an ecological and recreational hub within the recreational landscape of the Rottemeren with a distinct meaning to the surrounding neighbourhoods. The second is the vision about the bypass. The bypass should in the first place function as a means to get from a to b and in the trajectory of the LBB the bypass should be integrated. Second the bypass should stimulate the economic and social development of the northern region of Rotterdam. The common goals did not change since the mutual gains workshop since the evaluation was positive and no further input is generated.

The strategic design
The strategic design aims at integrating all the common goals in such a way that the LBB would profit the most. The centre which stems from the vision of the SPD is maintained. The centre is well accessible by car since the local road network was completed. The local road network now functions as a parkway system. The northern border of the park has been redefined in order to provide a hard urban edge. Large stretches of bypass have been covered to maintain the connection to the
Rottermeren and to keep the feeling of a large neighbourhood park. The Hoekse park has been developed to store water and at the same time this provides a robust ecological route. Following this ecological route are several recreational routes which connect to the larger recreational network. As far as possible the water network is connected to enable water recreation, storage and ecological routes. The details noted in the map are explained in the following section.

Figure 87, Strategic map of the LBB
Key strategic elements
The first detail is the profile of the bypass. Green walls with earth and rocks to create a permeable wall which will help decrease the sound pollution and at same time increases a green image surround the bypass. The middle wall is also to decrease the sound pollution. At the horizon it can be seen how the park crosses the bypass. The point at which the park crosses the bypass is the transition of the neighbourhood park to the regional park.

Figure 88, section and impression of the bypass

The transition from the neighbourhood to the regional park. The existing structure has been maintained and improved with more walking routes. The actual transition is the water connection towards the horizon in the middle. On the right the historical mill reminds the passerby to the former function of the park. New possibilities such as taking the canoe from the backyard throughout the whole park should enhance the quality of the living environment. Walking the dog most likely will remain the main activity of the neighbours.

Figure 89, transition of the neighbourhood to the region
The northern edge will become a new living environment. Living in the open with a lot of access to the park are the core qualities. Besides being the end of the park this should also be the new edge of Bergschenhoek.

The strategic map in combination with the details should be the start document for a detailed study in the next phase of the urban development process. It should be acknowledged that the strategic map does not have the same level of detail as an urban program of requirements. This is part due to time constraints and part due to the focus of this research. What is shown here could be the consensus of the Mediation Strategy but this should not be where the Strategy ends. Making sure that the interests as shown in the images become part of the actual implementation, is what makes the Mediation Strategy is finished. Although the input from the stakeholders was limited the information obtained proved that the Mediation Strategy was successful to a certain degree. What did happen with the input from the stakeholders is the change in perception of the SPD. The integrated bypass provided a means to reorganising the park in a regional context with strong connections to the neighbourhood. Besides the bypass the bargain areas became integral part of the design and the possible revenues of the ground value could be put to use in integrating the bypass.
Chapter 4; Discussion

This chapter aims at providing arguments for the discussion about the role of the SPD as a mediator. Arguments are provided for the value the SPD adds to the negotiation arena, the position the SPD could take in the negotiation arena and the various cases the Mediation Strategy applies to. The discussion about the SPD as a mediator is ongoing and this chapter will not address all the aspects of it, but it does provide an introduction to the discussion.

The added value of the SPD as a mediator;

In what ways does the SPD as a mediator in the process of urban development provide value for the other actors?

The SPD as a mediator differs from the SPD as a planner and designer who works for a single client. As a mediator the SPD could have more than one client with possible conflicting interests. The question is what difference it makes for the involved stakeholders that the SPD is involved in all the interests in the process and why they should accept the SPD as a mediator.

Mediation is typically done by a neutral third party who is expert in the problem field and aims at conflict resolution. (Edelman, 2007) The fact that the SPD is an expert in the build environment is out of the question but in the case of the Mediation Strategy the SPD is not a strict neutral third party. The SPD has a professional interest in the build environment about the way it should function and its aesthetics. (Carmona et al., 2008) furthermore in the interest of “good design” the SPD should be able to steer the process at times therefore the SPD is not strictly neutral. Why the involved stakeholders should accept this is because the SPD can provide a transparent negotiation process in which the arguments and the decisions are clearly formulated in images which even the layperson could understand. (Innes and Booher, 1999) Also the spatial implications of the decisions made will be shown in the same transparent language. In that way the Mediation strategy aims at closing the gap between the professionals and the layperson which provides value (Carmona, 2005).

The SPD as a mediator is able to value intangible qualities such as aesthetic value of the build environment from the start of the process. Seeing the potential of a location and the value it already has could be of great value for the urban development process because spotting potential and put that potential to use is often cheaper than create potential from zero. (Macmillan, 1999) Besides spotting the intangible qualities the SPD is this central position could overlook the process and safeguard a higher aesthetic end result which will in turn yield a higher value from the end users. (Rode, 2006) In line with the aesthetic value is the preservation of the cities as cultural forms. The cultural value of the city is intangible but essential to the experience of the users. (Castells, 2000) Acknowledgment of the cultural value of the city is possible within the Mediation Strategy due to its integral character and the ability of the SPD to recognize the cultural value of cities.

The integral character of the Mediation Strategy makes that all the stakeholders can deliver input to the process and so ensure that the design is user based. (Day and Parnell, 2003) User based design ensures stronger connections between the involved stakeholders and the build environment which increases the value of the space in the eyes of the users. (Carmona, 2005) The integral character also helps to maintain and restore the socio-spatial balance within the cities. With the involvement of all the stakeholders, the former non participating communities become more active in the development
process of their neighbourhood. This helps to strengthen social ties which in turn add to the value of place. (Cornelissen et al., 2007) The integral character furthermore helps to install long term commitments among stakeholders which could be the basis for mutual trust. (Edelman, 2007) This long term mutual trust could decrease the chance of opposition of future development projects and increases the chance of cooperation and so provides value for future projects.

The SPD in the position of a mediator provides more possible solutions to the negotiation process using his technical and creative skills. (Jong and Voordt, 2002) This increases the chance of finding common ground among stakeholders which could speed up the development process thus providing value for the developer. (Edelman, 2007) The SPD also takes the problem to different (time) scale which could create possible spin off projects or increase the project area to create more value in a larger area or in a longer time scale. (Ibid)

This answers the sub research question and should convince the stakeholders of the added value of the SPD as a mediator. It should be noted that the SPD should has the responsibility to value the interests of all the stakeholders in an egalitarian way. (Innes and Booher, 1999) This means that the SPD even while working as a mediator for a single client involves all the stakeholders and treat their interests equal to the interests of the client.

The various positions of the SPD as a mediator
The following section goes into the various positions the SPD can take in the negotiation process. Two main positions and two start moments will explained. In practice various combinations of these cases could occur. Also the negotiation arena is not only for the SPD, various actors could be involved in the arena ranging from various experts of the build environment to process and project managers and even spatial planners and designers operating in various ways. (Edelman, 2007) No matter who is active in the arena what must be clear is that the common goal is reaching consensus. The SPD as a mediator should take a leading role in the arena advocating the use of the Mediation Strategy and the value is offers for the various stakeholders. Another possibility is that when several mediators are active in the negotiation arena, an alliance between the mediators is formulated in which they act together using the same methods and language in order to keep the process transparent. In a less ideal situation where several mediators are active but not willing to cooperate with each other these mediators should be seen as intermediate stakeholders operating in the interest of their clients.
**Single client case**

The SPD operates for a single client with the task to streamline the negotiations in the interest of the client and to get to a consensus. In this situation the SPD operates primarily as the spokesperson for the client. However, the Mediation Strategy aims at involving all the stakeholders in an equal way and in true participation (Innes and Booher, 1999) so the SPD should communicate very clear to the client and the other stakeholders that all interests will be addressed. This is needed because the most important task in operating from a single client is overcoming mistrust of the other stakeholders. Mistrust of stakeholders will increase positional bargaining which has a negative effect on the negotiation process. (Edelman, 2007)

**Multiple client case**

The SPD operates for multiple clients; this already proves the willingness of the clients to reach for consensus. In this situation mistrust of the SPD as a mediator is less of an issue. What remains important is to involve all the stakeholders even in they are not the client, this needs to be clear from the start.

In both cases, the single client case as well as the multiple client case the way the Mediation Strategy works stays the same. First and most important is to reach for all the stakeholders and establish true participation. Open communication and transparency should be the trademark of the SPD operating as a mediator; this is to maintain trust and possibilities for integrative bargaining. (Innes and Booher, 1999, Edelman, 2007)

The various moments the SPD could enter the negotiation arena are from the start up of the process and during the negotiations. Ideally the SPD enters the arena from the start of the process in order to apply the Mediation Strategy from the start of the process. In this way the chance that stakeholders feel left out or emotion and conflict spirals out of control can be limited. (Edelman, 2007) This does need willing initiators of the process and that is not naturally the case, especially the true participation of all stakeholders is something uncommon. (Michels, 2004) A negotiation process which is in stalemate or about to go into stalemate is a more likely moment for the SPD to enter the arena. (Edelman, 2007) First thing to do is to calm down heated discussions and find ways to get stakeholders from their positional bargaining. (Fisher and Ury, 1981) The Mediation Strategy provides means to do so by insight and understanding in each other’s perspectives.

**The scale of the Mediation Strategy**

The Mediation Strategy is applicable to virtually every scale, from the curb to the national infrastructure however at the very small scale the strategy is somewhat overdone and at the very
large scale there is an information overload. The Mediation Strategy does not per se need to address a case where there is conflict; it could also act as a way to explore more possibilities and better solutions. The scale at which the Mediation Strategy is most applicable is where there are a lot of stakeholders and possible solutions. Based on an assumption this would be the between the neighbourhood scale and the city scale. Smaller scale and the Mediation Strategy would become a heavy means for a small solution and bigger scale and the Mediation Strategy needs a team of spatial planners and designers to address all the information. Also the bigger the scale the more difficult it becomes to set up true participation and to address all the stakeholders. (Cornelissen et al., 2007)

Chapter 5; Conclusions and recommendations

This chapter closes the research by drawing the main conclusions, evaluating the process and providing recommendations for further research.

Conclusions

The goal of this research to answer the main research question which is;

How can the SPD meet the emerging mediator role given by the changing urban development process?

The SPD will be able to operate as a mediator in the current and future urban development process by making use of the Mediation Strategy. Theory so far on how to operate as a mediator provided the background on why the SPD should operate as a mediator but limited itself to listing the required competences the SPD should have as a mediator. The Mediation Strategy now provides the theoretical background, the process model and the project model for mediation in urban development.

Current and future trends

Based on the background analysis it can be concluded that the forces that drive the current trends are ongoing which makes it likely that the trend of planning and design as a communicative action will continue. The case example proved that even without these trends the Mediation Strategy provides an addition to the negotiation process.

SPD as a mediator

The SPD is qualified to act as a mediator in the urban development process because of the expertise of the build environment and the creative skills to communicate with images. Following from the case example the current stalemate in the negotiation is exacerbated due to miscommunication between stakeholders; the SPD as a mediator could have helped to prevent the miscommunication. The SPD as a mediator is not a neutral third party, the professional opinion about the build environment and the responsibility for “good public space” makes that the SPD has an interest in the negotiations about the build environment. This should be communicated clearly to the other stakeholders in order to prevent mistrust. The SPD as a mediator while using the Mediation Strategy adds value to the negotiation process in the following way;

- Close the professional-layperson gap
- Value intangible qualities
- Safeguard the aesthetic qualities
• Preserve cultural forms
• Develop user based design
• Maintain and/or restore socio-spatial balance
• Create long term mutual trust among stakeholders
• Increase the range of possible solutions
• Place the problem in a larger (time) scale

The mediation strategy
The three levels of the Mediation Strategy, the theoretical, the process, and the project level provide useful knowledge and tools for the SPD to operate as a mediator. The theoretical level adds two fields of theory to the theoretical background of the SPD:

• Communicative action; the way planning and design could facilitate the urban development process in a just and transparent way
• Interest based collaborative negotiation; the interaction of the interests of stakeholders in relation to the build environment

These fields opened up the view about the way mediation takes place and provided the basis for the theoretical framework. The theoretical framework in turn provided the basis for the process model of the Mediation Strategy. The process model proved to be highly accurate on the case example, only minor adjustments had to be made. The translation of the process model into the project model is successful as far as the case example tells us;

Part A; Analysis
• The spatial analysis provided a quick way to assess the potential and the use of the location; results of the analysis were underpinned by the stakeholders. Furthermore the spatial analysis provides a null alternative for the ex ante evaluation.
• The intervention analysis provided insight in the existing and possible alternatives; this proved to be a necessity in the communication with the stakeholders
• The stakeholder’s analysis provided insight in the powerplay of the stakeholders which was useful in addressing the stakeholders. Confirming the actual powerplay between stakeholders was necessary as nuances were made by the stakeholders during the interviews.

Part B; Framing the problem
• The proposed method of defining and communicating the perspective of the SPD is transparent and easy to communicate.
• Making use of the perceptions of the stakeholders gave a new dimension to the existing ways of interaction between stakeholders. Feedback from the interviews proved that this was missing in the current process and should be adopted in the future.

Part C and D
These parts of the Mediation Strategy have not been evaluated and are still based on theory. In the case example the results are based on assumptions instead of input from the stakeholders. The difference in timescales of the case example and this research is the main reason the case example could not evaluate part C and D of the Mediation Strategy.
The case example

The case of the A13/A16 was not the right choice to evaluate the Mediation Strategy. Earlier in this research the conflict between top-down and bottom-up approaches was the main focus, the case of the A13/A16 was perfect for that phase. However, after a change in direction of this research towards developing the Mediation Strategy the case became unfit as an evaluation case. The fact that the analysis was already underway and that the stakeholders were already organised provided arguments to continue with this case but in retrospect it must be noted that the case was too big and complex to use as an evaluation case. An evaluation case on a smaller scale and with less complexity would have provided a better and more complete evaluation with feedback from the stakeholders up until the consensus. The fact that the case example was unfit for the evaluation does not mean that the Mediation Strategy is unfit for the case. In fact stakeholders responded very positive and saw possibilities in the Mediation Strategy to start new communication and cooperation.

In conclusion, the Mediation Strategy although not completely evaluated with stakeholder’s feedback does provide a useful overview of the theory needed for the SPD as well as a practice related process and project design. When compared to the knowledge previously available and the knowledge the Mediation Strategy offers in one package it can be said that the SPD should at least have a good introduction and start to the role as a mediator. At the same time it can be concluded that more practice testing of the Mediation Strategy is needed in order to complete its applicability to practice as well as providing more knowledge to the SPD.

Recommendations;

Refining the Mediation Strategy for further use and study is necessary. Not nearly all the questions related to the development of the Mediation Strategy have been answered. This research ends with the following recommendations for direct future research.

Within the Mediation Strategy true participation and involvement of all the stakeholders are at the basis. What needs to be worked out and added to the mediation strategy are the ways how to organise all the stakeholders to be involved in the process and how to stimulate true participation. For the organisation of all the stakeholders the theory of community planning gives some pointers as to how to reach and organise the community. For true participation theories are abundant. A booklet which provides a nice overview of participation is, Recipes for community participation. (Dennenberg et al., 2006)

Another recommendation on the Mediation Strategy is the organisation of feedback. Currently the feedback of stakeholders is direct via interviews or workshops. But not in all cases there will be the possibility of direct feedback; especially the larger cases will prove difficult at this. In future research this needs to addressed. A possible direction could be the Delphi method.

In order to test the Mediation Strategy for flaws and possible improvements in a fast way, simulations needs to be done. In these simulations the various positions of the SPD should be tested as well as the various bargaining positions of stakeholders. Once these simulations are completed the Mediation Strategy can be tested in practice but a strong recommendation is to start with a small scale, few stakeholders’ case.
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Appendices
Interview A13/A16

Since the interviews took place in the Netherlands the interview is in Dutch. Furthermore this interview was specifically on this case therefore for other cases it can only be used as an indication.

Introductie

- Wie ben ik
- Reden voor het onderzoek, uitleg van het model en beperking tot Lage Bergse Bos (LBB)
- Doel van het interview; het doorlopen van het model om na te gaan of het in praktijk zou kunnen werken.
- Structuur van het interview, het ontwikkelen van drie kaarten; perspectief op de ruimte, een ideaalbeeld inpassing en een kader voor alternatieven opstellen. Daarna een korte evaluatie.

Deel 1, Rol van belanghebbende in het proces

- Kunt u aangeven wat uw rol in het proces tot nu toe is geweest en hoe u het proces tot nu toe heeft beleefd?
- Op welke manier zou het proces moeten verlopen opdat u een betere rol in het proces zou hebben?

Deel 2, perspectief op de ruimte

1. Kunt u een mentale kaart (uit het hoofd) tekenen van het LBB?/ Heeft u een gebiedsvisie?
2. Kunt u kwaliteiten en kernwaarden aangeven op de kaart? Wat zijn de essentiële elementen van de gebiedsvisie?
3. Op welke manier denkt u dat er het meest gebruik wordt gemaakt van het LBB?
4. Wat voor type park zou u het LBB noemen een landschapspark of buurtpark?
5. Ervaart u het LBB als integraal onderdeel van het recreatieschap de Rottemeren?
6. Waar zou u het LBB mee willen vergelijken qua Nederlandse parken?
7. Wat vindt u een goed voorbeeld van een mooi en of goed werkend landschapspark/buurtpark?
8. Wat is uw toekomstvisie voor het LBB?

Deel 3 perspectief op de ruimtelijke ingreep

A; Opstellen ideaaltype inpassing (kaart)

9. Hoe ervaart u het gebruik van een snelweg?
10. Kunt u voorbeelden geven van goed ingepaste snelwegen in het landschap?
11. Kunt u uw optimale inpassing van het tracégedeelte A16/A13, LBB tekenen?
12. Wat is dit de meest gunstige inpassing van de snelweg in het landschap?

B; Opstellen zoekgebieden (kaart)

13. Mochten er niet genoeg middelen beschikbaar zijn voor uw optimale inpassing bent u dan bereid te kijken naar andere oplossingen?
14. Op welke punten denkt u dat er ruimte is om naar andere oplossingen te zoeken?
15. Bent u bereid te kijken naar het ontwikkelen van andere delen van het park, dwz integrale gebiedsontwikkeling toe te passen om zo met de vrijgekomen baten alternatieve oplossingen te financieren?

16. Zo ja kunt u aangeven welke gebieden hiervoor in aanmerking komen?

Evaluatie

17. Heeft u het idee dat deze methode u aanzet tot andere inzichten of het anders nadenken over de ruimte en de mogelijke inpassingen van een snelweg?

18. Zou u geïnteresseerd zijn om de resultaten van de andere partijen in te zien en samen te werken naar een mogelijke ‘win win’ situatie met bijvoorbeeld een workshop?
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