

Land Use Policy Special Issue

Mitigating boom & bust cycles: the roles of land policy and planning.

Guest editors

Kristof Van Assche

Professor Faculty of Science and Faculty of Extension

Leith Deacon

Assistant Professor Faculty of Science

Monica Gruzmacher

Adjunct Professor & Researcher Faculty of Extension

gruezm@ualberta.ca

In this special issue, we investigate through a comparative approach the potential of land use policies, understood in a broad sense, to mitigate the effects of boom and bust cycles. We are interested in situations with extensive and less extensive planning and land use systems, and in situations where (a) communities and people deal with mostly legacies of “bust” or down turns, (b) mostly with legacies of “booms” or growth or (c) mostly legacies of the repetition of boom & bust cycles.

We understand boom and bust as more than resource related. The reasons can be diverse. We understand it also as more than an economic phenomenon; we speak of boom and bust communities, where the effects of ups and downs can be very diverse, entangled, and resting on political, cultural root causes, beyond and besides economic ones.

We encourage authors to reflect on a situation, a community, a country, a region, with a serious impact of boom and bust, and look there at:

- Effects of boom and bust
- The entanglement of or associations between boom and bust
- Previous attempts to deal with these radical changes
- Current attempts to deal with these radical changes
- The problems and situations that remain there after
- The role of land use instruments in the past
- The potential role of land use instruments

Land use instruments used can be quite diverse, and it is explicitly not the point to pre-define them here or in your papers, but rather to **trace how coordination of land use has been used and could be used to mitigate the effects of boom and bust on communities taking a look at different scales**. Various sorts of planning, zoning, economic development strategies, preservation policies, downtown development, place branding, environmental policies, water management schemes, land use laws, infrastructure projects, property rights reform, participatory governance, can have the character of land use policy tool if they aim at the coordination of land use and the reorganization of land.

This can include for example land use planning and zoning or economic development strategies that have an effect on the coordination of land use. Various sorts of planning, zoning, economic development strategies, preservation policies, downtown development, place branding, environmental policies, water management schemes, land use laws, infrastructure projects, property rights reform, participatory governance, can have the character of land use policy tool if they aim at the coordination of land use and the reorganization of land. Other less obvious could include private pacts or deals between actors for preservation or development of the community and informal strategies or institutions (meaning coordination principles) for land use and development. They can include and activate more circumscribed and focused land use tools: a policy relies on plans, a plan relies on laws, a law relies on other laws, a strategy includes zoning, design, and reinterpretation of property rights.

In most cases, the coordination of land use will not be the focus but a consequence of a policy or strategy focusing on something else, supposed to deal with boom and bust, supposed to spur development, to make communities more resilient. Also, one cannot omit informal institutions and strategies as potentially powerful tools to respond to boom and bust, tools with potentially profound effects on the coordination of land use.

We encourage authors to reflect on the presence/ absence of long term development strategies, (formal or informal) within the community, and on the embedding or non-embedding of land use tools in those strategies. We argue that the presence of a long term strategy and the linking of land use tools to such strategy can dramatically enhance the impact of the land use tools, while forgetting land use can reduce the impact of the broader strategy. Both strategy and land use tools can be formal or informal.

We are explicitly interested in policy recommendations, while being open to the use of a wide diversity of theories. Theoretical development is much appreciated, but the main conclusions cannot be theoretical; rather, they would have to dwell on the potential and limits of land use

tools for mitigating boom and bust, as observed in your case study or studies, and, where possible, with reflection on broader implications.

When working on policy recommendations, there are a few common pitfalls we would like to mention:

The call for absolute policy integration

Assuming that integrating all policy domains into one master policy will automatically lead to a perfect overview of the situation and to fixing all problems. In reality, there are many reasons why specialization and compartmentalization occurred in domains of policy, and this complexity serves positive roles as well as creates problems.

The call for regional planning

This tool could be useful, but it can also be impossible, or it could be possible without really solving many problems.

The call for participation

Each governance system operates on a combination of participation and representation, and complete reliance on participation is bound to make many problems unsolvable

The call for localism

Complex societies operate on the basis of multi-level governance. It is possible that more local input or organization is part of the solution, but this has to be argued for.

In general, we much welcome analyses drawing on deep insight in both current issues and in the evolution of governance in a particular area. Both the problems and the solutions are tied to particular governance paths, where e.g. the absence of earlier mitigating strategies amplified negative consequences of boom/bust, and then makes it harder to come up with strategies and land use tools later, as there is no institutional base to work from, to understand the problems, to think of solutions, of alternative futures, and to think of strategies and land use tools to make those strategies real.

We are also open to smaller, conceptually more focused studies. Possible topics, still fitting within the general frame outlined above, can include, but are not limited to:

- The potential for land use policies and planning to contribute to community reinvention [in a context of boom/bust, ups and downs]
- The importance of land use policies and planning to be embedded in a broader community development strategy

- The roles of and conditions for policy and organizational learning, when rethinking land use
- Managing dependencies, in understanding and rethinking land use
- Balancing long term orientation and adaptive governance for land use
- Mapping, protecting, connecting, developing assets on the land, by means of land use policies & planning, for more resilient futures
- Functions of leadership in rethinking land use and governance
- Managing risk and expectations in planning for resilience
- The role of old and new narratives in rethinking land use
- What can boom and bust experiences tell us regarding the roles of land use and planning in general?

In a next step, the guest editors will develop a framing paper, which will be sent to all invited contributors, further developing the approach presented in this call. We will ask the contributors to engage with that framing paper, which will help to increase consistency in the special issue.

A few key elements will be:

The need for land use policies that fit a longer-term development strategy

The need to understand both strategy and land use tools broadly, that is, also beyond planning departments and beyond formal institutions

The need for new strategies to start from existing sets of policy tools and governance configurations

The need to grasp the actual, not professed, power of land use tools and embedding strategies

The importance of distinguishing between tools and strategies for different structural situations

We highlight the concept of a concentration problem: a history of ups and downs simplifies governance, reducing actors, institutions, forms of knowledge, power relations. The concentration problem makes reinvention more necessary, but harder at the same time.

And we introduce the concept of transitional governance: possibly, after analysis, it is very tough to envision a long term strategy from a low position; then rebuilding institutions to enable communities to envision alternative futures can be the first goal of strategy, a platform from which an actual long term development strategy can be articulated.

Practical considerations

By December 31st, 300-500 word abstract.

By June 1st full paper for those invited [aim at 6-7000 words]; fast internal comments.

By Sept 1st, revisions back to the editors, out to external review;

External review; second half of 2019 public; individual papers published earlier online