

**WestminsterResearch**

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**Place-Based Evaluation for Infrastructure and Spatial Projects:  
An Introduction**

**Woltjer, J., Alexander, E.R., Hull, A. and Ruth, M.**

This is a pre-publication version of a book chapter to be published in Woltjer, J., Alexander, E.R., Hull, A. and Ruth, M. (eds.) Place-Based Evaluation for Integrated Land-Use Management, Farnham, Ashgate Publishing, pp. 1-12 .

---

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

---

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail [repository@westminster.ac.uk](mailto:repository@westminster.ac.uk)

# **Place-Based Evaluation for Integrated Land Use Management**

*Edited by*

JOHAN WOLTJER

*University of Westminster*

ERNEST ALEXANDER

*University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee*

ANGELA HULL

*Heriot-Watt University*

MATTHIAS RUTH

*Northeastern University*

## Chapter 1

# Place-Based Evaluation for Infrastructure and Spatial Projects

### – an introduction

Johan Woltjer, Ernest Alexander, Angela Hull, Matthias Ruth

#### **Introduction**

In recent years, there have been some major changes in the management of planning projects and infrastructure development, such as roads, rail and waterways. The emphasis is increasingly on local and regional integration of these projects. Besides the linkages between projects, their value and interactions with other related planning matters including environment, housing, industry, green and water have become more pertinent. In other words, land-use planning and infrastructure management have become spatially and thematically more integrated (e.g., Black, 2010; Bertolini, 2012; Geerlings et al, 2012; Hull, 2008; Hijdra et al, 2013; Busscher et al., 2014).

These changes have a profound influence on questions of evaluation: the qualities legitimate project proposals should have, the benefits and costs related to development initiatives, the complexity and effectiveness of integrated land-use management practice. These kinds of questions are central to planning evaluation. The assumption behind practices of planning evaluation is that well-considered assessment and analysis help planners to create clarity about impacts of projects, make proposals more legitimate and make planning

intervention useful given societal needs. Evaluation research has been involved in suggesting tools and designing rules and measures, not only for expressing levels of socio-economic progress and development, but also in terms of environmental and institutional realities (Khakee et al, 2008; Oliveira and Pinho, 2010).

The challenge now is to include more strongly the local and regional layout of planning projects, and establish a stronger place-based understanding for their evaluation. Planning evaluation then implies looking at local and regional circumstances, and establishing an ‘open eye’ among evaluators for the specifics of cases in terms of local values, benefits, impacts, synergies, use, complexities and spatial change. This book, therefore, is presenting pointers as to how evaluation and the institutional design of evaluation processes might be improved for place-based infrastructure development and spatial planning.

This book brings together contributions from experts in the fields of spatial planning, regional science and infrastructure management to tackle an emerging agenda of spatially-oriented integrated evaluation. The book sets out to clarify the nature and roles of evaluation in the wider context of current planning and policy practices. The aim is also to present current academic thinking and concepts, case studies, methods, and policy and practice review, examining and assessing integrated land-use management.

## **Place-Based Evaluation**

The idea of incorporating and internalising various place-based factors into regional policy-making and planning evaluation has been a prominent theme in recent years (e.g., McCann et al., 2012). The emphasis on place in planning evaluation implies a broad definition and scope of projects, plans and programs. Local capacities such as levels of innovation, ecological resources,

financial opportunity or political support are important, as are externalities between infrastructure and environmental factors. A place-based approach implies the integration of distinctive spatial circumstances into broader policy-making and evaluation practice. Evaluation tools, then, are area-oriented, and seek to express qualities at specific places. An assessment of infrastructure and spatial projects requires less focus on generic indicators such as regional income, and relies more on contingent, specific markers for evaluation like local capacity.

A place-based approach offers a series of implications for planning evaluation research and practice. The emphasis on place and spatial context implies the need for distinct assessment items for evaluation such as co-benefits and co-costs, social impacts, individual value, long-term effects, and community engagement. Also methodological improvements are required. Evaluation tools like cost-benefit analysis (CBA), geographical information systems (GIS), scenario studies, institutional analysis and environmental assessment should express local geographies more clearly. The book, overall, points to four categories of implications: the need to expressing value and benefit, a focus on impacts in place, locally based spatial analysis, and the importance of institutional design for spatial change. These implications will be briefly discussed below.

A first implication of a place-based approach is that evaluation practice emphasises the importance of *expressing value and benefit* in land-use and infrastructure development. An important aspect is that evaluation can help clarify the values spatial plans and projects derive from infrastructure. Tools like impact studies, economic assessments, and broader cost-benefit analysis can be helpful. Decisions on value-capturing, for example, may then be more adequately informed. Another aspect is that land-use projects typically generate mutual benefits and costs like longer-term accessibility changes to green and urban space, which determine the quality of cities and regions. At the same time, little is known about these co-benefits and co-costs (Ruth,

2013). Evaluation practice, therefore, would also focus on the measurement and consideration of unobserved and cumulative benefits from infrastructure use and the broader potential of infrastructure project. These kinds of benefits and costs should be included. An understanding of co-benefits and co-costs does require decisions on the demarcation of the area covered by the evaluation, and the time horizon.

The second implication involves a *focus on impacts in place*. Understanding local conditions and local capacities is increasingly important in planning evaluation. Place-oriented evaluation activities explore both the spatial and institutional integration of physical infrastructures with other uses. An important consequence of this approach is that recipients and users of infrastructure facilities and impacts are a key point of reference in evaluation. In other words: linkages between infrastructure supply and demand, and those affected (individuals, places, groups, users, communities), are central. Evaluation activities would look at specific effects on certain groups in society, and estimate how impacts are accumulated over time, in space, and origin.

A third implication of a place-based approach to evaluation involves *locally based spatial analysis*. A local emphasis in evaluation implies that evaluators work with open source, contextualized, and community-oriented evaluation data. Professional and administrative data from specialist monitoring systems, for example for noise measurement or using transport modelling, would be supplemented with local insight and knowledge. Such an emphasis would also imply the need to use participatory processes for tools like cost-benefit analysis (CBA). Local involvement in CBA can make evaluation situation-specific, and thus provide a better understanding of relevant environmental conditions and capacities. It would also allow for learning processes aimed at generating knowledge, structuring options, identifying compliance, and perhaps improvement of the underlying plan or project.

The fourth category of implications involves *institutional design for spatial change* and stakeholder opportunity. The fundamental point is that evaluation would concentrate on the question how local institutions determine who is involved in spatial change and who might benefit from, and potentially contribute to projects. Benefits and contributions may range from issues of employment, the improvement of facilities, combining investments, or contributions in terms of knowledge and commitment. Such an involvement involves institutional design for value-capturing, partnerships, social responsibility and ‘buy-in’. Such an approach would need evaluative insight into the position of the parties involved in an infrastructure project in terms of the extent to which the infrastructure project or plan offers improved options and opportunities for local stakeholders.

## **Overview of the Book**

The chapters of the book are organized into four parts:

Part I. Evaluating Value and Benefit in Land-Use and Infrastructure Development;

Part II. Understanding the Evaluation of Impacts and Space;

Part III. Spatial Analysis for Integrated Projects;

Part IV. Evaluating Planning Intervention, Institutions and Spatial Change.

### *Part I. Evaluating Value and Benefit in Land-Use and Infrastructure Development*

The chapters in this section show how places of infrastructure projects are often associated with planned projects’ direct economic value and costs. But attention should also be paid to the longer-term and more indirect benefits that users can receive from public values embedded in

projects such as transit, highways and waterways. Evaluation practices, therefore, should better understand the relation between assets and users, and apply user-oriented criteria. Measurement of such values should be dynamic, ongoing, and include implicit and more indirect benefits and place-specific characteristics of a plan or project. New institutional arrangements are required to make these benefits explicit.

*Ernest Alexander* in his chapter discusses the important role of institutional design for planning and delivering infrastructure projects. Institutional design characteristics like organizational structures, rules and procedures are essential to facilitate effective planning processes. This chapter asks the question what kind of institutions, organization and processes are best suited for effective planning, delivery and operation of a particular infrastructure project in its specific context. Value capture is seen as critical, as it ensures the funding needed to make projects feasible. The position of evaluation includes assessing alternative institutional designs' value-capture potential. The chapter, therefore, emphasises the need for considering alternative institutional designs for value capture, particularly special assessments, functional authorities, and specified forms of public-private partnership.

*Matthias Ruth, Junming Zhu, Nancy Lee, and Sahar Mirzaee* call attention to a couple of innovative aspects for policy and planning – the co-benefits and co-costs of environmental planning, policy and investments, and the indeterminacy of causal relationships between system interventions and outcomes. Their chapter argues that plans, policies and investments generate co-benefits and co-costs (like health benefits from policies proposing traffic congestion reductions to improve transport), and that their magnitude can easily be decisive for decision making. The chapter also explores how co-cost and co-benefit analysis may be used to help shape planning, particularly through institutional innovation needed for capture of co-benefits, and minimization of co-costs.



The chapter by *Karsten Rusche and Jost Wilker* starts from the principle that high quality green environments have a significant positive impact on the attractiveness of cities and regions, and deliver economic, social and environmental benefits. The role of evaluation in this chapter largely is to clarify and justify investments in green infrastructure. The chapter focuses on the economic value and individual benefits of a series of landscape parks in the city of Stuttgart. Results from the analysis in this chapter show that benefits from green infrastructure generally well exceed their costs. The most significant benefit gains are generated through recreation and leisure, improved river access, and health and well-being. A detailed analysis like this shows specific values from green, and the usefulness to specify benefits for use in strategic planning.

*Anastasia Roukouni, Francesca Medda, Maria Giannopoulou, and Athanasios Vavatsikos* use the Crossrail project in London to show how evaluation can express the contribution of transport investment to sustainable economic growth. The focus is on land value capture as a tool for funding high cost public transport systems. In the case, a method called the Business Rate Supplement is used to raise funds from infrastructure generated value. Special attention in the analysis is spent on issues of timing, as value capture strategies are based on dynamic development, and distance, given space infrastructure and their zones of impact. The chapter essentially highlights the idea of evaluating value and using value capture finance for large transport infrastructure investment at a wide level of scale.

#### *Part II. Understanding the Evaluation of Impacts and Space*

The understanding from this theme is that evaluation activities should express more clearly the place-based spatial characteristics within which planning and plans unfold, and the impacts plan implementation has on local economies, the communities in which these economies function, and the ecosystems within which all of them are embedded. These characteristics would include,

in particular, institutional capacities, local economic potential, social impacts, and benefits broadly defined. Therefore, evaluation work must be place-based, and should contribute to raising spatial awareness among public and private stakeholders. One means to generate such awareness is the development of evaluation processes, dissemination of planning and decision support tools and results to the broader public, and the associated generation of a community-based 'evaluation vocabulary'.

One such evaluation process is the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) discussed by *Frank Vanclay and Ana Maria Esteves*, who emphasize recent trends in moving SIA from traditional ex ante prediction of negative impacts to a new paradigm of seeking to maximize positive outcomes to communities while minimizing harm. Since plans are established and investment and policy decisions are typically made under incomplete information, the SIA process is carried out as an adaptive management process in which all stages from pre-establishment of plans to outcomes post closure are monitored and evaluated to inform subsequent adjustments, learning, and re-intervention in the complex systems that plans try to shape.

Since communities are integral to the success of plans and the adaptive management that should guide them, engaging communities is essential to both the planning and evaluation process. Despite considerable experience with community engagement across a range of applied research fields, little systematic information exists in the planning literature that provides clear direction to inform practicing planners on their community engagement technique options, such as surveys, focus-group meetings or workshops, for example. Drawing on experiences in the related field of health impact assessments (HIAs), *John Gaber and Tammy Overacker* in their chapter distil information from 95 international projects on community engagement activities with the goal of better understanding the practices and experiences of community health planners

with community engagement processes. These experiences, so goes their argument, can provide valuable insight to the plan evaluation process.

In the following chapter, *Vitor Oliveira* presents the Plan-Process-Results (PPR) methodology developed to evaluate planning and plan implementation, and demonstrates its application to the Plano Director Municipal (PDM), the master plan for Porto, Portugal. A rich data set for the application of the PPR methodology comprises, among others, the plan itself, other regional and strategic plans that affect or are affected by it, interviews, official statistics, cartographic material as well as public accounts, such as newspaper articles. This data set allows for a rich analysis of a wide range of place-specific evaluation criteria, ranging from internal consistency of the plans and their relevance in the broader context of planning goals, to public participation, commitment of adequate resources for plan implementation, and plan effectiveness. With this chapter, *Oliveira* showcases how the PPR process can directly shape the design of plans and of planning practices that are being prepared, and identifies areas for future research in planning and evaluation.

Plans affect future realizations of local conditions, and as such are also based on the anticipation of such conditions. However, a wider range of futures will likely prevail than what is typically assumed in the planning process. Careful integration of future scenarios can therefore broaden the perspectives of planners and researchers concerned with both the planning and evaluation processes. *Abdul Khakee and Laura Grassini* attend to the methodological and practical challenges of using future scenarios in that manner and illustrate the approach with an application to a case study in Izmir, Turkey. That case study shows how future scenarios can provide deeper and richer appreciation of present space and thereby improve planning practice.

Another set of constraint on and synergies for current planning actually lies in the inconsistency not so much with future scenarios but instead with the broader landscape of

already existing plans and frameworks. To the extent that other plans and policy frameworks are not considered, conflicts may emerge, or opportunities to generate co-benefits may be missed, in the planning process. This is the case discussed by *Cecilia Wong, Brian Webb, Andreas Schulze-Baing, Mark Baker and Stephen Hincks*. These authors use GIS mapping overlays to identify the patterns of spatial synergies and conflicts that arise from sectoral government policies and programmes. They illustrate their approach for the case of housing delivery in England and highlight that even relatively simple mapping overlays can greatly inform policy debates and encourage enhanced partnerships among government policy-makers and stakeholders. Such partnerships may result in enhanced coordination, management and delivery of complex spatial planning policies across different spatial levels.

*Domenico Patassini, Matteo Basso and Giorgio Borghelot* evaluate spatial changes of location patterns of economic activities, which have been generated by the development of large infrastructure systems, such as regional transport networks. Such infrastructures may serve as an important pull for economic activities, provide a source for agglomeration economies, economic multipliers and accelerators, and thus serve as a key factor of regional competitiveness and have far-reaching social and environmental impacts. Their analysis showcases the large-scale and long-term impacts of the ‘Mestre Through Highway’ within the Venetian Metropolitan Area of Italy on spatial patterns of economic activity. The challenges associated with shaping the planning and implementation of the Mestre Through Highway demonstrates the limitations of good spatial governance when administrative procedures are characterized by inertia, when business interests accrue among select communities and interest groups, and when adverse effects are diffuse and long-term.

### *Part III. Spatial Analysis for Integrated Projects*

This section demonstrates how evaluation tools, such as cost-benefit analysis (CBA), can be made more 'spatial', and how efforts are under way to express synergies and benefits from projects, in a more distinct way. With this objective in mind, each of the four presentations explore how to adapt the strengths of CBA with its focus on single projects to more effectively assess integrated transport plans. All the chapters are written by scientists working in the Netherlands. Two chapters reflect on how CBA is used there and seek to improve the process. One chapter critically assesses the 'Sustainability Check' [in Dutch *Omgevingswijzer*] instrument and another develops a new tool: the Plan Review. These chapters suggest how CBA may be adapted as a learning tool, and how the results of spatial analysis may be merged with other evaluation tools in order to improve decision-making support. It is also pointed out that planning evaluation needs to assume a stronger focus on its users.

*Niels Heeres, Taede Tillema, and Jos Arts* develop their chapter in the context of current discussions in the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment on how to improve the instruments that are used in the early stages of plan making. They show how these discussions are leading to the development of new planning instruments that can assess the spatial effects of integrated infrastructure projects and can support a collaborative planning process with representatives of different government functions and different disciplinary backgrounds. Following a review of the planning instruments available, the authors critically assess the capability of the 'Sustainability Check' instrument with data derived from interviews with experts in the field. They find that, although, this instrument enables cooperation, learning and the finding of common ground for action, further refinement is needed to ensure that social values are embedded in the decision making process.

The aim of *Emile Dopheide*'s chapter is to ensure that CBA is used effectively as a tool to exchange learning in the decision making process rather than being a 'black box' where the end result is delivered by a consultant to the client. He, therefore, focuses on the final users of CBA and what they understand about the content and scope of CBA. First he reviews the substantive and process bottlenecks in using CBA to assess the effects of infrastructure projects and then he looks at how CBA. He argues that these bottlenecks should be made clear and transparent to the end user. He concludes that more research needs to be carried out to understand the relationship between CBA outcomes and the decision outcome and that, moreover, the extent to which the final users actually understand and can interpret the CBA results.

*David Hamers, Like Bijlsma and Anton van Hoorn* develop a new instrument – The Plan Review - to address some of the weaknesses of CBA. Their aim is to help deliver multi-level policy goals in an increasingly dynamic planning practice where projects are often small-scale, and adaptive, and promoted by many different stakeholders. The Plan Review takes the form of a matrix that considers 16 different spatial conditions or spatial qualities (policy requirements) and seeks to enable the reviewers to reflect and consider how the project plan fits with higher-level objectives. The matrix structures a dialogue, and focuses on context sensitivity and the project plan's reasoning, to help the plan reviewers to compare alternatives, rank them and explore possible plan improvements.

*Els Beukers* clearly acknowledges some of the limitations of CBA and seeks to refine the tool as a tool to facilitate communication, learning and reflection. Her CBA-Dialogue tool is tested in two experiential case studies with the tool structuring a two-way dialogue between the plan owners and the CBA evaluators. This works in her case studies, marked by high levels of interpersonal skills and trust, to enable a valuable exchange of knowledge to help refine the

integrated plan. She warns, though, that it is still difficult to see CBA as a standardized tool for integrated transport plan assessment, since the spatial context of each plan needs to be considered so that the spatial and synergistic effects of plan proposals can be carefully assessed.

#### *Part IV. Evaluating Planning Intervention, Institutions and Spatial Change*

This section reaffirms the importance of spatial awareness: evaluation in (and of) planning should include a clear understanding of the linkages between various spatial activities and land uses. One of these chapters' salient conclusions is the need for attention to institutional design – both of the concerned plans, projects and programs, and of the evaluation processes and contexts themselves. Different institutional arrangements are evaluated in a variety of contexts, from Swedish local planning through Budapest urban renewal and Italian land-use policy, to Scottish university communities. Evaluations apply diverse methods and innovative approaches, often integrating quantitative and qualitative measurement and analysis, to enhance contextual awareness in urban projects. These chapters demonstrate how evaluation instruments can be dynamic and provide timely evaluative information on institutions and spatial change.

*Angela Hull's* chapter applies institutional analysis to evaluate a project designed to encourage sustainability enhancing behaviour, based on research into individual and collective behaviour change. The case is a community project in a Scottish university to promote environmental projects such as bicycling, recycling, and communal gardening. The analysis found that bureaucratic obstacles prevented effective action, and concluded that the institutionalization of shared values is critical for achieving significant behaviour change.

*Ann Åkerskog, Sylvia Dowlén and Abdul Khakee's* contribution is an evaluation of planning: how well are sustainability factors integrated into Swedish local planning. Their

qualitative analysis covers two case studies. One assesses the introduction of an environmental perspective in sampled localities before and after implementation of the EU-SEA Directive; the other evaluates the integration of energy efficiency in a set of municipal structure plans. The study found that communities' pre-existing sustainability orientation explains much of the differences between municipal plans.

*Tom Kauko* offers a place-based evaluation of Hungarian urban revitalization. An innovative quantitative-qualitative methodology is applied to assess the impacts of selected urban renewal projects in Budapest in an overall framework of evaluating their sustainability contributions. Self-Organizing-Mapping measures projects' impacts on property price stability; field survey evaluates their physical and social impacts through observation, plan-document analysis and interviews. Institutional analysis of project planning and financing yields insights on the effectiveness of alternative ways to organize and implement urban renewal.

*Catarina De Lucia, Atif Kubursi and Dino Borri* raise the issue of vulnerability in public policy analysis with a striking application of place-based evaluation. This issue is important because adaptation to climate change demands consideration of possible catastrophic events: estimating the potential impacts (social and economic) of floods, landslides, earthquakes etc. This chapter presents a systematic method of vulnerability assessment, which is demonstrated by assessing the local impacts of landslides in Italy. The policy relevance of such analysis is illustrated in the chapter's conclusion tracing its implications for Italian planning, land-use and development control.

## **Key Conclusions**

The central conclusions from the book are:



- Evaluation should be more clearly informed by local spatial characteristics. These would include, in particular, institutional capacities, local economic potential and benefits. The understanding is that evaluation work should be more area-based and should raise spatial awareness among the various public and private parties involved in land-use and infrastructure development.
- Evaluation tools should be developed and used to inform strategic planning. To be useful, they should be user friendly and function as an intermediary between public and private users. Evaluation instruments should be dynamic and provide consistent and timely information.
- Evaluation in (and of) planning should include a well-developed appreciation of the linkages between different spatial activities and/or land uses. This understanding would include expressing more indirect and longer-term impacts of planned interventions (such as strategic infrastructure projects and major facilities), including co-costs and co-benefits, unobserved values, and transaction costs. The call here is for evaluators to think in terms of synergies, for example, between a road project and surrounding real estate.
- Attention to institutional design in evaluation activities is required. Current problems in the field of land-use and infrastructure development, such as the need to raise private funding and the need to better understand social impacts, make it necessary to articulate and evaluate the value of public spatial investment more explicitly. These evaluation demands imply the need to establish new organizational arrangements and rules.

## **References**

- Bertolini, L., 2012. Integrating mobility and urban development agendas: a manifesto. *DISP*, 48(1), pp.16-26.
- Black, W.R., 2010. *Sustainable transportation: problems and solutions*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Busscher, T., Zuidema, C., Tillema, T., Arts, J., 2014. Bridging gaps: governing conflict between transport and environmental policies. *Environment and Planning A*, 46(3), pp.666-681.
- Geerlings, H., Shifan, Y., Stead, D., 2012. *Transition towards sustainable mobility: the role of instruments, individuals and institutions*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Hijdra, A. Woltjer, J., Arts, J., 2013. Value creation in capital waterway projects; Application of a transaction cost and transaction benefit framework for the Miami River and the New Orleans Inner Harbor Navigation Canal. *Land Use Policy*, 38, pp.91– 103.
- Hull, A., Alexander, E., Khakee, A., Woltjer, J., 2010. *Evaluation of Sustainability and Participation in Planning*. London: Routledge.
- Khakee, A., Hull, A., Miller, D., Woltjer, J., 2008. *New Principles in Planning and Evaluation*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- McCann, P., Barca, P., Rodriguez-Pose, A., 2012. The Case for Regional Development Intervention: Place-Based versus Place-Neutral Approaches. *Journal of Regional Science*, 52(1), pp.134-152.
- Oliveira, V., Pinho, P., 2010. Evaluation in Urban Planning: Advances and Prospects. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 24(4), pp.343-361.