

2019

# Governance, Power and Empowerment



Toland, A., Kinniburgh, J., Z. Horn & J. Hopkins  
Place Agency  
10/15/2019

Prepared by:

Andrew Toland, Joanne Kinniburgh, Zoe Horn and Jillian Hopkins Jo Paterson Kinniburgh, the University of Technology of Sydney



For:



With the support of



This document was prepared as a teaching guide for placemaking academics to engage their students in the topic mentioned in the title. It is part of a 12 module series created through a multi-university collaboration including Curtin University, University of Notre Dame, the University of Technology of Sydney, University of New South Wales, University of Queensland, The University of Adelaide and the University of Melbourne. The module was informed by practitioners through an intensive skillset and gap analysis workshop in Oct 2017.

This module envisioned as a 1-week delivery includes:

- This template including ~10 hours of content as follows
  - A total of ~3 hours of presumed in-class exercises (no more than 1-hour lecture)
  - A total of ~7 hours of personal study time (i.e. readings/short essays/videos to watch)
- The slides/materials used for the lecture.
- List of 'mandatory' reading and recommended readings relevant to the module content.

The document is subdivided into two sections.

1. Section 1: Provides an outline of the aims of the module
2. Section 2: Expands on the specific topic covered by this module and the recommended exercises for tutorial activities.

# 1 Section 1: Module outline

## Overview

The Governance, Power and Empowerment module explores how government structures and power dynamics impact place-based decision-making. The module considers the legislative and regulatory systems that frame a project across multiple tiers of government and society. Students will understand top-down and bottom-up power structures, motivations and communication methods. The module will consider how diverse stakeholder groups can influence, leverage and advocate within or around these governance structures. Funding, procurement, partnerships and politics are also addressed. The module can be used to focus on a specific studio project site or a topical local development site.

**Note:** Please note that this module on governance is highly interrelated with the module on the role of local government and developers (Module5). As part of the subject offered at the University of Melbourne, the two modules were combined into a 4-hour in-class session with supplementary readings materials.

## Summary of materials referred to in this Module

The following should be easily accessible through the PlaceAgency web platform, local council and developer websites, or university library databases (journal articles etc). Some are for your reference, and some are needed by students for their activities.

### Resources needed for student's independent study outside the classroom.

- Carmona, M. (2014). The Place-shaping Continuum: A Theory of Urban Design Process, *Journal of Urban Design*, 19:1, 2-36.
- Hopkins, J. (2020) The Systems of Place Agency: Adaptive Governance for Public Benefit There's, In D. Hes and C. Hernandez-Santin (eds.) *Placemaking fundamentals for the built environment*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Zamanifard, H., Alizadeh, T., Bosman, C. (2018). Towards a Framework Of Public Space Governance. *Cities* 78:155–165.

Resources needed for students' in-class activities.

- Butchers paper, large-scale paper pad, whiteboard or chalkboard. Paper

### Additional resources: Case studies showcasing different ways of leveraging place governance for public benefit

- Subverting government regulations to make change: Santiago Cirujeda Guerilla Architecture Al Jazeera video documentary & article: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=674N2SnaAfs>
- Highlighting government structures to streamline approvals & decision making: Teddy Cruz  
Teddy Cruz Ted Talk:  
[https://www.ted.com/talks/teddy\\_cruz\\_how\\_architectural\\_innovations\\_migrate\\_across\\_borders?language=en](https://www.ted.com/talks/teddy_cruz_how_architectural_innovations_migrate_across_borders?language=en)
- Operational governance driving community ownership of public asset: Sydney Opera House  
<https://www.smh.com.au/video/video-entertainment/video-entertainment-news/thats-the-biggest-billboard-in-sydney-mate-the-chaser-20181008-58nld.html>

Sydney Opera House Reconciliation Action Plan:

[https://www.sydneyoperahouse.com/content/dam/pdfs/rap/SOH\\_RAP\\_2017-19.pdf](https://www.sydneyoperahouse.com/content/dam/pdfs/rap/SOH_RAP_2017-19.pdf)

- Freeing government constraints: Duisburg-Nord:  
Joern Langhorst (2014) Re-presenting transgressive ecologies: post-industrial sites as contested terrains, *Local Environment*, 19:10, 1110-1133, DOI: [10.1080/13549839.2014.928813](https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2014.928813)
- Site-specific governance structures defining ongoing operations and behaviour: Holzmarkt, Berlin  
The Guardian: The party city grows up: how Berlin's clubbers built their own urban village:  
<https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2017/apr/30/berlin-clubbers-urban-village-holzmarkt-party-city>

## Objectives of the Module

- To understand the role of government, legislative structures and regulatory systems in place-decision making
- To explore the 'politics' of place and the relative power dynamics of public and private actors
- To identify key decision-makers and leverage associated power structures
- To develop visual and practical tactics to make power structures legible through project processes
- To investigate the roles of civil society, community organising and activism
- To consider how issues of scale and procurement influence governance and stakeholder empowerment

## Module Content

- 1) The module focuses on the following topics:
- 2) Governance, government structures, processes
- 3) Leveraging governance
- 4) Power dynamics - top-down and bottom-up approaches
- 5) Advocacy and activism

## Learning outcomes

Upon completion of this module students will be able to:

- understand the structures, processes and jurisdictions determining the production of place
- identify relevant mechanisms for exerting influence and affecting change
- distinguish between top-down and bottom-up interests and their respective claims to power
- describe power relations in a visual manner

## Module Overview (10 hours)

This module is designed as a 1-hour lecture and 2-3-hour interactive workshop. The workshop develops a collective class role-play game to negotiate power and influence within a project, and can be used to explore a hypothetical project or a specific, contested local development site. Students are expected to undertake 5 hours reading and preparatory research before class and 2 hours reflection after the workshop.

Table 1: Module overview. Summary of the activities considered within this module and the time equivalency. In white content that is either delivered in-person or online but requiring some element of students listening/discussing with the group etc. In grey, self-study activities, videos, etc.

ACTIVITY	TIME	NOTES	
A	Readings	1.5 hr	<p>Carmona, M. (2014). The Place-shaping Continuum: A Theory of Urban Design Process, <i>Journal of Urban Design</i>, 19:1, 2-36.</p> <p>Hopkins, J. (2020) The Systems of Place Agency: Adaptive Governance for Public Benefit There's, In D. Hes and C. Hernandez-Santin (eds.) <i>Placemaking fundamentals for the built environment</i>. Palgrave Macmillan</p> <p>Zamanifard, H., Alizadeh, T., Bosman, C. (2018). Towards a Framework Of Public Space Governance. <i>Cities</i> 78:155–165.</p>
B	Preparatory tasks for tutorial	2 hrs	<p><b>'TOPICAL TERRAIN: Leveraging government structures'</b></p> <p>Working on a contested area (a site with complex land ownership, competing stakeholders and have the potential for strong community engagement) students will research the governance structures surrounding the site, including local environment plans, land ownership and stakeholders. They should also gather news articles about the contested nature of the site, in particular from the perspective of their assigned actor. They will write 300 words commenting on perceived governance structure from their research.</p> <p><b>Note1- what is expected from the lecturer:</b> Some reading materials will be provided by the lecturer including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Case Study Overview:</b> 500 words</li> <li>• <b>A brief history of the site:</b> 100 words</li> <li>• <b>Development history:</b> [400 words in bullet points]</li> <li>• <b>Major contested issue(s):</b> some links showing how it is contested</li> </ul> <p><b>Note 2:</b> As part of this, students must have completed a stakeholder analysis either during preparatory tasks or completed as a group during a session prior to this module (i.e. Community engagement module) – See attachment 1.</p> <p><b>Note for facilitator:</b> this can be the same site the students are using for their whole project.</p>

	Case study analysis	1.5 hr	<p>Explore the 5 case studies on leverage governance structures to achieve public benefit for public places.</p> <p><b>Subverting government regulations to make change:</b> Santiago Cirujeda Guerilla Architecture <a href="#">Al Jazeera video documentary &amp; article</a>: (25 min)</p> <p><b>Highlighting government structures to streamline approvals &amp; decision making:</b> <a href="#">Teddy Cruz Ted Talk</a>: (13:03 min)</p> <p><b>Operational governance driving community ownership of public asset:</b> Sydney Opera House. <a href="#">Video</a> (1:36 min) and <a href="#">Sydney Opera House Reconciliation Action Plan</a></p> <p><b>Freeing government constraints: Duisburg-Nord:</b> Joern Langhorst (2014) Re-presenting transgressive ecologies: post-industrial sites as contested terrains, Local Environment, 19:10, 1110-1133, DOI: 10.1080/13549839.2014.928813</p> <p><b>Site specific governance structures defining ongoing operations and behaviour:Holzmarkt, Berlin</b> <a href="#">The Guardian: The party city grows up: how Berlin's clubbers built their own urban village</a></p> <p>Write 10 dot points documenting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Why did Santiago Cirujeda Guerrilla Architecture subvert government regulations to make the change and what were the outcomes</li> <li>- What were the reasons for and benefits of the government streamlining approvals &amp; decision making in the Teddy Cruz case study</li> <li>- What were the key lessons and benefits from operational governance driving community ownership of public asset the Sydney Opera House</li> <li>- What were the key lessons and benefits from freeing government constraints: Duisburg-Nord</li> <li>- What were the key lessons and benefits from the site-specific governance structures defining ongoing operations and behaviour: Holzmarkt, Berlin</li> </ul>
C	Lecture	1 hr	<p><b>‘POLITICS AND POWER: Top-down &amp; bottom-up approaches to place-making’</b></p> <p>The lecture explores the political frameworks and methodologies for leveraging power to impact positive change to the place. Case studies will include government-led public projects, community activism and hybridised public-private and public-community partnerships. Issues of government structure, regulations, ownership and procurement will be explored against actor networks and critical reflections on project outcomes and processes.</p>
D	Workshop	2-3 hr	<p><b>Activity 1: ‘POWER IN PRACTICE: project processes and power dynamics’ (1-2hr)</b></p> <p>In this workshop, students will participate in an interactive game as a means of revealing and negotiating power dynamics. Each student will be assigned a politically charged role (such as government stakeholder, property owner, legislator, civil society, tenant, developer, heritage activist, interest group), a</p>

			<p>place-based agenda and an element of influence (money, policy documents, property, people). Through negotiation, trade, alliances and persuasion, students must work to influence decision making and achieve their hypothetical agenda.</p> <p><b>Activity 2 ‘MAPPING POWER RELATIONS’ (1 hr)</b></p> <p>On completion of the game, students will break into working groups (3 or 4) to map the relationships between the actors and their relative power/influence. Each working group will develop a complex diagram to map exchanges, influences and outcomes within the process, and to conclude 5 tactics for exerting influence. The diagram and reflection should be completed outside of class in preparation for the next lesson.</p>
E	Reflective task	2 hr	<p><b>‘MAPPING POWER RELATIONS’</b></p> <p>The diagram and reflection task about should be continued by individual students and completed outside of class in preparation for the next lesson.</p>
	<b>TOTAL MODULE</b>	<b>10hrs</b>	

## 2 Section 2:

### Introduction to Module – Background on Placemaking Process and Governance Structures

**‘Governance structure’** describes the arrangement of formal and informal mechanisms that *shape and conduct activities* of steering and coordinating interventions and actors towards objectives; place-shaping; and providing finance for the former two tasks. Governance structures:

- include actions of visioning, planning, design, development, management, and maintenance of the space (see Carmona, 2014 and place-shaping);
- must understand how ideas of development are imagined and passed from design to development and to management; how resources are marshalled; and how management works during the shifts in political and economic conditions (Adams & Tiesdell, 2013; Healey, 2010); and
- require an analysis of **power, authority and stakeholders’ relations**

**‘Place shaping’** is an act of multiple actors and stakeholders (beyond the public body) whose motivations, attitudes, and interests are different and perhaps contradictory. The different actors and stakeholders can take one or more than one roles of manager, developer, planner, user etc. (Carmona, 2014). In general sense, there are three broad groups of stakeholders with distinctive institutional interest and perception are civil society (individual or groups), the public sector (e.g. local government), and the private sector (Healey, 2010; Tiesdell & Adams, 2011) – specific roles are transient, changeable, and may overlap

Governance requires consensus, ground rules, law, and enforcement to fulfil its objectives. Depending on governance capacity and culture, level of trust among stakeholders, and the extent to which concerns of local community and marginalised voices are heard by formal government, process and tools can take different forms (Brandtner, Höllerer, Meyer, & Kornberger, 2016; Coaffee & Healey, 2003; Healey, 2015).

Governing tools can be formal or informal. Some examples include incentives, guidance, and control are three categories of formal governing tools (Carmona, 2016b). These tools may be translated into masterplans, briefs, legal acts or local laws in public space projects. The applicability of each of the tools has a strong tie with the governance structure, governing tasks, and actors engaged throughout the processes of development and management. For instance, incentives may target the physical environment, while local laws regulate the behavioural environment

- **Formal** tools can be either defined through actors' relative collaboration and consensus or by the institution in power.
- **Informal** tools are those indirect means of governance that stakeholders other than formal government bring in (Salamon & Elliott, 2002). For instance community values, aspirations, and attachments are all part of informal governing tools (Manzo & Perkins, 2006)

Given all these complexities, an analysis of governance boils down to the following considerations:

1. What are the implications of competing stakeholder interests and agencies to governance structure – how do they constitute each other and determine governance tools, processes and shape outcomes?
2. How can specific tools/mechanisms /tactics (linked to **power, authority and stakeholders’ relations**) shape a project’s design, development and management; define how resources are marshalled; and facilitate management across shifting political and economic conditions and evolving user expectations?



3. How can a project establish a governance framework that better aligns expectations and processes with desired outcomes?

The governance systems active in a particular area, directly affect the ability to conduct place-based projects; they can facilitate or hinder placemaking proposals. Through a case study analysis process on Australian and international placemaking projects, Hopkins (2020) identified six different ways to leverage governance structures to achieve public benefit for public places. This is an exploration of how governance processes and regulatory frameworks can enable alternative models of city-making.

With case studies outlined in the reading, the identified tactics are:

- 1) Revealing hidden complexities: exposing conflicts and spatial opportunities;
- 2) Subverting government regulations: identifying and exploiting legal loopholes;
- 3) Defining site-specific systems: sustaining collective agendas;
- 4) Freeing government constraints: enabling emergence and transgression
- 5) Structuring public ownership: adapting for a life cycle legacy;
- 6) Earning public trust: consistent demonstrations of public value decision making.

## References:

Carmona, M. (2014). The Place-shaping Continuum: A Theory of Urban Design Process, *Journal of Urban Design*, 19:1, 2-36.

Hopkins, J. (2020) The Systems of Place Agency: Adaptive Governance for Public Benefit There's, In D. Hes and C. Hernandez-Santin (eds.) *Placemaking fundamentals for the built environment*. Palgrave Macmillan

Zamanifard, H., Alizadeh, T., Bosman, C. (2018). Towards a Framework Of Public Space Governance. *Cities* 78:155–165.

## 2.1 'POWER IN PRACTICE: project processes and power dynamics'

Partially adapted from an exercise prepared by Paul Miesing and Edward J. Pavur (University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, N.Y. and published in *Journal of Strategic Management Education* Volume 4 2008.)

Addressing the theme through a workshop and interactive game, students will encounter a strategically complex placemaking scenario. Working as individuals or small groups, students will analyse stakeholder roles and agencies within the context of the placemaking scenario. Adopting specific stakeholder perspectives, students will take on different (and often conflicting) positions with respect to the same placemaking scenario. After initial analyses, students will convene to discuss, debate, and defend their positions, ideas, and preferences. The primary focus of the exercise is to develop a process for identifying and analysing the competing (and/or complementary) interests and agencies that are embedded in a placemaking problem and to work collaboratively to understand these dynamics while negotiating complex decision-making processes and outcomes.

### Purpose:

1. To allow participants to experience strategic negotiation to consider a complex placemaking governance structure;

2. To understand that placemaking outcomes are driven by relative stakeholder interests and agencies; and
3. To support reflective analysis of strategic placemaking processes including stakeholder behaviour and the consensus problematique.

**Participant Distribution:** Any number of groups (or individuals) with division corresponding to the number of stakeholders identified in Task 2 (see below).

**Time Required:** 2 hrs but can be adapted as required (excluding pre-work)

**Related Topics:** Strategic problem analysis; Group decision-making; Leverage; Brokerage and negotiation; Guerrilla and tactical placemaking.

**Exercise Schedule:** The following schedule is approximate

Exercise 1: POWER IN PRACTICE; the exercise works on the assumption of 2 hrs but aspects of the exercise can be removed and done before class for lecturers who have less face-to-face engagement with the students.

Instructions	Delivery	Time	The objective of the exercise
<p><b>Discussion on preparatory tasks</b></p> <p><b>The instructor must assign each student to one of the three broad stakeholder categories – <i>civil society, public sector or private sector</i>.</b></p> <p>The students will divide into the three assigned broad sector groups and use their independent research to compile three lists.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Civil Society stakeholders</li> <li>2) Public Sector stakeholders</li> <li>3) Private Sector stakeholders</li> </ol>	{In-Class online or both}	10 min	Students synthesise the research they have conducted.
<p><b>Distributing the roles</b></p> <p>In the groups, ask students to share their research and discuss debate and synthesise their findings to complete/refine their observations on the power dynamics.</p> <p>Students will then need to take note of the stakeholder roles within their broad sector group as shown on every student's table, and compile a comprehensive list. So, for example, if they are Civil Society Stakeholders, they need to identify all of the entries on the group's tables that correspond to Civil Society Stakeholders and compile a list of these.</p> <p>Next, they need to distribute these roles so that every student has a role, and so that all roles are adopted - by either individuals or small groups, depending on numbers. They remain in these</p>		15 min	Students develop focussed understandings of governance issues for a particular stakeholder group.

<p>roles for Task 3 &amp; 4. If a small group shares the same role, they move into Task 3 as a group identified by their single role.</p> <p>Ask two students to act as observers and to record key discussion points.</p>			
<p><b>Strategy Development</b></p> <p>Students will be required to elaborate a stakeholder profile for their role, including interests vis-à-vis the contested issue(s), agencies (resources, assets, opportunities, etc), tools/mechanisms/ tactics and preferred outcomes and choose one of the six tactics to leverage governance (hidden complexities, subverting government, collective agendas, freeing gov. constraints, public ownership or public trust)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Students will articulate a position vis-à-vis a major contested issue in the case study, including expectations for project outcomes and priorities.</li> <li>2) Each student will then propose a novel strategic approach/tactic/mechanism to help their stakeholder negotiate the contested landscape of the project.</li> <li>3) Students will discuss their proposals associated with their relevant stakeholder based on known interests and capabilities.</li> </ol> <p>Ask students to clarify the following:</p> <p>For the discussion, organize an outline and approach for the strategy recommendation, asking students to answer the six key questions about their own role as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>What are my objectives?</b></li> <li>2. <b>What am I willing to compromise on?</b></li> <li>3. <b>Who are other stakeholders I can potentially ally with?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Where do my own interests conflict with those of other stakeholders?</b></li> <li>5. <b>What are my negotiating strengths and weaknesses in this scenario?</b></li> <li>6. <b>What are the strategic tools, mechanisms or tactics can I use to effectuate the outcome I want?</b></li> </ol> <p>Ensure all students have completed Question 6 before moving on.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> This exercise is best used at a relatively early stage of the design process where this task can be used as a brainstorming exercise.</p>	<p>{In-Class online or both}</p>	<p>30 min s</p>	
<p><b>Stakeholder Discussion</b></p> <p>The Instructor chairs a discussion between stakeholders.</p>	<p>{In-Class online or both}</p>	<p>45 min</p>	

<p>In the discussion, the scenario consists of multiple stakeholders, each representing a different perspective. Each participant will play the role assigned.</p> <p>Students fold a sheet of paper into a ‘tent’ and write the name of their role on the paper, sitting it in front of them facing the group, so that the group can readily identify the role they are playing.</p> <p>Students should keep the details of their concealed from other stakeholders.</p> <p>Instruct students to participate in the group discussion by being consistent with the information they are for their role.</p> <p>Give students from each role two minutes to outline their proposed strategy/tactic (i.e. their ideas from question six) and to provide key observations with respect to the existing governance structure of the project.</p> <p>After each group has outlined their strategies etc, encourage participants to pose questions of one another and comment on emerging strategies.</p> <p>During the discussion, participants should notice conflicting stakeholder roles and demands. With everyone bringing in their own information, opinions, and perspectives, you should see the larger governance picture develop and its impacts on process and outcomes.</p> <p>Allow different roles to discuss potential alliances with each other and reach compromises.</p> <p>If more than one student is in each role, it can be useful to regularly pause the discussion to allow them to confer within their small role groups.</p> <p>The instructor will need to moderate for time.</p>			
<p><b>Debrief and reflection.</b></p> <p>The class debrief should address the process, issues involving competing interests and negotiation, communication, and governance. Students will reflect on what occurred that was effective and ineffective. For example, there might have been some missed opportunities for collaboration, some effective strategies for including other perspectives, steps taken for building coalitions, or some cultural clashes.</p> <p>Everyone should be prepared to individually discuss the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How does your role/position impact your ability to effectuate outcomes and engender cooperation with other stakeholders?</li> </ol>	<p>{In-Class online or both}</p>	<p>15 min s</p>	

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. How important was it to understand the governance structure and process in order to develop an effective strategy?</li> <li>3. In developing your position, in what ways did you consider your relationships with end-users?</li> <li>4. On hearing other proposed strategies, how did your understanding of the governance structure of the case study change?</li> </ol>			
--	--	--	--

## 2.2 ‘MAPPING POWER RELATIONS’

Exercise 2: MAPPING POWER RELATIONS; the exercise works on the assumption of 1 hr in class followed by personal reflection time. The table process outlines both aspects

Instructions	Delivery	Time	The objective of the exercise
<p><b>Mapping power relations</b></p> <p>On completion of the game, students will break into working groups (3 or 4) with others who were not in their same role, and begin to map the emerging case study governance structure. The map will depict stakeholder relationships and visualise relative power/agency, forms of authority and tools operating between and across stakeholders in order to produce a larger picture of the complex governance structure shaping process and outcomes within the case study. Students should leave class with a draft map based on shared understandings and observations during the exercise.</p> <p>TIME FOR THIS TASK MAY BE ADJUSTED depending on how long the groups wished to continue discussing in the Tasks above, or if the Instructor wishes to wrap up with a summary lecture</p>	<p>{In-Class online or both}</p>	<p>30-60 mins</p>	<p>Understanding the influence of governance structures and power relations in place.</p>
<p><b>Reflection and Mapping continued</b></p> <p>At home, students should refine their maps and develop a visually striking, legible map that annotated with final observations.</p> <p>An accompanying 500-word reflection should re-evaluate the strategies developed in Task 3 in light of new understandings of the governance structure within which the stakeholder is operating, and make any further comments or recommendations on strategic approaches to the case study scenario.</p>	<p>At home, online or both</p>	<p>2 hours</p>	

# Appendix 1: Stakeholder Assessment

Stakeholders	Powers, authorities and key relationships (or conversely, weaknesses and barriers)	Key governance tools/mechanisms or tactics to date:
<i>Sector X</i>		
<i>Students to fill out</i>	<i>Students to fill out</i>	<i>Students to fill out</i>
<i>Students to fill out</i>	<i>Students to fill out</i>	<i>Students to fill out</i>
<i>Students to fill out</i>	<i>Students to fill out</i>	<i>Students to fill out</i>
<i>Students to fill out</i>	<i>Students to fill out</i>	<i>Students to fill out</i>
<i>Students to fill out</i>	<i>Students to fill out</i>	<i>Students to fill out</i>

**Comments on perceived governance structure (min 300 words):**

*Students to fill out*

**Imagine. Inspire. Connect. Create.**