

Spaces of Non-State Actors in the Urban Development Process: Rethinking the Community-based Planning in the Housing Sector

Mahesti OKITASARI, United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS), JAPAN

Abstract

This paper examines how community-based planning in Indonesia changes with the shifting roles of non-State actors in the development process and the introduction of international urban development agenda and approaches focusing on sustainability and resource efficiency approaches. Within this period, Indonesia planning system went through decentralization and transition. By using longitudinal study as a heuristic device, the paper aims to capture a more nuanced model of community-based planning. This paper intends to identify the key factors of systems changes and the realization of collective action that facilitate acceptance of sustainability and resource efficiency approaches for urban development.

1. Introduction

For the last half century, urban development theory and practice has increasingly focused on how people engage in the planning and implementation processes. Citizen participation in planning and development, in turn, is continuously being influenced by changes in urban development approaches, from participation for incremental to radical and transformational change. This focus is exemplified by works on community-based planning in synoptic planning, radical planning, and collaborative planning. Taken together, this continuum represents the varying degrees of citizen participation depending on their agency and power and social and political consciousness.

Recent international development approaches following the development and implementation of global agreements (e.g. Habitat Agenda, Millennium Development Goals, Rio+20, and as recently the 2030 Agenda, Paris Agreement and the New Urban Agenda) increasingly require collective action in delivering and managing urban area to attain its goals and, in broader context, sustainable development. These pressures from international community has influenced the way urban development approaches are taken, particularly through development assistances and introduction of new development measures. From the socio-economic and political administrative point of view, the decentralization which took place in Indonesia in 1999 has further accelerated the role of community and non-state actors in the planning system. These have inevitably changing the relationships between the State and non-State actors in approaching planning and development. With presence and participation from non-state actors continue growing, the government is moving away from their traditional way of working with non-State actors; from consulting to policy-making; from beneficiaries to partners. Amidst increasing demand of resources to catch up with rapid urbanization, it is expected that spaces are opening up for non-State actors to actively participate the development process. However, the questions remain whether the new approaches will contribute to urban development in a collaborative manner for the community.

While collective planning presence in development gain broader audience, constraints continue to exist throughout the changes of development approaches. The externalities affecting collaborative planning relies on the local circumstances and context where the planning takes place. To understand these constraints, there is need to understand local

collective action initiatives in the context of government policies, to explore ways in which such policy is interpreted and enacted by strategic actors and to examine the perception of members of the society themselves. As planning exists in a multi-level governance setting, it is pertinent to also examine government policies at its vertical interplay, between the national and local government. In the community-based planning, it means to take account of the perspective from the strategic actors in the community and examine the perception of deliberative community. Furthermore, the implementation of any policy, in turn, is influenced by different factors, one of which is assumed to be people's acceptance (Ekins, 2004).

Building upon this understanding and challenges, the paper examines how community-based planning in Indonesia changes with the introduction of resource efficiency as a platform to achieve sustainable urban development. It tries to understand how innovation and implementation of integrated resource efficiency measures on an urban scale shift the roles of non-State actors in delivering urban services in the housing sectors. At the community level, it looks at the intersection between community collective action and resource efficiency by identifying the residents' acceptance of resource efficiency and the ways of incorporating the concept into community planning, using waste management in the social housing as a case study

Following this introduction, this paper is elaborated into four parts. First, it looks into literature covering resource efficiency in the housing sector, its linkage to sustainable development concepts and the role of social acceptance. Second, it attempts to conceptualize the role of non-state actors in the community-based planning. Third, examine the space of non-state actors in the community-based planning through the case study. The final part offers conclusion on how to move forward with the community-based planning in the housing sector by maximizing community acceptance over collective issues.

2. Sustainable Development Concepts: Resource Efficiency in the Housing Sector

Urban responses to climate change have been the driver of the sustainable development movement in cities. Climate change mitigation and adaptation measures are incorporated in planning, construction and management of urban infrastructure (Walsh et al, 2011; Zimmerman and Faris, 2011). Yet, despite using the climate change approach relevant to many cities' needs and demands, the contradictions of sustainable development and urban priorities remain. In the last two decades, the need to dematerialize economies to preserve natural resources, to reduce the environmental impacts and to reduce pressure on ecosystem services led to the bringing of resource efficiency approaches to the forefront of sustainable development debates (Steinberger et al, 2010). These approaches understand that environmental pressures, such as greenhouse gas emissions, are closely related to material consumption and its flows (Barrett and Scott, 2012). One of the shifts in how cities respond through these policies is moving from increasing energy efficiency of local government assets to reducing a broad array of emissions linked to urban sectors. Rather than relying on producing single isolated plans, cities are putting effort to mainstream through a complex of technological, spatial and financial aspects.

2.1. Integrating Resource Efficiency Measures in Urban Housing

To this end, there are various entry points to examine the existing urban responses to sustainable development through resource efficiency approach. At least several major sectors could be identified, including transportation, energy, waste, industry, commercial, housing, and spatial plan. Housing sector, in particular, plays a crucial role to sustainable cities at the same time it is an integrating element to urbanization, planning and the use of resources through its linkage with the built environment. Further, the concept of housing encompasses the social, cultural, environmental and economic facets of cities. The future of

cities depends on how well the quality and the accessibility to sustainable housing are in place.

Yet in many cities, it is unclear to what extent sustainable housing as the solution for the built environment through resource and energy efficiency, environmental, resilience contributes to the overall work of resource efficiency, considering gaps between the physical (e.g. resource and energy use, design) and social economic system of housing policies (e.g. affordability, social justice, cultural and economy). Among many, the search for affordable land at the edge of urban areas to make the construction of affordable public housing financially feasible has the potential of creating a greater cost burden for the local government, as well as a global environmental burden through the emission of greenhouse gases caused by extended vehicle commuting distances (World Bank, 2011). Resource wise, the selection of materials and quality of assembly do not always go hand-in-hand with reducing long-term operations and maintenance cost, and minimizing environmental impacts as housing projects are not motivated by sustainability policy, but by the need to improve economic indicators in the generation of housing stocks (Gordillo and Hernandez, 2014).

In the light of the realities of existing urban housing responses, it is necessary to design policies for sustainable housing in a manner that provide opportunities to achieve social and economic goals through its contribution to reduce resource consumption and emission production. This involves not only developing sustainable housing technologies applicable to various climate regions, economic conditions and residential customs, but also the management innovations for urban governance targeting housing sector. To this end, comprehensive science-based housing policy options are needed to guide planners and policy makers in achieving trade-off between environment and urban growth. These include evidence-based insights on green buildings, sustainable housing, green infrastructure, climate change resilience and urban industrial symbiosis.

From the perspective of resource efficiency, sustainable housing can be defined from design, social, economic and eco-efficient points of view. Notwithstanding certain characteristics of sustainable development, sustainable housing is coherent to the idea of self-reliant development within natural resource constraints and the idea of cost-effective environmental development (Choguill, 2007). Those ideas are in line with a developmental concept which should not degrade environmental quality, nor should it reduce productivity in the long run. It is pertinent to note that housing sector significantly contributes to sustainability due to its large amount consumption of natural and man-made resource in construction, maintenance and continued use by society. Through its design, construction and operation, housing represents a significant point of direct consumption of natural materials, water and energy (World Bank, 2011). As a fixed asset with a long operational lifespan, housing is amenable to produce embodied energy equal as much as 15 years of the operational energy requirement during its construction only (Reardon, 2001). While sources of emissions vary depending on climate, designs and behavior, housing sector remains as the predominant land use in most cities and a major contributor to greenhouse gas emission (Jowsey, 2012).

The housing sector offers substantial opportunities to improve environmental performance and, in the long run, to contribute to the betterment of consumption and production. Recently, a large number of technology and innovations are available for efficiently operating the buildings, including wastewater treatment and use, energy efficiency, solar heating, passive cooling, and creating green spaces in proximity to compact housing. Taking into account the greenhouse gas emissions embodied in housing, incorporating those technologies and innovations into housing developments, particularly public housing and large-scale programs, provides opportunities to minimize local and global environmental programs. However, as housings are highly energy intensive through their life cycle, to shift will require taking into consideration demand-side parameters such as availability, reliability and effective consumption as well as improving energy efficiency and urban density (Rehman et al, 2012).

Sustainable housing policies can be designed to incorporate sustainable materials with potentially large-scale economic impacts. The housing sector is in a unique position to help achieving the triumvirate of sustainable growth; the social goal of reducing the housing deficit, the economic stimulus goal of creating jobs in the construction industry, and the environmental goal of developing healthy homes and communities (World Bank, 2011). Through current observations on existing housing policies, particularly in developing countries, there are still rooms for the betterment of sustainable housing policies and programs to greatly improve urban sustainability. Taking the example of Indonesia, its existing housing policies have yet to fully comply with environmental policies and there is not a comprehensive urban policy in support to the provision of sustainable housing sector.

2.2. Social Acceptance of Resource Efficiency

Social acceptance has been a key part to measuring sustainability and quantifying the social dimension of sustainability (Alcorn). The social sustainability dimension is approached from an angle of social acceptance due to accepted understanding that for a technical approach to be deemed socially sustainable, it should enjoy wider social acceptance (Assefa and Frostell, 2007). Social acceptance is increasingly important factor in the design of effective policy (Steg et al., 2006). Acceptability is also a particularly important issue to manage transitions to sustainability as policies for a transition to sustainable resource use require a significant degree of behavioral change (Geels, 2013). It, thus, depends on the consent of actors at various levels, from multinational to the individual (Bicket and Vanner, 2016). For example, individuals are more likely to accept certain policies if they are well informed of the consequences of issues addressed by the targeted policies and the benefits are well described. A string social norm is associated with higher public acceptability (Schade and Schlag, 2003).

While broadly can be applied to many issues related to technology, the concept of social acceptance is particularly popular in the area of energy and other large-scale infrastructure initiatives (Fournis and Fortin, 2016). The concept of social acceptance has also been frequently applied in the waste management (Seguin, 2005). Contributions to the literature from broader and over encompassing umbrella issue of resource efficiency is less popular compared to specific sector such as energy. Focusing on acceptance and resource efficiency is supposed to offer an opportunity to explore dimension associated with mainstream considerations with social acceptance.

On the operationalization of social acceptance approach, a triangle of social acceptance was introduced by Wustenhagen, Wolsink and Burer (2007) based on the synthesis of three dimensions; socio-political acceptance of technologies and policies by major social actors; community acceptance of local actors and deliberative community themselves; and market acceptance that representing the process of market adoption of an innovation. Szarka (2007) offered a complementary approach of 'social acceptability' which link technology to an evolving social contract which involves three levels of collective choice; socioeconomic and technological choice; public policy choice; and governance choice. The addition of the latter takes social acceptance to be a symbolic decision-making framework and a contested and dynamic process (Fournis and Fortin, 2016), informed by collective norms, diverse evaluation processes, political struggles, and the legitimacy of behavior (Szarka, 2007). From governance perspective, social acceptance then is understood as a collective choice of technology-social contract that often conditional and affected by politics. In this framework, conceptualization of acceptance is differentiated through the hierarchisation of distinct levels instead of the plurality of dynamics (Fournis and Fortin, 2016).

This paper follows both lines of thought in order to understand the interplay of complex processes. It focuses on the micro-social level associated with processes such as coordination, social interpretation and the construction of perceptions and meanings by individual in relation to specific situations, activities, and policies. The terms social defined in

this paper as encompassing all agents involved. The primary focus of this paper, however, is community acceptance.

3. Conceptualizing the Role of Non-State Actors in the Community-based Planning Process

Community-based planning is considered a fundamental aspect of bringing urban planning closer to its target constituents. Further, the last two decades have seen a global movement promoting democracy, justice and sustainability through active involvement of people, often representing through community participation. The principal implication is that community-based planning has become one of the key requirements to legitimize planning process. The experience in the ground shows that establishing inclusive community-based planning is very challenging. It is often pointed out that disadvantage groups and the poor are struggling to have access to actively participate in the planning processes (Mahjabeen, Shrestha and Dee, 2009).

3.1 Collaborative Planning

From the urban planning's perspective, community participation is considered fundamental to achieve inclusive decision making and sustainable development (Shrestha and McManus, 2008). The idea behind was with community groups actively engaged in planning and implementation processes, plans are likely to be respond well to stakeholders' needs, interests, and expectations (Healey, 1999). Community involvement in planning is also seen as means to bring together information, knowledge and skills from various stakeholders involved to improve the planning outcomes.

The systems of governance of a society or community refer to the processes through which collective affairs are managed (Healey, 1997). Collaborative planning is grounded in the theory of relation-building process creating intellectual and social capital through shared understandings and mutual trust (Healey, 1997). Thus, governance activity is diffused through the multiplicity of social relations we have, and may take many forms. It is a matter of specific geography and history how responsibilities as distributed between formally-recognized government agencies and these other arenas of governance.

Participatory planning approach are often based on the assumption that non-state actors, particularly civil society, are definable, homogenous, relatively organized and actively consensus seeking (Cooke and Kothary, 2001). On the other hand, the societal complexity and conflicts are present in many parts of the world and non-state actors take on very different. At the community level, the differences among community groups are due to various reasons, including socio-economic, culture, political, etc. The situation is exacerbated where the state is the weaker locus of authority (Watson, 2009). Assumption over the characteristics of non-state actors cannot be blamed as the reason why collaborative planning have been less than adequate in addressing urban development issues. In the global South, for example, the inherited planning system and approaches are often not equipped with consideration for inclusiveness, even though the context in which they operate has changed (Watson, 2009).

Baresford (2002) has identified two fundamental contradictions of collaborative planning and public participation: "enhanced political interest, but public dissatisfaction; official priority but very limited achievements and resourcing", implying that public participation initiatives do not always translate into a shift towards a more collaborative planning. In order to make sense of this, he calls for more focus on the social policy of public participation; its ideological, political and socio-economic relations behind.

3.2 Decentralization and Transition

Decentralization in the global South is often seen as the predominant measure of governance structure for delivering to the poor the basic services tasked in the international agenda, such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), as it would be achieved primarily through sub-national governments (Ingram and Hong, 2008). Consequently, in the 1990s, decentralization is considered as a tool to improve public service, economic development, and other social development, particularly when governments are seen less capable in doing so at the rate desired by citizen (e.g. Manor, 1999; Blair, 2000; Ito, 2005). There are many reasons that drive decentralization beside international pressures for governance restructuring, including the failure of centralized planning for economic development (see Freire and Stern, 2001), lack of transparency and exclusive decision making process exercised by the central government (e.g. De Angelis, 2005).

Indonesia was decentralized in 1999, following subtle movements started in early 1990s. The change marked a movement from a centralized and hierarchical government structure to a decentralized system. The decentralization law was enacted in 1999 and was implemented starubf January 2001. Indonesian decentralization was designed to bring a greater role on the local government, bringing a functional and responsibility shift of the central government, designated to lower levels of government through policy reform. The responsibility shift generally revolves around three main principles, i.e. de-concentration, decentralization and co-administration. The sub-national authorities in Indonesia (e.g. provinces, regencies (*Kabupaten*) and municipalities (*Kota*)) were granted autonomous status as local government. The head of regencies and municipalities are no longer directly respond to the provincial government, but to the local assembly.

Decentralization in planning system followed in 2004 after the national assembly passed the new law about national development planning system (Law 25/2004) and the new spatial planning law in 2007 (Law 26/2007). According to the new national development planning system, local governments are not obliged to make their local development plans as the direct extension of the national development plan. Instead, the national plan acts only as guidance and reference. Further, planning is governed at the local level with higher level governments as coordinating partners for regional planning.

Decentralization is not without governance issues. Bottom-up accountability and deficiencies in the existing capacity are often seen as the lacking part of Indonesian decentralization (see Shah and Thompson, 2004; Local Development International, 2013). Decentralization failed to sufficiently integrate elements of decentralization (e.g. political, economy, administration) with other public sector reforms. This lack of coherence was due to weak coordination of key actors where consensus is rarely reached. It is also found that the implementation has been uneven across municipality which largely depends upon the leadership quality of the local elites (see Firman, 2003). Municipalities with better capacity have better records in policymaking and implementation.

Collaborative planning, including local community-based planning, was affected by decentralization as it is closely related to the relationship formed between involved actors and their willingness to collaborate. The resources, objectives and roles that particular actors bring determine the nature of social relations forged within and across networks (Koliba et al, 2011). In a fragmented decentralized system such as Indonesia, actor relations vary across administrative jurisdiction, various levels of governments and between government and nongovernmental sector.

4. The Case Study

The concept of social acceptance towards sustainability and resource efficiency measures through community planning is illustrated with an example of community group that planned, established, and maintained a community based waste management. To facilitate an understanding of the increasing role of communities in the case study, the local sense of social relations and the institutional relationships created by the local administrative structure are explained.

4.1 Data

This case study is drawn from a longitudinal study of low income residential housing. The study was conducted in the city of Surabaya and focused on two housing communities located in the city center (Rusun Urip Sumoharjo and Rusun Grudo). The broader purpose of the study was to analyze the social acceptance of people towards sustainability and resource efficiency measures applied in the low income housing projects. For this paper, the study specifically looks into the role and capacity of community to support people's acceptance through community-based planning.

The initial round of field research gathered secondary data from the local officials regarding the targeted community and changes in community-based planning in the city of Surabaya. In later rounds, the study sought a more in-depth understanding of the social acceptance of the low income housing communities. The study used a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Data were collected in a series of intervals begin in 2014 and currently is still ongoing. Research methods included questionnaire surveys, analysis of transcripts based on in-depth interviews and oral histories. The questionnaire surveys to the households were conducted to gather information on household structure, education, employment, consumption and use of resources, housing ownership, access to services, and participation in community-level decision making processes. For each housing complex, 100 samples were collected.

4.2 Social and Economic Characteristics

As of 2018, Surabaya has 78 low-income housing blocks in 14 locations. From the start, development of low-income residential housing in Surabaya was aimed to provide affordable housing and to reduce squatters through relocation.

Rusun Urip Sumoharjo

As one of the oldest low-income housing in Surabaya, Rusun Urip Sumoharjo was built to replace residential houses burned down in a 1982 fire accident. Residents were not allowed to rebuild their houses and instead were temporary relocated while the local government built the multi-store housing which was finalized in 1985. Unlike other low-income housing blocks, Rusun Urip Sumoharjo was not a rental housing. The building undergone a reconstruction in 2003-2005 to replace the structure. Since the budget to rebuild and to maintain the building came from the local government, rental fee exclusive of utilities was imposed to residents starting in 2006.

The majority of the residents living are the owner of houses replaced in 1982. The housing block housed a total of 120 households. Most of them has non-wage source of income. Each unit consists of living-dining room, one bedroom and one bathroom, totaling about 24sqm.

Rusun Grudo

Rusun Grudo was originally built to improve the living condition of slum settlements and to provide housing for low-income local government retirees. It is a rental based housing with

subsidy from the local government. Each of the five stories building housed 96 households. The size of housing unit is 24sqm each.

4.3 Planning at the Community Level

In Indonesia, how local residents engage in planning at the community level is defined by the institutional relationships created through the urban political-administrative structure. For the administrative purposes, urban area is subdivided into districts and sub-districts with civil servants as officers. At the community level, there are two units of community group, *Rukun Warga* (RW) and *Rukun Tetangga* (RT) whose leaderships are on voluntary basis and directly elected by community members. In the residential housing complex, unlike in landed housing-based urban settlement, prior to establishing a RT, the community has to set and register a Residents Group in the sub-district office. With each RT consists of 30 to 40 households, each building with 5-6 floors could have two or more RTs. In the political-administrative structure, these community groups institutionally linked community and state. They also hold status as non-state actors alongside civic society organizations. For both Rusun Urip Sumoharjo and Rusun Grudo, RT was formed in each floor with 5-6 RTs in total in each building block.

Synoptic Planning

In 1982 when the first Rusun Urip Sumoharjo was built, residents were not involved in any capacity to develop the housing plan. The local government instead worked with private sector, resulting in many complaints about the quality of the building and housing units throughout 1985-2000. While community planning was enshrined in the planning law starting 1992, the practice was challenging due to a highly restrictive social and political context in which there exists a threat of repercussions for any activism considered political. Any community planning activity was highly controlled and directed by the government. The participatory process available was to improve the living conditions of the housing, including infrastructure and services. It was not an openly participative experience and instead local government adopted a problem-solving approach. Thus, resident participated in a formal, institutionalized planning process with limited power that allow residents to engage in negotiations with public officials.

Decentralization influence the change of process. It gave rise to new social debates on planning where the residents start gaining power to present suggestions and statements to local government to improve the condition of the housing block. The process led to approval of reconstruction. The process leading to the designing and developing the new housing block was more participative than the previous development process. The planners employed by the local government adopted a consultative approach where they offered meetings and participated in public consultation with the residents.

Collective Planning

In Rusun Grudo, residents were not involved in the planning and development of the housing blocks. However, the RT managed to reorganized themselves and establish a local waste recycling and management right after they started inhabiting the housing blocks. Their community-based waste management was considerably more advanced and organized compared to similar activity in Rusun Urip Sumoharjo despite the community group in the latter residential housing complex was established earlier with decades of experience in community organizing for social movement.

Collective local waste management was introduced at the city level in early 2000s following the green city movement and the successful settlement improvement program of affordable housing in the 1980-1990s. Eco city programs were introduced in mid 2000s targeting local communities to develop sub-district level community-based planning for waste management as part of the community green and clean advocacy. Local communities targeted were

mostly in the densely-populated urban areas and many of them were low-income, including residential housing complexes.

4.4 Community Acceptance of Resource Efficiency

The level of social acceptance is partly determined by community acceptance, a practical acceptance of new program within the targeted communities. The attitude toward resource efficiency, particularly on issues such as energy and water supply efficiency and waste management, is shaped by deep rooted cultural and ideological identities. It is also influenced by changing forms of information and advocacy. Reward and incentives from other local actors were also influential, including better outlook of general public opinion toward their living areas and neighborhood. For the waste management advocacy, it is the issue of NIMBY in the development of landfill. It is not necessarily close to the communities observed, but as the landfill serves the whole city the debates surrounds it affects the communities at large. Media, in particular, has a string influence on the community acceptance of resource efficiency as it sets emphasis on certain stories and link them with the ongoing supra-local and global movement on similar issues. This structures the public and community debate with perspectives and viewpoints.

We conducted a questionnaire survey on community acceptance of resource efficiency in Rusun Urip Sumoharjo and Rusun Grudo using the indicators listed in table 1 below to gather community perception. Our study found that the overall attitude over resource efficiency is tied to the social-economic factors of sustainable housing, including economic sustainability, accessibility and affordability. The better these factors are, the stronger community acceptance towards resource efficiency. Community satisfaction over their housing quality and quality of life also influences its acceptance towards resource efficiency. If they see exercising resource efficiency affect positively towards their housing quality and quality of life. The positive attitude towards community participation also significantly affect resource efficiency and the strength and coverage of resource efficiency initiatives being implemented in the housing sites.

The table below show the theme of resource efficiency and related community acceptance indicators used to collect the data through the questionnaires. A more detailed analysis using regression is currently being undertaken.

Theme	Type of community acceptance
Economic	Income generation
	Return investment
Accessibility	Accessibility
Affordability	Affordability of rent and utilities
	Quality of electricity
	Quality of water supply
	Overall affordability
Resource efficiency	Efficiency of electricity usage
	Efficiency of water usage
	Efficiency due to housing design
	Waste management
Housing quality	Design adaptability
	Quality of the sanitation
Well-being and neighborhood quality	Quality of the housing
	Quality of the housing amenities
	Quality of the housing environment
	Overall quality of life
Community participation	Community engagement and planning

Table 1: Survey indicators for community acceptance.

5. Conclusion

There are both similarities and differences between community acceptance over resource efficiency within the same urban jurisdiction as shown by Rusun Urip Sumoharjo and Rusun Grudo. On the other hand, the citizen participation possible in both cases was determined more by the leadership in each housing complexes and the socio-economic opportunities generated by different local factors than by the influence of supra-local and global dynamics. The local enabling factors in the community-based planning, however, were influenced by supra-local and urban dynamics as the city introduced new urban development approaches through its planning programs.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the Environmental Research and Technology Development Fund (S16-4) of the Environmental Restoration and Conservation Agency of Japan.

References

- Alcorn, P.A. (2003) Social issues in technology: A format for investigation, 4th ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Assefa, Getachew, and Bjorn M. Frostell (2007) Social sustainability and social acceptance in technology assessment: A case study of energy technologies. *Technology in Society*, 29, pp. 63-78.
- Barrett, John, and Kate Scott (2012) Link between climate change mitigation and resource efficiency: A UK case study. *Global Environmental Change*, 22, pp. 299-307.
- Bicket, Martha, and Robin Vanner (2016) Designing policy mixes for resource efficiency: The role of public acceptability. *Sustainability* 2016, 8, pp. 1-17.
- Choguill, C. L. (2007) The search for policies to support sustainable housing. *Habitat International*, 31, pp. 143-149.
- Cooke, B., and U. Kothari (eds) (2001) Participation: The new tyranny? London: Zed Books.
- De Angelis, Massimo (2005) The political economy of neoliberal governance. *Review XXIII*, 3, pp. 229-257.
- Ekins, Paul (2004) Step changes for decarbonizing the energy system: Research needs for renewables, energy efficiency and nuclear power. *Energy Policy*, November 2004, pp. 1891-1904.
- Firman, Tommy. 2003. Potential Impacts of Indonesia's Fiscal Decentralization Reform on Urban and Regional Development: Towards a Pattern of Spatial Disparity. *Space and Polity*, 7(3), 247-71.
- Fournis, Yann, and Marie-Jose Fortin (2016) From social 'acceptance' to social 'acceptability' of wind energy projects: towards a territorial perspective. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 2016, pp. 1-21.
- Freire, Mila and Richard Stren (eds) (2001) *The challenge of urban government policies and practices*. World Bank Institute (WBI) development studies. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Geels, Frank W. (2013) The impact of the financial-economic crisis on sustainability transitions: Financial investment, governance and public discourse. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 6, March 2013, pp. 67-95.

- Gordillo, F., and N. Hernandez (2014) Sustainable urban housing: Strategies for implementation in Bogota. Poster presented at the Fourth World Sustainable Building, 28-30 October 2014, Barcelona. Accessible from http://wsb14barcelona.org/programme/pdf_poster/P-087.pdf (accessed 13 July 2018).
- Healey, Patsy (1997) Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Healey, Patsy (1999) Institutional analysis, communicative planning and shaping places. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 19, pp. 111-121.
- Ingram, Gregory K., and Yu-Hung Hong (2008) The Nexus of Fiscal Decentralization and Land Policies. In Ingram and Hong (eds.), *Fiscal Decentralization and Land Policies*. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, pp. 3-16.
- Ito, Takeshi. 2006. The Dynamics of Local Governance Reform in Decentralizing Indonesia: Participatory Planning and Village Empowerment in Bandung, West Java. *Asian and African Area Studies*, 5(2), pp. 137-83.
- Jowsey, E. (2012) *The contribution of housing to carbon emissions and the potential for reduction: Australia-UK comparison*. In: 18th Annual Pacific Rim Real Estate Society Conference, 15 - 18 January 2012, Adelaide, Australia.
- Koliba, Christopher, Jack W. Meek and Asim Zia. 2011. *Governance Networks in Public Administration and Public Policy*. Boca Raton, FL: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Local Development International (2013) *The role of decentralization/devolution in improving development outcomes at the local level: Review of the literature and selected case*. London: UK Department for International Development.
- Mahjabeen, Zeenat, Krishna K. Shrestha, and John A. Dee. (2009) Rethinking community participation in urban planning: the role of disadvantaged groups in Sydney Metropokitan Strategy. *Australian Journal of Regional Studies*, 15(1), pp. 45-63.
- Manor, James. 1999. *The Political Economy of Democratic Decentralization*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Rehman, I. H., A. Kar, M. Banerjee, P. Kumar, M. Shardul, and J. Mohanty (2012) Understanding the political economy and key drivers of energy access in addressing national energy access priorities and policies. *Energy Policy*, 47, pp. 27-37.
- Schade, Jens, and Bernhard Schlag (2003) Acceptability of urban transport pricing strategies. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behavior*, 6(1), March 2003, pp. 45-61.
- Seguin, Michel (2005) Solid waste or solidarity?, In Social Movements and Institutional Changes: Collective action in the age of globalization, Louis Guay, Pierre Hamel, Dominique Masson, and Jean-Guy Vaillancourt (eds), pp. 199-214. Quebec: Presses de l'Universite du Quebec.
- Shah, Anwar and Theresa Thompson (2004) Implementing decentralized local governance: Treacherous road with potholes, detours and road closures. *Policy Research Working Paper 3353*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Shrestha, K.K., and P. McManus (2008) The politics of community participation in natural resource management: lessons from community forestry in Nepal. *Australian Forestry*, 71(2), pp. 135-146.
- Steg, Linda, Lieke Dreijerink, and Wokje Abrahamse (2006) Why are energy policies acceptable and effective? *Environment and Behavior*, 38(1), January 2006, pp. 92-111.
- Steinberger, J., F. Krausmann, and N. Eisenmenger (2010) Global patterns of materials use: A socioeconomic and geophysical analysis. *Ecological Economics*, 65, pp. 636-649.

Szarka, Joseph (2007) *Wind power in Europe: Politics, business and society: Energy, climate and the environment series*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

UNGA (2016) *Draft outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III)*, A/CONF.226/4.

Walsh, C. L., R. J. Dawson, J. W. Hall, S. L. Barr, M. Batty, A. L. Bristow, S. Carney, A. S. Dagoumas, A. C. Ford, C. Harpman, M. R. Tight, H. Watters, and A. M. Zanni (2011) Assessment of climate change mitigation and adaptation in cities. *Urban Design and Planning*, 164, pp. 75-84.

Watson, Vanessa (2009) Seeing from the South: Refocusing urban planning on the globe's central urban issues. *Urban Studies*, 46(11), pp. 2259-2275.

World Bank (2011) *Green cities: Sustainable low-income housing in Brazil*.

Zimmerman, R. and C. Faris (2011) Climate change mitigation and adaptation in North American cities. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 3, pp. 181-187.

Wustenhagen, Rolf, Maarten Wolsink, and Mary Jean Burer (2007) Social acceptance of renewable energy innovation: An introduction to the concept. *Energy Policy*, 26 February 2007, pp. 2683-2691.